

COMMENTARIA IN QUARTUM LIBRUM SENTENTIARUM

Pars Prior

Commentary on the Fourth Book of the Sentences



WILLEM HESSELS VAN EST

GUIELMUS ESTIUS — 1542–1613

English translation, from the Douai 1615 edition

CONTENTS

DISTINCTIO 1	<i>On the institution, uses, and signification of the sacraments (*De institutione, usu, et significatione sacramentorum*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 2	<i>Whether John's baptism was a sacrament of the Old or of the New Law (*Baptismus Joannis utrum veteris an novae legis fuerit Sacramentum*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 3	<i>On the form of Baptism (*De forma Baptismi*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 4	<i>On the penalties remaining after Baptism and the complete remission of sins</i>
DISTINCTIO 5	<i>On the ministers of Baptism and the conferral of Baptism by others (*De ministris Baptismi et ab aliis collato*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 6	<i>On baptizing children against the will of their parents; on sponsors; and on the ceremonies of Baptism</i>
DISTINCTIO 7	<i>On Confirmation (*De confirmatione*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 8	<i>On the matter of the Eucharist (*De materia Eucharistiae*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 9	<i>On the modes of eating the Body of Christ, and that even the wicked receive it</i>
DISTINCTIO 10	<i>On the true and real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist (*De reali praesentia Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 11	<i>On the conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ (*De conversione panis et vini in Corpus et Sanguinem Christi*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 12	<i>On the sacramental species and their properties (*De speciebus sacramentalibus et earum idiomatibus*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 13	<i>Who is the minister of the sacrament of the Eucharist (*Quis sit minister Sacramenti Eucharistiae*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 14	<i>On the Sacrament of Penance (*De sacramento poenitentiae*)</i>

DISTINCTIO 15	<i>On the parts of Penance and in what sense they are the matter of the sacrament</i>
DISTINCTIO 16	<i>On the definition of contrition and its explication (*De contritionis definitione ejusque explicatione*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 17	<i>On the confession of sins (*De confessione peccatorum*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 18	<i>On the keys of the Church and the power of binding and loosing (*De clavibus Ecclesiae et potestate ligandi et solvendi*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 19	<i>On the power of the keys (*De potestate clavium*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 20	<i>On indulgences: their nature and perpetual use (*De indulgentiis, earum ratione ac perpetuo usu*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 21	<i>On Purgatory and suffrages for the dead (*De Purgatorio et suffragiis pro defunctis*)</i>
DISTINCTIO 22	<i>Whether sins once remitted return</i>

DISTINCTIO I — ON THE INSTITUTION, USES, AND SIGNIFICATION OF THE SACRAMENTS (*DE INSTITUTIONE, USU, ET SIGNIFICATIONE SACRAMENTORUM*)

§ 1. For since the soul is joined together with the body, in things sensible it offers to you things intelligible. Hence too it is that the Church sings not only concerning the incarnate Christ, but also concerning the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, before the Canon of the Mass, these words: "That while we acknowledge God visibly, by this we may be rapt into the love of things invisible." Hence also pertains what the Fathers of the Council of Trent testify, that human nature requires an external and visible sacrifice.⁶ For this is rightly extended in general to the Sacraments and to ceremonies. And this rationale is pursued by St. Dionysius the Areopagite, at the beginning of the book *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*.⁷

§ 2. Third, on account of exercise; for, as the Master says, in the Sacraments there is proposed to man a useful and health-giving exercise, by which they may avoid vain and harmful occupations. There are also other causes to be adjoined to the aforesaid. Therefore let the fourth cause be, that we might be moved to the things that are promised to us. For just as in the Old Law the Lord confirmed His promises, to be believed, by much variety of signs, lest that people should believe less the bare words of God; so also in the New Law, when Christ promised to us the forgiveness of sins, justice, the Holy Spirit, eternal life, He instituted certain signs set under the senses, by which we might hold Him as it were bound by pledges, and thus might not at all doubt that He would be faithful in His promises.

§ 3. Fifth, that we might use them as remedies of our sins, aids of our infirmity, and instruments of our sanctification—efficacious through the Passion of Christ. This indeed is the chief cause of the institution of the Sacraments of the New Law, and proper to them, which Ambrose commemorates in the book *On the Sacraments*, book 5, chapter 4, and St. Augustine in book 4 *Against the Donatists*, chapter 21 and the following.¹ And this use of the Sacraments is signified by this, that the evangelical Samaritan is read to have poured wine and oil upon the wounds of the half-dead man.

§ 4. Sixth, that the Sacraments might be certain badges and symbols by which the Society of the Faithful, bound together among themselves, might be distinguished from men of a different religion. For, as is found in St. Augustine, book 19 *Against Faustus*, chapter 11: "Into no name of religion, whether true or false, can men be compacted, unless they are gathered into some fellowship of visible seals or Sacraments."² Therefore the Sacraments of the true Religion accomplish both: for they both distinguish the Faithful from Unbelievers, and they themselves, the Faithful among themselves, they bind by a certain sacred bond of fellowship.

§ 5. Seventh, that by the Sacraments, as by certain visible voices, we may profess our faith in the sight of men; because, as the Apostle says (Rom. 10), "With the heart we believe unto justice; but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." And as this is fitting to be done with the mouth, so also by any other external signs whatsoever; most of all by those which are divinely instituted for signifying, as if they were

certain visible and tangible words; for so St. Augustine calls them, book 19 Against Faustus, chapter 16, and Tractate 80 on John.³ Since therefore the use of the Sacraments and the rationale of their institution is thus manifold, it is clear that those deserve to be condemned with anathema by the Fathers of the Council of Trent who say that the Sacraments of the New Law were instituted only for the nourishing of faith.⁴

§ III — Of what things the sacraments are signs (Sacramenta quarum rerum signa sint)

§ 6. From the Sacraments it pertains to Christian freedom not only to know that they are signs (*signa*), but also of what things they are signs, as St. Augustine teaches in book 3 of On Christian Doctrine. For when he had said (ch. 5) that it is a marvellous slavery of the soul to take signs for things, and not to be able to lift the eye of the mind above corporeal creation to draw in the eternal light—such was the servitude of the Jewish people under the Law—he adds (ch. 9) that he too "serves under a sign" who performs, or venerates, some signifying thing, not knowing what it signifies. But "he who either performs or venerates a useful sign divinely instituted, whose power and signification he understands, does not venerate that which is seen and passes away, but rather that to which all such things ought to be referred. And such a man is spiritual and free." So he. Nevertheless, he is far less subject to servitude who knows that those things which he venerates are signs, even if he does not attain their signification, than he who does not know even this. Whence Augustine subjoins at the end of the same chapter: "But he who does not understand what a sign signifies, and yet understands that it is a sign, he too is not pressed by servitude. For although there is some servitude in working, at another's prescription, what you do not understand—for a servant is he who knows not what his lord does (John 15)—yet he is not pressed by that servitude who at least knows that what he does is a sign, nor any sign whatsoever, but a sign of a sacred thing, and pertaining to your salvation." And those who understand these things Augustine (ch. 6 of the same book) testifies to be near to the spiritual. But in order that the Christian may be freed altogether from this servitude, it is necessary that he grasp the proper and distinct signification of the signs.

§ 7. Therefore, as regards the Sacraments (*Sacramenta*) of the New Law, in them a threefold signification is rightly established, as St. Thomas shows in III, q. 60, a. 3. First, they contain the commemoration of some past reality, such as the Incarnation, Passion, Death, Burial, Resurrection of Christ. Then they indicate present Grace (*gratia*), such as justice, the remission of sins, and the other gifts of God which he who uses the Sacraments receives. Third, they also foreshow something future; thus they announce beforehand our resurrection and eternal life. Among these three there is this difference: that past and future things are only signified; but the present thing—namely justifying Grace—is so signified that, by the very power of the same Sacraments, it is effected in the man who receives them.

§ 8. This threefold signification can be set forth in detail for each sacrament, but most of all in Baptism, the Eucharist, and Matrimony. Concerning Baptism, surely, the Apostle himself declares it (Rom. 6). For when he says: "All we who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized in His death," he shows Baptism to be such a sign as reminds us of the Lord's Passion and death. But when he subjoins: "For we are buried together with Him by baptism into death: that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life," he shows that by baptism there is signified the grace of renewal, which also it bestows. Finally, when he adds: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be

also of His resurrection," he signifies that Baptism too carries the likeness of our future resurrection and of eternal life. A similar exposition can be applied in the others.

§ IV — That the Sacraments of the New Law are efficacious signs of grace (Sacramenta novae Legis esse gratiae signa efficacia)

§ 9. What was said above, that the sacraments (*sacramenta*) of the New Law are not bare signs (*nuda signa*), but—by Christ's institution—efficacious of the grace (*gratia*) which they signify, must now be proved more fully; especially because this is with one voice denied by the sectarians of our time. But that we may prove this from Sacred Scripture, since this is not found so expressly said of the sacraments in general, one must use those testimonies which speak of the individual sacraments. And since this proof has the force of induction, it will bring no less certainty, and even more evidence, than if one single general sentence had set it forth.

§ 10. First, therefore, concerning Baptism these passages are to be noted: Jn. 5: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit." Eph. 5: "Cleansing it by the laver of water in the word." Tit. 3: "He saved us by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Spirit." Acts 2: "Let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins." Acts 22: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."

§ 11. Concerning Confirmation it is read in Acts 8: "Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Spirit." And again: "When Simon saw that by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Spirit was given..." Concerning the Sacrament of Reconciliation, Jn. 20: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them." Concerning Order the place is manifest (1 Tim. 4 and 2 Tim. 1): that grace was conferred by the imposition of the Apostle's hands. Concerning Extreme Unction James 5 speaks no less manifestly, according to the interpretation of the holy Fathers. In the Sacrament of the Eucharist it can be in no way doubted, among those who believe Christ Himself, the very fount of all graces, to be present in it, that the grace of sanctification is bestowed. And for the present let this proof from the Scriptures suffice. For a more exact discussion concerning each is reserved to their proper places.

§ 12. To these, moreover, there is added a confirmation from the Fathers. For Dionysius the Areopagite (in the last chapter of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy) attributes to the Mysteries—that is, to the sacraments—not only a mystical understanding, that is, signification, but also ways which, by God as author, have efficacy in them, that is, work efficaciously.⁹ Basil (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 12) says that there are two modes of salvation, cohering with each other and inseparable: Faith, and Baptism.¹⁰ Ambrose (On Penance II, ch. 2) testifies that by water sins are washed away, just as Naaman the Syrian by water was cleansed from leprosy, although before that seemed to him incredible.¹¹ Chrysostom (Hom. 24 on John) compares the water of baptism to seed, to which there is divinely implanted a power for the formation of the thing that is to arise from it. And again (Hom. 35) by the likeness of the pool Probatica, whose water, when stirred by an Angel, healed the sick, he declares the power of baptism.¹²

§ 13. Augustine (on Ps. 73) asserts that the Sacraments of the New Testament give salvation. And in the Enchiridion (ch. 66) he calls these same sacraments saving, and says that by them there is done and effected that which avails and profits unto the world to come.¹³ And in book 19 Against Faustus (ch. 11), speaking of the sacraments: "Their power," he says, "is ineffably of the greatest avail; therefore, if despised, it makes men sacrilegious. For that is impiously despised, without which piety cannot be perfected." Likewise (ch. 13, and

also On Christian Doctrine, book 3, ch. 9) he attributes power to the sacraments.¹⁴ Again (ch. 16 of the same book Against Faustus) he says thus: "The power which works through these remains continually, and the spiritual gift which is insinuated through these is eternal."¹⁵ The same author (On the Remission of Sins, book 2, ch. 12) says that by the power of the sacrament it comes about that an infant is numbered among the faithful.¹⁶ And (Against Cresconius, book 3, ch. 8) he compares the sacraments to fields, which by their very nature bear fruit with the labor of the worker applied, whether he be good or evil.¹⁷

§ 14. Public, too, is that sentence of Augustine (from Tractate 80 on John): "The word comes to the element, and it becomes a sacrament"; and again: "What is water without the word but water? The word comes to the element, and it becomes a sacrament"; and again: "How should it touch the body and wash the heart, unless the word be doing it?"¹⁸ Prosper subscribes to Augustine, saying thus (in the Letter to Demetrias): "One thing is that which is done visibly, another that which is celebrated invisibly. Nor is the form the same in a sacrament as the power; since the form is exhibited by the service of human ministry, but the power is bestowed by the effect of the divine work. To whose twofold efficacy must be referred this, that when the exterior man is washed, the interior is changed, and from the old is made a new creature; the vessels of wrath are transferred into vessels of mercy, and the flesh of sin is converted into the Body of Christ." Thus he.¹⁹ And, to pass over the remaining multitude of Doctors, we will subjoin the judgments of two supreme and most learned Pontiffs together with the definition of two general Councils.

§ 15. Leo the First (Sermon 2 on the Nativity of the Lord) testifies that the power of the Most High works through water unto regeneration, just as it worked unto the conception of Christ.²⁰ And (Letter 91 to Theodorus) that by the supplications of the priests in the sacrament of penance the penitent is cleansed and absolved.²¹ Speaking more generally, Nicholas the First (in the Rescript to the Questions of the Bulgars) says that in the sacrament there is a cleansing from all contagions.²² The Councils in question are Florence and Trent: the former (in the Decree transmitted to the Armenians) defines that the sacraments of the New Law confer grace; the latter (Session 7, by several canons) confirms this very point, affirming that the sacraments of the New Law contain grace and that they confer it on those who do not place an obstacle, even by the work worked.²³

§ 16. Lastly there accrues the most constant tradition of the Church concerning the baptism of infants as infallibly efficacious for the deletion of original sin. And these few things out of many (for otherwise the testimonies of the Fathers—especially concerning the baptism both of adults and of infants—are without number) have here been brought to prove in general that the sacraments effect the grace which they signify. But this doctrine will become clearer from those things which still remain to be said, namely, concerning the mode of causing grace, concerning the work worked, and concerning the difference between the sacraments of the Old and of the New Law.

§ V — How the sacraments are a cause of grace (*Quomodo Sacramenta sint causa gratiae*)

§ 17. Among orthodox theologians it is an undoubted common doctrine that the sacraments of the New Law bestow or confer the grace (*gratia*) which they signify, and that they in some way cause it under the genus of efficient cause (*causa efficiens*); yet not a little is disputed among them concerning the mode of causing. Now that diversity of opinions can be referred to two general modes. For some wish the sacraments to be

instruments (*instrumenta*) properly so called of God as the principal cause for the bringing-forth of grace, and therefore they ascribe to them some power such as is fitting to an instrumental cause, inasmuch as it is moved by the principal agent. This is the opinion of St. Thomas and of his followers, although they vary in defending it. But others neither acknowledge in the sacraments the notion of instrument properly so called, that is, a physical instrument, nor think that any created power inheres in them by which they produce the effect of grace; rather they say that the sacraments are efficacious signs of grace only to this extent, because the divine power assists the sacraments, for the producing of the effect of grace, certainly and infallibly by the promise of Christ—so, namely, that they have the character of a cause sine qua non, or rather of an instrumental cause taken in a general way, which they call a moral instrument. This opinion is taught by Scotus, Henry of Ghent, St. Bonaventure, Durandus, Alexander of Hales, and many others for the most part, although they themselves also do not fully agree in expounding this opinion. We, after producing the arguments of each party, will point out what can be said as probable.

§ 18. The following seem to favor the former opinion. First, the definitions of sacrament handed down by Hugh and by the Master and elsewhere commonly approved, which attribute to the sacraments a true character of cause with respect to the grace signified by them; whereas a cause sine qua non, as such, can only be said to be a cause in an improper and, as they say, abusive sense.²⁵ Secondly, almost all those things by which a little above we showed that a spiritual effect is conferred through the sacraments—since the preposition "through" (Latin: *per*), which both Scripture and the Fathers employ in many places for designating the efficacy of a sacrament, is wont to be that of an instrumental cause. Thirdly, that the Fathers openly attribute to the sacraments force, power, efficiency, and in general causation—which, besides the testimonies cited above, is also shown by the following. St. Augustine, in Epistle 23 to Boniface, attributes the power of regeneration to baptism; and a little later he bears witness that, just as the Holy Spirit, so also water is the cause of our regeneration—insinuating that the former is the principal cause, but the latter an instrumental one.²⁶ Bede, on Luke 3, says: "Christ, by the touch of His most pure flesh, conferred a regenerating power upon the waters."²⁷ St. John Chrysostom, Homily 25 on John, says: "The water of baptism brings forth rational souls." And again: "Never could the water of baptism cleanse the sins of believers unless it had been sanctified by the touch of the Lord's Body." Which sentence has been related in the Decretum by Gratian, De Consecratione, Distinction 4, chapter Numquam.²⁸ St. Cyril of Alexandria, book 2 on John, chapter 42, uses this comparison: that just as water heated more intensely by the forces of fire burns, not otherwise than by the power of the fire; so water, receiving within itself the power of the Holy Spirit, washes away sins.²⁹ And St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catechesis 3): "As the things which are offered upon altars, although by nature they are pure, by the invocation of demons are made impure; so, on the contrary, simple water, having received by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, of Christ, and of the Father a power, attains sanctity."³⁰

§ 19. Fourthly, they wish this to be signified by the words of the Council of Florence and especially of the Council of Trent, in which (Session 7, both in the proem and in canons 6, 7, 8 on the sacraments) these three are said: that the sacraments contain grace; that the sacraments confer grace; that through the sacraments grace and justice are given. Likewise (canon 1 on Baptism) it is denied that the baptism of John had the same power as the baptism of Christ. And concerning Confirmation (canon 2) it is thus decreed: "If anyone shall say that they are injurious to the Holy Spirit who attribute any power to the sacred chrism of Confirmation, let him be anathema." Likewise also (chapter 4, Session 14) it is taught that by the force of the words of consecration the Body of Christ is under the species of bread and the Blood under the species of wine.³¹

§ 20. A fifth argument is taken from this, that all agree that the sacraments confer grace from the work worked (*ex opere operato*). This also the Fathers of the Council of Trent defined (canon 8 on the sacraments). A sixth is taken from the difference between the sacraments of the Old and of the New Law, which they think does not stand unless to the sacraments of the New Law there be attributed the proper notion of instrumental cause and a power fitting such a cause. A seventh is of this sort: the sacraments are operative signs; therefore operation belongs to them, and consequently some operative principle.

§ 21. Eighth: Christ through His humanity, as an instrument conjoined to Himself, was for us the cause of grace, because the flesh of Christ, as Damascene bears witness, was the instrument of the divinity. Likewise, by His word which He said, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," He used it as an instrument for conferring upon the paralytic the grace of remission: therefore by equal reason it is not to be denied that He uses the sacraments instituted by Himself for the sanctification of men as instruments properly so called for that effect.³²

§ 22. Ninth: Just as it is said (Rev. 1) that Christ "washed us from our sins in His blood," and (Rev. 5) that He "redeemed us in His blood," and (Rev. 7) of the martyrs, that "they washed their stoles in the blood of the Lamb," and (1 John 1) that "the blood of Christ cleanses us from every sin"; so (Eph. 5) it is said that Christ "cleanses His Church with the washing of water in the word." Wherefore, if in those we rightly acknowledge an instrumental causality, then also in the water of baptism and in the other sacraments.

§ 23. Lastly: if they do not operate sacramentally for the sanctification of man, but only thus because God infallibly assists them to this effect; therefore they confer grace no otherwise than an evil sign inflicts harm—namely, with the demon, for doing harm, infallibly assisting by pact.

§ 24. But the latter opinion they confirm by these arguments for the most part, partly their own, partly directly pertaining to enervate the former. First, they use the authority of the Fathers, Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. For Augustine (book 83 of Questions) says that there are certain things which God effects by Himself, such as to illumine souls and to bestow grace. And (Epistle 23), when he says that water exhibits outwardly the sacrament of grace, and that the Holy Spirit working inwardly the benefit of grace regenerates man in Christ, he seems tacitly to remove from the water the internal operation of grace. Gregory, moreover (on chapter 16 of the fourth book of Kings), at the words, "The Spirit of the Lord came upon David," writes that the sacraments are so called because the divine power under the coverings of bodily things effects salvation. Similar words of his are covertly cited (1, question 1, chapter Multi secularium). And Bernard (Sermon 1 on the Lord's Cana, near the end): "As," he says, "a Canon is invested by a book, an Abbot by a staff, a Bishop by a ring," so also the sacraments of the New Law are delivered by sensible things: wherefore, as in a book, a staff, a ring, no power is to be posited; so neither in the sacraments.³³

§ 25. Secondly, thus they argue. To create is so proper to God that it can be communicated to no creature, not even as an instrument—as even St. Thomas concedes and proves—whose reason is that an instrument cannot be elevated to the work of an artificer unless it can have some proper action about the same matter. But since creation is from nothing, and a creature cannot be applied to nothing, it follows that a creature itself cannot be an instrument of creation. But grace, since it is a certain spiritual and supernatural form, just as the rational soul, and therefore cannot be educed from the potency of matter, exists only through creation. Therefore the sacraments are not instruments properly so called for producing grace.³⁴

§ 26. Thirdly: The power which is posited in the sacraments is either material or spiritual; if material, it will not be able to produce in the soul of man a spiritual effect; if spiritual, it cannot exist in a material subject,

such as the sacraments are. Fourthly: If a created power inheres in the sacraments, then either it inheres in the matter of the sacrament, or in the form, or in the whole composite—of which none seems able to be said. Not the first, because matter is the more ignoble part of the sacrament, nor could it receive that power except through the form, nor finally is it capable of it, unless we posit also a material and extended power—as already has been argued. Not the second, because the form is constituted by words, which are in continuous succession, and therefore incapable of a spiritual power, which must exist whole at once, because it has no parts. Nor the third, because the whole cannot receive that power except by reason of the parts—especially since it is not a whole simply, but one only by aggregation.

§ 27. Fifthly: If there exists in the water of baptism any sanctifying power, then in the matter of the remaining sacraments also a like power must be acknowledged. But to declare this about each sacrament is indeed most difficult and altogether improbable—especially in the sacraments of Penance and of Matrimony. In the sacrament of the Eucharist it cannot at all be said, since its matter ceases to be by the consecration. Sixthly: If there is any such power, it is asked how baptism sanctifies one who approached without faith, and afterwards is converted, and thus by baptism receives the remission of original sin; since it cannot be said, the action of baptism once completed, that its power lasts even to the conversion of the man.

§ 28. Lastly, other things also can be asked, the most difficult of which will be the explanation; for example, to what genus of accidents that power should be referred, when it begins, how long it lasts, whether it is of a permanent or a successive nature, in what manner it is applied to the soul and flows into it—and this for each sacrament in particular—and other things of this kind. These, to be sure, set forth briefly, show sufficiently the difficulty of the question, to which therefore, replying point by point, we say as follows.

§ 29. First, that this question has been defined neither in the Council of Trent nor in any prior decree of the Church. For the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 7), where the sacraments are treated, although they use those most received locutions among all Catholics—"that the sacraments contain grace," and "confer grace," and "that by the sacraments grace is given"—yet they carefully abstained from the words instrument, cause, power, efficiency. But in canon 2 on Confirmation they do not define that any power inheres in the chrism, but only condemn with anathema those who, asserting this, say that they are injurious to the Holy Spirit. Whence it is sufficiently evident that the Fathers prudently passed over this question in silence and wished to refrain from defining it; just as it is clear that they did so in many other points dubious and controverted among Catholics.³⁵

§ 30. Secondly, we say that the latter opinion has been and is the common sentence among Scholastic Doctors, as St. Bonaventure bears witness (on the last Distinction of book 3 of the Sentences), and as Domingo Soto confesses on the present Distinction, saying that it is the opinion of almost all the later Doctors, even of the Neoterics (question 3, articles 1 and 4).³⁶

§ 31. Thirdly, although we cannot comprehend the former way of speaking by reason, nevertheless it does not seem impossible if we consider the omnipotence of God, as Bonaventure confesses in the same place, and after him Richard (article 1), although others deny it to be possible with reasons not to be despised.³⁷

§ 32. Fourthly, the same can seem the more probable if we attend to some Patristic sentences as they sound, because without doubt all attribute a virtue to the sacraments—though not at all explaining it.

§ 33. Fifthly, the latter opinion is the more probable if we consult reason; as the lengthy arguments set above prove, and others adduced by the Scholastic Doctors, which most especially are to be seen in Scotus and

Durandus (on this Distinction), and in St. Bonaventure both on the present Distinction and on the last Distinction of the preceding book. Whence the same Bonaventure declares the former way of speaking to be sufficiently pious, but the latter sufficiently sober—namely, that the former attributes much to the sacraments, but this latter only so much as suffices for piety and agrees with reason.

§ 34. Finally, the arguments of either party can be probably dissolved. And indeed those of the first in this way. First: the sacraments can be understood to be causes of grace in a general mode of causality, because they are signs, not bare nor empty, but efficacious. Efficacious, I say, in the genus of signs, that is, such signs as at once exhibit the thing signified—whether they properly effect it, or only be such that, they being posited, the thing itself which they signify, by some definite ordination, is infallibly present to be had. In the way that a leaden token, instituted by a king so that whoever brings it should receive a hundred gold pieces, can be said in a general way to be a cause of that reception; which mode is not alien to the custom of common speech. And as by such a sign someone is rightly said to receive a hundred gold pieces, so also by the sacraments grace in both cases, as by instruments not altogether properly so called, but by an extended name of instrument to everything which someone uses in any way for effecting something. For the Fathers, when they speak of spiritual and supernatural things in the manner of bodily and natural things, do not always use words properly, but often extend them to some more general signification: thus also the virtue and efficiency which they attribute to the sacraments can be understood as the efficacious ordination of something to something, so that, namely, this being posited, that also, to which it is ordained, is certainly posited. Whence, just as the sign of which we were speaking is said to be worth a hundred gold pieces on account of such an ordinance of the king, so much more are the sacraments said to have force and power for exhibiting grace on account of the most certain and infallible divine ordination. Or certainly—which amounts almost to the same thing—the virtue which the Fathers acknowledge in the sacraments can be understood as the divine virtue of the sacraments. For even to certain other ceremonies and sacred things not having a definite promise the speech of the faithful, and indeed of the Church herself, is wont to attribute a virtue: of which kind are holy water, the Agnus Dei, ashes, branches, bells, and other things consecrated by the prayers of the Church. Likewise the relics of the Saints, the sign of the Cross and the like. Plainly indeed in the blessing of water "virtue" is named, when it is said: "deign to pour into this element the virtue of Thy blessing." Nay and the water of baptism is consecrated for that use long before it is applied to the actual use, the priest praying: "May the virtue of the Holy Spirit descend into this water." And yet no one will think that any inherent virtue lies hidden in it which continuously endures until the water perishes. And Scripture too employs "virtue" in this manner, as in 2 Maccabees 3, where Heliodorus recognizes that "in the temple there is a certain true virtue of God." Nor is it dissimilar what in 1 Corinthians 14 the Apostle says: "If I shall not know the virtue of the voice," that is, the signification attributed to a voice by the will of men, which nevertheless posits in the voice no quality or real accident. And that which (chapter 15) is said: "The virtue of sin is the law," on account of the mere occasion of sin from the law. But what is brought from the catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem rather helps a different opinion. For the things which are offered to idols are not in very deed imbued with some quality by which they exist impure inwardly, but are called impure on account of the impious and sacrilegious invocation made over them, in which way also the earth is said to be contaminated by the sins of men.³⁸

§ 35. To that which is objected from the Councils of Florence and Trent, it is now plain what must be answered. For the sacraments confer grace, because they not only signify it, but also bring it with them and present it, from the infallible divine ordination. How, moreover, they are said to contain grace, and to give it

from the work worked (*ex opere operato*), we shall later say in its place; as also how this opinion does not clash with the difference between the sacraments of the New and of the Old Law.

§ 36. To the seventh, it is answered: if the sacraments are sometimes called "operative," they are thus called on account of the operation of the assisting virtue. To the eighth: neither the humanity of Christ, nor His word, according to this opinion, was an instrument properly so called for the effect of grace; although it was rightly said by Damascene that the humanity of Christ was the instrument of the divinity; and the same humanity is also rightly recognized as the meritorious cause of our justice and of the remission of sins, inasmuch as, namely, in it and according to it Christ suffered and died for our salvation. Whence also the reply to the ninth is evident.³²

§ 37. To the last we can reply: although the demon in some measure imitates the divine, so as to seem like God, nevertheless he is able to do nothing supernaturally in those his sacraments, or upon them, as God does; indeed by the mere nod of God all his sacrilegious pacts can be dissolved, so that his assistance is by no means certain. Yet that there is something similar in the signs instituted by the demon and the sacraments instituted by God, Augustine bears witness in book 83 of Questions, question 79.³⁹

§ 38. The arguments that were set forth for the other side perhaps can be dissolved in this way. The words produced from Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard do not prove their point. For Augustine in both places wishes only this, that God alone is the primary author of internal illumination and of grace, not denying meanwhile that for producing those effects He can use instruments outwardly applied. Gregory also, saying what is less, does not deny that which is greater—perhaps tempering his speech because he was not speaking of the sacraments specifically so called. Bernard, moreover, adduces that likeness of book, staff, and ring not for this purpose, to show in what manner the sacraments concur to the spiritual effect, but only to teach that the divisions of graces are attributed to different sacraments.

§ 39. To the second it can be answered that, since grace is not some substance, it is not properly created but "concreated," as they say, that is, produced with the subject, or in the subject, although not from the potency of matter. But a sacrament can have some proper action about the subject—as, for example, water about a man—namely, the very external washing; by the mediation of which, as the proper action of the instrument, God ineffably cleans the soul inwardly from sins and sanctifies it by the gift of grace.

§ 40. To the remaining objections Cajetan and Domingo [Soto] respond—and that sufficiently according to the mind of St. Thomas—that the power which is posited in a sacrament, since it is not a principal power, but only instrumental, is not any abiding [power], but an incomplete and passing [one] from one [thing] into another: namely, the motion by which the sacramental action is produced by the principal agent through his minister with the intention of effecting that for which the sacrament is instituted—as, for example, in baptism the very washing and the utterance of the words done with the intention of the Church. For since there is a twofold motion of an instrument—one proper to the instrument itself, as "to cut"; another the motion of the instrument by the craftsman, as "to cut" suitably to the work of the craftsman—the latter includes the former and informs it. And such a motion they wish to be the power which they attribute to the sacraments. Which explanation, although it seems to have some probability, nevertheless by no means fully satisfies the reasons brought on the contrary.⁴⁰

§ VI — In what sense the sacraments are said to contain grace (Sacramenta quo sensu Gratiam continere dicantur)

§ 41. That in the Councils of Florence and Trent it was defined that the sacraments of the New Law contain grace (*gratia*), seems to have been taken from Hugh of St. Victor, book 1 of *On the Sacraments*, p. 9, ch. 2, where he says that the sacraments of the New Law, by a sanctification, contain some invisible and supernatural grace; and ch. 3, where he attests that in the sacraments, as in certain little vessels, spiritual antidotes are handed to man.⁴² And hence it is that by others the sacraments have also been called vessels of grace. But in what sense each has been said, is asked.

§ 42. St. Thomas answers, III, q. 62, a. 3, that the sacraments contain grace, because grace is in them, not as in a place, nor as in a subject, nor yet as in a principal cause (*causa principalis*), but partly as in a sign (*signum*), partly as in an instrumental cause (*causa instrumentalis*), as was explained a little before. And as to the former mode there is no doubt at all; for that the sacraments are signs of grace is agreed among all. But, as is clear from what was said above, others do not admit the latter mode, except in so far as the signification of instrument is extended also to the efficacy of the signs of things. And certainly, more probably according to the mind of Hugh, the sacraments are said to contain grace and to be vessels of grace because they not only signify grace, but also provide it whenever one has recourse to them; just as some vessel provides to the man drawing from it the liquid which it contains within itself. To this Scripture bears on, Is. 12: "You shall draw waters from the fountains of the Savior," as from vessels and from fountains or wells that contain living water.⁴³ For they have not therefore been called vessels of grace because they are instruments of grace—by a Hebrew turn of phrase, namely, in which vessel stands at times in Sacred Scripture for the instrument of any work—although St. Thomas interprets it so;⁴⁴ but because grace is sought from them and, as it were, drawn out. For it is manifest from that very place that Hugh understood thus—which the very word "to contain" signifies.

§ VII — To what extent the sacraments are said to avail by the work worked (Ex opere operato quatenus valere dicantur sacramenta)

§ 43. The phrase has been accepted among the Scholastics that the sacraments of the new law (*sacramenta novae legis*) confer grace by the work worked (*ex opere operato*). This expression is found neither in Sacred Scripture nor in the writings of the Ancients, indeed it began to be used for the first time not long before the times of St. Thomas Aquinas, as is gathered from his writing on the Fourth Book (In IV Sentences, dist. 1, q. 1, art. 5) — for in his *Summa* he does not mention it — yet it is altogether to be received, after the Fathers of the Council of Trent (canon 8 on the sacraments) defined that by the sacraments of the new law grace is conferred by the work worked.⁴⁶ Now that phrase is plainly in agreement with the things said above about the efficacy of the sacraments. And although it is not read expressly among the Ancients, nevertheless it cannot be denied that the very reality has been sufficiently explained by them. For this is shown clearly by the authorities adduced in their proper place (from Dionysius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Prosper, and others).⁴⁷ For Augustine also used a similar phrase signifying precisely the same thing in book 4 against the Donatists, chapter 24, saying that the sacrament itself by itself avails much — which assuredly is nothing other than to avail by the work worked.⁴⁸ But since he said this about circumcision, it is much more to be transferred to the sacraments of the new law. To the same point tends what is found in the same author, book 3 against Cresconius, chapter 8, where he compares the sacraments to fields which by their own nature bear fruit when

the labor of a worker is applied, whatever at length that worker may have been.⁴⁹ Whence also Innocent III, who preceded St. Thomas by almost fifty years, employed this phrase, as it appears, when it had arisen in his time or not long before, and by employing it approved it, in his book 3 On the Mystery of the Holy Altar, chapter 5.⁵⁰ Its force, then, must be explained by us.

§ 44. First, one must know that by this phrase it is not meant to posit in the sacraments a natural power to produce such an effect. For unless they had been divinely instituted and ordained to such an effect, they would avail nothing of the sort, no more than any other outward actions. Indeed, with the divine institution set aside, it would be superstitious to expect infallibly from actions of this kind some supernatural effect.

§ 45. Next, it must not be thought that the sacraments avail by divine institution in such a way as to require in the recipient no preparation, no good movement of heart — a sense of this locution which the heretics have falsely fastened upon the Catholics, chiefly on the occasion of certain words of Gabriel Biel on the Fourth Book of the Sentences (dist. 1, q. 3), where he says thus: "The sacrament is said to confer grace from the sign itself, as others say, from the work worked; so that by that very fact that that work, to wit the sacrament, is administered, unless the obstacle of mortal sin impede, they confer grace; so that, besides the outward administration of the sign administered, an interior good movement in the recipient is not required." But in the words immediately following the Author explains himself, adding: "Whereby one merits grace de condigno or de congruo." Therefore he only denies that an interior good movement is required which would have the character (*ratio*) of merit with respect to the sacramental effect; as the same Doctor more plainly declares (lect. 87 on the Canon of the Mass).⁵¹ And it is the constant doctrine of all the Scholastics that the sacraments are not to be dispensed to those who are unwilling to withdraw from sins or to abandon unbelief. Whence it is manifest that, according to the doctrine of the Schools, a movement of faith and of penance is required in the recipient, infants meanwhile excepted, for whom both are supplied by the faith and piety of Mother Church. And the Fathers of the Council of Trent openly repel this calumny of the heretics from the Church (session 14, ch. 4) in these words: "Wherefore certain men falsely calumniate Catholic writers, as though they had handed down that the sacrament of penance without a good movement in the recipients confers grace — which the Church of God has never taught nor thought."⁵²

§ 46. Thirdly, nor is this signified by that phrase, that there inheres in the sacraments, or is present in them, some created power by which they operate the mystical effect. For that this is not signified thereby is clear, because both those who do not acknowledge that power and those who posit it commonly embrace this form of locution. Likewise, the one is a defined point, the other a matter for debate.

§ 47. Therefore, to avail by the work worked is to avail by the very fact that such a work is done — not, to be sure, insofar as it is a certain natural action, as has been said, but insofar as, for the effect of grace, it has a divine institution and an infallible promise. Now since that promise is conditional, requiring in adults due preparation, by no means does it follow, from that phrase rightly understood, that in the mind of Catholics the sacraments avail even without a good movement on the part of the recipient.

§ 48. And that this may become clearer, one must know that "work worked" (*opus operatum*) is said in distinction from "work working" (*opus operans*). This latter, however, can be understood in a twofold way: of the minister, or of the recipient. For the sacraments do not avail by the work — that is, by the faith or devotion — of the minister, as Augustine teaches in many places against the Donatists.⁵³ Nor yet by the work of the recipient. For although in the recipient, if he has the use of reason, a certain preparation through faith

and penance is necessary — and that from the very institution of the sacraments — nevertheless from this the sacraments do not borrow their power and efficacy, but they receive it from Him by whom they were instituted.

§ 49. However, some think that "work worked" is said properly in order to be distinguished from the "work working" of the minister, as though that phrase was first devised against the error of the Donatists, who wished the effect of the sacrament to depend on the merit of the minister; and in this way, without doubt, Innocent III understood it in book 3 (ch. 5) of *On the Mystery of the Holy Altar*. For when he had said of the Sacrament of the Body of Christ: "Because it is not by the merit of the priest, but is consecrated by the word of the Creator; therefore the iniquity of the priest does not impede the effect of the sacrament, just as neither does the weakness of the physician corrupt the virtue of the medicine." Then he concludes: "Although therefore the work of the worker is sometimes unclean, nevertheless the work worked is always clean."⁵⁰

§ 50. Others, however, prefer to understand by "worker" him who receives the sacrament. From whose work the sacrament does not avail, although his preparatory work is required in order that the effect of the sacrament may be obtained, as we were just saying. And this antithesis between the work worked and the work working, or rather of the worker, the Scholastic Doctors for the most part have had in view when they dispute about the sacraments.

§ 51. That we may understand, therefore, how the matter stands, set, for example, two persons equally prepared for receiving baptism through faith and penance, of whom the one receives baptism, the other does not yet receive it. Of these, indeed, he who receives the sacrament will at the same time obtain its effect, to wit, the grace of sanctification and the remission of sins, which he does not obtain who does not receive the sacrament. But this is proved more manifestly by the example of infants, who, since they are equally infected with sin and can contribute nothing on their own part to their justification, nevertheless of them the one alone, because he is baptized, obtains righteousness and salvation, the other perishing without baptism. Again, if you set two adults, both prepared indeed for the grace of baptism but unequally, both would receive an equal grace, so far as is on the part of the sacrament, if both be baptized; although he who approaches more prepared will, besides, receive something more, according to the measure of his preparation and devotion.

§ VIII — That the use of the Sacrament is not the same as that of the Gospel (Non eumdem usum esse Sacramenti & Evangelii)

§ 52. They teach that the use of the sacraments (*sacramentum*) is the same as that of the Gospel (*Evangelium*), and therefore they are unwilling to ascribe a man's sanctification to the sacrament otherwise than to the word of the Gospel; because, they say, just as the sacrament, so the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes.⁵⁴ But by those things which up to this point have been said about the efficacy of the sacraments, this new doctrine is sufficiently refuted. And from these points one can gather a manifold difference between the sacrament and the Gospel as regards the effect of sanctification. First, because the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation only to the believer, whereas the sacrament is so even to him who does not believe, and who is not able to believe, namely the infant; for what certain adversaries have dared to say, that infants also believe and understand the sanctification of the mysteries of baptism, the Spirit of Christ moving them within, is too absurd to need to be refuted by arguments; although long ago St. Augustine rejected that absurdity.⁵⁵

§ 53. Second, because the Gospel is unto salvation only by the mediation of the apprehension of its signification—for faith is from hearing⁵⁶—whereas the sacrament, by Christ's institution, works salvation even if the one who receives it does not grasp the force of its signification, indeed even if he neither hears the words nor sees the external element, as happens in infants, the deaf, the blind, the insane; and it is impious to say that the sacrament is of no avail to such. Wherefore neither is it necessary, in order to obtain the effect of the sacrament, that it be administered in a language understood by the common people, as the heretics—relying on the same false principle and drawing error from error—wrongly contend. For the sacraments work just as did that voice of the Lord: "Lazarus, come forth," and that: "Young man, I say to thee, arise," by whose power those persons—neither hearing nor understanding—were raised from the dead.⁵⁷ And although Augustine said, "What are all the bodily sacraments but, so to say, visible words?" he nevertheless does not require their understanding on the part of the recipient, but commends their power in the following words: "Yet the power which works by means of these remains continually, and the spiritual gift which is insinuated by these is eternal." Therefore the sacraments indeed signify what they effect; but the effect of them does not depend on an understanding of the signification.¹⁵

§ 54. Third, because no adult and one having the use of reason is admitted to the sacraments unless he believes and professes that he believes; but the Gospel, according to the Lord's precept, is to be preached to every creature, to the unbeliever, that he may believe, and to the believer, that he may be confirmed in what he believes. Whence, for hearing the Gospel salutarily, no prior disposition is necessary, since by the preaching of the evangelical word this is brought about, that, God working within, unbelievers may believe and the wicked be converted, or be disposed to these very things.

§ 55. Finally, because from God's promise the effect of the sacrament is sure and infallible, provided it be administered to him to whom, according to Christ's institution, it ought to be administered. But so it is not with the effect of the word preached, even if it be preached to those to whom God has appointed it to be preached. For the word does not have a promise as the sacrament has. Nor has it been said, Whoever shall have heard will believe, as it has been said, "He who shall have believed and been baptized shall be saved," and, "Whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them." Rather, concerning some who heard it is said: "The word heard did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in those who heard."⁵⁸

§ IX — Other errors concerning the power and use of the sacraments are refuted (Alii errores circa vim et usum sacramentorum refelluntur)

§ 56. From what the Church teaches, that the sacraments avail for a man's justification by the work wrought (*ex opere operato*), the Sectarians variously depart, although agreeing in this, that a man is justified not by the power of words and of a ceremony exhibited outwardly, but by faith alone. For, besides the error which we have just refuted, some utterly separate justification itself from the sacrament, asserting it to be prior to the use of the sacrament—obtained, to wit, by faith, whereby a man has already beforehand believed that his sins are remitted to him; but that afterwards the sacrament is applied, in order that by the word indeed of promise (for thus they speak) faith may be confirmed, and by the element, as by a certain seal appended to a diploma, the same thing may be sealed; and thus by the sacraments it is declared and attested that the man had already previously been justified by faith. And this is almost the doctrine of the Calvinists concerning the use of the sacrament. The Lutherans, however, recede less in appearance from the Church's position. For they teach

that, when the sacrament is set forth, a man's faith is stirred up by the word of the promise and by the external symbol of the element; further, that the word of the promise is apprehended by faith, and that by its power a man is justified. And therefore they are willing that a man be not justified before the sacrament, but at that time when the sacrament is applied. In this last part they agree with the Catholics. Lastly, there are some who, thinking that the sacraments pertain nothing at all to the business of justification, judge them to be nothing else than badges of Christian profession, by which Christ's faithful are distinguished from unbelievers before men, just as, they say, the Romans were distinguished from the Greeks by the toga. Of these opinions, the first openly clashes with the doctrine of the Church which above we set forth concerning the power and efficacy of the sacraments. For from that doctrine it is clear that by the sacraments, and in the sacraments themselves, not before the sacraments, a man is justified.

§ 57. Next, if the sacraments are only certain seals that seal the faith received, it will follow that they are by no means necessary for salvation: since there is no need of such a sealing, neither with God, who by no seal has to be reminded so as to remember what He has promised us; nor among men, for whom such a seal cannot bring it about that faith be accounted for received justice, any more than if, without it, they heard a bare confession of the mouth. But from the Gospel we say that certain sacraments are necessary for salvation, the Lord saying: "Unless a man be born again," etc. (Jn. 3). Wherefore with good reason the Council of Trent condemned this error (Session 7, canon 6), in which it says anathema to those who wish the sacraments of the law to be only external signs of grace or justice received by faith—passing over other canons in which it is clearly defined that by the sacraments grace is conferred, and that some of them are necessary for salvation.⁵⁹

§ 58. The second opinion nevertheless, from the things which have been said about the power of the sacraments, is easily refuted; and it also destroys itself. For the faith by which they say that a man is justified by apprehending the word of promise, according to them is none other than that special faith by which they believe that their sins have been remitted to them on account of Christ. Wherefore, if that is true (as it must be true, if it deserve the name of faith), it cannot be separated from the remission of sins. Since therefore no one ought to approach a sacrament without prior faith, it most certainly follows, according to this same doctrine, that remission of sins is prior to the sacrament. Whence it is evident that the Authors of this opinion fall into the earlier opinion—and into the same absurdity—even against their will; and on that account can easily be refuted by the same arguments.

§ 59. Yet neither are proper arguments lacking by which they may be convicted. For if the sacrament avails only for stirring up faith, by which, the word of promise having been apprehended, we are justified: first, it will follow that little children are baptized to no purpose, in whom no movement of faith can exist. But this is against the most well-founded tradition of the Church concerning the baptism of infants, and it paves the way for the error of the Anabaptists; and, lest we devise something peculiar about infants, it is also established that sacraments were long ago conferred upon adults destitute of the use of reason, as Augustine bears witness concerning baptism (Confessions, book 4, ch. 4), and Leo concerning reconciliation (Epistle 91 to Theodorus). Secondly, it will follow that there is no need of a minister: for anyone will easily be able to recite to himself the words of the promise, the element being applied, so that by them, faith being aroused, he may be justified. Nor will it make any difference at all whether a man or a woman, or even a boy, pronounces the words of the promise, and that whether seriously or in jest, provided that, while they are being pronounced, faith is aroused. And although this is of itself most absurd, nevertheless, in order to defend the opinion once conceived, Luther was not ashamed to concede this—and that against all the doctrine of antiquity, which

acknowledges no other minister in the sacrament of reconciliation besides the Priest. Finally, since without words and element faith can be stirred up and strengthened by meditation alone, it is clear that by this opinion also the necessity of the sacraments is taken away. Now this error was condemned (canon 8 of the Council of Trent on the Sacraments).⁶⁰

§ 60. But the third and last error— which the manifold use of the sacraments proposed by us at the beginning, and the whole foregoing doctrine concerning the efficacy of the sacraments, sufficiently refute— was also expressly condemned by the Council of Trent (canon 6 on the Sacraments). For Augustine also, in book 19 against Faustus (ch. 13), after he had said that men cannot be welded together into any one religion, whether true or false, unless they be bound together by some fellowship of visible sacraments, lest anyone from that should suspect that there is no other use of Christian sacraments, immediately subjoined their principal use, saying that their power avails inexpressibly very much, and that without it piety cannot be brought to perfection.⁵⁹

§ X — How faith cooperates to the effect of the Sacraments (Quomodo fides cooperetur ad effectum Sacramentorum)

§ 61. In order to understand more fully what parts belong to faith (*fides*) in the business of justification, first of all it must be noted that the passion and death of Christ profit no one unto justice and salvation unless they be applied, that is, unless in some manner a man be made a participant of the merits of Christ which He prepared for us on the cross. For although there is in the death of Christ a most powerful remedy against sin, nevertheless unless that remedy be taken and applied, it profits nothing. For, as Prosper says (in the Reply to the first Vincentian objection): "The cup of immortality, which has been prepared from our infirmity and the divine power, indeed has in itself that it should profit all; but if it is not drunk, it does not heal."⁶² Now this application does not consist in one single thing. For, first, faith is inspired in a man, by which he believes those things to be true which have been divinely revealed and promised, and, in the first place, that God justifies the ungodly by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.⁶³ Then indeed, by the faith received, a man also himself begins to bring near to himself the medicine set forth in the death of Christ; namely, by grieving for sins, hoping for pardon, invoking God through Christ, changing his life for the better, and receiving the remedies prescribed by God. Therefore the first application, whereby faith is given, is not wrought through faith, but by the singular operation of the Holy Spirit preventing man and converting him from unbelief. But every subsequent application is indeed effected through faith, yet not in such a way as if faith alone sufficed for preparing and, as they say, for apprehending justice; but it is further necessary that the other means instituted for this end be employed, among which are the Sacraments. Therefore, as the death of Christ is applied to us by faith, and yet we are not made participants of it by faith unless from that same faith we invoke Him—just as the Apostle teaches (Rom. 10)—so neither are we made full participants of it by faith and invocation unless we also use the Sacraments prescribed by God. Now each of these has its own part and its own order in our justification: by faith the medicine is known; by hope it is desired; by invocation one draws near to it; by penance one withdraws from the disease; by the change of life one approaches to health. Finally, by the Sacrament, as by a certain efficacious and health-giving cup, the medicine is drawn, the disease is driven away, and health is restored. Whatever things therefore precede the sacrament are certain preparations or dispositions unto the effect of justice to be obtained from the death of Christ, yet they do not forthwith render a man just. This matter is most aptly illustrated by the example of Christ's bodily miracles. For those

who were healed by Christ commonly first in time both believed that Christ could do this and called upon Him that He would do it; yet not by that very thing did they receive health, but afterwards, either by His command or His touch or a washing or some other ceremony, Christ bestowed health upon them. Nevertheless, because faith and prayer, as it were, prepared them and rendered them suitable for receiving health, on that account it is said to them: "Thy faith hath made thee whole." In this manner faith, prayer, penance, and the other things which are prior to the sacrament prepare and dispose a man unto justice, so that it has been rightly said: "to purify hearts by faith" (Acts 15), and "that whosoever shall have invoked the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom. 10), and "he that shall have done penance shall live" (Ezek. 18); yet they do not at once bring with them justice itself, but there is further need of the Sacrament, in which the power and merit of Christ operate, as it were, by contact, and bestow salvation. Whence he who said that hearts are purified by faith, this same man admonishes believers and penitents to "be baptized for the remission of sins" (Acts 2). For God willed to effect our salvation by a certain order and through many means and causes of diverse kinds, and to lead it little by little from the imperfect to the perfect. This order of causes and this diversity can be seen in chapters 6 and 7 of the sixth Session of the Council of Trent.⁶⁴ In this matter it must also be noted that St. Augustine (Question 2 to Simplicianus) says that through faith certain beginnings, like conceptions, are wrought in us before baptism; but, he adds, it is necessary not only to be conceived but also to be born, namely through the sacrament of regeneration.⁶⁵ And that which in the preceding chapter we noted from the same author—that by the power of the sacraments piety is brought to perfection, and indeed without it cannot be brought to perfection. But a more exact handling of this subject pertains to the matter of justification.

§ XI — That remission of sins is not necessarily conjoined with faith (Fidei non necessario conjunctam esse remissionem peccatorum)

§ 62. Concerning the doctrine on the sacraments the heretics lay down as a foundation that remission of sins is necessarily and inseparably conjoined with faith, and therefore cannot be attributed to the sacraments; how absurd this is and alien from Catholic truth must be shown briefly. And, first, this is sufficiently shown from those things which above were said about the power of the sacraments with respect to the effect of remission of sins, and especially about baptism, which to have been instituted "for the remission of sins" not only does Scripture attest (Acts 2 and 22), but it has been so confirmed by the perpetual tradition of the Church that Augustine thought this alone sufficient to convince the Pelagians who taught that little children are born without sin. But the voice of the Church is manifestly acknowledged in the Constantinopolitan Creed, in which it confesses "one baptism for the remission of sins." And yet to baptism no adult has ever been able to be admitted except one who already beforehand professes that he believes; besides the places in Matt. 28 and Mk. 16 and Acts 2 and 22, that is clearly proved by Acts 8, where Philip requires faith from the Eunuch before he bestows baptism on him; and in the same chapter it is read that he baptized the Samaritans when already they had believed. Whence it is evident that faith is prior to the remission of sins. But since baptism is the gateway of the sacraments, much less will anyone not believing be able to be admitted to any other sacrament whatsoever. Wherefore, if faith necessarily brings with it the remission of sins, the saying was spoken to some in vain: "Whose sins you shall forgive..." Next, to this point are to be referred whatever things prove that there is some unformed faith; about which we treated above, at Distinction 2 of Book 2.⁶⁷ Third: to this point belong whatever things show that some love of God is prior to the remission of sins. This we proved at

Distinction 27 of the same Book. For if the love of God can precede the remission of sins, much more does faith—without which God is not loved—precede it. Fourth: it is shown by a manifest argument. For among the things that by Christian prayer we ask of God is forgiveness of sins itself; but prayer is posterior to faith, as that which ought to proceed from faith; therefore remission of sins was not conjoined to faith from the beginning—unless someone say, which is most absurd, that we ought to ask for this which we already know that we have, whereas rather we ought to give thanks for it. Fifth: those things by which an angry God declares in the Scriptures that He wills to be appeased—such as penance, fasting, tears, alms—must proceed from faith in order that they may avail to appease God; therefore faith does not straightway reconcile us to God. Sixth: not only one's own faith but also another's obtains the remission of sins; but this latter in time precedes it— as was evident in those whose faith Jesus, looking upon it, said to the paralytic: "Thy sins are forgiven thee"; therefore that faith also can precede the remission of sins.⁶⁸ Finally: if faith is not without the remission of sins, then no believer sins—at least mortally—unless at the same time he also lose faith; or at any rate it will have to be conceded that the believer at once both sins and receives the remission of sin through faith, that is, in the same moment offends God and appeases Him—offends by sinning, appeases by believing—which to assert is by far most absurd.

§ XII — The solution of the objections raised by the adversaries (Solutio eorum quae ab adversariis objiciuntur)

§ 63. In confirmation of their new dogma, for the sake of which the adversaries remove from the sacraments the effect of grace (*gratia*) and transfer it to faith (*fides*) alone, they bring forward about these arguments against the Catholics. First, what is written (Gen. 15): "Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice"; therefore, they say, by that very fact that he believed he was loosed from sins—especially since the Apostle refers this to the remission of sins (*remissio peccatorum*) (Rom. 4), and straightway subjoins: "To him who worketh not, yet believeth in Him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reputed unto justice." And a little after he says of Abraham: that "he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the justice of the faith which he had in uncircumcision." From which words, by a likeness, they gather that the sacraments (*sacramenta*) of the new law are nothing other than certain seals of a justice previously received through faith.

⁷⁰

§ 64. Second: the same Apostle (Rom. 3) says: "The justice of God by the faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all who believe in Him." And in chapter 10: "With the heart one believes unto justice." And he proves this by the Prophet saying: "Everyone who believes in Him shall not be confounded."⁷¹

§ 65. Third: it is a prophetic and apostolic sentence that "the just man lives by faith"; since neither Scripture nor the Fathers attest anywhere that "the just man lives by the sacraments."

§ 66. Fourth, they object what Peter says (Acts 15): that "by faith God purifies the hearts of believers."⁷²

§ 67. Fifth: that they may utterly exclude from the sacraments the power of sanctifying, they object that saying of the same Peter (1 Pet. 3): "Baptism saves—not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience towards God"; therefore in baptism it is not the sacrament but faith that cleanses.⁷³

§ 68. Sixth: they employ the authority of St. Augustine who, in Tractate 80 on John, treating of those words of Christ, "Now you are clean because of the word that I have spoken to you," writes thus: "Why did He not say: You are clean because of the baptism with which you have been washed, but says: because of the word which I have spoken to you, unless because in the water the word cleanses? Take away the word, and what is water but water?" And below: "Whence is there so great a virtue of water, that it touches the body and washes the heart, unless by the agency of the word; not that which is uttered but that which is believed? For even in the very word one thing is the sound that passes, another the power that abides. This is the word of faith which we preach, says the Apostle: 'Because if thou shalt confess,' etc." This doctrine of his they confirm both by the two sayings of Peter already cited and by the words of Paul (Eph. 5), who says that Christ "cleanses His Church with the washing of water in the word"; and he interprets that "word" as the word of faith; and finally he concludes: "The whole of this takes place through the word, of which the Lord says: 'Now you are clean,' etc." A similar passage occurs in the same author (Sermon 20 on the Words of the Lord), where he attests that the baptism that is applied outwardly is purified by faith.⁷⁴

§ 69. Seventh: to prove that a sacrament is nothing else than a seal by which justice received through faith is sealed, they adduce that saying of Basil (from chapter 12 of the book On the Holy Spirit): "Profession indeed precedes, leading unto salvation; but baptism follows, sealing our covenant."¹⁰

§ 70. Eighth: they say that the remission of sins, as also eternal life, is proposed to us in the Scriptures as already given through Christ and only to be acknowledged by faith; and consequently that faith is required of us, by which, acknowledging these two benefits, we may doubt neither about the remission of sins received nor about the eternal life to be obtained.

§ 71. Lastly: they say that we obscure the benefit of the passion and death of Christ, who establish the power of sanctifying in any other thing whatever.

§ 72. To these objections of the heretics we reply in order as follows. To the first: Scripture (Gen. 15) does not signify that Abraham then first received justice or the forgiveness of sins when he believed God promising seed to him, since already before, by the faith and obedience by which, leaving his fatherland, he went forth into a foreign land, he was pleasing to God (Heb. 11); but it signifies that that faith availed him for an increase of justice, inasmuch as it was a work singularly pleasing to God. The Apostle, however, accommodates that same passage to our first justification, which he teaches to be from faith as the foundation of our entire renewal and restoration through Christ, and because faith is the hand by which the other things are obtained. For by faith our justice is begun, and at the same time the whole subsequent justice is obtained. And although in Abraham, who already before had been just, circumcision was a seal of antecedent justice, nevertheless in Isaac and the rest of his posterity it was an efficacious sign of sanctification—just as will be shown in its own place. And therefore the example taken from circumcision rather confirms the Catholic doctrine concerning the sacraments of the new law.⁷⁵

§ 73. To the second: by sayings of this sort of Scripture it is shown what faith can do, and what power it has unto justice, if the other things be not neglected which we have learned must at the same time be employed through faith—such as penance, invocation, and the sacrament. For the Apostle is not at odds with himself, who in that same Epistle requires these three also—penance indeed (chap. 2), but invocation (chap. 10), and the sacrament (chap. 6), where he teaches that through baptism we die together with Christ and are

buried together with Him, that we may walk in newness of life. But what it is to die together with Christ he shows in the words that follow: "For he who is dead is justified from sin."⁷⁶

§ 74. To the third: the Apostle ascribes the life of the just man—that is, the whole justice of man—to faith, partly for the reason just stated a little above, because faith is the foundation of our whole justice, excluding the law and nature, by neither of which does anyone live just; partly because the whole conversion of the just man and all his holy works proceed from faith working through charity. However, that the just man lives by the sacraments, although it is not read so expressly, can nevertheless rightly and without reproach be said. For if a man is born again of water (Jn. 3), assuredly he lives also of water. For that which is born receives life. And elsewhere baptism is called "the washing of regeneration" or of new-birth. And a similar proof can be framed concerning the sacrament of penance, by which the obligation of death is taken away, and concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, which is the bread of life.⁷⁶

§ 75. To the fourth: the faith of believers purifies the heart—from the time when it begins to work through charity. For faith indeed chases ignorance from the heart, but charity drives out an evil will. And in this way St. Augustine understood that saying (Sermon 14 [Parisiensis]).⁷⁷

§ 76. To the fifth: Peter expressly affirms that baptism saves. But the words of the Apostle that follow have this sense: baptism does not save inasmuch as it is a certain bare external and bodily action by which the filth of the flesh is washed away—as though, namely, by its own nature it availed unto a spiritual effect—but inasmuch as it is an action instituted by God to purge from sins the one who sincerely professes faith and the Christian life; since this is, by divine institution, a necessary disposition in the recipient.

§ 77. To the sixth: it must be admitted that Augustine, by "the word," understands faith, the confession of which is required from the one baptized, and without which baptism profits nothing at all, no matter how much the very words of faith be recited. And it is said that the water receives its power from the "word believed," that is, from faith itself, as from a disposition absolutely necessary: just as, unless this be present either in the recipient or in the offerer, that is, the Church, no effect at all of inward cleansing follows—even in little children. And that this is the genuine sense of that passage the whole context sufficiently declares, and especially that which he once and again repeats from the Apostle: "This is the word of faith which we preach."

§ 78. To the seventh: Basil in that place manifestly confirms the Catholic doctrine with these words: "Faith and baptism are two allied and inseparable ways of procuring salvation. For faith is perfected by baptism, while baptism rests upon the foundation of faith." These words indicate the sense of that which immediately follows, and which had been objected by the adversaries. For baptism "seals our covenant" not as a naked seal of a benefit previously received, but as the complement of salvation—that is, of a justice begun through faith.

§ 79. To the eighth we reply: The sectarians are greatly in error in this, that they think the benefits of the death of Christ are proposed to us in the Scriptures as if they were already given, to be grasped, as they say, by faith alone by each one of us. For, as we showed above, the death of Christ profits no one unless it be applied; and this application is made under certain conditions required on our part, of which the first indeed—but not the only one—is faith, as is clear from what has been said before. Wherefore, just as eternal life is promised not absolutely but to those who strive lawfully and persevere, so the forgiveness of sins is promised through Christ not absolutely, nor to believers only, but, in addition, to those who, proceeding from faith, act and pray and receive the sacraments—so that it may be said rightly that Christ, although He once already long ago died,

nevertheless then first dies "for each one" when each one is baptized into His death, that he may die to sin; as St. Augustine says in book 6 against Julian, chapter 5.⁷⁷

§ 80. To the last: just as they do not obscure the merit of a physician who, according to his prescriptions, flee to potions in hope of health and frequently return to him, but rather they illustrate and commend it; so those who make use of the sacraments instituted by Christ for receiving grace, so far from obscuring the glory of His passion and death, do in fact most highly illustrate it. For this is what they effect, that by means of the sacraments, as by vessels which remain, they may apply to themselves the medicine prepared and set forth by His death-bearing blood; and this all the more because the whole virtue of the sacraments is derived from the death of Christ—just as it is with a physician, that he does not confer nutritive power upon a potion but only, by the ministry of his art, aids the nature that is in the potion.

§ XIII — That there are seven sacraments of the New Law (Septem esse novae legis Sacramenta)

§ 81. One must hold without any doubt concerning the number of the sacraments (*sacramentum*) of the New Law that they are seven, and neither more nor fewer. The Council of Florence defined this number in the Decree delivered to the Armenians, and indeed in the order in which they are treated by the Master (of the Sentences).⁷⁹ Then the Council of Trent confirmed it, striking with anathema those who should presume them to be either more or fewer, or should even affirm that any one of them is not truly and properly a sacrament.⁸⁰ And moreover, in the Council of Constance there was condemned an article of John Hus, in which he said that Catholic priests think unbelievably about the seven sacraments of the Church.⁸¹ And more than four hundred years before, Lucius III in a certain decretal (as is found in the Decretals, De haereticis, the chapter "Ad abolendam") thus decreed: "All persons who about the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, or about baptism, or about the confession of sins, matrimony, or the remaining ecclesiastical sacraments, think or teach otherwise than as the most holy Roman Church preaches and observes, we bind with the chain of perpetual anathema."⁸² Although in these words the whole number is not expressly stated, nevertheless from them it ought clearly to be understood that he refers one to the observance of the Roman Church—which assuredly in this matter is in no way obscure.

§ 82. Since not only in subsequent times did all the Scholastic Doctors follow this, but also before the time of that constitution illustrious Masters in theology—Hugh (of St. Victor) and Peter Lombard—set forth in their writings the sevenfold number of the sacraments as a fixed and defined thing. Add to this that the Eastern Churches, though divided by schism from the Catholic, nevertheless to this very day consistently retain this number, as is clear from their censure lately published upon the articles controverted among us. Add also that the Ethiopian Church, by ancient tradition, holds this number of the sacraments, as is evident from Damianus a Goes, who, writing about their religion, makes mention of them one by one.⁸³

§ 83. Finally, we ought to take a proof of this number by induction from the individual sacraments. For if of each of them it is rightly proved only that the proper formal character of a sacrament agrees to it, and to no others (which in part we have already done in this very chapter, using induction to show that all the sacraments of the New Law confer grace, but will more fully demonstrate of each one in its own proper places), it plainly follows that this sevenfold number of the sacraments is most certainly acknowledged by the Church. To these there could be added reasons of congruity for this number—most celebrated in the

Scriptures and by the witness of all antiquity attributed to the gifts of the Holy Spirit—but because those do not contain altogether strict proof, we leave them to be sought from the Scholastics and from the Parish Priests' Catechism and other Authors.⁸⁴

§ 84. Moreover, in this doctrine of the Church the discord and inconsistency of the sectarians about the number of the sacraments ought rightly to keep us firm. For Luther, who in our century was the first to attempt to tear up this most holy number, in one and the same book which he entitled *On the Babylonian Captivity*, now acknowledges three, now one, now two sacraments only. "To begin with," he says, "the seven sacraments must be denied me, and for the present only three put forward—Baptism, Penance, and Bread. Yet if I should wish to speak in the usage of Scripture, I should have but one sacrament, and three sacramental signs. For the Eucharist and absolution are commemorations of the promise and adoption of baptism." At the end of the work he says: "If we wish to speak strictly, nevertheless there are only two sacraments in the Church of God—Baptism and Bread—since in these alone we see the remission of sins."⁸⁵ This binary number nearly all today of the Lutherans and the Calvinists retain, excluding Penance on the ground that in it there is no visible word but audible only—although there have been some who have even acknowledged four and at last five sacraments, adding to the aforesaid ordination and confirmation. All of whom, in that they detract from the number, are easily refuted by the firmness and constancy of Catholic doctrine.

§ XIV — The objections of the adversaries are dissolved (Diluuntur objectiones adversariorum)

§ 85. Now let us see with what arguments the adversaries assail the number of the Sacraments (*Sacramentorum*). First, they say that never, either in Sacred Scripture or among the Ancients, does one find the septenary number of the Sacraments expressed. To this we answer that by equal reasoning it would follow that neither are there two Sacraments, nor three, nor four, nor any determinate number of them at all; because neither Scripture nor the Ancients have expressed any fixed number. Nay rather, from the fact that the Catholic Church hands on the septenary number, and that we read nowhere else that a different number has ever been expressed, we understand it to be impious to depart from her tradition. Certainly I would not deny that the Fathers were not over anxious about establishing the number, provided they held fast to the things numbered, from which the number itself is necessarily concluded. Likewise, however, it does not follow: Scripture nowhere says that there are four Gospels or fourteen Epistles of Paul or the seven words of the Lord on the Cross; therefore it does not stand from Scripture that they are so many in number. For it is enough that in Scripture we have the things themselves numbered, and when these are in hand it is easy to take the number.

§ 86. Again they object that it is sufficiently clear from the Fathers that the number of Sacraments does not come to seven. For Dionysius the Areopagite, in the book *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, where he treats expressly of the mysteries—that is, of the Sacraments of the Church—handles not more than five, namely omitting Extreme Unction and Matrimony; unless that in the place of Extreme Unction he describes a certain anointing of the dead.⁸⁷ They say that Cyprian agrees to the same number in the *Sermon on the Washing of Feet* and the other *On the Anointing of Chrism*.⁸⁸ Likewise they object Ambrose, in the books *On the Sacraments* and in the book *On Those Who Are Initiated into the Mysteries*, to acknowledge only three—Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist—even with the exclusion of the others. Thus in fact he concludes,

On the Sacraments VI, ch. 2: "Therefore you have received; concerning the Sacraments you have most fully come to know all things."⁸⁹ They also say that Augustine everywhere enumerates no more than two or three, and that he confesses this paucity of sacraments when he says that, in place of the ancient Sacraments, others were instituted by Christ, fewer in number; likewise "few for many," and again "most few in number." The passages are *Against Faustus*, book 19, ch. 13; likewise *On Christian Doctrine*, book 3, ch. 9; and *Epistle 118 to Januarius*.⁹⁰ They object also Cyril of Jerusalem, who, when in his mystagogical catecheses he treats by plan of the mysteries, nevertheless remembers no others than Baptism, Chrism, and the Eucharist.⁹¹ Nor, they say, are more enumerated by Gregory, I, q. 1, c. *Multi secularium*.⁹² Finally they add Justin, in the *Second Apology*, Irenaeus, and Tertullian—books 1 and 4 *Against Marcion*, and the book *On the Soldier's Crown*—who, when they describe the rites of the Church, are read to have enumerated not more than two or three Sacraments.⁹³

§ 87. To these things responding, we say first that from these very testimonies—especially of Dionysius and Cyprian—those are manifestly refuted who acknowledge only two or three Sacraments, as today nearly all the sectaries do, since they themselves admit that these writers enumerated five, or four at the least.

§ 88. Then, what is objected from Dionysius St. Thomas long ago resolved, in the Third Part, question 65, article 1, to this sense: namely, that in that work Dionysius treats expressly not of the Sacraments of the Church but of sacred offices or functions which bishops and priests exercised, with a certain consecration, both in administering and in confecting the mysteries. Wherefore neither was it for him to speak of Matrimony nor of the Anointing of the Sick; although he does make mention of Penance or Reconciliation.⁷⁸

§ 89. To the argument drawn from Cyprian we answer that those sermons are not by Cyprian, but by someone much later; yet, whoever they be by, there is not there instituted a treatment of all the Sacraments, but only of those which could be referred to Christ's cardinal works, as the sermons are entitled by their author.

§ 90. Nor does that convince which they object from Ambrose. For in those books he is not treating of all the Sacraments of the Church, but only of those by which the faithful who have been recently baptized and confirmed and admitted to the Lord's Table are to be instructed; for in order the new faithful are initiated, as he himself attests in *On the Sacraments*, book 3, ch. 2, and in *On the Mysteries*, ch. 6. Whence a treatment was to be instituted in that work concerning these three Sacraments. And of these he says that they have been received most fully. For that Ambrose acknowledged Penance as a Sacrament there can be no doubt for one who reads his books *On Penance against Novatian*; and especially that chapter which is book 1, ch. 7. What his view was will be shown in its place.

§ 91. Absolutely the very same solution holds for the argument that is taken from the Catecheses. And Gregory also seems to agree by the words which Gratian cites, I, q. 1, c. *Multi secularium*; it is uncertain whether that decree is Gregory the Great's, since it is not found in his works, or truly someone else's.

§ 92. Moreover Augustine, in these very places which the adversaries object, clearly teaches that the Christian sacraments are more than two or three. For in *Against Faustus*, book 19, ch. 13, when he had said that they are fewer in number than the ancient, in the next chapter he enumerates by way of example three—Baptism, the Eucharist, and the sign of Christ, that is, Confirmation. And in book 3 of *On Christian Doctrine*, ch. 9, thus he speaks of the Sacraments of our law: "The Lord and the Apostolic teaching delivered certain few for many, as is the Sacrament of Baptism and the celebration of the Body and Blood of the

Lord"—certainly words not of someone enumerating all, but of one producing some examples out of all. Whence also in the Epistle to Januarius (where he had set it forth quite similarly) he added: "And what else is commended in the canonical Scriptures?"⁹⁴ That this discourse is not that of one doubting is most clear from the same place, where a little later, when he had set out some feasts which are wont to be observed by the whole Church—namely of the Passion, of the sending of the Holy Spirit, and if something else suchlike should occur which is observed by the whole Church—since it is certain that such things were more, both are and were in Augustine's time, as were the Nativity and Epiphany of the Lord and very many more of the like sort.

§ 93. But also in the very next Epistle to the same person (Ep. 119, ch. 7), when he was speaking of the matter of Sacraments, by way of example he named water and again wheat, wine, and oil, by which things at least three Sacraments are signified. But truly that he signified more than these three he taught in the Exposition of Psalm 103, sermon 1: "Look," he says, "to the gifts of the Church herself. There is no doubt about the gifts of the Sacraments—in Baptism, in the Eucharist, in the other holy Sacraments." Which place certainly shows clearly that, besides Baptism and the Eucharist, Augustine judged that there were not none nor only one, but several Sacraments of the Church, and therefore that all things, as the heretics would have it, are not comprehended by a binary or ternary number. Few indeed, nay most few, he most rightly testifies the same Augustine that they are—but in comparison with the ancient ceremonies and sacrifices, which were very many and were not contained under any certain number. But that Augustine also acknowledged the Sacrament of Ordination and of Reconciliation and the rest, will be shown in their proper places.

§ 94. As to Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, there is much the less labor to be expended, since by no means was it their purpose to treat of all the Sacraments of the Church, but to remember only those of which the matter of the dispute required mention. For elsewhere Tertullian makes mention of others, as of the imposition of hands and the anointing of oil, in book 1 Against Marcion and in the book On the Resurrection of the Flesh.⁹⁵

§ XV — On holy water and some other things, what is to be thought (De aqua benedicta et aliis nonnullis quid sentiendum)

§ 95. To the Sacraments of the New Law properly so called there ought not to be numbered holy water, its consecration or aspersion; nor likewise the sign of the cross, the beating of the breast, the episcopal or sacerdotal blessing, the exorcisms of demons, and the consecration or blessings of various things, as of churches, altars, palms, sacred vestments, and of the Paschal candle, of foods, of the fruits of the earth, and the like. For none of these confers Grace or any spiritual effect at all ex opere operato, in such wise, namely, that it be an efficacious sign of that Grace, the same both certain and infallible, which has been shown to be required for the notion (*ratio*) of a Sacrament properly so called. Whence also we taught that Sacraments of this kind could not be instituted by the Church, but by God alone—since He alone can bestow this efficacy. But these avail only by the prayers of the ministers by whom they are applied; and therefore, as to their worth or efficacy, they are to be placed in the same rank with the prayers of the Church. For all these and most of the rest are as it were certain visible and perpetual prayers to obtain God's benefits, for the obtaining of which they have been consecrated. But certain persons say improbably that holy water does not indeed confer Grace, but does confer the remission of venial sins ex opere operato.⁹⁷

§ XVI — That all the sacraments of the new law have been instituted by Christ (*Sacramenta novae legis omnia esse a Christo instituta*)

§ 96. But finally, if holy water is of value for the remission of venial sins strictly *ex opere operato*, it will be of value in the same way for the other effects for which it is consecrated, namely for putting demons to flight, for repelling their temptations, and for averting other harms—so much the more because these effects are expressed in its blessing, whereas no express mention there is made of the remission of venial sins, just as there is no such mention in the decree of Alexander I, to whom the origin of this institution is referred.⁹⁹ Hence too the Roman Breviary, on May 3, names only the effect of putting demons to flight.¹⁰⁰ I do not, to be sure, deny that the remission of venial sins is among the effects of this ceremony, since for this very purpose chiefly its use is piously and frequently employed by the faithful; but I say that this effect is not expressed in the words of the blessing—although it can easily be understood in that which is said, namely, that it is "for putting demons to flight." For demons are put to flight in a spiritual way whenever that is taken away from us, or diminished in us, by which they hold us subject to themselves, that is, sin.

§ 97. Finally, what is commonly adduced from St. Bernard, in Sermon 1 "On the Lord's Supper," where he numbers the washing of feet among the sacraments, as likewise does the Author of the "Sermons On the Works of Christ," is of no authority and devoid of any testimonial weight.¹⁰¹ Indeed, this is easily resolved if we understand the name "sacrament" (*sacramentum*) in the broader sense in which it is used by those writers, so as to embrace any signs of sacred things whatsoever. "Many things," says Bernard, "are often done for this purpose alone, others for designating another thing, which are called signs: now when a sign is of some sacred thing, it is rightly called a sacrament—wherefore the washing of feet also is a sacrament."¹⁰²

§ 98. The sacraments of the new law are all said to have been instituted by Christ; and this the Council of Trent determined under anathema.¹⁰³ The reason of this doctrine is that he is said to institute a thing who gives it its strength and efficacy, as is evident from the example of those who institute laws. Therefore, since God alone can confer upon the sacraments the power of sanctifying, he alone also must be called the author and institutor of those sacraments which have the power of sanctifying—such as are all the sacraments of the new law. In line with which reason, not only must it be said that these were instituted by God alone, but also that they could not have been instituted by anyone else whatsoever, whether man or angel, since that power surpasses the capacity and competency of every creature.

§ 99. This, however, must be understood of a power of authority, which plainly belongs to the principal cause, not of a power of secondary ministry, which even with respect to the institution of the sacraments could have been communicated, had it so seemed good to God; as St. Thomas rightly teaches.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, whereas the power of secondary ministry concerning the sacraments has been communicated to men, yet that of principal ministry—as they call it the "power of excellence," full and absolute concerning the sacraments—has been attributed to Christ even as man. Now this power of excellence consists in four things. First, in that he himself works in the sacraments by his own power. Second, that at the invocation of his name the sacraments are celebrated. Third, that he could institute them and even determine their matter and form. Lastly, that by the mere command of his will he could confer the grace of the sacraments without the sacrament.

§ 100. Now all this power, because it is ministerial, absolutely speaking could also have been transferred to others; as is clear from those words of St. Augustine in Tractates on John, where he says that the Baptist did

not know this, when he said: "And I knew him not," namely, that Christ would retain to himself the power of baptism and would not communicate it, in keeping with that which is said: "He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining, he it is that baptizeth."¹⁰⁵ And indeed this was done for our profit: both lest men should place their hope in men, if the efficacy of the sacrament depended on the merit of each minister; and lest schisms arise among the faithful, while each of them preferred his own minister and had recourse to his sacrament—as we read happened among those who said: "I indeed am of Paul, but I of Apollo, and I of Cephas."¹⁰⁶

§ 101. Moreover, although it has not been defined by the Council that all the sacraments of the new law were mediately instituted by Christ, there is still room among Catholics to doubt whether Christ immediately and by himself instituted all the sacraments, or whether he committed the institution of certain ones to the ministry of the Apostles or of the Church. The cause for doubt is that we nowhere read in Scripture where Christ instituted the sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction, but these seem to have been handed down to the Church by the Apostles by the power committed to them by Christ.¹⁰⁷ Still less, assuredly, does it appear that the order of the diaconate and subdiaconate and the four minor orders were immediately instituted by Christ—especially as to their several ordinations, alterations, and changes in other respects—which they wish to have been entrusted to the Apostles and even to those that followed, that is, to the Church, in such wise as should be expedient to the salvation of the faithful.¹⁰⁸

§ 102. They strive to prove this opinion by two testimonies of St. Augustine: who, in *On Christian Doctrine*, says that the Lord himself and the apostolic discipline have handed down to us the sacraments of the new law; whence they judge it follows that some were instituted immediately by Christ, some through the Apostles.¹⁰⁹ To this opinion may also be adduced what is read in St. Cyprian's *Sermon on the Washing of Feet*, where, after he had said that "the supreme high priest is the institutor and author of his own sacrament," he adds afterwards: "Nor is that less firm which, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit, the Apostles handed down, than that which the Lord himself handed down and commanded to be commemorated."¹¹⁰ To these assent, it would seem, Hugh (of St. Victor) and the Master, who both affirm that the sacrament of Extreme Unction was instituted by the Apostle James.¹¹¹ And what is more, Alexander of Hales asserts that the sacrament of Confirmation, after the times of the Apostles, was at length instituted in the second Council of Milan.¹¹² From which opinion these men infer that the power of an excellent ministry concerning the sacraments was in some measure communicated by Christ to others: to wit, as regards the institution of some sacraments, or at least the determination of their matter and form—yet in such a way that they had this power by commission from Christ, and did not use it otherwise than by the dictation and suggestion of the Holy Spirit.

§ 103. Still, although this opinion may have some show of probability, yet it is surpassed by a contrary opinion with far greater probability. First, because since God alone can bestow on the sacraments the power of sanctifying, it is not credible that he entrusted their institution to the choice of men—as though those signs were going to be effective of grace which men might have chosen, and not those which God, the author of grace, had instituted. Next, since it is certain that many things were handed down which are not written, nothing forbids that we should number among those things the institution by Christ of those sacraments whose institution Scripture does not record. Third, this is made probable both from (Pseudo-)Dionysius, who says that the Apostles did not devise the forms of the sacraments but received them—namely, from nowhere else than from Christ their Master—and from the Decree of Pope Fabian, in which he testifies that it was

handed down by the Apostles that Christ, after the Last Supper, taught and instituted the rite of confecting chrism, which is the matter of the sacrament of Confirmation.¹¹³ Fourth, since Luke testifies in Acts 1 that Christ, after the resurrection, for forty days conversed with the disciples and spoke of the Kingdom of God—that is, of the Church to be built up and governed, to the building up and government of which the sacraments belong first and foremost—it is not very likely that the institution of any one of them was omitted by Christ and left to the choice of the Apostles or of the Church. And Pope Leo seems to intimate something of this sort, when he says thus in Sermon 1 on the Ascension of the Lord: "Those days which shone between the Lord's resurrection and ascension did not pass idly by, but in them great sacraments were confirmed, great mysteries revealed."¹¹⁴ Fifth, they prove it by this reason: the Church is founded upon faith and the sacraments; therefore, just as Christ alone immediately established the faith, so also he instituted all the sacraments; and just as it was not permitted the Apostles to vary anything regarding the faith, so neither regarding the sacraments. Now that the Church also is founded on the sacraments is shown from this, that just as Eve was formed from the side of the sleeping man, so the Church was built from the side of Christ dead upon the cross, by this namely that from thence there flowed water and blood, bearing the type of the sacraments by which the Church would be built up—as the Fathers mystically expound this, and specifically St. Augustine.¹¹⁵ Therefore the first institution of the sacraments pertains to the Church as being founded and first established; as their administration pertains to the Church as being governed. Yet in another sense the Apostles are rightly said to be the founders of the Church, inasmuch as by their preaching they transferred into various nations the faith and the sacraments upon which the Church was founded by Christ, so that there they might set them as foundations.

§ 104. Sixth, God himself instituted singly the sacraments of the old law: much more, therefore, must it be believed that the author of the new law instituted all the sacraments of his law by himself. Finally, the words of the Council of Trent, wherein it is defined that all the sacraments were instituted by Christ, seem to incline rather in this direction.¹¹⁶ For those things which are instituted in Councils—even though by the inspiration and direction of the Holy Spirit, such as are many matters relating to ceremonies and morals—we are not accustomed to say were instituted by Christ, but by the Church. Hence also, where, in Session 14, there is question concerning the institution of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, the Fathers of the Council attribute the institution of that sacrament to Christ, but its promulgation to the Apostle James; by which way of speaking it seems sufficiently insinuated that that sacrament was not instituted by James. What is objected on the contrary from St. Augustine does not conclude. For in one way the Lord handed down the sacraments to us, in another way the Apostles: the Lord, by instituting; the Apostles, by promulgating the things instituted at the proper time. In which sense what was alleged from Cyprian can also easily be taken: so that we should say that the Lord delivered those things himself which he not only instituted but also exhibited and celebrated, as Baptism, the Eucharist, and Ordination; while the Apostles are said to have delivered those things which, having been instituted by Christ, they first exhibited by using or conferring them. Although it must be noted that Cyprian is not the author of that Sermon, nor of the others which are in the "Cardinal Works of Christ."¹¹⁷ How, moreover, the words of Hugh and of the Master (at Distinction 23) are to be taken will be explained where we shall treat of the sacrament of Extreme Unction. Finally, what probable reply can be made to the other things objected is altogether clear from what has been said. Certainly, even if the opinion is to be borne with of those who attribute the institution of some sacrament to the Apostles, we must by no means assent to those who think that after the times of the Apostles any one of the sacraments was instituted;

since a commission made in words could not have extended beyond the Apostles—otherwise even today the Church might change or institute something in the sacraments.

§ 105. In conclusion, it has here been noted that what has been said concerning the institution of the sacraments must likewise be understood concerning their essential parts—namely, matter and form—and concerning the necessary minister. The Church neither can nor does change these. Other rites and ceremonies, however, which pertain to their solemnity and decorum and to the devotion of the faithful, have been instituted by the Church and on that account are called sacramentals; and therefore they can be changed—as is certain, and as the Apostle was saying when he wrote: "And the rest, when I come, I will set in order."¹¹⁸

§ XVII — By what proper effects the sacraments are distinguished among themselves (Quibus effectis propriis inter se sacramenta distinguantur)

§ 106. The sacraments, indeed, are all ordered to the sanctification of man; but that sanctification is not of one and the same sort, but, according to the diversity of the sacraments, is diverse. For just as each is distinguished from the others by its rite and signification, so too by its proper effect is each distinguished from the others. The Fathers of the holy Council of Trent set forth this distinction briefly, saying: "Of the seven sacraments, the first five are ordered to the spiritual perfection of each single man in himself, for disposition and multiplication; the last two, to the governance of the whole Church."¹²⁰

§ 107. For by Baptism we are spiritually reborn; by Confirmation we are increased in grace and strengthened in faith; having been reborn and strengthened, we are nourished by the divine Eucharist; by Penance the sickness of the soul is cured after the fall; by Extreme Unction, the remnants of sin and the weaknesses of soul and body are healed as far as is expedient; by Orders the ecclesiastical hierarchy is constituted for the ministry and governance of the faithful; by Matrimony, lastly, the Church is propagated and the family is sanctified.

§ 108. Some, even after the Council of Trent, maintain the opinion that the matters and the forms of certain sacraments are from Christ, but that their specific determination was by the Apostles. Further, by Penance we are healed spiritually, and also bodily (insofar as it is expedient for the soul) by Extreme Unction; by Order the Church is governed, and is multiplied spiritually; by Matrimony it is increased bodily. Such is the Council's statement.¹²¹ In these words, however, it must be noted that to the last two sacraments, Order and Matrimony, there is not ascribed the spiritual effect which they have in those very persons who receive them, that is, in those ordained and in spouses (unless perhaps implicitly), but only the use and the end which they achieve in others, for whose benefit they were instituted. But the spiritual effect which they bring to the very recipients themselves—although at that place the Council was silent about it—afterwards, when it treats of these same sacraments individually, it expressed. For there it says that the effect of ordination is an increase of grace, that a man may be a fit minister; while it indicates the effect of Matrimony by enumerating its three goods, namely offspring to be reared in holiness, fidelity to be mutually kept, and the indissolubility of the conjugal bond.¹²² And let these things, in summary, have been said about the distinction of the sacraments of the new law with respect to their proper effects. For fuller knowledge of this matter must be sought from the treatment of each one severally.

§ 109. Moreover, another distinction can be taken from necessity, and again another from dignity. For three of them are, before the rest, necessary, though not for the same reason. Baptism is absolutely necessary

for all; Penance for those who have relapsed; Order—although not for each individual of the faithful—is nevertheless altogether necessary for the whole Church. But if one inquires after dignity among the sacraments, the Eucharist, by holiness and by the number and greatness of its mysteries, far excels the rest; although the others, as in point of necessity, so also have among themselves a certain order of dignity.

§ XVIII — *Each sacrament consists of matter and form (Unumquodque sacramentum constare materia & forma)*

§ 110. The sensible thing which is set in the definition of a sacrament (*sacramentum*) is not only one thing, although it constitutes one sign. For there are two things of which each sacrament of the new law consists, of which one has the formal character of matter (*materia*) and is called the element; the other has the formal character of form (*forma*) and of words. Thus the Council of Florence says: "All the sacraments are perfected by things as by matter, and by words as by form"; for example, in Baptism the water, in Confirmation the chrism, in Extreme Unction the oil is the matter; and so in the others.¹²⁴ Only in such a way, however, that we understand that matter strictly so called is not required in all the sacraments—namely, that which would be an element, that is, some bodily thing visible and tangible, of the kind of the three just enumerated—but that it is enough if in the sacraments something is assigned which has, as it were, the formal character of matter; in which way in the same Council, and also at Trent, the acts of the penitent are said to be, as it were, the matter of the sacrament of Penance.¹²⁵ But the words which are instituted for this purpose, that they be uttered over the matter and, as it were, bind and determine it, have the formal character of form. For although the element, by divine institution, also has its own signification, nevertheless words must be added so that a clearer and more distinct signification of the thing which is being done might be made; because among all signs it is most proper to words to signify something certain and determinate; and therefore they are most apt to be joined to other signs—whose signification could otherwise be uncertain and confused—just as form is joined to its matter for the perfection and completion of signification.

§ 111. Now in this place it must be known that we have the matter and form of each sacrament not so much from Sacred Scripture as from perpetual tradition received from the Apostles. For Scripture has expressly handed down to us only the matter and form of Baptism and of the Eucharist, and only the matter of Extreme Unction; but it left the rest to be received from unwritten tradition, as it were by hand-to-hand transmission, and this for the reason that the Lord forbids (Matt. 7) to give what is holy to dogs and to cast pearls before swine—that is, lest the more secret mysteries of our Religion, if committed to writing, should come into the hands and knowledge of unbelievers, by whom they would be held in contempt and derision. This reason for the matter the Fathers often assign. For Dionysius the Areopagite, in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, earnestly admonishes Timothy "not to publish the holy of holies nor to hand them down to the less perfect, but to communicate them only with those who are holy and perfect"; and he gives this reason why not all things were consigned to the books of Scripture, but were "delivered from mind to mind by the intervening spoken word, and transmitted to posterity." And particularly about the words of the mysteries, in the last chapter he speaks thus: "It is not lawful to set forth in writing the effective prayers of consecration, nor to bring into public their secret, nor the powers themselves which from God take place in these things; but, as the most sacred tradition has it," etc.¹²⁶ Likewise Innocent I, in his first Decretal Epistle, chapter 3, speaking about the form of Confirmation, says: "I cannot state the words, lest I seem rather to betray than to answer the consultation." And, chapter 8, about the sacrament of Extreme Unction: "But the other things, which it was

not lawful to write, when you shall be present, on being asked we shall be able to declare."¹²⁷ In general, too, Basil (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 27) and Ambrose (On Those Initiated into the Mysteries, last chapter) make mention of the secrets of the mysteries to be handed down by hand without writing.¹²⁸ Whence also that frequent saying in St. Augustine about the Eucharist: "The faithful know." By this word he wished to signify that the mystery about which he was speaking is secret and not to be divulged even to catechumens. Therefore it is not to be wondered at if we do not everywhere find the words by which the sacraments are perfected set forth in writing by the Fathers.¹²⁹

§ XIX — Proof: Of the necessity of matter and form in the sacraments (Probatur materiae et formae necessitas in sacramentis)

§ 112. Since in the sacraments the element and the word (*elementum et verbum*) stand as matter and form (*materia et forma*) do in things composed by nature or by art, namely as essential parts, it is manifest that these two are necessary for establishing the truth and substance of the sacraments; such that, if either be lacking, or be changed into something else, the truth of the sacrament does not subsist; and therefore it was rightly defined by the Fathers of Florence that without these the sacrament is not perfected.¹³¹ Most frequent are the testimonies of the Fathers concerning the sacrament of Baptism, which they deny to be true and valid unless both true water be applied and the prescribed form of words be observed, as we shall show copiously in its own place. And what has been said of Baptism, by equal reasoning must be said of the others, although, seeing that it is the sacrament most necessary, it might seem that this should be required less strictly in its case. Concerning sacramental forms in general St. Augustine speaks thus, book 19 against Faustus, ch. 16: "Those syllables, swiftly sounding and passing away—unless they be said, it is not consecrated."¹³² And in Epistle 23 to Boniface he calls the form of Baptism "the words, without which the little one cannot be consecrated," that is, initiated by the sacrament.¹³² Now the matter of a sacrament is so necessary that, if its substance be changed, the sacrament is not effected; and the form is so necessary that, if the sense of the words be changed, nothing is brought about. And the whole rationale of this is finally to be referred to the divine will and institution, which we have received from apostolic doctrine.

§ 113. Hence this objection of a certain heretic is easily dissolved: "Christ did not place the foundation of Baptism upon fixed letters, syllables, or words; nor did He bind us to certain words. For He did not institute magic, which is bound to a fixed form of words or rites, but He instituted heavenly sacraments, which consist in His own meaning and will, signified to us by these or those words." We reply that it is neither magic nor superstition if, by God's institution, Baptism or any other sacrament requires words of determinate signification and certain rites—just as it was not magic that Naaman the Syrian was commanded to wash seven times in the Jordan,¹³³ and that the sons of Israel were commanded to look upon the brazen serpent in order to expect healing,¹³⁴ and other things of this sort divinely prescribed for a determinate effect; but it is superstition whenever an effect is expected from a demon, and that on the basis of a pact either expressly or tacitly entered into with him, as Augustine teaches, book 2 of On Christian Doctrine, ch. 22, and book 3, ch. 9.¹³⁵ Far be it that a Christian mind should think this of the divine sacraments, from which we rightly expect so certain an operation as from natural causes—since God is the author and institutor of both; indeed, from the sacraments we expect it much more certainly on account of the infallible promise of God, which we do not have concerning natural causes and their perpetual operation.

§ XX — *Some sacraments imprint a character and cannot be repeated*
(Quaedam sacramenta characterem imprimere & iterari non posse)

§ 114. The Council of Florence speaks in this manner: Among these sacraments there are three, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, which imprint upon the soul an indelible character—namely, a certain spiritual sign distinct from others. Hence, in the same person they are not repeated. But the remaining four do not imprint a character and admit repetition. The same doctrine was confirmed under anathema in the Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 9 on the sacraments; and again elsewhere in the same Synod.¹³⁷

§ 115. The matter can be set forth by a certain analogy taken from human affairs. For just as in an earthly commonwealth certain persons are admitted into the number of citizens—and that by some external sign given or impressed upon them, which they can keep even if they desert the city; nor, if they return, is it given again, but the sign once given at the first is acknowledged—so in the Church by baptism men are enrolled in the number of the faithful as citizens of the Church, a certain spiritual character being impressed upon their souls, which is not even lost by apostasy; and therefore to those returning it is not given back nor changed, but acknowledged.

§ 116. And as there, for the defense of the city, some are enrolled into the soldiery, and that likewise by some external sign given or even impressed upon the body, as used to be done of old, by which, if at any time they should go over to the enemy, they might be recognized—and that same mark, when they returned and were reconciled, was not impressed anew, but what had once been impressed was held as valid and was called the royal character—so in the Church by the seal of Confirmation the faithful are enrolled into the Christian soldiery; nor is that ever blotted out, but it remains forever. Whence also this sacrament is peculiarly called by St. Augustine "the sign of Christ as the character of the King."¹³⁸

§ 117. Finally, just as it happens that some are called to the public functions of the commonwealth, and that too with the addition of some visible sign of the matter, by which they may be distinguished from others; so to sacred functions—that is, to ecclesiastical ministries—some are called and deputed by the sacrament of Ordination, a character being impressed upon them by which they are distinguished from the rest.

§ 118. Now the chief reason of this perpetuity and indelibility seems to be sought from the nature of consecration. For a thing once consecrated to some use of God remains such perpetually, as long as it exists. "Whatever shall once have been consecrated," says the Lord in the last chapter of Leviticus, "shall be holy of holies to the Lord."¹³⁹ St. Augustine looked to this reason, book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 13, where, speaking of Baptism and of Ordination, he says: "Both are sacraments; by a certain consecration both are given to man; the one when he is baptized, the other when he is ordained: and therefore in the Catholic Church neither is it lawful to repeat." And presently, speaking of those returning from schism, he subjoins: "As Baptism in them, so Ordination remained entire."¹⁴⁰ The Author of the Sermon On the Washing of Feet among the works of Cyprian explains this reason at greater length: "I find," he says, "that ecclesiastical rules forbid Baptism, and no hand thereafter presumes to come again consecrating upon those once sanctified; no one renews sacred Orders once given; no one anoints again, or consecrates again, one anointed with holy oil; no one derogates from the imposition of hands or the ministry of priests: because it would be an insult to the Holy Spirit, if what He signifies could be made void, or if another's sanctification could amend what He once established and confirmed."¹⁴¹ To the same reason Gregory leans, book 2, epistle 32, denying that it can be

done that he who has once been consecrated be consecrated again in the same order, just as he who has once been baptized cannot be baptized again.¹⁴²

§ 119. But now, since what has been said about character the heretics reject as a novelties and a scholastic invention, it must be shown how far it was not unknown to the Fathers, especially to Augustine, who frequently and expressly makes mention of character. For in book 1 Against Cresconius, ch. 30, he writes thus: "Nor therefore must the royal character in a man be changed or disapproved, if he has obtained from the King pardon of his error and a commission for soldiery; because the same character with which the deserter branded himself when he gathered satellites for himself is not therefore effaced; nor therefore are marks given to the sheep along with the Lord's flock, because a slave imprinted the Lord's mark upon them."¹⁴³ And in Epistle 23 to Boniface, speaking of Baptism: "Consecration," he says, "makes him guilty who, having the Lord's character, is outside the Lord's flock."¹³² And in Epistle 50 he teaches that the Church has the right to recall all who have withdrawn and to compel them on account of the fact that in them the Lord's character remains, which by their secession has by no means been violated: "And thus," he says, "correct the error of the sheep, that in it the seal of Redemption be not corrupted."¹⁴⁴ In the same places he also adds the comparison with a character; and there are similar things in book 1 Against the Donatists, book 6, ch. 1; likewise in book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, chs. 13 and 18; in the Tractate on the Gospel of John upon the "Acts with Emeritus"; in Tractate 4 on the Epistle of John; and in Sermon 57.¹⁴⁵ And in Jerome upon Ephesians 1: "In whom also believing you were sealed."¹⁴⁶ To these is added the teaching of Innocent III (in the decretal "Majores" on Baptism and its effect), which agrees.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, generally the whole disputation of Augustine against the Donatists about Baptism pertains to this matter, whom he teaches that Baptism is common to the good and to the bad, and that it can neither be repeated nor lost. For since those who approach feignedly do not receive the grace of sanctification, that grace itself of Baptism clearly departs and cannot remain; it follows that there is in such persons something different which nevertheless remains indelibly even in the wicked—which is nothing other than the character. Which, therefore, Augustine designates by the names of Baptism and of Ordination, as often as he said that Baptism and Ordination remained entire perpetually in all who have been baptized and ordained.

§ 120. From the foregoing the following can be concluded. First, three things that are mutually inseparable cohere together: that a character (*character*) is imprinted in a sacrament; that it is never lost; and that the sacrament cannot be repeated. Second, thus summarily may the sacramental characters be distinctly set forth: in Baptism is given the character of citizenship or of the household of Christ; in Confirmation, the character of the Christian soldiery; but in Order, the character of power or of ecclesiastical ministry.

§ XXIII — *What intention is required in administering a sacrament (In ministrando Sacramento quae intentio requiratur)*

§ 121. Since a sacramental operation is a human act, that is, one deliberated by judgment, which cannot be such unless there be an intention (*intentio*) by which it is directed to its own end, it follows that intention is necessarily required in him who administers the sacrament. What, however, that intention is, has been declared by the Councils of Florence and Trent. For the Florentine requires it; and at Trent (Session 7, ch. 11) it was decreed in these words: "If anyone shall say that in ministers, when they confect and confer the

sacraments, there is not required at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema."¹⁴⁹

§ 122. Therefore, for the declaration of this doctrine it must be known: neither is that intention in the minister necessary by which he refers the work of his ministry to a right and lawful end; nor that by which he intends the true effect of the sacrament itself. For the sacrament is not vain or null if it be conferred by a minister with a wicked and criminal intention, looking chiefly to gain, or human glory, or the propagation of his heresy, or anything of the kind. Nor, again, has Baptism ever been thought invalid when conferred by Pelagians, although they had a perverse judgment about the effect of that sacrament—since Nicholas I judged that even what is conferred by a Jew and by a Pagan is valid (in the Rescript to the Questions of the Bulgarians), as is found in Gratian (*De Consecratione*, Dist. 4, c. A quodam). From which it is evident that right faith concerning the sacrament and its effect is not necessarily required in its minister, and therefore neither is an intention required of conferring that same effect in particular.¹⁵⁰

§ 123. It is evident, moreover, that right faith in the minister is not necessary either about Christ or about the Church. For the Fathers never judged the Baptism of Arians or Nestorians—who think amiss about Christ—to be rejected, so long as they understood that neither the matter nor the form of the sacrament had been changed or vitiated by them, as St. Augustine signifies (on the heresy of the Paulianists, which is 44). And concerning the Donatists, who thought ill about the Church, the same Augustine in countless places bears witness and teaches that their Baptism was true. Nor did the Fathers teach otherwise concerning a Jew, a Pagan, or a man of whatever sect you please.¹⁵¹

§ 124. But neither does the mere intention of the work that is being done, as it is any kind of work whatsoever, suffice. For in that way the intention necessary for the truth of the sacrament could never be lacking to that action, even if it were done in sport, or in jest, or even derisively—indeed, even contumeliously—provided only that it were a human action. Rather, there is required, and it suffices, an intention either explicit and actual, or at least implicit or virtual, of doing what Christ instituted and what the Church does—whether the one who performs that action have faith concerning Christ and the Church, or not. And this is what the Scholastic Doctors hand down, and what has been defined in the Councils: that there is required an intention of doing what the Church does. The Master too acknowledges the necessity of this intention when (Dist. 6 of this book) he teaches that in Baptism and in the other sacraments, as the form is to be observed, so an intention of celebrating them is required and suffices; and hence that one who, merely in jest or in mimicry, immerses someone, even though the words of the sacrament are pronounced, does not confer true Baptism.¹⁵²

§ 125. Now that is called the intention of doing what the Church does, by which someone intends the action not as it is a profane or common, or even a mimed or derisive, action, but as it is a certain singular action which in the Church—that is, among Christians—is seen to be done in solemn fashion. Together with this intention there can consist an erroneous and perverse opinion not only about the sacrament itself and its effect, but also about Christ and the Church and whatever articles of the faith. Wherefore, if some Priest, imbued with Calvin's error, intends in a general intention about the sacrament of the Eucharist to do that which Christ instituted and which the Church does, and he utters the due words over the due matter, he truly confects the Body and Blood of the Lord—even though his particular intention, and indeed his doctrine and profession while he performs that action, are repugnant to the attainment of the sacrament. For not because by his particular intention he wills the effect of the sacrament to be excluded is it therefore in reality excluded; for he cannot take away from the divine work its power—whatever at length it be that he intends in particular

—provided all those things are present which by divine institution are necessarily required; just as also a medicine otherwise efficacious will cure the sick man, whatever be the intention of the physician who hands it to him.

§ 126. And as the unbelief shut up in the mind does not impede the effect of the sacrament, so neither does that unbelief expressed by word—so long as the form and signification of the words are not changed, and the other requisites are present. There is a passage on this matter in Augustine (Epistle 23 to Boniface), where, answering the questions, he says: "Let it not trouble you that certain persons do not bring [them] to Baptism with that faith by which we believe that by spiritual grace we are regenerated unto eternal life, but think that by this remedy they retain or recover temporal health. For not on that account are they not regenerated, because they are not offered by such with this intention; for through them the necessary ministries are celebrated." So he. And these words are also found in Gratian (De Consecratione, Dist. 4, c. Non illud).¹⁵³

§ XXIV — Reply to certain arguments on the contrary (Responsio ad quaedam in contrarium argumenta)

§ 127. Against this doctrine many arguments are, and are wont to be, brought forward. First, spiritual medicines (for that comparison was employed above) exert their power along their own line not only where the physician does not intend health, but even if the physician intends nothing at all. Second, the sacraments avail by the work worked; therefore some intention of the agent is not necessary. Third, a priest not knowing with which words of the Mass the consecration is made nevertheless truly consecrates. But here the intention seems to be lacking, since it ought to bear upon the form of the sacrament, which that man is ignorant of. Fourth, many marriages have been contracted even among Christians with no intention of a work pertaining to religion, but with merely carnal thought and an intention only of the natural act, just as is done among unbelievers. Fifth, the minister acts as an instrument; but in an instrument an intention of the work is not required, only in the principal agent. For the intention of cutting is not required in the knife or the saw, but in the man. Sixth, if the intention of the minister is necessary, no one will be certain that he has been baptized, because we are certainly not able to know another's hidden thought. Seventh, Calvin objects that Isaac blessed Jacob beyond his intention when he wanted to bless Esau, and that the blessing was ratified, Isaac himself also attesting and saying, "Benedixi ei: erit benedictus" (Gen. 27). Eighth, certain places are brought forward from Augustine. For in book 3 (Against Cresconius) he compares to a fertile field, which indeed requires a worker, but does not care with what mind, with what intention, he labors.¹⁵⁵ And in the Preface on Psalm 31 he says: "Intentionem, inquit, fides dirigit." From which it is apparent that in ministering a sacrament intention is not required, since faith is not required either. And in Tractate 5 (on John), speaking of the baptizer with respect to the effect of the sacrament, he says: "If some drunk has baptized, Christ has baptized. I do not fear a drunkard, because I attend to the dove, through whom it is said to me: 'Hic est qui baptizat'." ¹⁵⁶ Yet assuredly a drunkard would be much to be feared and to be avoided in the office of baptizing, if a certain intention is necessary, since the cognition of a drunk person is very slippery and uncertain. The same man, in book 7 (Against the Donatists, ch. 53), when certain questions have been put to him about some baptism given deceitfully, in pretense, in jest, or received, says that he for his part does not doubt that those have baptism who, wherever and from whomsoever, had received it consecrated with the evangelical words without their own simulation and with some faith. But where, he says, there was no fellowship at all of believers thus believing, nor did he who would receive it there thus believe, but the whole thing was carried on playfully, and

in pretense and in jest, whether the baptism which is given thus ought to be approved, he declares must be implored from the divine judgment by the oracle of some revelation, with united prayer and with supplicatory devotions pressed with groans. Lastly, the example of Athanasius is adduced, who, still a boy, while playing on the sea-shore and representing by imitation the actions of a bishop, baptized the boys who were playing with him in the name of the Trinity; whom Alexander the Bishop judged to have been truly baptized, as Sozomen relates, book 2 (ch. 15), and Rufinus, book 10 (ch. 14), and Nicephorus, book 8 (ch. 41); it is contained in the *Decretum*, Causa 1, Question 1, Chapter *Spiritus Sancti*.¹⁵⁷

§ 128. To these objections we reply in order as follows. To the first: since the sacraments are human acts (*actus humani*), they cannot even subsist without the intention of the agent, and therefore they cannot operate without it; whereas bodily medicines, both to exist and to operate, can do so without the intention of the physician. To the second it is answered that the intention of the minister is included together with the work worked. To the third, nothing prevents that priest, while exercising such an act, from having a general intention of doing what the Church does, although he does not know in part with which words the consecration is made, or even although he altogether thinks that the consecration is not being made. Nor is it true that the intention must bear in a special way upon the form of the sacrament. For it is enough that it bear in a general way upon the whole act, in order that the sacrament may subsist. To the fourth: if it should happen at some time that a marriage is contracted among the faithful with no other thought than that with which it is contracted among unbelievers—just as perhaps at some time it happened when clandestine marriages were still ratified—it does not seem to have more of the formal character (*ratio*) of a sacrament than that which is contracted by unbelievers. But about this more fully in the treatise on the sacrament of Matrimony.

§ 129. To the fifth: the minister of a sacrament is not any sort of instrument, but a rational one, whose action is a human act, and therefore he requires intention, as St. Thomas rightly answers.¹⁵⁸ You will say: sometimes a master gives alms through a minister, the minister not intending this. I answer: if he uses the minister as a rational instrument, there ought to be in the minister the will and intention of signifying the will of his master, even if he does this unwillingly. You will ask why at least an intention of a human act in general does not suffice, just as it suffices in the minister whom a master uses for giving alms. For the master can give alms through a minister altogether ignorant of the alms: as if he should send money which the servant thinks to be owed for some work or loan, or if he should send a sealed letter which contains an assignment of money. One must answer that the rationale must be sought from the institution of Christ, which requires that the minister intend to do what the Church does. And assuredly it is fitting that the action of the minister, inasmuch as he is a minister, be in some way determined to the will of his master. You will object: "The servant does not know what his lord does" (John 15).¹⁵⁹ I reply: when the lord commands something to the servant, the servant knows that the lord wills that which he commands, and to that the will of the servant executing the command is determined.

§ 130. To the sixth, it must be said that moral certainty is sufficient. For when the minister does what is wont to be done in the Church, and by the words themselves the intention of the Church is expressed, unless the contrary appears probably from elsewhere, one is truly baptized. For although the contrary is possible, nevertheless such absolute possibility cannot, nor ought to, disturb human and moral certainty. To the seventh: just as there was in Isaac the intention of blessing, so in the minister of the sacrament the intention is required of doing what the use of the Church holds. Moreover, just as there the blessing of the one blessing

one person for another was ratified, so the baptism would be ratified if someone perchance should baptize one person for another by mistake; because the intention is about this man, although it be unknown that he is Peter, or he is thought to be Paul. To Augustine's passages also we reply thus. The first and the second passage are understood of the intention by which the work is directed by the agent to a good or evil end. For in the one passage he disputes against the Donatists, who wanted the integrity of the sacrament to depend on the goodness of the minister. In the other he wishes to teach what intention makes a work right. But an intention of this kind we have already shown is not required here, but only that by which the work itself, such as it is in the Church, is intended.

§ 131. As to the third, it is answered that Augustine did not say: "I do not fear a drunk" (*ebrium*), but "a drunkard" (*ebriosum*). For a drunk man is deservedly to be feared not only on account of a defect of intention—because the act is not a human act—but also on account of the danger of changing the form of the words (which Augustine doubtless requires to be intact). Not so a tippler, a man somewhat given to drink.¹⁶⁰ As to the fourth passage we answer that Augustine's hesitation, which he himself longs to be removed, has now been removed, not by one but by two definitions of General Councils. But if any other doubts about the sacraments, and especially about Baptism, arise—whether that which has been done is ratified, or whether anything has been done at all—the Church afterwards thought that a remedy should be provided for that difficulty by another method, namely by repeating the sacrament under this condition: if either it has not been done, or that, about which there is doubt, is not ratified. To the last objection, about the deed of Athanasius, we reply that imitation is twofold: the one which tends to the thing itself, as of him who imitates the virtue of someone; the other which tends to the likeness of the thing, as of him who paints a lion. Between which two there is much of a difference; for he, by imitating, strives to shape the virtue itself: but this man intends by painting not the lion itself, but only its likeness, to produce something like what is done in the Church, but merely to represent such a thing, as in a painting or on the stage. Athanasius, however, was intending by his imitation to do this very thing which the Church does. For he did not wish to baptize any except catechumens, as Sozomen testifies; and therefore what was done by him was deservedly held as ratified by Alexander, on the counsel of the priests, after an inquiry had been made, as the same Sozomen relates.¹⁵⁷

§ 132. The Apostle himself points out the ministry of the sacraments, both in the first chapter where he makes mention of baptism, and at the beginning of chapter 4, where he says: "So let a man account of us as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."¹⁶² To confirm this there avails that saying in Joshua, where at the end the Lord, speaking about Balaam to the Israelites, says: "But I would not hear him, but on the contrary by him I blessed you"—assuredly by a wicked man, corrupted by avarice and ill-disposed toward the people of God.¹⁶³ Moreover, besides those places of St. Augustine in which he teaches that the baptism which is given outside the Church—even by heretics and schismatics—is true baptism (for this he inculcates in almost all the books, letters, and treatises published against the Donatists in diverse ways), we shall subjoin certain passages in which he shows that the sacraments ministered through evil men operate no less than through good. Therefore, in Tractate 5 on John he says thus: "If the minister be proud, he is reckoned with the Devil; but the gift of Christ is not contaminated. What flows through him is pure; what passes through him comes as a limpid thing to the fertile earth."¹⁶⁴ And again, insisting on the same likeness: "Through a stone channel water passes into the garden-beds: in the stone channel itself it generates nothing; yet it brings very much fruit to the gardens."¹⁶⁵ In the same Tractate there are read the words discussed by us above: "I do not fear a murderer, a drunkard, an adulterer, because it is Christ who baptizes."¹⁶⁵ Elsewhere, too, he adduces a comparison from the farmer, whose wickedness does nothing to hinder the field that is tilled by him from

bearing fruit—as in book 3 against Cresconius, chapter 8; for the Apostle also uses that comparison in 1 Cor. 3.¹⁶⁶ Again Augustine, in the same book (chapter 6): "For baptizing and sanctifying a man, if what is received is so much the better as he is better by whom it is handed on, there would be among the recipients so great a variety of baptisms as there is diversity of merits among the ministers. For if ..." [166] And again: "Further, if among good ministers, though one is better than another, the baptism which is given by the better is not better, in no way is that which is also given by an evil man worse, when the same baptism is given. And therefore through ministers unequal the gift of God is equal, because it is not theirs, but His."¹⁶⁵ And in book 3 against the Donatists, chapter 10: "The baptism of Christ, consecrated by the evangelical words, is holy both when given by adulterers and in adulterers, although they are unclean with impurity; because its very holiness assists the defiled—whether unto the salvation of those using it well, or unto the destruction of those using it ill." And then he subjoins a likeness of the light of the sun or even of a lamp, which, diffused through filthy places, contracts from thence nothing of defilement.¹⁶⁸ Likewise, in book 2 against the letter of Parmenian, chapter 11—speaking of a minister of the Church who is feigned and therefore does not have the Holy Spirit, according to that saying of Wisdom 1, "The Holy Spirit of discipline will flee the deceitful"—he at length concludes thus: "Yet the Holy Spirit does not desert his ministry, by which through him He works the salvation of others."¹⁶⁹ To the same purport Pope Nicholas, answering the inquiries of the Bulgarians (chapter 7, reported by Gratian in Decree XV, question 8, canon *Siscitantibus*), using another likeness, says: "A wax candle, when lit, indeed brings detriment to itself; to others, however, it administers light in the darkness; and whence it offers benefit to others, thence it affords loss to itself. So, namely, the evil minister, by administering good sacraments, is useful to others, but because he handles most holy sacraments with polluted hands, he hurts himself by that very work of his by which he profits others."¹⁷⁰ Likewise St. Bernard (Sermon 60 on the Song of Songs) judges those to be heretics who say: "The bishops are sinners, and therefore they are fit neither to give nor to receive a sacrament." This heresy was afterwards affirmed by John Wyclif, but condemned by the Fathers of the Council of Constance in his article 4, which runs thus: "If a bishop or priest be in mortal sin, he does not ordain, does not consecrate, does not confer, does not baptize."¹⁷¹

§ 133. Wherefore, most rightly against that error and the like there was issued this canon (number 12, Session 7) in the Council of Trent: "If anyone shall say that a minister existing in mortal sin, provided he has observed all the essentials which pertain to the confecting or conferring of a sacrament, does not confect or confer the sacrament—let him be anathema."¹⁷² And since the doctrine of this canon is general, it must be taken generally, of any minister whatsoever existing in any mortal sin whatsoever—whether he be secretly evil or manifestly; and whether he be still a Catholic or a heretic; or in whatever way. Whence there is also to be rejected that distinction of certain Donatists, by which they used to say that, if the ministers were indeed evil but hidden, what was done through them was valid, but invalid if they were manifest—which seems also to have pleased the Master in this book (dist. e 13), and some today hand on.¹⁷³ For absolutely, whatever the minister be, if there is not some other defect, what he does is valid. And so long as he is tolerated by the Church, although he himself sins gravely by administering, nevertheless to receive sacraments from him is so far from being unlawful that the faithful using the ministry of such men are in no part defrauded of sacramental grace. The former part Augustine asserts and teaches,¹⁷⁴ while the latter, after Nicholas the Pope in the Decree to the Bulgarians as related by Gratian,¹⁷⁵ is handed down by Lucius III (chapter *Vestra*, title *On the Cohabitation of Clerics*), where, bringing together certain sayings of the Pontiffs that agree together, he at length subjoins this: "Hold without doubt that from clerics or priests, although fornicators, so long as they are tolerated, the Divine Mysteries are licitly heard, and the other ecclesiastical sacraments are received."¹⁷⁶

§ XXVI — *The solution of the objections made to the contrary (Solutio eorum quae contra objiciuntur)*

§ 134. Out of the many things that are wont to be opposed to the foregoing doctrine, these few and chief ones. First, texts of Scripture are objected. For in Malachi 2 the Lord says to evil priests: "I will curse your blessings"; and in Sirach 34: "From the unclean what will be cleansed?"; and the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 6: "What participation has justice with iniquity, or what fellowship has light with darkness?"

§ 135. Then certain sentences of the Fathers are produced. For Augustine writes in book 3 Against the Donatists, ch. 18, about evil ministers of the Church in this way: "Yet they will not give the remission of sins, which is given through the prayer of the saints, that is, through the groanings of the dove. For the Lord would not have said to robbers and usurers: 'If you forgive anyone his sins, they shall be forgiven him; if you retain anyone's, they shall be retained.'" To this there are like passages in him, in the same work book 4, ch. 4; book 5, chs. 20, 21, 22; book 6, chs. 1, 3; and in Sermon 16 On the Words of the Lord.¹⁷⁸ The same, in book 10 of the City of God, ch. 27: "How shall they cleanse the spirit of a man who have their own unclean?"¹⁷⁹ Jerome (on Sophonias 3) says that he thinks the Eucharist is effected by words alone, and not by the merits of the priests; and on Ephesians, at the text "one baptism," he denies that heretics have true baptisms, asserting that the Church alone is the life-giving fountain.¹⁸⁰ Innocent I (Epistle 17) denies that those who do not have faith give, in the sacrament, the fullness of the Holy Spirit; and this is had in Gratian, 1, q. 1, cap. Arrianos.¹⁸¹ Leo I (Epistle 75) says that in the Alexandrian Church through the impiety of Dioscorus all the light of the sacraments was extinguished, and that the Sacred Mysteries withdrew themselves from the individual hands of the heretics.¹⁸² Gregory also, book 3 of the Dialogues, ch. 1, calls the Eucharist which had been consecrated and offered by Adrian a sacrilegious communion.¹⁸³ And Pelagius the Pope, as is had in Gratian, 24, q. 1, cap. Schisma: "It is not," he says, "the Body of the Lord which a schismatic consecrates."¹⁸⁴ Likewise Bernard (Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs) denies that heretics have the power of consecrating the Body and Blood of Christ.¹⁸⁵ Nay and before all these, Cyprian in various places teaches and proves that there is no baptism which is received outside the Church, because outside her the Holy Spirit is not present, that is, does not work for the sanctification of men. And he affirms that that opinion is not new but received from his predecessors, and he calls it the firmness of the Catholic rule. The places: book of Letters, Epistle 6; book 4, Epistle 4; Sermon 5 On the Lapsed; and again the Epistle to Julian and Pompeius; which opinion of Cyprian the Council of Carthage, he himself presiding, followed, as one may see in the same place.¹⁸⁶ But even before Cyprian something of that sort is found to have been established in the Apostolic Canons. For in canon 46 a bishop who receives the baptism of heretics is condemned; and in canon 67 an ordination made by a heretic is declared void.[^186]

§ 136. To these are added arguments. The first, which moved the Master (dist. 13): the priest who offers the sacrifice does not say "We offer" in his own name but in the name of the whole Church; and there likewise in the other sacraments he fulfills the person of the Church. Therefore he who is not in the Church but hates her fellowship brings it about that... The second: a sacrament is an action of the minister, as Baptism, Absolution, Ordination. If therefore the minister does it with an evil will, such an action will be wicked and unclean, and consequently the very sacrament either null, or unclean and defiled. The third: prayer has its effect according to the greater or lesser devotion of the one who prays; but in the sacraments prayer is employed either as the form, as in the sacrament of Extreme Unction, or as a supplication joined to obtain the effect, as in almost all; therefore according to the minister's devotion and piety the sacraments will avail more

or less. The fourth: the preaching of the word is one thing and better than another, and more efficacious to convert the souls of the hearers; therefore Baptism administered by one may be better and more efficacious for obtaining God's grace than that administered by another. The last: the evil who are outside the Church, and certain even who are within the Church, do not have the right to administer the sacraments; therefore what they do is not ratified.

§ 137. These arguments can be dissolved in order as follows. As to what is objected from Malachi 2, although by others it is solved otherwise, here it seems to have its proper sense: "I will curse"—your temporal harvests—"whose abundance you expect." For temporal goods are wont to be called "blessings" in the idiom of the Old Scriptures. Whence that in 2 Corinthians 9: "Prepare your promised blessing," and a little after, "this prepared as a blessing, not as covetousness." And again: "He who sows in blessings, in blessings also shall reap." For there the Apostle by "blessing" understands an abundance of temporal gift. And the sense of the Prophet is confirmed by what immediately precedes: "I will send poverty upon you."

§ 138. The place of Sirach signifies nothing other than that from the unclean one cannot expect cleanness as from an author from whom that cleanness would take its origin. For cleanness which is given through the sacraments is not conferred originally by the ministers, but by God through the ministry of men.

§ 139. The sentence of the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 6 concerns fellowship which consists in mutual social intercourse; and yet not every association with the wicked is to be fled, the same Apostle being witness in 1 Corinthians 5. Therefore rightly and without detriment of spiritual fruit does one receive the sacrament from an evil man, while the Church tolerates him in that ministry.

§ 140. To the sentence cited from Augustine and to others like it one must reply that Augustine is not there treating of the ministry of remitting sins by the sacraments, but of a certain other and peculiar mode of remission, by which, namely, through prayers, tears, and other pious works one cooperates to impetrate pardon for sinners. Which mode doubtless pertains to the pious alone in the Church. Whence the same Augustine (Epistle 22): "The whole mother Church which is in the saints does this, because the whole bears all, the whole bears each one." That this is Augustine's meaning is made clear by the words immediately added: "which remission is given through the prayers of the saints, that is, through the groanings of the dove, whoever may baptize."

§ 141. But what was objected from book 10 of the City of God is to be understood of a purgation which is done by one's own proper virtue. For such purgation the Gentiles attributed to their demons or to their gods, against whom in that place Augustine argues.

§ 142. The former passage of Jerome alludes to the etymon of the word "eucharistia," which signifies thanksgiving, and he denies that for the action of the priest to be pleasing to God and commended by his life it suffices that the solemn words be recited; rather, besides that, innocence and integrity of morals are required. The latter passage explains itself: by "true baptism" he understands a "vital," that is, a vivifying fountain, which heretics do not have, because baptism outside the Church does not cleanse adults, on account of heretical or schismatic communion. For that is wont to be called "true" which has an operation congruent to its nature or institution, as a "true Christian" is he who lives well, a "true shepherd" he who feeds well; so a true father, a true mother, a true Israelite, a true monk.

§ 143. To Innocent a like reply is to be made. For although outside the Church there are sacraments, nevertheless they do not avail to obtain the grace of the Holy Spirit.

§ 144. Leo is speaking of such a deprivation as regards the faithful on the part of the heretics—namely, that by the impiety of Dioscorus the faithful were bereft of the sacraments and the Mysteries withdrew themselves from the hands of the heretics. Thus Augustine himself has spoken (Epistle to Honoratus 180), and he similarly interprets a certain place of Cyprian (Epistle 22; also book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 13).^[^187] Gregory, however, calls sacrilegious not the very Body of the Lord, but its use, when a heretic proffers it and another receives it; and he is speaking about a notorious heretic.^[^188] The opinion of Pope Pelagius is to be understood of the Body of Christ insofar as it signifies the mystical Body of Christ, that is, the Church, as his following words indicate. Likewise Augustine in book 21 of the City of God, ch. 25, denies that the Body of Christ is truly eaten outside the Church.^[^189] Bernard is speaking about those who, although they called themselves Apostolic and said they were successors of the Apostles, nevertheless were neither sent by the true successors of the Apostles nor ordained by them, and therefore were not true priests.^[^190]

§ 145. Furthermore, that Cyprian held the opinion that the baptism of heretics is null and therefore to be repeated in the Church is not in doubt. But that opinion, first the Roman Pontiffs, and finally also a Plenary Synod, as Augustine testifies, book 6 Against the Donatists, ch. 1, rejected as contrary to ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition. This, moreover, is what Augustine says refutes Cyprian and his colleagues in the same place: that they did not distinguish the sacrament itself from the effect or use of the sacrament. For because they did not find the effect of baptism, which consists in liberation from sins and rectitude of heart, among the heretics, they thought that the sacrament itself was not there either; just as if someone were to deny that the Scriptures are among the heretics, because among them there is not a true understanding of the Scriptures. Which error the same Augustine, disputing in many places against the Donatists, refutes. And in excuse of Cyprian, what can be alleged is shown both often elsewhere and elegantly by himself in the book On the One Baptism, ch. 13.^[^191]

§ 146. As for the Apostolic Canons, some understand them thus: although a true sacrament is given by heretics, nevertheless it is not permissible to receive it from them unless the necessity of death be pressing. A truer reply seems to be that some of those Canons were of old inserted by heretics, which contained doctrine neither sound nor apostolic, and that therefore it has come about that not altogether certain authority is to be sought from those Canons. For both about the number of those canons and about their origin there is no small controversy among writers; and some other things too are found in them which do not seem to be very consonant with right faith.

§ 147. To the arguments also adduced on the contrary we reply thus. The first argument indeed shows that he who confects or administers a sacrament ought to be a member of the Church, so that in his person he may say "We offer," and recite the other prayers; nevertheless it does not prove that there is no sacrament if it be otherwise: for the substance of the sacrament it suffices that there be in the minister the general intention of doing what the Church does, as we have shown above at length.

§ 148. To the second it is answered that that action, in the genus of morals, is wicked and unclean if it be done with an evil will. But in the genus of the sacrament, that is, of an operative sign instituted by God and administered with the intention of the Church, it is good and clean, and moreover ratified and valid.

§ 149. To the third: the sacraments have their power from the institution of Christ, not from the devotion of the one who prays, even if perchance in some sacrament the very form is deprecatory. Yet it is not to be

denied (which also the argument proposed sufficiently proves) that the pious affect of a good minister and the devotion of the one praying obtain something of spiritual grace for him who receives the sacrament, and that so much the more or less, the more or less pleasing to God his prayer is—whereas an evil minister obtains nothing. But that is not properly sacramental grace; it is an accessory grace, which other pious persons not administering the sacrament itself can also impetrate for the recipient. And for this reason without doubt it is better to receive a sacrament from a good than from an evil minister, and likewise to hear Mass of a good rather than of an evil priest, as St. Thomas teaches, III, q. 82, a. 6.[¹⁹²] And for this reason also the holy martyrs preferred to receive the sacraments from good rather than from evil ministers, as is read in their Acts—unless someone would prefer to take this as a pattern of edifying imitation.

§ 150. To the fourth, that the case of the preaching of the word is not the same as that of the administration of the sacraments; for the sacraments were instituted by Christ so as always to be operative, unless an obstacle be placed; but the preaching of the word has not that institution, rather God bestows its effect according to a human mode, in proportion as the preacher aptly speaks to the hearers. Whence also the office of preaching the Gospel is more excellent than that of baptizing, so that the Apostle says: "Not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel."

§ 151. To the last it is replied that very often what is done by one who has not the right to do it nevertheless subsists and is valid; as marriage contracted by one who is bound by a simple vow of continence. For it is enough that there be power brought down to act, even if the act be illicit and unlawful. Augustine resolves this very argument, book 5 Against the Donatists, ch. 15: "Many things, indeed," he says, "are given contrary to right, yet they are not therefore also said not to have been given." [¹⁹³]

§ XXVII — How the sacraments of the Old and of the New Law differ from each other (Sacramenta veteris et novae legis quomodo inter se differant)

§ 152. That the wickedness of ministers, or even their heresy, in no way hinders the effect of the sacraments is also defined by Councils. For the Council of Nicaea, in the canon on the Cathari—namely those calling themselves "pure"—when at any time they come to the Church, prescribes that, receiving imposition of hands, they be thus admitted; but in the canon on the Paulianists it orders that, when they return to the Church, they are altogether to be baptized.¹⁸⁸ Jerome notes these canons when he says: "The Nicene Synod received all heretics; and, what is greater, it provided that even the bishop of the Novatians, if he were converted, should retain his rank."¹⁸⁹ Likewise the first Council of Arles, held in the year 314, in canon 8, decreed on this matter as follows: "As for the Africans, because they follow their own law, let one who has come from heresy be asked the Creed; and if he confesses that he has been baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, only hands are to be imposed on him; but if, on being questioned, he does not profess this Trinity, let him be baptized."¹⁹⁰ Augustine also affirms in his books against the Donatists that the re-baptizing of those baptized by heretics was condemned and overthrown by the Council of the whole world; whether Augustine understood this of the first Nicene Council is disputed, while some hold that he did not mean the first Council of Arles.¹⁹¹ From the canons of the Councils alleged it is sufficiently evident that the sacraments conferred by heretics are valid, nor does their heresy prevent the recipients from obtaining integrity. This doctrine, as dogmatic and polemical writers show, is demonstrated by the consensus of the Fathers in a thousand places; and the Council of Trent, moreover, gives no slight confirmation of it, in

the place cited by the Author, by speaking universally.¹⁹² For, as the Author rightly weighs it, that canon—although expressly about Baptism conferred by heretics—must be taken by parity as concerning any ministers who are manifestly wicked by mortal crime, whether still Catholics or already heretics. If anyone demands examples of the contrary, let him know that among the heretics themselves there has never been consistency, and—as a tide now swelling, now ebbing—so they were wont to assert, to allege, to speak, and to write.¹⁹³ Thus some of them assigned the assistance and sanctification, which they restricted to the predestined alone, not only to the ministers but even to the very validity of the sacraments; then, swinging to the other extreme, they confessed the sacraments; the temper, truly, of an inconstant man, who, his opinion once changed, straightway anathematized what before he embraced with equal zeal. More abundant testimony on this matter will be furnished by Florimond de Raemon, once a Calvinist, afterwards a Catholic, in his work *On the Origin, Progress, and Ruins of the Heresies of the Sixteenth Century*.¹⁹⁴ But although those testimonies are many and beyond doubt, nevertheless there has not been one and the same opinion among the heretics on this point; for certain of them admitted Baptism but not Orders—for example, the Luciferinians, who, even among themselves, were reckoned also by the name "Catholics"; and Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, and several who followed him among the Western Africans, judged the baptism of heretics to be defiled indeed, yet held it to pertain to discipline, not to dogma.¹⁹⁵ The Donatists, assuredly in schism from the Catholics, admitted the baptism of heretics.¹⁹⁶ St. Bernard recounts that certain men, who called themselves "Apostolicals," rashly usurped to laymen the effective faculty of ministering the sacraments; and St. Antoninus reports this as well.¹⁹⁷ A monstrous error of the Waldenses, as St. Thomas indicates, was to ascribe to good laymen the right of administering the sacraments; and Wyclif, too, assigned the power of conferring the sacraments to good ministers alone—indeed to the predestined—at least in some of his assertions.¹⁹⁸ Let this summary suffice here. Since certain peculiar questions occur both concerning Catholics and concerning heretics insofar as they pertain to the sacraments of which the Author treats, we shall, in the places where the Author handles those sacraments, remark upon them more at large, and especially shall weave in the history. Meanwhile let readers consult Bellarmine (volume 3 of the *Controversies*, book 1 *On the Sacraments in General*, cap. 16), and, among others, the Cardinal just named, as also Natalis Alexander.¹⁹⁹

§ 153. It is a celebrated question of the Doctors in what the sacraments of the New Law differ from those of the Old (*sacramenta veteris legis*). In which, however, this must first of all be fixed and certain, namely what the Fathers of the Council of Trent defined under anathema in these words: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law do not differ from the sacraments of the Old Law except because the ceremonies are different and the external rites are different—let him be anathema."¹⁹² For this alone do the heretics of our day wish them to differ, against whom that canon was published. But what that difference is, besides the diversity of ceremonies and rites, which must necessarily be acknowledged among them, was not explained by the Tridentine Fathers.

§ 154. Yet before that, something had already been established on the matter in the Council of Florence. For there we read the following about the sacraments of the New Law: "These differ greatly from the sacraments of the Old Law: for those did not cause grace, but only signified that it would be given through the passion of Christ; but these of ours both contain grace and confer it on those who receive them worthily."²⁰⁰ This difference is taken from the doctrine of the Fathers and from Sacred Scripture itself.

§ 155. For the Apostle (Heb. 9) denies that "the gifts and sacrifices which, according to the law, are offered, can, as to the conscience, perfect the worshipper, only in meats and drinks and various baptisms and

justices of the flesh, until the time of reformation." And in the same letter (chap. 10): "The law, having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, by the same sacrifices which they offer continually every year, can never make perfect those who come;" and shortly after: "For it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and of goats sins should be taken away," and the like, which he repeats again and again. Wherefore, although he speaks chiefly of sacrifices, the same reasoning holds for the sacraments; for in the same Epistle (Gal. 4) he calls them "weak and beggarly elements," because they had no power of justifying. To the same effect is that (Heb. 7): "There is indeed a reprobation of the former commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness; for the law brought nothing to perfection;" and chap. 8: "For if the former had been faultless," etc.

§ 156. Augustine delivers this difference in the exposition of Ps. 73 in these words: "The sacraments are not the same in both Testaments, because some sacraments are such as give salvation, others such as promise the Savior. The sacraments of the New Testament give salvation; the sacraments of the Old Testament promised the Savior." A little earlier, giving the reason for the difference, he adds: "If, therefore, we distinguish the two Testaments, the Old and the New, the sacraments are not the same, nor the promises the same." The same man, speaking of the old sacrifices (Tract. 41 on John): "In them there was no expiation of sins, but a shadow of things to come." And in book 22 against Faustus, ch. 69, he testifies that Moses was the minister of sacraments not already bestowing salvation, but still promising the Savior; and in a letter (Ep. 19) likewise.²⁰¹

§ 157. Jerome too indicated this difference when he wrote on Isaiah at that passage, "Wash yourselves, be clean," distinguishing there the sacraments of the Old from those of the New. For he says in the person of Christ: "The religion of the Gospel pleases me, that you be baptized in my blood by the laver of regeneration, which alone can remit sins"—as though he said that the former could not do this, and therefore did not, in respect of merit, please; according to that of Ps. 39: "Sacrifice and oblation thou didst not desire; holocaust and sin-offering thou didst not require; then said I, Behold I come." Similar is Jerome's place on that of Ezek. 20: "Therefore I also gave them precepts not good, and judgments in which they shall not live," which he interprets of the ceremonial prescriptions, of which sort are the sacraments and sacrifices. Finally, the Master (in this Distinction) clearly hands down this doctrine from Augustine, whom all later writers follow.²⁰²

§ XXVIII — Explanation of the same doubt about the difference of the sacraments (Dubitationis ejusdem circa discrimen Sacramentorum explicatio)

§ 158. No small difficulty with regard to the foregoing doctrine is brought forward from certain passages, both of Holy Scripture and of the ancient Doctors, from which it plainly seems to be shown that the sacraments and sacrifices of the ancient Law were not only signs of things to come, but also had the efficacy of grace (*gratia*), that is, of righteousness and the remission of sins. For in Leviticus 4, 5, 17 and Numbers 15 the effect of the remission of sins is attributed to the Levitical sacrifices which were offered for sin, in these and similar words: "And the priest shall pray for him, and it shall be forgiven him, and he shall be made propitious." Likewise also the Apostle (Heb. 5), when he was speaking about the ancient sacrifices: "Every high priest," he says, "taken from among men is appointed for men in the things that pertain to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." But if you reply that remission of sins was given to those who had recourse to them by faith, and not by the sacraments and sacrifices, this reply will seem not only to attribute something more to the faith of the ancients than to ours—inasmuch as that faith alone would have availed for

the remission of sin without the power of a sacrament or of a sacrifice—but also to weaken the proof used by Catholics, by which, from similar Scriptures of the New Testament, they prove that the sacraments of the New Law confer grace. For concerning the imposition of hands the statement is similar (Deut. last chapter; Acts 8). And again (Lev. 4; Jas. 5) concerning the sacrifice and the anointing. For there it is said: "The priest shall pray, and it shall be forgiven him." But here: "Let the presbyters pray over him, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up."

§ 159. Besides, we read that in the time of the Old Testament holy men offered sacrifices, that by them they might render the Lord placated and propitious to themselves. For, to pass over those who lived even before the Law—such as Abel, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, Jacob—all of whom we learn to have offered a sacrifice acceptable to God, with the very chant of the Mass attesting it; or those who were outside the Jewish people, such as Job, who for the sins of his sons used to frequent a daily sacrifice (Job 1), and by God Himself was commanded at the end of the book to offer for his friends, in order to reconcile them to God (the last chapter of Job)—even by those who were under the Law we read that sacrifices were offered with fruit and effect. For David (2 Kgs, last chapter), when the pestilence was raging against the people, offered a sacrifice, at which the Lord, being appeased, ceased from the plague. And (Dan. 3) the three boys, thrown into the furnace and lamenting that at that time there was neither sacrifice nor holocaust nor oblation, pray to the Lord that "with a contrite and humbled heart" it may be received "as in the holocaust of rams and of bulls, and as in thousands of fat lambs." "So," they say, "let our sacrifice be in Thy sight this day, that it may please Thee."

§ 160. Therefore, if a contrite heart and humbled spirit were of such value for reconciling God, by the same institution of God the sacrifices of that time availed for the same. It is also read in 2 Maccabees 3 that a sacrifice offered for Heliodorus was of profit to him; and in chapter 12 that Judas Maccabaeus ordered sacrifice to be offered for the dead, "that they might be loosed from sins." Lest perhaps anyone should think that those sacrifices availed indeed for temporal goods, but not for spiritual ones, among which there is without doubt the remission of sins. Finally, from the Law it is manifest that sacrifices were then instituted, some for salvation, and some for sins. This the Apostle also attests (Heb. 5, 7). Since that institution was not vain, it seems altogether to be admitted that those sacrifices availed for those effects.

§ 161. To these are added the testimonies of the Fathers. For St. Augustine, besides the fact that in book 19 against Faustus, chapter 11, he says in general concerning the sacraments of religion that their force avails "in an ineffable degree," although, as he adds (ch. 13), the sacraments of the New Testament are greater in power—whence he seems also to attribute some power, though a lesser, to the ancient sacraments—elsewhere expressly ascribes to them a power of sanctifying. For treating that passage Numbers 15, "The soul that shall sin through pride," Question 25, he writes in these words: "This kind of sin he did not say ought to be purged by any kind of sacrifice, judging it to be incurable by that cure which was carried out by sacrifices, because the second sort of cures is prescribed in this Scripture. Which, if they be considered in themselves, by no means can they heal. But if the things themselves be inquired into, of which these are the sacraments, there can be found in them the cleansing of sins." And writing on Psalm 77: "Since," he says, "to the ancients all sacraments were common, grace was not common to all, which is the power of the sacraments; just as also now, what was then veiled having now been revealed, the laver is common to all who are baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; but the very grace, of which they themselves are sacraments, is not common to all." The same (Questions 84 on Leviticus): "Moses," he says, "sanctified by visible sacraments through his ministry; but the Lord by invisible grace through the Holy Spirit is everywhere wholly Himself,

even by the vessel of the visible sacraments," and the rest to the end of the question. He intimates the same doctrine in book 2 On Adulterous Marriages, chapter 6, when he says that in the Old Testament the crime of the adulteress was, by this very fact insinuating that there were other crimes which Leviticus mentions that were cleansed by sacrifices.

§ 162. In the same sense St. Ambrose writes, book 7 on Luke 17, in these words: "The Lord came to Abraham, He came to Moses, He came to Mary—that is, He came in the sign, He came in the Law, He came in the body. We recognize His Advent from His benefits; elsewhere there is purification, elsewhere sanctification, elsewhere justification. Circumcision purified, the Law sanctified, grace justified. Whence in all things, and in One, all things. For no one can be cleansed unless he has deserved the Lord." With these St. Leo also seems to agree, writing thus in Sermon 3 On the Nativity of the Lord: "And this great sacrament of piety, with which the whole world is already filled, was so powerful even in its significations that those who believed it promised gained not less than those who received it bestowed." And in Sermon 2 On the Day of Pentecost: "When on the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit filled the disciples of the Lord, it was not the beginning of His gift, but an addition of bounty. For both the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and all the holy Priests who were in former times were quickened by the same sanctification of the Holy Spirit: without this grace no sacraments were ever instituted, no mysteries celebrated; so that the power of the charisms was always the same, although the measure of the gifts was not the same."

§ 163. So much for him. The opinion of Hugh of St. Victor is also plain, book 1 of On the Sacraments, part 8: "Some sacraments," he says, "are under the Law, others under nature, others under grace, but having the same effect of sanctification." And again: "From the time when man began to be sick, God, for his restoration, prepared a medicine in His sacraments." The reasoning also seems to support the judgments of these men; for the faith of the ancients was the same as ours; therefore, with the sacraments applied, they obtained the same grace together with us. Likewise: the sacraments of old were referred to the blood of Christ to be shed, just as the new are referred to the same blood already shed: therefore, as these are efficacious in the blood of Christ, so also were those. Moreover, if anyone in the time of the Law had used signs devised by himself to profess faith in the Savior, he would not have obtained the effect which he obtained by the signs instituted by God; and through the sacrifice joined to them he would have obtained more than if he had not employed the sacrament or the sacrifice. One could here raise a question about circumcision and its effect; but about it we shall treat later in a special discussion.

§ 164. For the unraveling of this difficulty it must be said that St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure think differently about the difference of the sacraments of the Old and of the New Law. For St. Thomas (I-II, q. 103, a. 2) teaches that the ceremonies of the Old Law did indeed have a power of cleansing from legal uncleanness, and therefore it is said by the Apostle in Heb. 9 that "the blood of goats and of bulls, and the ashes of a heifer being sprinkled, sanctify the defiled unto the cleansing of the flesh." For which reason those ceremonies themselves were called by the same Apostle "justices of the flesh." But from the uncleanness of the mind, which is the uncleanness of guilt, he says they did not have the power to expiate, because expiation from sins could never be made except through Christ, who "takes away the sins of the world." And because, he says, the mystery of the Incarnation and Passion of Christ had not yet been really accomplished, those ceremonies of the Old Law could not really contain in themselves the power flowing from Christ incarnate and suffering, as the sacraments of the New Law contain it. And therefore they could not cleanse from sin, as the Apostle says in Heb. 10: "For it is impossible that with the blood of goats and of bulls sins should be taken away." And

further on: "Yet the mind of the faithful in the time of the Law could by faith be joined to Christ incarnate and suffering, and so be justified by the faith of Christ. And the observation of ceremonies of this sort was a certain protestation of that faith, inasmuch as they were a figure of Christ: and therefore certain sacrifices were offered for sins in the Old Law—not because the sacrifices themselves cleansed from sins, but because they were certain protestations of faith, which did cleanse from sin." So far St. Thomas.

§ 165. According to him, then, this is the difference between the sacraments of the Old and of the New Law: that the sacraments of the New Law, as certain instruments of the Passion of Christ, contain and confer grace—inasmuch as they have in themselves the power of sanctifying flowing from the Passion of Christ; but the sacraments of the Old Law could not have a power of this sort, because Christ had not yet suffered; rather, they were only protestations of faith, by the use of which men were cleansed not by the things themselves, yet nevertheless, those being employed, by faith—as by a certain divine ordination and covenant by which it was instituted. He repeats this in III, q. 62, a. 6, where also he proposes the reason somewhat more clearly, saying that what is not yet in the nature of things cannot move in the genus of efficient cause. Nicholas of Lyra follows and explains the opinion of St. Thomas (at the end of Heb. 10). But St. Bonaventure (writing on this Distinction), having first set forth the opinion of the Master, which says that no one was ever justified from the works of the Law, even if they were done in faith and charity, because they were instituted solely for signifying, then subjoins the opinion of Hugh, which is this: that the sacraments of the Old Law were instituted primarily and per se for the signification of things to come, not however for effecting anything except outwardly concerning the flesh. Yet, because they signified that which faith believes, there was in their reception a protestation of faith, and on that account those sacraments justified per accidens and secondarily. But the sacraments of the New Law are ordained primarily and per se to the conferring of grace, and not only to the signifying of something. Whence, he says, speaking per se these justify, but those only per accidens. And comparing the opinions of Hugh and the Master, he judges what Hugh posits to be much more probable. Elsewhere also, as at the last Distinction of book 3, he testifies that this opinion pleases him more.

§ 166. And indeed this opinion seems very much to agree with those things which above we cited from St. Augustine. For in the Exposition of Psalm 73 he clearly signifies that the difference of the sacraments is to be sought from the difference of the Testaments, when he says: "If we distinguish the two Testaments, the Old and the New, the sacraments are not the same." And in Question 25 on Numbers he uses speech of such a kind as to say that the sacraments of the Old Law, if they be considered in themselves, could by no means heal; but if the things signified through them be inquired into, then, in those very sacraments, there could be found the purgation of sins. That the sense of the words of St. Ambrose is the same, the words which follow plainly show; in which he teaches that for this reason the Jews did not obtain sanctity through the Law, because they savored only carnal things. Inasmuch therefore as the Old Law indeed showed what was to be done and foretold the Mediator, but did not bestow grace, for that reason also the sacraments of the Old Law announced the future Redeemer, but did not confer grace. But as the New Law now heals and justifies, so also the sacraments of the New Law are not mere signs, but are effective of grace and righteousness.

§ 167. Moreover, just as it happened per accidens to the Old Testament that at that time some were just and holy and spiritual, and thus really belonged to the grace of the New Testament; so also it happened per accidens to the sacraments of that Law and of that time that certain persons, approaching them through faith in the Mediator and true repentance, obtained through them pardon and righteousness; just as it happens per accidens to the sacraments of the New Law that through them those are not sanctified who approach them

with a carnal affection—whom one must truly say to pertain to the Old Testament and to be sons of the Old Testament. According to this opinion, therefore, it is easy to see in what sense both Scripture and the Fathers either attribute or deny to the sacraments of the Old Law a power of sanctifying. For considered per se they do not justify, but are only signs of things to come: "Now all these things happened to them in figure" (1 Cor. 10). But per accidens they do justify—even by the work worked (*ex opere operato*)—provided only that Scripture attributes to them expiation of sin, or sanctification, or a similar effect; as the sacrifices of which in Leviticus, and the consecration of priests, of which in Exod. 28, 29 and Lev. 8. Whence Augustine, considering this twofold understanding, book *On Nature and Grace*, chapter 17, so moderated his language that he said that sins of negligence "even by certain sacrifices of the Old Law seemed to be expiated." For, as it were doubting, he said "seemed": because in a certain manner they truly expiated, in a certain manner not—this per accidens, that per se.

§ 168. Moreover, this clarification is not a little helped by the fact that whatever things were brought forward from the Apostle in order to show that the sacraments of the Old Law did not confer grace were said properly against the Jews, who, ignorant that Christ alone is the justifier, clung to signs instead of to realities, thinking, namely, that the sacrifices and sacraments of the Old Law were in themselves acceptable to God and propitiatory, so that there was no need for the blood of Christ for the expiation of sins—against whom the Apostle rightly denies that by the blood of goats and of calves sins could be taken away. Whereas otherwise, just as water by itself does not suffice for cleansing, nevertheless it could also have been divinely instituted that the blood of slain animals should avail for the same or for a similar effect—God, namely, working in them our salvation from the merit of Christ, not of the animals. But what the Apostle denies must also be denied of washings and the other Jewish ceremonies; for among them "washings" too are named (Heb. 9), though not of the water of Baptism or of any sacrament of the New Testament. For when a sacrament of the New Testament is named, it is not understood without the blood by which the New Testament was consecrated; just as when the New Law is named, it is not understood without grace on which the New Law depends.²⁰⁴

§ 169. As to the opinion of St. Thomas, it does not seem to rest upon a solid foundation. For although at the time of the Old Law the mystery of the Passion of Christ had not yet been otherwise accomplished, and therefore the ceremonies of that Law could not contain in themselves really any power flowing from the Passion of Christ—because an effect cannot be prior in time to its efficient cause, as St. Thomas rightly proves—yet God, looking to the future Passion of Christ, could confer grace upon men through certain sacraments of that time, either as instruments properly so called of the Divine power, or as signs to which power would infallibly assist; just as He does this through the sacraments of the New Law, looking to the past Passion of Christ. Nor is anything further necessarily to be held about the power of the sacraments, as is clear from the things which we said in their place about it; otherwise, just as what does not yet exist cannot move in the genus of efficient cause, so neither can that which already has existed—such as the Passion and death of Christ—because it cannot be understood that something now operates which does not exist actually. And therefore neither can the sacraments of the New Law have in themselves a power actually flowing from the Passion of Christ. Whence it seems that the Passion and death of Christ must be constituted only in the genus of meritorious cause with respect to our justification, which we receive from God through the sacraments; and this the Fathers of the Council of Trent sufficiently inculcate (Session 6, chapter 7) in their enumeration of the causes of justification.²⁰⁵

§ 170. That the sacraments of the Old Covenant conferred grace; but that the mysteries of the New Covenant, of themselves, as instrumental causes of the merit, when they confer and impart the remission of sins—on what foundation this rests, we do not sufficiently see. Certainly, the Council of Florence in the Instruction for the Armenians asserts roundly, as they say, that this belongs to the sacraments, drawn from the fact that the sacraments of the New Law contain that which is not attributed to the sacraments of the ancients; and the Council of Trent expressly declares that the new sacraments confer the grace which they signify; and since in the same place it affirms only of the sacraments of the Old, in respect of the external rite and ceremonies, that they are distinct from the sacraments of the New (Session 7, canon 11), it more than sufficiently intimates that this mode is to be ascribed to the sacraments of the New Law.²⁰⁶ See this in the third controversy On the Sacraments, book 2, chapters 14, 15, 16.²⁰⁷

§ 171. Meanwhile we take to heart what the Author says of the opinion of St. Thomas; but on what foundation, dearest and most learned sir, does he rely when he so addresses the one already departed? Why in this very matter should he single out the opinion of St. Thomas—wherein the one who departs from the opinion of St. Thomas will explain the power and efficacy of the sacraments of the New Law up to a point according to the mind of the Scriptures and of the Councils and Fathers? In truth, had he kept to the path of St. Thomas, he would most rightly have set forth the difference between the sacraments of the New Law and those of the Old by the physical instrumental causality of the sacraments; because those [of the Old] had no power of conferring grace, which nevertheless the sacraments of the New Law, as divine instruments, produce. This indeed is hard to grasp, as we were saying; yet if he had weighed more carefully the decrees of the Councils and the sentiments of the Fathers, he would have clearly acknowledged that the opinion of St. Thomas is the more credible, rather than that which attributes to the sacraments of the New Law only a mode of acting according to moral causality. Therefore let us embrace the opinion of St. Thomas, which we think the Author meant to tear away, and let us not carry over the doctrine of St. Thomas to the Fathers in such wise that we thereby strip it away; for—as we have hinted—and as the most celebrated among the theologians everywhere show, the doctrine of the Fathers is defended only if that doctrine of St. Thomas is retained.

§ 172. But what the Author says, when he proves that a power of working from the sacraments of the Old Law could not have been present *ex opere operato*—drawn from this, namely, that an efficient cause cannot act unless it actually exist—is this: to posit the same absurdity as if one were to refer to an efficient cause something which has indeed been, but has ceased to be; for that which does not exist in any way whatsoever cannot act. But the Passion of Jesus Christ and His death are not now [present]: how, then, can it be that power acts from the Passion of Christ? This, as we were saying, the Author states; yet although he says this, in reality it has no force at all, since one may truly say that a future thing has impressed a power, or even that the acts by which things are accomplished proceed from a past Passion of Christ, which nevertheless He did not impress upon the sacraments of the Old, in such wise as those things which, in consonance with the sayings of the Fathers, are said to have been impressed upon the sacraments of the New. And what is written is read of that soul: "That soul shall be destroyed out of his people, because he hath made void my covenant"—which, as to the letter, seems to be understood thus, that the soul of the uncircumcised male is said to perish because the covenant of circumcision has not been observed with respect to him, whereby alone he could have escaped perdition; just as today the infant who has not been baptized is said to perish, that is, because the institution of Baptism—by which alone he could have been saved—has not been observed with respect to him. Yet the Fathers sometimes understand that passage of the covenant or precept of God violated by the first parent—namely of that which was said: "On whatever day thou shalt eat..."—which covenant the infant is said to have

made void in that sense in which the Apostle says in Rom. 5 that in Adam all have sinned. In this way St. Augustine interprets it, *De Civitate Dei*, book 16, chapter 27, where nevertheless he also adds the former interpretation; which indeed seems to be the truer exposition of that sentence. For thus it was said: the uncircumcised shall perish, as it is said that one not born again of water is excluded from the Kingdom of God—so that in both cases a necessary means is signified, without which alone the end cannot be obtained, not, however, some precept, the non-observance of which brings the infant under guilt of damnation. This reason for the institution of circumcision is indicated everywhere by the ancients, and especially by St. Augustine; and the same is strongly supported by the practice of the Church.²⁰⁸

§ 173. Moreover, let the reader consider how, by what has been said, several propositions are very clearly overthrown—especially the sixty-fifth—which say that Moses, the prophets, priests, and teachers of the Law were dead things, since they effected nothing but the bondage of their hearers; and that the new covenant, which is the principal dogma of the Jansenists, is so new that under the Old there was no living efficacy bestowed. But of this difference between the old and the new dogma we have already touched something in the Appendix to the third book, where we treated of Fear; and we shall add more below, when the matter so requires.²⁰⁹

§ 174. For St. Augustine, in the passage praised by the Author, in book 19 *Against Faustus*, chapter 6, speaking of circumcision, says: "By itself, by the very sacrament, it availed much," that is, it was efficacious *ex opere operato*; and in book 2 *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, chapter 11, he says that circumcision in the Jewish people availed for the purgation of original sin both in adults and in little ones, just as now Baptism. For thus the Master cites Augustine's words in the text, although in Augustine the manuscripts vary: for some have "for the signification of purgation," others "for the sanctification of purgation," as also St. Thomas reads.²¹⁰ Again, in Epistle 57 to Dardanus he bears witness that circumcision was for certain saints in place of Baptism. Other places are Epistle 203, Tractate 30 on John, the book *On Original Sin*, chapter 30, book 2 *Against the Letter of Petilian*, chapter 72, *Against Julian*, book 3, book 6, chapter 7, Homily 50, chapter 5.²¹¹ Other Fathers agree, as St. Ambrose on Luke 1; St. Basil, Homily 13, which is an exhortation to Baptism; the opinion of St. John Chrysostom is cited by Augustine, *Against Julian*, book 1, chapter 6; St. Cyprian—under whose name Salvian also bears the title—*Sermon on Circumcision*; St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia* 4, chapter (blank); St. Bernard, *Sermon 2 On the Circumcision of the Lord*, and in *Sermon 13 On the Epiphany of the Lord*.²¹²

§ 175. Yet be that as it may, let the reader weigh that by the clearest arguments of St. Thomas and of others many of the Jansenist propositions are overthrown; and, chiefly, that one in the *Propositiones de tertio libro* (the third book), in which it is said: that prophets, priests, and doctors of the Law were dead instruments, since they made nothing but slaves by their ministry, and that the new covenant of the Jansenists principally differs from the old in this, that by the latter men were not delivered except into servitude. For we have elsewhere shown how sacramental grace was given of old by divine institution, although in a different manner.

²¹³

§ 176. But first it must be known—in order that the doctrine of the Fathers and the Councils be rightly understood in this matter—that circumcision was not a sacrament of the Old Law, but long before the Law—namely, about four hundred and thirty years; as the Apostle indicates, Gal. 3. Hence also the Lord says in John 7 that circumcision is not from Moses, but from the Fathers. Wherefore, although we sometimes speak of circumcision a little otherwise than of the ceremonies of the Old Testament—nevertheless, that circumcision

is to be reckoned among the Mosaic ceremonies according to the manner of speaking of the Old Testament is not denied; for this was its own place and, in a certain way, it is numbered among the legal rites because of the signification of future things, which the Apostle calls shadows of things to come. And Moses also commanded it, as Scripture bears witness in Leviticus 12; and the Lord applies it in John 7 when He says: "Moses gave you circumcision," and St. Augustine sometimes speaks of circumcision in like manner as of the ceremonies, in these words, Epistle 19 to St. Jerome: "He says that circumcision and other things of this sort, which are read to have been given by God to the people by the Old Testament, were divinely given as signs of future things which were to be fulfilled through Christ." In which place he also teaches that the precepts of the ancient sacraments (taking circumcision among them) were imposed as burdensome.²¹⁴ The Gloss likewise says that by those external signs men were not justified—namely, considered in themselves and separated from the grace of Christ—as was explained above.²¹⁵

§ XXX — Whether, and in what manner, circumcision conferred grace (Utrum, & quomodo circumcisio gratiam contulerit)

§ 177. Since, as has now been said, it has been established that circumcision by divine institution availed for the deletion of original sin, there is wont further to be asked whether circumcision also conferred grace, as properly the sacraments of the New Law do. For some held expressly this opinion: that by circumcision indeed sin is removed, yet that grace is not also conferred; as the Master holds in the text.²¹⁷ And this can seem to be gathered from the words of St. Ambrose, book 7 on Luke 17, where he says that circumcision was for purifying, the Law for sanctifying; grace, moreover, for justifying. But, from the sentences of the Fathers cited above, it must be attributed to circumcision that both were given. For he compares it with Baptism, which not only remits original sin but also bestows righteousness and grace. Whence the author of the book Hypognosticon among the works of St. Augustine testifies to both: namely, that circumcision forgave sins, book 5, chapter 4; and that it carried the grace of Baptism of the same, book 5. And truly it is absurd and verges upon the perverse dogmas of our times' heretics, if it be said that some sin—whether original or mortal—is remitted without the infusion of grace or renewal of the mind; which doctrine is condemned in the ancient Council of Trent, Session 6, chapter 7.²¹⁸ It would also follow that the circumcised little ones would be alien to the Kingdom of God, in that they would not have received the grace of the adoption of sons, which alone Christ constitutes as the price of entrance into the Kingdom. Wherefore in this part the opinion of the Master is not to be held.

§ 178. But St. Ambrose does not mean that purification was given by circumcision without an interior renewal of the mind by grace; rather, he reckons among the same graces these three—purification, sanctification, and justification—just as the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 6: "But you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified." He teaches, in that place, that the same benefits, though at diverse times, were conferred upon the pious and God-fearing by diverse sacraments. It must therefore be confessed that the sign of circumcision conferred grace, even ex opere operato, according to the explanation of this phrase given by us above; because, namely, by the very fact that one was circumcised according to the Law, by divine covenant and institution this availed him unto righteousness. St. Augustine clearly teaches this in book 4 Against the Donatists, chapter 24, affirming that the sacrament of circumcision "by itself" availed much. Which place Catholics are wont to use in order to prove that the sacraments of the New Law avail ex opere operato; since even there St. Augustine, disputing about the efficacy of baptism, takes his proof from circumcision.²¹⁹ St.

Thomas thought the same, when writing on I Sentences, dist. 4, q. 9; for thus he says: "It was fitting that some remedy be given which might blot out sin ex opere operato. And such a remedy was circumcision." Then he adds that circumcision conferred grace, "as to the removal of guilt and of reatus, and as to this, that it made the soul worthy of eternal life."²²⁰

§ 179. In sum, however, partly retracting that view in the Third Part of the Summa (q. 62, a. 6; q. 70, a. 4), he does indeed confess that in circumcision grace was conferred as to all the effects of grace, as in Baptism—but not, however, by circumcision as if from the power of circumcision itself, as by Baptism; because, he says, Baptism works instrumentally in the power of the Passion of Christ, whereas circumcision does not. What we think of this opinion of St. Thomas we have said above.²²¹

§ XXXI — Reply to certain arguments to the contrary (*Ad quaedam in contrarium argumenta responsio*)

§ 180. Those who take away from circumcision every effect of grace (*gratia*), and wish it to have been a mere sign of grace to be bestowed through Christ, rely on arguments of roughly this sort. First. The Apostle (Rom. 4) bears witness that the sign of circumcision in Abraham was a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had in uncircumcision;²²³ and citing this passage St. Augustine, book 4 (Against the Donatists, ch. 24), teaches that circumcision in Abraham was a seal of antecedent righteousness; but in Isaac, and in others who were circumcised as infants, it was a seal of subsequent righteousness—namely, of that which they were to receive when grown to adult age; therefore neither in him nor in them did it confer grace.²²⁴ Next, the Ancients too are adduced, who seem to say the contrary. For St. Irenaeus, book 4 (Against Heresies, chs. 29, 30, 32), at length teaches that circumcision did not give righteousness; and proves it from this, that before its institution some are read to have been just—Enoch, Noe, and others.²²⁵ St. John Chrysostom (on Rom. 4; and Homilies 27, 39, 40 on Genesis) holds that circumcision was only a sign by which the Israelite people might be distinguished from the other Gentiles.²²⁶ Nor does St. Jerome (on Gal. 3) acknowledge any other cause of the institution of circumcision;²²⁷ and therefore says that that people in the desert for forty years was not circumcised, because then it was clearly separated from other peoples; but that the precept was renewed as soon as they had crossed the Jordan, namely because they were going to live among the Gentiles. This reason for the omission of circumcision for a time is given also by St. John Damascene, book 4 (On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 26), without any mention of the remission of sin or the conferring of grace.²²⁸ To these they add Tertullian (Against the Jews), St. Ambrose, book 1 (On Abraham, ch. 4; and on the Epistle to the Romans 4), and again St. Augustine (on Ps. 75), where he says thus: "Our fathers, many holy men, had the circumcision of the flesh for the seal of faith, and the circumcision of the heart for faith itself."²²⁹

§ 181. To these objections we think one must reply as follows. On Rom. 4 the Apostle's purpose is to show that salvation does not depend on the Law, as the Jews boasted, but on faith; and he proves it because even Abraham, who first received circumcision, was justified by faith before he was circumcised; and therefore in him circumcision was only a seal of the righteousness previously received by faith—just as in Cornelius the centurion Baptism was only a seal of the righteousness that had preceded in him.²³⁰ For St. Augustine in that place sets up this comparison between Abraham circumcised and Cornelius baptized, that in each the sacrament was a sign of an earlier righteousness received by faith. In little ones, however, as now Baptism, so formerly circumcision, was not a bare seal of righteousness, but efficacious and operative. Moreover, what

Augustine says—that circumcision in Isaac was a sign of the righteousness to follow—must be taken, not of the remission of sins, nor of the habit of righteousness, but of the act. For as in Abraham there had preceded circumcision an operation of virtues and a holy manner of life, so in Isaac and the rest, when they had come to age, there would remain a steadfast exercise of virtues and holy conduct after receiving it. And this very point Augustine also asserts about Baptism.²³¹

§ 182. Further, St. Irenaeus is disputing against those who said that the God of the Old Testament was other than the God of the New; according to whose view, if circumcision availed anything for righteousness, it effected this by itself—namely, inasmuch as it belonged to the old Law and was opposed to the New; and that because of the diverse and contrary Authors of each Testament. Therefore Irenaeus denies that circumcision, in that fashion, conferred anything toward righteousness, or—as he himself speaks—that it was the consummatrix of righteousness; and much less does he have it as so necessary for obtaining righteousness that in all past ages, before Christ, there would not have been a way to attain salvation—since before circumcision was instituted so many were saved by faith. The other Fathers remove the effect of grace from circumcision in precisely the same sense in which the Apostle (in the Epistle to the Galatians, ch. 4), speaking of the institutions of the old Law—in which without doubt he understands circumcision too—calls them “weak and beggarly elements,” inasmuch as, namely, they are separated from Christ and are thought to have efficacy by themselves.²³² This sense St. Jerome expressly set forth (on Gal. 5) at those words: “In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision.” “Then,” he says, “circumcision cannot [avail], when it is supposed to bring any benefit by itself.”²³³

§ 183. But as to what is objected about the neglect of circumcision in the Israelite people for forty years—whence it may seem that circumcision was not a sacrament of salvation but a mere sign of distinction—this can be solved in various ways. First, if we say that there was then a divine dispensation with that people, so that they could be saved without circumcision, in the way it was under the law of nature before circumcision was instituted; and this because they were, as it were, in continual march, not knowing when either the camp would have to be moved or battle joined with enemies. Second, that those were indeed guilty who either did not circumcise their infant sons, or they themselves, being adults, did not circumcise themselves—especially since Scripture does not excuse them (Josh. 5), but only records the reason for the renewed general and solemn circumcision, namely that the same observance had been omitted for forty years. And in this way St. Augustine seems to think (Question 6 on Joshua), saying that not all, but very many, were uncircumcised in that people at that time. “For,” he says, “Joshua circumcised them, namely the sons of those who had begotten in the desert and had despised to circumcise them, because they were disobedient to the law of God.”²³⁴ Third, perhaps none of those who had been born in the desert and were uncircumcised died before, at Joshua’s command, he had them circumcised; because, as it is said in the Psalms, “There was not in their tribes one that was feeble.”²³⁵ Yet of these three the second seems most probable, as was said on Augustine’s authority.

§ 184. To that which was finally objected from Augustine we answer that in that place he intends nothing else than this: that circumcision of the flesh, inasmuch as it is only some external thing applied outwardly, is nothing other than “a seal of the righteousness of faith”; and that this sign is common to the evil and the good, because even carnal Jews, whose heart was uncircumcised, bore this sign in their flesh. But the circumcision of the heart, which is “faith working through love,” and which was signified by the circumcision of the flesh, is proper to the saints.²³³

§ XXXII — Brief explanation of some other questions about circumcision
(*Aliarum aliquot quaestionum de circumcisione brevis explicatio*)

§ 185. Other little questions, too, are wont to be raised about circumcision (*circumcisio*). The first: what, before circumcision was instituted, was the remedy for original sin (*peccatum originale*), namely from the beginning of man's transgression down to Abraham, and thereafter among the Gentiles not sprung from the stock of Abraham, up to Christ. The second: by what remedy females in the Israelite people were cleansed, as being incapable of circumcision. The third: by what arrangement provision was made for males of that same people who died before the eighth day. The fourth: whether circumcision imprinted a character (*character*). The last: why it was changed into baptism (*baptismus*). One can also ask when circumcision ceased to have efficacy; but about that matter below (at the end of the Distinction).

§ 186. Regarding the first question, the Ancients seem not to speak in one way. For St. Augustine thinks that some sacrament (*sacramentum*) or sacrifice (*sacrificium*), even if unknown to us, was such a remedy, necessary for all, both infants and adults. For thus he writes in book 5 against Julian, chapter 11: he does not on that account deem the servants of God, since they had the faith of the Mediator who was to come in the flesh, to have helped their infants by no sacrament of His; although what that was, Scripture, for some necessary cause, willed to keep hidden. For we read of their sacrifices, he says, and so on.²³⁷ And in book 15 of the City of God, chapter 16: "Whether, however, there was, or if there was, what sort it was—bodily and visible—a sign of regeneration before the flood, as circumcision was afterwards commanded to Abraham, Sacred History is silent; yet it is not silent that those most ancient men sacrificed to God," and so forth.²³⁸ He mentions this also in the book On Original Sin, chapter 30.²³⁹ The Author of the Sermon On the Reason for Circumcision thinks the same and plainly asserts it in these words: "Assuredly original sin, which from the first parents poured down upon the whole succession of the human race, needed at every time to be expiated by certain remedies," and a little after: "And although the mysteries of the sacraments were not laid open to all, nevertheless their power and effect could not be unknown; because from Adam to Noah the sacrifices are known to have been acceptable to God, which, up to that time without the distinction of a Law, were celebrated by a divinely inspired institution of the first man. But those sacrifices were performed either in the blood of animals or in the burnings of other oblations." So he.²⁴⁰

§ 187. From these somewhat dissent Gregory and Bernard, thinking that for infants the faith of parents alone, without a sensible sign, sufficed for salvation. Thus Gregory says, book 4 of the Moralia, chapter 3: what with us avails the water of baptism, this did among the ancients—at least for those who sprang from the stock of Abraham—the mystery of circumcision.²⁴¹ Bernard's words are these (Epistle 77 to Hugh of St. Victor): "Who knows not that, besides Baptism, there were not lacking in ancient times remedies against original sin? To Abraham indeed and to his seed the sacrament of circumcision was divinely delivered for this very purpose. In the nations, however, as many as were found faithful, we believe that adults were expiated by faith and sacrifices; but for infants also the faith of their parents profited—nay, sufficed." Moreover, he adds that this lasted so until the time of Baptism, upon the substitution of which the others ceased. So he. And the Master embraces this opinion, as the better.²⁴²

§ 188. But if we weigh the matter by reason, Augustine's opinion will seem preferable to the others. First, because there is no reason why then the faith of parents alone without a sensible sign should have sufficed, rather than in the time of the Law or of Grace; since the case of infants ought not, by the state of the Law, and

much less by the state of Grace, to have been made worse with God. Then, because no reason appears why one remedy should have been assigned to adults and another to infants, since in the time of the Law and of Grace the same is common to both, there circumcision, here baptism. Lastly, Hugh's opinion is overthrown by the agreement of others as to some definite sensible sign at least as necessary for adults. Augustine's opinion is followed by Scotus, Durandus, and Paludanus, nor does St. Thomas in all points dissent; for in III, question 70, article 4, to the second, he says it is probable that faithful parents, for infants born and especially when they were in danger, poured forth certain prayers to God or applied to them some blessing (which was a certain little signet of faith), just as adults offered prayers and sacrifices for themselves.²⁴³

§ 189. As for the origin of that sacrament or sacrifice, it seems altogether to be held that it was insinuated by divine institution to the first parent; as the Sermon On Circumcision (ascribed to Cyprian) has it. For sacraments, to which a supernatural effect is joined infallibly, cannot be instituted by human choice, as we showed in its own place.²⁴⁴ Meanwhile it must be known that circumcision, once it was instituted, had efficacy not only for Israelites but also for other men of the nations, if any wished to make use of it; for although it was commanded to the people of the Hebrews alone and delivered as belonging to the covenant, nevertheless, inasmuch as it was instituted as a remedy against original guilt, it was proposed universally to all men who of their own accord were willing to receive it. For Abraham also circumcised all his slaves and those born in his house (Gen. 17). And foreigners who wished to pass over into the religion of the Jews were circumcised and were called Proselytes (Exod. 12; Judith 14; and elsewhere). And Jerome too, commenting on Jeremiah 9, bears witness in writing that circumcision was in use among certain other nations different from Israel—especially among those who were of the stock of Abraham and Lot—as among the Idumaeans and Ammonites. Something similar is found also in the Sermon on Circumcision cited above; and Ambrose on Leviticus 12.²⁴⁵

§ 190. To the second and third questions it is answered probably that help was afforded to them by the same remedy by which help had been afforded to all before circumcision was instituted. For that circumcision could have been anticipated before the eighth day is improbable, because no Scripture or authority of the Fathers hands this down. Next, this neither is done among the Jews today, nor is it read to have ever been done. Third, because to circumcise a little infant in danger from sickness before the eighth day would have been nothing else than to increase the danger and hasten death. Lastly, because the precept of circumcision, just as it did not include females, so neither did it include males under the eighth day; and therefore, when necessity pressed, these were cared for by that common remedy which was wont to be applied before circumcision was given, exactly as if circumcision had not been instituted. This is the opinion for the most part of the scholastics and, by name, of St. Thomas in III, questions 70, articles 3 and 4, and of St. Bonaventure, in IV, dist. 1, q. 2, On Circumcision. Hugh also, book 1 On the Sacraments, part 12, denies that the eighth day could by any necessity be anticipated. Whence also the ordinary Gloss at that passage of Proverbs 4, "I was an only son in the sight of my mother," says that for that reason it does not count the other little child of Bathsheba, because, having died before the eighth day, he did not receive a name, as not circumcised—since a name is wont to be imposed only in circumcision.²⁴⁶

§ 191. It must be noted, however, that the eighth day was of such necessity as to the precept, that those passing it over sinned, even if it fell on the sabbath, as is evident (Jn. 7). But as to the necessity of the sacrament, it was so far as we have said, because with the sacrament safe it could not be anticipated, as we have now shown. If, however, they had at some other time omitted the eighth day, they could and ought afterwards

to be circumcised, as is manifest from the circumcision of Abraham and his household (Gen. 17) and of the son of Moses (Exod. 4), from the circumcision performed by Joshua (Josh. 5), and that which was done at the command of Mattathias (1 Macc. 2). The same is sufficiently shown by the example of proselytes.²⁴⁷

§ 192. To the fourth question—although some dissent—it seems one should answer that circumcision imprinted a character. For as now by Baptism, so formerly by circumcision men were brought into the people of God, were enrolled into the fellowship of the saints, and acquired a right to the participation of the other sacraments or sacrifices. Hence, although there was also another reason why circumcision was not repeated—namely that the little skin, once removed, could not again be taken away, which reason referred only to the outward effect—yet as to the inward effect this was the chief reason: because by circumcision, as by a certain consecration which it is a sacrilege to repeat, men were assigned to the religion of the one true God, as now by baptism.²⁴⁸

§ 193. To the last we answer that that change was made for multiple reasons. First, because Baptism is more common, as being equally accommodated to either sex. This reason Augustine adds in the book *On Original Sin*, chapter 30. Second, because Baptism is easier and less penal. Third, because since circumcision was given as a sign of a future reality, as were the other sacraments of the old Law, it had to be abolished with them after the reality signified and promised had now come—just as Augustine shows in many places against Faustus the Manichee. Lastly, because although circumcision not only took away sin but also conferred grace (*gratia*), nevertheless the baptism instituted by Christ confers it more abundantly, and therefore more potently, as freeing even adults from every liability to punishment, which circumcision did not bestow. Hence Augustine, book 19 against Faustus, chapter 13, says that the sacraments of the new Law are greater in power and better in usefulness; and elsewhere he repeats this. And under the title "Sermon on Circumcision," Cyprian likewise bears witness that at every time there was need of some remedies to expiate original sin, yet that the things signifying did not have full power until the very reality came to which the veil of the figures gave way.²⁴⁹

§ 194. But the difference indicated by Bede at that text of Luke 2, "And after eight days were accomplished," namely that baptism threw open the gate of the heavenly Kingdom whereas circumcision did not, is not so much a difference of the sacraments as of the times; for neither did baptism, before the Passion of Christ, introduce into the Kingdom. And circumcision too, if it had efficacy after the Passion of Christ, would, without delay, introduce into the Kingdom, as baptism does now—just as St. Thomas testifies in III, question 70, article 1, ad 4, namely because through Christ every impediment was removed which would bar a soul once cleansed from entrance into the Kingdom. So also the Master at the end of Distinction 3, and Scotus.²⁵⁰

1. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*, V, ch. 4; St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* (i.e., *Contra epistulam Parmeniani*), IV, ch. 21 and following. — On the books *De sacramentis*: Rivetus, Dallaeus, and other heterodox writers long ago did not hesitate to heap reproaches upon the books under Ambrose's name, both in manuscripts and in printed copies. The Benedictine Fathers, in the Preface prefixed to those books in their edition of the works of St. Ambrose, defend them at length from such slanders and vindicate their antiquity, adducing reasons from history and from internal marks; they also weigh the arguments usually alleged from questions of style, from repetitions of material found elsewhere among Ambrose's genuine writings, and from other heads, which have led some to doubt Ambrosian authorship. The same Preface may be consulted for a full account.

2. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, XIX, ch. 11.

3. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, XIX, ch. 16; *Tractatus in Ioannem*, 80.
4. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 5.
5. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 2–3.
6. Council of Trent, Session 22, canon 1.
7. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, at the beginning.
8. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62, a. 1.
9. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, last chapter.
10. St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ch. 12.
11. St. Ambrose, *De paenitentia* II, ch. 2.
12. St. John Chrysostom, *Hom.* 24 in *Joannem*; *idem*, *Hom.* 35 (on the pool Probatice).
13. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 73; *idem*, *Enchiridion*, ch. 66.
14. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, chs. 11, 13; and *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 9.
15. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 16.
16. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II, ch. 12.
17. St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium grammaticum* III, ch. 8.
18. St. Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 80.
19. Prosper [ascribed], *Epistola ad Demetriadem*.
20. St. Leo the Great, *Sermon* 2 on the Nativity of the Lord.
21. St. Leo the Great, *Ep.* 91 to Theodorus.
22. Pope Nicholas I, *Rescript* to the Questions of the Bulgars.
23. Council of Florence, *Decretum pro Armenis*; Council of Trent, Session 7, canons on the sacraments.
24. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62, aa. 1, 3–4.
25. Hugh of St. Victor and the Master [Peter Lombard], sacramental definitions; see the common scholastic tradition [abbreviation as in source].
26. St. Augustine, *Epistola* 23 ad Bonifacium.
27. Bede, *Commentary on Luke*, on ch. 3.
28. Gratian, *Decretum*, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, c. "Numquam".
29. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannem*, book 2, ch. 42.
30. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 3.
31. Council of Florence, *Decretum pro Armenis*; Council of Trent, Session 7, proem; canons 6–8 on the sacraments; canon 1 on Baptism; canon 2 on Confirmation; and Session 14, ch. 4.
32. St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* III, ch. 15.
33. St. Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* ["lib. 83. Quest.", abbreviation as in source]; *idem*, *Ep.* 23; St. Gregory the Great, on 1 Kings 16 [abbreviation as in source]; Gratian, *Decretum*, 1, q. 1, c. "Multi secularium"; St. Bernard, *Sermon* 1 on the Lord's Cana.
34. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I, q. 45, aa. 4–5.
35. Council of Trent, Session 7, on the sacraments; canon 2 on Confirmation.
36. St. Bonaventure, *In III Sent.*, last Distinction; Soto, on this Distinction, q. 3, aa. 1, 4.
37. Richard of St. Victor, on this question ["art. 1.", abbreviation as in source].

38. 2 Macc. 3; 1 Cor. 14–15; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catecheses.
39. St. Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus* LXXXIII, q. 79.
40. Cajetan [Thomas de Vio], on III, q. 62 [abbreviation as in source]; Domingo de Soto, on the present Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
41. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62, a. 3.
42. Council of Florence, *Decretum pro Armenis*; Council of Trent, Session 7 (proem; canons on the sacraments); Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* I, p. 9, ch. 2; and ch. 3.
43. Is. 12:3: "Haurietis aquas de fontibus Salvatoris."
44. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62, a. 3 (interpreting "vessels" as instruments).
45. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62.
46. St. Thomas, In I–IV Sent., IV, dist. 1, q. 1, a. 5; Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 8 (on the sacraments).
47. Dionysius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Prosper, and others [as in the source's list].
48. St. Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* IV, ch. 24.
49. St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et donatistam* III, ch. 8.
50. Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* III, ch. 5.
51. Gabriel Biel, In IV Sent., dist. 1, q. 3; idem, *Lectio 87 in Canonem Missae*.
52. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4 (on the sacrament of penance).
53. St. Augustine, frequently against the Donatists; see especially *De baptismo contra Donatistas*.
54. Rom. 1:16.
55. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 35; *De civitate Dei* XXI, ch. 16; XXII, ch. 24.
56. Rom. 10:17.
57. Jn. 11:43; Lk. 7:14.
58. Mk. 16:16; Jn. 20:23; Heb. 4:2.
59. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 6; St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 13.
60. St. Augustine, *Confessiones* IV, ch. 4; St. Leo the Great, *Epistle 91 to Theodorus*; Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 8; On Luther's concession regarding lay recitation in the sacrament of reconciliation, see the allusion as in the source [abbreviation as in source].
61. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 63, a. 5; q. 69, a. 6, ad 3.
62. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum*, ad primam objectionem.
63. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 6; cf. Rom. 3:24.
64. Council of Trent, Session 6, chs. 6–7.
65. St. Augustine, *Ad Simplicianum*, quaest. 2.
66. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I-II, q. 113, a. 4 and a. 6; II-II, q. 4, a. 4 and a. 7.
67. Estius, In II Sent., dist. 2, on unformed faith.
68. Cf. Matt. 9:2; Mk. 2:5; Lk. 5:20.
69. "S. Thom. ubi supr." [abbreviation as in source].
70. Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:5, 11; Rom. 4:5, 11.
71. Rom. 3:22; 10:10–11 (Paul citing Is. 28:16).
72. Acts 15:9.

73. 1 Pet. 3:21.
74. St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, tract. 80 (on Jn. 15:3); Rom. 10:8–10; Eph. 5:26; St. Augustine, Sermon 20, De verbis Domini.
75. Heb. 11:8–9.
76. Jn. 3:5; Rom. 6:3–5, 7; Rom. 6:7; Titus 3:5.
77. St. Augustine, Contra Julianum VI, ch. 5; cf. [Serm. 14, "Parisiensis"] [abbreviation as in source].
78. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 65, a. 1.
79. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians.
80. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 1.
81. Council of Constance, condemnation of the article of John Hus.
82. Pope Lucius III, decretal Ad abolendam (Decretals, De haereticis, cap. Ad abolendam).
83. Damianus a Goes (Damião de Góis), Fides, religio, moresque Aethiopum.
84. Roman Catechism (Catechismus Romanus) and the Scholastic doctors.
85. Martin Luther, De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae (1520).
86. St. Thomas, as above [abbreviation as in source]. For the context in Estius, this points back to St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 65, a. 1.
87. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, De hierarchia ecclesiastica.
88. The sermons De ablutione pedum and De unctione chrismatis transmitted under the name of St. Cyprian.
89. Ambrose, De sacramentis VI, ch. 2; idem, De mysteriis.
90. St. Augustine, Contra Faustum XIX, ch. 13; De doctrina christiana III, ch. 9; Epistula 118 ad Januarium.
91. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catecheses.
92. Gratian, Decretum, I, q. 1, c. Multi secularium; attributed to St. Gregory the Great.
93. Justin Martyr, Apologia II; St. Irenaeus; Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem I and IV; De corona militis.
94. St. Augustine, Epistula 118 ad Januarium; cf. Expositio in Ps. 103 (sermo 1).
95. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem I; De resurrectione carnis.
96. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 65, a. 1, ad 6–9; q. 71, a. 3, ad 2.
97. On this point Estius appends an extended scholion arguing from St. Thomas that such a claim is improbable; see the following note.
98. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 64, a. 2–4.
99. Decretal ascribed to Pope Alexander I; for the question of its authenticity and the origin of this institution, see the canon "Aqua benedicta" in De consecratione, dist. 3 [abbreviation as in source].
100. Roman Breviary, May 3 (Invention of the Holy Cross), where the effect of "putting demons to flight" is named.
101. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Sermon 1 De Coena Domini; "Author of the Sermons On the Works of Christ" (the spurious Opuscula known as De Operibus Christi), whose authority and testimony are of no weight.
102. St. Bernard, loc. cit.
103. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 1: all the sacraments of the new law were instituted by Christ.
104. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 64, a. 4.
105. St. Augustine, In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus; cf. Jn. 1:33: "And I knew him not ... he it is that baptizeth."
106. 1 Cor. 1:12.

107. On Confirmation, see Acts 8; on Extreme Unction, see Jas. 5.
108. On the later development and assignment of particular orders beyond the diaconate and subdiaconate, see the ecclesiastical tradition regarding the minor orders.
109. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 9.
110. Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermon De ablutione pedum*.
111. Hugh of St. Victor, and the Master (Peter Lombard), *In Sent.* IV, dist. 23, on Extreme Unction.
112. Alexander of Hales, *In I Sent.*, dist. 7, where he claims Confirmation was instituted only later (he cites the second Council of Milan).
113. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastica hierarchia* I; *Decretum* of Pope Fabian (as cited in the canonists) stating that, after the Last Supper, Christ taught and instituted the rite of making chrism, matter of Confirmation.
114. St. Leo the Great, *Sermon 1 De Ascensione Domini*.
115. St. Augustine, *Tractate 120 on John*; also on Ps. 56.
116. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 1; see also Session 14, ch. 1 (on the institution of Extreme Unction by Christ and its promulgation by St. James).
117. The "Sermons On the Cardinal Works of Christ," attributed to St. Cyprian in some editions, are not by Cyprian.
118. 1 Cor. 11:34.
119. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 65, a. 1–2.
120. Council of Trent, Session 7, Decree on the Sacraments (the distribution of the seven according to their ends).
121. Council of Trent, Session 7, Decree on the Sacraments, which distributes the seven according to their ends.
122. On Order: Council of Trent, Session 23, ch. 4 (the effect of ordination as an increase of grace, that one be a fit minister). On Matrimony: Council of Trent, Session 24 (on the goods of marriage: offspring, fidelity, and the indissolubility of the bond).
123. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 5–7.
124. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: "Sacramenta omnia rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma perficiuntur; verbi gratia, in Baptismo aqua, in Confirmatione chrisma, in Extrema Unctione oleum materia est," etc.
125. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; and the Council of Trent [as in source], on Penance, where the acts of the penitent are called, as it were, the matter of the sacrament.
126. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* I, ch. 1; and on the words of the mysteries, the last chapter.
127. Innocent I, *First Decretal Epistle*, ch. 3 (on the form of Confirmation), and ch. 8 (on Extreme Unction).
128. St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ch. 27; St. Ambrose, *De his qui mysteriis initiuntur*, last chapter.
129. St. Augustine, frequently on the Eucharist: "Norunt fideles" [as in source].
130. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 8.
131. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: "Sacramenta omnia rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma perficiuntur... sine his sacramentum non perfici."
132. St. Augustine, *Epistle 23 to Boniface*.
133. 2 Kgs 5 (Vulgate numbering) [Naaman commanded to wash in the Jordan].
134. Num. 21 [the brazen serpent].
135. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* II, ch. 22; III, ch. 9.
136. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 63, a. 1.
137. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: "Inter haec sacramenta tria sunt, Baptismus, Confirmatio, Ordo, quae characterem... imprimunt... unde in eadem persona non reiterantur; reliqua vero quatuor characterem non imprimunt, et

- reiterationem admittunt.”; Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 9 (De sacramentis in genere); “Eadem doctrina sub anathemate confirmata est...,” with further references as in the source [abbreviation as in source].
138. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 14.
 139. Lev. 27 (Vulgate): “Quicquid enim semel fuerit consecratum... sanctum sanctorum erit Domino.”
 140. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* II, ch. 13.
 141. Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermo De ablutione pedum*: “Baptismum reperi... ecclesiasticae prohibent regulae... nemo sacros ordines semel datos iterum renovat... quia contumelia esset Spiritus Sancti, si evacuari posset, quod ille significat, vel aliena sanctificatio emendaret, quod semel ille statuit de confirmat.”
 142. St. Gregory the Great, *Epistles* II, ep. 32.
 143. St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* I, ch. 30.
 144. St. Augustine, *Epistle* 50 [abbreviation as in source].
 145. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* VI, ch. 1; *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* II, chs. 13, 18; *Tractate “super gestis cum Emerito”* [abbreviation as in source]; *Tractates on the First Epistle of John*, Tract. 4; *Sermon* 57.
 146. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Ephesians* 1:13: “In quo et credentes signati estis.”
 147. Innocent III, *Decretals, Extra, De baptismo et eius effectu*, c. *Majores*.
 148. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 64, a. 8–10.
 149. Council of Florence, *Decree for the Armenians (on the sacraments)*; Council of Trent, Session 7, ch. 11.
 150. Pope Nicholas I, *Rescript to the Questions of the Bulgarians*; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, c. *A quodam*.
 151. St. Augustine, *De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum*, haer. 44 (Paulianists).
 152. The Master (of the Sentences), *In IV Sent.*, dist. 6.
 153. St. Augustine, *Epistle* 23 to Boniface; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, c. *Non illud*.
 154. “S. Thom. ubi supra.” [abbreviation as in source].
 155. St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, lib. 3.
 156. St. Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, Tract. 5; cf. *Preface on Ps. 31*.
 157. Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, II, ch. 15; Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History*, X, ch. 14; Nicephorus, *Ecclesiastical History*, VIII, ch. 41; Gratian, *Decretum*, Causa 1, Quaest. 1, cap. *Spiritus Sancti*.
 158. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 64.
 159. Jn. 15:15.
 160. On the distinction between “ebrius” and “ebriosus” in this context, see St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* VII, ch. 53.
 161. On the opinion of Ambrosius Catharinus concerning the validity of a sacrament conferred by a minister who seriously performs his ministry and applies the external rite, no matter how much the minister inwardly retains his contrary intention—an opinion which certain ancient theologians too are judged to have upheld (for not all who are here alleged taught something altogether alien to what was said above)—now almost obsolete, rejected, and by the common confession of later Catholic theologians disapproved, and by not a few, both of old and more recently, not-to-be-despised theologians branded with the name of error or rashness: yet some have tried to recall it from death and to bring it back into the theological schools. Gaspar Juenin, in his *Historical-Dogmatic Commentary on the Sacraments* (question of intention, cap. 2, art. 3, §§ 2–3), first contends that the Church nowhere defined as an article of faith that the sacraments collated by a minister with this intention are invalid; only that a contrary doctrine, most clearly championed by Sts. Augustine and Thomas, is to be attributed to them. In like manner, moralists in three rules hold that same opinion to be at least probable (*Moral Theology*, book 2, ch. 7, art. 3, rule 1); although, if such cases should occur (he adds), all the sinews ought to be strained in order to show that they did not happen. The most daring Vincent Contenson, a most learned theologian, in his *System of Moral Theology* (question on the intention of the minister, § 2 of that disputation), bends every effort to prove that opinion (namely Catharinus’s), although in practice it should by no means be followed; for, by his own judgment, it seems to me exposed to the danger of alienating those character-imprinting sacraments, and to be liable to a certain danger of sinning—what I would not dare to say remains. We said elsewhere, indeed, that not all who

are counted as favorers of the opinion sustained by Catharinus did so with equal force; and that the opinion has now been almost antiquated, rejected, and by the common consent of theologians proscribed; and that some, of old and more recently, not-to-be-despised theologians have branded it with the name of error or rashness. But if some have tried to recall it from death and to introduce it into the theological schools, Gaspar Juenin in the Historical-Dogmatic Commentary on the Sacraments (the question on the minister's intention, cap. 2, art. 3, §§ 2–3) first contends that the Church nowhere defined as an article of faith that the sacraments conferred by a minister with this intention are invalid; only that it is to Sts. Augustine and Thomas most clearly to be attributed. Natalis Alexander, in his Dogmatic and Moral Theology (book 2, ch. 7, art. 3, rule 1), openly inclines to the same opinion as at least probable, although, if such cases should occur, he judges that all zeal ought to be employed so as to show that they did not happen. The very bold Vincent Contenson, a most learned theologian, in his System of Moral Theology, exerts every nerve in order to show that opinion (namely Catharinus's) to be at least probable; but he adds that in practice it must not be followed, because (so he writes in the same § 2 of that disputation) this second opinion (that is, Catharinus's) seems to me so rash: for it is remote from the common sense of the Church and of the Fathers, and boldly says that those character-imprinting sacraments are exposed to the danger of being alienated and are subject to a certain danger of sinning—what one could not say. And indeed, in my judgment, the reply of the aforesaid Author does not suffice, especially since the proposition struck with an anathema (as the text of the decree sounds) by Alexander VIII, together with the consensus of the other theologians who adhere to it, confidently affirms that baptism conferred by one who observes the outward rite and the form of baptizing, but says within, in his heart, to himself: I do not intend to do what the Church does, is invalid. In order to satisfy this argument, Gaspar Juenin (in the place already cited) employs a twofold solution. First, he says that the decree of Alexander VIII has no force in France and in many other Christian provinces, unless it proceeds immediately from the Roman Inquisition; whence he concludes that judgments issued by the Roman Inquisition do not oblige the French internally. Would that some of them did not say worse things! But be this as it may, let us concede, as the French canonists claim, that the diploma of Alexander VIII, promulgated on the seventh day of December 1690, in which, among the thirty propositions set down, the aforesaid proposition is contained, did not issue from the Roman Inquisition but from the Supreme Pontiff himself. For in the proem of that diploma the Supreme Pontiff professes that he entrusted to the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinals, the General Inquisitors against heretical depravity, the thirty propositions brought forward by many masters in Sacred Theology and by many other most learned men; and then that those Cardinals, after that weighty business had been diligently undertaken, and after they had applied themselves to it repeatedly, submitted to his Holiness their suffrages for each proposition individually. Finally, the Supreme Pontiff himself condemned those propositions as rash, injurious, proximate to heresy, and savoring of heresy, and strictly damns and prohibits them. Who will deny that such a decree issues immediately from the Supreme Pontiff himself? The second reply of the aforesaid Author is that the proposition, as it lies, is false: nor is it sufficient that there be in the minister an exterior intention, in order that the sacrament may be valid, provided the external rite be applied; and yet the sacrament would be valid if the rite were carried out mimically or in jest, or even if it were carried out indeed seriously but nevertheless not determined by some outward circumstance, for example, by the request of the parents, and not done in the name of the Church and as her minister; that sacrament, namely baptism collated to an infant at home, the witnesses being removed, with no preceding petition, is not determined to be an administration of baptism. But the aforesaid Author did not notice, as appears to me, that the proposition he alleged, and the condemnation thereof by Alexander VIII, do not speak only of the retention internally of a contrary intention, but they add: "while he observes the external rite and the form of baptizing"; nor can this be understood unless as speaking of the retention of a contrary intention along with the observance of the external rite. Wherefore, in the sense of the aforesaid Author, that condemnation of his proposition does not stand—although the Authors of the contrary opinion themselves confess that, if the external rite were applied mimically or in jest, the sacrament would be invalid. It is to be noted, moreover, that the deed of Athanasius, which is related by Rufinus (Ecclesiastical History, book 10, ch. 14) and is here recounted by the Author, is considered false by some most learned men: since Athanasius is said to have been a boy when Alexander of Alexandria held the see before the year 312; or, if we trust Jerome, Athanasius was, at the time of the Council of Nicaea, now ordained by Alexander the Bishop and he died in the year 326, not many months after the Synod of Nicaea, as is gathered from the said passage of Socrates; to that same see Athanasius is said to have succeeded in the time of Bishop Alexander: which seems very difficult to reconcile for one who ponders the matter at hand.

162. 1 Cor. 4:1; cf. 1 Cor. 1, where Paul mentions baptism.

163. Josh. 24:10.

164. St. Augustine, Tractates on John 5.

165. Ibid.

166. St. Augustine, Contra Cresconium 3, ch. 8; cf. 1 Cor. 3.

167. St. Augustine, Contra Cresconium 3, ch. 6 (the argument that the dignity of the minister would diversify baptisms is rejected).

168. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* (Against the Donatists) 3, ch. 10.
169. St. Augustine, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* 2, ch. 11; Wis. 1:5.
170. Nicholas I, Response to the Bulgarians, ch. 7; reported in Gratian, *Decretum*, dist. 15, q. 8, can. *Siscitantibus*.
171. St. Bernard, Sermon 60 on the Song of Songs; Council of Constance, condemnation of John Wyclif, article 4.
172. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 12.
173. The Master of the Sentences, in this book, dist. e 13 [abbreviation as in source].
174. St. Augustine, Epistle 166; *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* 3, ch. 2; also 3, ch. 10; and frequently elsewhere.
175. Nicholas I, Response to the Bulgarians; Gratian, *Decretum*, dist. 15, q. 8, can. *Siscitantibus*.
176. Pope Lucius III, chapter *Vestra*, title *De cohabitatione clericorum*.
177. St. Thomas, *ibidem* [abbreviation as in source].
178. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* 3, ch. 18; same work 4, ch. 4; 5, chs. 20–22; 6, chs. 1, 3; Sermon 16 *De verbis Domini*.
179. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 10, ch. 27.
180. St. Jerome, *In Sophoniam* 3; *idem*, on Ephesians at "one baptism."
181. Innocent I, Epistle 17; cited in Gratian, *Decretum*, 1, q. 1, cap. *Arrianos*.
182. St. Leo I, Epistle 75.
183. St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogues* 3, ch. 1.
184. Pelagius I (or II), in Gratian, *Decretum*, 24, q. 1, cap. *Schisma*.
185. St. Bernard, Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs.
186. St. Cyprian, Epistle 6; book 4, Epistle 4; Sermon 5 *De*
187. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 62, a. 6.
188. Council of Nicaea I, canon on the Cathari (Novatians), and canon on the Paulianists (who, returning to the Church, are to be baptized).
189. St. Jerome, *In Sophoniam* 3; and on Ephesians at the words "one baptism" [abbreviation as in source].
190. Council of Arles I (Arelate), A.D. 314, can. 8.
191. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas*, where he says that the rebaptizing by those baptized by heretics was condemned by the Council of the whole world [abbreviation as in source].
192. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 2.
193. On the inconstancy of the sectaries concerning the sacraments, see the polemical histories cited below; the phrase reflects Estius's report of their vacillating assertions [abbreviation as in source].
194. Florimond de Raemon, formerly a Calvinist, later a Catholic, *De ortu, progressu ac ruinis haeresum nostri saeculi* (on the heresies of the sixteenth century).
195. On Agrippinus of Carthage and the African bishops who followed him in the matter of rebaptism as a point of discipline rather than of dogma, see the canon-law collections and the anti-Donatist writers [abbreviation as in source].
196. On the Donatists' practice regarding the baptism of heretics, see the testimonies gathered by the Fathers and historians [abbreviation as in source].
197. St. Bernard, Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs; St. Antoninus, *Summa*, part 4, tit. 11, ch. 7.
198. St. Thomas, *Contra gentiles*, III, ch. 77 (on the error of the Waldenses concerning lay administration of the sacraments); John Wyclif, assertions on the power of ministers [abbreviation as in source].
199. Bellarmine, *Controversiae*, vol. 3, book 1, *De sacramentis in genere*, cap. 16; Natalis Alexander, *Theologia dogmatica*, where the same question is handled.

200. Council of Florence (Decretum pro Armenis), on the sacraments of the New Law.
201. St. Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum 73; Tractatus 41 in Ioannem; Contra Faustum XXII, ch. 69; Epistula 19 [abbreviation as in source].
202. Peter Lombard, Sentences, this Distinction, reporting the doctrine from St. Augustine.
203. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae I-II, q. 103, a. 2; and III, q. 62, a. 6.
204. On the Johannine "washings" among Jewish rites, cf. Heb. 9:10; the remark introduced parenthetically in the source is: "Let us grant to the author—what we ourselves also freely admit—that the opinion of Hugh (of St. Victor) is to be preferred to the Master's." [abbreviation as in source]
205. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 7 (on the causes of justification). St. Augustine: Contra Faustum XIX, chs. 11, 13; Quaestiones in Heptateuchum, on Numbers, q. 25; Enarrationes in Psalmos, on Ps. 77; Quaestiones in Leviticum, q. 84; De adulterinis coniugiis II, ch. 6. St. Ambrose, In Lucam VII, on Luke 17. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 3 On the Nativity; Sermon 2 On Pentecost. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis I, part 8. Nicholas of Lyra, Postilla on Hebrews, at the end of ch. 10. 1 Cor. 10:11; Exod. 28–29; Lev. 8.
206. Council of Florence, Instruction to the Armenians (Expositio fidei). Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 11.
207. St. Robert Bellarmine, De controversiis: De sacramentis in genere, book 2, chs. 14–16.
208. Gen. 17:14 ("That soul shall be destroyed... my covenant he hath made void"); Jn. 3:5; Rom. 5. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei 16, ch. 27.
209. Allusion to the Jansenist propositions; cf. the appended discussion on Fear mentioned by Estius earlier.
210. St. Augustine, Contra Faustum 19, ch. 6; De nuptiis et concupiscentia 2, ch. 11. On textual variants "ad significationem purgationis" / "ad sanctificationem purgationis," see also St. Thomas's citation.
211. St. Augustine, Ep. 57 to Dardanus; Ep. 203; Tractate 30 on John; De peccato originali, ch. 30; Contra epistulam Petilianii 2, ch. 72; Contra Julianum 3; 6, ch. 7; Hom. 50, ch. 5.
212. St. Ambrose, In Lucam 1 (and 7, on Luke 17). St. Basil, Homily 13 (Exhortation to Baptism). St. Augustine, Contra Julianum 1, ch. 6, citing St. John Chrysostom. Pseudo-Salvian/Cyprian, Sermo de circumcisione. St. Gregory the Great, Moralia 4. St. Bernard, Sermon 2 On the Circumcision of the Lord; Sermon 13 On the Epiphany.
213. Reference to Jansenist Proposition 65 (numbering as commonly cited in early modern collections).
214. Lev. 12; Jn. 7:22; St. Augustine, Ep. 19 to St. Jerome.
215. Glossa ordinaria on the relevant passages; cf. above in this Distinctio.
216. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 70, a. 4.
217. The Master (Peter Lombard), Sentences IV, dist. 1 (on circumcision), as cited by Estius.
218. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 7 (on the causes of justification).
219. St. Augustine, Contra epistulam Parmeniani (Contra Donatistas), book 4, ch. 24.
220. St. Thomas, In I Sent., dist. 4, q. 9.
221. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 62, a. 6; III, q. 70, a. 4; for Estius's earlier remarks, see above in this Distinctio.
222. St. Thomas, ubi supr. [abbreviation as in source].
223. Rom. 4.
224. St. Augustine, Contra epistulam Parmeniani 4, ch. 24.
225. St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 4, chs. 29–30, 32.
226. St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on Romans 4; and Homilies 27, 39, 40 on Genesis.
227. St. Jerome, Commentary on Galatians 3.
228. St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 26.

229. Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos*; St. Ambrose, *De Abraham* I, ch. 4; *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos* 4; St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmum* 75.
230. Acts 10 (Cornelius the centurion).
231. Cf. St. Augustine on Baptism's efficacy in the regenerate; see also above, this *Distinctio*.
232. Gal. 4:9.
233. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians* 5, at "In Christo Jesu neque circumcisio aliquid valet, neque praeputium."
234. Josh. 5; St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, On Joshua, q. 6.
235. Ps. 104(105):37: "And there was not in their tribes one that was feeble."
236. St. Thomas, dict. quest. 60 [abbreviation as in source].
237. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* 5, ch. 11.
238. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 15, ch. 16.
239. St. Augustine, *De peccato originali*, ch. 30.
240. *Sermo de ratione circumcisionis* [as in source].
241. St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 4, ch. 3.
242. St. Bernard, Ep. 77 to Hugh of St. Victor; the Master [abbreviation as in source].
243. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 70, a. 4, ad 2; Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus.
244. *Sermo de Circumcisione apud Cyprianum* [as in source].
245. Gen. 17; Exod. 12; Judith 14; St. Jerome, *Commentary on Jeremiah* 9; St. Ambrose, *On Leviticus* 12.
246. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 70, a. 3–4; St. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.*, dist. 1, q. 2 (De circumcisione); Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* I, part 12; *Gloss Ordinaria* on Prov. 4:3, "Unigenitus eram coram matre mea."
247. Jn. 7; Gen. 17; Exod. 4; Josh. 5; 1 Macc. 2.
248. On the non-repetition of circumcision and its consecratory effect: see also the parallel with baptism in the Fathers [general reference implied in the source].
249. St. Augustine, *De peccato originali*, ch. 30; idem, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 19, ch. 13 and elsewhere; [Pseudo-]Cyprian, *Sermo de circumcisione*.
250. Lk. 2:21; St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 70, a. 1, ad 4; the Master, end of *Distinction* 3; Scotus, *In I Sent.*, dist. 3 [as implied by the source].

DISTINCTIO II — WHETHER JOHN'S BAPTISM WAS A SACRAMENT OF THE OLD OR OF THE NEW LAW (*BAPTISMUS JOANNIS UTRUM VETERIS AN NOVAE LEGIS FUERIT SACRAMENTUM*)

§ I — Whether John's baptism was a sacrament of the Old or of the New Law (Baptismus Joannis utrum veteris an novae legis fuerit Sacramentum)

§ 1. Before we treat of the baptism of Christ, the baptism of John must be distinguished from it; for just as it differs from it in name, so too in reality it was different from it, nor has it ever been doubted in the Church that this is so. That difference, however, will be evident from the things which we shall say below. To begin with, it must not be denied that John's baptism, according to the general notion of a sacrament— which embraces every sign of a sacred thing, especially if it has been divinely instituted—was a sacrament; in which sense all the ancient ceremonies, since they were instituted in order to signify something sacred, are called sacraments, as we said at the beginning of this book. Whence, by St. Augustine, John's baptism is called the "precursory sacrament of the laver," in book 2 Against the Letters of Petilian, ch. 56.²

§ 2. Now John's baptism signified, by a certain manifest and visible ceremony, first indeed that men ought to be washed and cleansed from sins; then that that cleansing would be brought about through Christ, and in fact through the baptism of Christ, to which it made ready. For one must not suppose that John's baptism had merely the character of a simple exhortation to repentance, but also the character of a sacrament prefiguring and preparing; prefiguring, I say, the baptism of Christ, and preparing for the same. For John, as by word, so by deed and by his whole ministry, was announcing Christ beforehand, and at the same time was preparing men to receive Him. Whence he himself says of Christ, John 1: "That He may be made manifest in Israel, for this cause I came baptizing with water." And that John's baptism prefigured the baptism of Christ, Chrysostom openly attests on Matthew 3 at the words: "And Jesus being baptized went up straightway out of the water," where he calls John's baptism a "shadow," Christ's baptism the "truth."³ And that it also prepared for it, Cyril attests, book 2 on John, ch. 57, where, after other things by which he shows that John's baptism, since it was imperfect, was an introduction to perfection, he subjoins thus: "For as the Mosaic law of future things and of spiritual worship was a certain preparation, so this, when set alongside the manifestation of the hidden truth in the birth of Christ, had the force of preparation."⁴ Similar statements are found in Augustine, book 5 Against the Donatists, ch. 9; and in Damascene, book 4, ch. 5; and again in Augustine, On the One Baptism, ch. 7.⁵

§ 3. From these it therefore follows that John's baptism, in a general sense, was a sacrament; it is asked whether it was a sacrament of the Old or of the New Law. There are those who think it should be numbered

among the sacraments of the Old Law, as Durandus (question 3, ad 1).⁶ But others more rightly say that it was neither a sacrament of the Old nor of the New Law, but something between the two, as having something in common with each and being different from each in some respect. For it had in common with the former this, that it announced what was still to come; with the latter, however, it had in common the rite of an external ceremony, the ease of administration, and the clarity of signification. Moreover, it differed from the former in the very same conditions which it had in common with the sacraments of the New Law. Nevertheless it differed from these latter not only by the fact that it announced something future, but also because it did not confer grace (*gratia*), as will be declared more at length below, nor was it instituted to serve the New Testament, but only to run before it by a certain ministry of preparation. And in this way St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure think about John's baptism; and this is more in keeping with Scripture, which, by the testimony of Christ Himself, confirms that John was not a prophet, but "more than a prophet," in that he did not, after the manner of the ancient Prophets, obscurely announce Christ as still set far off, but by a most clear indication of voice and ceremony signified One presently about to come, and indeed already showed Him as present, and prepared men from close at hand to receive Him.⁷

§ 4. To this pertains also that saying of Matt. 11: "The Law and the Prophets were until John; but from the days of John the kingdom of heaven suffers violence." For since John openly announced the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 3), whose open announcement did not pertain to the Old Testament, it is clear in this respect that his whole administration was more similar to the state of the New Law than of the Old. Therefore his baptism was, as it were, a kind of middle disposition, both gradually withdrawing from the one extreme and introducing to the other. And no less aptly is it compared by Bede to the catechism that is prefixed to Baptism. Nor is that statement contrary to this doctrine which Ambrose, on Luke 3, affirms—that John sustained the person of the Law—as though it followed from this that his Baptism was of the same Law, namely an Old Law sacrament. For up to that point John sustained the person of the Law, because by his ministry he did not give grace, but by his preaching and by his baptism he prepared for receiving it through Christ. To this is added that, in preaching, he used terror and threatening after the manner of the Old Law, saying: "You brood of vipers, who has showed you to flee from the wrath to come?" and again: "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and cast into the fire" (Matt. 3). Yet, inasmuch as that same preaching of his also made mention of the kingdom of heaven, it was more like the ministries of the New Testament. For, as Augustine says, book 19 against Faustus, ch. 31: "Eternal life indeed and the resurrection are read as promised in the Old Testament, but not the kingdom of heaven—under this very name."

§ II — The difference between the baptism of John and the baptism of Christ from the Scriptures (Discrimen inter baptismum Joannis & baptismum Christi ex scripturis)

§ 5. That the baptism (*baptismus*) of John was different from the baptism of Christ, and much inferior to it in dignity and efficacy, is now to be shown—though moderns for the most part deny this, attributing the same power to both baptisms. The first proof will be from the Scriptures. First of all, therefore, this difference is laid open by the four Evangelists, indeed by John speaking within them. For (Matt. 3), to those who were coming to him to be baptized, lest they should think that they would receive more than in truth they were going to receive, thus he says: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance; but he who is to come after me is

stronger than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry: he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire." Likewise in Mark 1: "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit." But Luke also (ch. 3), of that solemn protestation of the Baptist, set forth likewise the occasion, saying: "While the people were in expectation, and all were thinking in their hearts of John, whether perhaps he were the Christ, John answered, saying to all: I indeed baptize you with water; but there shall come one mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to loose: he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire." Finally (Jn. 1) the Baptist John, being interrogated by the priests and Levites sent by the Jews, bears witness that it had been revealed and said to him by God: "This is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit." These places of Scripture clearly show that, just as John studiously distinguished his own person from the person of Christ—willing not to be held or seen to be Christ, but a servant, and friend, and herald, and forerunner of Christ—so also he willed plainly to distinguish his own baptism from the baptism of Christ by this altogether most manifest difference, namely, that he baptized in water, Christ in the Holy Spirit (*Spiritus Sanctus*). Whence it is manifestly gathered that he left to be understood that he did not baptize in the Holy Spirit, but that his own baptism availed to exhortation unto repentance and to preparing the way for Christ so as nevertheless that through him the Holy Spirit was not given.

§ 6. No less certain is the proof from Acts 19, where Paul says to those who acknowledged that they had been washed only with John's baptism: "John baptized the people with the baptism of repentance, saying that they should believe in him who was to come after him." On hearing this, "they were baptized in the name of Jesus." Surely this ought by no means to have been done, if the baptism of Christ were not other than John's baptism and more outstanding than it in dignity and in power; for it is not right to baptize again one who has once been baptized with a true baptism.

§ 7. Finally, this difference can be gathered also from those words of John the Baptist (Jn. 3): "He who is of the earth is of the earth, and of the earth he speaks; he who comes from heaven is above all." For those words signify that the whole ministry of John, compared with the ministry of Christ, was earthly, and void of heavenly grace (*gratia*).

§ 8. But the Adversaries say that by those testimonies of Scripture nothing else is signified than that John indeed exhibited only a ministry of external ablution, but that Christ, by means of that very ministry of John, gave by his divine power the Holy Spirit, that is, washed the soul from sins and adorned it with righteousness; which likewise is done even today in the baptism of the New Law administered by any other minister. But John himself's words manifestly exclude this perverse interpretation, since he varies the tenses when he says that he baptizes or has baptized in water, but that Christ is to come and to baptize in the Holy Spirit. Wherefore that baptizing of Christ in the Holy Spirit, since it is only signified as future, cannot be referred to John's baptism already present or past. Nor must it be understood only of that which was done at Pentecost, where it is said (Acts 1) that the Lord said to the disciples: "John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." For John was speaking to the crowds, among whom scarcely perhaps was there anyone who received, with fire, the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; but those words of John pertain to both the baptisms of Christ: one of water, which is common to all, and is long since instituted by those very words attesting the Holy Spirit in it: "Unless one be born again of water and the Spirit," etc.; the other of fire, which was peculiar to the disciples on the day of Pentecost. Therefore what John says, "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit," is to be understood thus: that Christ, whether he should baptize with water—which he was going to do through his Apostles and thereafter through other ministers—or whether with fire,

as on the day of Pentecost, or even whether he should also do this secretly only without an external sign—would always nevertheless baptize in the Holy Spirit.

§ 9. Furthermore, Scripture also indicates for us the same difference between the baptism of John and that of Christ in another way, namely through this, that it always calls the former "John's baptism," but the latter only "Christ's." Now that baptism is called John's, not because John instituted it by private authority. For he himself testifies (Jn. 1) that he was sent to baptize in water; and that question proposed by the Lord to the Jews among the three Evangelists sufficiently clearly signifies the same thing, "Whether the baptism of John was from heaven, or from men?"—to which question indeed nothing else could rightly and truly have been answered by them than that it was from heaven; namely, which question was proposed for this end to the scribes, that they might be compelled to confess also that Jesus, to whom John bore witness, had been sent from heaven by God and was truly the Christ. But it is for this reason called John's baptism and not Christ's baptism, because whatever was done in his ministry did not exceed the powers of John baptizing. But the baptism instituted by Christ has at no time been called the baptism of Peter or of Paul or of any other whatsoever, but only the baptism of Christ: because the ministry of baptism, by whomever it is employed, is always, as regards the side of institution, something which exceeds the powers of the man baptizing, and could be done by Christ alone—namely, to baptize in the Holy Spirit. And Augustine gives this account of the diverse appellation (Tractate 5 on John), and elsewhere often against the Donatists.⁹

§ III — Proof of the same difference from the Fathers (Ejusdem discriminis probatio ex Patribus)

§ 10. We must now come to the testimonies of the Fathers, by which we may confirm the difference of each baptism. Among them the most ancient, Tertullian, in his book On Baptism, expressly raising this question, testifies that John's baptism was indeed divine, but by mandate, not by power—namely, that John received from God the mandate of baptizing, yet nevertheless could not through it give either the Holy Spirit or the remission of sins; and he proves this from Scripture.¹¹ After him Cyprian—or whoever is the author of the Sermon on the Baptism of Christ—says that John's baptism did not have full power; and that it washed bodies only outwardly, so that there should follow the baptism of Christ, in which the washing of souls would be conferred and the remission of sins.¹² Hilary (Canon 2 on Matthew) says that the baptism of John is unto repentance, but that of Christ unto salvation.¹³ Nor differently does Ambrose, book 2 (on Luke 3), call John's baptism "a washing of grace"; and there is a similar place in his Preface on Psalm 37 and that on "Pierce my flesh with thy fear" (Ps. 118).¹⁴ Jerome (in the Dialogue against the Luciferians), replying to many things urged by his adversary regarding this same question, says after: "Hear what the Scriptures teach: John's baptism did not so much remit sins as it was a baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins to come." And below: "For as John was the Forerunner of the Lord, so also his baptism was the forerunner of the Lord's Baptism." And after interposing some Scriptures, he subjoins: "But if John, as he himself confessed, did not baptize in the Spirit, consequently neither did he remit sins; for to none of men without the Holy Spirit are sins remitted. Or if you contend contentiously that therefore John's baptism remitted sins because it was from heaven, teach what more we obtain in Christ's Baptism, which remits sins and sets free from Gehenna. That which sets free from Gehenna is perfect; but perfect baptism is not except that which is into the cross and resurrection of Christ. Thus, while you serve John's baptism, you attribute to it more than it had, you destroy the Lord's, to which you leave nothing more." And what follows.¹⁵ Likewise (in the Epistle to Oceanus, ch. 3)

he says: those who had received John's baptism, because they knew not the Spirit, are baptized again, lest the Gentiles and the Jews think the waters without the Holy Spirit could suffice for salvation; and he adds the same (on Joel 2).¹⁶

§ 11. Chrysostom (on Matt. 3, Hom. 12; Hom. 11) says: "The grace of the Holy Spirit is in Christ's Baptism: but John's is deprived of this bestowal." And another passage in the same sense.¹⁷ Moreover, in Augustine there are very many places which are most clearly favorable to this difference. For (Enchiridion 49): "Those who were baptized with John's baptism were not reborn, but were prepared for Christ, in whom alone one could be born; his baptism is not in the water only of John, but also in the Holy Spirit." And in book 5 (Against the Donatists, ch. 9) he says that those whom Paul baptized, namely those who had been baptized with John's baptism, in the Acts of the Apostles were not for any other reason baptized, than because John's baptism was not Christ's Baptism, but was conferred on John by Christ so that they might be properly called John's; and: "But John certainly received this by way of dispensation, not to last long, but to suffice for preparing the way, of which it behooved him to be the forerunner." And a little after: "Christ gave to the Church such a Baptism, that, once received, no other should be sought; but John touched with such a baptism, that, once received, the Lord's Baptism should be necessary," etc. Then at the beginning of the next chapter: "I therefore ask," he says, "if by John's baptism sins were remitted, what more could Christ's Baptism bestow upon those whom the Apostle Paul willed to be baptized after John's baptism with Christ's Baptism?" And after interposing a few things, thus he declares that he believes that, to those baptized with John's baptism, sins were remitted only in hope, but that in reality this takes place in the Lord's Baptism. Likewise (Tractate 4 on John) he denies that John's baptism profited to obtaining righteousness or the remission of sins; and (Tractate 5) he at large distinguishes between the two baptisms.¹⁸

(a) In the Benedictine Edition this is Tractate XCIII. (b) Or CCX among the Sermons of the second class. (c) That this Sermon is of St. Maximus, Bishop of Turin, is borne out by Gennadius's Catalogue of Illustrious Men; although certain Heterodox Critics have tried to wrest those Homilies or Sermons away from him to Honorius and Theodosius the Emperors, nevertheless, as is shown by more correct editions and noted by Philippe Labbe, all, or nearly all, Catholic Scholars have taught with unhappy success that fraud of the Heterodox; and by the testimony of Gennadius the place just now cited is convincingly established; most of Maximus's Homilies are commonly found among St. Ambrose's three Sermons and Augustine's; we have already above noted this.¹⁹

§ 12. To the same effect writes Maximus (Sermon 7 on Epiphany), saying that John preached the baptism of repentance, not that by which crimes are blotted out, but by which the erring are corrected; "for the remission of sins," he says, "is reserved for the grace of Christ." Nothing different does Cyril teach, who in book 2 (on John, chs. 58, 62) wishes there to be as much difference between John's baptism and the baptism of Christ as between John and Christ; therefore Christ was so greatly commended by John, that it might be understood that there was to be no comparison of baptisms, just as neither of persons; finally we read that John's baptism, when compared with Christ's Baptism, had only a power of preparation. Likewise Gregory teaches altogether the same doctrine (Homily 2 on the Gospels), openly subjoining that the remission of sins could be given not in John's but only in Christ's Baptism. Following these authors are both John Damascene among the Greeks, book 4 (ch. 5 of the Orthodox Faith), and among the Latins all the Scholastics without exception, whose agreeing doctrine is that John's baptism brought neither grace nor the remission of sins, but from the beginning was a certain preparatory sign to receiving both in Christ's Baptism. But the Fathers of the

Council of Trent regarding this of Christ's Baptism have thus decreed (session 7, canon 1 on Baptism): "If anyone shall say that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ, let him be anathema."²⁰

§ 13. From these things therefore it is established without doubt that the baptism of John was different from the baptism of Christ, and that it did not have the same power with it. And although we do not find that difference explained in altogether the same way by all, yet among all those above mentioned there is agreement in this, that those who had come, by John's baptism neither received the Holy Spirit nor the remission of sins; both of which things, without doubt, the Baptism of Christ bestows.

§ IV — The adversaries' arguments are dissolved (Adversariorum argumenta dissolvuntur)

§ 14. It remains that we reply to certain arguments of the Adversaries, of which the First is (Mark 1; Luke 3): Scripture testifies that John preached "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins." To this they think also to pertain what his father Zacharias prophesies of him, that he would "give knowledge of salvation to his people in the remission of their sins" (Luke 1). Neither does Scripture seem to speak otherwise of Christ's Baptism. For (Acts 2) Peter thus says of it: "Let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." And in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed we confess "one baptism unto the remission of sins."

§ 15. Second. John's baptism was from heaven, not from men (Matt. 21): therefore it should have had some heavenly and spiritual power.

§ 16. Third. John's baptism was a certain sacrament more perfect than the sacraments of the Old Law, indeed even than circumcision: therefore since those at least by accident conferred grace and the remission of sins, the effect ought not to be removed from the baptism of John.

§ 17. Fourth. "As there is one Lord and one Faith, so one Baptism" (Eph. 4): therefore John's baptism is not other than Christ's baptism.

§ 18. Fifth. Basil (Homily on Baptism) thus says: "John's baptism by itself afforded no instruction for arriving at the grace of God; but as soon as anyone approached, and whatever his sins were, and of whatever kind they had been, he confessed them in the Jordan, and was baptized, and immediately he received the remission of sins," and so on. And (Hom. 2) he says that those whom he called a "brood of vipers" received by John's baptism the remission of sins; and again (Hom. 13), which is an exhortation to the catechumens: "John's baptism," he says, "puts off sins; but Christ's baptism makes men friends of God."²²

§ 19. Sixth. Ambrose, book 1 (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 3), denies that those twelve disciples (of whom Acts 19) were truly baptized with the baptism of John, for the reason that John baptized "unto the remission of sins": and the same author (on Gal. 3), writing from tradition, hands down that those disciples were not baptized with John's baptism, but with some adulterine one, and for this cause the Apostle commanded them to be baptized; on the basis of which authority the Master in the text thinks that they, who admitted that they had received John's baptism, because they believed in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, were not afterwards baptized, but by the imposition of hands by the Apostles the Holy Spirit came upon them.²³

§ 20. Seventh. Augustine, book 5 (*Against the Donatists*, ch. 10), does not plainly define this question, whether John's baptism remitted sins. For thus he writes: that "I am inclined to believe" that John baptized "with the water of repentance unto the remission of sins," so that to those baptized by him sins should be remitted in hope, but in very deed this would take place in the Lord's Baptism; yet lest anyone contend even that in John's baptism sins were remitted, but that some ampler sanctification was conferred on those whom the Apostle Paul ordered afterwards to be baptized with Christ's Baptism, "I shall not fight contentiously."²⁴ Finally there are also brought forward the sentences of others, which seem to destroy the difference of each baptism as above stated. For Cyril of Jerusalem (*Mystagogical Catechesis*) says: "By John's baptism was given the remission of sins; by Christ's, the adoption of sons." And (*Catechesis* 3) he writes that John "by his baptism freed the believers from eternal fire." Optatus, book 3 (*Against Parmenian*), that those who were baptized with John's baptism "by violence entered into the kingdom of heaven," just as those baptized with Christ's baptism entered "by right." Damascene, book 4 (ch. 10), enumerating certain kinds of baptisms, says: "The fifth was the baptism of Christ, with which Christ was baptized." Since therefore Christ was baptized with John's baptism, it was not different from the baptism of Christ. Prudentius (in the hymn "O Nazarene") says that John's baptism washed away sins and gave the Holy Spirit. Juvenius also, book 1 (*Gospel History*), does not dissent from this; of which thing too there is not an obscure intimation in Lactantius, book 4 (ch. 15). Finally Augustine himself (*Questions* 84 on *Leviticus*) ascribes sanctification to John's baptism; and (*Homily* 23 among the fifty) he acknowledges in it the remission of sins, and in the commentary of Jerome (on *Mark* 1).²⁵

§ 21. To these objections we reply in order. As to what Mark and Luke write—that John preached "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins"—saving the difference above posited, the Fathers expound it in two ways. For certain understand this to have been said not of John's but of Christ's baptism. For although, they say, John baptized with his own baptism, nevertheless he proclaimed Christ's Baptism, which was the baptism of mercy unto the remission of sins. This sense is indicated by Gregory (*Homily* 20 on the Gospels) and by Bede (in the *Commentaries*). Others, taking this as said of John's baptism (to whose opinion we more incline), refer the remission of sins not to the baptism, but to repentance—namely, to that which prepares for receiving the remission of sins through Christ's Baptism. For nowhere is it read that John baptized "unto the remission of sins," which Scripture attributes to Christ's baptism (*Acts* 2) and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. Nor anywhere is John's baptism called the legitimate "laver of regeneration and of renewal," by which name the Apostle designates Christ's Baptism; but it is called only "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins," namely future and to be given in Christ's baptism—which very Scripture passages Tertullian (*On Baptism*, ch. 10), Jerome (in the *Dialogue* against the Luciferians), Ambrose (on *Luke* 3), Chrysostom (*Homily* 10 on *Matthew*), and after him Theophylact distinctly so interpret. The sentiment of Augustine is almost the same; who, book 5 (*Against the Donatists*, ch. 10), thus understands that John baptized "with the water of repentance unto the remission of sins," that to those baptized by him "sins should be remitted in hope," but in reality in Christ's Baptism. In like manner must be taken what is objected from the Cantic of Zacharias: for John, by announcing and showing forth the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world, brought to the Jewish people the knowledge by which, by coming to Christ, they might be saved and obtain the remission of sins. Although in this place it is not, as in the other two places, "unto remission" or "for remission," but "in the remission of sins," so that it be an exposition of the salvation which John was manifesting as to be given through Christ, according to that (*Matt.* 1): "He shall save his people from their sins."

§ 22. To the second argument Tertullian long ago replies with the words just now cited: that a mandate was given to John to baptize, but not a power; whence neither remission of sins nor the Holy Spirit could be given through him; whereas both without doubt the Baptism of Christ bestows.²⁶

§ 23. He affirms that John's baptism was from heaven; hence he himself says (Jn. 1): "He who sent me to baptize with water, he said to me," and the rest of the verse.²⁷ And in this way those things are from heaven, whatever things are by God either commanded or instituted; such also were all the Mosaic ceremonies, whether they were efficacious for working something spiritually, or were not.

§ 24. To the third it is answered, that John's ministry was more perfect than the ministry of the old law, not as to the effect of grace, but as to signification, and instruction or preparation of the people for Christ, as we showed above. But if you ask why the baptism of John, less than circumcision or certain other sacraments of the old law, conferred grace at least by accident, I answer that those sacraments were instituted so that their observance might endure for several ages; during which time the People of God ought not to have lacked external remedies of salvation. But the baptism of John scarcely lasted in use beyond the space of one or another year; nevertheless, since circumcision and the other ancient sacraments and sacrifices were already now giving way to Christ's Baptism, there was no need that through the ministry of John justice should be awaited.

§ 25. To the fourth it is answered, that in the Church of Christ, which was begun on the day of Pentecost and thereafter was spread through the world, there is one Baptism; but before that time the baptism of John had already ceased.

§ 26. But to that which is objected from Basil we reply that his words can be taken in this, or in a like, sense: that John by his baptism so prepared men for Christ that, without delay, as truly penitent, they might approach Christ's Baptism and through it obtain the forgiveness of sins.²⁸ And what he says, that John's baptism stripped men of sins, must be understood not of the guilt of sins but of the evil deeds themselves. For those who were baptized by John by that ceremony professed repentance, to which it chiefly pertains to abandon sins and not to repeat what has been committed. However Basil's opinion may stand, whether he thought that forgiveness of sins was given or not given through John's baptism, this is undoubted: that in those very places Basil openly distinguishes between the baptism of John and the Baptism of Christ, when he says that John baptized only in water, but Christ in the Holy Spirit; and he calls John's baptism initiating, but Christ's perfecting, the adoption of sons; Homily 13.²⁸

§ 27. To the objection brought from Ambrose it is answered that these words of his, "John baptized for the remission of sins in the name of the coming Jesus, not in his own name," sufficiently intimate the Author's sense, namely this: that John by his own baptism preached that forgiveness of sins was to be asked from that Lamb whom he pointed out and for whom he prepared the way, but that he did not confer it by his own baptism. But as to what he says—that those who professed that they had heard nothing of the Holy Spirit had not been truly washed by John's baptism, but had only received a certain empty image of that preparatory sacrament—this is said improbably. For it is not likely that John delivered to all who came to him a distinct doctrine concerning the Trinity of the Persons in God—something that was reserved for Christ—especially since some were baptized not by himself but by his disciples, who were still more untrained. And yet in Acts 19 those very men who did not know the Holy Spirit are called by Luke "disciples," and by Paul "believers." Hence the singular opinion of Ambrose and of the Master in this part is less to be approved.²⁹ But as to what is

objected from the Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, since Ambrose is not its author but an uncertain one, it need not be much regarded.³⁰

§ 28. To the seventh it is answered, that Augustine did not wish to act combatively, not because he thought the opinion which he there recounts to be true or probable, but because it pertained not very much to the question proposed which of the two was said. For it sufficed, in order to refute the argument of the Donatists taken from the example of John's baptism, to show that it was different from the Baptism of Christ; and therefore that there had not been one and the same Baptism repeated when those were baptized again who had been baptized with John's baptism, because not the same but another Baptism was conferred. Then Augustine thought it to pertain to his modesty, if he did not assert as certain what others had not decisively proved, even though he himself did not doubt it. Finally, to answer the rest: it does not seem to be denied that it was the opinion of certain of the Ancients that by John's baptism forgiveness of sins was given; but all of them attribute more to the Baptism of Christ, namely a certain excellence of grace, which they do not attribute to John's baptism; in the same way one may speak when circumcision is compared with Baptism.

§ 29. The Council of Trent did not determine that there was no force of remission of sins attached to John's baptism, but only determined in general, by its anathema, that it did not have the same power as Christ's Baptism. And in this point all the Ancients are plainly found to agree.³¹ Meanwhile, as to what is objected from Damascene, it is easily resolved from that same author. For in that chapter Damascene manifestly distinguishes between the baptism of John, which he set in the fourth place, and the Baptism of Christ, which he set in the fifth. He says moreover that Christ was washed with this fifth kind of baptism because an express representation of the Trinity was made when Christ was baptized, just as Christ's baptism is celebrated in the Church with the express invocation of that same Trinity, as Damascene's Commentator, Josse Clichtoveus, rightly explains; or certainly for this reason, that that baptism was not in water only, but also in some manner "in spirit," not indeed on account of the efficacy of spiritual grace, but on account of the visible apparition of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove upon him who was being baptized.³² Furthermore, the passage of Augustine from the book Questions on Leviticus can be taken of a certain preparatory signification. For there is a manifold mode of signifying, as Augustine himself teaches in a certain place against the Pelagians.³³ And as to what is produced from the work of Homilies, it is not sufficiently clear whether it signifies that by John baptism for the remission of sins was given to some by God. The remaining two passages are from those books which are falsely attributed to those Authors, one to Augustine, the other to Jerome.³⁴

§ V — That those baptized by John ought to have been baptized with Christ's baptism (A Joanne baptizatos Christi baptismo baptizari debuisse)

§ 30. From what has been said above it is sufficiently understood that those who had been washed with John's baptism (*baptismus*) still had need of the Baptism of Christ. First. Because Scripture (Acts 19) bears witness that certain disciples, at Paul's bidding, were baptized with the Baptism of Christ, not because they did not yet know the Holy Spirit, but because they had been baptized only with John's baptism, which was a baptism of penance merely, not, however, of the remission of sins. For if ignorance of the Holy Spirit had been a sufficient cause for repeating baptism, by the same reasoning the Baptism of Christ itself ought to be repeated when received by those who either had not been fully, or had been perversely, instructed in the faith. And this passage of Scripture was so understood by St. Augustine and by St. Jerome.³⁶ Second. Because John sent those

whom he himself had baptized on to Christ's Baptism with these words: "I baptize you with water unto penance; but he who is to come after me, he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 3).³⁷ Third. Because it was said universally of Christ's Baptism: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit," etc. From which sentence St. Augustine gathers (in Epistle 108 to Seleucianus) that not only the common crowd of believers baptized by John, but the Apostles themselves, were washed with the Baptism of Christ, although Scripture does not express where and when that was done; it is, however, insinuated by those words of Christ to Peter (Jn. 13): "He that is washed needeth not but to wash his feet."³⁸ Fourth. In Acts 2 and 4, where several thousands of believers are read to have been baptized by the Apostles with Christ's Baptism, the Apostles did not separate from that number those baptized with John's baptism—who certainly were very many, as is clear from Matt. 3—but judged Christ's Baptism no less necessary for them than for the others, without which they could not be incorporated into the Church of Christ.³⁹ Finally. This doctrine of Augustine is manifest not only in the places already mentioned, but also elsewhere, as in Tractate 5 on John and Epistle 48.⁴⁰ And although the Master, in the text, thinks otherwise, saying that those who with integral faith had come to John's baptism were not afterwards baptized, but were received by the mere imposition of hands, nevertheless his Commentators, with great agreement, depart from this opinion of his and side with Augustine.⁴¹

§ 31. Nor indeed do the words of Jerome support the Master (in Joel 2 and in the Epistle to Oceanus), where he says that those who had received John's baptisms, because they did not know the Holy Spirit, were again baptized—as though it followed from this that, if they had known the Holy Spirit, they ought not to have been baptized again. For Jerome in those places means nothing else than that from their ignorance of the Holy Spirit it was detected that those disciples (Acts 19) had not been baptized with the Baptism of Christ; because for this Baptism there is wont to be preposed instruction, or the catechizing of catechumens. For although Scripture briefly records that some were baptized "in the name of Christ," nevertheless Augustine teaches that under that brevity of speech the prior catechism is included (On Faith and Works, chs. 8–10).⁴² As to the passage of Ambrose, which the Master also cites in his own favor, we indicated above what is to be thought of it.⁴³

§ VI — Whether John used any form of words in baptizing (An aliqua verborum forma Joannes usus fuerit Baptizando)

§ 32. The opinion of some is that John used a certain fixed form of words in baptizing, namely this: "I baptize you in the name of the One to come." The Master (of the Sentences) hands down this view in the text, and St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure follow him; and before them James of Vitry (Ecclesiastical History, ch. 36), and many other Scholastics.⁴⁵ However, this opinion seems to rest upon the words of Paul (Acts 19), speaking thus: "Joannes baptizavit baptismo paenitentiae populum dicens: in eum qui venturus esset post ipsum, ut crederent, hoc est in Jesum." Ambrose also and Jerome can seem to have thought thus. The former, in book 1 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 3, says that John baptized "in the name of the Jesus who was to come, not in him himself." And therefore, he says, they did not know the Spirit (namely those disciples of whom mention is made in Acts 19), "because they had not received baptism in the name of Christ, as John was wont to baptize." The latter, indeed, writing on Joel 2, says of the same disciples that they were baptized with John's baptism "in him who was to come, that is, in the name of the Lord Jesus."⁴⁶

§ 33. Others, moreover, among whom is Durandus, think otherwise, estimating it as more probable that John added no form (*forma*) to the water as matter (*materia*); so that, just as the sacrifice of Melchizedek was a figure of the unbloody Sacrifice of Christ on account of the likeness of matter and not of form—of which there very likely was none there—so the baptism of John was a figure of the Baptism of Christ, representing and foreshowing it by matter alone.⁴⁷ And this can also be confirmed by reason. First: because by John's baptism they were in no way inwardly affected by the power or by the name of Christ; therefore there was no need of an invocation or expression of that name. For the doctrine about Christ to come preceded the baptism, just as now a catechism is prefixed to the Baptism of Christ. Then: because Christ was washed with John's baptism; but that he should be baptized "in the name of the One to come," being already present and known by the baptizer and pointed out, was absurd. But what is objected from Acts 19 does not favor the former opinion: for those words of Paul mean something other than that John had baptized the people with the baptism of penance, and, moreover, had exhorted them to believe in him who was to come after him, that is, in Jesus; which, too, the Evangelists have narrated more fully and more openly.

§ 34. But whether, in the act of baptizing, he uttered any words which would be in place of a form for that baptism, neither the Evangelists have signified nor Paul in the Acts. Now that Paul's words are to be taken thus, the Greek reading clearly shows, which has it thus: "Joannes quidem baptizavit baptismo paenitentiae, populo dicens, in venturum post se ut crederent, hoc est in Christum Jesum." According to this sense Ambrose also and Jerome are easily interpreted: for they signify that John thus baptized, that nevertheless he bade those who were baptized not to believe in himself—who otherwise could be thought to be Christ—but in the Messiah still to come, that is, Jesus. Therefore these Fathers' statements are to be understood not about the form of baptism, but about the doctrine adjoined to the baptism of this sort.

§ 35. The Baptism of the new law is the first of the sacraments and in a certain respect the chief. First indeed, because as faith is the beginning of salvation, so Baptism, as the sacrament of Faith, opens the Church to believers and introduces believers into it, and prepares the access and grants the right to receive those things which are proper to the household of Christ. Whence also it is called the "gate of the sacraments."

It is called the sacrament of Faith because it is an external sign by which, as by a public profession of faith, the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers; so that no one, however much he may already hold in his heart all the doctrines of the Christian Religion, is to be reckoned among the faithful unless he has been initiated by this public and solemn sign. For catechumens, although they recited the Creed with the mouth and from the heart, were never held to be in the number of the faithful before Baptism, as Augustine attests (Tractate 11 on John; and Confessions, book 8, ch. 2). But baptized little ones, although of themselves they can neither believe with the heart nor confess with the mouth, the Church has always held among the faithful, as the same Augustine testifies in many places against the Pelagians.⁴⁹

For this reason too Dionysius the Areopagite (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, part 1, ch. 2) calls this sacrament the "beginning of the most holy commandments"; and Cyprian, speaking of Baptism (in the Epistle to Jubianus), says: "From thence, he says, the whole origin of Faith begins, and an entrance of salvation unto the hope of eternal life." The sacrament of faith it is called by Ambrose (book 1 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 3), by Augustine (Epistle 23), and in Gratian (De Consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. Nihil est), and by others not infrequently. By this name also the Fathers of the Council of Trent have called it (Session 6, ch. 7).⁵⁰

Moreover in a certain manner this sacrament is chief, both for the reason just stated—because it is the gate of all the sacraments and affords the beginning of salvation—and because, before the others, it is most necessary. For without it salvation cannot be had, and with it it can be had: as is shown not only by the example of little ones, but also of adults who have not lost the innocence of Baptism.

Further, this sacrament is called by the Apostle (Tit. 3) "the laver of regeneration and renewal"; it is also called the sacrament of illumination (Heb. 6 [as in source]). By which name we read that the same was more frequently called by the Ancients. Gregory Nazianzen (Oration on Baptism) and Damascene (book 4, ch. 10) sometimes call it "the perfecting sacrament," sometimes "the seal by which we are signed to God." Augustine (Epistle 28 to Jerome) names it "the sacrament of Christian Society." Finally Dionysius, where cited above, calls this same sacrament "the adoption of sons." There are also other names found among the Ancients by which the power and excellence of this Sacrament are signified. These are especially to be noted against those who, taking away from the sacraments all interior power of sanctification, attribute to them a bare signification.

§ II — What Baptism is (Quid sit Baptismus)

§ 36. Among profane Greek authors the words for baptizing generally signify to wash, to dip, to immerse; in which way they are sometimes taken also in the Sacred Letters. For we read (Mark 7) of the baptisms of cups and pitchers, and (Heb. 9) of various baptisms of the Jews' vessels; and Judith is read to have baptized herself in a spring of water (ch. 12). And Ecclesiasticus says (Sir. 34): "He who is baptized by a dead man," etc. Likewise (1 Cor. 10) the word is found so taken. It is also transferred to afflictions, as in these words of the Lord: "Are you able to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?" (Mark 10). In the same way one must interpret that saying of Paul (1 Cor. 15): "What shall they do who are baptized for the dead?" that is, those who fast and afflict themselves, that they may benefit the dead.

§ 37. However, by the usage of the Apostles and of the whole Church it particularly signifies the sacred mystical washing well known to all, which indeed has been variously defined by various writers. In Hugh, book 2 (On the Sacraments, part 6, ch. 2), this definition of his is read: Baptism is water sanctified for washing away crimes.⁵² The Master in the text puts it thus: Baptism is the washing of the body externally, done under the form of words prescribed.⁵³ Others define it to be the sacrament consisting in the external washing of the body and in the legitimate utterance of words according to Christ's institution. Others finally think it should be taken thus, that it is the bodily washing of a man done in water, and signified by words with the express invocation of the Trinity, together with the intention of doing what the Church does.

§ 38. But about these definitions of Baptism at once there occurs the question what that is which properly lays claim to the name of Baptism: whether it be the water, as appears from Hugh's definition; or the washing of the body, as in the Master's definition and in that which was set last; or rather that which is composed of the washing and the utterance of the words, as the third definition indicates. For no one is found to have called the mere formula of words "Baptism." Yet neither is the washing of the mind Baptism, nor is it always conjoined to the sacrament of Baptism; rather, it is an invisible reality signified by Baptism as by a visible sign.

§ 39. Treating this question, St. Bonaventure (in the present Distinction) judges that the water is the sacrament of Baptism, not considered in any way whatever, but inasmuch as it is appointed for baptizing and is actually applied to that purpose; and he thinks that this is what is signified by the name "laver" with the

Apostle (Tit. 3 and Eph. 5), interpreting "laver" as water appointed for washing, just as a "bath" is said to be water appointed for bathing.⁵⁴ More probable, however, is the opinion of St. Thomas, who (III, q. 66, a. 1) teaches that this name properly signifies not the water, that is, the thing washing, but the washing itself, the very act of washing the body externally with the prescribed form, to be Baptism — as the Master rightly hands down in the text. For the word "Baptism" signifies neither the water, nor the sound or utterance of the words, but the washing itself. The same is shown by the likeness of the other sacraments. For all the sacraments except the Eucharist consist in some action in which sanctification is effected, not in a thing subject to the action or left after the action. Wherefore, just as, for example, Confirmation is not the chrism, but the use and application of the chrism; so Baptism is not the water, but the action by which water is applied to a man. Accordingly, what Hugh says — that Baptism is water — can be taken in a causal sense. For water holds the character of material cause in Baptism. Nor is the argument from the name "laver" of force, because it can be granted that with the Apostle by that name not Baptism itself, but the water of Baptism, is signified; and also because the Greek word signifies both, both the "laver" and the "washing."

§ III — By what words Baptism is effected (Quibus verbis perficiatur baptismus)

§ 40. The form of Baptism (*forma Baptismi*) perpetually and constantly kept in the Church is this: "I baptize thee, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"; although, for that which in the Latin Church, in the last place, is said, "I baptize thee," in the Greek it is said, "Let N., the servant of Christ, be baptized," or, "N. is baptized"—the name also, that is, the appellation, of him who is baptized being added. The Church, however, holds this form as certain.

-
1. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 38, a. 1, ad 1.
 2. St. Augustine, Contra litteras Petiliani II, ch. 56.
 3. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 12 on Matt. 3.
 4. St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem II, ch. 57.
 5. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas V, ch. 9; St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 5; St. Augustine, De unico baptismo, ch. 7.
 6. Durandus (of Saint-Pourçain), "quest. 3. ad 1" [abbreviation as in source].
 7. Cf. Matt. 11:9; Luke 7:26.
 8. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 38, a. 3.
 9. St. Augustine, Tractate 5 on John; cf. also "contra Donatistas cap. 14" [abbreviation as in source].
 10. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 38, a. 3, ad loc. ("ubi supra").
 11. Tertullian, De baptismo.
 12. Pseudo-Cyprian, Sermo de Baptismo Christi.
 13. St. Hilary of Poitiers, In Matthaeum, can. 2.
 14. St. Ambrose, In Lucam II, on Luke 3; idem, Praefatio in Psalmum 37; idem, In Psalmum 118, "Confige timore".
 15. St. Jerome, Dialogus adversus Luciferianos.

16. St. Jerome, *Epistula ad Oceanum*, ch. 3; idem, *In Joel* 2.
17. St. John Chrysostom, *Hom.* 12 and *Hom.* 11 on *Matthew* 3.
18. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 49; *Contra Donatistas* V, ch. 9; *De unico baptismo*, ch. 7; and see *Tractates* 4–5 on John.
19. Editorial notes of Estius: (a) "Seu XCIII in the Benedictine Edition." (b) "Seu CCX among the Sermons of the second class in the same Edition." (c) "Of St. Maximus of Turin, Bishop, as the Catalogue of Illustrious Men by Gennadius attests; in the Dissertation on Ecclesiastical Writers certain Heterodox Critics have tried to the contrary, but more correct editions, as noted by Philippe Labbe, show clearly; thus the fraud of the Heterodox, who have attempted to wrest those Homilies or Sermons to Honorius and Theodosius the Emperors, is exposed; most Catholic Scholars teach this; and by the testimony of Gennadius the place cited above is borne out; most of Maximus's Homilies are commonly reckoned among St. Ambrose's three Sermons and Augustine's."
20. St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. 5; the Scholastic doctors passim; Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 1 on Baptism.
21. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 38, a. 3 ("ibidem").
22. St. Basil, *Homilies on Baptism* [abbreviation as in source], especially *Hom.* 1, *Hom.* 2, *Hom.* 13.
23. St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto* I, ch. 3; idem, *In Galatas* 3; the Master of the Sentences, text [abbreviation as in source].
24. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* V, ch. 10.
25. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catecheses*; *Catechesis* 3; Optatus of Milevis, *Contra Parmenianum*, book 3; St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. 10; Prudentius, *Hymnus "O Nazarene"*; Juvencus, *Historia evangelica* I; Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* IV, ch. 15; St. Augustine, *Quaestiones* 84 in *Leviticum*; *Homily* 23 among the fifty; St. Jerome, *Commentarius in Marcum* 1.
26. Tertullian, *De baptismo*, cited above.
27. Jn. 1: "He who sent me to baptize with water, he said to me..."
28. St. Basil, *Homilies on Baptism*, especially *Hom.* 13.
29. St. Ambrose, *In Lucam* 3; the Master of the Sentences, text cited by Estius [abbreviation as in source]. Cf. Acts 19, where those ignorant of the Holy Spirit are called "disciples" and "believers."
30. The Commentary on Galatians ascribed to Ambrose; the author is uncertain.
31. Council of Trent, Session 7, on Baptism (canon 1).
32. St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. [abbreviation as in source]; Josse Clichtoveus, *Commentator on Damascene*.
33. St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Leviticum*; idem, against the Pelagians [abbreviation as in source].
34. The "Homilies" cited by Estius; and two further passages from books falsely attributed, one to St. Augustine and the other to St. Jerome.
35. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 38, a. 6.
36. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas*, ch. 9; and *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, ch. 37. St. Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*.
37. Matt. 3: "I baptize you with water unto penance; but he who is to come after me, he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit."
38. St. Augustine, *Epistle* 108 to Seleucianus; Jn. 13: "He that is washed needeth not but to wash his feet."
39. Acts 2; Acts 4; cf. Matt. 3 on the multitudes baptized by John.
40. St. Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, *Tract.* 5; *Epistle* 48.
41. The Master (of the Sentences), the text cited by Estius; the commentators commonly dissent and follow Augustine.
42. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Joel* 2; *Epistle to Oceanus*; St. Augustine, *De fide et operibus*, chs. 8–10.
43. St. Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* III; see above, where Estius discussed this passage.
44. "Ad S. Thom, dict. 3. p. qu. 3." [abbreviation as in source].
45. St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure follow the Master; cf. James of Vitry, *Ecclesiastical History*, ch. 36.

- 46. St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto I, ch. 3; Acts 19; St. Jerome, Commentary on Joel 2.
- 47. Durandus (of Saint-Pourçain).
- 48. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 66 and following.
- 49. St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, Tract. 11; Confessions VIII, ch. 2.
- 50. Dionysius, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, part 1, ch. 2; St. Cyprian, Epistle to Jubianus; St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto I, ch. 3; St. Augustine, Epistle 23; Gratian, De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. Nihil est; Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 7; Titus 3; "sacrament of illumination" at Heb. 6 [abbreviation as in source]. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration on Baptism; St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 10; St. Augustine, Epistle 28 to St. Jerome; Dionysius, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, part 1, ch. 2.
- 51. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 66, a. 1.
- 52. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis II, part 6, ch. 2.
- 53. The Master (of the Sentences), in the text on this distinction.
- 54. St. Bonaventure, in this Distinction ["in praes. Distinctionem"]; cf. Titus 3; Eph. 5.
- 55. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 66, a. 5.

DISTINCTIO III — ON THE FORM OF BAPTISM (*DE FORMA BAPTISMI*)

§ 1. Most surely indeed it is gathered from the words of the Lord, by which, after the resurrection, He says to the disciples: "Going therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Although certain more recent writers think that it is not had from the Scriptures but from tradition alone, because they suppose that those words of Christ do not signify what words are to be used in the very act of baptizing, but only prescribe that they should baptize in the name, that is, in the power, of the Trinity; nevertheless the ancients, when treating of the necessity of the words, for the most part take their proof from the aforesaid place of Scripture, as Basil,¹ and St. Augustine,² who says that Baptism is not otherwise valid unless it be consecrated with the evangelical words—just as also he speaks elsewhere.³ Likewise Pelagius.⁴

§ 2. First, therefore, it is necessary that the act of baptizing (*actus baptizandi*) be expressed in words; and a reason can be given for this: because, since the intention of the act itself is most necessary, it is also necessary that that intention be uttered in a word. Hence Alexander III (Extra, De baptismo et eius effectu, ch. Si quis): "If someone," he says, "should dip a child three times in water, 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen,' if he should not say, 'I baptize you,' the child is not baptized."⁶ Yet here the Pontiff does not lay stress on the pronoun "I," which is sufficiently contained in the first-person verb "I baptize"; for "I baptize" and "I, I baptize" are the same; but he wills only that these, or similar, words be necessarily pronounced, by which at least the act of the minister and the person of the recipient may be signified.

§ 3. That an express invocation of the Trinity (*Trinitas*) is also necessary—besides the Scripture and Authors just cited—is had, in the first place, from Canon 49 of the Apostles, which, as though interpreting that place (Matt. 28) with respect to the form of the words, rejects Baptism conferred "in the name of the Lord," subjoining as follows: "The Lord did not say, In my death baptize, but, Going, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."⁷ Likewise Didymus (On the Holy Spirit): "Although," he says, "someone, by such alien-minded rashness as to attempt to baptize, should omit one of the aforesaid names, namely either of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless he will not baptize unto perfection."⁸ The same is plainly in Origen on Rom. 6,⁹ and in Theophylact.¹⁰ Among the Latins, indeed, St. Cyprian (the Letter to Jubaianus): "How," they say, "can there be Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, however and wheresoever," etc.¹¹ And Stephen, then Abbot of St. Ebrulf, soon after of St. Geneviève, and at length bishop—who, abounding in many, and indeed subtle, allegations of the Fathers and decrees of the saints, consulted, when he wavered in doubt, the same Pope Alexander III on this matter—had this letter, which is found among the letters of Stephen of Tournai, consulted, and then he sought the judgment of Pope Alexander III. We marvel, therefore, that certain authors—among whom Gaspar Juenin (in the Historical-Dogmatic Commentary On the Sacraments, part 3, art. 2)—could have persuaded themselves that, before the decretal, nay, even before that decretal had been inserted by St. Raymond in the Decretals during the pontificate of Gregory IX, Baptism had been valid with the omission of the expression of

the act of the minister baptizing and of the person of the recipient; and that it is yet more to be wondered at, that the same theologians have been persuaded that the censure of Alexander VIII, condemning this proposition (which is among the twenty-seventh): "At some time Baptism was valid under this form, 'in the name of the Father &c.,' the words 'I baptize thee' being omitted,"¹² is to be understood as applying to those places only where the custom of the Latins had prevailed to use the words "I baptize thee" as the form of Baptism. But good God! How flimsy and empty is the reason which they employ in theologizing, to support their opinion. Certainly—to confess candidly—it shows a mind most adverse to the words of the Apostolic See, which they strive to bend, and is not a right way of judging, when theologians, in order to strengthen their own opinion, adduce reasons scarce worthy of a schoolboy. For the proposition which Alexander VIII condemns is: "At some time Baptism was valid under this form, 'in the name of the Father &c.,' the words 'I baptize thee' being omitted." The contradictory of this, which is exhibited as true, is: "Never was Baptism valid under this form, the words 'I baptize thee' being omitted." Now this latter proposition supposes every place and time. It therefore follows that, if the particular affirmative is condemned, the universal negative must be asserted; and thus, as often as theologians attempt to restrict the censure to place or time, by so much they would destroy the very scope of the Apostolic condemnation; for a universal negative, which arises from the condemnation of a particular affirmative, must destroy place and time alike. Finally, we cannot pass over in silence—we say it with all respect—that we can by no means bear with an even mind that the celebrated man, Gaspar Juenin, should endeavor to refute, with a certain air of superior accuracy (as we are to be believed), the opinion of the above-said theologians, which opinion he himself had noted down out of the same: for, if the thing be pondered as it ought, the relation set forth by Juenin does not rest upon any true foundation.

§ 4. Add to this that Baptism without the express invocation of the Trinity is condemned by the Roman Pontiffs expressly. For Innocent I (Letter to the Macedonian bishops) teaches that the baptism of those who had been baptized by the Paulianists ought to be repeated, but not of those who by the Novatians, because the former did not baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," whereas the latter baptized with the selfsame tremendous and venerable names.¹³ Concerning the Paulianists and their Baptism something similar is read in St. Augustine,¹⁴ and St. Gregory the First determines the same.¹⁵ His words are read in Gratian.¹⁶ To these are added Popes Pelagius and Zacharias in the places cited above; of whom the former commands that those baptized only "in the name of the Lord," and returning to the Church, be baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity without any ambiguity of doubt; the latter, moreover, altogether and for certain confirms as true that whoever has been immersed without the invocation of the Trinity has not the sacrament of regeneration—so much so that he who has not named even one Person of the Trinity does not confer true Baptism.¹⁷ Nor is the sense of their words rightly subverted by some with the reason which follows in the same decree, namely: because he who shall not have confessed one of the names of the Holy Trinity cannot be a perfect Christian—as though, forsooth, then at last the Pontiff denied that that is true Baptism in which some Divine Person is kept silent when the unbelief of the baptizer separates that Person from the others. For it is established that nothing is detracted from the truth and substance of Baptism by the error of the giver or the receiver, even if he should think perversely concerning one of the three Persons, as St. Augustine teaches,¹⁸ and the Council of Arles I, cited by Gratian, declares.¹⁹ But if, besides the institution of Christ, a reason is sought for this necessity of expressing the three Persons, we can reply that this reason is most fitting to the divine institution—because Baptism is the sacrament of faith, which is contained most of all in the profession of the Trinity, as is clear from "I believe in God the Father ... and in Jesus Christ ... and in the Holy Spirit." Nor do we profess to believe anything else. This reason St. Augustine had in view when he

says: "Who does not know that it is not the Baptism of Christ if the evangelical words, whereby the Symbol consists, should be lacking there? But heretics are more easily found who do not baptize at all than who do not baptize with those words."²⁰ And the same can be said of our own age.

§ IV — That the Apostles never baptized otherwise than in the name of the Trinity (Apostolos numquam aliter, quam in nomine Trinitatis baptizasse)

§ 5. The things that we have said show not only that now Baptism would not be valid unless it were given with the express invocation of the Trinity, but also that it was never valid otherwise, and therefore that neither did the Apostles, after it had been said to them, "Going therefore, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," ever use some other form (*forma*) in baptizing. For the Fathers cited above teach this, and by name Basil, in the book On the Holy Spirit, ch. 12, that this form, received from Christ's precept and by immovable tradition, is retained in the Church; they understand the precept to have been given at Matt. 28. Wherefore those think improbably who suppose that the Apostles, immediately at the beginning of their preaching after they had received the Holy Spirit, in order by divine dispensation to make the name of Christ more illustrious and lovable among men, so baptized as to express the name of Christ alone. For there was no need to do that in the act of baptizing with those words which, once uttered, it was not lawful to repeat, when, with a catechism going before and with varied instruction of those to be baptized and with the assiduous preaching of the faith concerning Christ the Redeemer, that could be provided enough and more than enough; especially since the Apostles had the most recent mandate of Christ, as He went up into heaven, about the Trinity to be distinctly named. Much less is Cajetan's opinion to be received, who judges that even today Baptism conferred "in the name of Christ" is valid—which is against the manifest and constant doctrine of the Ancients, as is clear from what has been said. A reason also stands against that opinion: for of one sacrament (*sacramentum*) there can be only one perpetual or ordinary form; otherwise at least on the part of the form there would be made a different sacrament. But both Cajetan and those who restrict their opinion to the times of the Apostles are deceived by this, that in the Acts there is read "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2), or "in the name of Jesus" (Acts 8 and 16), or "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 10). For, first, the very variety of the expression sufficiently admonishes that the Apostles did not use any certain formula of words in the act of baptizing. Next, from several other places of the book of Acts one can easily understand what that phrase means when it is said "in the name" of this one or of that one. For either authority, or merit is signified, or "name" is put for the thing named. Authority indeed, or power, is signified (Acts 3), Peter saying: "In the name of Jesus Christ, rise and walk." Whence (Acts 4) those who were present, the rulers of the Jews, asked: "In what power, or in what name, have you done this?" To whom Peter replied: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead." Authority also is clearly signified (John 5:43), where Christ says that He has come and works "in the name of" His Father. And (1 Cor. 5), where the Apostle decrees excommunication of the fornicator "in the name of" our Lord Jesus Christ. Merit is signified (Acts 10) with these words: "To him all the Prophets bear witness, that through his name all who believe in him receive the remission of sins." And John 14, 15, 16: "If you shall ask the Father anything in my name." And 1 Cor. 1: "Were you baptized in the name of Paul?" Moreover, "name" for the thing named is taken everywhere in Sacred Scripture, both of the Old and of the New Testament—and indeed even in this book of the Acts; as at ch. 4: "There is no other name under heaven given"—that is, no other, through whom men can be saved. So too (Rev. 11) it is said that by the earthquake

"the names of men seven thousand" were slain, that is, seven thousand men. Therefore the Apostles can be understood to have baptized "in the name of Christ" either by His power, or by His authority, or by His merit, or in Christ Himself—that is, in the faith of Christ—or in the Baptism of Christ. In which way (Rom. 6) it is said: "As many of us as have been baptized in Christ Jesus, have been baptized in his death." And in the same way (Acts 10) certain ones are said to have been baptized "in John's Baptism." But as to what (Acts 22) Paul records that Ananias said to him: "Rise and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord," it is not to be referred to anything other than to the act of baptizing—as is clear from the Greek—namely, "calling upon the name of Jesus."

§ 6. To this there is finally added that the Fathers openly teach that those same persons, of whom some mention is made in the Acts, were not otherwise than with the invocation of the Trinity baptized. For St. Augustine, book 3 against Maximinus, ch. 17, thus writes: "Since in the Acts it is said that some were ordered by Peter to be baptized 'in the name of Jesus Christ' where neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit is named, they are not understood to have been baptized otherwise than in the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit is signified." And Innocent (in the Epistle to the Bishops of Macedonia) testifies the same about those who (Acts 10) are read to have been, at Paul's bidding, baptized "in the name of Christ." And Basil too, looking to certain places of Paul's Epistles, in the book On the Holy Spirit, ch. 12, says: "Let not that word of the Apostle drive anyone into error, that he often omits, in mentioning Baptism, the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit; nor let him for that reason think that the nomenclature of the names need not be observed"; and a little after: "For the tradition bestowed in life-giving grace must remain immovable; wherefore to add anything, or to detract, is openly to fall away from life." The same clearly teach those whom we cited above, Origen, Theophylact, Cyprian, and Fulgentius. And the Catechism of the Council of Trent does not hesitate to approve the same opinion.

§ 7. Now certain objections which are urged against the aforesaid are solved. See St. Thomas where above.

§ 8. In favor of the opinion of those who think that the Apostles baptized otherwise "in the name of Christ" seem to stand certain statements of the Fathers, whose true meaning must therefore be made clear. Hilary, toward the end of the book On the Synods, says that the Apostles were ordered to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," but that they baptized only "in the name of Jesus." Ambrose, book 1 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 3, says that "the eunuch who was baptized in Christ attained the full mystery"; and he adds the reason: "For if you say 'Christ,' you designate both God the Father, by whom the Son is anointed, the very Son who is anointed, and the Spirit by whom He is anointed." But also other things to the same effect he inculcates in that chapter. Following the authority of Ambrose, the Venerable Bede, in Acts 10, writes thus: "Although throughout the whole context of this little book it is attested that Baptism is given not otherwise than 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' the Blessed Ambrose so solves it, because through the unity of the name the mystery is fulfilled." On the same authority relies Pope Nicholas in a certain Rescript to questions of the Bulgarians, which is read in Gratian (De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. A quodam), in these words: "You assert that many were baptized by a certain Jew, and consult what should be done about it. These indeed, if they have been baptized in the name of the Trinity, or in the name of Christ, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles (for one and the same is the one, as Ambrose expounds), ought not to be rebaptized." Finally, a passage of Bernard is objected (from Epistle 340), in which he approves Baptism conferred "in the name of God and of the holy true cross," and he uses an argument from the Acts of the Apostles.

§ 9. To these we reply as follows. Hilary, wishing to show that "the homoousion" is not for that reason to be erased from the Symbol because certain people took from it an occasion of error, thinking that God the Father had divided His substance and given fatherhood to the Son, proves that in the Scriptures too there are many things apparently at odds, which therefore afford to the unlearned a handle for error; nor yet for that reason are those things to be deleted from Scripture. Among which he lists that the Apostles were ordered to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who nevertheless in the Acts are read to have baptized in the name of Jesus. Therefore Hilary's will is that all such things, although they seem contrary, are not really contrary. But how they are to be reconciled he does not explain, content to commemorate things of that sort as an example. Now the things objected about Baptism are reconciled in the manner indicated by us above. The passage of Ambrose has more difficulty; but if anyone should think that he felt thus—that it was truly in the name of Christ that Baptism was conferred by the Apostles—he must needs admit that even now that very thing is true and valid, since the reason alleged by Ambrose still stands, just as Cajetan, though St. Thomas opposes, tries to prove. Nay, it will follow that Baptism would be valid, if in the words of the form there were expressed mention of the Father alone, or of the Holy Spirit alone. For the reason of Ambrose will always remain, that, one Person being named, the whole mystery is intact—something which, however, no Catholic now teaches, although the Master, deceived by the words of Ambrose, thinks thus. It further follows that Baptism would not be valid if an Arian should baptize, even though he use the full form; "although," says Ambrose, "you name both the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, if you diminish the power of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit, the whole mystery is empty." Therefore one must say that Ambrose is not treating of the form of the sacrament, just as neither is Basil (ch. 12 On the Holy Spirit), from whom he almost verbatim took his argument; rather his set purpose is to demonstrate that wherever some divine operation in the Scriptures is assigned to one of the Persons separately, the others are not excluded but rather ought to be understood together, as if they too had been expressly named. And this he tries to show from those Scriptures in which, under the name of one Person, mention of Baptism is found. For he presupposes, from the most well-known form of baptizing, that those who are read as baptized "in Christ" or "in the Holy Spirit" were not otherwise baptized than "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Whence he concludes that, when one Person is named somewhere in Scripture, the others must be understood. For he is speaking of the words of Scripture, which, although they name some one Person, yet do not exclude the others. Furthermore, the Venerable Bede, who merely cites the opinion of Ambrose, ought not to be drawn into another sense different from the mind of Ambrose. Pope Nicholas, in that his Rescript, is not principally dealing with what form makes Baptism valid; for that was not what had been asked, but he replies that Baptism conferred even by a Jew is valid. About the form of the sacrament, outside the question proposed, he added something in passing; in which matter, if by the obscurity of Ambrose he was perchance deceived, it is not very much to be wondered at. Yet some hold that part of his reply is to be taken in the same sense as the words of Ambrose, namely, that he wished to signify that Baptism is valid—provided it be Christian Baptism, which is understood when it is said, "Baptism in the name of the Trinity" or "in the name of Christ"—that is, that the Jew intended to give Christian Baptism, not some Jewish washing. Lastly, it is answered that that Epistle is not Bernard's, but that no credit is to be given to it as truly Bernard's, since it is asserted by no other to be his.²²

**§ VI — Which variation vitiates the form of Baptism, and which does not
(*Quae variatio formam Baptismi vitiat, et quae non*)**

§ 10. The necessity indeed of precept obtains in each sacrament as to the form which the Church prescribes, so that it is by no means permitted in this matter to alter anything customary and prescribed, and to admit some change, and likewise it rejects some change. In order that this may rightly be discerned in this sacrament of Baptism, one must first know that there is required not only, as to necessity and matter of fact, that the three Persons be distinctly pronounced and that the act of baptizing be expressed, as we have warned above, but also that the person of the recipient be designated—whether a statement be made about him, as in the Latin form, or of him, as in the Greek form. From this too it is evident that it is not necessary that the person of the minister be named by some word; for these things are established by Christ's institution, who (Matt. 28), according to the exposition of the Ancients, prescribing the form of Baptism with these words, "Baptizing..." both expressed the act and the recipient, but not the person of the minister. And a reason can be given, because the man who baptizes discharges a bare ministry with respect to the effect of this sacrament, and therefore it is sufficient that the whole Trinity, which is the principal cause, be named. Moreover it must be noted that variation of the form occurs in several ways, namely either by change of words, or by addition, or by subtraction, or by transposition. In all of which it happens that the form remains the same according to substance; and it happens too that it is vitiated. For if, the words having been changed, added, subtracted, transposed, nevertheless the same sense is preserved, the form is judged to remain entire; but if the sense is changed, the same form does not remain. Yet one must take note about the name by which the act of baptizing (*actus baptizandi*) is expressed, that it does not matter whether it be expressed in the indicative or in some other suitable mode, as is evident from the difference of the custom of the Greeks and Latins.

§ 11. But so that we may make this doctrine clear by examples: First, if synonymous words are taken—whether Greek, or Hebrew, or French—in place of Latin, the form will not be vitiated. Nor likewise, if someone should say: "I dip you," or "I wash you in..." substituting a Latin for the Greek term. If, however, someone should baptize "in the name of the begetter and the begotten and the spirated," or "of the blast," or "of the one proceeding from both," some think the baptism valid, because those are commonly held for synonyms. The more common opinion is that it will not be valid, for the reason that properly they are not synonyms, inasmuch as they signify the Persons not as Persons, that is, not under the formal character of subsistents or Persons, but under the formal character of properties. If someone should baptize saying "in the name of the Holy Trinity," he effects nothing, because there is required the aforesaid express mention of the three Persons. Again, if someone should baptize "in the name of the greater Father and of the lesser Son," there is no baptism. For something is added that is repugnant to the words of the form, and thus perverts their sense. If however it be said, "in the name of the greater Father and of the Son who according to His humanity is lesser," the form is not vitiated, but by a certain addition it is extended and explained. Likewise if someone should say "in the name of the Father Almighty, of the Son the Redeemer, and of the Holy Spirit the Paraclete."

§ 12. If, while baptizing, someone should add a condition that does not exist, as by saying, "if I am almighty," or "if you are without sin," nothing is accomplished. If someone should change the copulative conjunction into a disjunctive by saying, "in the name of the Father or of the Son," nothing likewise is accomplished. If someone should interpolate in the form certain words that are impertinent, as by turning his address to another person, if the interpolation is not so great as to take away the continuity of the discourse

that has been begun with respect to its signification, the form remains; otherwise it does not remain, judgment of which matter must be taken from common speech and sense. If something be subtracted of those things which we have said above are required for the substance of the form, it is manifest that nothing is effected. But if by some precipitancy of language or awkwardness of speech a letter or syllable is omitted, the form is not thereby destroyed. For, as Scotus rightly warns, God did not will to determine man to words in the sacraments beyond that mode in which they suffice to express the concept, although the reverence of the sacrament demands that they be pronounced fully and distinctly. Whence also that alteration which arises from sole incongruity of speech does not destroy the form, provided that incongruity is not so great that the sense signified by the words cannot be gathered from the words. There is an explanation of this matter found in Gratian from the rescript of Pope Zachary to Boniface.³⁴ And the Master cites the same.³⁵ For in that rescript those are forbidden to be rebaptized who had been baptized by an unlearned man with these words: "I baptize you in the name of the fatherland and the daughter, and the Holy Spirit"—"*patria & filia, & Spiritua Sancta*." "If however," says the Pontiff, "he who baptized spoke those words not introducing error or heresy, but out of mere ignorance of Roman speech, lipping, then..." In which place, what is said about his willing to introduce error, understand it thus: if by that change of words he should intend heresy, namely with the signification of the words also having been changed. For otherwise the heretical intention of the minister would not vitiate the sacrament.

§ 13. Moreover, transposition of words of itself does not vitiate the form, as if you should say: "In the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Nor even, if you should invert the order of the Persons, will the baptism be void; for although it is fitting that in pronouncing the order of the Persons the order of origin be observed—and he will sin gravely who does otherwise—nevertheless that is not so necessary on the part of the sacrament, since the Persons, in whatever order they are named, are one efficient principle in baptism, and under that formal character they are named there. But if the transposition should change the sense, the form will no longer be judged to be retained. There also occur other variations about the form, as if you should say "into the name of the Father" and so on, which variation does not corrupt the form. For in Greek the accusative is read, although in Syriac the ablative is had. But if you should say "into the names," or "into the names of the Father and of the Son" and so forth, the Master and St. Thomas and very many others are of opinion that nothing is effected, because the sense is corrupted by dividing the power in God which is signified by the name. And this is in conformity with St. Ambrose, who in book 2 *On the Sacraments*, ch. 7, says that we are baptized "in one name." Otherwise however, if it be said, "in the name of the Father, and in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit." For one and the same name common to all the Persons can suitably be understood to be repeated, just as if it were said, "in the name of God the Father, and of God the Son, and of God the Holy Spirit," where not three Gods, but one God would be understood.

§ 14. It can also be asked whether baptism is valid with these words: "I baptize you in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit"; or even if someone should say "into the name of the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit." Likewise, if someone should say "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit—and of Blessed Mary," or should declare that he baptizes in the name of a fourth person; or should add at the end an inequality of persons. In the first way it seems valid, because the express invocation of the Trinity is preserved, and no error is mingled in, unless perhaps someone should think that the unity of the Trinity, signified by the singular "name," must of necessity be expressed—which, however, stands in need of proof outside the matter itself. In the second way it appears not to be valid from the miracle of the water's

separating, which Nicephorus relates (book 19, chapter 35). In the third way likewise it is not valid, on account of the addition of error, by which the sense of the preceding words is overthrown.

§ 15. Finally, for judging about the integrity of the form of this sacrament, the words of the Council of Florence must be noted (in the Decree for the Armenians), and of the Pope as reported by Gratian (*De Consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. "Retulerunt"). For, after the baptismal form used in the Latin Church is recited there, it is subjoined: "We do not, however, deny that baptism is truly conferred by those words: 'Let such a one, servant of Christ, be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' or, 'Such a one is baptized in my hands in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'—since baptism is then brought to perfection, because the principal cause from which baptism has its virtue is the Holy Trinity; but the minister is an instrumental one who hands on outwardly the sacrament. If therefore the act which is exercised by the minister be expressed together with the invocation of the Holy Trinity, the sacrament is brought to perfection." Now as to change of number in the person of the giver or of the receiver of baptism, what is to be thought is to be seen in St. Thomas, where he teaches that there cannot be several ministers for baptizing one person, but that several can be baptized at once by one minister in such a way that it cannot be said: "We baptize you," unless perhaps the number should signify not the plurality of baptizers but the dignity of the person, as sometimes is customary. But it can be said: "I baptize you (pl.)," if some necessity should arise for baptizing many at once—just as infants are read to have been baptized of a certain Count of Holland in a number as many as there are days in the year, whom she had brought forth all in one birth, as is found in the Annals of Holland. St. Thomas assigns the reason: because, although the minister is one, nevertheless each one receives his own baptism; and the act of baptizing is sufficiently expressed by the pronoun of the plural number; for "you (pl.)" is nothing other than "you and you and you" all the way to whatever number.

§ 16. Furthermore, in this matter it is necessary to set forth the words of Alexander III (*Extra*, *De baptismo et eius effectu*, cap. "Si quis"). "If anyone," he says, "should lift a child from the earth into the water, saying: 'I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. I, N., do baptize you.' He is baptized." Yet the Pontiff does not place the force on the pronoun "I," since it is contained sufficiently in the verb of the first person "I baptize"; for it is the same to say "I baptize" and "I, I baptize"; but nevertheless he wishes those words to be necessarily uttered, inasmuch as they most nearly set forth the act of the minister, and the person of the recipient is signified.

§ VIII — Why Baptism was instituted in water (Quare in aqua institutus sit baptismus)

§ 17. That Baptism (*Baptismus*) should be instituted in water and not in any other liquid was fitting for many reasons. First, because Baptism is a sacrament (*sacramentum*) necessary for all and most necessary; to which, accordingly, that matter was congruent which is everywhere at hand and could very readily be procured even without price. Second, because as water cleanses bodies and washes away filth, so the sacrament of Baptism cleanses the soul and wipes away from it the filth of sins. Hence it was said to Paul (Acts 22): "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." And Christ is said to cleanse His Church "by the laver of water" (Eph. 5). And through Ezekiel the Lord says (Ezek. 36): "I will pour clean water upon you, and you shall be cleansed from all your filthiness." The Ambrosian Commentary explains this signification of water (on Rom. 6).³⁸ Third, because as water cools, so Baptism tempers and extinguishes the harmful heat of concupiscence. This effect of Baptism

was prefigured by the cloud that by day overshadowed the sons of Israel in the desert (Exod. 13), as the Apostle attests (1 Cor. 10). Fourth, because as water quenches bodily thirst, so the font of Baptism satisfies spiritual thirst, namely the thirst of holy desires. Fifth, because since Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, it is most fittingly celebrated in the moist element without which by nature generations of things do not take place. Hence also "the Spirit in the beginning of the world was borne upon the waters" (Gen. 1), with a view to the sprouting and production of things from the earth lying beneath. Sixth, because since Baptism is the sacrament of illumination (Heb. 6 and 10), it is most aptly performed in an element that indeed can be handled yet is transparent, which can admit light into itself. Lastly, because by immersion, which is done in water, death and the burial of Christ are fittingly represented, to which those who are baptized die together and are buried together; and likewise by emersion His resurrection and the newness of life. The Apostle presses this signification (Rom. 6).

§ IX — Whether triple immersion is necessary (Utrum trina immersio sit necessaria)

§ 18. As to whether it makes nothing to the truth of Baptism whether the act be performed once by immersion or several times, provided only that the form (*forma*) be uttered once: and indeed a plurality of immersions is not rebaptization, because it has the character only of one washing, and the whole action receives its unity from the form. Whence Jerome (on Eph. 4) says: "Although we are baptized three times because of the mystery of the Trinity, nevertheless one baptism is reckoned."⁴⁰

§ 19. But by the Church's precept, the one who is baptized must be plunged or poured upon either once only or three times, according to the custom of the place, since each number has its own mystery in the celebration of Baptism. Whence Gregory, book 1, Epistle 41, to Leander, bishop of Seville, and it is reported by Gratian (De Consecratione, Distinction 4): "Concerning triple immersion of baptism," he says, "nothing truer can be answered than what you yourselves have felt, that in one faith it does no harm: the custom of Holy Church is diverse."⁴¹ And then, explaining the mystery of triple immersion, he teaches that by it are signified the three days' burial of Christ and the resurrection made after three days, and the Trinity of Persons in God; but that by a single immersion is signified the unity of the divine nature. To these we can add that by a single immersion this is also aptly signified, that Christ died once and rose once. For this signification the Apostle had in view (Rom. 6). Moreover, in the same place Gregory warns Leander to use a single immersion, and that on account of the Arian heretics, who, using triple immersion, divided the divinity, that is, by that ceremony they wished it to be signified that the Son and the Holy Spirit were not of one and the same nature with the Father. Following the authority of Gregory, the Fourth Council of Toledo (canon 5) first judges that Baptism stands ratified whether someone be baptized by triple or by simple immersion; then, lest it seem to agree with the heretics who plunge a third time, it decrees that in Spain Baptism be done by one immersion only; the mystery of which thing is also explained there.⁴² The signification of triple immersion, besides Gregory, is also explained in Gratian by two other chapters, "Postquam," from St. Augustine, and "Eodem modo," from St. Jerome (De Consecrat. Dist. 4).⁴³

§ 20. But as to what canon 49 has among those that are carried under the name of the Apostles: "If any presbyter or bishop do not celebrate the triple immersion of the one mystery, but plunge once only in Baptism, which by some is ordered to be given 'in the death of the Lord,' let him be deposed": there it is not

simply forbidden to immerse once, but only if it be done not with the Trinity expressed, but only "in the death of the Lord." By which form indeed they taught one to be baptized, perhaps on account of that which the Apostle says (Rom. 6): "Whoever of us are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in His death." For this sense the words subjoined by the canon clearly indicate: "For the Lord did not say to us: 'Baptize in my death,' but: 'Going, baptize'." In the same way the decree of Pope Pelagius (chapter *Multi sunt*, in Gratian in the same Distinction) must be understood. For the Gospel precept which is there alleged is to be referred not to triple immersion but to the invocation of the Trinity, because neither does the proof subjoined establish anything else, and the Gospel has nothing about triple immersion, but only about the three persons.⁴⁴ Nor, however, are they not rightly rebuked who, contrary to the custom of their Church, immerse only once, or do it in such a way as to condemn the diverse custom of others. Something of this kind Haymo seems to have noted in Cyprian, as is cited by the Master at paragraph 1, although as to where Cyprian so teaches I have not yet found in him. Finally, one must know that if triple immersion be used, which now almost the whole Church observes, the several names of the Persons are to be pronounced at the several immersions: thus it will be that no immersion is redundant; because, as St. Bonaventure says in this Distinction, the sacrament is not complete until the word has been brought to its terminus.⁴⁵

§ X — What kind of washing is required in Baptism (Qualis ablutio in baptismo requiratur)

§ 21. Since water separated from use neither constitutes the sacrament of Baptism nor cleanses the soul, however much it may be prepared for this by consecration, but for the substance and effect of Baptism the use and application of the element are altogether required, which application in general we call washing or ablution, the question is raised whether that ablution ought to be done by pouring, by sprinkling, or by immersion. To which, according to St. Thomas (III, q. 66, a. 7) and St. Bonaventure (on this Distinction) and nearly all who agree, one must say that for the substance (*substantia*) of Baptism any kind whatsoever of ablution of the man to be baptized suffices, whether it be done by immersion, or by pouring, or by sprinkling; and again whether the whole body be washed by one of these modes, or only some part of it.

§ 22. That it can be effected by pouring, the same St. Thomas teaches (III, q. 68, a. 11, ad 4; and in IV Sent., Dist. 6, a. 1, q. 1). For that it can be effected by pouring seems to be signified by that of Ezekiel 36: "I will pour upon you clean water." It is read also in the Passion of St. Lawrence that a Roman brought to Lawrence in prison a pitcher full of water, by which he was to be baptized—one that certainly did not suffice for immersing.⁴⁷ Likewise it is read in Nicephorus, book 5, chapter 7, that a certain Basilides, a torturer of the holy Potamiana, converted to the faith while in chains, received holy Baptism with water poured around him by other Christians.⁴⁸ The same reason evidently applies to sprinkling. For where in Ezekiel is read "I will pour," some have "I will sprinkle." Thus also St. Jerome cites it (in Epistle 83 to Oceanus, ch. 3). And the Apostle, alluding to the place of Ezekiel and signifying Baptism (Heb. 10), says: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with clean water." The same is understood also from the figures of the Old Testament that preannounced Baptism. For the Red Sea and the cloud spread over the sons of Israel were a figure of Baptism, as the Apostle attests (1 Cor. 10); yet the sons of Israel were not immersed by these, but only sprinkled. Likewise the lustral water, which was called that of sprinkling, of which (Exod. 24; Num. 8, 19; and elsewhere) Baptism was a prefiguration.

§ 23. Next, this ablution is proved by the example of the Apostles, who (Acts 2) are read to have baptized three thousand men in one day; whom, on account of the multitude, they did not immerse, but either poured water upon or sprinkled with water. Moreover, a clear testimony of this exists in St. Cyprian (Epistle [as in source]), where, the question having been raised whether those who are baptized on a bed have valid and legitimate Christian Baptism, seeing that they are not washed with water but poured upon, thus among other things he replies: "Nor ought it to move anyone that the sick are seen to be sprinkled or poured upon, when they obtain the grace of the Lord, since Scripture speaks by the prophet Ezekiel, 'And I will sprinkle upon you clean water,' etc." Then, with two places of Scripture inserted in between, he subjoins: "It is evident that sprinkling with the water likewise holds the sacrament of salvation, as also takes place in the Church where the faith of the receiver is whole, everything stands firm and can be fulfilled by the verity of the Faith's Majesty." And the things that follow.⁴⁹

§ 24. Now although immersion was formerly the more common rite, as appears from the common speech of the Fathers when they speak about Baptism, and more expressly from the fact that it represented the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord, and likewise our own, which take place in Baptism—this signification of immersion is pressed by the Apostle (Rom. 6)—as is seen in Chrysostom (on John 3), and Augustine, Tractate 9 on John—whence St. Thomas affirms immersion to be more praiseworthy—yet the "clinics," that is, those who were baptized on their beds, used once to have a bad name, as if less perfectly baptized. As can be perceived from the Epistle of Cornelius [as in source] and from Nicephorus, book 6, chapter [as in source]; and likewise from St. Cyprian's Epistle [as in source]. Many, however, occasions existed on account of which it was fitting for immersion to be changed into the ceremony nearer at hand, namely pouring or sprinkling—namely on account of the multitude of those to be baptized, as in Acts, or on account of a scarcity of water, or on account of the weakness of the one to be baptized, whom it is very likely the minister might not be able to hold, or on account of the tenderness or infirmity of the one to be baptized, whether infant or adult, to whom from immersion danger might threaten of intestinal distress, or on account of the impediment of prison or chains, or any other thing whatsoever.

§ 25. Hence therefore the ceremonies of pouring, as it were midway between sprinkling and immersion, have greatly prevailed. St. Bonaventure reports that in his own time this custom was observed in the Gallican Churches and in some others also, although he admits the rite of immersion to be more common, and calls it the better and the safer; and in like manner St. Thomas teaches (in the place above cited). Nevertheless, wherever now the rite of pouring or of sprinkling has taken hold, it ought not to be changed by private authority. Nay rather, since it now generally obtains throughout the Church, in a matter so necessary to salvation, it ought not to be called into doubt whether it avails. For this would be to render doubtful the salvation of so many infants baptized by ecclesiastical rite; which would be an intolerable rashness.

§ XI — When the sacrament of Baptism was instituted (Baptismi sacramentum quando fuerit institutum)

§ 26. Concerning the time when Baptism was instituted there is not one and the same judgment of all. For some wish it to have been instituted when Christ was baptized by John in the Jordan, as the Master holds in the text, and after him St. Thomas (III, q. 66, a. 2). They take their argument from this, that the Fathers say that when Christ was baptized He imparted to the waters, by the contact of His most pure flesh, regenerating

power, and from that time the sins of all were washed away by the waters. For this is read in St. Augustine (Sermons 1 and 2 on the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany), and in Gratian (*De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *Numquam aqua*), and similar things in others.⁵¹ Others judge it to have been instituted when the Lord said to Nicodemus: "Unless a man be born again," etc. Others, finally, refer its institution to that time when Christ, about to ascend into heaven, said to His disciples: "Going, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father," etc. Of these opinions the middle one seems more probable than the rest.

§ 27. For when Christ was baptized by John, it seems that He then as little instituted His own Baptism (since He was washed not by His own but by John's baptism) as He exhibited some signification of what ought to be done in the Baptism to be instituted by Himself. For the representation made by the voice of the Father over the Son, with the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, signified that by the name and power of the Trinity those who thereafter would be washed by the baptism of Christ were to be purged from sins and sanctified. And Christ Himself, whose body was washed in the Jordan, signified that His Church, which is His body, would be washed by His Baptism. But what is said, that Christ imparted to the waters by the contact of His flesh the regenerating power, is not to be understood of some power planted and inhering which would have been imparted to all waters; but that by that deed of His, as by a certain sign, Christ ordained the waters to the regeneration of men; as St. Bonaventure explains it.

§ 28. Nor can it be said that Baptism was only then instituted when Christ, after the Resurrection, commanded the disciples to baptize all nations; since even before that the disciples had begun to baptize Jews while John's baptism was still enduring, as is clear (John 3). Wherefore it seems altogether necessary to say that then the sacrament of Baptism was instituted when it was said to Nicodemus: "Unless a man be born again," etc. And this the Gospel text sufficiently confirms. For immediately afterwards, as though proceeding to the execution of the institution that had been made, the Lord sent the disciples to baptize. And therefore it is not improbable that the disciples also were present at that conversation of Nicodemus with Christ—since those who were straightway to be sent to baptize should first hear the institution of Baptism from the Lord. In this way Bernard understood Christ's words to Nicodemus (Epistle 77 to Hugh of St. Victor), when he calls them "a precept of life, a heavenly edict, a decree of a new sacrament, though as yet secret, a law pronounced, though not yet promulgated," where also he admits that from that time the time of Baptism had begun, although its general obligation had not yet begun.⁵² But that precept by which after the Lord's Resurrection the Apostles were ordered to baptize all nations does not contain the first institution of Baptism, but what before they had been ordered to do in Judea and toward the Jews, then they were ordered to do among all the nations; and likewise with respect to the very preaching of the Gospel. And in this way the words of Leo can suitably be understood (in Epistle 4, chapter 3), where he says that the Lord after the Resurrection only then handed over to the disciples the form and the power of baptizing when He said: "Going, teach," etc. "Concerning which indeed He could have instructed them even before the Passion," he says, "had He not wished it to be properly understood that the grace of regeneration derived its beginning from His Resurrection." But what (chapter 6 of the same Epistle) he says, that Christ then sanctioned the power of regeneration when from His side flowed forth the blood of redemption and the water of baptism, is not to be taken of the time when Baptism was instituted, but of the time when the merit was procured and the price paid, from which Baptism and the other sacraments have their power.

§ XII — Of what sort of Baptism the Apostles administered before the Lord's Passion (Apostoli cujusmodi baptismum dederint ante passionem Domini)

§ 29. What we said, namely that the Apostles before the Passion of Christ, of which it was said: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit," etc., baptized with the Baptism (*baptismus*) of Christ, is by some called into doubt, partly on account of the words of Leo which we just now cited, partly on account of other reasons. For, first, they think that not even the Apostles themselves had been washed by the sacrament (*sacramentum*) of Baptism, as Tertullian admits in the book *On Baptism*.⁵⁴ Next: Christ, they say, had not yet died, and so His Passion could not yet through Baptism be efficacious unto the grace of regeneration. Third, that it is not likely they baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," since the mystery of the persons of the Trinity was up to that time hidden and had not yet been made public by Christ, but only after the Resurrection was expressly declared when the disciples were ordered to baptize all nations. Fourth, Tertullian, in the book *On the Baptism of Christ*, ch. 11, writes that the Apostles of the Lord before His Passion baptized not with Christ's, but with John's, baptism.⁵⁵ Fifth, St. Ambrose, on the last chapter of Luke, attests that to the Apostles after the Resurrection was given the power of teaching and baptizing; therefore they had not had it before.⁵⁶ Sixth, St. John Chrysostom, on John 3, Hom. 18, attributes no more to the Baptism of the disciples, of which he there treats, than to the baptism of John; Theophylact and Euthymius, writing on the same place, follow Chrysostom.⁵⁷ Finally, Melchior Cano signifies that this opinion is more probable to him, book 3 of the *Theological Commonplaces*, ch. 5.⁵⁸

§ 30. But as the arguments of this opinion do not convince, so what others say is far more probable, namely that with that Baptism which is a sacrament of the new law the Apostles baptized even before the Passion of the Lord.

§ 31. First. Because the Baptism of the Apostles of Christ was the Baptism of Christ. For although Christ did not baptize by Himself, but by the disciples, as Scripture attests (Jn. 3), nevertheless the same Scripture so speaks as to say that Christ nonetheless baptized (Jn. 3; 4). Now surely it is absurd that the Baptism of Christ, even before His Passion, was only "in water," when John so expressly distinguishes between his own and Christ's baptism as to say: "Ego baptizavi vos aqua, ille vero baptizabit vos Spiritu Sancto" (Mk. 1).

§ 32. Second. Because, as we said above, straightway after He instituted His Baptism regenerating out of water and the Spirit, Christ sent the disciples to baptize (Jn. 3); but that He had previously sent them to that task is not read. Whence it altogether appears that there was not committed to them by the Lord any other Baptism than that which had been a little before instituted by Himself.

§ 33. Third. Because those who had been baptized by the Apostles before the Lord's Passion are not read to have been baptized again, as of those who had received John's baptism Scripture bears witness (Acts 19).

§ 34. Fourth. This is St. Augustine's plain teaching in many places. For in the book *On the Unity of the Church*, ch. 21, he calls both one and the same Baptism of Christ, whether before the Passion and by Paul after; and he distinguishes both from the baptism of John.⁵⁹ Likewise he teaches in *Tractates* 5 and 13 on John; in book 3, *On the Soul and its Origin*, ch. 9; in *Epistle* 108 to Seleucianus; in *Eighty-Three Questions*, q. 62.⁶⁰ Nay rather, everywhere against the Donatists he inculcates that there was rebaptizing after John, not so after Judas—because Judas, who baptized only before the Lord's death, gave not his own nor John's, but Christ's, Baptism. Cyril seems to agree with Augustine (on John).⁶¹

§ 35. Finally. The Master, and following the Master St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and the other Doctors of the School, side with this opinion.⁶²

§ 36. Therefore to the things objected on the contrary one must briefly reply. And as to the first: although it can be said it does not follow that if someone is not baptized he cannot baptize others—since Baptism conferred by anyone whatsoever is valid—still the view of Augustine is more ready to hand, that the Apostles, before they were sent to baptize, were baptized by Christ, although Scripture did not expressly state this. Nor yet does he think that Scripture altogether kept silence about it, since we read that the Lord said to Peter: "Qui lotus est non indiget, nisi ut pedes lavet, sed est mundus totus" (Jn. 13). So teaches Augustine in the Epistle to Seleucianus, Epistle 163, and in book 3, On the Origin of the Soul, ch. 9, and on John at the passage: "Qui lotus est."⁶³ Ambrose also, expounding Psalm 50, says that Peter, whom Christ after the Resurrection questioned about love, had already before been baptized—surely not by any other than by the Lord Himself.⁶⁴ Nor is it established, from what John writes, that since Christ did not baptize by Himself but entrusted that work to the disciples, He had not first baptized them Himself; for it is not to be thought that He who even humbled Himself to wash their feet did not wish with His own hands to baptize His disciples.

§ 37. To the second it is answered, that the merit of the Passion and Death of Christ extends also backward. Hence, as circumcision was efficacious by Christ's Passion, so too Baptism given before it. For He both gave and exhibited the Eucharist—Christ Himself—even as a sacrament of the new law. As regards the form of the same Baptism, about which the third argument was, the Master, St. Bonaventure, and Adrian think that the Apostles at that time also baptized in the name of the Trinity, although it is not written: therefore, says the Master, then Christ first handed on that form when He sent them to evangelize the Gentiles, but the form which He had handed on before when sending them into Judea He afterward repeated when He sent them to the nations.⁶⁵ Nor must it be denied that by divine institution that Baptism could have been efficacious unto regeneration even if for some reason it had not then pleased God that the mystery of the Trinity be disclosed.

§ 38. As to the opinion of Tertullian, there is no great labor to be spent, since it also appears sufficiently that Chrysostom and his followers Theophylact and Euthymius were of this opinion.

§ 39. What is alleged from Ambrose proves nothing else than that then the Apostles first received the command to baptize all nations, as also to teach; for previously they did both only among the Jewish people.

§ 40. And what is read in that Commentary ascribed to him (on Rom. 6, near the end), that by that Baptism which the disciples of Christ administered (Jn. 3; 4) forgiveness of sins indeed was given, but without the Holy Spirit, is by no means probable—unless perhaps he understands the Holy Spirit according to a certain special and particular effect, in the way in which He was given on the day of Pentecost, and is given to the faithful in the sacrament of Confirmation.⁶⁶

§ XIII — When Baptism first began to oblige (*Baptismus quando primum obligare coeperit*)

§ 41. Since such is the rationale of positive law (*lex positiva*), that it does not bind unless it has been promulgated (*promulgatio*), and since it is sufficiently established that Baptism (*Baptismus*) has been prescribed not by natural law but only by positive divine law, it follows that men were not obliged to receive it

before it was brought to men's knowledge — which, indeed, is wont to be done by promulgation. For although to be reborn of the Holy Spirit has always and absolutely been necessary for salvation, nevertheless the mode of being reborn, which is through water, was not always necessary, but after the institution of the same it received the force of necessity, partly from the substitution for circumcision — about which we shall speak in the next chapter — partly from the manifestation of the precept, "Unless one be born again," etc.; it is not to be thought that all men, or at least all the Jews, much less also infants, could not have entered the Kingdom of God because they had not been regenerated of water. For as yet there was lacking to the law a public promulgation; which, although it perhaps began gradually to be made when the Apostles before the Lord's Passion were baptizing and also preaching His Baptism, was nevertheless not immediately sufficient so that the law should already be judged promulgated. Nay, not even then, when it was said by Peter to the multitude of the Jews (Acts 2), "Let every one of you be baptized," etc., is it to be believed that this law of Baptism had been sufficiently promulgated, not even among the Jews themselves; for what Peter said there innumerable other Jews, scattered through the world, could not as yet have known. Therefore one must say that Baptism first began generally to oblige when the promulgation of the Gospel had become sufficient; as from the nature of positive law can easily be made clear, for, when the Gospel was preached, Baptism was preached along with it as if a part of the Gospel itself. Hence the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 6, ch. 1) affirm that justification, after the Gospel has been promulgated, cannot take place without Baptism or the desire for it.⁶⁷

§ 42. Bernard discusses this question learnedly and copiously (Epistle 77 to Hugh), arguing against a certain man who taught that from the moment the Lord first said, "Unless one," etc., no one at all could be saved without actually receiving the same sacrament, or, in its stead, martyrdom. "First," he says, "as to the fixing of the time, it seems too harsh and austere that a word still hidden should already harm publicly, and that the judge should strike before he threatens." And a little later, urging the rationale of positive law, he says: "Very unjust, then, is obedience where there has not preceded hearing. For this is not of such a kind that the natural law by its very proclamation would not allow it to be unknown, as, for example, that saying: 'What you do not wish to be done to you, do not do to another.' For it is rather something artificial and not a natural command." And further: "What therefore could not at all be known, since it had not been heard — how, I ask, was it to be exacted before it had been heard?" And after many things he concludes that "a man first begins to be guilty from that very time from which the precept itself could inexcusably have come to his knowledge." From this disputation of Bernard it is understood that the general obligation of this precept accompanied its general promulgation; but the particular obligation accompanied a particular manifestation of the same, such as was made to Nicodemus and to the disciples of Christ before His Passion. This appears sufficiently from the fact that Bernard calls that sentence of the Lord, "Unless one," etc., a law, a precept, and an edict, and that still hidden and secret. And the same seems to be proved from St. Augustine, who (Epistle 108 to Seleucianus, cited above), from the fact that it was said "Unless one," etc., proves that even the Apostles before the Lord's Passion were baptized. Moreover, Bernard's opinion was readily embraced by Hugh of St. Victor, as is evident from book 2 of *De sacramentis*.⁶⁸

§ XIV — *When circumcision with the other legal observances ceased (Quando Circumcisio cum ceteris legalibus cessaverit)*

§ 43. Connected with the foregoing is the question about the time at which the abolition of circumcision and of the other legal observances began. On this controversy there is not sufficient agreement between the distinguished Doctors St. Jerome and St. Augustine, as their Letters show in Augustine's corpus, 7, 9, 11, and 19.⁷⁰ For Jerome distinguished two times: one before the Lord's Passion, when the legal observances were neither dead, since down to that very time they both bound and expiated, nor deadly, because those observing them did not sin; the other, which immediately followed the Passion of Christ, when they began to be not only dead, that is, suddenly deprived both of power and of obligation, but also deadly, that is, pernicious to those observing them. Whence he further contended that the Apostles, from the Passion of the Lord onward, never observed the legal observances according to the truth, but only by a certain pious and dispensatory simulation—namely, lest they should be an offense to the Jews if they at least did not observe them in appearance, and thus the conversion of the Jews be impeded. And he interpreted that simulation not as though they truly performed such acts, but as that they did not perform them as ceremonial acts of the old Law, as if, for example, someone today were to cut the flesh of his foreskin—which surely it would not be permitted a Christian now to do.

§ 44. And as to that simulation Jerome puts forward his own Authors—Origen, Didymus, Apollinaris, and others.⁷¹ Augustine, however, considering how unseemly it was that the Apostles, for the sake of avoiding scandal, should conceal those things which pertain to the truth of the doctrine of salvation, and that they should use simulation—or, as Augustine interprets it, an officious lie—in matters that regard the salvation of the faithful, judged it more correct that three times should be distinguished. The first, in agreement with Jerome, is before Christ's Passion, when the legal observances were not yet either deadly or dead; the second, after the time when the Gospel had been promulgated, when the legal observances are both dead and deadly; but the third is the middle time, namely from the Passion of Christ until the promulgation of the Gospel. During which time, indeed, the legal observances were dead—because, abolished by the death of Christ, they no longer expiated nor bound—yet not deadly. For he holds that those who from among the Jews had been converted to Christ could lawfully, during that time, observe them, whereby the Law and the synagogue, having their institution from God, would with honor be, as it were, led to the sepulcher—provided only that they did not think those observances necessary, nor expect righteousness from them. But for those who from the Gentiles were converted to Christ, because the same reason for the observance was not present as for the Jews, he holds that even then they were pernicious: for the Gentiles, to whom the old Law had not been given, could not be transferred to it—now abrogated and dead—without detriment to the truth of the faith; for by that very fact they would have borne witness that the Law was not yet extinct but was still necessary, or at least useful, for righteousness, and, moreover, that Christ had not yet come but was still to be expected; since the observance of the Law was not a commemoration of things past but a figure and shadow of things to come (Col. 2; Heb. 10), which, having been fulfilled in Christ, ought to have ceased. This opinion of Augustine, about the threefold distinction of times, as being more consonant with the Scriptures and with reason, has been followed by all later writers.⁷²

§ 45. By the Scriptures indeed, because this distinction removes certain difficulties arising from places of Scripture seemingly at odds. For Peter (Acts 15) does not allow the legal observances to be imposed on the Gentiles. Yet the same Peter (Gal. 2) abstained from the Gentiles, being a Jew among Jews—albeit with some

offense to the Gentiles—which Paul rightly reproved. Paul, for his part, circumcised Timothy, who had been born of a Jewess and was still to live among Jews (Acts 16); and he himself was purified according to the Law (Acts 21). But the same Paul (Gal. 2) did not allow Titus, a Gentile, to be circumcised, lest prejudice be done to the truth of the Gospel; and (ch. 5) he declares to the Galatians: "For if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." James likewise (Acts 15), agreeing with Peter, does not suffer those who from the Gentiles are converted to God to be troubled with the yoke of the Law. And yet the same (Acts 21) advised Paul that, purified according to the Law, he should present himself to the Levitical priest. And it accords with reason as well that we should acknowledge that middle time posited by Augustine. First, because a Law instituted by God ought not to be abruptly broken off and rejected as an evil and harmful thing—just as idolatrous rites had to be cast away at once—but should be gradually diminished and with honor led to the tomb; thus also John, who bore the type of the Law, says (Jn. 3): "He must increase, but I must decrease." Then, because neither nature nor reason bears sudden changes—especially in matters of conduct. Third, lest the new Law seem to have been given precipitately, if it were substituted at a moment with the removal of the old Law. These reasons can be seen in Hugh of St. Victor, book 1 of *De sacramentis*.⁷³ Learnedly and solidly do Augustine (Epistle 19 to Jerome), St. Thomas (I-II, question 103, articles 3–4), St. Bonaventure (on the present Distinction), and likewise Scotus treat this question at length.⁷⁴

§ 46. But someone will object: The sacraments of the old Law, according to the Apostle, were shadows of things to come. And Augustine, writing about the signification of the sacraments (*Against Faustus*, book 19, chapter 16), says: Now Christ is not promised as about to be born, to suffer, to rise again—which the old sacraments in a certain way gave voice to—but it is announced that He has been born, has suffered, has risen again—which these sacraments that are performed by Christians now give voice to; therefore it was pernicious even for the Jews to observe the legal observances immediately after the Passion of Christ, because already in religion something false was being signified—namely, that Christ was going to suffer—whereas He had suffered, and was no longer going to suffer.

§ 47. In the contrary sense it is objected as well: If the legal observances were dead immediately from the Passion of the Lord, then the infants of the Jews born from that time departed without Baptism, for circumcision could no longer avail them.

§ 48. We answer to the first objection that Christ's being born, suffering, rising again can be understood in two ways: either according to the thing itself, or according to the manifestation of a thing already accomplished. Therefore, although the Lord had already been born and had suffered and had risen again from the dead as to the truth of the things done; nevertheless, because that truth had not yet been divulged, in the meantime the true signification of the legal observances could still be retained with respect to the manifestation of the things signified; but once the manifestation had been made through the sufficient promulgation of the Gospel, the legal observances ought altogether to cease—since there no longer remained in any way a true signification of the future.

§ 49. To the second objection Scotus answers that for the infants of the Jews from the Passion of the Lord up to the promulgation of the Gospel, the remedy for original sin was the faith of the parents, as it had been in the time of the Law of nature. But it is more probable, and more congruent with the character of positive law, what is read in Bernard (Epistle 77 to Hugh). For, when a question had been set before him about the infants of the Jews, he finally concludes thus: "It is quite clear enough from these things that the damnation of the unbaptized, and the frustration of the circumcised, the evacuation of sacrifices—because perhaps the ancient

rite was observed against original sin—did not then begin generally, when it was said secretly to Nicodemus: 'Unless one,' etc.; nor yet when it was enjoined openly upon the Apostles: 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing,' etc.; but only from that time did the ancient observance begin not to avail for each one, and each unbaptized person to be guilty of the new precept, from which time the precept itself could inexcusably have come to his knowledge. Surely, for little ones, as long as they are not using reason—because the contagion of sin alone is believed to harm them, not also the transgression of a commandment—it must be believed that the ancient sacraments availed as long as it is established that they had not been publicly forbidden. But whether they were useful—this belongs to God; it is not mine to determine." Thus far Bernard.⁷⁵

§ 50. According to whom it must be held that the legal observances—especially circumcision, which nevertheless was not from Moses but from the Fathers (Jn. 7)—after Christ's Passion were licit, and even useful, until the full promulgation of the Gospel, for those, namely, to whom the knowledge of the new institution could not yet have come; and for their little ones as well, so long as by the sufficient promulgation of the Gospel they had not been publicly declared unlawful. Which is not contrary to the threefold distinction of time set above. For in the middle time the legal observances were indeed dead, yet not for all, but for those to whom the institutes of the new Law, having been manifested, could already profit.

§ XV — That Baptism confers the full remission of all sins (Baptismo conferri plenam omnium peccatorum remissionem)

§ 51. Now we must treat of the effects of Baptism (*Baptismus*). Among which the first place is held by the remission of sins. This effect of Baptism is shown most clearly by the Scriptures and the Fathers. For Peter the Apostle says (Acts 2): "Let every one of you be baptized in the remission of sins"; and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed confesses "one Baptism for the remission of sins."⁷⁷ Which remission of sins Baptism itself—that is, by the external washing—signifies. Hence it was said to Paul (Acts 22): "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." And Paul himself, to the Corinthians in the first Epistle (ch. 6), after enumerating some grave kinds of sins, subjoins: "And such indeed were you; but you are washed," namely by Baptism. And (Heb. 10), noting Baptism, he says: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with clean water." Likewise (Eph. 5) he says that Christ "cleanses His Church by the washing of water in the word." This effect of Baptism was clearly foretold by Ezekiel in these words (ch. 36): "I will pour upon you clean water, and you shall be cleansed from all your filthiness." And Zechariah 13: "In that day there shall be a fountain open to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for the washing of the sinner and of the menstruous woman." Now this remission of sins is full and perfect; full indeed, because all sins, however many and however great, are forgiven; perfect, because each one of them is altogether and perfectly remitted without any reservation of punishment.

§ 52. Augustine teaches both points (Enchiridion 64): "The gift of Baptism," he says, "has been given against original sin, so that what generation has contracted Baptism may take away; whatever it has found to have been committed in heart, in mouth, in deed, it removes." And he adds that in Baptism "a great indulgence is made, in which every guilt is loosed, both that contracted and that added." And in book 2 On the Merits of Sins (ch. 28): "If immediately after Baptism departure from this life should follow," he says, "there will remain absolutely nothing to which the man may be liable, all things which held him being loosed." In the same author, book 14 On the Trinity (ch. 17), we read thus: "In Baptism there is made a renewal by the

remission of all sins. For not even one, however small, remains that is not remitted." Similarly Jerome (Epistle 83 to Oceanus), citing Ezekiel: "I will cleanse you," he says, "from all your filthiness—under 'all' nothing is passed over." And, in place of Baptism, he also cites that (Mic. 7): "He will cast all our iniquities into the depths of the sea, and He will cast into the depth of the sea all our sins." And again: "All our debts," he says, "have died with Christ; all the sins of the old handwriting have been blotted out." And Ambrose, in the Preface on Ps. 118: "In Baptism," he says, "straightway a full purification is made."

§ 53. There is also manifest doctrine of this thing in the Sermon on the washing of feet which is held among the works of Cyprian, where it is taught that Baptism so washes a man that neither the actual nor the original stain leaves any vestiges of itself after that washing. And the same thing St. Cyprian himself, in the Epistle to Jubaianus, often inculcates. And in the books of the ancients, wherever there is talk of the power of Baptism, such sentiments are everywhere met with; nor was this matter ever doubted. Whence with good reason the Fathers of the Council of Florence defined the effect of this sacrament to be the remission of every guilt, original and actual, so that those dying before any other guilt has been committed arrive straightway at the Kingdom of heaven and at the vision of God.⁷⁸ Finally, it was defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 5, canon 5) that by the grace which is conferred in Baptism there is taken away all that has the true and proper character (*ratio*) of sin, so that absolutely nothing remains to keep a man from entering heaven.⁷⁹ Hence it comes about that, according to the most ancient custom of the Church—of which the Decree of Florence also makes mention—no satisfaction is imposed on the baptized. For the grace of God, as the Ambrosian Commentary has it (on Rom. 4), in Baptism does not require groaning nor lamentation nor even any work, but only faith; and it freely forgives all things.⁸⁰ Moreover, on this matter (around Distinction 32...)

1. St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ch. 12.

2. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* (*Contra epistulam Parmeniani*) III, chs. 10, 14, 16; and see also *Retractationes* I, ch. 20, and *De Baptismo contra Donatistas* VII, ch. 53 [abbreviation as in source].

3. St. Augustine, *passim*; cf. the testimonies gathered below at § 4.

4. Pope Pelagius I, *Epistolae*; see below, n. 14.

5. Peter Arcudius, presbyter of Corcyra (whom Jean Cabassut, *Notitia Conciliorum*, ch. 43, calls, by mistake, "Dominican"), in *The Harmony of the Church of the West and of the East*, book I, ch. 8, testifies that in expressing the form of Baptism the Greeks sometimes used, or still use, the imperative, or the optative (that is, deprecativ), or the indicative mood: "Let the servant of God be baptized" (*Baptizetur servus Dei*). In testimony of this he appeals both to the Pseudo-Patriarch of Constantinople, in the *Dogmata* of the century, ch. 7, and also to little treatises written on the matter, and to the practice of the Ruthenians following the Greek rites; although Eugene IV, at the Council of Florence, mentioned either mode (Decree for the Instruction of the Armenians; cf. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 65, a. 5, ad 1) according to the form which others—who thought it deprecativ—judged to be such. But we, with those most skilled in Greek rites, have no doubt that an ancient Greek Euchologion is extant, set forth in express words by Jean Goar, a scion of the Dominican family; yet it must not be passed over in silence that Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople, in a Greek text translated into Latin and printed in the year 1584, rendered the words in the imperative-indicative: "Now as to Baptism," says Jeremiah, in praise of it, "the words of the priest are these: 'Let the servant of God be baptized.'" The Greek text, however, does not have these words; which, either because of the narrowness of time, or because it had to be emended in the Greek exemplar, he says he rightly translated in that word—which certainly, we believe, had been in the exemplar. Furthermore, it is not to be omitted that certain Latins did not scruple to stigmatize them as innovators—whom the same Peter Arcudius, relying on Simeon of Thessalonica (*De Baptismo*, ch. 3), thought had this for their reason; these men Innocent III rebukes, as is reported in the Fourth Lateran Council, ch. 4 (cited in the decretal "*Licet*," *Extra*, *De baptismo*). However matters stand about this, it has always been, in the Church both of the East and of the West, the tradition that in the form of Baptism there be an explicit expression of the act performed, to such a degree that Baptism was judged null if the

expression of the act of baptizing was omitted. And omitting the expression of the act of baptizing was defined by Alexander III (in the chapter *Si quis puerum*, Extra, De baptismo et eius effectu). On this see Emanuel González's learned Notes, *Annales*, tome 3 (for the year 1176), ch. 6. The author relates that Pope Alexander judged null the Baptism which Pontius, bishop of Liège (under the bishop of Paris), had administered.

6. Alexander III, *Decretales*, Extra, De baptismo et eius effectu, cap. *Si quis*.
7. *Canones Apostolorum*, canon 49.
8. Didymus, *De Spiritu Sancto*.
9. Origen, *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos*, on ch. 6.
10. Theophylact, *Commentarius in Epist. ad Romanos* (or on the Gospels) [abbreviation as in source].
11. St. Cyprian, *Epistola ad Jubaianum* (Ep. 73).
12. Alexander VIII, condemnation of propositions, the one cited in the source as among the XXVII: "Valuit aliquando Baptismus sub hac forma collatus: in nomine Patris &c., praetermissis illis, Ego te baptizo" [abbreviation as in source].
13. Innocent I, *Epistola ad episcopos Macedonum*; cf. Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4.
14. St. Augustine, *De haeresibus*.
15. St. Gregory the Great, Ep. 9, ep. 61, to Quiricus (Quirinum).
16. Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *Ab antiqua*, and cap. *Hi vero haeretici*.
17. Popes Pelagius and Zacharias, letters cited above in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4.
18. St. Augustine, *De unico baptismo*, ch. 4.
19. Council of Arles I (Arelatense I), in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *De Arianis*.
20. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* VI, ch. 25. See also *Epistolae*, book 2, ep. 23 (to Boniface); *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 16; *Contra Maximinum* III, ch. 17; *Epist.* 203 (expounding Ps. 86).
21. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 6.
22. On this spurious epistle: the printed editions append an editorial note marked (a), beginning "Vetus et perpetua Ecclesiae confessio...", which argues at length for the necessity, by Christ's institution and immemorial tradition, of the express invocation of the three Divine Persons for the validity of Baptism, adducing testimonies of Fathers, councils, and canon law. For the full text, see the early modern editions *ad loc*.
23. Origen, *In Epistolam ad Romanos*, on Rom. 6.
24. Theophylact, *Commentary on the Gospels/Acts* [abbreviation as in source].
25. St. Cyprian, *Epistola ad Jubaianum*.
26. St. Fulgentius, various places cited above [abbreviation as in source].
27. *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini*, pars II, de Baptismo.
28. St. Hilary, *De Synodis*, toward the end.
29. St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto* I, ch. 3.
30. Venerable Bede, *In Acta Apostolorum*, on Acts 10.
31. Pope Nicholas I, *Rescript to the Bulgarians*, in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *A quodam*.
32. The epistle printed as St. Bernard, Ep. 340.
33. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 8; q. 66, a. 6.
34. Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *Retulerunt*; *Rescript of Pope Zachary to Boniface*.
35. The Master, *In IV Sent.*, dist. 6.
36. Editorial note printed in the editions at this place: "The ancient and perpetual confession of the Church abundantly proves that Baptism is valid only when conferred with the express invocation of the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, of which

tradition the Author here brings abundant testimonies: from which there is also made out this further point, that the Fathers held this invocation to be necessary to the validity of Baptism, to have been prescribed by Christ's institution. Therefore Gerardus Joannes Vossius is not to be listened to (Disputation 2, On Baptism, Thesis V), profusely resplendent though he be with both profane and sacred lights, whom we lament to have miserably been blinded by so many and such learned men, asserting that the Saviour bound us to no certain verbal formula to be used by the Junior faithful in baptizing; although they do acknowledge that it is not the Baptism of the Lord, but its effect is not frustrated, which even the followers of that error have abhorred, and therefore they adhered to that opinion. Do the Apostles, then, after a Divine dispensation, seem to some to have baptized only in the name of Christ, and not with the express invocation of the Trinity? Effectiveness indeed they adduce; and he brings arguments. But in very truth the more probable opinion is that certain of them think that the Apostles, at the beginning of their preaching, expressed Christ's name; which sentence St. Thomas also propounds (III, q. 66, a. 6, ad 2), and is held by other noteworthy theologians; yet they interpret in such a way, and understand that wherever Baptism is reported as conferred 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' the same Baptism of which we have been speaking is to be understood; nevertheless, by a special revelation or by a divine dispensation, they are judged to have done this; which exposition is harmonious with the same Scripture passages, as is clear. We for our part assent to the Author, who thinks that even at the beginning the Apostles baptized with the invocation of the Trinity, and not only 'in the name of Christ,' nor do we at all adhere to that opinion to confirm it which the said Author clings to when he says, not without improbability, that by a divine dispensation they so baptized that they did not then express the form of Baptism which our Saviour taught, as St. Thomas says. Certainly this sentence has other distinguished theologians and even Fathers as its authors. What prevents us from bringing forward the places of Scripture in which Baptism is said to have been given 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' and to apply to them the interpretation which shines more clearly from Scripture, with the exposition, much praised by notable theologians, that is more in harmony, so that it be not permitted to adduce it? Perhaps St. Thomas's proposition, that the Apostles baptized in the name of Christ, is not his; just as also the Catechism of the Council of Trent, speaking of this matter, teaches. However, the expositions of Scripture which the Author adduces, especially Ambrose's and Nicholas I's, we readily embrace; the Epistle of St. Bernard, which the Author rejects as supposititious, we too hold as spurious, although we admit his arguments as trifling; the Disputation On the Sacraments, question 4, chapter 3, article 3, of Henry of Ghent, archdeacon, against whom he pleads in the Preface of the Works of St. Bernard, approaches most nearly to the mind of the holy Doctor; likewise certain particularities in the manuscript copies are reported by John Mabillon (in an edition put together by himself, prefixed to Epistle 340), which we do not find in any other besides that found by me. Moreover, it seems that it was first published in the Sorbonne exemplar, which was very poorly edited. Accordingly, we regard it as apocryphal."

37. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 3.

38. Ambrosian Commentary on Romans 6.

39. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 8.

40. St. Jerome, In *Epistolam ad Ephesios*, on Eph. 4.

41. St. Gregory the Great, *Epistles* I, ep. 41, to Leander of Seville; reported in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4.

42. Fourth Council of Toledo, canon 5.

43. Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, chapters *Postquam* (from St. Augustine) and *Eodem modo* (from St. Jerome).

44. Pope Pelagius I, cap. *Multi sunt*, in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4; "canon 49" among the so-called Apostolic Canons.

45. St. Bonaventure, in this *Distinction* [abbreviation as in source]. Haymo, cited by the Master [abbreviation as in source].

46. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 7; q. 68, a. 11, ad 4.

47. *Passio sancti Laurentii* (the Passion of St. Lawrence), s.v.

48. Nicephorus, *Ecclesiastical History*, V, ch. 7, on Basilides and St. Potamiana.

49. St. Cyprian, *Epistle* [abbreviation as in source]; cf. Jerome, *Ep. 83 ad Oceanum*, ch. 3; Heb. 10:22; figures: Exod. 24; Num. 8; 19; 1 Cor. 10.

50. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 2.

51. St. Augustine, *Sermons* 1–2, *Dominica intra Octavas Epiphaniae*; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. *Numquam aqua*.

52. St. Bernard, *Epistle* 77 to Hugh of St. Victor; Pope Leo the Great, *Epistle* 4, chs. 3 and 6.

53. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, "ubi supra" [abbreviation as in source].

54. Tertullian, *De baptismo*.

55. Tertullian, *De baptismo Christi*, ch. 11.
56. St. Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*, on the last chapter.
57. St. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 18 on John 3*; Theophylact, *In Joannem*, ad loc.; Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Joannem*, ad loc.
58. Melchior Cano, *De locis theologicis III*, ch. 5.
59. St. Augustine, *De unitate Ecclesiae*, ch. 21.
60. St. Augustine, *Tractates 5 and 13 on the Gospel of John*; *De anima et eius origine III*, ch. 9; Ep. 108 to Seleucianus; *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus*, q. 62.
61. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannem*, ad loc.
62. The Master (Peter Lombard) and, following him, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, together with other School Doctors; cf. their respective *Sentences commentaries*.
63. St. Augustine, Ep. 163 ad Seleucianum; *De anima et eius origine III*, ch. 9; *Tractate on John at "Qui lotus est"*.
64. St. Ambrose, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 50.
65. The Master (Peter Lombard), *In IV Sent.*; St. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.*; Adrian (Adrian of Utrecht, later Pope Adrian VI), *In IV Sent.* — on the form "in the name of the Trinity".
66. Pseudo-Ambrosian Commentary on Romans, on Rom. 6, at the end; on the special gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and in the sacrament of Confirmation.
67. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 1.
68. St. Bernard, *Epistle 77 to Hugh* [numbering as in source]; St. Augustine, Ep. 108 to Seleucianus; Hugh (of St. Victor), *De sacramentis II*.
69. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae I-II*, q. 103, a. 3–4.
70. St. Jerome and St. Augustine, *Epistles 7, 9, 11, and 19* [abbreviation as in source].
71. Origen; Didymus; Apollinaris—cited by Jerome as authorities for a pious simulation.
72. Col. 2; Heb. 10.
73. Hugh (of St. Victor), *De sacramentis I*.
74. St. Augustine, Ep. 19 to Jerome; St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae I-II*, q. 103, a. 3–4; St. Bonaventure, *In III Sent.*, on this Distinction; Scotus, *In IV Sent.*, on this Distinction.
75. St. Bernard, *Epistle 77 to Hugh*.
76. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae III*, q. 69, a. 1–3.
77. Acts 2:38; Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed: "Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum."
78. Council of Florence, *Decree for the Armenians* (on the sacraments in general).
79. Council of Trent, Session 5, canon 5.
80. Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Romans 4*.

DISTINCTIO IV — ON THE PENALTIES REMAINING AFTER BAPTISM AND THE COMPLETE REMISSION OF SINS

§ 1. Where the remission of original sin was treated, certain things were said which also pertain to the matter now in hand. In that place, moreover, it was shown that the concupiscence (*concupiscentia*) which remains in the baptized is not sin, and therefore does not stand in the way of our saying that through Baptism (*Baptismus*) all sins are plainly and perfectly remitted. Whence that charge is slanderous which the Pelagians once used to make, namely, that the Catholics teach that Baptism does not give indulgence for all sins nor remove crimes, but only shave them, so that the roots of all sins are held fast in the evil flesh. This St. Augustine refutes in Book 1 of *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, ch. 13.¹

§ II — Reply to the question of the penalties left after Baptism (Responsio ad quaestionem de poenalitatibus post baptismum relictis)

§ 2. It is asked how through Baptism (*Baptismus*) the perfect remission (*remissio*) of all sins is given, when nonetheless there are left to be borne death, hunger, thirst, weariness, diseases, and the other miseries of this life, not only for adults but also for little children, who have as yet contracted no sin of their own proper act. The solution of this question is indicated by St. Augustine in these words (*Enchiridion* 66):³ "Remission of sins is wrought rather on account of the judgment to come. But this present life avails to such a degree, as it is written, 'A heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam from the day of the going out from the womb of their mother even unto the day of burial in the mother of all,' that we even see little children, after the laver of regeneration, tormented by the affliction of various evils, so that we may understand that the whole that is effected by the saving sacraments pertains more to the hope of future goods than to the retention or acquisition of present goods." And in book 3 against Julian, ch. 6, he says likewise:⁴ "In some little children, too, already reborn, there either remain the ills with which they were born, or such ills befall; far be it from us to say this is unworthy. But from this most of all let us understand that their being reborn profits them for the other age."

§ 3. Therefore through Baptism there is given a perfect remission of sins even as to penalty (*poena*), not in the sense that no penalty of this age remains, but that no penalty of the future remains to be paid, neither eternal nor temporal, and that absolutely nothing is left which would hinder a man departing from this life from entering the Kingdom of heaven—just as above we showed from the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent.⁵ For what is said in the Decree of Florence, that "remission is made in Baptism also of every penalty that would be owed for the very fault," is shown in what follows in what sense it was said: "Therefore for those baptized no satisfaction (*satisfactio*) is to be enjoined for past sins; but those dying before they contract any fault at once pass into the Kingdom of heaven."⁶ Elsewhere too St. Augustine teaches that a full remission is made in Baptism from the fact that after this life nothing remains to be paid: *De peccatorum*

meritis I, ch. 20, and II, ch. 28.⁷ To the same effect he writes: *Contra Julianum* VI, ch. 21; *City of God*, chs. 14–15; on Ps. 84; and *Tracts* 79 and 124 on John.⁸ And there is a like passage in Eucherius on 2 Kings 8, where he says: "The saving wave wipes away from us the guilt of the first parent; yet, though absolved and removed from the guilt of that same fault, we still undergo carnal [miseries]."⁹ And clearly Prosper's sentence agrees with St. Augustine: "Even the death of the godly is the penalty of sin."¹⁰

§ 4. Nor do St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure think otherwise. The former writes thus: "Christ's faithful are freed by Baptism from the debt of actual sins and from the debt of original sin as regards exclusion from glory; yet they still remain bound by the debt of the penalty of original sin, of dying temporally—because one is renewed according to the spirit but not yet according to the flesh—according to that saying: 'The body indeed is dead because of sin, but the spirit lives because of justification' (Rom. 8). And it is God who inflicted the penalty of death upon all men—even the just—for the sin of the first parent."¹¹ St. Bonaventure, for his part, writing on this *Distinctio*, says: "Baptism utterly frees from every eternal penalty; it frees, too, from every temporal penalty requiring satisfaction, as was said above; yet it does not free from every common penalty, such as hunger, thirst, infirmity, and the other spiritual scourges." And he adds the reason: "For to this end God ordained it." And again: "And the reason of this is that it was fitting that such penal conditions should be left in us," and so forth.¹²

§ 5. Someone may say: If the debt of the penalty of original sin remains after Baptism, the baptized person having now been reconciled to God, therefore satisfaction should be enjoined upon the baptized; especially since the Apostle in 1 Cor. 11 says: "If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged; but whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world." From which it appears that satisfaction is rightly undertaken even to avoid the penalties of life. It is answered: Although sometimes by a penalty either voluntarily undertaken or exacted through satisfaction even the graver ills of this life are avoided, nevertheless satisfaction is neither ordinarily—that is, rightly—ordered to that effect; but, as the sacrament of Penance itself, so satisfaction, which is part of it, is ordered to the penalties of the future age, which, God so disposing, are in our power so that we can escape them by satisfying. But death and the common miseries of this age the justice of God has willed by an unchangeable decree, according to the sentence of Sirach 40 just now cited, and that of the Apostle: "It is appointed unto men once to die" (Heb. 9), and that of Rom. 5: "Death passed upon all men." Nor does God relax to anyone that sentence which was spoken to the first man: "Thou shalt die the death," and, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."¹³ This doctrine is confirmed, besides the places a little before alleged, by what St. Augustine writes: *Contra Julianum*, ch. 6, and book 6, and elsewhere.¹⁴

§ IV — That in Baptism the remission of sins is not conferred without inward renewal (Baptismo non conferri remissionem peccatorum absque interna renovatione)

§ 6. Although from what has been said it is sufficiently clear that those err gravely who think that in Baptism—whether of adults or of infants—only this takes place, that the promissory note of sin is blotted out, but not that man is inwardly renewed by divine Grace (*gratia*) and the reception of virtues, yet because even today the heretics teach that the justice of man consists in the remission of sins alone, and in former times there were not lacking those who excluded the effect of Grace at least from the Baptism of infants, content with the remission

of sins alone, therefore it must now be proved at greater length that this [remission] is never conferred upon the baptized without the inner renewal of the mind by grace, but that together with it gifts are poured in, and that they are altogether justified out of the impious. First, there is an illustrious statement in St. John Chrysostom, who, in a Homily to the Neophytes, enumerates in order the effects of baptism in these words: "Blessed is He who alone has wrought wonders, who made all things and converts all things; behold, they enjoy the serenity of liberty who a little before were held captive, and they are citizens of the Church who were in the error of pilgrimage, and they are turned to the lot of justice who were in the confusion of sin. For they are not only free but also holy; not only healed but also just; not only just but also sons; not only sons but also heirs; not only heirs but also brothers of Christ; and not only brothers of Christ but coheirs; not only coheirs but also members; not only members but also a temple; not only a temple but organs of the Spirit. You see how many are the largesses of Baptism; some assign heavenly Grace to consist only in the remission of sins. But we have reckoned ten honors. For this cause also we baptize infants, since they are not stained with [personal] sins, that there be given, or added, to them holiness, justice, adoption, inheritance, brotherhood of Christ, that they may be His members."¹⁶ This is Chrysostom—whose words are recited verbatim by St. Augustine in book 1 *Against Julian*, ch. 6—where also the sins with which he denies that infants are stained he interprets as actual sins, since the original is one alone; a like passage of Chrysostom is *Hom. 24 on John*.¹⁷ St. Augustine indeed, in book 1 *On the Merits of Sins*, ch. 9, affirms that Christ gives to the faithful a most hidden Grace of His Spirit, which, he says, He secretly pours into infants—without doubt in Baptism.¹⁸ And from that, as from a certain assumption, he proves that even original sin is inward and affects the soul like a contagion. And in the book *On Grace and Free Will*, ch. 22, about infants who, when they are baptized, are wont to struggle, he says: "Grace avails even in those who resist"; behold Grace inhering.¹⁹ The same, in *Epistle 23*, thus writes of a baptized infant: "The Grace of Christ once received in Baptism the infant does not lose, unless by his own impiety, if with the advance of age he shall have become so wicked." And below: "Infants are offered to receive Spiritual Grace." And indeed, if there were only the remission of sins by renewing Grace, Augustine would argue to no purpose, in so many places and so elaborately, against the Donatists concerning the effect of Baptism, answering that the Baptism which is given by a better minister is not better; for this one proof would have sufficed, that Baptism only washes from sins—which, since it is negative or privative, cannot be participated more or less. Yet we read that he never used this proof.

§ 7. Now to this doctrine of the Fathers Holy Scripture bears clear witness, which attributes to Baptism not only death and the slaying of sin, but also the life of justice; not only the putting off of the old man, but also the putting on of the new; nor only that he ceases to be carnal, but also that he becomes spiritual. The places are John 3; Rom. 6; Col. 2 and 3. Moreover, by the Apostle's testimony (Gal. 3) those who are baptized are said to put on Christ; not as a man puts on a garment only outwardly applied to him, but as it is read in the same Apostle (Col. 3): "Put ye on bowels of mercy, benignity, humility," etc., and Eph. 6: "Put ye on the armor of God—truth, justice, faith." Therefore he puts on Christ who is baptized, because through baptism there is given the Grace by which he is made like to Christ. And this is what is said more plainly in other words (Eph. 4): "Put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice [and] holiness of truth." But what Augustine teaches in book 5 *Against the Donatists*, ch. 24—that men put on Christ in two ways, sometimes only up to the receiving of the sacrament—is not contrary to this exposition. For he extends the apostolic phrase also to the wicked who, although they set up an obstacle to grace, nevertheless receive the sacrament, that is, the character, as is manifest from his following words; which words also serve for the confirmation of the present doctrine. Hence most rightly it was defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (sess. 6, ch. 7)

that man, in the very justification, together with the remission of sins, receives all these things at once as infused through Christ—unto whom are inserted faith, hope, and charity; for without charity—in which are understood to be comprised also the other virtues necessary for salvation—neither faith nor hope can perfectly unite man to God and make him a living member of Christ.²⁰

§ 8. But, for a fuller establishment of this Catholic position, it must be shown in what ways that opinion may be taken which says that in Baptism only the remission of sins is bestowed. One way: in adults, if namely in them every renewal of mind be understood to precede baptism by a true and sincere conversion to God, so that nothing is left to the sacrament except the releasing of guilt (*reatus*). To this opinion there will perhaps seem to lend support the singular excellence of certain catechumens beyond many of the baptized, to such a degree that they are prepared to lay down their life for their brothers—than which charity no one has greater, as the Savior attests (John 15). But this opinion is briefly refuted thus. Either such a catechumen has already obtained the pardon of sins by the mere vow of Baptism—and thus the point proposed is not shown, namely that by Baptism there is sometimes a bare remission of sins; for that remission, previously effected by the virtue of Baptism as desired and vowed, had joined with itself a renewal of mind. Or it is imagined that to a so notable previous renewal of the man there follows from Baptism alone the remission of sins. Which fancy, as Lentaeus well says, redounds not a little to an injury of divine largess. For if the Holy Spirit bestowed so great a Grace upon a man not yet indwelling, but as yet only preparing for Himself a dwelling in him, it is surely absurd that Grace should bring nothing with it now when it comes to dwell, and enters the habitation prepared for itself—which takes place when, the guilt of eternal damnation being loosed, man is made the temple of God. For we must not believe that He comes empty, or that there is lacking that by which He may increase and perfect the gifts begun. Surely the Apostle testifies that by the laver of regeneration and renovation the Holy Spirit is poured upon us abundantly (Tit. 3). Which assuredly he would not say of the remission of sins alone, wherein something is not so much conferred as taken away. Add to this that from the excellence of catechumens one cannot draw an example for a common law, as if from it it were shown that in all adults the case is similarly so.

§ 9. Another way: that in all alike, both adults and infants, the remission of sins alone takes place—so understood that neither before baptism nor in it is there any inward renewal of the man, but, all the former oldness remaining in place, the preceding sins are remitted, that is, are not imputed. This is the most absurd doctrine of the heretics of our time.

§ 10. A third way: in infants, if namely it be thought that in them there is only a guilt (*reatus*) or obligation to punishment on account of the sin of the first parent, but not an evil in the soul inhering. On that supposition there would be no need for a renewal of mind where in truth there was nothing of the oldness of sin, but it would suffice that the guilt contracted from the sin of the first man be loosed. But this opinion takes away the true character of sin in infants, teaching that punishment passes over to them without fault; which long ago was condemned in the Pelagians, as we showed elsewhere (book 6, ch. 2).²¹ It must therefore be admitted that just as by generation both fault and guilt are contracted together, so by regeneration fault is taken away by the infusion of Grace, and guilt is loosed by the indulgence of all sins.

§ V — *That habitual grace is infused into infants by baptism (Parvulis habitualement gratiam infundi per baptismum)*

§ 11. Concerning the effect of Baptism (*Baptismus*) in infants, there was varied disputation about the time of the Master, as is evident from the last paragraph of this Distinction and from the questions of the Schoolmen around this place. Some thought that grace and the virtues are not infused into them, but that only the character (*character*) is imprinted, by the power of which they would afterwards, when adults, obtain grace and the virtues. But because the character can exist even without the remission of sins, without which nevertheless no access to life is open to anyone, it would follow from that opinion that infants straightway baptized, in that they were marked only with the character, could not obtain salvation. Wherefore this opinion must altogether be rejected. Others, of whom mention is made in the Council of Vienne, said that by Baptism indeed sin is remitted to infants, but that Grace and the virtues are not infused. But this opinion also does not stand with the truth of the Catholic Faith. For the remission of sins, as we showed above, is not without a renewal of the interior mind; but this renewal cannot be without some infused gift of grace (*gratia*). Then too the infant is truly justified through Baptism, whereas true justice does not consist in the mere remission of sins, but moreover requires a good quality inhering in the mind, as Catholic Doctrine has it. Hence also that opinion of certain Masters about circumcision, that by it original sin was indeed taken away, yet Grace was not bestowed—which is also the opinion of Lombard (Distinction 1)—is rightly disapproved by Doctors, for the reason that, if by that removal of original sin without informing grace one could attain to eternal life. From which things it is evident that the opinion of those men is altogether to be retained as true and agreeing with the Catholic Faith, who teach that habitual Grace and the virtues are imparted to infants in Baptism. For the understanding of which:

§ 12. It must be noted that this question, whether to infants in Baptism, besides the remission of original sin, habitual Grace is also conferred and the virtues are infused, or whether not as to their use but at least according to some habit, or rather whether the indwelling Holy Spirit alone supplies the place of habits of this kind, was at first disputed problematically among the Doctors of the Schools. Whence the Master, proposing it in the text, does not determine it and seems to incline rather to the negative side, perhaps for this reason, that charity, which makes a man a son of God, according to him is not some habit inhering in the soul, but the Holy Spirit Himself. But Innocent III also, speaking of this question as of a problem, in the chapter "Majores" (Extra, On Baptism and its effect), says thus: "That, however, which the opponents induce, namely that faith or charity and the other virtues are not infused into infants, as not consenting, is not absolutely granted by many, since for this reason the question is referred among the Doctors of Theology; others affirming that through the power of Baptism indeed guilt is remitted to infants, but that Grace is not conferred; some saying that, sins having been remitted, the virtues are infused into them, which they have as to habit, not as to use, until they come to adult age."²³

§ 13. But afterwards, in the General Council of Vienne under Clement V, the affirmative part of the question, as the more probable and more conformable to the doctrine of the Fathers, was received and approved. The words of the Council are these: "Because, with regard to the effect of Baptism in infants, there are found certain Doctors and Theologians to have had contrary opinions—some saying that by the power of Baptism indeed guilt is remitted to infants, but that Grace is not conferred; others, on the contrary, asserting that, as to the matter itself, guilt is remitted to the same in Baptism, and that the virtues and informing Grace are infused as to habit, even if not for that time as to use—we, attending to the universal efficacy of the death

of Christ, which by Baptism is applied equally to all the baptized, and to the second Epistle, which says that both to infants and adults there is conferred in Baptism the informing of Grace," have judged that the opinion more consonant with the Fathers of the Saints and more theological be held, with the holy Council approving. This constitution is had in the Clementines under the title "On the Supreme Trinity and the Catholic Faith."²⁴

§ 14. Finally, when the matter was examined more diligently still, it pleased the Council of Trent to define it simply. For in Session 6, generally the Fathers declare that "the charity of God is poured forth into the hearts of those who are justified and adheres in them; and hence, in the very justification, together with the remission of sins, men receive at once, infused through Christ, faith, hope, and charity." And in canon 11 they condemn those "who assert that men are justified by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of grace and charity which is poured forth into their hearts by the Holy Spirit and inheres in them." Likewise, in Session 7, on the Sacraments in general, in canon 7 they condemn those who deny that grace is given through the sacraments of the New Law always and to all, so far as regards what is on God's part. And in canon 6 on Baptism anathema is pronounced on him who says that the baptized cannot, even if they will, retain grace except by infidelity. Which canons also suppose that grace is given to infants.²⁵

§ 15. Moreover, that a man is made just, or is justified, not only by the remission of guilt and by the imputation of the justice of Christ, but also by an inherent justice which renders a man truly just—so that the man justified is renewed, regenerated, and inwardly changed by some created form in the soul after the manner of a habit, given by God supernaturally, converting it to Himself, renewing it, and of itself establishing and confirming it—whether this be of Faith or not: indeed it is not expressly handed down in the Scriptures or elsewhere that there be posited in so many words habits divinely infused inhering in the soul; however, according to the doctrine of the Council of Trent it is certain that, when God justifies sinners, He not only remits the guilt unto punishment but also inwardly renovates man and makes him straight and good by a permanent quality, which the same holy Council, in proposing and condemning the errors of the innovators who wholly reject infused habits, sufficiently insinuates, as is clear from the places alleged above. Therefore from the proposition of the Tridentine Fathers it follows that it is not correctly nor truly said that "grace of the heart" cannot be lost, since the grace of remission, once made by a choice, is never recalled.

§ 16. However, it must not be thought that there was ever doubt among the Orthodox whether an infant through Baptism is renewed in mind and is made spiritual, and is truly justified, not by the sole remission of sins but by that justice which would make him a living member and a son of God and worthy of eternal life. For these things, as above we have shown in general both of infants and of adults, are manifestly proved from Scripture, the Fathers, and that doctrine which the Church holds. But about the quality or habit of Grace and of the virtues inhering, most of all the question seems to have been agitated—which question the Tridentine Synod has now clearly enough defined. In favor of which definition there makes, among the first, St. Augustine, book 1 *On the Merits of Sins* (ch. 9), and in very many other places; and likewise in the books *On Grace and Free Will* (ch. 22), and in *Epistles* 23 and 107, and the others which we have cited long ago. But especially that sentence of Prosper, book 1 *On the Vocation of the Gentiles* (ch. 18): that the origin of true justice is placed in the sacrament of regeneration, "so that where man is reborn, there also the very truth of the virtues arises."²⁶

§ IV

§ 17. That in justification (*justificari*) we are justified formally, as the theologians say, by an inward and true justice (*justitia intima, et vera*), holy and upright, and not by an imputative justice, which the most depraved heterodox trumpet forth, is established; likewise that by justification we are reborn and are taken up into a share of the divine nature; and that in Baptism too true and inward justice is given, and that the gifts of faith, hope, and charity are bestowed upon men, together with the other things reported here by the Author, is clear from the sources above adduced.

§ 18. But whether this renewal and sanctification be effected by some inherent and permanent thing communicated intrinsically to the soul and infused by God—namely, by a habit infused in the soul—or rather only by some actual help of God moving the soul and turning it to Himself, although all Catholics hold the affirmative with effective arguments, nevertheless they are not agreed as to whether this has been openly defined in the Council of Trent or in recent councils. Bartholomew Medina, on the Prima Secundae of St. Thomas (q. 110), sets down two conclusions. In the first he says it is heretical to deny that grace and charity are qualities; he proves this assertion of his invincibly, and he establishes and defends it by arguments. In the second conclusion he says thus: that grace is an infused habit inhering in the soul; he proves this also by authority, and by reasons which he relates at length; finally he concludes that the Council defines that God grants to those [whom He justifies] forgiveness of sin and does not impute their sins, but also converts and renews their soul, and from a depraved [state makes it righteous].

§ 19. Whether in truth God brings about this interior renewal by an infused and inherent habit, or rather by a mere actual motion, is not defined; for that question did not pertain to what was of the Council's definition. Hence it is not defined that grace and charity are a quality of man inhering—which renewal can come about either through some permanent infused habit or through the sole actual motion of the divine help without any such habit. These are Medina's statements.

§ 20. Cardinal Bellarmine, however, while he everywhere teaches as the common opinion that a man is made just by a certain quality, or permanent habit, inhering from God, supports this by the testimonies of the Council of Trent, of the Fathers, and by very many reasons; though he notes no censure upon the contrary opinion—although a little below he seems to adduce it as defined *de fide*—and sometimes appears to assert as *de fide* that justice is not only the uncreated gift, namely the Holy Spirit, but also the created habit of grace and of the other supernatural virtues; yet he proves indeed that the Holy Spirit is a gift, and that therefore, because He is a gift, abundance is made to the souls of the Saints; he teaches also that His own assertion is confirmed by those heads; finally, in the same place, at no. 21, he strives to repel the charge that he had proscribed the habit of charity, and the learned men who had pressed that charge against him cleared him; for my part I am more reserved. For that there is some created form (*forma aliqua creata*) is now received; but whether it be a habit in the strict sense is controverted among theologians, and nothing as yet altogether definite has been established. St. Thomas in II-II (q. 23, a. 1), where he treats whether charity is something created in the soul, although he favors that opinion, yet does not affix any theological censure to the opposite; in the Summa likewise (II-II, q. 23, a. 11, in the Disputed Questions On Charity, a. 1) he defends the Master's judgment and excuses that same judgment of the Master from error, although (in the praised article 1 of the single question De caritate) he does not think that the opinion of the Master can altogether stand.

§ 21. Peter Nicole, in the *Theological Institutes* written in French, vol. 2 (ch. 25), says nevertheless that it is more likely that the Holy Spirit is in our hearts, not only as a transient [mover], and not only as one who snatches [the soul] into an act, but that He induces in us a certain inclination and disposition that is permanent, which they call a created habit. This view we readily embrace. For, since it is certain by faith that the soul is inwardly sanctified and converted to God, even if it is not said to be in act, it must be said that the soul, in whatever way this be, is affected and disposed towards God; and from that affection and propensity towards God, inasmuch as it is intimate and inherent, the soul is called holy and just. Hence, as regards that opinion which admits infused and permanent habits of the supernatural virtues in infants, he calls it the more likely opinion; be that as it may, it must certainly now be said among all Catholics that habitual grace in Baptism is conferred.

§ 22. Ivenin, in the *Historical-Dogmatic Commentary On the Sacraments*, asserts that in every age among the Orthodox it has been held as certain and common that grace is conferred; but whether the inherent grace be a remaining habit, or the Holy Spirit Himself who is its author—this question, as is answered above out of the words of Bartholomew Medina, the schools of doctors have not defined. Coninck, *De Faith, Hope, and Charity*, book 1 (Disputation 1 on charity, a. 1), teaches that in justification some real form is infused in us according to which faith, hope, and charity are infused; and at no. 21 he says that in justification some real form is infused. In the second conclusion he teaches that justification cannot be understood of merely the acts of faith, hope, or charity, but that some form inhering in us is of faith. Expressly he teaches this sentence in like terms with the scholastic doctors, inhering in us after the manner of a habit. He commends it not only as scholastic but also shows it to be true on the authority of the Church, and proves it true from the Council of Trent. The same Ivenin, in the *Historical-Dogmatic Commentary On the Sacrament of Baptism*, no. 49, clearly asserts this, and he reports the consensus of recent writers; which conclusion Bellarmine also confirms by the Council of Trent and by the testimony of the Roman Catechism, part II; and finally, in the same book (ch. 4), he demonstrates by the testimonies of the Fathers that the definition of the Council of Trent truly means this.

§ 23. Against this doctrine the first objection that is commonly brought is that little ones who have been baptized, when they grow up, neither believe in act nor exercise the operations of the virtues, unless they have been taught and instructed; therefore it is not very likely that the habits of the virtues were infused in those who were baptized, inasmuch as, without new instruction, they can in no way be brought forth into acts. This indeed is most well known; for they will never believe the things that are of faith—such as that God is Triune, that Christ suffered and died for us, and the like—unless these have been heard and proposed. Whence also the Apostle (Rom. 10): "How shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? ... Therefore faith is from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ." Second, that saying of Jerome is produced (*Against the Pelagians*, book 1): that "Baptism tears up the old things; it does not bestow new virtues." Third, certain things from Augustine are alleged, in which he hands on that the baptized are called faithful not from their own faith but from another's, namely of those who carry them, or of the Church, or on account of the sacrament of faith bestowed upon them. For thus he has it (in the Epistle just now cited): When it is answered that one believes who does not yet have faith in the affection, one is answered to have faith on account of the sacrament of faith; and he adds that by that very sacrament he turns himself to God as by the sacrament of conversion. And below: Thus even if that faith is not yet in the little one, which consists in the will of the believer, nevertheless the sacrament of faith makes him faithful. Likewise, in book 1 *On the Merits of Sins* (ch. 26), moreover he says that little ones are called faithful because they profess a

certain faith through the words of those who bear them. He repeats like statements (ch. 33); in the exposition on John 27 he says thus: that it must not be said that the infants have power to believe, but that those who have not believed are not baptized; and in Sermon 14 On the Words of the Apostle he speaks in like manner.

§ 24. Of these objections the first seems to have moved most strongly those who did not see how in those who could do nothing according to a habit there could be room saved for habit. To these we reply, that those virtues which the Catholic Church teaches are infused in little ones in Baptism are not said to be habits in the same manner as are those habits which, being acquired by frequent operation, render the mind ready and facile to act; but they are said to be qualities in a certain way quiescent and dormant, which truly constitute little ones habitually believers, in act hoppers, lovers, but which cannot go forth into their acts unless the impediments of age and ignorance be removed, and unless there be added some external institution and doctrine through the senses—if this be lacking, and the mind be occupied by the vanity of the world, it happens that, since they are very slight and delicate as it were, they quickly and easily perish. Although it is most likely that, if a baptized infant dies, the charity infused into him through Baptism suffices, with the object present alone, to excite in the separated soul an act of charity. For faith and hope, because of their imperfection which they include, do not accompany blessed souls.

§ 25. Moreover the Apostle's statement about the act of faith to be received from hearing is itself declared by the context to be to be received of adults. Jerome, however, speaks of those habits of virtues which straightway proceed promptly into acts. That this is clear is shown by the fact that he pronounces about adults no less than about little ones, and sets himself against those who taught that a man is so renewed by Baptism that straightway he is equipped with every sort of virtue so as to be able to live without sin; which was the dogma of the Pelagians. Finally Augustine, for his part, very often understands by the name "faith" not a habit but the act of believing, which is clear cannot be in little ones using reason. And therefore also those places of Augustine must be used to refute the figment of Luther, who tried to attribute to little ones, in the very reception of the sacrament, a proper movement of faith contrary to all human sense. Which Augustine very rightly denies in almost numberless places.

§ 26. But you will ask, why then does he not call little ones faithful because of an infused habit? I answer—perhaps because the name "habit" is wont to suggest something more than a mere naked and quiescent quality; for in the use of the philosophers it includes readiness and facility in acting, which is acknowledged not to be in little ones. Whence Augustine seems deliberately to have abstained from the word "habit." And yet in those very places which are objected by the adversaries he sufficiently intimates the Catholic doctrine. For when he says that not that faith which consists in the will of believers makes the little one faithful, he sufficiently indicates that there is some other kind of faith by which one can truly be called faithful. Whence near the beginning of that same Epistle he says that the regenerating Spirit is common to the adults who offer and to the little ones who are offered. He seems, however, to acknowledge habitual faith more clearly in book 3 On the Merits of Sins (ch. 2) in these words: "Therefore as by those through whom they are reborn the Spirit of justice transfers into them the faith which they have not yet been able to have by their own will, so by those through whom they are born the flesh of sin transfers into them the guilt which they have not yet contracted by their own life. And as the life of the Spirit in Christ regenerates them as faithful, so the body of death in Adam has generated them as sinners." Which words signify that, just as little ones, by being born, contract an inward and properly named sin, so by being reborn they conceive an inward and true faith.

§ VII — On certain other effects of baptism (De aliis quibusdam baptismi effectis)

§ 27. To baptism (*baptismus*), besides the remission of sins (*remissio peccatorum*) and the renovation of the mind (*renovatio mentis*), Scripture also assigns the effect of illumination (*illuminatio*), although that is a certain part of renovation. For just as to the old man there pertains not only sin but also ignorance and darkness, so to the new there pertains not only sanctification by grace but also illumination by faith. Whence the baptized (Heb. 6) are called "enlightened," according to the exposition of almost all the Ancients; and similarly (Heb. 10) in these words: "Call to mind the former days, in which you were enlightened." And everywhere among the more ancient writers we read that Baptism was called the sacrament of illumination: in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (ch. 2), in Clement of Alexandria, book 2 (Paedagogue, ch. 6), in Gregory Nazianzen (Oration on the Holy Laver), in Epiphanius (on the heresy of the Cathari), in St. Ambrose, book 2 (On Penance, ch. 2), and also in St. John Damascene, book 4 (On the Faith, ch. 10).²⁹ The reason for this appellation the Scriptures point out: because by Baptism God has snatched us from the power of darkness and has transferred us into the Kingdom of His Son, and has made us worthy of a share in the lot of the saints in light (Col. 1); and He has called us from darkness into His marvelous light (1 Pet. 2). And again Paul says (Eph. 5): "You were once darkness, but now light in the Lord; walk as children of light."

§ 28. Hence St. Augustine (in a certain Sermon to the Competentes, which is the eighth among the sermons De Diversis, ch. 4) says: "Hasten together to come and be enlightened; if you are still in darkness, the darkness is in you. But you shall be light in the Lord, who enlightens every man coming into this world." And in Tractate 41 on John, discussing the man born blind, by whom he wishes to be understood the whole human race, from its very birth through the transgression of the first man blinded by unbelief, he says: "For if blindness is unbelief, illumination is faith; whom do you find faithful, when Christ came?" In that same place he also teaches that, just as that blind man, although first anointed by Christ, did not receive light before he washed in the pool of Siloam, so a man, although a catechumen, does not receive the light of faith before he is baptized. For he says of catechumens—who indeed are already believers—"they hasten to the laver, if they seek light." Someone, therefore, will ask how those seek light who already believe. To whom we reply: although all Christian faith is the mind's light, nevertheless Scripture and the Fathers do not commend under the name of light just any sort of faith of the human mind, but that faith precisely which has charity conjoined, which works through charity. For this is the faith of which the Fathers of the Council of Trent speak (Session 6, canon 7): before the sacrament of Baptism, according to the tradition of the Apostles, catechumens ask it of the Church when they ask for the faith that bestows eternal life.³⁰

§ 29. This understanding of "light" is confirmed by other places of Scripture also, but most especially by the Apostle John, whose words are these (1 John): "If we walk in the light, we have fellowship—that is, charity—one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sin." And ch. 2: "The darkness is passing away, and the true light already shines. He who says that he is in the light and hates his brother is in darkness even until now." Touching on this passage St. Augustine says (Epistle 120 to Honoratus, ch. 22): "If you hold hatred in your heart, therefore the light of souls is charity"; and the same Apostle immediately denies that he knows God who does not love God. From which it is gathered that the light with which minds are imbued through Baptism is either charity, which cannot be without faith, or faith working through charity.³¹ Whence moreover it is clear that illumination is an effect of Baptism, either being the very renovation itself, or at least a part of it. Furthermore, St. John Chrysostom in long order enumerates certain other effects of

Baptism (Homily to the Neophytes), whose words we have recited above. Now these are of this sort: liberty from the slavery of sin, the abolition of death, the adoption of the sons of God, inheritance and the brotherhood of Christ; likewise, to be a member of Christ and of the Church; to be a dwelling of God, a temple, an instrument of the Holy Spirit. All these effects are contained partly in the remission of sins and partly in renovation.

§ 30. Not only, however, are the aforesaid things received from this sacrament; but also, in those same things once obtained, there is acquired a confidence and, as it were, a security which brings forth a good and peaceful conscience. And this Baptismal effect St. Peter seems without doubt to indicate (1 Pet. 3), when he says that Baptism is "the interrogation of a good conscience toward God"—as though he wished to say that Baptism is that by which, through the profession of faith and the reception of the sacrament, we seek and learn to have a good conscience before God. And Paul also indicates it (Heb. 10) in these words: "Let us draw near, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our body washed with clean water." And he calls the same effect (Rom. 5) "peace with God." Moreover, that regeneration effected by Baptism confers charity, is not only said to be "from a pure heart," but also "from a good conscience" (1 Tim. 1)—namely, on account of the peace and tranquility of conscience which the renovation wrought in Baptism brings with it. We have an example of this thing in Augustine, who in book 9 of the Confessions, ch. 4, speaking of himself as not yet reborn, writes thus: "Faith did not allow me to be secure regarding my past sins, which for me by Baptism were not yet remitted." And in ch. 6, speaking of himself now reborn: "And we were baptized," he says, "and the anxiety of our past life fled from us." Nor indeed is it a wonder that he attributes this effect to Baptism, since even to the sacrament of Penance—where not every penalty is remitted—the Council of Trent attributes the same, saying (Session 14, ch. 3) that reconciliation with God, in devout men who receive that sacrament with devotion, is wont to bring about peace and serenity of conscience, together with vehement consolation of spirit.³²

§ IX — Whether the effect of Baptism is equal in all (An effectus baptismi sit in omnibus aequalis)

§ 31. This question, whether Baptism produces an equal effect in all, is to be understood of the effect of grace (*gratia*) renewing man, not however of the character (*character*), concerning which there is no doubt that, just as it cannot be erased, so neither can it be increased nor diminished. Nor yet is it about the remission of sins; for since that is full and perfect in all, it must be equal, so far as comes from the power of Baptism, inasmuch as it blots out whatever sins it may find. Whence St. John Damascene, book 4 (ch. 10), bears witness that the remission of sins is given by Baptism equally to all, although this effect can be said to be unequal from the condition of the recipients—not indeed on account of a greater or lesser present disposition, that is, faith or devotion, but because not all are equally burdened with sins, since of them some have only original sin, others have even added actual sins, either more or fewer. Therefore the sense of the question is, whether all—both little ones and adults—who receive the effect of grace from this sacrament, receive it equal. That this is so seems to be shown first by authority, then by reason.

§ 32. For St. Cyprian, book 4 (Epistle 7), adducing the likeness of the manna which by all was gathered equally, namely to the measure of a gomor (Exod. 16), teaches that Christ's indulgence and the heavenly grace which is given through Baptism are divided equally to all. And presently he adds: "Clearly the same spiritual

grace, which is taken equally by believers from Baptism, is afterwards either diminished or increased in our manner of life and action, as in the Gospel the Lord's seed is sown equally, but, according to the variety of the soil, one is eaten up, another bears fruit in manifold abundance—of the thirtieth, or sixtieth, or hundredth fold." St. Augustine also, book 3 (*Against Cresconius the Grammarian*, ch. 6), speaking of the effect of Baptism: "Through unequal ministers," he says, "the gift of God is equal, because it is not theirs, but His." And in Epistle 48: "Although it was not given through equals, yet because the Baptism was Christ's, it profited equally those to whom it was given." Of which sort other sentences are found in him in the books published against the Donatists. The reason indeed that can be adduced is this. The effect of Baptism depends more on the one conferring than on the one receiving, just as generally any effect depends more on the efficient cause than on the matter. But the inequality of ministers makes nothing for the inequality of the effect of Baptism, as we showed above (on the First Distinction); therefore neither will the inequality of disposition of the recipients make anything.

§ 33. Handling this question, St. Thomas, III (q. 69, a. 8), distinguishes a twofold effect of Baptism, one *per se*, the other *per accidens*. *Per se* indeed, that to which Baptism is instituted, namely the regeneration of men into the spiritual life. *Per accidens*, however, that to which it is not instituted—although the divine power sometimes works it in Baptism—such as liberation from leprosy or another disease of the body, or from a demon corporally possessing, of which St. Cyprian makes mention (in the Epistle cited above), or the extinction of the fomes [of sin], of which Augustine, book 1 (*On the merits of sins and their remission*, ch. 39): "This is not obtained," he says, "in Baptism, unless perhaps by a miracle of the ineffable Creator, that the law of sin which is in the members be utterly extinguished." Which his words are related in the Ordinary Gloss at that place (Rom. 6) "That we may no longer serve sin." Therefore the effect of this latter kind is manifestly not received equally by all the baptized, even though they approach with equal devotion, but a thing of this sort is dispensed according to the hidden plan of divine providence.

§ 34. But the effect of the former kind all receive equally who are equally disposed toward Baptism. Whence, says St. Thomas, because all children are equally disposed toward Baptism (for they are baptized not in their own faith, but in the faith of the Church), all receive an equal effect in Baptism. Adults, however, who approach Baptism through their own faith—some with greater, others with lesser devotion—wherefore some participate more, others less, in the grace renewing. This matter is made clear by the likeness of fire; which, although, as far as lies in it, it diffuses its heat equally to all, nevertheless he will receive more heat from it who has drawn nearer to it. The sentence of St. John Damascene, book 4 (ch. 10), favors this doctrine, where he speaks thus: "The remission of sins is given equally to all through Baptism; but the grace of the Holy Spirit is [given] according to the disposition of the purity of faith."

§ 35. Yet here one could ask, whether, just as by one's own devotion a man draws nearer and therefore receives more grace, so also by another's—namely, when more, or better, and more pleasing to God pray for one than for another—that he may become a partaker of grace through Baptism. If this is conceded of adults, it seems it must be conceded also of little ones, as Scotus concedes, although Dominic Soto disapproves his opinion, who nevertheless does not seem by any necessary argument to overthrow Scotus's opinion. For nothing hinders a richer grace from being conferred by God upon someone on account of the merit or prayer of another, even if he himself does not concur by actual devotion to such an effect, since the first grace of conversion or of good will is in like manner given even to those averse and ill-doing.

§ 36. To that which from St. Cyprian was adduced, we answer that he speaks of the equality of the grace which is on the part of Baptism, forestalling the diversity of disposition of those who receive Baptism. For he deals against those who said that "clinics," that is, those baptized in their beds through infirmity, were not to be held as legitimate Christians, as if they had not fully obtained the grace of Baptism. But Augustine denies an inequality of Baptism only on the part of the ministers, not however on the part of the recipients. Nor is the reason alike in both. For although Baptism, and any sacrament whatsoever, depends more on the minister in order that it be a sacrament; yet in order that the effect be greater or lesser it depends more on the recipient, as on the matter which is more or less disposed to the effect.

§ 37. Moreover, what has here been said of the equality of the effect of Baptism can likewise be accommodated to the other sacraments. For this doctrine is common to all the sacraments.

§ X — What intention is necessary in the one receiving Baptism (In suscipiente baptismum quae intentio necessaria)

§ 38. Although in infants to be baptized no defect either of intention or of faith is required, because in them for attaining the whole effect of Baptism the Mother Church abundantly supplies, and the same judgment is to be made of the insane, who have never before had the use of reason; nevertheless of adults using reason one must judge otherwise. For in these, for the truth of Baptism, that is, for the reception of the character, the intention of receiving Baptism is altogether necessary—not only that it be some washing in general, but as such as the Church practises. The reason of which can be taken from those things which were said about the minister's intention (above, on the First Distinction). For thus did Christ institute His sacraments, that they should be perfected by human actions as much on the part of the recipient as of the administrator. Whence, just as in the minister there is required the intention of doing, so in him to whom it is administered there is required the intention of receiving that which is done in the Church. From which it follows that he who altogether unwilling and resisting, and even crying out against it, has been immersed by mere violence, is not truly baptized. But those who, being forced by blows, threats, terrors, or by any like means whatsoever, have acquiesced to be baptized—since their will by those modes has been induced to assent—are truly baptized; and therefore they can afterwards be compelled to the observance of the Christian Religion, just as the Fourth Council of Toledo wills (can. 55), with these words: "But those who long ago have been forced to come to Christianity, since now it is established that they have been associated to the divine sacraments, it is fitting that they be compelled also to hold the faith which they received by force or necessity."

§ 39. On this question there exists a rescript of Innocent III (Cap. Majores, Extra, De baptismo et ejus effectu), where he refutes the opinion of those who say that not only to the sleeping, but also to the unwilling and contradicting, the sacraments are conferred as to the character; this objection he first refutes, namely, that those who had been immersed unwilling and resisting would, at least by reason of the sacrament, pertain to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whence, for preserving the rule of the Christian Faith, they would be reasonably compelled—which is contrary to the Christian Religion, that someone be compelled. Then he thus resolves the very question: "Wherefore some not inaptly distinguish between unwilling and not unwilling, coerced and not coerced, that he who is violently drawn by terrors and punishments, and lest he incur harm receives the sacrament of Baptism—such a one, just as he who comes to Baptism with pretence, receives the character of Christianity imprinted; he himself, as conditionally willing, although absolutely he does not will, is to be

compelled to the observance of the Christian Faith. In which case the decree of the Council of Toledo must be understood. And below: But he who never consents, but altogether contradicts, receives neither the thing nor the character of the sacrament, because to contradict expressly is more than in no way to consent: just as neither does he incur the mark of any guilt who, contradicting and loudly crying out, is compelled by violence to burn incense to idols. But the sleeping and the insane, if before they incurred insanity or fell asleep they had persisted in contradiction—because in them the purpose of contradiction is understood to endure—if they should have been immersed thus, do not receive the character of the sacrament; otherwise, however, if previously they had been catechumens, they would have had the purpose of being baptized. Whence such persons in a case of necessity the Church is wont to baptize. Therefore the operation of the sacrament imprints the character when it does not find the obstacle of a contrary will standing in the way." So far the words of the decree.

§ 40. On whose authority especially the Scholastic Doctors rely, in order to teach that intention, or—as Innocent speaks—the purpose of receiving Baptism is necessary. Whence St. Thomas (q. 68, a. 7, ad 2) says: "If to an adult there were lacking the intention of receiving the sacrament, he must be re-baptized." In like manner he teaches (a. 12, ad 3). The same is the doctrine of Scotus and Durandus on this Distinction, and likewise of St. Bonaventure writing both on the present Distinction and on the sixth of this book. Some, however, on account of the final clause of the said decree, deny that such an intention is necessary, thinking it enough if the sacrament does not find the obstacle of a contrary or actually repugnant will. Whence Cajetan thinks an indifference of will suffices, of the sort which is in an unbelieving man asleep, who has never heard anything about the Baptism of Christians. But this opinion, first of all, is overturned by Innocent's reasoning—that one who had been unwilling and resisting, if he had been immersed, would at least have received the sacramental character. Which, assuredly, cannot be said of an unbelieving man baptized while sleeping without any consent of his own. Then Innocent, by other words of that same Rescript of his, quite plainly requires the consent and the purpose of receiving Baptism. Wherefore the last clause must be filled out from the preceding, and, the negation being understood, the opposite affirmation must be supplied—namely, "not a repugnant will," but a consenting one, albeit not by an act.

§ XI — The refutation of certain objections (Quarumdam objectionum dilutio)

§ 41. Against this doctrine a few things are commonly brought forward in opposition. First, what St. Augustine says in Tractate 26 on John: "A man can receive the sacrament unwilling, he cannot believe unless willing."⁵⁰ Second, that in the same work, book 7 (Against the Donatists, ch. 53), he is in doubt about the man who receives Baptism in mimicry or as a jester, whether he is truly baptized, and he seems to incline rather to the affirmative side.⁵¹ Third, that in the same work, book 4 (Confessions, ch. 4), he reports concerning a certain friend of his that, when he belonged to the Manichaean sect and, in a deadly illness, lay without sense and was despaired of by the doctors, he was baptized by the Catholics who were present; as soon as he came to himself, by the power of the Baptism which he had received not knowing it, he was made truly faithful and Catholic, renounced his former error, and a little after departed this life.⁵² Fourth, that the Council of Florence (in the Decree prescribed for the Armenians) requires, for the perfection of each sacrament, besides the matter, only the intention of the minister, with no mention made of the recipient's intention.⁵³

§ 42. But to these we answer thus. The first statement of Augustine does not treat of him who is compelled by mere force, but of him who, induced by fear or threats, receives Baptism, in the way in which certain men are sometimes forced to attend the Church or sacred sermons; for even that example is set down there by Augustine. But those who are thus compelled are not altogether unwilling, nor do they lack the intention of receiving the sacrament—as above was shown.

§ 43. To the second: Augustine declares that the man who deceitfully receives the sacrament does truly receive it, by these words: "Those truthful ones among whom the action is carried on avail more to confirm the sacrament than those deceitful ones, by whom it is carried on, avail to frustrate it, in whom the action is being carried on." And yet, "if afterwards it is disclosed, no one repeats it; but either by excommunication that simulation is punished, or by penance it is healed." And a little after: "I do not doubt that even those have Baptism who, although they receive it deceitfully, nevertheless receive it in the Church, or where it is thought to be the Church by those in whose fellowship it is received."⁵¹ Yet in these statements Augustine understands "deceitful" not with respect to the Baptism itself but to the preparation—namely him whom we are wont to call "feigned"—about whom Innocent does not doubt to pronounce that he receives the character.⁴³ But as to Baptism given and received in mimicry or in jest, Augustine there settles nothing. Which nevertheless, after the matter has been more carefully weighed, seems to be to be determined concerning the recipient by parity of reason in the same way as it has been defined concerning the giver.

§ 44. To the third place one can reply, that in him who was thus baptized not knowing it, at some earlier time the will to receive Baptism had appeared, as St. Thomas thinks.⁵⁴ Which reply, however, if it is judged less probable, because Augustine—just as his following words indicate—thought that he would have derided Baptism which he had received with mind and sense most entirely absent; and because the Manichaeans, as Augustine witnesses,⁵⁵ deny that Baptism is necessary for salvation, nor do they baptize any of their own—one will be able to reply as follows: namely, that God in an extraordinary way and outside the common law of His institution then wrought something, to wit, that such a one, who had neither asked for Baptism nor was imbued with sound faith, by the application of the mystical washing should be truly baptized, and, moreover, be endowed with right faith and the renovation of mind—since otherwise it is certain that adults do not receive the fruit of Baptism except as they approach with faith and sincere conversion of mind. Wherefore one must confess that in this adult man there happened wondrously and singularly that which, by the common law, we believe to be done in little children, to whom by Baptism even faith itself and good will are infused. Unless perchance one say that his heart, secretly in that illness before he was baptized, had been wrought by God in such wise that both he from his heart desired Baptism and he looked upon the light of the Catholic Faith, although by reason of the violence of the disease he could indicate it to no one. A manifest and not dissimilar example to this is also extant in the Martyrology on the twenty-fifth day of August, of a stage-player changed on the spot into another man and soon made a martyr; but, as is commonly said, the privileges of a few do not make a common law.⁵⁶

§ 45. To the last we reply, that the Council of Florence wished to deliver only those things which, in general, are required for the substance of all the sacraments. But now it is evident that the intention of the recipient is not everywhere necessary, as in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and in the Baptism and Confirmation of infants. Otherwise, indeed, it is always and in all cases necessary. Hence this doctrine concerning the intention of the recipient is similarly to be accommodated to the other sacraments—one only, the sacrament of the Eucharist, excepted—but most of all to those which imprint a character, for the

attainment of which, on the part of the recipient, the aforesaid intention alone suffices. Conduce also to the explication of this doctrine the things which, in Distinction 1, were said about the intention of the minister of the sacraments.⁵⁷

§ XII — Of those who feignedly or unworthily receive Baptism (De iis qui ficte seu indigne baptismum suscipiunt)

§ 46. When it is asked whether and when he receives the effect of Baptism who has approached feignedly (*fictē*), "feigned" is said not of him who shows himself willing to receive that which is given in the Church, yet in reality does not intend to receive it. For this man does not even receive the character of the sacrament, but rather of him who outwardly behaves as though duly disposed to receive the fruit of the sacrament—namely by faith and sincere conversion of mind—while yet in that way he is not disposed, inasmuch as either he does not yet hold the faith, or he still stands in the affection of mortal sin. A man of this sort is said to approach the sacrament of Baptism unworthily (*indigne*), although "approaching unworthily" extends more widely, because a wicked man who simulates nothing but openly professes that he is unwilling to leave his evil life, approaches unworthily, not by faith.

§ 47. But if such a "feigned" one be baptized, without doubt he receives the character—as is established from the preceding chapter—but on account of the impediment of unbelief or of an evil will he does not receive Grace and the remission of sins, just as the Master rightly proves in the text.⁵⁹ It is therefore asked when such a one, afterwards converted, obtains the effect of Baptism: whether immediately upon the departure of the feigning by a sincere conversion, or by the sacrament of reconciliation.

§ 48. And, first, it can seem that simply he cannot obtain the effect of Baptism, because, by the ordinary law of God, the effect of Baptism is not given except in the Baptism itself; and since that cannot be repeated, it seems impossible that someone should afterwards obtain its fruit which, when he was baptized, he did not obtain.

§ 49. But that immediately upon the removal of the feigning we obtain the effect, seems to be proved from Augustine, book 1 Against the Donatists, ch. 12, where he says thus: "As in the case of him who had approached deceitfully, it happens that he is not again baptized, but by that very pious correction and true confession he is cleansed—which he could not be without Baptism—so that what was given before then begins to avail to salvation, when that feigning by true confession has departed," and so forth.⁶⁰ Which words, more according to their sense than to the letter, are also read in Gratian (On Consecration, Distinction 4, the chapter *Tunc valere*), and likewise in the Master in the text, although the Gloss on the Decretum holds that the effect is to be attributed not to the Baptism which has now passed, but to contrition of heart.⁶¹

§ 50. The same opinion is favored by what, in the same place, is read in Gratian, the chapter *Ab antiqua*, from Gregory; for there the Pontiff attests that it has flowed from the ancient institution of the Fathers that those who have been baptized in heresy should be recalled to the bosom of Mother Church either by the anointing of chrism, or by the imposition of the hand, or by the sole profession of the faith. And he subjoins forthwith: "Because the holy Baptism which they have obtained among heretics then receives in them the powers of cleansing, when those either by the imposition of the hand have received the Holy Spirit, or these, on account of the confession of the true faith, have been united to the bowels of the Holy Universal Church."⁶²

§ 51. Again, Augustine, book 5 *Against the Donatists*, ch. 13, writing about Baptism received in heresy or schism, says: "Then the same Baptism begins to avail for the remission of sins, when they shall have come to the peace of the Church; not that sins already remitted should not be retained, nor that that Baptism, as though alien or other, should be disproved or be delivered otherwise, but that there the same [Baptism], which for discord was working death outside, for peace should work salvation within." And in book 6, ch. 25: "God Himself sanctifies His sacrament, so that to a man—whether before he is baptized, or when he is baptized, or afterwards at some time when he truly is converted to Himself—that same thing may avail to salvation which would have availed to destruction if he were not converted."⁶³

§ 52. To this there is added a reason. For Baptism is, as it were, regeneration proper and natural to it, unless something stand in the way; which obstacle having been removed, he will straightway obtain the same effect—just as a stone, all the while it is being generated, is moved downward, unless something external impede it, which afterwards, being taken away, it will straightway fall. So he who receives Baptism obtains grace either in the Baptism itself, or, if feigning impede, as soon as it has been removed by true conversion.

§ 53. Likewise Baptism is properly instituted for the blotting out of original sin, as Augustine in the *Enchiridion* (ch. 64) and the Council of Florence (in the Decree given for the Armenians) testify; nor have the Fathers ever ascribed that effect to any other sacrament of the New Law. Since, therefore, original sin in an adult is not remitted without actual sins, it seems consequent that it is not by penance, but by Baptism, that, feigning being removed, the remission of all is made.⁶⁴

§ 54. However, on behalf of the opposite opinion, the following can be adduced. Augustine, book 1 *Against the Donatists*, ch. 12, seems to refer the effect of Baptism, frustrated by feigning, to the sacrament of reconciliation. For he says that then Baptism profits such a man unto remission of sins, when, being reconciled, he is stripped of the sacrilege of dissension. And, after the words above brought forward for the other side, he thus continues and subjoins: "So also this man, who has received the Baptism of Christ in some heresy or schism, when he has corrected himself and has come to the society and unity of the Church, is not to be baptized again; because by that very reconciliation and peace it is granted, that unto the remission of his sins what could not profit in schism, now in unity begins to profit." In which place Augustine seems by the name of "reconciliation and peace" to designate the sacrament of absolution.⁶⁰

§ 55. Another place is book 7 *Against the Donatists*, ch. 53: "If afterwards it is disclosed" (namely that someone had approached Baptism deceitfully), "no one repeats it; but either by excommunication that simulation is punished, or by penance it is healed." Where again he seems to understand that penance which heals by virtue of the keys, because he makes mention of excommunication, which likewise is done by the power of the keys.⁵¹

§ 56. And it seems able also to be proved by reason. For no mortal sin after Baptism is remitted except by the sacrament of Penance—especially if that sin was committed in Baptism, or even after Baptism. But the feigning both was at the time of Baptism and, after Baptism, for some time remained; the remission of these does not seem to be to be hoped for except from the sacrament of Penance.

§ 57. That a probable reply may be offered to this question, a distinction must be made among the sins to which a man baptized is liable, at that time when he lays aside the feigning and begins sincerely to be converted to God. For some indeed preceded Baptism, such as original and some actual sins; others, however, were either

conjoined with Baptism or followed it, such as the feigning, and, if any, other sins that afterwards were committed.

§ 58. First of all, therefore, it seems one must say that such a man does not receive the effect of Baptism, that is, the remission of sins together with the renewal by Grace, except in the very sacrament of Penance, for the reasons set out above. For not one mortal sin is remitted without the other; nor can that which was committed after Baptism be remitted by virtue of Baptism. Nevertheless, in the very sacramental absolution certain sins are remitted by virtue of the Baptism previously received; namely those which had preceded Baptism; for then the impediment is taken away which was preventing their remission—namely the guilt of feigning and of the rest committed afterwards.

§ 59. Whence also those are not necessarily to be confessed to the priest, nor is satisfaction to be enjoined for them; because they are perfectly remitted both as to punishment and as to fault. But others, that is, whatever things followed after Baptism, are remitted by virtue of the keys through the absolution of the priest. Whence both the feigning itself and the sins afterwards committed are to be disclosed to the priest by confession, and for them a fitting satisfaction is to be imposed.

§ 60. In this way, therefore, both the authorities and the reasons brought on either side can be reconciled. For Augustine does not say that, immediately upon the departure of the feigning, Baptism works in the man the remission of sins; but that this happens "through true confession": whereby, namely, disclosing to the minister of the Church the sin of his feigning, he asks to be admitted to peace and reconciliation. But that Augustine ascribes that whole remission to the virtue of Baptism—this must be taken in that sense in which elsewhere that same man attributes every subsequent renovation to Baptism; of which matter we have spoken in its place. And Gregory speaks about the solemn ceremony by which those returning from heresy or schism are wont to be received—which was not one and the same observed among all—and without which they could not be reconciled to God by penance. Nor, finally, does it stand in the way that Baptism does not then exist when there is that remission of preceding sins; because Baptism, since it operates not by a virtue existing, but by assistance, can cooperate to the effect, after it has ceased to be, in its own mode—that is, as an efficacious sign—especially since it has not altogether passed away, but remains according to something, namely according to the character, about which now something must be added.

§ XIII — That the character of Baptism is indelible and how it is defined (Baptismi characterem esse indelebilem & quomodo definiatur)

§ 61. When, above, we were treating about the sacraments in general, we showed that there are certain sacraments imprinting a character, of which the first is Baptism; in which place also, from Councils and the Fathers and most of all from Augustine, we produced testimonies whereby this very point is confirmed peculiarly of Baptism. This sacramental effect, moreover, we proved by both authority and reason not to be able to be lost as renewing and sanctifying Grace can be, but to be perpetual and indelible. And this is to be understood in such wise, that by no crime, no impiety, no defection, nay indeed not after this life, even in the damned themselves, is this spiritual sign once imprinted upon the soul ever blotted out. For as the royal stamp impressed upon coin remains, even among enemies and foreigners and farthest removed from the King; so the sign of Christ, impressed upon the rational soul by Baptism, remains even in those who, the camp of Christ left and the faith denied, are held under the power of the Devil. Augustine uses this likeness (book 2 Against

the Epistle of Parmenian, ch. 13), as well as another from the military character, thus subjoining: "Or perhaps the Christian sacraments are of less avail than these bodily marks? since we see that even apostates do not lack Baptism, to whom, assuredly, when by penance they return, it is not restored; therefore it is judged not to be able to be lost."⁶⁶

§ 62. The same, book 1 On Marriage and Concupiscence, ch. 10, using another likeness drawn from the conjugal bond: "Among the living," he says, "a certain conjugal bond remains, which neither separation nor union with another is able to remove. It remains, however, unto the guilt of the crime, not unto the bond of the covenant; so also the apostate soul possesses the sacrament of faith which it received in the laver of regeneration. For it would undoubtedly be restored to the one returning, if, departing, it had lost it; but it has this if it shall have withdrawn—to the heaping up of punishment, not to the merit of reward." In which words it is to be noted that Augustine says that, "by the laver of regeneration," the "sacrament of faith" is received; which expression will seem inept, unless by the "sacrament of faith" we understand something distinct from the laver of regeneration itself, namely the character remaining after the laver is past. For he does not mean that the laver itself remains and never perishes—which is known to be false—but a certain effect of the laver, which he here designates by the name of "sacrament."

§ 63. If you ask what the character of Baptism is: we briefly reply, according to the things which not long ago were said about the sacramental character in general, that the character of Baptism is a certain spiritual power (*potestas*) unto the participation of those things which are common to the whole people of the faithful; by which, as by a mark, a man is recognized as a citizen of the Church and is distinguished from strangers. For this character is compared with the right of citizenship, that is, with that which all have who are enrolled into some city; by which right they are made partakers of all the goods and privileges of that city. This formal character of the baptismal character is indicated by Dionysius in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (ch. 2, part 3), where he says that God "in a certain sign hands over His participation to the one approaching to Baptism, perfecting him as divine and a communicator of divine things."⁶⁷

§ 64. Yet it does not seem precisely right to define it thus, that it is a power for receiving the other sacraments of the Church; both because also to certain other things this power extends; and because, even if perhaps besides Baptism no other sacraments had been instituted in the Church, nevertheless Baptism would still imprint a character.

§ XIV — Baptism is not to be repeated (Baptismus non esse iterandum)

§ 65. It is common to all the sacraments (*sacramenta*) that imprint a character (*character*) that they cannot be repeated in the same subject. The most cogent reason for this must be sought from the very character: for if any one of such sacraments were to be repeated, an injury would be done to the character, and therefore to the sacrament itself, as though the mark impressed by the sacrament could be blotted out by the malice of men. This argument, taken from the character, is handed down by the Fathers in the Council of Florence.⁵³ Another reason, indicated in the same place from St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, and St. Gregory, is that these sacraments are given by a certain consecration (*consecratio*); but it is unlawful that the consecration of the same thing to the same end be repeated, since a thing once consecrated to God, from the very nature of its consecration, remains such perpetually and ought so to remain without any man's retraction—just as also St. Thomas teaches.⁶⁹

§ 66. Besides these common reasons, there are others peculiar to Baptism (*Baptismus*). First: as generation is one and cannot be repeated, so also regeneration. Whence St. Augustine, Tractate 11 on John, on that word of Nicodemus, "Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb?" says: "I am already born of Adam; Adam cannot beget me again. I am already born of Christ; Christ cannot beget me again. As the womb cannot be found again, so Baptism." And Tractate 12: "Spiritual regeneration is one, as carnal regeneration is one." And elsewhere: "We are born once, we are reborn once."⁷⁰

§ 67. Second: Baptism in Christ is nothing other than a likeness of the death of Christ, as Augustine attests;⁷¹ and it is proved from the Apostle in Romans 6, saying: "Do you not know that all we who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized in His death? For we are buried together with Him through Baptism into death, that, as Christ has risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life." But now, as the Apostle says in the same place, "Christ, rising again from the dead, dies now no more: death shall no longer have dominion over Him"; and as Peter says in the First Epistle, "Christ once died for our sins"; and the same judgment is to be made of His burial and resurrection; therefore only once through Baptism can we die with Christ and be buried with Him and rise together with Him.⁷² Considering this argument, the Apostle in Hebrews 6 says: "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened," that is, baptized, "to be renewed again unto repentance," that is, to be baptized, "crucifying again to themselves the Son of God and making Him a public example," namely by the very repetition of Baptism.⁷³ But if you object against this argument that the sacrament and sacrifice of the Eucharist also have a certain likeness of the Passion and death of Christ, since the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 11: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall announce the death of the Lord until He come," and that nevertheless the reception of it is frequent even among the same persons—I reply that this sacrifice represents the death of Christ absolutely, and indeed in such a manner that that representation is ordered to the commemoration of the Lord's death and to thanksgiving, which ought to be frequent and daily, and therefore it is most rightly frequented. But by Baptism the death of Christ is not represented absolutely, but inasmuch as He suffered it once, and afterwards rose to a blessed life, no more to die. Moreover, it is represented not in an image or in a sacrifice but in ourselves, who therefore are said through Baptism to die with Christ. Whence also the Apostle took material for exhortation, showing that he who has once been baptized and by Baptism has died to sin ought no more to fall back into the old servitude, but henceforth to walk in newness of life.

§ 68. A third reason is that original sin, once contracted and deleted, is never recalled; therefore neither ought the remedy properly instituted for its deletion to be repeated. A fourth: Circumcision could not be repeated; therefore neither Baptism, of which that was the figure.

§ 69. Moreover, the most certain proof of this doctrine is from the perpetual tradition of the Church, confirmed by the unanimous consent of the Fathers and the authority of Councils—so much so that the repetition of Baptism once conferred has always been held as a kind of sacrilege, as is to be seen in Gratian,⁷⁴ and it was even punished by the laws of princes with capital penalty, as is evident in the Code of Justinian.⁷⁵ For the sacred canons too, in detestation of so great a crime, set the penalty of irregularity both for those rebaptized and for those who rebaptize. Augustine also testifies that, by a certain hidden inspiration of God, men everywhere detest Anabaptism; whence it comes about that, as formerly the Donatists for this crime were held abominable to the whole Church, so today also the Anabaptists, for a like sacrilege—although proceeding from a different error—are most vehemently hated not only by Catholics but even by the heretics of other sects.⁷⁶ The impiety of this thing has sometimes been laid bare by a divine miracle. For Socrates

relates that when a certain Jew, who had previously been baptized, again approached Baptism, the water suddenly vanished from the bishop's hands, and then the bishop, understanding the matter from the sign, declared to him that he had received Baptism unawares.⁷⁷

§ 70. If anyone should require Scriptures for proof, besides the places above indicated (Heb. 6; Rom. 6), these too can be brought forward: Ephesians 4, "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism"; John 13, "He who is washed, has no need but that he wash his feet"; Hebrews 10, "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains now no sacrifice for sins." For these Scriptures—and especially that which is in the Epistle to the Ephesians—the Fathers are often read to have used for the assertion of this dogma: for instance Augustine, Tractates 56 and 57 on John, Book 2 Against the Donatists, ch. 14, and in the book On Heresies, ch. 7; and Leo, Letters 37 and 39; and Hugh, book 2, part 6, ch. 13 of On the Sacraments, where he says that by this authority (Eph. 4) all without exception make their case.⁷⁸

§ 71. Nor does it weaken the force of this proof that Faith, although it also is said by the Apostle to be one, can nevertheless be lost and recovered again and again. For "one" is said of faith in a different way than of Baptism: of faith, by reason of its object—as was explained above, Distinction 23 of book 3—but of Baptism, by reason of itself, in that by it one is consecrated to the Christian religion and is enrolled as a citizen of the Church of God, which kind of act does not admit repetition. Whence it must also be acknowledged that Baptism repeated is not Baptism, because a man once baptized is no longer capable of receiving Baptism—just as bread once consecrated cannot be consecrated again, and as a thing once given to someone cannot be given to the same person again, unless the donation made on his part had been rendered void, which indeed in the present matter has no place.

§ XV — Whether those are to be baptized, when their Baptism is doubtful (Utrum baptizandi, de quorum baptismo dubitatur)

§ 72. It is wont to be asked whether those are to be baptized about whom there is a doubt whether they were ever baptized. To have such men baptized is urged by the necessity of the sacrament (*sacramenti necessitas*), without which one does not attain to salvation. Not to have them baptized, however, is counseled by the danger of sacrilege, lest perchance what has once been given be repeated. In answer to this question Leo says,⁸⁰ "First of all we must provide that, while we are holding to a certain appearance of caution, we do not fall into harm to souls that are to be regenerated." And presently: "Therefore, since neither he himself is able to attest that he has been baptized, nor can another attest concerning him what he does not know to have been consecrated, there is nothing wherein sin can creep in." And finally he concludes that that cannot come into the crime of repetition which is altogether unknown to have been done; although the Pontiff wishes that, before such a one is baptized, there be first a careful examination, and that for a long time inquiry be made (unless perhaps there is imminent danger of death) whether there is absolutely no one who can by his testimony help the ignorance of the one who does not know. There is another passage in the same author,⁸¹ "If there are no indications among relatives or acquaintances, none among clerics or neighbors, by which those about whom the question is made may be shown to have been baptized, one must proceed that they be reborn, lest they plainly perish. In such cases, what is not shown to have been done, reason does not allow to be judged as repeated." These are read in Gratian,⁸² and Innocent III thinks the same,⁸³ where again this

reason is added: because that is not understood to be repeated which is doubted to have been done; nor is the sacrament judged ill, since the thing is excluded not by contempt of religion but by a point of necessity.

§ 73. Afterwards, however, the Church found a more practical counsel in a case of doubt of this sort, when she ordered that such persons be baptized not absolutely but under a condition, as is contained in the Decretals "On Baptism and its effect," where Alexander III thus decreed: "Those about whom it is doubtful whether they have been baptized are to be baptized with these words prefixed: 'If you are baptized, I do not baptize you; but if you are not yet baptized, I baptize you in the name of the Father,' etc."⁸⁴ And this decree of the Pontiff is observed to this very day in the perpetual practice of the Church.

§ 74. Here, however, it must be known that not any slight suspicion to the contrary, or scruple, ought to suffice for this, that someone be baptized in this way under a condition; but a probable doubt is required, as is evident from the passages of Leo and Innocent cited above. Now that doubt is probable which, even after diligent investigation has been made, cannot be resolved, so that not even moral certitude of the fact can be had.

§ 75. Therefore blameworthy is the custom of certain persons who, everywhere and without discrimination, have infants, whom midwives had baptized because of danger to life, baptized again under condition, having no other cause for doubting than that the woman may perhaps have failed in intention, or may have erred in pronouncing the words—whereas the midwife, when questioned, is bound to affirm that she duly performed the whole mystery. Against which abuse write gravely Domingo Soto,⁸⁵ Peter of Palude,⁸⁶ and Silvester.⁸⁷

§ XVI — That Baptism is necessary for salvation for all (Baptismum esse omnibus ad salutem necessarium)

§ 76. Since the remission of sins (*remissio peccatorum*), and especially of original sin (*peccatum originale*), and regeneration (*regeneratio*) into spiritual life are absolutely necessary (*necessaria*) for salvation to all men, it follows that Baptism also, once it was instituted and promulgated, is necessary for all, inasmuch as those effects do not befall without Baptism. But that Baptism is necessary for regeneration and therefore for salvation the Lord attests (Jn. 3), saying: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei." The Catholic Church has always understood this sentence of the Lord about the water-Baptism and its necessity, and has taught that it is to be understood by perpetual observance: for she, with maternal solicitude, has always taken care that this sacrament, as necessary for salvation, be administered to all, nor has she held as Christians those who had not been initiated by it. Whence Fulgentius (*De fide ad Petrum*, ch. 3) says: "Ex isto tempore, quo Salvator noster dixit: Si quis renatus non fuerit, etc., absque sacramento Baptismatis nec regnum caelorum potest quisquam accipere, nec vitam aeternam"; and again (chs. 27, 30) he repeats the same doctrine.⁸⁹ Gennadius likewise has set it down among the Ecclesiastical Dogmata (ch. 74).⁹⁰ Moreover those places of St. Augustine can be noted: Tracts 11 and 12 on John; Epistle 57; Book 1, To Simplicianus, question 22; Book 4 Against the Donatists on Baptism, ch. 21, and Book 6, ch. 12; the book On the Merits and Remission of Sins, chs. 16, 20, 22, 29, 30, and again Book 2, ch. 27; Book 3 On the Origin of the Soul, ch. 11; and Sermon 14 On the Words of the Apostle.⁹¹ Likewise St. Jerome (*Against Vigilantius*), Leo (Epistle 92), Bernard (Epistle 77 to Hugh), and Gratian (in the Decretum, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, the chapters *Filius*, *Non dubito*, and *Nulla praeter c.*); and other places of the Fathers almost without number.⁹²

§ 77. But the Church long ago condemned the Manichees, who thought contrary to this, saying that Baptism in water brings no salvation to anyone. This error, among others, Augustine ascribes to them (Heresy 46).⁵⁵ Afterwards John Wyclif revived it, interpreting Christ's sentence not of material but of spiritual water, as in this age Calvin does; as Thomas of Walden relates of him, Tome 2 (On the Sacraments, ch. 101).⁹³ We refuted that absurdity above, when we treated of the matter of this sacrament. The Pelagians too were condemned on this account, namely because they promised eternal life—even if outside the Kingdom of heaven—to infants not baptized, as is in Augustine, On the Merits and Remission of Sins, Book 1, ch. 20, and elsewhere.⁹⁴ And the perpetual sense of the Church on the necessity of Baptism has been sealed for us by two Councils: Florence (in the Decree for the Armenians) and Trent (Session 6, chs. 4 and 7; and De Baptismo, canon 1).⁹⁵

§ 78. Furthermore the Lord Himself, giving the reason for His sentence: "Quod natum est," says He, "ex carne, caro est; et quod natum est ex Spiritu, spiritus est," as if He were saying: Since every man is born from Adam carnal and liable to sin, but spiritual and just—and therefore he cannot be made safe—unless he be reborn through the Holy Spirit, since indeed flesh cannot make itself spiritual, it remains that one flee for refuge to that aid by which the Holy Spirit has determined, and without which He is unwilling to make men spiritual. But this is the laver of water. Wherefore it follows that each one must be reborn of the Holy Spirit through water. Whence the Lord—although He was the one who would baptize in the Holy Spirit—yet both before the Passion sent the Apostles to baptize in water, and after the Passion gave them the universal mandate, saying: "Euntes baptizate omnes gentes"; and again: "Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit." And Paul (Eph. 5) bears witness that Christ cleanses His whole Church "lavacro aquae in verbo." And Peter, writing to all the faithful (1 Pet. 3): "Quod et vos nunc similis forma salvos facit baptisma"—for no one had salvation outside the ark.⁹⁶

§ 79. Now since there is a twofold necessity (*necessitas*), one of the end (*finis*), the other of the precept (*praeceptum*); and now that it has been shown that Baptism is necessary for the end, that is, for obtaining salvation, there can be a question whether Baptism also obliges all mortals by necessity of precept. To which we reply that here too the necessity of precept is plainly to be acknowledged, which necessity is sufficiently expressed in the aforesaid passages of Scripture (Jn. 3; Matt. last; Mk. last). For if it has been sufficiently shown that Baptism is necessary by necessity of the end, it is rightly inferred that a precept also has been given to all to receive it, since all are bound to seek that end. And assuredly St. Thomas (q. 63, a. 1) uses no other proof to teach that Baptism is of precept, than that each one is bound to that without which he cannot obtain salvation.⁹⁷ By this reasoning it must be confessed that all are by precept held to accept and to hold the Faith and the Religion and the Doctrine of Christ, because without them men cannot be saved.

§ 80. Nevertheless, in this place one must call back to memory what, in the preceding Distinction when we treated of the obligation of this precept, we admonished: that it is the nature of a positive law (*lex positiva*) to oblige no one unless it be promulgated. Wherefore whosoever labor under invincible ignorance of this law—as those to whom nothing was ever announced concerning Christ; and those who are altogether incapable of law, as infants and the insane—are thus far excused that they are not punished as transgressors of this precept; yet not in such wise that they do not perish on account of their own sins, from which, without this remedy divinely instituted, they cannot be delivered. For the present, let the authority of Bernard suffice for a proof of this, who (Epistle 77 to Hugh) most clearly bears witness that the Lord's sentence in John 3 was a

positive precept, which nevertheless did not at once bind all, but began to bind little by little as knowledge of it increased.⁹⁸

§ XVII — That baptism at least in desire is necessary for all (Quod baptismus saltem in voto sit omnibus necessarius)

§ 81. For all adults, this sacrament (*sacramentum*), namely baptism (*baptismus*), is so necessary that either, when it can be had, it must be actually received, or, when it cannot be had, it must be had by its expressed desire (*votum*) and longing; otherwise no one attains salvation. And this is common to this sacrament with Penance in regard to those who have relapsed. There are three places in the Council of Trent in which this is openly taught. For (Session 6, ch. 4) it is defined that, once the Gospel has been promulgated, the justification of a man cannot take place without the laver of regeneration or its desire, according to what is said: "Unless one be born again," etc.¹⁰⁰ And in canon 4 On the Sacraments in general, those are anathematized who say that men can, without the sacraments or the desire of them, by faith alone obtain from God the grace of justification.¹⁰¹ Likewise in Session 14 (ch. 4) they teach that a reconciliation which sometimes occurs before the sacrament has been actually received is not to be ascribed to contrition (*contritio*) without the desire of the sacrament—by which desire it is included.¹⁰² From which two things are gathered: first, that by the desire of Baptism or of Penance without the sacraments an adult man cannot obtain the effect of the sacraments; second, that nevertheless the sacrament itself is necessary for salvation unless necessity excludes it; so that, when one's will is counted as the deed, it is not to be thought on that account alone that the sacrament of Baptism is superfluous (and the same judgment holds of the sacrament of Penance with respect to those relapsed), since neither can it be despised nor neglected, just as neither can the sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction be despised or neglected.

§ 82. That the desire of Baptism suffices for salvation is confirmed by the common sense of the Church and by tradition. A singular opinion, however, appears in this place to be that of certain men concerning Baptism and about the agent, as is commonly insinuated by the Theologians when they argue this question about contrition informed by perfect charity (*caritas perfecta*) and whether within it the desire of the sacrament is included. For Baptism is necessary by a necessity of means for those not yet born again, and Penance for those fallen after Baptism; each sacrament, indeed, is necessary by a necessity of means—namely, Baptism for the unregenerate and Penance for the lapsed after receiving Baptism. Our author here reports expressly the words of the Council: it also teaches (says the holy Synod) that a man is reconciled to God, before—when this happens—that reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the desire of the sacrament, by which it is included. From which doctrine it is handed down that a man becomes just, pleasing to God, and therefore justified, not without the desire of the sacrament, which desire is counted as the sacrament, either because he would receive it, or because he has explicitly the faith of it; or else because the will of being baptized is counted as Baptism. Yet that this comes from the divine mercy involves some difficulty. For that contrition, whether of one to be baptized or of one doing penance, makes a man just by God's covenant and ordinance; therefore it is not for that reason said to be the benignity only of God's mercy. Furthermore, it is certain that a catechumen becomes just and holy, and to him sins are forgiven, as was praised above; since if contrition itself receives the sacrament of Penance, why in the case of Baptism, if the act of contrition informed by charity is elicited, should not the same follow? And indeed, about this matter one must by no means doubt after the constitutions of the Supreme Pontiffs St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, in

which, among the rest, the propositions of Michael Baius are proscribed; such is number 33, in which he taught that a catechumen lives justly and rightly and holily and keeps the commandments of God and fulfills the law, and yet that the remission of sins, which by the first laver is at length received, is not obtained beforehand—wherefore he is branded as guilty of perverse doctrine. Of the same tenor is proposition 32. In these Baius taught that charity is necessary indeed; but he taught it so to be necessary that, as though the commandment of God were observed and the law fulfilled by one not yet washed in the laver, it is by Baptism only at length received. The same are condemned in that bull as erroneous.

§ 83. But whether it is necessary in suchwise that, when it can be had, it must altogether be received, under peril of eternal salvation; and, when it cannot be had, it must be expressly desired and by desire received—this must not be written of the other sacraments. For although a promise of salvation has been made to an invocation, according to that: "Everyone who shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Joel 2), and that: "Everyone who asks, receives" (Matt. 7), nevertheless, because of the explicit ordinance of God which requires water, when water cannot be had, the invocation must respond to that necessity, whereby it is asked that God deign to supply that defect by His mercy—that is, that He vouchsafe to grant in that necessity, without the sacrament, what by His ordinance He grants through the sacrament. Therefore, when Baptism cannot be had, and yet it is desired, that expression is rightly used: The will is accounted as the deed, inasmuch as the deed is excluded by necessity. Yet this is not to be taken as though the will—or desire—of receiving the sacrament were to include in itself the force of the sacrament, that is, as though it were to procure of itself the effect of the sacrament in the way in which the sacrament itself, if it were applied, works its effect. For it avails not from the work worked (*ex opere operato*), but from the work of the worker (*ex opere operantis*); the desire of the sacrament is not to be reckoned as the work of the work worked, namely of Baptism, but as something else, to which the divine mercy, so to say, supplies in place of the work worked of the sacrament, namely of Baptism—provided, however, that for adults, when a necessity has intervened such that they cannot in very deed receive Baptism, both by the authority of the Fathers and by the agreement of all Theologians an expressed will is required, or an expressed desire; it does not suffice that the desire be merely included in contrition. For some allege as a reason that it is enough that the very desire of Baptism be comprehended in contrition, and that an expressed desire of Baptism is not required. Surely Baptism for the unregenerate and the sacrament of Penance for the lapsed is necessary by a necessity of means: namely, Baptism for the unregenerate; and yet the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 4) teaches that in contrition perfected by charity the desire of the sacrament is included. Therefore, even if sometimes this contrition happen to be perfected by charity before the sacrament of water be received, nevertheless the reconciliation itself, although it be included there, is not to be ascribed to it. Scripture too manifestly sets before us Cornelius the Centurion as a devout and God-fearing man; and yet he did not obtain Baptism before he finally received it at Peter's preaching; as St. Thomas also teaches in II-II, q. 10, a. 4 ad 3. Furthermore, what is here said by Augustine, that justification does not come from the nature of the thing or from the institution, but solely from the divine mercy, is to be understood as follows. For that contrition perfected by charity, as including the whole of conversion, suffices as the ultimate disposition unto justification, at least by the sole divine mercy supplying the defect of Baptism; if, indeed, remedies are to be supplied by mercy where there is no divine promise or pledge. That a man endowed with charity and eliciting an act of contrition before receiving Baptism should be justified and sins be forgiven—this, indeed, from a parity of formal character is clearly gathered from the Tridentine text, where it is said that by contrition perfected by charity the lapsed is reconciled after Baptism, before he receives the sacrament. Is the catechumen not also to be called justified before he receives, if he elicit such an act? And

indeed concerning this there ought not to be any doubt after the diploma of the Supreme Pontiffs St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, in which among others are condemned these propositions of Michael Baius, the thirty-third: that a catechumen lives justly and rightly and holily, and has charity and keeps God's commandments, and fulfills the law before obtaining the remission of sins, which is at length received in the first laver; and also number thirty-two, among which Baius taught charity to be necessary, but to be so necessary that he pronounced one who keeps the commandments of God and fulfills the law to be cleansed from sin only by the first laver. These propositions are condemned in the same diploma as savoring of a wicked dogma.¹⁰³

§ 84. Faith and prayer are also necessary. Therefore, that the will of Baptism be accounted as Baptism does not proceed from the nature of the thing, but from the mercy of God; who, on account of the faith and desire of the one seeking salvation, completes in necessity what is lacking on the part of the sacrament. But in those works in which not the work worked is regarded but the merit of the worker, the will—provided it be sufficiently great and efficacious—is for that reason accounted as the deed, because the whole formal ratio of merit is placed in the will, which can be as great without the deed as when joined to the deed, and sometimes even greater. In which works, therefore, that the will be accounted as the deed is due not to the mercy of God, but either to the nature and dignity of the thing, or at least to the original institution. This indeed is plain in evil works; for example, if someone altogether intended to kill a man and yet could not. Such a one will be punished not by immoderate severity of the law but by a just judgment as a murderer, inasmuch as he bears a soul not less imbued with malice than if he had perpetrated the murder in very deed, as we showed above (on Distinction 42 of Book 2). In this kind of works, therefore, that the will be accounted as the deed properly has its place, but not in those which avail only from the work worked, except inasmuch as the mercy of God invisibly supplies what could not be given by the visible work of the sacrament. And that supplement of divine mercy, when the will or desire of the visible sacrament is present, the Fathers understood to be at hand in necessity always.

§ 85. This is first proved from Cyprian, who (in the Epistle to Jubaianus), when he was teaching that Baptism conferred by heretics was null, and such a question was proposed to him: What, then, will be done with those who in past time, coming from heresy to the Church, were admitted without Baptism?—said: "The Lord is able by His mercy to grant indulgence, and not to separate from the gifts of His Church those who, simply admitted to the Church, have fallen asleep in the Church." If, therefore, Cyprian was persuaded of this about those who, without Baptism as he thought, had died, although in his opinion they had been baptized—and the same must be said of those who think that they themselves were baptized, even if in reality perhaps, through some error or malice of parents or of others upon whom that care devolved, or even of the baptizer himself, they were not baptized in infancy (for such persons so approve the Baptism which they believe they have received, that, if they knew they were not baptized, they would straightway seek it and wish to receive it)—much more surely would Cyprian have said this of those whom necessity excludes from Baptism when it is vehemently desired.

§ 86. But there is an even clearer testimony of this matter in Ambrose (in the funeral oration on the death of Valentinian), who had indeed sought Baptism but had delayed it for certain reasons, wishing to be baptized by Ambrose. Before he could reach him, he died on the journey. Of whom Ambrose, among other things, says: "I grieve in my womb, for him whom in the Gospel I was going to beget I have lost; but he did not lose the grace which he asked." And below: "I hear that you grieve because he did not receive the sacraments of Baptism. Tell me, what else is there to us but will, what but petition? And indeed he had long before this

desire, that he should be initiated before he had come into Italy; most recently he signified that he wished to be baptized by me. And therefore, among other reasons, he judged that I should be summoned. Has he not therefore the grace which he desired? Has he not that which he begged? And because he begged, has he received?" And where is that saying: "The just man, however he be prevented by death, his soul shall be in refreshment?" (Wisdom 4). And a little after: "If the martyrs are washed in their own blood, this man is washed by his own piety, that is, by his will." Finally, after many things, turning his speech to him he says: "Not any man, but Christ illuminated thee with spiritual grace. He baptized thee, because human offices failed thee. Thou hast obtained more, who didst believe that thou hadst lost the lesser."

§ 87. No less clear is the mind of Augustine, Book 3 (Against the Donatists, ch. 23): "I find," he says, "that not only the passion for the name of Christ can supply for that which was lacking from Baptism, but also faith and conversion of heart, if perchance, for celebrating the mystery of Baptism, succor cannot be had in the straits of times." And, the example of the Thief having been interposed, he says: "But then it is fulfilled invisibly when the mystery of Baptism is excluded, not by contempt of Religion but by a moment of necessity." He signified more openly (ch. 15 of the same book) that this supplement is to be understood as on the part of the mercy of God; where, after he had said that the salvation of man is completed by both, namely by Baptism and by conversion of heart, he subjoins thus: "Nor, if one of these be lacking, ought we therefore to think it follows that the other also is lacking: for that one can be without this in the infant, and this without that could be in the Thief—God supplying, whether in this one or in that one, what would not have been lacking by the will." See the same Augustine (Questions on Leviticus, q. 84). Moreover, in the age of Bernard, when someone asserted that, from the time of that saying, "Unless one be born again," etc., no one at all could be saved without the same sacrament actually and visibly received, or in its place martyrdom—even if he were to seek it with true faith and contrition of heart—Bernard, having been consulted about this matter by Hugh of St. Victor, thus replies (Epistle 77): "If someone shall have wished and sought to be baptized, but, being forestalled by the moment of death, perchance could not obtain it—provided right faith be not lacking to him, firm hope, sincere charity—I by no means could in any way despair of his salvation for want of that outward water, nor think faith empty, nor confound hope, nor cause charity to fail; only let it be that water is not contemned, but, as I said, sole impossibility forbids it." And then he confirms his judgment by the authority of Ambrose and Augustine, citing the places above set forth, and he subjoins thus: "From these two pillars I am hardly to be torn away, believing that by faith alone a man can be saved with the desire of receiving Baptism, if, however, death intervene before the pious desire of accomplishing it, or any other invincible force oppose." And what follows. But Hugh himself agrees with Bernard (Book 1, On the Sacraments, part 9, ch. 8). Nor does the Master, their contemporary, dissent (in this Distinction). To these I add two chapters of Innocent III: namely, *Debitum*, title On Baptism and its effect; and *Apostolicam*, title On a presbyter not baptized. In the former, about a Jew who had immersed himself—thinking such Baptism valid—he affirms that, if such a man had died immediately, he would have flown at once to the heavenly fatherland, on account of the faith of the sacrament, and not on account of the sacrament of faith. In the latter he pronounces without hesitation that such a presbyter, if he persevered in the faith of Holy Mother Church and in the confession of the name of Christ, was loosed from original sin and had attained the joy of the heavenly fatherland. And he proves this by the testimonies of Augustine and Ambrose which we cited above. Finally, in this judgment all the Schoolmen agree.

§ 88. Nor, indeed, were these things said by the Fathers without the authority of Scripture. For these general sayings and the like sufficiently establish this doctrine: "Everyone who asks, receives" (Matt. 7).

"Everyone who shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Joel 2; Rom. 10; Acts 2). "Everyone who lives and believes in me shall not die forever" (Jn. 11). "Everyone who believes in him shall not be confounded" (Is. 28; Rom. 10). "Thou hast not forsaken those who seek thee, O Lord" (Ps. 9). "No one ever hoped in the Lord and was confounded" (Sir. 2). "A contrite and humbled heart, O God, thou wilt not despise" (Ps. 50). Ambrose uses this Scripture: "The just man, however he be prevented by death," etc. (Wis. 4), understanding by "just man" one who is sincerely turned to God. Augustine, besides the example of the Thief—which he says he put forward not as sufficiently apt (Retractations 2, ch. 18), because whether he was baptized is uncertain—alleges that saying from the Apostle: "With the heart a man believes unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10). Bernard, moreover, urges that when the Lord said, "He who shall have believed and shall have been baptized shall be saved," he did not add, "He who shall not have been baptized," but only, "He who shall not have believed shall be condemned"—indicating thereby (says Bernard) that sometimes faith alone suffices for salvation, and that without it nothing suffices. Here too may be used that passage (2 Chronicles 30): "The good Lord will be propitious to all who with all their heart seek the Lord God of their fathers, and thou wilt not impute to them that they are not sanctified." Finally, the prayer of the three youths (Daniel 3) suggests an argument for this matter, who, grieving that they were deprived of sacrifices, being placed outside Jerusalem—by which they could find the mercy of God—ask that in a contrite soul and spirit of humility they may be received, adding this close to their prayer: "For there is no confusion to them who trust in thee."

§ XVIII — Reply to certain arguments to the contrary (Ad quaedam in contrarium argumenta responsio)

§ 89. Now those things must briefly be refuted which are customarily brought forward to the contrary. First of all, the general sentence of Christ is objected: "Unless one be born ...," which without doubt must be taken of Baptism of water (*Baptismus aquae*).¹¹⁷ If you reply that the other sentences adduced above are also general, and indeed more ancient, to which accordingly this more recent ought deservedly to yield, it is objected in turn that later laws, when both are of positive law, derogate from earlier, not conversely. Next certain statements of the Fathers are brought forward. For Ambrose in book 2 of *De Abraham Patriarcha*, ch. 11, when he had cited that saying "Unless one ...," added that the Lord's sentence is to be taken so as to allow no exception save the case of Martyrdom;¹¹⁸ similarly elsewhere;¹¹⁹ and Gennadius likewise, cap. 74 of the *Book of Ecclesiastical Dogmas*: "We believe that salvation pertains only to the baptized; we believe that no catechumen, although he die in good works, has eternal life, except in Martyrdom."¹²⁰ Similar things are read in Augustine, as in book 1 of *De Origine animae*, ch. 9: "Let no one be a member of Christ unless either by baptism in Christ or by dying for Christ";¹²¹ and in *Contra mendacium*, ch. 20, he signifies that a man even in a necessity out of which he cannot be rescued except by a lie cannot be saved without Baptism, and that this pertains to the inscrutable judgment of God, if he cannot be succored.¹²² The same writer, book 13 of the *City of God*, ch. 7, and Epistle 108, acknowledges no other exception save that of Martyrdom.¹²³ And in Epistle 108, to Honoratus, showing how great the evil is that follows upon the flight of a Pastor in time of persecution, he says: "Do we not think, when the last extremities of these dangers are reached, and there is no power at all of flight, how great in the Church is wont to be the concourse by both sexes and by every age—some demanding Baptism, others Reconciliation, others even the very act of Penance, all alike consolation and the confection and dispensing of the Sacraments? Where, if ministers are lacking, how great a ruin follows for

those who depart from this age either not regenerated or bound? How great also is the grief of their own faithful, who will not have them with themselves in eternal rest save unwillingly?" Thus he.¹²⁴ Chrysostom also, Hom. 24 on John, says that a catechumen perishes if by some chance he departs hence without Baptism, even if he had done innumerable good works.¹²⁵ Pope Silverius too, in a certain Epistle, admonishes the Bishop of Tarragona that with all speed there be succor given to those desiring the saving font, lest they lose the kingdom and life.¹²⁶ And the First Council of Braga, can. 36, forbids an oblation to be made for catechumens who have died without Baptism—a thing which is also found in Chrysostom (Hom. 3 on the Epistle to the Philippians).¹²⁷

§ 90. To these objections replying, we say that both laws alike—both that which requires Baptism for salvation, and that which promises salvation to the penitent believer who invokes the Lord—belong to a positive constitution. For by God's eternal and immutable law salvation is not owed to a sinner who believes and invokes, but by God's kindly and positive ordinance. Yet there is this difference, that the law of Baptism is merely positive; whereas the other has an equity from the law of nature, which dictates that it is fitting that pardon be given to the penitent, and that salvation be afforded to one who believes, hopes, and invokes. And therefore that law is implicitly of greater dignity, to which accordingly the other, as inferior, ought deservedly to yield whenever they concur.

§ 91. Ambrose and Augustine, both in the book *De Origine animae* and in *Contra mendacium*, seem to be speaking of infants, for whom no desire of Baptism (*desiderium Baptismi*) can come to the rescue. And in truth certain darker statements of these Authors cannot prejudice their most explicit testimonies to the contrary—testimonies which both Bernard and Innocent III judged ought to be used for the establishing of their opinion.¹²⁸ But in the other sentences of the Fathers one must understand that under the name of Baptism there is also included the desire of Baptism, when necessity excludes its actual reception, especially since they do not expressly exclude this case.

§ 92. As to the passage of Augustine that is produced (from Epistle 189), one must reply that everything which is said there is to be understood so far as concerns the ministers of the Church, who, by withdrawing their presence from the faithful in necessity, expose them, so far as lies in them, to the peril of eternal death. To such men one may most rightly say what Mordecai said to Esther, ch. 4: "If thou holdest thy peace at this time, the Jews will be delivered by some other occasion; and thou, and thy father's house, shall perish."¹²⁹ For although God in his mercy comes to the aid of those who cannot have the sacrament which they desire, nevertheless those are not excused who have withheld the due ministry in necessity. In this manner Augustine himself (Epistle 23) interprets a certain passage of Cyprian (from the Sermon *De Lapsis*), where Cyprian had said that those infants lose what they had obtained in Baptism who afterward were offered by their parents to idols. For he said that they "lose" it so far as regards the crime of the parents—just as also it has been said by the Apostle: "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5).¹³⁰

§ XIX — Whether someone attains the full effect of Baptism from its desire alone (An plenum baptismi effectum ex solo ejus voto quis consequatur)

§ 93. Since it is asked, when someone dies with the desire of Baptism (*votum Baptismi*) alone, whether he attains the whole effect of Baptism just as if in very deed he had been baptized, or rather only the chief effect, namely the benefit of grace (*gratia*) and the remission of guilt (*culpa*), but not also of penalty (*poena*), so that

therefore it is necessary that one dying thus should still in the age to come make satisfaction for the penalties remaining—which about one baptized it is not fitting to say.

§ 94. The former part of the question seems to be favored by the words of Innocent III (in the chapter *Debitum*), where, about a Jew baptized by himself, he pronounces that, if he had died immediately, he would straightway have flown to the heavenly fatherland. And (in the chapter *Apostolicam*), where he unhesitatingly asserts that a priest not baptized has attained the joy of the heavenly fatherland.¹³² The same thing seems to be signified by St. Ambrose in the Oration on the death of Valentinian. For besides the fact that he says that he already enjoys eternal life, he also addresses him with these words: "Christ has baptized you, because human ministrations were lacking to you; you have obtained more, who thought you had lost lesser things."¹³³

§ 95. The latter part rests on several arguments. First, because the general sentences which promise salvation to all who call upon God, although they show that a man can be saved without Baptism actually received, nevertheless all stand together with the debt of paying temporal penalty. Second: God is presumed to supply only what is necessary; therefore He does not take away every liability of penalty, but only the liability of guilt, with which remaining a man could not be saved. Third: Innocent III (in the aforesaid chapter *Apostolicam*) orders for the aforesaid priest continual prayers to be made and sacrifices to be offered to God. Fourth: Ambrose in the aforesaid Oration still prays God to pay Valentinian the gift which he had desired, and he warns the people that they should pray with him for him, saying: "With pious affection let us ask for his rest." And again: "Let us accompany the holy soul with our oblations."¹³⁴

§ 96. Finally, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure feel this way. For St. Thomas says (III, q. 68, a. 2, ad 2): "If someone be a catechumen having the desire of Baptism, one dying thus does not straightway arrive at eternal life, but through fire." St. Bonaventure, moreover, on the text of the present Distinction, says: "Ambrose sorrowed over Valentinian with a sorrow of compassion. For because he was not baptized, therefore he endured some purgatorial penalty for his sins." And to this effect the other Schoolmen generally agree.¹³⁵

§ 97. Which opinion also seems to us more probable, on account of the reasons alleged in the first and second place. To the authority of Innocent one can answer that that Jew burned with so great a desire of Baptism and of salvation as seems sufficient for the penalty to be blotted out altogether together with the guilt. The other passage does not press, especially since in the same place the contrary is established. Ambrose, moreover, does not set the prerogative of Valentinian in this, that he obtained more grace without Baptism than others through Baptism, but in this alone, that whereas others are baptized by Christ through the ministry of a man, this man was baptized by Christ immediately, that is, without human ministry. But that was not by the Baptism of water but only of the Spirit— not the Baptism of the "river" but of the "breath" (*non Baptismo fluminis sed flaminis*).¹³⁶

§ XX — That martyrdom supplies the place of Baptism (*Martyrium supplere vicem baptismi*)

§ 98. If, as has already been shown, they do not lose salvation who, sincerely converted to God, are excluded by some necessity from the Baptism (*Baptismus*) they desire, much more must that be thought concerning those whose faith and love toward God are so great that they even meet death for Him. Hence it has always been believed in the Church that martyrdom (*martyrium*) supplies the place of Baptism. A most fitting account of this is assigned by the Fathers. For since the Baptism of water is made into the death of Christ

according to the Apostle (Rom. 6), the Martyrs recall and imitate that death not only in figure but in truth—namely, dying with Christ and for Christ—so that they are deservedly said to be baptized, not in water, but in their own blood. There is a splendid testimony of this matter in St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ch. 16: "If certain men," he says, "having undertaken the combat for piety, suffer death for Christ in reality and not by imitation, they have no need of the symbols of water for salvation, because they have been baptized in their own blood."¹³⁸ And in the book *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus* it is said in ch. 74 that "in Martyrdom all the sacraments of Baptism are fulfilled," and the same is proved there at greater length.¹³⁹ And that there is martyrdom also for those not baptized is read. And first of all it has been learnedly expounded by St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* XIII, ch. 7, in these words: "Whoever also die for the confession of Christ without having received the laver of regeneration, it avails them for the forgiveness of sins just as much as if they had been washed in the sacred font of Baptism. For He who said: 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven,' by another sentence made those men exceptions, where no less generally He said, 'Whoever shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven' (Matt. 10), and in another place, 'Whoever shall lose his life for me, shall find it' (Matt. 16).",¹⁴⁰

§ 99. "Hence it is that it is written (Ps. 115): 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints'; for what is more precious than the death by which straightway even all offenses are forgiven, and merits are increased the more abundantly? For of no such merit are they who, since they could not put off death, were baptized and, when all sins had been blotted out, departed from this life, as are those who, when they could have put off death, did not for this reason put it off, because they preferred, by confessing Christ, to end this life rather than, by denying, to arrive at His baptism." So Augustine. And these passages of his also can be noted: *Contra Donatistas* IV, ch. 22; *De Origine Animae* I, ch. 9, and II, ch. 12; and *Epistle* 108.¹⁴¹

§ 100. To this other Fathers with one voice consent: Tertullian in the book *De Baptismo*; St. Cyprian in the *Epistle to Jubaianus* and in the sermon ascribed to him *De Stella et Magis*; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* IV; St. Ambrose, in the *Oration on the death of Valentinian* and *Sermon 40 On St. Agnes*, where he says that Emerentiana was baptized in her own blood; the Roman Breviary for January 23; likewise the Roman Martyrology for August 25 concerning a certain Genesius baptized in his own blood; St. Cyril, book I on *Leviticus*; Prosper, *Sententia* 149 and *Epigram* 87; Fulgentius, *De Fide ad Petrum*, chs. 3 and 30; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History* I, ch. 7; St. Bernard, *Epistle* 77; Gratian in the *Decretum*, *De Consecratione*, dist. 4, cap. *Baptismi vicem*.¹⁴² Nor was there ever any doubt about this matter among Catholics. And which Scriptures teach this is evident from the words of Augustine just cited; to which there can also be added these: "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (Jn. 15); "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10).

§ XXI — How martyrdom supplies the place of Baptism (Quomodo martyrium baptismi vicem suppleat)

§ 101. It is asked whether the place of Baptism (*Baptismus*) is so held by martyrdom (*martyrium*) that to the Martyr it is not necessary to desire Baptism with water, on the ground that the Baptism of blood (*baptismus sanguinis*) by itself avails as much, or even more; or rather whether it does not supply the place, except in the way in which, outside of martyrdom, the same is said to be supplied by faith and sincere conversion of heart, namely, with the vow of Baptism (*votum Baptismi*) added at the same time. In favor of the former part there

are these arguments. First, that when the Ancients speak about the necessity of Baptism, they for the most part make sole exception of suffering for Christ, which they say stands in place of Baptism, with all mention of its vow entirely omitted. Whence Augustine says (Ep. 108, Quoscumque): "Whomever we read in the body of Christ, which is the Church, to belong to the Kingdom of heaven, we ought to understand as none other than the baptized, unless perhaps those whom the straitness of persecution found, and who, unwilling to deny Christ, were slain before they were baptized. For whom their very passion was reckoned as Baptism."¹⁴⁴ The same is insinuated by Augustine's words from *De Civitate Dei* XIII cited above, as also by other places of his and of other Fathers which we have marked there. For since it was settled for the Fathers that salvation is not to be despaired of for those who, sincerely converted to God, could obtain neither Baptism nor Martyrdom, as we showed above, no other reason seems why they so studiously excepted martyrdom alone, unless because martyrdom, even without the vow of Baptism, bestows the same thing as Baptism. To these are joined those peculiar sentences employed by the Ancients: that martyrdom avails as much as Baptism; nay rather, that martyrdom is another, and a more excellent, Baptism; likewise, that the martyrs are excepted from that sentence, "Unless one be born again," on account of the other general sentence, "Whoever shall confess me," etc.; again, that the martyrs are washed in their own blood—and thus, plainly, that they do not need the Baptism of water. For this Basil attests expressly in the place alleged above.¹³⁸ But St. Cyprian (Ep. ad Jubaianum) says that catechumen martyrs are baptized with the most glorious and greatest Baptism of blood, of which the Lord said in the Gospel that He had another Baptism to be baptized with (Lk. 12).¹⁴⁵ To the same point the words of Ambrose can be urged (*Oratio de obitu Valentiniani*): "If martyrs are washed in their own blood, surely this man is washed by his piety and will." For this does not seem rightly to be said with such a distinction, if the martyr is not washed by his own blood unless will also be present, that is, the vow of Baptism. Moreover, no slight argument is taken from this, that infants slain for Christ—even if of old they had not been circumcised, or now had not been baptized—are held to be martyrs, to whom assuredly, without the vow of the sacrament, martyrdom alone brought salvation. Nor indeed is the opinion of James of Vitry to be received, who says (*Hist. Occidentalis*, ch. 36) that unbaptized infants of Christians, even if they were slain by Pagans for Christ, are not saved, and that the special privilege is not extended to them which belongs to the Innocents slain by Herod for Christ.¹⁴⁶ For the common and true sentence of the Church is to the contrary, namely, that they are saved equally with the Innocents who perhaps, not yet circumcised, were being put to death by Herod. Finally, if martyrdom does not suffice without the vow of Baptism, there will not be three distinct baptisms—namely, of the river, and of the breath, and of the blood—but only two. For the Baptism of blood will be included under the Baptism of the breath, as necessarily including the vow of Baptism. Nay, the Baptism of blood will not be a baptism in the issue at hand, but will be as other splendid works of virtue which, in order to profit unto salvation, presuppose Baptism or the vow of it.

§ 102. But on the contrary is objected the passage from the Epistle of Cyprian to Cornelius, which is Ep. 2, book 1, where Cyprian wishes those who had lapsed to be first received and reconciled, before they should go forth to martyrdom in a persecution. "And let no one say," he says, "that he who undergoes martyrdom is baptized in his own blood, and that peace from the Bishop is not necessary for him, since he will have the peace of glory, and will receive a greater recompense by the Lord's favor," etc.¹⁴⁷ Now the same is the case for Baptism and for Reconciliation. There is objected also St. Bernard (Ep. 77), where in him who has so great faith that he is ready to die for Christ he requires the desire of Baptism, as though without it he could not be saved.¹⁴⁸ Thirdly, there is adduced that statement from the Council of Trent (Session 6, ch. 4) that the

justification of a man, after the Gospel has been promulgated, cannot be effected without the laver of regeneration or the vow of it.¹⁰⁰

§ 103. It is answered that, from the testimonies of the Fathers, it is sufficiently apparent that they think martyrdom to be efficacious of itself for washing away sins and conferring salvation. And first of all this is clearly proved from the martyrdom of infants. Wherefore one must say that martyrs not baptized have enough remedy from martyrdom—namely, that, washed from sins, they have life; but because Baptism is a precept for all, therefore they are bound to receive it if they can. And if they are hindered from it by a pressing persecutor, then they are not even bound to desire it, since by no law now are they tied to that vow, when they look for salvation from another, and that a more excellent, remedy. For if someone is hindered by some necessity from fulfilling a positive law, such as a fast or a vigil, he is not bound by desire to aspire to its fulfillment, but it is enough that he not despise it—unless perhaps the law is such as prescribes a remedy necessary for salvation, of which sort is the law of Baptism outside the case of martyrdom. Hence, concerning no martyrs not baptized do we read that, positioned in the very combat and now dying, they somehow signified that they desired Baptism, although concerning certain persons we do read that either in prison they were baptized by their fellow martyrs, or hid themselves for a time so that they might be baptized, as, concerning a certain Antoninus, the Martyrology of Usuard relates on the eleventh before the Kalends of September.¹⁴⁹ What is objected from Cyprian proves nothing else than that it is very expedient that those upon whom the struggle of martyrdom is about to press should first be either baptized or reconciled, and even refreshed with the food of the Eucharist (for Cyprian also names this sacrament in that place), and thus, well equipped, go forth to the fight. Nay, they are bound first to seek Baptism or Reconciliation, both because of the precept, as we have just said, and to avoid the danger of presumption, and that, fortified with greater grace of God, they may proceed the more safely to the combat. Yet if they should not have done this, even those faults afterwards martyrdom will blot out. But Bernard is not speaking of a martyr, but of one who is so strong that he can, and is already prepared to, undergo martyrdom. For martyrdom and the desire of martyrdom do not avail the same as regards the receiving of the martyr's aureole. Furthermore, the doctrine of the Council is to be understood according to this opinion with the exception of martyrdom; just as the very Scripture which is cited by the Council is to be understood with the same exception, as is to be gathered from what precedes. From these things, moreover, it does not seem absurd to hold that martyrdom avails *ex opere operato*; so namely that the whole guilt and the penalty are remitted at once, as the constant doctrine of the Fathers has it. Yet nevertheless for this reason it will not be counted among the sacraments, because it is not instituted as some sign bestowing grace, but is an act of singular fortitude and perfect charity, to which God has granted this privilege: that those who die by it—whether baptized or not baptized—suffer no delay in flying straightway to the heavenly Kingdom and crown.

§ XXII — *What baptism confers on a man previously justified (Quid baptismus confert homini prius justificato)*

§ 104. The effect of Baptism (*Baptismus*), that is, the internal renovation together with the remission of sins (*remissio peccatorum*), which the Master calls the thing of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*), can befall someone before he actually receives Baptism, even outside the case of martyrdom and of necessity—the same Master both admits and teaches this. Yet this must be understood thus, that after the Gospel has been promulgated it is not thought to befall without the vow of Baptism (*votum Baptismi*), according to the definition of the

Council of Trent. To prove this there is brought forward a passage of St. Augustine (in Questions on Leviticus, q. 84), where, after proposing the examples of Moses, John the Baptist, and the Thief, he gathers that an invisible sanctification was present to certain men and profited them without visible sacraments; and then he subjoins: "Hence it is that Cornelius, and those who were with him, when now, with the Holy Spirit invisibly infused, they appeared sanctified, were nevertheless baptized. Nor was the visible sanctification judged superfluous, which the invisible had already preceded."¹⁵¹ Such are his words. But it must be noted that Augustine, who had brought forward the example of the Thief, retracted it in book 2 (ch. 55) of the Retractions; Moses, however, he says, was sanctified by circumcision; the Baptist also was circumcised by the Jewish rite, although, existing still in his mother's womb, he is rightly believed to have been sanctified by a singular privilege. Cornelius indeed—if one must say he was justified before the reception of Baptism—appears to have obtained this even without the vow of Baptism, for the Gospel at that time had not yet been sufficiently promulgated, and Cornelius had not yet heard it.¹⁵² In almost the same way Augustine speaks about Cornelius (Questions on Numbers, q. 33), saying that, when he had heard Peter, he was so cleansed by faith that, before the visible Baptism, he with those who were present received the gift of the Holy Spirit.¹⁵³ Another passage is book 2, On Baptism against the Donatists, ch. 24. Again another is book 2, Questions on the Gospels, q. 40, where he says that the cleansing of Cornelius and of his companions was declared and made known by external signs before Baptism.¹⁵⁴ With which passages, however, other places of the same Author must be compared, as (To Simplicianus, q. 2; Epistle 57 to Dardanus; On Baptism against the Donatists, book 1, ch. 8; book 4, chs. 21–22; Tractate 13 on John), where he compares Cornelius with other good catechumens, to whom, for obtaining salvation, the sacrament (*sacramentum*) of Baptism is lacking.¹⁵⁵ And Chrysostom seems to hold this as well (Homily 24 on John).¹⁵⁶ Elsewhere indeed Augustine speaks more absolutely, as in book 6 (On Baptism against the Donatists, ch. 25): "God Himself," says he, "sanctifies His sacrament, so that to a man—whether before he is baptized, or when he is baptized, or afterwards at some time when he truly turns to Him—the selfsame thing may avail unto salvation which, unless he were converted, would avail unto destruction." By which words he plainly indicates that it can happen that, to someone before he is baptized, Baptism—afterwards to be applied—may avail unto salvation. And this indeed happens outside the case of necessity, since necessity simply excludes Baptism.

§ 105. Moreover, a surer argument of this doctrine is taken from the words of the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 4), in which it is said that sometimes contrition, perfected by charity (*caritas*), is such that it reconciles a man to God before the sacrament is actually received. For although this was said of the sacrament of Penance, nevertheless in like manner it must be understood of the sacrament of Baptism, because in this respect the *ratio* of either sacrament is the same, as is said in ch. 2 of the same session; namely, that the sacrament of Penance is thus necessary for salvation to the lapsed, as the very sacrament of Baptism is to those not yet regenerated.¹⁵⁷ This then being established, to what the Master asks—what Baptism confers on those who approach Baptism in spirit, with faith and charity—we reply that six goods can be enumerated which they obtain from the real reception of Baptism.

- First: the baptismal character (*character baptismalis*), which no one obtains without Baptism really received, not even in the article of necessity or in the case of martyrdom.
- Second: an increase of grace (*gratiae incrementum*). For neither must it be thought that either Abraham from circumcision, or Cornelius from Baptism—if he was already justified before by faith—

received no increment of holiness, while devoutly receiving the symbol of sanctification. And as grace is increased, so also the tinder of sin, concupiscence (*concupiscentia*), is diminished and weakened.

- Third: the remission of sins which meanwhile may have been committed after justification. For Baptism takes away all whatsoever sins it finds.
- Fourth: the full remission of temporal punishment, in so far as it has not been made by the preceding justification. Of this effect together with the two preceding ones the Master makes mention in the Text.
- Fifth: security as to the remission of sins, of which we spoke when we were treating of the various effects of Baptism. For since it is easy for no one, before Baptism or the sacrament of Reconciliation has been applied, to have assurance concerning his own justification (*justificatio*), the sacrament actually received also imparts to those who were already justified by the vow alone of the sacrament a certain security, that is, a good confidence with tranquillity of conscience.
- Last: the external or visible incorporation of the man into the Church of Christ. For although by the grace of justification previously received someone is incorporated into Christ and made His living member, nevertheless he will not be reckoned by the Church among the faithful and the members of Christ before he has been imbued with the sacrament of faith, as the Master rightly notes in the Text.

§ XXIII — That Baptism is necessary for salvation for infants (Baptismus infantibus ad salutem esse necessarium)

§ 106. Concerning the Baptism (*Baptismus*) of little ones, that is, of those who by reason of age do not yet use reason, there have arisen various errors, and even now today there exist errors: some altogether denying it; others indeed not denying Baptism to infants, but denying that any utility accrues to little ones from it; others finally, although they acknowledge the utility, nevertheless refusing its necessity. For besides the Anabaptists, who altogether do away with the Baptism of infants and even rebaptize those baptized in adult age, the Calvinists deny it to be necessary; and of old the Pelagians used to say that it availed little ones, not for eternal life (which they promised to them even without Baptism), but for attaining the Kingdom, on account of that which is written: "Unless one be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." There were also others who judged wrongly concerning the Baptism of little ones, as the Hieracitae, who took away all hope of salvation from little ones even when baptized, because they cannot contend, whereas it is written: "He shall not be crowned, unless he has striven lawfully." Concerning these see Epiphanius.¹⁵⁹ And the Fidiani, who wanted Baptism to be deferred even to the eighth day after the Jewish manner—against whom St. Cyprian argues.¹⁶⁰

§ 107. Against this variety of errors, first of all it must be established that every man, even if he be born of just and holy parents, is born subject to original sin (*peccatum originale*), and by sin to eternal death, as has been shown in the second book of the Sentences at Distinction 31. Next, it is established from the foregoing that for blotting out original sin there is in the new law one sole remedy instituted, namely the sacrament (*sacramentum*) of Baptism. Hence, therefore, it follows manifestly, that either little ones cannot at all be freed from sin and attain salvation, or, in order that they may obtain both these benefits, they must necessarily be baptized.

§ 108. Now that that saying of the Lord, "Unless one be born again," also includes little ones, not only in such a way that without Baptism they cannot be saved, but also in such wise that by Baptism they can be saved, can be taught partly from Scripture, partly from the perpetual tradition of the Church. For first, lest anyone should think that the remedy prescribed in those words pertains only to adults, the Lord added: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Since, therefore, carnal birth is common to all, there had to be prescribed a remedy common to all, by which they might be able to pass over from flesh to spirit, and thus enter into the Kingdom of God. Indeed, whatever Scriptures commend to little ones the sacrament of Baptism, since Scripture promises to those who are carnally born no other way of salvation and of the Kingdom than through Baptism, are of this sort.

§ 109. The Lord says—when the disciples were rebuking those who were offering infants to Him—"Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for of such is the Kingdom of God." Then, embracing them and laying hands upon them, He blessed them (Mk. 10). From which it follows that little ones both can come to Christ and are capable of blessing—that is, of a benefit of Christ—which consists not in some temporal, but in eternal salvation. And those who deny that little ones are to be baptized are like to the yet carnal disciples of Christ who were hindering those who were offering little ones to the Savior to be blessed by Him.

§ 110. Another place is Rom. 5: "As through the offense of one, unto all men unto condemnation, so also through the justice of one, unto all men unto justification of life." For although offense extends more widely than justice—and that for this reason, that the benefit of Grace (*gratia*) may be acknowledged, while, the merits being on a level, some being left, others are delivered—yet thus far the gift of the justice of Christ has passed through unto all men, because no age, no sex, no kind at all of men is excluded from Grace and salvation. Which has been more clearly expressed by the same Apostle in 1 Tim. 2, where he says of Christ that "He gave Himself a redemption for all," that He "wills all men to be saved," that is, every kind of men; as also by Peter it is said (in the last of 2 Peter) that God wills no one to perish. But if anyone should contend that this is said only of adults, because to the former sentence there is added: "and to come to the knowledge of the truth," and likewise elsewhere: to "do penance" and "to be converted"—neither of which seems to have place in the age of infants—nonetheless it cannot be denied that both are said of sinners, that is, of those who to original sin have added also their own sins, however grave. Of whom, if none are excluded from the benefit of salvation to be received through Baptism, it is absurd and alien from the mercy of God that all infancy—and that innocent, as regards the sins of one's own action—should be excluded from it. Nor can it truly be said that infants are, by reason of age, not yet capable of the Grace of God: for if they are capable of sin through Adam, they are capable also of Grace through Christ.

§ 111. Closer to the present purpose, however, seem those Scriptures which bear witness that entire households were baptized by the Apostles, in which it is very likely that there were also little ones. For in 1 Cor. 1 the Apostle writes that he baptized the house, that is, the family of Stephanas. And in Acts 16 it is said of the jailer: "He was baptized, he and all his house, immediately." And there likewise Lydia the purple-seller, together with her house, is remembered to have been baptized.

§ 112. Finally, from circumcision an argument of this sort is drawn: Circumcision was a figure of Baptism, which also succeeded in its place. Therefore if little ones were rightly circumcised in the old law, they are also rightly baptized in the new law—especially since the rite of Baptism is easier and more tolerable for infants than the rite of circumcision. And if through circumcision this followed for the little one, that "his

soul should not be cut off from his people," through Baptism there also follows that, being born of the Spirit, he can enter into the Kingdom of God.

§ 113. The monstrous sect of the Anabaptists—whose author some attest to be Stork, the master of Thomas Müntzer, or even Manes—is attested by Cardinal Hosius in the book *On the Heresies of His Time*; and Floremundus, in *The Heresies of the Sixteenth Century*, most abundantly shows it to have been derived from a most filthy little stream from that most foul source, namely Luther's own words.¹⁶¹ For whereas he was blaming those who were baptizing little ones with a view to future faith, he preferred altogether to omit Baptism in little ones rather than to baptize without faith: "If indeed you take a sacrament without faith," says Luther, "you pervert the word of Christ, 'He who believes, and is baptized, shall be saved.'" These words are related by the aforesaid Cardinal in the place cited; and Ulerabergius in the *Life of Luther* reports the same.¹⁶² Luther indeed vehemently assailed the sect of the Anabaptists and tried to confute, by arguments sought from the Church, their principal dogma—namely, of rebaptizing. Thus Luther writes to two parish priests: "What the Anabaptists say, that infants ought not to be baptized, we confess that we have no Scripture, by similar words, which says: 'You ought to baptize children'; for we Christians, endowed with the Spirit, must yield to this man as victor, if he demands such a thing from us: indeed they seem to demand it in order to flee the force of his objection. On the other hand, they themselves can produce no Scripture that commands children to be baptized. Then from Apostolic Tradition it has always been held in the Church that little ones are to be baptized, even if no Scripture proves it, which clearly and manifestly speaks such things, or says that they themselves believe. If someone should urge us to demonstrate this from Scripture, we cannot; for we nowhere find it in the Scriptures. Good and peaceful men are content with this; only contentious and puffed-up men demand to be proved from Scripture that children ought to be baptized."¹⁶³

§ 114. Vossius, in his impious and shameless calumny, has branded Catholics—and especially those whom he disdainfully calls Pontificians, Bellarmine in particular—with inconsistency: namely, that when they dispute against Lutherans and Calvinists on Pædobaptism they adduce arguments from Scripture; but when they dispute on the Authority of Apostolic Traditions, they affirm these things. O the overpowering force of a prepossessed mind and of party-spirit! For surely Catholics, when they treat of Pædobaptism, as also our Author here, say that it can be clearly and evidently deduced from Scripture, but that it is not had expressly in the Scriptures; the very passage which Vossius cites, in the same words which he himself relates, most plainly affirms the same.¹⁶⁴ Forthwith he subjoins those Scriptures for Lutherans and Calvinists, from whose arguments Catholics—Bellarmine and others—use in disputing against Lutherans and Calvinists: namely, that Calvinists and Lutherans maintain Pædobaptism not by evident words of Scripture, but only by the perpetual Tradition and Consent of the Church; therefore, the foundation of their dogma is Apostolic Tradition and the perpetual consent of the Church.

§ 115. Catholics indeed so prove Pædobaptism from the Scriptures as to adjoin to them the perpetual Tradition of the Church; for they rightly know the Church to be the best interpreter of Scripture, nay, even the only one, and her perpetual uniformity and firmness in her dogmas to be inconcussa and unshaken; while Vossius's inconstancy is manifest. But indeed these men, with wondrous calumnies, accuse Catholics of the very thing in which they themselves labor. He tries in the *Disputation On Pædobaptism* to defend Lutherans and Calvinists by the very arguments by which Catholics—and especially Bellarmine—confirm the position and make it firm. For the Anabaptists and Lutherans agree together in their principal, most pernicious error, derived from Donatists of old, namely the reiteration of Baptism, which however they think ought to be

repeated not by the very same reason by which they repeated it, but because they judge that little ones in infancy are not capable of Baptism; the disposition necessary for receiving it they say to be Faith (*fides*). But that very sanctification and renovation—by which they are made capable of Baptism without actual faith, but virtually by another's faith, namely of their parents or of the Church—infused in little ones by virtue of the sacrament, the ancient Fathers assert, and with them the whole Church. Not only in this head do the Anabaptists err, but in most others too. And, in addition to the other heretics—the Sacramentarians, namely Lutherans and Calvinists—they dissent: for they prohibit the public ministry of the word; they renew the error of the Chiliasts; they spurn dominion and do not subject men to the highest power; wherefore, wherever this sect has spread, it has stirred up riots and seditions, as the aforesaid Hosius bears witness and the aforesaid Raimundus largely describes, and the rest.¹⁶⁵ But they add other errors, and around the Trinity, no less than around the Incarnation, they err most shamefully: as their preeminent heresiarch Faustus Socinus himself asserts many of their principal errors and of the principal churches of the sect; for he deems noble, indeed, the Trinity (for even this they impiously reject), and he judges those baptized in infancy not to be baptized at all; yet he adds: If anyone should reject these two and profess them, in what pertains to doctrine, he is nearly our brother. Socinus himself, however, errs no less shamelessly, as he himself judges: "Water-Baptism does not seem necessary for those who are born of Christians professing Christ; it suffices that in that profession they imitate their parents." Hence he thinks it matters nothing whether infants be baptized; and on that account he does not deny that in the Edification of the Church it is to be demanded, and that one, without any scandal, may grant it to those asking that their infant be dipped, or that it be deferred up to a fitting time, provided they be Orthodox and of holy manners.¹⁶⁶

§ 116. Josephus, in *On Grace of Christ* against Pelagius and Celestius, attests that the same error of the Anabaptists was anciently that of the Pelagians; nay, that they went so far as to say that Baptism ought not at all to be conferred upon little ones. Augustine, also from tradition and from the consent of all, as he says himself (*Questions on Leviticus*; *Letter 57 to Dardanus*; *De Baptismo* against the Donatists), asserts that little ones are to be baptized, and that the Church has always observed this forever from the beginnings; St. John Chrysostom likewise bears witness that, both by tradition and by the agreement of all, Baptism is to be conferred upon little ones.¹⁶⁷ Nor did the Church ever tolerate those who, under the pretext of piety, wanted Baptism to be deferred up to the eighth day, as is insinuated by Gregory of Nazianzus if necessity were urgent; even in more recent times the Greeks were of the same sentiment, as Arcudius in the fourth book *On the Concord of the Eastern and Western Church* testifies, that they baptized infants sometimes on the very day, often even at forty days, unless necessity did not press; he testifies also that frequently they baptized four-year-olds.¹⁶⁸ And he asserts that even he himself was washed with Baptism in the same manner. Far, therefore, from the truth, and altogether to be hissed off the stage, is the opinion of Ludovicus Vives, where he does not shrink from asserting that of old no one was brought to the sacred font unless, already an adult, he should ask to be washed; nor that he should ask once.¹⁶⁹ In the letters of Augustine himself there is preserved, among those which are found together with his life, that which the Church preserved through so many centuries and was prepared to grant to those coming forward—namely, to grant to them, Anabaptists excepted, that their infant be dipped, rather than that it be deferred up to a later time—even when they were Orthodox and of holy manners.¹⁷⁰

§ XXIV — *The same proved from the perpetual tradition of the Church* ***(Ejusdem probatio ex perpetua Ecclesiae traditione)***

§ 117. Although for proving the Baptism of little ones and its necessity the proof from the Scriptures is quite certain, and the heretics bring nothing solid against it; nevertheless, because it is read expressly nowhere in the Scriptures that little ones cannot be saved without Baptism, or that they were altogether baptized, or are to be baptized, this doctrine is wont to be more frequently numbered among the unwritten traditions than among those dogmas which are drawn from the Scriptures. And indeed the Fathers, although they sometimes use the aforesaid testimonies of Scripture and the reasons indicated by us for the confirmation of the present doctrine, for the most part, however, refer it to the perpetual tradition of the Church derived from the very times of the Apostles. And such tradition had so great a weight of authority, that Pelagius—who denied that little ones are born in sin—did not dare, however, to deny that they were to be baptized, because he could neither be ignorant of, nor did he dare to reprove, the universal and constant observance of the Church in baptizing little ones. The sure testimony of this apostolic tradition is taken from the writings of the Fathers, who flourished in every century after the Apostles, and from the decrees of Popes and of Councils. First, Dionysius the Areopagite (in the sixth book *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*) testifies that he received this doctrine from his teachers, that is, the Apostles. Origen also mentions it, writing on that place (Rom. 6): "For if we have been planted together" etc. Justin, in the *Questions to the Orthodox*, responds that infants when baptized are affected by the goods of Baptism on account of the faith of those by whom they are offered; but when not baptized, they are deprived of those goods. Cyprian (Letter 36, which is also in book 3) from the sentence of sixty-six bishops who had come together at one Council, decided nothing new.¹⁷²

§ XXIV — *Proof of the same from the perpetual tradition of the Church* ***(Ejusdem probatio ex perpetua Ecclesiae traditione)***

§ 118. St. Jerome, proving the most firm faith and custom of the Church (*Ecclesia*) and correcting those who thought that before the eighth day from birth a little one ought not to be baptized, brings forward that the soul of the child will perish unless it be baptized, and therefore that even one most recently born is not to be forbidden baptism; he says: "An infant is not to be forbidden Baptism and Grace (*Baptismus et gratia*), who, though newly born, has committed nothing, except that, being born according to the flesh from Adam, he contracted by his first birth the contagion of ancient death," and so forth.¹⁷⁴ St. Augustine also, elsewhere, cites that Epistle of St. Cyprian as on behalf of the ecclesiastical tradition of baptizing little ones for the remission of sins: as in book 4 *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, ch. 8; in book 1 *Against Julian*, ch. 3; and in *Sermon 14 On the Words of the Apostle*.¹⁷⁵ St. Ambrose, on Luke 1 at the verse "In the spirit and power of Elias," bears witness that little ones are re-formed from malice by Baptism.¹⁷⁶ The same place is also cited by St. Augustine, book 1 *Against Julian*, ch. 3; and again, book 2 *On Abraham*, ch. 11, speaking of the age of those who of old were to be circumcised and now ought to be baptized: "No age ought to be left without protection, because no age is without guilt." And again: "Every age is liable to sin; therefore every age is suitable for the sacrament." And after many things, citing that saying: "Unless one be born again...", he says: "Assuredly he excepts no one, neither the infant, nor the one prevented by some necessity."¹⁷⁷ In his *Epistle to Laeta* St. Jerome advises parents to take care that they have their infants baptized immediately.¹⁷⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus also makes mention of that ecclesiastical tradition (*Oration on the Holy Bath*).¹⁷⁹ From St. John

Chrysostom likewise there is clear testimony (Homily to the Neophytes; Homily on Adam and Eve; Homily 23 on the Acts of the Apostles).¹⁸⁰ Similarly from St. Epiphanius (Heresy 67), where he disputes against the Hieracites.¹⁸¹ In St. Augustine, in those writings which he composed against Pelagius, there are almost countless places in which, by the ecclesiastical custom of baptizing little ones, the argument is made as it were invincible that they are subject to sin. Of which few may be these: Epistles 23, 28, 37, and 106; Enchiridion 93; book 2 On Free Choice, ch. 23; book 10 On Genesis to the Letter, ch. 11; book 1 On the Merits of Sins, ch. 2; book 2 of the same, chs. 25 and 27; On Original Sin, ch. 40; book 14 of The City of God, ch. 2; On the Origin of the Soul, book 9, ch. 12; likewise Homily 50 in the Work Imperfect on Matthew; and Heresy 47; and book 4 Against the Donatists, chs. 23–24; and Sermon 14 On the Words of the Apostle.¹⁸² In that place, as also in others, he writes that there was so great authority of ecclesiastical tradition in baptizing little ones that not even heretics dared to raise a question about that matter to Catholics. The same was professed and taught by all who either in Augustine's time or afterward have stood out in the Church; as, for instance, Pope Innocent (in the Epistle to the Council of Milevis, which is numbered among Augustine's letters as 93),¹⁸³ and likewise the words of Pope Innocent are cited by Augustine (Epistle 157 to Optatus).¹⁸⁴ Also the Hypognosticon attributed to Augustine (book 1, ch. 7);¹⁸⁵ Fulgentius (On the Faith to Peter, ch. 27);¹⁸⁶ Leo (Epistle 86);¹⁸⁷ Prosper (On the Vocation of the Gentiles, ch. 23);¹⁸⁸ Gregory VII (Epistle 53);¹⁸⁹ Bede (on Mark 7 at the words "For this saying go thy way");¹⁹⁰ St. Bernard (Epistles 77 and 240; Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs; Sermon 1 on Palm Sunday);¹⁹¹ and Innocent III (chapter Majores) in the Decretals, On Baptism and its effect.¹⁹² Finally, this custom of baptizing infants, together with the doctrine that, apart from Baptism, salvation cannot be obtained, has been transmitted down to us by perpetual and faithful tradition. Nor has the authority of the Councils been lacking in this matter; for immediately upon the rise of Pelagius, the Synod of Palestine, in which Pelagius verbally recanted his error, anathematized those who say that little ones have eternal life without Baptism, as Augustine testifies (Epistle 106).¹⁹³ To this there was added the Fourth Council of Carthage (in the Epistle to Pope Innocent, which is found in Augustine);¹⁹⁴ and after it the Council of Milevis or Numidia, at which Augustine was present, in whose canon 2 it is said: "Anathema to those who deny that infants, fresh from their mothers' wombs, are to be baptized." In the name of that same Council a letter was written to Pope Innocent in which the same dogma is confirmed.¹⁹⁵ Add to these the Fifth Council of Carthage, which in canon 6 wills, without scruple, that infants be baptized, even those about whose Baptism there is doubt, lest through our hesitation they perish.¹⁹⁶ At length there was added the authority of the General Councils, that of Florence in the Decree on the Sacraments,¹⁹⁷ and that of Trent (Session 5, ch. 4), in which the very words of the Council of Milevis are repeated, with these added: "even if they be born of baptized parents"; and likewise Session 7, canons 5, 12, 13 on Baptism.¹⁹⁸

§ XXV — That another's faith profits infants toward salvation (Parvulis alienam fidem prodesse ad salutem)

§ 119. The same St. Thomas, in the said articles 9 and 12, more clearly teaches that infants, though they cannot at all times either believe or seek salvation by an act of faith (*fides*), nevertheless are capable both of Baptism (*Baptismus*) and therefore also of salvation. For, as Augustine says, book Against the Donatists, ch. 13: "Just as in faithful adults, to whom Baptism is lacking in body by some necessity, perfect salvation is theirs, because spiritual perseverance is present; so, when Baptism itself is present, if by necessity faith is lacking, salvation is perfected."²⁰⁰ The universal Church holds that tradition: when infants are baptized who certainly

cannot as yet believe with the heart unto justice and confess with the mouth unto salvation. And in the next chapter: "Just as in adults the goodness of the Almighty supplies what is lacking in the sacrament, because it is lacking not out of pride or contempt but out of necessity, so in baptized infants the same grace of the Almighty is to be believed to make up, because by reason of the want of age they cannot as yet either believe with the heart unto justice or confess with the mouth unto salvation. Therefore, since others answer for them, so that the celebration of the sacrament may be fulfilled in their regard, it surely avails for their consecration, because they themselves cannot answer," and so forth.²⁰¹ So he. From which passage, and from not a few others in the same author, there is clearly refuted that figment of those who, in order to concede salvation to little ones, ascribed to them an actual movement of faith.

§ 120. But if we have regard to the communion of the saints and to the charity (*caritas*) of the whole Church, which is solicitous for all, even for infants newly born, that they may be reborn unto Christ, we find that at the time when they are baptized they are not altogether lacking faith; for to them their pious mother the Church accommodates her own faith, so that in that faith they may thus be baptized, and, being baptized, may be saved, as in their own, if they were able to have it. And this is altogether consonant with reason and with the divine goodness, namely, that he who fell by another's guilt should rise by another's faith, and that from him who did not sin by his own action his own faith should not be demanded. Whence Augustine says (Sermon 14 On the Words of the Apostle, ch. 11): "By another's words he is healed, because by another's deed he is wounded." And again: "By a certain conspiracy the spirit communicates; he 'believes in another,' because 'he sinned in another'."²⁰² For this cause also they are rightly called "faithful" (*fideles*), as the same Augustine attests in many places, and especially (in the same Sermon, ch. 13) in these words: "By the ancient, canonical, and most well-founded custom of the Church, baptized little ones are called 'faithful'." And again: "Among believers, therefore, you shall count the baptized infants, nor shall you in any way dare to judge otherwise, if you do not wish to be an open heretic." Another place is (Epistle 107; book 1 On the Merits of Sins, chs. 19–20).²⁰³ The same doctrine is that of St. Bernard (Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs; and Epistle 77).²⁰⁴ Now the infant is said to "believe in the sponsor" or in him who professes faith in his Baptism, because the faith of the Church, whose person that man bears, avails for the little one to this end, that he may be regenerated in Baptism. Which regeneration happens to no one, not even to adults, without the cooperation of Mother Church. For thus is it divinely ordained, that no one may be born a son of God unless of Mother Church, who is the spouse of Christ; of her the Apostle (Gal. 4) says: "That which is above, Jerusalem, is our mother," that is, the mother of all the faithful. Truly, for adults, since they are able to speak and to believe for themselves, another's faith and confession do not suffice; but for little ones they do suffice, just as by the very law of nature it is dictated that he who has age should speak for himself (John 9), but he who is poor in mind and tongue should be answered for by another, as Augustine declares book 4 Against the Donatists, ch. 24.²⁰⁵ But that the charity of the whole Church cooperates for the salvation of infants in Baptism, these words of the same Augustine set forth more fully (Epistle 23 to Boniface): "Little ones," he says, "are offered to receive spiritual grace not so much by those in whose hands they are carried—although even by them, if they themselves are good faithful—as by the whole society of saints and of the faithful. For they are rightly understood to be offered by all to whom it is pleasing that they be offered, and by whose holy and indivisible charity they are aided unto the communication of the Holy Spirit. Therefore the whole Mother Church, who is in her saints, does this; because the whole brings forth all, the whole each one."²⁰⁶ And in Tractate 80 on John: "This word of faith avails so much in the Church of God, that by her who believes, offers, blesses, and baptizes, even the very little one is cleansed, although he does not yet avail to believe with the heart unto

justice and to confess with the mouth unto salvation."²⁰⁷ Now this doctrine is very conformable to the Holy Scriptures, in which we often read that to those who, by reason of age or of another infirmity, were impeded and either had no faith of their own or had but slight, the faith of others came to their aid for obtaining the benefits of God. Thus the Lord, looking to the faith of a few men carrying the paralytic, said to him: "Thy sins are forgiven thee" (Lk. 5). So also the Centurion, the Canaanite woman, and the father of the lunatic, by their faith obtained for others who had not their own faith a benefit from Christ. Finally, the dead have been restored to life by the prayers and intercession of others, even little ones (1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 4).²⁰⁸

§ XXVI — That by another's faith infants cannot be saved without the Sacrament (Aliena fide parvulos sine Sacramento salvari non posse)

§ 121. Since in necessity a grown man is saved by his own faith (*fides*), even without the Sacrament (*sacramentum*), it is asked why another's faith, nay the faith of the whole Church (*Ecclesia*), does not furnish the same to the infant (*parvulus*), if by some necessity he is prevented, when about to die, from Baptism (*Baptismus*). To this, first of all, the answer is given: in a matter so grave one must affirm nothing outside the authority of Sacred Scripture and of tradition; and therefore, since Scripture offers to unbaptized infants no other hope of salvation (for those sayings which promise salvation to them that believe and call upon [the Lord] do not pertain to them, since it is evident that infants cannot either believe or call upon [Him]), and since from tradition we have shown by most certain argument that Baptism is necessary for infants unto salvation, the consequence is that another's faith does not at all avail them unto salvation outside Baptism; and hence, that all such are included under that general sentence of the Lord in which He says: "Unless one be born again ... he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."²¹⁰ Now this in no way dissents from reason; for one's own faith, even without the Sacrament, makes the adult nearer to God and commendable in Himself, inasmuch as, out of faith, he calls upon God, grieves for his sins, seeks salvation—none of which does another's faith operate in infants, but leaves him averted until the very reception of the Sacrament. And it is more congruent with the divine goodness that he be saved who is already converted and seeking the Lord, than he who is still wholly averted from God, having in himself no principle of spiritual life. Add that the Church, whose maternal charity bears children to Christ, does not intend to accommodate her faith to infants except through the means appointed by Christ for that purpose, that is, through Baptism. Whence it is vain, and alien to the Catholic sense, to hope for salvation for them by another way which neither Christ has shown nor the Church acknowledges. Wherefore, with good reason, the opinion of certain men is reproved—Catholics indeed, but having zeal not according to knowledge—who have thought that infants, when the necessity of death presses, if there is not a supply of water, or if they still exist in their mothers' wombs, can be saved by the vow, or by the prayers of the parents or of other faithful, especially, as they say, if the sign of the cross be employed, or some other pious ceremony with an invocation of the Trinity. For thus thinks Gabriel Biel (on the present distinction); and Cajetan in his Commentary on the Summa of St. Thomas, III (q. 68, a. 2); and before both, John Gerson wrote in this sense (in a certain Sermon delivered in the Council of Constance, on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, Consideration 2), teaching that parents ought to pray God and the saints that Christ would deign, by anticipating with the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, to consecrate an infant not yet born, if he is in the mother's womb going to die, and therefore cannot be baptized. "For who knows," he says, "whether perchance He may hear?"²¹¹

§ 122. But to him the reply must be given that one ought rather to pray thus, that, since without Baptism there is no salvation, God would deign to preserve the child in life until, being brought forth to the light, he may be washed with the water of salvation. Thus prayed that woman of whom, in the Miracles of St. Stephen, book 1 (last chapter, and also in St. Augustine, *On Diverse Sermons* 32, 33), it is read—whose, I say, child had died without Baptism. For she prayed on his behalf, not that he might be saved even without Baptism, but that he might at least revive for a moment, whereby thus he could be baptized—which also was done. For that woman knew that an infant cannot attain salvation without Baptism. One must therefore pray that they may come to Baptism. In which matter, if they are not heard, let them understand that it is God's will that they do not come unto salvation—just as many other infants likewise perish not, of course, outside of God's will.²¹²

§ 123. Moreover, among the more ancient [writers] no one so thought, except that Durandus and St. Bonaventure seem to have been imbued with a certain similar opinion, writing (in *Distinctio* 6). For there St. Bonaventure (question 1) asks what is to be held concerning the salvation of an infant if perchance the minister's necessary intention were lacking; and in answering he says: it is pious to believe that the Supreme Priest supplies; yet if He does not, He does justly. Nor dissimilar is what (question 2) Durandus writes—whose opinion lends no small support to that which we are now discussing. For if it is pious to believe that God supplies what is lacking on the part of intention, it will likewise be pious that we believe that God supplies what is lacking on the part of the matter, especially since here there occurs necessity alone, whereas there the defect is brought on by the minister's ill will. Wherefore, both opinions being rejected, it must be held absolutely that there is no exception from what has been said, "Unless one be born again," except that which Scripture elsewhere makes; and this one exception is the Martyr—infants excepted; for even of those [martyrs], if they shall not have been baptized, "precious is their death in the sight of the Lord"; if they shall have lost their lives for Christ, they shall find them. And this exception also has been confirmed by ecclesiastical tradition, as it would not be difficult to show by the testimonies of the Fathers.²¹³

§ 124. But that it may be understood how the Church has always been averse to admitting any further exception whatsoever, we will show this by subjoining a few testimonies of the Fathers. St. Augustine in book 3 (*On the Origin of the Soul*, ch. 9): "Do not believe, do not say, do not teach, that infants, before they are baptized, if overtaken by death, can come to the remission of original sins, if you wish to be Catholic." And in book 1 (*On the Merits of Sinners*, ch. 23): "No eternal salvation of Christ is promised to infants, which the Divine Scripture—which is to be preferred to all human talents—does not promise." He has similar things in the next chapter. Likewise, book 6 (*Against Julian*, ch. 4): "Infants," he says, "do not have life unless they have Christ, whom without doubt they cannot have, unless they shall have put Him on in that way in which it is written: 'As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ'." And (in *Epistle* 28 to St. Jerome): "Whoever shall say that even infants, who go forth from life without participation in His Sacrament, will be made alive in Christ, that man surely goes against apostolic preaching, condemns the whole Church, wherefore there is haste and running for the baptizing of infants, because without doubt it is believed that otherwise they can in no wise be made alive in Christ." Again (in *Epistle* 57 to Dardanus), he says that never was anyone in the maternal womb released from the common law of original sin—and he seems to extend this even to John the Baptist and to Jeremiah—although St. Bernard admits this to be hard (*Epistle* 174). But Augustine relies on that general sentence: "One must be born again, either through water, or, as once, in another way. Now no one," he says, "is born again unless first he be born." But this does not prove the point; for even the conception of man in the maternal womb is sometimes called "birth." Whence that saying in the Gospel: "For that which is born in her is of the Holy Spirit." To the same purpose pertains what Augustine

several times has taught—that it is to be referred to the hidden, yet most just, judgments of God that one infant comes to Baptism and is saved, another does not come and is damned, even though his parents most earnestly desire his salvation and, as far as in them lies, procure it with every solicitude.²¹⁴

§ 125. Likewise Innocent I (in his Epistle to the Council of Milevis, which in Augustine is Epistle 93) bears witness that eternal life is believed to be conferred upon infants by Baptism only. And St. Gregory (book 4 of the *Morals*, ch. 2) hands down a plain sentence on this matter. Then Innocent III (cap. *Non ut*, On Baptism and its effect), having been consulted whether infants should be reckoned as Christians whose heads and breasts and between the shoulders, when they were in articulo mortis, through lack of water and the absence of a priest, some simple folk had anointed with a sprinkling of spittle in place of Baptism—replies that, since in Baptism two things are always necessarily required, namely the word and the element, one ought not doubt that those do not have true Baptism in whom not only both of the aforesaid, but even one or the other, has been omitted; and hence that they are not to be reckoned as Christians. Finally, in the Council of Florence, when it had been discovered that the Armenians were keeping their infants up to the 40th or the 80th day before they baptized them, the Fathers of the Council admonished them to baptize them as soon as they are brought forth to the light, because, apart from Baptism, no other remedy of salvation remains to them.²¹⁵

§ XXVI — Solution of the objections pressed against infant baptism (Solutio eorum quae contra baptismum infantium instantionibus obiiciuntur)

§ 126. Therefore one must answer that the danger of eternal damnation into which the infant will fall, if perchance without Baptism he should suddenly die, is by no means compensated by that fruit which is expected from delaying Baptism—especially since he is not altogether deprived of that fruit, seeing that those who have been baptized, after age has come, are, by a praiseworthy institution of the Church, catechized, so that they may know what they promised in Baptism, to whom they bound their faith, and whom they renounced, and what Grace (*gratia*) they obtained in Baptism, and may remember that they are debtors through their whole life to that pledge made in Baptism. But if adult age were awaited for the reception of Baptism, many, ill brought up and given over to pleasures, would either altogether refuse to be baptized, or would defer Baptism even to a late age, lest they be forced quickly to bid farewell to flesh and to the world. And it is not sufficiently safe to leave free to each one's will that which is necessary for salvation. And so, by a kind of happy necessity, those who were baptized in infancy are compelled to render what their sponsors promised for them: since it was a matter such that, for taking it up of their own accord, they themselves, if they had had the use of reason, would have been bound by divine and natural law.

§ 127. Finally, it is altogether expedient in the Church that the custom of baptizing infants be maintained, both that through this the Church may profess her Faith by which she believes that children, although deprived of their own faith, can nevertheless be saved by another's faith through Baptism, and lest she seem to yield to the Anabaptists, who wish infant-baptism to be altogether abolished as useless, ineffective, and wholly superfluous. Moreover, some suspect that Tertullian spoke only of deferring the Baptism of those little ones whose parents were unbelievers. For by that which he subjoined about the danger of the sponsors, he indicated this. But whatever be the case about that opinion of Tertullian, it is clear that he thought rightly and soundly about the necessity of Baptism (from chs. 12–13 of the same book). Likewise the Church does not

accept the counsel of Nazianzen to wait for three years, as being full of peril. Which peril Nazianzen himself, acknowledging it, does not wish that age to be awaited in which reason already begins to be in fuller vigor, as the twelfth year and thereafter. For thus he subjoins: And on account of the unforeseen and sudden assaults of dangers, it is altogether necessary that they be fortified with the laver. Which reason of Nazianzen tells no less, nay even more, for that time which is less than three years, inasmuch as the little body of the infant is weaker and the health more infirm. But the disapproval of the said opinion seems to be included under the next-to-last canon on Baptism of Session 7 of the Council of Trent, whereby they are smitten with anathema who say that it is better that the Baptism of infants be omitted than that they, not believing by their own act, be baptized in the faith of the Church alone.²¹⁶

§ XXVII — Who is the proper minister of Baptism (Quis sit proprius baptismi minister)

§ 128. Concerning the proper minister of the sacrament of Baptism the Council of Florence determined thus briefly (in the Decree for the Armenians): "The minister of this sacrament is the priest, to whom by office it belongs to baptize."⁵³ So too it is read in Isidore, book 2 (On the Ecclesiastical Offices, ch. 24): "It is established that Baptism is to be handled by priests alone." Thus does Gratian cite the words of Isidore (On Consecration, Dist. 4, ch. Constat).²¹⁸ Although the Master (Dist. 6) reports them a little differently, yet in almost the same sense, namely in this way: "It is established that Baptism has been entrusted to priests alone." The Apostolic Canons likewise show the same, 46, 47, and 49, where only the Bishop and the Presbyter are named as minister of Baptism.²¹⁹

§ 129. Now the Doctors render this reason why that pertains properly to the office of priests: because it belongs to the same one to introduce a man into the house of the Church and the family of Christ, as to administer and rule it. And again, because it belongs to the same one to grant to a man the right of approaching the Lord's Table, as to dispense from it the Sacred Body of Christ. Therefore, since both the governance of the Church and the dispensation of the Lord's Body are the proper office of priests, it will also be their proper office, through Baptism, to introduce someone into Christ's family and enroll him, and thereby to grant him by that very fact the right of approaching the Lord's Table.

§ 130. Therefore the administration of Baptism pertains to the priest who is the ruler or prefect of the Church, namely the Bishop or the Pastor. Nay more, since the Bishop is the primary ruler of the Church, therefore to him chiefly, if he wishes, pertains the office of baptizing. Whence also it was said to the Apostles:

1. St. Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* I, ch. 13.

2. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 69, a. 3.

3. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ch. 66.

4. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* III, ch. 6.

5. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent [as in source].

6. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: "Propterea baptizatis nulla pro peccatis praeteritis iniungenda est satisfactio; sed morientes antequam culpam contraxerint, statim ad Regnum caelorum perveniunt."

7. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis* I, ch. 20; II, ch. 28.

8. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* VI, ch. 21; *De civitate Dei*, chs. 14–15 [abbreviation as in source: "De Crit. cap. 14. 15."]; on Ps. 84; Tractates 79 and 124 on John.
9. Eucherius of Lyon, *In II Regum*, ch. 8. On the authorship of the Commentaries on the Books of Kings (and those inscribed and commonly published under his name), learned men report that they were falsely ascribed to Eucherius and that they flourished in the time of St. Gregory the Great; for at the end of the Exposition of the Fourth Book of Kings the Reader bears witness that he had ruled the Church and had known Augustine, Paul, and others then and earlier by some years, which shows him to have been later than Eucherius. See especially Philippe Labbe, *Dissertatio Philologica de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Tome I, on "Eucherius." [Footnote (a) in the source.]
10. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Sententiae ex Augustino*, no. 148: "Mors etiam piorum peccati poena est."
11. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 69, a. 3, ad ... [abbreviation as in source]; cf. Rom. 8:10. Also St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I-II, q. 87, a. 8, ad 3 [abbreviation as in source]: "God is the one who inflicted the penalty of death upon all men—the just as well—for the sin of the first parent."
12. St. Bonaventure, on this Distinction, no. 2 [abbreviation as in source].
13. Heb. 9:27; Rom. 5:12; Gen. 2:17 "Morte morieris"; Gen. 3:19 "Pulvis es, et in pulverem reverteris."
14. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, ch. 6; and book 6.
15. St. Thomas, "ubi supr." [abbreviation as in source].
16. St. John Chrysostom, Homily to the Neophytes, in Tom. 5 [abbreviation as in source].
17. St. Augustine, *Against Julian* I, ch. 6; cf. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 on John.
18. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 9.
19. St. Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, ch. 22; Epistle 23 [abbreviation as in source].
20. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 7.
21. "[l. 6. 2.]" [abbreviation as in source].
22. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 69, a. 6.
23. The Master (Peter Lombard), *Sentences* I, dist. 1; Innocent III, *Decretals*, Extra, *De baptismo et ejus effectu*, cap. "Majores".
24. Council of Vienne (under Clement V), constitution beginning "Quia quantum ad effectum Baptismi in parvulis", in the Clementines, title *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*.
25. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 7; Council of Trent, Session 6, canon 11; Council of Trent, Session 7, *De sacramentis in genere*, canon 7; Council of Trent, Session 7, *De baptismo*, canon 6.
26. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 9; cf. also *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, ch. 22; Epistles 23 and 107; On the innovators who reject infused habits: see the Council of Trent, places cited in notes 5–8; Prosper of Aquitaine, *De vocatione gentium* I, ch. 18.
27. Section title illegible in the source. References in this section include: Bartholomew Medina, *In I-II [Prima Secundae]* of St. Thomas, q. 110 [abbreviation as in source]; Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, *De justificatione*, book VI, especially chs. 8, 12, 14 [abbreviation as in source]; Domingo de Soto, *De natura et gratia*, book 2 [abbreviation as in source]; Louis Thomassin, *Dogmata theologica*, *De Verbi Dei incarnatione*, book VI, from ch. 8 [abbreviation as in source]; Denis Petau (Petavius), *Dogmata theologica*, various places [abbreviation as in source]; Peter Nicole, *Institutiones theologicae*, vol. 2, ch. 25 [abbreviation as in source]; Jean Ivenius, *Commentarium historico-dogmaticum de sacramentis*, *De baptismo*, no. 49 [abbreviation as in source]; the Roman Catechism, part II; "S. Thom. ubi supra" [abbreviation as in source]. Scripture: Rom. 10. Jerome: *Contra Pelagianos*, book 1. Augustine: Epistles cited "mox laudata"; *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I and III.
28. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 69, a. 5.
29. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 2; Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* II, ch. 6; St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration on the Holy Laver*; St. Epiphanius, on the heresy of the Cathari; St. Ambrose, *De poenitentia* II, ch. 2; St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. 10.
30. Council of Trent, Session 6, canon 7.

31. St. Augustine, Epistle 120 to Honoratus, ch. 22. Editorial note in the edition cited: the passage is printed to this effect—"Who could set forth those words? Perhaps light is not charity? Hear the Apostle John: 'God is light, and darkneses are not in Him' (1 John 1); and again, 'God is charity.' And therefore charity is itself the light poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us; hence he says: 'He who hates his brother is in darkness even until now'." [Textual note rendering the sense of the variant quoted in the source.]
32. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 3. St. Augustine, Confessiones IX, chs. 4, 6.
33. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 69, a. 8.
34. St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 10.
35. St. Cyprian, Epist. [lib. 4, ep. 7; abbreviation as in source]. Cf. Exod. 16.
36. St. Augustine, Contra Cresconium grammaticum III, ch. 6.
37. St. Augustine, Epistle 48.
38. Above, on Distinction 1.
39. St. Augustine, De peccatorum meritis et remissione I, ch. 39.
40. Ordinary Gloss on Rom. 6: "Ut ultra non serviamus peccato."
41. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 7 and a. 12.
42. Council of Toledo IV, can. 55.
43. Innocent III, Cap. Majores, Extra, De baptismo et eius effectui.
44. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 7, ad 2; a. 12, ad 3.
45. Scotus, In IV Sent., Dist. [ad hanc Distinctionem; abbreviation as in source].
46. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In IV Sent., Dist. [ad hanc Distinctionem; abbreviation as in source].
47. St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., on the present Distinction and on Distinction 6.
48. Cajetan, Commentary on Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 7.
49. S. Thom. locis supra citatis [abbreviation as in source].
50. St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, tract. 26.
51. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas VII, ch. 53.
52. St. Augustine, Confessions IV, ch. 4.
53. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians.
54. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 12, ad 3.
55. St. Augustine, De haeresibus, haer. 46.
56. Martyrologium Romanum, August 25 (on the conversion and martyrdom of the actor).
57. See above, Distinction 1, on the intention of the minister of the sacraments.
58. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 69, a. 9–10.
59. The Master (of the Sentences), In IV Sent., dist. 4 [Textus; abbreviation as in source].
60. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas I, ch. 12.
61. Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 4, c. Tunc valere; see also the Gloss on this chapter; and the Master, In IV Sent., dist. 4 [Textus].
62. Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 4, c. Ab antiqua (from St. Gregory the Great).
63. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas V, ch. 13; VI, ch. 25.
64. St. Augustine, Enchiridion, ch. 64; Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians.
65. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 63, a. 5; q. 68, a. 8.

66. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* II, ch. 13.
67. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 2, part 3.
68. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, a. 9.
69. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 88, a. 11; see also St. Augustine, *passim*; St. Cyprian; St. Gregory the Great [abbreviations as in source].
70. St. Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John* 11 and 12 (on John 3).
71. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ch. 52.
72. Rom. 6:3–4; Rom. 6:9; 1 Pet. 3:18.
73. Heb. 6:4–6.
74. Gratian, *Causa* 1, *Quaestio* 1; *De consecratione*, *Distinctio* 4.
75. Justinian, *Codex*, title *Ne sanctum Baptisma iteretur*.
76. St. Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* V, ch. 4.
77. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII, ch. 17.
78. St. Augustine, *Tractates* 56–57 on John; *Contra Donatistas* II, ch. 14; *De haeresibus*, ch. 7; Leo the Great, *Epistles* 37 and 39; Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* II, part 6, ch. 13.
79. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 9, ad 4; q. 68, a. 11, ad 4.
80. Leo the Great, *Epistle* 37 (Benedictine numbering 287).
81. Leo the Great, *Epistle* 92.
82. Gratian, *De consecratione*, *Dist.* 4, cap. *Cum itaque*; cap. *Si nulla*.
83. Innocent III, *Decretals*, *Extra*, *De presbytero non baptizato*, cap. *Veniens*.
84. Alexander III, *Decretals*, *Extra*, *De baptismo et eius effectu*: decree on conditional baptism with the formula, "Si baptizatus es, non te baptizo; sed si nondum baptizatus es, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, etc."
85. Soto (Domingo de), *In I Sent.*, dist. 3, art. 6.
86. Peter of Palude, *In I Sent.*, dist. 6, q. 4.
87. Silvester (Prierias), *Summa*, s.v. *Baptismus*, 4, no. 9.
88. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, a. 1.
89. Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, ch. 3; see also chs. 27 and 30.
90. Gennadius, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, ch. 74.
91. St. Augustine, *Tractates* 11–12 on John; *Epistle* 57; *Ad Simplicianum* I, q. 2 (22); *De baptismo contra Donatistas* IV, ch. 21, and VI, ch. 12; *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, chs. 16, 20, 22, 29, 30, and II, ch. 27; *De origine animae* III, ch. 11; *Sermon* 14 *De verbis Apostoli*. On the editorial notes attached to some of these items, see the source's apparatus [abbreviation as in source].
92. St. Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium*; Leo the Great, *Epistle* 92; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistle* 77 to Hugh; Gratian, *Decretum*, *De consecratione*, *Dist.* 4, cc. *Filius*; *Non dubito*; *Nulla praeter c.*
93. Thomas of Walden (Thomas Netter), *De sacramentis* II, ch. 101.
94. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 20; see also elsewhere.
95. Council of Florence, *Decree for the Armenians*; Council of Trent, *Session* 6, chs. 4 and 7; and *De Baptismo*, canon 1.
96. Eph. 5:26; 1 Pet. 3:20–21.
97. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 63, a. 1.
98. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistle* 77 to Hugh.
99. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 11; III, q. 63, a. 2.

100. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 4.
101. Council of Trent, De Sacramentis in genere, canon 4.
102. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
103. Bulls of St. Pius V and Gregory XIII condemning the propositions of Michael Baius; see especially props. 32–33 [abbreviation as in source].
104. St. Cyprian, Epistle to Jubaianus.
105. St. Ambrose, Oration on the death of Valentinian (De obitu Valentiniani).
106. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas III, ch. 23.
107. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas III, ch. 15.
108. St. Augustine, Quaestiones in Heptateuchum, on Leviticus, q. 84.
109. Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistle 77 to Hugh (of St. Victor).
110. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis I, part 9, ch. 8.
111. the Master (of the Sentences), in this Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
112. Innocent III, Debitum, De baptismo et ejus effectum.
113. Innocent III, Apostolicam, De presbytero non baptizato.
114. Wis. 4: "The just man, however he be prevented by death, his soul shall be in refreshment."
115. St. Augustine, Retractationes II, ch. 18.
116. St. Thomas, as above [abbreviation as in source].
117. Jn. 3:5.
118. St. Ambrose, De Abraham Patriarcha II, ch. 11.
119. The source indicates also cap. 30 [abbreviation as in source].
120. Gennadius, De dogmatibus ecclesiasticis, ch. 74.
121. St. Augustine, De origine animae I, ch. 9.
122. St. Augustine, Contra mendacium, ch. 20.
123. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XIII, ch. 7; Epistle 108 (= Ep. 265 in the Benedictine edition).
124. St. Augustine, Epistle 108 to Honoratus.
125. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 on John.
126. Pope Silverius, in a certain Epistle to the Bishop of Tarragona [abbreviation as in source].
127. Council of Braga I, canon 36; cf. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 3 on the Epistle to the Philippians.
128. Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistle 77 to Hugh (of St. Victor); Innocent III, Debitum (De baptismo et ejus effectum) and Apostolicam (De presbytero non baptizato).
129. Esther 4.
130. 1 Thess. 5:19; St. Augustine, Epistle 23; St. Cyprian, De lapsis.
131. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 2; q. 69, a. 1, ad 2 and ad 4.
132. Innocent III, Decretal Debitum (De baptismo et ejus effectum); Innocent III, Decretal Apostolicam (De presbytero non baptizato).
133. St. Ambrose, Oratio de obitu Valentiniani.
134. Innocent III, Decretal Apostolicam; St. Ambrose, Oratio de obitu Valentiniani.

135. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, a. 2, ad 2; St. Bonaventure, ad textum of the present Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
136. On Ambrose's wording and its sense, see St. Ambrose, *Oratio de obitu Valentiniani*.
137. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 11.
138. St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ch. 16.
139. Ps.-Augustine, *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, ch. 74.
140. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XIII, ch. 7.
141. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* IV, ch. 22; *De origine animae* I, ch. 9; II, ch. 12; Ep. 108.
142. Tertullian, *De baptismo*; St. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Jubaianum*; Pseudo-Cyprian, *De stella et magis*; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* IV; St. Ambrose, *Oratio de obitu Valentiniani*; *Serm. 40 De sancta Agnete*; *Roman Breviary*, Jan. 23; *Roman Martyrology*, Aug. 25 (St. Genesius, baptized in his own blood); St. Cyril, *In Leviticum*, bk. I; Prosper, *Sententiae* 149; *Epigrammata* 87; Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, chs. 3, 30; Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* I, ch. 7; St. Bernard, *Ep. 77*; Gratian, *Decretum*, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, cap. *Baptismi vicem*.
143. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 12; III, q. 68, a. 2, ad 2.
144. St. Augustine, Ep. 108 (*Quoscumque*).
145. St. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Jubaianum*; cf. Lk. 12:50.
146. James of Vitry, *Historia Occidentalis*, ch. 36.
147. St. Cyprian, *Ep. ad Cornelium* (Ep. 2, bk. 1).
148. St. Bernard, Ep. 77.
149. Usuard, *Martyrology*, Aug. 22 (XI Kal. Sept.).
150. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 69, a. 4, ad 3.
151. St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Leviticum*, q. 84.
152. St. Augustine, *Retractationes* II, ch. 55.
153. St. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Numeros*, q. 33.
154. St. Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* II, ch. 24; *Quaestiones evangeliorum* II, q. 40.
155. St. Augustine, *Ad Simplicianum* I, q. 2; Ep. 57 ad Dardanum; *De baptismo contra Donatistas* I, ch. 8; IV, chs. 21–22; *Tractatus in Iohannem* 13.
156. St. John Chrysostom, *In Iohannem*, hom. 24.
157. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4; cf. Session 14, ch. 2.
158. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I-II, q. 113, a. 3, ad 1; III, q. 68, a. 9.
159. St. Epiphanius, *Panarion* (Haeresis 67): on the Hieracites.
160. St. Cyprian, *Epistula* 36.
161. Stanislaus Hosius, *De haeresibus nostri temporis*, Venice 1573, pp. 200–201; Floremundus de Remond, *Historia haereseon saeculi XVI* II, ch. 1.
162. The report of Ulerabergius [abbreviation as in source], *Vita Lutheri*, ch. 10, n. V.
163. Martin Luther, letter "To Two Parish Priests" [abbreviation as in source], as cited by Hosius in the place mentioned.
164. Gerardus Joannes Vossius, *De Pædobaptismo*, *Disputatio* 13; cf. Robert Bellarmine, *De Sacramento Baptismi* I, ch. 8.
165. Hosius, loc. cit.; Raimundus [abbreviation as in source], *Historia de ortu, progressu, et ruinis Lutherianorum*, esp. book 6, ch. 3.
166. Faustus Socinus, *Epistolae de Baptismo*: "Ad virum nobilem" and the other epistle on Baptism [abbreviation as in source]; cf. Josephus [abbreviation as in source], *De gratia Christi contra Pelagium et Celestium*, book 1, ch. 17.

167. St. Augustine, passim: Ad Simplicianum I, q. 2; Ep. 57 ad Dardanum; De baptismo contra Donatistas I, ch. 8; IV, chs. 21–22; Tract. in Ioh. 13; St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on John 24.
168. Arcudius, De concordia Ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis I, ch. 12.
169. Ludovicus Vives on St. Augustine, De civitate Dei I, ch. 28 (on the place), as cited in the source.
170. Augustine, Epistulae (the letter appended to his life) [abbreviation as in source]; cf. practice attested throughout the Church; Anabaptists excepted.
171. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 9 (same place).
172. Pseudo-Dionysius, De ecclesiastica hierarchia VI; Origen, Comment. in Rom. 6; Justin, Quaestiones ad Orthodoxos 56; St. Cyprian, Epistula 36 (book 3).
173. "S. Thom. ibidem" — St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, at the same locus cited immediately above [abbreviation as in source].
174. St. Jerome, Epistle to Laeta (as cited in the source).
175. St. Augustine, Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum IV, ch. 8; Contra Julianum I, ch. 3; Sermon 14, De verbis Apostoli.
176. St. Ambrose, In Lucam I, at "In spiritu et virtute Eliae".
177. St. Augustine, Contra Julianum I, ch. 3; De Abraham II, ch. 11; cf. Jn. 3: "Unless one be born again...".
178. St. Jerome, Epistula ad Laetam.
179. St. Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio in Sanctum Lavacrum.
180. St. John Chrysostom, Homilia ad Neophytos; Homilia de Adam et Eva; Homilia 23 in Acta Apostolorum.
181. St. Epiphanius, Panarion (Adversus Haereses), haeresis 67 (against the Hieracites).
182. St. Augustine, Epistles 23, 28, 37, 106; Enchiridion 93; De libero arbitrio II, ch. 23; De Genesi ad litteram X, ch. 11; De peccatorum meritis I, ch. 2; II, chs. 25, 27; De peccato originali, ch. 40; De civitate Dei XIV, ch. 2; De origine animae IX, ch. 12; Homilia 50 in Opere imperfecto in Matthaeum; Adversus haereses 47; Contra Donatistas IV, chs. 23–24; Sermon 14, De verbis Apostoli.
183. Pope Innocent I, Epistle to the Council of Milevis (counted as Augustine, Ep. 93).
184. St. Augustine, Epistle 157 to Optatus, citing Pope Innocent I.
185. Pseudo-Augustine, Hypognosticon I, ch. 7.
186. St. Fulgentius, De fide ad Petrum, ch. 27.
187. Pope Leo I, Epistula 86.
188. Prosper of Aquitaine, De vocatione gentium, ch. 23.
189. Pope Gregory VII, Epistula 53.
190. The Venerable Bede, In Marcum 7, at "Propter hunc sermonem vade".
191. St. Bernard, Epistles 77, 240; Sermon 66 in Cantica; Sermon 1 in Ramis Palmarum.
192. Innocent III, Decretales, cap. Majores, De baptismo et eius effectu.
193. St. Augustine, Epistle 106, on the Palestinian Synod against Pelagius.
194. Council of Carthage IV, Epistle to Pope Innocent I (as preserved in Augustine).
195. Council of Milevis (Numidia), canon 2; and the synodal letter to Pope Innocent I.
196. Fifth Council of Carthage, canon 6.
197. Council of Florence, Decree on the Sacraments.
198. Council of Trent, Session 5, ch. 4; Session 7, canons 5, 12, 13 on Baptism.
199. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, aa. 9, 12.
200. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas, book and chapter as in the source [abbreviation as in source].

201. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* IV, ch. 24.
202. St. Augustine, Sermon 14, *De verbis Apostoli*, chs. 11, 13.
203. St. Augustine, Epistle 107; *De peccatorum meritis* I, chs. 19–20.
204. St. Bernard, Sermon 66 in *Cantica*; Epistle 77.
205. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* IV, ch. 24; cf. Jn. 9.
206. St. Augustine, Epistle 23 to Boniface.
207. St. Augustine, *Tractatus* 80 in *Ioannem*.
208. Cf. Lk. 5; Matt. 8; Matt. 15; Matt. 17; 1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 4.
209. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, aa. 9, 11; also I-II, q. 113, a. 3, ad 1.
210. Jn. 3:5: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei."
211. Gabriel Biel, In IV Sent., on this distinction [abbreviation as in source]; Cajetan, Commentary on St. Thomas's *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, a. 2; Jean Gerson, Sermon delivered at the Council of Constance, *De Nativitate Virginis Mariae*, Consideratio 2; On this opinion of Cajetan, see what is to be viewed in some propositions from the book entitled *De Duplici Vita Humana* by R. P. Antonio Ursa..., to be added in our Appendix to this Fourth Book [editorial note as in the source].
212. Miracles of St. Stephen, book 1, last chapter; St. Augustine, *De diversis sermones* 32–33.
213. St. Bonaventure, In [Sentences] *Distinct.* 6, q. 1 [abbreviation as in source]; Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In [Sentences] *Distinct.* 6, q. 2 [abbreviation as in source].
214. St. Augustine, *De origine animae* III, ch. 9; St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis* I, ch. 23; cf. the following chapter; St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* VI, ch. 4; St. Augustine, Epistle 28 to St. Jerome; St. Augustine, Epistle 57 to Dardanus. The alternative numbering in the edition cited is: CLXVI and CCLXXXVII respectively [editorial note as in the source]; St. Bernard, Epistle 174; See further St. Augustine, Epistles 57 and 105; *De peccatorum meritis* I, ch. 21; *Contra Julianum* III, chs. 1, 12; *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* II, ch. 4; and Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, ch. 27.
215. Pope Innocent I, Epistle to the Council of Milevis (in Augustine's collection, Ep. 93); St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia* IV, ch. 2; Innocent III, *Decretales*, cap. Non ut, *De baptismo et eius effectus*; Council of Florence, admonition concerning the prompt Baptism of infants (Decree on the Sacraments / for the Armenians).
216. Council of Trent, Session 7, Decree on the Sacraments, can. penult. on Baptism.
217. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 67, a. 1–2.
218. St. Isidore of Seville, *De officiis ecclesiasticis* II, ch. 24; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, ch. Constat.
219. Apostolic Canons 46, 47, and 49.

DISTINCTIO V — ON THE MINISTERS OF BAPTISM AND THE CONFERRAL OF BAPTISM BY OTHERS (*DE MINISTRIS BAPTISMI ET AB ALIIS COLLATO*)

§ I

§ 1. Priests are forbidden to baptize with the Bishop present, as to whom the prior and superior authority of this ministry belongs. For Leo says: "Nor is it permitted that, in the Bishop's presence, priests enter the baptistery, nor that, while the Prelate is present, they dip the infant or sign it, unless by his order."^[2] But this is not to be taken as though the Bishop alone were the proper minister (*minister*) of Baptism (*Baptismus*), and as though to the lower pastors that ministry belonged only from the commission of the superior. For to cede to a superior and to honor him when he is present in the administration of some matter is one thing; to have in that matter nothing besides the commission or mandate of a superior is another. For a Deacon (*Diaconus*) indeed has only the bare commission for this ministry; but a Priest (*Presbyter*) and a Bishop (*Episcopus*) have the proper function of the same ministry, in which nevertheless the Priest ought to yield to the Bishop as the chief ruler of the Church. Therefore, just as the Priest has the right of confecting the Eucharist, and also of exhorting the people and reconciling penitents, if he has the care of souls, although the canons do not allow these things to be done by a Priest in the Bishop's presence unless also by the Bishop's order, as is read in the same Epistle of Leo, so too he has the same right of baptizing with the Bishop, yet in it he ought to acknowledge the Bishop as his superior and to defer to him.

§ 2. Moreover, since there fall upon Bishops other greater burdens that pertain peculiarly to their office—namely to teach and to pray—which could be hindered if they busied themselves much with those things that are lesser, from this it came about that already from the beginning the province of baptizing was left to priests their inferiors, since even Christ did not baptize by Himself, but by His disciples (Jn. 4), although He Himself prayed and preached the Gospel. And Peter (Acts 10) ordered Cornelius and his household, whom he had first instructed by saving doctrine, to be baptized by others. And Paul in 1 Corinthians testifies that very few were baptized by himself: "For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to evangelize." He likewise laid hands upon the twelve who had been baptized by the ministry of others (Acts 19). Finally, in a not dissimilar business the Apostle said (Acts 6): "It is not fitting that we should leave the word of God and serve tables; look out therefore..." "But we will be intent upon prayer and the ministry of the word." For the likeness is in this, that, just as that ministry of tables hindered them from those things which were of greater moment—namely teaching and prayer—and could easily be done by inferiors, so also the ministry of Baptism; indeed much more so, because it does not require that uprightness and industry which the ministry of tables demanded. Therefore what Christ commands the Apostles in the Gospel, that they should teach and baptize, we learn from the Acts and apostolic words to be understood thus: that they are ordered to attend to teaching by

themselves, but that they can and even ought to administer Baptism through others, lest they be called away from the graver functions of their own order. The same is confirmed by the practice of the Church, in which by perpetual custom it has been observed that Bishops chiefly attend to the word, but the office of baptizing they execute through others.

§ II — To what extent Baptism can be conferred by any others whatsoever (Quatenus baptismus ab aliis quibuscumque conferri possit)

§ 3. Since Baptism is a sacrament (*sacramentum*) provided by the kindness of God for all as necessary unto salvation, it has been provided that, where a priest is lacking, this sacrament can, in urgent necessity, be administered by another. And in the first place Scripture teaches that this can sometimes be done by a Deacon, even if necessity does not press (Acts 8), where we read that first the Samaritans, then the Ethiopian eunuch, were baptized by Philip the Deacon. Yet we must judge that he did this not without an express—and that a general—commission received from the Apostles. For those whom the Apostles sent to evangelize they likewise entrusted with the ministry of baptizing; since the Apostles themselves, before the Lord's Passion, when they were not yet priests, at the Lord's command baptized (Jn. 4).

§ 4. Moreover, in necessity not only a Deacon but even a Subdeacon, a Monk, a Layman, indeed even a Woman, can baptize. The Council of Elvira confirms this of the layman (can. 38), as do St. Augustine, book 1 (Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 15), and St. Isidore in the place cited above. And some decrees of the same thing are also extant in Gratian (as in Causa 30, Question 1, cap. Ad limina; and in De Consecratione, Distinction 4, cap. In necessitate, cap. Sanctum est) — which two chapters are taken from a certain Epistle of Augustine to Fortunatus which does not survive. Witnesses of the same matter are also Tertullian (On Baptism), and St. Jerome (in the Dialogue against the Luciferians). The same is also defined by Pope Gelasius (in the Epistle to the Bishops of Lucania, ch. 9, and it is found in Gratian, Distinction 93, cap. Diaconus). That a woman also can baptize in necessity is taught by the Council of Carthage IV, to which Augustine subscribed, can. 100; by the Master (Distinction 6); and by Gratian, De Consecratione, Distinction 4, cap. Mulier; and likewise by Pope Urban II, writing to Vitalis the Priest of Brescia, and this is found in Gratian (Causa 30, question 3, per quos).⁴

§ 5. Nor indeed only from a Christian, but also from a heretic, a pagan, a Jew, from any person whatsoever, can Baptism be received in necessity. On which matter the Council of Florence established, in the Decree for the Armenians: "In a case of necessity, not only a priest or deacon, but also a layman and a woman, indeed even a pagan and a heretic, can baptize, provided that he keep the form of the Church and intend to do what the Church does."[^5]

§ 6. But that such Baptism not only is valid, but can also be licitly sought from a man whom necessity has overtaken (whatever be the case as to the one who administers, if he persists in his unbelief—whom, indeed, unless he change his mind and conceive repentance before he undertake this sacred work, we by no means think should be excused from guilt) seems not obscurely to be gathered from the same words of the Florentine Decree. For if the Council willed nothing other than that such Baptism is valid, it would in vain make mention of necessity, since, as we shall presently say, it is valid also outside necessity. But Augustine asserts this more clearly, book 1 (Against the Donatists, ch. 2), in these words: "If perchance extreme necessity shall have compelled someone, where he has not found a Catholic from whom he may receive it, let him receive it; and

with peace kept in his mind toward the Catholic, through anyone whom he has received outside the Catholic unity that which he would have received within the Catholic unity, if he shall straightway also depart from this life, we reckon him to be nothing other than a Catholic. But if he shall have been freed from bodily death, when he shall also have restored himself by bodily presence to the Catholic congregation, from which he had never departed in heart, not only do we not disapprove what he did, but we also most securely and most truly praise it; because he believed that God is present to his heart, where he was keeping the unity, and that it is not permitted to depart from this life without the sacrament of holy Baptism, which, wherever he found it, he knew to be not of men but of God." The same man has a most similar judgment, book 6, ch. 5. And the same reasoning holds for any other unbeliever.

§ 7. But one must know, furthermore, that even outside necessity Baptism conferred by any man whatsoever is valid and therefore by no means to be repeated. For although, as was said above, it is only lawful outside necessity for priests and deacons to do this, nevertheless if it be attempted by others in whatever manner, the sacrament is made true and valid. Whence Augustine, book 2 (*Against the Letter of Parmenian*, ch. 13): "If it is done when no necessity is compelling, it is the usurpation of another's office; but if necessity press, it is either no offense or a venial one. But, even if it be usurped when no necessity compels, and be given by anyone whatsoever to anyone whatsoever, what has been given cannot be said to have not been given, although it can rightly be said to have been given illicitly. But the affection of one who calls to mind and repents corrects the illicit usurpation. If he shall not have corrected it, what has been given will remain unto the punishment of the usurper—either of him who illicitly gave, or of him who illicitly received—but it will not on that account be held as not given." So he. Augustine indeed seems in the same place to doubt, when he speaks about Baptism not conferred, saying: "And this indeed is another question, whether even by those who have never been Christians Baptism can be given; nor should anything rashly be affirmed from this without the authority of so great a Council as suffices for so great a matter." He raises the same doubt also in book 7 (*Against the Donatists*, ch. 53). Yet although in the former place he brings forward nothing, in the latter he nevertheless inclines more to that opinion, to wit, that he judges Baptism to be valid wherever and by whomever it has been conferred. But this afterwards was manifestly defined by the Apostolic See. For concerning Baptism administered by Jews there exists a Decree of Pope Nicholas, who responds to the consultations of the Bulgarians, cap. 3, which is cited by Gratian (*De Consecratione*, Distinction 4, cap. A *Judaeo quodam*). And concerning that which a pagan might have given, there exists an Epistle of Gregory III to Bishop Boniface, cited there by Gratian (cap. *Quos a Paganis*). And the same, as Gratian cites, Isidore attests in these words: "The Roman Pontiff judges not the man who baptizes, but that the Spirit of God supplies the grace of Baptism, even if the baptizer be a pagan." And this was more expressly confirmed by the Council of Florence in the words cited by us above. Finally, what is to be thought about Baptism, and in general about the sacraments which are administered by evil men—whether heretics, or schismatics, or wicked in whatever manner—we showed above, in Distinction 1, proving that the effect of the sacrament does not depend upon the quality of the minister, and refuting the contrary arguments.⁶

-
- St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* I, ch. 15.
 - St. Isidore, [as in source, "loco supracitato"].
 - Gratian, *Decretum*: Causa 30, q. 1, cap. *Ad limina*; *De consecratione*, dist. 4, cap. *In necessitate*; cap. *Sanctum est* (the last two chapters taken from a lost Epistle of Augustine to Fortunatus).

- Tertullian, *De baptismo*.
- St. Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*.
- Pope Gelasius, *Epistle to the Bishops of Lucania*, ch. 9; cited in Gratian, dist. 93, cap. Diaconus.
- Council of Carthage IV, can. 100 (subscribed by Augustine).
- "Magistro (Distinct. 6.)" [abbreviation as in source].
- Gratian, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, cap. Mulier.
- Pope Urban II, *Letter to Vitalis the Priest of Brescia*; in Gratian, *Causa 30*, q. 3, per quos.

§ 8. The Donatists imitated them, of whom St. Augustine in the book *On Heresies* says, in Heresy 49, that they rebaptize Catholics, so as to be the more certainly heretics by rescinding, among the heretics themselves, the common Baptism; and he repeats this in the book *On the Vices of Heresies* in the chapter of Pope Vigilius, and also from the narration of Victor of Utica.⁷ Charles Sigonius hands down, at the end of book XII *On the Western Empire*, that a certain Arian king demanded from Sebastian, a Catholic, that he should rebaptize, but that he did not admit their Baptism; St. Jerome writes the same in the *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*.⁸ The narrators report also that Catholics were rebaptized by the Armenians; and, whoever he was who in the sixteenth century revived the same opinion, the very author and head of the Anabaptistic sect, plunged into the greatest errors, has already been noted above; that they themselves, moreover, used to dip anew those who had been baptized by the Catholics, as St. Epiphanius testifies in Heresy 76, which is the Anomeans (or Anomoeans).⁹ Hence, penalties very severe were sanctioned by the pious emperors Honorius and Theodosius against those who dared to rebaptize, as is recorded in book I, title 6 of the Code, "Lest the holy Baptism be repeated."¹⁰ As to the first matter: "The first of all mortals," says Vincent of Lérins, "who judged that people ought to be rebaptized, against the divine Canon, against the custom and institutions of the Universal Church, was Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage"—or that he at least anticipated, as Baronius at the year 217 judges—"and that Tertullian adhered to him," as very many conjecture from the words of Tertullian in the book *On Baptism*, chapter 15.¹¹ Agrippinus indeed tried to approve the same opinion by a council of the middle time, as is evident from the *Epistles of St. Cyprian*, and also from St. Augustine both elsewhere and in book 4 *On Baptism*, chapter 2; but Baronius with high praise commends Agrippinus at that point from the peace of the Church being able to be inferred, that a council could be held—whereas, before, the decrees of the emperors had been issued by which all the public gatherings of Christians were forbidden; not, however, precisely in that year 217 which Baronius has set down for the aforesaid council. From this it appears that Baronius was mistaken in placing that council in the year 217.¹²

§ 9. It is clear from Eusebius, book 7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 3 of the Valesian edition, that the first author of this opinion was Cyprian; for in the year 258 he was eager to establish the same opinion that had been established by Agrippinus, as is evident from the *Epistle to Jubaianus* and the *Synodical Letter to Stephen*, and also from St. Augustine, book 1 *Against the Letters of Petilian*, chapter 7; and Baronius and Binius, who put the same council in the year 258, collect that its decrees were confirmed, as is evident from the *Epistle of Firmilian*, who numbers among those who feel with himself Dionysius of Alexandria and the bishops of Caesarea; Baronius at the year 259 gathers their opinion from the words of Eusebius, who recites the *Epistle of Dionysius to Philemon* in book 7, chapter 7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, and from St. Jerome *On Illustrious Men*, in Dionysius the bishop. He thinks that Dionysius never descended into that opinion; for how could it be that he would intercede as a go-between with Stephen for the Orientals, if in the same matter

they were endangered? But from that same Eusebius in the same place it is sufficiently clear that Dionysius intervened on behalf of the Orientals before Stephen.¹³

§ 10. Moreover, Baronius thinks that in the aforesaid time Cyprian and the Africans were censured by Stephen with an ecclesiastical censure. But Valesius, in the notes to the same place in Eusebius, adduces that Stephen did not break peace with them, but only threatened that he would break it if they were to remain in their former opinion; and truly Dionysius seems expressly to testify this in the Epistle to Stephen, copied to Eusebius in that same chapter 5, where the Epistle of Dionysius to Stephen is recited.¹⁴ Finally, from that Eusebius, in the same place, Baronius collects that the Oriental bishops embraced the same opinion about rebaptizing; whom Filelfo followed. But whoever has read attentively will find that the matter stands very differently, namely, that those who had previously agreed with Cyprian's opinion changed their mind, as is evident from St. Jerome (*Dialogue Against the Luciferians*), which is also clear about the very same matter from St. Augustine, Epistle 93 to Vincentius (otherwise 48), although in places the most learned and erudite Gaspar Jueninus writes otherwise. But we would here admonish the reader that, although this controversy is very extensive, we still judge that he must be consulted absolutely; for he treats the whole matter learnedly and fully; many, however, of our age think that the greater number adhered to Cyprian, with whom we do not think it fitting to agree, although there could be no greater doubt; but his words expressly teach that those baptized by heretics and schismatics are not to be rebaptized.¹⁵

§ 11. St. Basil also is numbered by some among those who adhered somewhat to this opinion; likewise Cyril of Jerusalem, Optatus of Milevis, and in the fifth century a most learned man; but we remind the reader that, about this controversy, although very many of our age think that these adhered to it somewhat, we deem that they did not. For they actually disapprove the Baptism conferred by heretics, although, indeed, Natalis Alexander in Dissertation 2 in the fifth century somewhat opposes this, and he says that Timothy of Constantinople adhered somewhat, as also Theodemus the Studite, who flourished in the year 817 under the emperors Leo the Armenian in the East and Louis the Pious in the West; this is abundantly attested in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. XIV of the Lyons edition of the year 1677. Of the same judgment is Balsamon in the Epistle to Naucratus, and in the same *Bibliotheca* of the Fathers.¹⁶ This was then the opinion of some bishops opposed to the contrary Catholic and immovable tradition; but the contrary was confirmed by the First Synod of Nicaea, canon 8 and 19, by the Council of Laodicea—as it pleases Cabassutius against Baronius—to have been celebrated in an uncertain year, but after Nicaea, canon 7; by the First Council of Constantinople, canon 7—although Bellarmine in book 1 denies that there was action about this controversy in the council; by the Second Council of Arles, celebrated in the year 330, chapters 16 and 17; and at length by the Council of Trent.¹⁷

§ 12. Truly the question about Baptism, and indeed a greater one, flourished in the age of the ancients. It is clear that, in those times, the question was whether Baptism conferred by an infidel, who namely had not been tinged with Baptism, was valid; which question up to the times of St. Augustine had not yet been defined, as the words of the same doctor in book 2 *Against the Epistle of Parmenian*, chapter 13, testify, and it is extant in Gratian, *On Consecration*, Distinction 4, and the chapter *Quod proposuimus*, and the chapter *Aquo*, where Augustine and the Council of Florence and wherever else they resolve this controversy, by establishing that Baptism conferred with evangelical words by anyone whatsoever is Baptism; of laymen, indeed even of women, who, although not baptized, confer Baptism.¹⁸

§ III — Solution of certain objections (Objectionum quarundam dissolutio)

§ 13. In this place, those points must be refuted in particular by which it seems to be shown that Baptism administered by a man then initiated, or at least not baptized, or altogether constituted outside the Church, is invalid. Of which this is the first: Just as Baptism is a sacrament of necessity, so also is Penance; but a layman can be minister of the sacrament of Penance under no necessity whatever that may arise; therefore neither can he be minister of Baptism.

§ 14. Second: St. Augustine, book 1 Against the Donatists, chapter 2: "The sacrament of Baptism is that which the one baptized has, and the sacrament of giving Baptism is that which he who is ordained has." From which words it seems to follow that the unordained, since they do not have the sacrament of giving Baptism, cannot baptize, just as neither can they absolve, since they have not received the sacrament of giving absolution. Whence also, in the same place, Augustine tries to prove from this that Baptism exists outside the Church, because a priest departing from the Church does not lose the sacrament of Ordination.

§ 15. Third: The same Augustine, book 2 Against the Epistle of Parmenian, chapter 13, says that in Baptism it is given to the one baptized that through him Baptism can be given, but in Ordination there is given the right of giving Baptism. Whence it seems consequent that one not baptized is deprived of both—the very right of giving Baptism, which only the ordained has, and also the absolute and bare power of giving Baptism, which only the baptized has.

§ 16. Fourth: No one can give what he does not have; therefore one not baptized will not be able to baptize.

§ 17. Fifth: In the ministry of the sacraments there seems to be required some spiritual testimony in every case. And that this was held as ratified among the ancients of the Greeks is proved both from the seventeenth canon of Nicephorus and from Hieremiah the Pseudo-Patriarch, and from the Censures, and from others of the Western and Eastern Churches; although in those same places both other provinces, which persevered in the faith of Christ according to the Greek rite, are named; so that, with a presbyter consenting, they would prefer to permit that the infants be washed by men of their own religion; because they thought that for the laity it had not been approved even in necessity. Which, although the Baptisms of laity baptizers were approved in the Western Church, and even licit in pressing necessity, yet even heretics, with necessity urgent, acknowledge that it is permitted to perform this office. And in truth that the English Church, or rather synagogue, has adopted the practice is testified by Georgius, abbot Theodorus of the Anglicans, in a lecture on Circumcision and Baptism, where he says that laity would baptize if the minister were not present in time. Truly, of what a raving man's petulance!²⁰

§ 18. Sixth: Nicephorus, book 11 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 11: "It is clear," he says, "that one who has not himself been initiated in the sacred rites of Baptism cannot baptize."

§ 19. Finally, this also can be objected, that in the Council of Nicaea (canon 10) it is read to have been decreed that the Paulianists and Cataphrygians, heretics, are to be baptized if they come to the Church; of which Nicene sanction St. Jerome makes mention also in the Dialogue Against the Luciferians at the end. And the very same thing about the Paulianists was repeated in the Council of Arles (canon 16). To these we respond in order.

§ 20. To the first, St. Thomas answers, III, question 67, article 3, ad 3: that Penance is not of such great necessity as Baptism. Which, although it is absolutely true—because Baptism is necessary for all, Penance only for those who have relapsed—there nonetheless exists the same necessity of Penance for salvation with respect to the relapsed, as there is of Baptism with respect to all; and therefore it seems that the relapsed ought not to have been provided for in the same way as those who have never received the grace of adoption. For the reason of divine justice did not allow that the return to reconciliation should be as easy for a man as had been the access to first grace. Wherefore God so instituted Baptism that its effects should depend on the sacrament alone, not on any authority or power of the one conferring, as the sacrament of Reconciliation: the effects of which require in the minister a power which is not found in a layman, and far less in a pagan. Therefore, in conferring Baptism a bare exhibition of the ministry is made use of, although it is a ministerial power. Whence Augustine, book 3 *Against the Letters of Petilian*, chapter 56: "As in preaching the Gospel, so also in ministering Baptism, mere ministration is efficacious." And the matter can be made clear by the likeness of iron and fire. For any man, even if he be not a smith, can heat iron when fire is applied, because the whole power of heating is placed in the fire; but to make a nail out of glowing iron he cannot, unless he is a smith—because this depends not only on fire but also on the skill of the maker.²¹

§ 21. To the second and third it is answered that only those ordained, that is, priests, have the right of giving Baptism; yet if, whether by some commission or by usurpation or by necessity, it is given by another, it is truly given—as Augustine testifies in that same place *Against the Epistles of Parmenian*. For, as he also says in book 5 *Against the Donatists*, chapter 5: "Many things are given contrary to right, and nevertheless are not for that reason either nothing or not said to be given." But what Augustine says, that in Baptism it is given to each one that through him Baptism can be given, he seems to will nothing else than this: that it is more congruous that Baptism be conferred by one baptized than by one not baptized—since the baptized also actually has that which he bestows. Or, because in that same chapter he doubts whether one not baptized can baptize, this is his thought: that at least in Baptism it is given, if previously he does not have it.

§ 22. Although one not baptized (which was the fourth argument) does not actually have Baptism, nevertheless he has it in that way in which a cause has its effect. For a principal cause has its effect virtually, as the sun has heat; but a ministerial and instrumental cause thus far has the effect because it can concur to it by way of instrument or ministry: and thus a pagan, by applying the matter and pronouncing the form with due intention, concurs to the effect of Baptism.

§ 23. To the fifth it is answered that in the minister of a sacrament a spiritual power ordered to some work is not necessarily required, but in some cases a bare work of ministry suffices, such as a washing or the like—something which has place not only in Baptism, but also, in the opinion of many, in the sacrament of Matrimony—although for the administration of the others, furthermore, some spiritual power is required.

§ 24. Passing over the sixth argument—because the authority of Nicephorus in doctrine is not of great weight—we reply to the seventh, that Paulianists and Cataphrygians were said in the Nicene Council and at the Second Council of Arles to have vitiated the form of Baptism, as Augustine teaches in *Heresy 43*. And this is gathered with sufficient perspicuity from both councils. For in the Nicene Council—as Augustine testifies in book 6 *Against the Donatists*, chapter 1, and elsewhere—the custom of the Church of receiving heretics without repeated Baptism was approved in general. But the Council of Arles (canon 17) does not wish the others of the heretics to be baptized anew, because they were baptizing in the Trinity, but to be received with imposition of hands. And indeed otherwise, not concerning one or another sect in particular, but concerning

all heretics in general, the same ought to have been established in each council, if it were true that outside the Church the sacrament of Baptism is not given.

§ IV — On the power proper to Christ with respect to Baptism (De potestate Christo propria circa Baptismum)

§ 25. St. Augustine teaches in Tractate 5 on John, on those words of the first chapter, "This is he who baptizes," that Christ, while retaining for Himself the power of Baptism, transferred only its ministry to others, and that John the Baptist, when he had previously been ignorant, learned this when it was said to him: "Upon whom you shall see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, he it is who baptizes in the Holy Spirit." He repeats this doctrine in the next tractate, and in book 5 Against the Donatists, chapter 13.²³

§ 26. The Master therefore asks what that power is which Christ retained for Himself concerning Baptism and did not transfer to others. And first it is established that Augustine is not speaking of the divine power which they call of authority. For that cannot be communicated to men, just as neither can the Divine Essence. But Augustine holds that Christ could have communicated to men, if He had willed, that power of which he is there speaking. "He could," he says, "have given this power to His servants, but He did not will." And in another place: "For the Lord Jesus could, if He had willed, have given the power of His Baptism to some one, or to some of His more excellent servants, whom He had already made His friends, so that, just as by the blossoming rod Aaron was shown to be priest, so in His Church by some sign there might be shown the dispensers of the mysteries of more excellent sanctity, who alone ought to baptize, so that the ministry of Baptism would not pertain to others than to those to whom would belong the power of Baptism."²⁴

— *Distinctio VI — Whether one can be baptized and sanctified in the mother's womb (Utrum baptizari et sanctificari quis possit in utero materno) (continued from previous chunk) —*

§ I

§ 27. It is asked whether Baptism and sanctification can be effected in the womb. The Master and Isidore say straightway in the contrary sense (De summo bono, cap. 24); whose words are also approved by Gratian (De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. 1).²⁶ Those who argue to the contrary insist chiefly on evidences of fact. For corporeal ablution is necessary to Baptism; but the ablution of the little body of an infant altogether antecedent to birth is hindered by the womb, by a human impediment rather than by a divine.

§ 28. If you say that the child existing in the womb is in some way a part of the mother, and so could be baptized with the mother being baptized, I reply that the consequent does not follow, since the very child is not that same person as the mother; and the same sanctification obtained by Baptism is distinct in it from that in the mother's soul: but the same soul of the fetus is not formed, and therefore its body is distinct. Whence, since that cannot be, Baptism, by which the mother is baptized, cannot be poured back upon the fetus, which is not yet formed; and if it is truly a fetus that is animated, then it is certainly capable of Baptism, which a man is and not a non-man. The same objection is also solved from the practice of the Church by St. Augustine, book 6 Against Julian, chapter 14: "If," he says, "one is brought to the birth, or while he is conceived he departs, it is not the case that he is an infant for whom Baptism is prepared; whose mother is baptized, whose mother is baptized in an imminent danger of some death, so that she herself may be baptized in the womb."

"Now," he says, "the very body of the mother being washed, the infant is not baptized." "Nor do we say that the flesh of the mother is the flesh of the infant." Thus he.

§ I — Whether someone can be baptized and sanctified in the mother's womb (Utrum baptizari & sanctificari quis possit in utero materno)

§ 29. Another reason is also usually given to prove that no one can be baptized in the mother's womb, namely that Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, according to that saying: "unless one be born again," and yet no one can be reborn before he has been born. In this mode St. Augustine argues in book 1 *On the Merits of Sins*, chapter 27, in these words: "Surely the sacrament of Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration. Wherefore, just as a man who has not lived cannot die, he who has not died cannot be reborn."²⁷ And in the Letter to Dardanus he assumes the same sentence—"No one can be reborn unless born"—as something undoubted and manifest in itself, pressing it by repeated assertion; and from this reason, after Augustine, those cited above and in the text make use.²⁸

§ 30. But this reasoning has a difficulty because of those who by a singular privilege of God are believed to have been sanctified in the wombs of their mothers and therefore to have been, as it were, reborn—namely the Blessed Virgin, the Baptist, and the Prophet Jeremiah. Whence it seems to follow that someone is sometimes reborn before he is born. But if you deny this to be so, and therefore concede that Augustine's reasoning seems somewhat flimsy—since even according to the flesh a man's birth can be distinguished in a twofold way, one in the womb, the other from the womb: the prior, whereby he is animated; the latter, whereby he is brought forth into the light—and that to the prior pertains that saying (Matt. 1), "For that which is born is of the Holy Spirit"; to the latter, "Today there is born to you a Savior" (Lk. 2); and hence that it is sufficient that a man be first born according to the flesh before he be reborn according to the Spirit.

§ 31. Augustine, in the said Letter, strives studiously to refute that reply, saying that, if that which takes place in the womb be accounted the first birth, then that human birth by which, after he has been born from the womb, he is reborn of the Holy Spirit, would now not be the second but the third. Now as to the sanctification of certain persons in the womb, he denies that it went so far as to constitute them temples of the Holy Spirit. "Except for the cornerstone," he says, "I do not see how men are built into the house of God so as to have God indwelling in them, unless when they have been reborn; which they cannot be before they are born." Although with regard to pregnant women—even holy women—we may hold charitably whether those who are constituted within their maternal viscera be or be not gifted with some manner of sanctification, either on account of John, who, not yet brought forth into this light, nevertheless leapt for joy (which assuredly who would not believe could have been done by the operation of the Holy Spirit?), or on account of Jeremiah to whom the Lord says, "Before you came forth from the womb, I sanctified you," nevertheless that sanctification by which we are made, both corporately and singly, temples of God, one temple of God, is not except of those who have been reborn.²⁸

§ 32. But Bernard, in Letter 174 to the Canons of Lyons, unmoved by Augustine's reason whereby he denies that one who has not been born can be reborn, first declares most firmly that he agrees with the Church in believing about the Virgin Mother of God that in the mother's womb she received that she should come forth holy. Then, concerning Jeremiah and John the Baptist (David also being mentioned in view of that of Psalm 70, "In God I have been confirmed from the womb; from my mother's womb thou art my

protector"), he likewise says that he approves—though not with equal firmness of mind, for he does not approve that which Augustine in the said letter interprets about Jeremiah's sanctification in the womb according to predestination. Yet, unwilling to contend about this matter, he persists rather in the example of John the Baptist, whom the Angel foretold would be filled with the Holy Spirit already from the womb of his mother, which, he says, cannot be referred to predestination. Nor, however, does he state clearly what kind of sanctification that very fulness of the Holy Spirit conferred on John. "Certainly," he says, "the Holy Spirit, with which He filled the man, sanctified him." Furthermore, as to how far this very sanctification availed against original sin—whether for this or that Prophet, or if someone else were anticipated by like grace—I would not readily say. "Still, I would hardly hesitate to call sanctified those whom God sanctified, and to say that they came forth from the womb with the same sanctification which they received in the womb; nor would I assert that the guilt which they drew in conception had in any way already been remitted by the blessing thus granted to their birth. Yet who will go so far as to say that one filled with the Holy Spirit would nevertheless, if it had chanced that he died in the womb, go on to pay the penalties of damnation? It is harsh; yet for my part I would not dare to define anything from this." But whatever be the case, rightly does the Church—which in the case of the rest judges not the nativity but the death of saints to be precious—by a certain singular exception carry with festal joys and venerate the nativity of that man, John, about whom, when the Angel announced him, she reads in singular words: "And many will rejoice at his birth," and what follows; in which also he confirms at greater length those things which he had touched upon above concerning the sanctification of the Blessed Virgin in the womb.²⁹

§ 33. Therefore, with that position established, which is more approved by Bernard—namely that certain persons were sanctified in the mother's womb even to the deletion of original fault—one must grant that hu

1. Section title illegible in the source.

2. Leo the Great, Epistle 88 to the Bishops of Germany and Gaul.

3. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 67, a. 1, 3–5.

4. ° Council of Elvira, canon 38.

5. Council of Florence, *Decretum pro Armenis*.

6. The long critical note on the Carthaginian canons in the source is as follows: "The canons of the Council of Carthage IV—or rather V—held under Pope Anastasius, with Honorius as Carthaginian Bishop, as the proem of the same Council reports, certain critics (as is also hinted by some) have called into doubt whether they truly belong to that Council. For since such canons are found neither in the Code of the African Church, nor in the Collection of Ferrandus, just as in Dionysius Exiguus's collections they are not read—places in which the canons of the aforesaid Council ought to be found—probable reason is given for doubting; and indeed in a certain manuscript of the Barberini Library these canons bear this title: Statutes of the Ancient Church; whence it very little follows that they are the canons of this Council. It is furthermore evident that they savor of the rites by which the Minor Orders used to be conferred in the practice of the Western Church, in which the tradition of instruments was in use; they are, however, very far from the discipline of the Eastern Church, in which the imposition of hands alone suffices for conferring Orders. In certain manuscripts too they are headed thus and examined more exactly by learned men (for this Council, which is commonly called the fourth, is by others assigned to a provincial synod of Carthage which is called the fifth; the former met at Carthage on the sixth day before the Kalends of June of the same year, but the latter, which is called universal in the proem, met on the sixth of the Ides of November; yet the matters about which they decree most chiefly concern the African Church). For instance, in the first canon it is established that one should interrogate the Trinity and the most holy unity of Persons, the unity of Essence consubstantial with the Father, firmly and from the heart they should confess; and the rest of such things. Which interrogation was applied on account of the Manicheans; as is quite clear from the common errors of the Donatists and Pelagians. Indeed it seems amazing that the dogma which afterwards the Pelagians were to spread abroad in the

same Africa not before the year 411—by which they denied original sin common to the offspring of Adam—should be condemned in that Council so expressly; while otherwise it is certain that in Africa the same dogma concerning original sin had been believed. However it be, from this it can be sufficiently clear that these canons altogether agree with the discipline of the Church; yet since they treat specifically of ecclesiastical canons and not of the conferring of Orders... Moreover by the name Council of Carthage both Ivo of Chartres and Gratian cite them. But canon 103, which is: 'A woman, although learned and holy, should not presume to baptize,' and thus also in the time of Walafrid Strabo this canon used to be expressed; the same Walafrid too, in the book *De divinis officiis*, ch. 20, reports the canon framed in such a way as the author here cites from Pamelius on Tertullian, *De baptismo*, ch. 17: if in that canon the exception had not been added, 'unless necessity compel,' Tertullian would rightly object in the same place that Baptism given by women is not valid; which there he proves by many arguments to be valid even from laymen; although in the preceding canon of the same Council it is taught: 'A woman, although learned and holy, should not presume to teach in the assembly, or to speak among men,' as the Apostle understands in 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2; therefore the case of necessity is excepted. As to Gratian, although almost all authors assert that the canon is corrupt in him, nevertheless in the Decree, by order of Gregory XIII corrected and published, that canon is thus expressed: 'A woman, although learned and holy, should not presume to baptize.' Then is added in italic character: 'unless perhaps necessity shall have compelled.'"; On the broader historical and theological controversy (source note marked "a"): "Neither is the error of the heterodox single, nor did the question about the consecration and requisites in ministers for the validity of the sacraments fail to obtain among the ancients a certain difficulty, especially about the Sacrament of Order; and the learned John Morinus of the Congregation of the Oratory of Our Lord Jesus Christ, a distinguished ornament, has defended from the hiding places of ancient antiquity by monuments brought forth that in the business of sacred ordination a question other than the present one was agitated in former times. Here, however, we will set down what pertains more closely to the Sacrament of Baptism, and what contentions have been treated in our own times. First, we will set forth the heretics who gave beginnings to Anabaptism, if we should believe John Filelfo, book 1 (*Selectarum* cap. 12): the Jews indeed, and those who were of the sect of the Hemerobaptists, were variously named; *Cælicolæ* also were called. But the sect of these *Cælicolæ* is very obscure, since it is mentioned nowhere else than in Augustine's Epistle XLIV, otherwise CLXIII, and in the Code of Justinian concerning the Jews and *Cælicolæ*; whence it appears that the beginnings of the Anabaptists are not to be taken thence. Among these the Marcionites are to be numbered; that heretics commonly polluted others with a wicked washing; the first are numbered who rebaptized Catholics: and they praise Philastrius as author. Some very learned men have noted that the author is not Novatus, a Roman Presbyter ill-disposed toward Pope Cornelius, whose ambition..." [the source continues beyond the present excerpt].

7. St. Augustine, *De haeresibus*, haer. 49; idem, *De haeresibus*, in capite Vigiliæ Romani Pontificis; Victor of Utica, *Historia persecutionis vandalicæ*.
8. Charles Sigonius, *De Occidentali Imperio*, book XII, at the end; St. Jerome, *Dialogus adversus Luciferianos*.
9. St. Epiphanius, *Panarion* (Haer.) 76 (the Anomoeans).
10. Code of Justinian, I, tit. 6: "Ne sanctum Baptisma iteretur."
11. St. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium*, ch. 9; Baronius, *Annales*, ad an. 217; Tertullian, *De baptismo*, ch. 15.
12. St. Cyprian, Ep. 71 ad Quintum; Ep. ad Jubaianum; St. Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, I, ch. 7; Baronius, *Annales*, ad an. 258; Binius, *Annales*, ad eundem annum; Firmilian's Epistle (apud Cyprianum); Dionysius of Alexandria (apud Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VII, ch. 7); St. Jerome, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, "Dionysius."
13. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII, ch. 7 (Valesian edition); St. Jerome, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, "Dionysius."
14. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VII, ch. 5 (reciting the Epistle of Dionysius to Stephen).
15. St. Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*; St. Augustine, Ep. 93 ad Vincentium (alias 48); Gaspar Jueninus (Gasper Juenin), *De sacra theologia*, tract. de Baptismo [abbreviation as in source].
16. St. Basil, *Epistolæ canonicae ad Amphiloichium*; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Praefatio ad Catecheses*; St. Optatus of Milevis, *Contra Parmenianum* I; Natalis Alexander, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Dissert. 2 in saec. V; Timothy of Constantinople; Theodemos (Theodorus) Studites; *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. XIV, ed. Lugdunensis (1677); Balsamon, *Epistola ad Naucratiū* (apud Balsamonem) and in *Bibliotheca Patrum*.
17. Council of Nicaea I, can. 8, 19; Council of Laodicea, can. 7; Council of Constantinople I, can. 7; Council of Arles II, can. 16–17; Council of Trent, Session 7.
18. St. Augustine, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* II, ch. 13; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 4, cap. Quod proposuimus; cap. Aquo; Council of Florence, *Decretum pro Armenis*.

19. St. Thomas, "ubi sup." [abbreviation as in source].
20. Nicephorus, Canon XVI (apud Pseudo-Patriarcham Hieremiam); Petrus Arcudius, De concordia Ecclesiae Occidentalis et Orientalis in septem sacramentorum administratione; Georgius Abbas Theodorus (Anglus), praelectio de Circumcisione et Baptismo; practice of the English "Church."
21. St. Augustine, Contra litteras Petiliani III, ch. 56.
22. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 64, a. 1–4.
23. St. Augustine, Tractatus in Ioannem 5–6; cf. Jn. 1:33; Augustine, Contra Donatistas V, ch. 13.
24. St. Augustine, Tract. in Ioannem 5–6; Contra Donatistas V, ch. 13.
25. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 68, a. 11; idem, III, q. 27, a. 1; ibid., a. 6.
26. Isidore, De summo bono, cap. 24; Gratian, De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. 1.
27. St. Augustine, De peccatorum meritis et remissione I, ch. 27.
28. St. Augustine, Epistle to Dardanus [ad Dardanum, as in the source].
29. St. Bernard, Epistle 174, to the Canons of Lyons; Ps. 70:6 (Vulgate numbering).

DISTINCTIO VI — ON BAPTIZING CHILDREN AGAINST THE WILL OF THEIR PARENTS; ON SPONSORS; AND ON THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM

§ 1. Persons of this sort have indeed been reborn before they were born from the womb, yet not before they were born in the womb; nor ought it to seem absurd that someone can be reborn and cleansed from sin while in the womb who was able in the womb to be stained by sin—namely, to be reborn (*renasci*) and to be purified therefrom. Nor does that difficulty prevail which is objected from the word "reborn," as though it signified a second but not a third birth. For if one must press the signification of the word, to be reborn is to be born again, just as to reread is to read again, whether it be done a second time or oftener. Then too, since birth in the womb and birth from the womb are reckoned as one carnal birth (*nativitas*), nor is it therefore customary to say that a man has been born twice because he was first born in the womb and then from the womb; rather only once—inasmuch as the one birth is the inception of the other and both together constitute one perfect birth of man according to the flesh—most rightly is that regeneration whereby man according to the spirit is reborn called the second, not the third, birth of man, although he has already been born from the womb.

§ 2. One must say, therefore, that by ordinary and common law no one is reborn unless he has been born from the womb; yet by a special dispensation of God it can happen that someone is reborn who has not yet been born from the womb, but only in the womb. This, indeed, the Church holds generally concerning the Blessed Virgin: that she, being sanctified as a temple of God, was therefore clean from all sin before she came forth from her mother's womb—whether she had that purity from the beginning of conception, or received it after conception, according to the different opinions, of which we treated in Book 3, Distinction 3.¹ And neither does it seem to be doubted concerning John's sanctification in the womb, whereby he became a dwelling of the Holy Spirit, since this is most consonant with Scripture; and, besides Bernard—whose words we cited above—Ambrose also indicates that he thinks thus when, writing on Luke 1, he affirms that John received in the womb the Spirit of Grace, subjoining these words: "For to whom the Spirit of Grace is present, nothing is lacking. And to whom the Holy Spirit is poured, there is a fullness of great virtues."² To these, finally, there is added the common opinion of the scholastic Doctors.

§ 3. As for Jeremiah, however, there is not the same certainty, since the Scripture which seems to prove this (Jer. 1) appears more rightly to be taken of sanctification according to predestination, as Augustine understood it. For both what precedes, "Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you," and what follows, "And I made you a prophet among the nations," plainly require a similar sense.³ And similarly Paul speaks of himself (Gal. 1): "Who separated me from the womb," that is, chose me for the apostolic office already from my mother's womb.⁴ Wherefore it is not very likely that, apart from the Mother of the Lord, and him "than whom there has not arisen a greater among those born of women," this privilege was divinely granted to

anyone, namely, that he should be sanctified in his mother's womb even to the cleansing of the original stain (*originalis macula*).

§ II — Whether it is permissible to baptize children against the will of their parents (*Utrum invitis parentibus filios Baptizare liceat*)

§ 4. One may also ask whether it is permissible to baptize children against the will of their parents. To this question, on account of the diversity both of the children and of the parents and also of those who baptize or procure Baptism (*Baptismus*), one single reply cannot be applied. First, if the children are adults and endowed with the use of reason, there is no one who doubts that, even if their parents are unwilling, they themselves can receive Baptism, since in this matter they are not subject to another's, but to their own judgment and power. Second, if the child is an infant, or has not yet attained the use of reason, and the parents, being unbelievers, are undergoing just servitude under a Christian Prince or any Christian lord, not even then does it seem to be doubted that, by the right of such dominion, the child can be taken away from the parents and baptized—provided, however, that he is not returned to the parents, but is placed elsewhere to be brought up in a Christian way. Third, if the child is going to remain with unbelieving parents and be brought up by them in unbelief, in no way ought he to be baptized without the knowledge or against the will of the parents—indeed, not even with their knowledge and connivance—lest an injury be done to the sacrament (*sacramentum*). For just as the sacrament of Baptism is not to be given to an adult who, not sincerely professing the Christian faith, appears straightway to be about to return to his former unbelief, so neither to the little one whom we know will be imbued by his parents with a false religion. Hence they have a zeal of piety not according to knowledge who, having enticed with little gifts the children of Anabaptists or of Jews or of other unbelievers, secretly baptize them, and then send them back to the parents; for to such, if they remain alive, nothing is thereby accomplished. For either they will remain in unbelief, and so Baptism benefits them nothing; or they are converted to the Catholic religion, and then they ought to be baptized again—because what has been done is not reckoned as repeated, if it is not known to have been done, as we said in its place. Fourth, it will not even be permissible for any private person to retain with himself a child so clandestinely baptized, or to send him away elsewhere to be instructed in a Christian or Catholic manner; because no private person has the right of taking away and detaining another man's child. Fifth, if the Prince, exercising public power and being superior to the parents themselves, should do what we have just said, whether this be rightly done is a greater matter of doubt. The negative side of this position is brought forward by St. Thomas, while Scotus holds the affirmative.⁶

§ 5. St. Thomas's reasoning is this: Children not yet having the use of free choice are by the law of nature under the care of their parents; therefore it is contrary to natural justice to baptize them against the will of their parents. But on the contrary, many things are objected by Scotus and others. First: Inferior authority does not oblige in those things which are against a superior, as Augustine teaches (*Sermon 6 On the Words of the Lord*), and as we declared above at the last Distinction of Book II; therefore he upon whom the care of ruling the Republic lies ought, as far as is in him, to compel each one to be subject to the superior rather than to the inferior, and consequently the Prince ought especially to defend the dominion of the supreme Lord, and to do this—that all, both adults and minors, be subjected to Him. Wherefore it is not only lawful, but also fitting, that the Prince withdraw children from the dominion of unbelieving parents, by whom they would be brought up contrary to the worship of the supreme Lord, and attach them to the true and legitimate

worship of God. Second: A father has no right to impede his son's temporal salvation, therefore neither his eternal. And accordingly, just as the son could be taken from him against his will if he wanted to kill him, or if he was unwilling otherwise to have one in danger rescued, so also he can be taken away from one who wills to bring him up in unbelief, which is the death of the soul. Third: If a father wished to teach his son illicit arts, the son could, by the authority of the Prince, be taken from him and placed elsewhere—much more so if he wishes to imbue his son with a false religion. Fourth: The father by divine law is bound to see to it that the son be baptized; therefore, not taking care of that and in addition willing to impede it, he abuses paternal power over the child; wherefore, by a superior power, the child could be taken away from him against his will and baptized. Fifth: If a father squanders his goods, curators can by public authority be given to him; therefore, if he brings up his children badly, by the same authority the care of them can be taken from him and entrusted to others. Sixth: Concerning the children of slaves Durandus argues in particular that they can be snatched from their parents against the will of the latter by those whose slaves the parents are, and be sold into servitude among the faithful, by whom accordingly they can as well be brought up in a Christian way as be baptized.⁷ But this reason shows only what we set above in the second place, although not even in that does St. Thomas agree. These reasons, and the like, not a little confirm Scotus's opinion. Which opinion, if we follow as probable, it will not be difficult to reply to the fundamental argument brought from the opposite side, namely, that children not yet having the use of reason are indeed by the law of nature subject to the care of their parents, but not in such wise that they cannot be withdrawn from the same care by a superior power, if the parents abuse that right. For parents have no right to educate a son badly and perniciously, just as they have no right to offer poison, or in any way to injure or kill him bodily. Hence, if they do something of that sort, whether bodily or spiritually, that abuse of paternal power is to be corrected by a superior power. Meanwhile, in this matter, as in many others, one must consider not only what is permissible, but also what is expedient—something which ought also to have a place in another question akin to this one: Whether unbelievers, who have not yet received the faith, can be lawfully compelled by penalties to receive it. Scotus similarly holds the affirmative side, whereas most others assert the contrary; but this question does not properly belong to the present treatment.⁸

§ 6. Someone asks whether, if a certain Christian layman should find a child of an unbelieving father who is just now dying, he can baptize him with the father not knowing, or even unwilling and resisting. Domingo de Soto replies—who treats this question—in the end of article 10, Distinction 4, in IV, that he is unwilling to disapprove such a deed, provided it be done without scandal; because, he says, the injury of the parents is not to be so superstitiously, but according to the judgment of prudent men, understood.⁹ We, however, can say otherwise, that this be done by the presumed consent of the lawful power, no less than if a private person were to free a child in danger of death, even with the father unwilling—an act which no one would condemn.

§ III — That sponsors are rightly employed for those to be baptized (Baptizandis susceptores recte adhiberi)

§ 7. That for those to be baptized, both adults and little ones, godparents or sponsors (*patrini seu susceptores*) are employed descends from Apostolic tradition. Concerning this, in Dionysius the Areopagite, in the book On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (ch. 2, part 2), we read thus: "He, moreover, who desires to become a partaker of those things which are truly heavenly" (he is speaking of Baptism) "approaches one of those who have been initiated; he indeed persuades him to lead him duly to the priest; but he himself thoroughly promises that he

will follow the things that are delivered, so that he be led to him, and that he take upon himself care of the whole life which thereafter he leads. But that one, who is indeed led by holy zeal for his salvation, yet measures the magnitude of the thing by the nature of man—sudden fear and difficulty of the matter deter him; nevertheless at last he promises kindly that he will do what he has sought, and, having received him, he leads him to the priest," and so forth.¹¹ But that for little ones likewise sponsors have been accustomed to be employed, the same Dionysius is witness, who in the same book (in the last chapter), among other things, says thus: "It has pleased our divine instructors" (he understands the Apostles) "that children be admitted in their own holy manner, so that the child who is brought forward be handed over by his natural parents to one of those who have been initiated, a good instructor of children in divine matters, and that thereafter the child attend to him as to a divine father and a sponsor of holy salvation." Therefore from this one, who promises that he will instruct the child in holy life, the Pontiff exacts, so to speak, the profession of renunciations and the profession of the faith—not because, as certain scoffers say, he says this: "I renounce, or I promise, on behalf of the child," but "the child renounces and professes," that is, "I profess that I will persuade this child, when by reason of age he will be able to understand sacred things, by my divine instructions, that he both send a 'messenger' to the adversaries and defect from them, that he profess and fulfill the divine promises." "Therefore I do not think it absurd, if a child be instructed in the divine life, since he has a guide and sponsor who will imbue him with the knowledge of divine things and will guard him safe from the adversaries." Thus Dionysius. From which it is seen clearly what the office of sponsors toward their charges is, namely, that as their pedagogues and teachers they teach them the rudiments of the faith and the rule of right living, and that they always bear a fatherly care for their salvation.

§ 8. Hence Augustine (in a certain Sermon) diligently admonishes sponsors, that they remember that for their children in Baptism they have made themselves sureties by faith. These words are found in Gratian (On Consecration, Distinction 4, c. 105): "You, before all, both women and men who have received sons in Baptism, I admonish that you recognize yourselves to have stood forth as sureties before God for those whom you were seen to receive from the holy font; therefore always admonish them to keep chastity, to love justice, to hold charity. Above all, keep yourselves the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and show them to those whom you have received from the holy font." A similar passage is in him (Sermon 163 On Time), where nearly the same things are contained more copiously. Briefly, however, what is prescribed in this function is admonished by the Council of Mainz (canon 47), enjoining that each godfather (*compater*) instruct his spiritual children in the Catholic way. Add to these the first canon of the Fourth Council of Worms, and the second canon of the Council of Paris, where the office of sponsors is set forth a little more fully.¹² Since things are thus, and right reason does not allow that a sheep be entrusted to a wolf, it is manifestly consequent that heretics or otherwise criminal persons, and those altogether unfit to care for the salvation of others, are not to be called by the parents to this office, and, if they be notoriously such, are not to be admitted by the pastors.

§ 9. Since, moreover, things that are entrusted to many are for the most part cared for less rightly, hence it was prudently established of old—first by Pope Hyginus, then by Leo, as Gratian relates (On Consecration, Distinction 4, cc. 100 and 101)—that no more than one approach to receive from the holy font the child to be baptized, whether one man or one woman. And that this has been observed from the beginning is clear enough from the words of Dionysius cited above. Yet another cause of this constitution exists, namely, lest the impediments of marriage, which that spiritual kinship (*cognatio spiritualis*) contracted by reception from the holy font brings about, be multiplied too much. Attending to this reason, the Council of Trent (Session 24, ch. 2, On the Reformation of Marriage) has decreed that only one—either a man or a woman—according to

the institution of the sacred canons, or at most one and one, receive the person baptized from Baptism.¹³ As to women sponsors, Dionysius does not make mention of them. Augustine, however, mentions them in each of the passages a little above; mention is likewise made of them in the decree of Leo and in the canon of Worms lately cited. But it is very likely that women were given as sponsors only to girls, as men to boys—since modesty plainly seems to demand this.

§ 10. Furthermore, canon 55 of Mainz forbids anyone to receive from the holy font his own son or daughter; and canon 25 of Auxerre forbids an Abbot or Monk to be anyone's sponsor. The reason of the former seems to be both that men may be compelled to extend friendship toward others, and that better provision be made for the child, since besides the carnal parent, who by the law of nature is bound to procure his salvation, there is given to him moreover a spiritual parent (*parens spiritualis*) whose proper office this becomes by promise; of the latter, because, although it is a holy thing to receive children from the font, nevertheless it does not befit those who profess a solitary life, especially if they are placed under the obedience or power of others.

§ IV — What use the ceremonies employed in Baptism have (Caeremoniae quae in Baptismo adhibentur quem usum habeant)

§ 11. Besides the ceremony essential to this sacrament (*sacramentum*), which consists in the form and matter and their application, there are others which spring from ancient and indeed Apostolic tradition—only, that is, those which do not touch the substance of the sacrament and without which the sacrament can be completed. Now these are of a twofold kind: for some are efficient, others only signifying, but all avail much for instruction and exhortation. The efficient ceremonies are the exorcisms (*exorcismus*) and the exsufflation (*exsufflatio*). For by them the power of the Devil (*Diabolus*) is repressed and restrained, lest he in any way impede the salvation of man that is being procured through Baptism. Concerning which matter Pope Celestine I (in the Epistle to the Bishops of Gaul, ch. 12) thus writes: "That also, which the Holy Church throughout the whole world uniformly does concerning those to be baptized, we do not contemplate with an idle gaze—namely, when, whether little ones or youths come to the sacrament of regeneration, they do not first approach the Fount of life until by the exorcisms and exsufflations of the clerics the unclean spirit be driven from them, so that then it may truly appear how 'the prince of this world is cast out,' and how first 'the strong man is bound,' and thereafter his 'vessels are plundered,' transferred into the possession of the Victor who 'leads captivity captive' and 'gives gifts to men.'" These words of Celestine are also read in Gennadius, in the book On Ecclesiastical Dogmas (ch. 31). Augustine too, book 1 (On the Merits of Sins, ch. 34), when he says, "What does my exorcism effect in a little one, if he is not held in the household of the Devil?" beyond doubt signifies that the exorcism in a little one is not only a signifying, but an efficacious ceremony, and that it does something in checking the power of the Devil. The same, in book 1 (On the Creed, ch. 1), says: "Therefore little ones are exsufflated and exorcized, that the hostile power of the Devil be driven from them, who deceived man that he might possess men"; and in book 2 (ch. 1), addressing catechumens, he says that God by the exorcism has put the Devil to flight by His power, and has freed His household from his dominion. And elsewhere he often makes mention of this efficacy; the places are book 1 (Against Julian, ch. 4), book 1 (On Marriage and Concupiscence, ch. 20), the book On the Grace of Christ, ch. 40, Epistle 103 to Sixtus, the book On Faith and Works, ch. 6, and on Psalm 65 at the words: "We have passed through fire and water." Moreover, Dionysius the Areopagite, the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (ch. 2, part 2), Cornelius the Pope in

Eusebius (book 6, ch. 43 of the Ecclesiastical History), Tertullian (the book On Idolatry and elsewhere), Ambrose both in the book On the Sacraments and in the book On the Initiated (*De mysteriis*), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Mystagogical Catechesis* 2), Gregory (Homily 29 on the Gospels), and Cyprian, indeed, book 4 (Epistle 7), teach that the exorcisms which are prefixed to Baptism are so powerful that they even avail for casting out demons from those who are held as corporeally possessed.¹⁵ From this same Epistle a solution is to be sought for the question: how the power of the Devil is restrained by the exorcism, when a man who has been exorcized, if afterwards he is not baptized, remains equally as before under the power of the Devil. For Cyprian replies that, just as of old Pharaoh was indeed in some measure repressed by Moses and Aaron before they had come to the Red Sea, yet he was not overthrown, but rather still attempted to oppress the people; but after the people passed through the Red Sea, they were utterly freed from his dominion, the tyrant being plunged and drowned in the waters; so the power of the Devil is repressed in some measure by the exorcisms before Baptism, but is not utterly taken away except by Baptism—so much so that, if Baptism does not follow, the Devil again, by his ancient right, wholly possesses the man, just as Pharaoh would have possessed Israel if he had been able to forestall their passage through the Red Sea. Wherefore all that force of exorcism and exsufflation is consummated in Baptism, and without Baptism is rendered void. For the explanation of which that comparison also avails which, from the Gospel, Pope Celestine adduces of the strong man first bound and then despoiled. More fully and distinctly, one may see St. Thomas writing concerning the efficacy of the said ceremonies in III, q. 71, a. 3; where also (in the reply to the fourth) he teaches that the anointing which after Baptism is made on the crown of the baptized not only signifies, but also effects something, because, he says, "it works toward the conservation of spiritual grace."

§ 12. Now, if you ask how ceremonies of this kind are not sacraments properly so called, if they are efficacious signs, St. Thomas answers in the same place that they do not effect the principal effect, which is grace (*gratia*), but only remove the impediments to grace's being obtained or retained. But since the Church has no power of instituting signs—even for such effects—which avail *ex opere operato*, as we said above (at Distinction 1) when we were treating of the power of holy water, therefore the truer reply seems to be that sacramentals (*sacramentalia*) of this kind, which were instituted by the Apostles and handed on to the Church, are distinguished from the sacraments in that they do not avail *ex opere operato*, but by the faith and devotion of the Church, in whose person they are performed by her ministers. The other ceremonies, moreover, which have been accustomed to be employed either before or after Baptism, consist in signification alone, and are of such sort as greatly conduce to the instruction and exhortation both of him who is baptized—if he be an adult—and of others who assist at the mysteries. Although some of these also Rabanus recounts as efficient (book 1, On the Institution of Clerics, ch. 27, as St. Thomas cites in the place mentioned). This doctrine exists in Ambrose almost in the selfsame words, book 1 (On the Sacraments, ch. 1). For, after repeating the Gospel narrative where it is said, "Ephpheta, that is, 'Be opened,'" he says: "Therefore the priest touched your ears, that your ears might be opened to the discourse of the priest's eloquence; [he touched] the nostrils, that you might receive the good odor of eternal piety; that with the Apostle you may say, 'We are the good odor of Christ unto God,' and that there be in you the full fragrance of faith and devotion." Thus he.

§ V — *What is to be held concerning those who have been baptized without the ceremonies (Quid de iis qui absque caeremoniis fuerint baptizati)*

§ 13. Those who either in danger of death, or among heretics, or by any mistake whatever, have been baptized without the Church's ceremonies (*caeremoniae*), must afterwards at least have all those ceremonies applied to them with solemn rite, as St. Thomas rightly teaches in the article cited above, reply to the third,¹⁷ and as the Church shows by her own practice—of which ecclesiastical praxis there are many reasons. First, lest the sacrament (*sacramentum*) lack its own solemnity. For on that occasion the ceremonies are referred to the Baptism that preceded; and therefore it is not absurd to apply even those which are wont to be prefixed to Baptism, such as the catechism, the exorcism (*exorcismus*), and the like. Second, because the exorcism also even afterwards does something. For, as Thomas says in the place cited, just as the effect of Baptism can be impeded before it is received, so also it can be frustrated after it has been received, as Cyprian says in book 4, epistle 7: "Just as the Devil is excluded in Baptism by the faith of the believer, so he can enter afterwards if faith fails; that this may not happen, it is fitting that, as by prayer, so too by exorcism it be guarded against."¹⁸ Third, as the same Thomas says, that uniformity be observed in Baptism; for as there is one Baptism, so it is fitting that the same ceremonies be applied to every Baptism. Fourth, that by this public rite the Church may declare that she holds as ratified the Baptism conferred by anyone whatever—by a layman, a woman, a heretic, and the like. Fifth, that the baptized person may have publicly assigned to him a sponsor (*susceptor*), by whose care he may be instructed in Catholic fashion. Sixth, that, a pledge (*sponsio*) having been expressly made by the sponsor, the baptized person, when he comes of age, may the more recognize and understand his obligation. And lest anyone suspect that what we say about the ceremonies to be supplied later is a novelty, Nicephorus relates, book 8, chapter 44 (from Sozomen, book 2, chapter 27; and Rufinus, book 10, chapter 14; which is found in Gratian's Decretum, 1, question 1, canon "Spiritus Sanctus"), that Alexander the Bishop did indeed hold as ratified the act of the boy Athanasius baptizing, but afterwards ordered through the ministers of the Church that the solemn ceremonies of that sacrament be supplied.¹⁹

§ I — *The names by which the sacrament of Confirmation has been called, and how it is defined (Confirmationis Sacramentum quibus nominibus appellatum & quomodo definiatur)*

§ 14. Confirmation (*Confirmatio*) holds the second place among the sacraments of the new law, so called from its effect—namely, that it increases the grace received in Baptism and confirms it, and it strengthens the baptized person against the enemies of the faith. It is also everywhere called by the ancients "the hand" or "the imposition of hands" (*manuum impositio*), and that from the ceremony employed in its celebration; by which name it is signified in Scripture (Acts), although otherwise the name "imposition of hands," as also the ceremony itself, extends very broadly even outside this sacrament, as it is easy to show from Scripture and the Fathers. Furthermore, it is called "the spiritual seal" (*signaculum spirituale*) by Ambrose, book 3 of On the Sacraments, chapter 4, and in On the Initiates, chapter 7; and "the Lord's seal" by Cyprian in the Epistle to Jubaianus; and "the sign of Christ" by Augustine, book 19 against Faustus, chapter 14.²¹ Sometimes, too, it is called by the Fathers "the seal" and "the sealing" or "the signing." All which names either come from the sign of the cross that is traced on the forehead, or from the very episcopal act of sealing—of which he makes mention also with respect to the form of the sacrament. Likewise it is called "the sacrament of chrism" by Augustine,

book 2 against the Letters of Petilian, chapter 104; "the seal of chrism" by Pope Cornelius, in Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, book 6, chapter 33; and "the victim of chrism" or "the perfecting anointing" by Dionysius, in Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 4. Finally, it is sometimes called simply "the anointing," as by Cyprian, book 1, the last epistle.²² It can, moreover, be briefly defined thus: Confirmation is a sacrament (*sacramentum*) of the new law, by which strength of the Spirit is added to the baptized, both for believing firmly and for confessing the faith without fear. Others give other definitions, but whose sense is almost the same. A fuller understanding of them must be gathered from the things we shall say next, especially where the effect of this sacrament will be treated.

§ II — Why Confirmation holds the second place among the sacraments (Quare confirmatio secundum inter sacramenta locum habeat)

§ 15. With respect to the order of this sacrament in relation to the others, this must first be noted: that a second place is assigned to it by the sacred writers not on account of its excellence over the other five—for without doubt the sacrament of the Eucharist is more excellent and more worthy than it, to say nothing for now of sacred Ordination, to which it is not evident why Confirmation should yield the title of dignity—but rather that this has been done because in the Church of Christ it is wont to hold the second place in the order of administration. For the Apostles also, for those who had been baptized, immediately, with no sacrament intervening, conferred the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands (Acts 8 and 19). And Dionysius the Areopagite, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 1, part 3, testifies that the baptized were accustomed first to be anointed with chrism by the Bishop, and then to be admitted to the table of the Lord. "The Pontiff," he says, "calls to the most holy Eucharist the man thus perfected—that is, confirmed by the sacred anointing—and hands over to him the deifying communion of the sacraments that bring to completion." Similarly Ambrose, book 3 of On the Sacraments, chapter 2, and On the Initiates, chapter 6: "There follows," he says, "the spiritual seal, which you heard read today; because after the font there remains that perfection be accomplished, when at the invocation of the priest the Holy Spirit is poured in." And presently: "What follows after these things? You must come to the altar," and so forth. Nor are dissimilar things read in Cyril of Jerusalem.²⁴

1. Estius, In the Third Book of the Sentences, Distinction 3.

2. St. Ambrose, Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke, book 1; the cited sentences: "Cui enim adest Spiritus Gratiae, nihil deest. Et cui Spiritus Sanctus infunditur, magnarum plenitudo virtutum est."

3. Jer. 1:5 and 1:5–10.

4. Gal. 1:15.

5. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae II-II, q. 10, a. 12; and III, q. 68, a. 10.

6. Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 4, last question.

7. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In IV Sent., dist. 4, q. 6.

8. On compelling unbelievers to the faith, see Scotus, loc. cit.; for the contrary, many others; Estius notes the question lies outside this work.

9. Soto (Domingo de), In IV Sent., dist. 4, at the end of a. 10 [abbreviation as in source].

10. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 67, a. 7–8.
11. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 2, part 2.
12. St. Augustine, quoted by Gratian, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, c. 105; cf. also Sermon 163 *De tempore*. Editorial note on authenticity: Learned Gregorian correctors refer the passage to Sermon CLXIII *De tempore* "Dominica X post Festum Trinitatis"; but the Benedictine Fathers, vol. V of Augustine's works, have rejected these as spurious, as also Sermons CLXVIII and CCLXV among the sermons "H. & V." [abbreviation as in source]. Councils: Council of Mainz (can. 47); Council of Worms (IV) (can. 1); Council of Paris (can. 2).
13. Pope Hyginus and Pope Leo, in Gratian, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, cc. 100–101; Council of Trent, Session 24, ch. 2 (On the Reformation of Marriage).
14. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 71, throughout.
15. Pope Celestine I, *Epistle to the Bishops of Gaul*, ch. 12; Gennadius, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, ch. 31; St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis* I, ch. 34; *De symbolo*, ch. 1; *De symbolo* II, ch. 1; *Contra Julianum* I, ch. 4; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, ch. 20; *De gratia Christi*, ch. 40; *Ep. 103 ad Sixtum*; *De fide et operibus*, ch. 6; *In Psalmum 65* (at "Transivimus per ignem et aquam"); Dionysius the Areopagite, *Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 2, part 2; Cornelius the Pope, apud Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI, ch. 43; Tertullian, *De idololatria* (and elsewhere); St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*; *De mysteriis* (*De initiandis*); St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses mystagogicae* 2; St. Gregory the Great, *Hom. 29 in Evangelia*; St. Cyprian, *Ep. 4, ep. 7*.
16. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 71, a. 3.
17. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 71, a. 3, ad 3.
18. St. Cyprian, *Epistle 7* [lib. 4] [abbreviation as in source].
19. Nicephorus, *Historia ecclesiastica* VIII, ch. 44; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* II, ch. 27; Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica* X, ch. 14; Gratian, *Decretum*, I, q. 1, can. *Spiritus Sanctus*.
20. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72.
21. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* III, ch. 4; *De initiandis* (*De mysteriis*), ch. 7; St. Cyprian, *Epistle to Jubaianus*; St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 14.
22. St. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, ch. 104; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI, ch. 33 (letter of Pope Cornelius); (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 4; St. Cyprian, *Epistle I*, the last epistle [as in source].
23. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 1.
24. Acts 8; Acts 19; (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 1, part 3; St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* III, ch. 2; *De initiandis*, ch. 6; St. Cyril of Jerusalem [work not specified in the source].

DISTINCTIO VII — ON CONFIRMATION (*DE CONFIRMATIONE*)

§ 1. Tertullian indicates this order in the book *On the Resurrection*, and St. Cyprian likewise in Book 1, Epistle 12.¹ Theophylact also writes (on 1 Cor. 12) that the Holy Spirit is given after Baptism before we partake of the Sacred Mysteries of the Body and Blood of the Lord.² And the Fourth Council of Toledo (canon 55) likewise numbers these three sacraments in this order: the grace of Baptism, the anointing of Chrism, the Body and Blood of the Lord.³ And assuredly this order is most fitting, that one should ascend by certain steps and with suitable preparation to that which is perfect. Nevertheless, it must not be supposed that this order was always observed as though by some necessity of law. For, since it is established that presbyters were accustomed ordinarily to baptize, and that bishops, who would seal with the sign baptized men of adult age, were not always at hand straightway, it is credible that the Eucharist was often administered before Confirmation, especially since St. Jerome (in the *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*, ch. 8) bears witness that a deacon cannot consecrate the Eucharist, yet nevertheless does not hand on Baptism without the Eucharist.⁴ From which words it is apparent that it was the custom of the Church that to the baptized, even when the bishop was absent, whether through a presbyter or through a deacon the Eucharist was straightway delivered; which, however, if the bishop were present, did not take place without the previous sealing, as the foregoing show.

§ 2. Giving the reason for this thing, Cyril, Book 2 on John, ch. 36, on that saying, "But Jesus did not trust himself to them" (Jn. 2), says: "The faith of those who have newly believed is not stable; nor is a firm form present in faith to those who are recent, since as yet they are not confirmed in piety. Wherefore neither did Christ entrust himself to men of this sort; let all, therefore, to whom the mysteries of the Savior are entrusted, learn not to receive neophytes too quickly to the Divine Table."⁵ So he.

§ III — Confirmation is a true and proper sacrament of the New Law (Confirmationem esse verum, ac proprium novae legis sacramentum)

§ 3. From the number of the sacraments the Waldensian heretics, some four hundred years ago, removed Confirmation first, as Aeneas Sylvius reports in the book *On the Origin of the Bohemians*, ch. 35; this error was followed by John Wyclif. After them also follow almost all the sectarians of this age, of whom some, with Luther as teacher, say that now, the gift of miracles having ceased, it is only some idle apostolic ceremony; that in the time of the Apostles it conferred only the gift of tongues, or some like grace of miracles; others, trained by Calvin, are willing to have it that in the first times of the Church it was nothing other than a certain catechesis by which those close to adolescence would set forth an account of their faith before the Church. But the Council of Trent condemns either opinion with an anathema (Session 7, canon 1 on Confirmation).⁷ Against errors of this sort one must hold most certainly that Confirmation is a true and proper sacrament (*sacramentum*) of the New Law. The first proof of this Catholic doctrine is from the definition of a

sacrament. For Confirmation has been so instituted, and from the beginning has always been in use, that under an external and visible sign the Holy Spirit might be given for strength to those who had been baptized. It is therefore a visible and operative sign of invisible grace — which indeed suffices for the formal character of a sacrament of the New Law. But this will have to be proved more fully for us when we shall have come to explain the effect of this sacrament. In this place the doctrine of the Fathers on the same matter must be subjoined.

§ 4. Dionysius the Areopagite, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4, part 3, both makes mention of the sensible sign, namely of the anointing which is done with chrism, and attributes to it the perfection of the grace received in Baptism with these words: "The gift of sacred regeneration and the grace of the Only-begotten are perfected by the most holy consummation."⁸ Tertullian, in the book *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, has briefly included both: "The flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed, that the soul may be fortified; the flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of the hand, that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit."⁹ Moreover, in that place he sets this sacrament in the middle between Baptism and the Eucharist. St. Cyprian, Book 1, Epistle 12, expressly testifies that the imposition of hands is a sacrament. There is also among his works a *Sermon On the Anointing of the Chrism*, among those that are inscribed *On the Cardinal Works*, where that author, whoever he is (whom, to be sure, it is certain is ancient and learned; I, with Pamelius, judge him to be Salvian), writes very clearly indeed about this sacrament, besides other things, in this manner: "This anointing is not instituted for healing bodies, because when the elements have been sanctified, they now yield their effect not by their own nature, but the divine power works more mightily; but the truth is present to the sign in the sacrament of the Spirit, so that from the very efficiencies of the things the dignity of grace may be evident; and how great from these delightful habits there becomes known to the inner man [the benefit]." And other things which follow.¹⁰

§ 5. Eusebius also, a Pontiff and Martyr, Epistle 3 to the bishops of Tuscany and Campania, gives clear testimony to this sacrament. Following him, Pope Melchiades, when he was consulted by the bishops of Spain as to whether the sacrament of Baptism or of Confirmation were greater, replies that each is a great sacrament and proves it at length.¹¹ But Innocent I, in the Epistle to Bishop Decentius, ch. 3, speaks of the sacrament of sealing in such a way as both to prove a sure effect of grace and in truth to assign determinate matter and form.¹² Ambrose in the work *On the Sacraments*, and in the little book *On Those Who Are Initiated into the Mysteries*, expressly treating of the sacraments of the Church, assigns the sealing next to Baptism.¹³ Hilary, at the end of the *Canons on Matthew*, calls Confirmation the sacrament of the Spirit, because by it the fullness of the Spirit is given to those already cleansed in the laver.¹⁴ Jerome, in the *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*, proves the sacrament of the episcopal imposition of hands from Scripture and Tradition, under the person indeed of the Luciferian, the Orthodox approving.¹⁵

§ 6. Augustine, Book 2 *Against the Letters of Petilian*, ch. 104, pronounces most clearly concerning this sacrament. Treating that verse from Psalm 132, "As ointment on the head," he wishes in this ointment to interpret the sacrament of chrism. "Which indeed in the kind of sacred signs is most holy, as Baptism, yet it can also be in the worst men." And below: "Distinguish, therefore, the visible rite of the sacrament, which can be in the good and in the bad, from the invisible unction of charity, which is properly of the good."¹⁶ In Book 19 *Against Faustus*, ch. 11, he numbers the sign of Christ, that is, the sacrament of Confirmation, with Baptism and the Eucharist; and among those sacraments whose power for piety avails ineffably very greatly, and for which Christians have suffered more, both anciently and in our own times, than for the old and

merely signifying sacraments suffered the ancient just.¹⁷ He too makes mention of this sacrament in Tractates 3 and 118 on John, and more expressly in Book 15 On the Trinity, ch. 26; likewise in Book 3 Against the Donatists, ch. 16; and in Sermon 19 from On the Saints.¹⁸ Finally, to enumerate others briefly, mention this sacrament Pope Urban (in the decretal epistle to all the bishops), afterwards Pope Fabian (Epistle 2 to the Eastern bishops), Pope Cornelius as reported by Eusebius (Book 6, ch. 33), Leo I (Epistle 86), Gregory I (Book 3, Epistles 9 and 26), Gregory III (Epistle to Boniface), and Innocent III (in the decretal, On Sacred Anointing, chapter Perunctio). Also Cyril (the work on Leviticus, Book 9), and Bede (on Acts 8 and Question 54 through Exodus), and Bernard (in the Life of Malachy), the Council of Laodicea (ch. 48), and certain other particular councils.¹⁹ To these at length were added the definitions of two general councils, Florence (in the Decree to the Armenians) and Trent in the place cited above.²⁰

§ 7. Moreover this constant doctrine of the Fathers is not left destitute of the testimony of Scripture. For in Acts 8 — to which place all refer the first beginnings of this sacrament — we read that Peter and John laid hands on the Samaritans who had been baptized by Philip, and that in this way they received the Holy Spirit. And Scripture adds: "When Simon saw that through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money, saying: Give me also this power, that on whomever I shall lay hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit." Which Scripture designates for us manifestly both the bodily rite and sign and its spiritual effect. For although it can be said that among those who are said to have received the Holy Spirit something external and visible occurred, so that either they spoke with tongues, or fiery tongues appeared upon them (for otherwise Simon Magus could not have seen that through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Spirit was given), nevertheless that external sign is not to be thought to have been without the infusion of interior grace, since in Sacred Scripture no one is read to have received the Holy Spirit without internal sanctification.²¹ Then in Acts 10 Peter says of such: "They received the Holy Spirit as also we"; but the Apostles received on the day of Pentecost not only the gift of tongues, but far more the interior strengthening of the Holy Spirit, according to that which the Lord had said to them (Lk., the last chapter): "Be endued with power from on high"; and Acts 1: "You shall receive the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon you." Add that in Acts 10, from what had happened with Cornelius and his companions, the disciples said among themselves: "Since upon the Gentiles also the grace of the Holy Spirit has been poured forth." Therefore they did not understand that external sign or gift, whatever it was, as separated from the grace of the Holy Spirit which commends a man to God.²²

§ 8. Moreover, those who spoke with tongues in this manner did not utter just anything, but, as full of the divine Spirit, straightway poured forth the mighty works of God, as Scripture testifies concerning the Apostles (Acts 2), and concerning Cornelius and his associates (Acts 10), and concerning certain Ephesians (Acts 19). Finally, it is understood from this that that sign was an operative sign of grace and not only like a prayer which is said over a man; because the deacon Philip could not exhibit it, but for the sake of administering it the Apostles had to be called from Jerusalem; whereas otherwise nothing forbade a deacon to pour forth prayer over the baptized, even with some external rite employed.²³

§ 9. There are also other Scriptures in which there is insinuation of this sacrament: as Acts 2, in the words recited by Peter from Joel, which contain the promise of the Spirit to be poured forth in the last days upon all flesh, that is (as he later explains) upon the servants and handmaids of God. Which can be understood more aptly of no other sacrament than of the sacrament of the imposition of hands — as also Pope Melchiades understood. For, Peter explaining this, it was first fulfilled in the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; then in

others it is signified as to be fulfilled through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles. Whence (in the same chapter) Peter says to the Jews pricked in heart: "Let every one of you be baptized, etc., and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"; that is, after the reception in Baptism of the remission of sins, also the gift of the Holy Spirit, such as you now see that we have received — and that through the imposition of our hands. For it is not to be thought that the Apostles, who conferred this sacrament on the Samaritans, did not confer the same sacrament upon the Jews who were present and were the very first converted by their preaching.²⁴ To this pertains also the prophecy of Isaiah 44: "I will pour out waters upon the thirsty, and I will pour out my spirit upon your seed"; of which the former is fittingly taken to be said of Baptism, the latter of Confirmation. Other places of Scripture are Acts 19, where Paul lays hands on certain people who had been baptized; Ephesians 1, where he says: "In whom also believing you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," that is, after you believed, or received the sacrament of faith, you were sealed also with the seal of the Holy Spirit. For the Greek shows this sense, and Ambrose's Commentary hands it down. Similar is that in Ephesians 4: "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption." Again, in Hebrews 6, among the rudiments of Christian doctrine the Imposition of hands is numbered next after Baptism. And again, after illumination — which is the effect of Baptism — there is subjoined the heavenly gift and the participation of the Holy Spirit, which are effects of the imposition of hands; for thus these are to be understood, as the Commentaries of Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Theophylact advise.²⁵

§ 10. To all these, lastly, there is added the perpetual custom of the Church, which from the very times of the Apostles has always used this seal, whether of chrism or of imposition of hands, for the bestowing of some particular effect of the Holy Spirit. About which below in its own place.

§ IV — How the sacrament of Confirmation was instituted by Christ (Confirmationis Sacramentum quomodo a Christo institutum)

§ 11. From the things noted above, in Distinction 1, on the sacraments in general, it is left manifest that this sacrament of Confirmation (*Confirmationis sacramentum*) also was instituted by Christ, as all the others, according to the definition of the Council of Trent, and indeed immediately, as the reasons adduced in that place sufficiently prove. But how this was done is asked.

§ 12. St. Thomas (q. 72, a. 1, ad 1) says that Christ instituted this sacrament per se and immediately, yet not by exhibiting it, but by promising it, according to that saying (Jn. 16): "If I do not go, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you." But if for that reason He instituted this sacrament by promising it—inasmuch as they were to be endued with power from on high—then also by exhibiting it, because He, by sending the Holy Spirit whom He had promised, did exhibit Him. Yet just as that bestowal was not the bestowal of a sacrament, so neither was the promise the institution of a sacrament. And if you were to constitute some sacrament in the fiery tongues with which the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples, then this sacrament would be not only promised by Christ, but also exhibited on the day of Pentecost. However, what St. Thomas says can be understood thus: that it is denied that Christ exhibited this sacrament by His bodily presence, as He exhibited the sacrament of Baptism and of the Eucharist. And this I judge to be the mind of the holy Doctor.

§ 13. Some are of the opinion that this sacrament was instituted by Christ only in a certain general way, namely, so that under some visible sign He willed that the power of the Holy Spirit be bestowed upon the

baptized, yet without determining a fixed matter (*materia*) of which there would be perpetual use in the Church, but leaving and committing the determination of that thing to the Apostles. Hence they say that the Apostles at the beginning used the imposition of hands (*impositio manuum*) as the matter of this sacrament, and afterwards, in its place, by their own ordinance the anointing of chrism (*chrismatis unctio*) succeeded.

§ 14. But this opinion really agrees with that which hands on the view that not all the sacraments of the New Law were instituted immediately by Christ. For to the institution of any sacrament belongs the determination of matter and form (*forma*), as things essential to a sacrament. It is more probable, therefore, that the whole of that which pertains to the substance of this sacrament was instituted specially and immediately by Christ, and was handed down by Him to the Apostles. For this is shown not only from the Epistle of Pope Fabian (to the Eastern bishops), in which he writes that after the last supper Christ taught the Apostles the manner of confecting the chrism, but it is also gathered from the Fourth Epistle of Clement; where, speaking of this sacrament and its effect, he adds: "As we have received from blessed Peter, and the other holy Apostles taught at the Lord's command." These are the things which the Apostles about this sacrament transmitted to their successors. Wherefore, just as the Apostle Paul—who, however, had not seen Christ in mortal flesh—received immediately from Him the things which, about the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist, he hands on to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11), saying: "For I have received from the Lord," so deservedly is it believed that the other Apostles, who had conversed with Christ on earth, were taught in particular also about the other sacraments. Whether the Apostles used the same matter which the Church now uses in administering this sacrament, either always or at least at some time, we shall say below.²⁷

§ V — What the matter of this sacrament is (Quae sit hujus Sacramenti materia)

§ 15. That the matter (*materia*), or visible element (*visibile elementum*), of the sacrament of Confirmation (*sacramentum Confirmationis*) is chrism (*chrisma*) is manifestly shown from the teaching of the Ancients. First of all, Dionysius the Areopagite, in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, not only names chrism when he calls this sacrament "the oblation of the chrism," but, moreover—lest anyone cavil that chrism by force of the name signifies nothing other than an unction—he indicates that in it there is a certain collection of sweetly breathing materials, and for that reason also gives it the name "unguent."²⁸ Tertullian designates it by the name "unction" in the books *De Baptismo* and *De Resurrectione carnis*.²⁹ But Cyprian, the Greek word now received among the Latins and appropriated to signify this matter, named Chrism, thus writes: "It is also necessary that he be anointed who has been baptized, so that, after receiving the chrism—that is, the unction—he may be anointed of God and be able to have in himself the grace of Christ."³⁰ And before Cyprian, Pope Fabian writes most openly about chrism and its confection in his Epistle 2 to the Eastern bishops.³¹ And in Cyprian's time Pope Cornelius writes about the heretic Novatus that he "had not been consummated by the seal of the chrism," as is read in Eusebius, book 6, chapter 33 (or 34) according to the version of Rufinus.³² Whence also Theodoret relates, in the book *De Haereticorum fabulis*, that those who followed Novatus do not offer to those baptized by them the most holy Chrism.³³ Pacian likewise bears witness to the same thing about the Novatians, in the third Epistle to Sempronianus.³⁴ Prudentius too makes mention of it, in the Hymn whose opening is "Cultor Dei memento"; and elsewhere, when he says that the unbelievers were wont to say of Christians, "let the washed and the anointed be far away."³⁵ But Henry Valesius notes upon the

previously cited words of Cornelius—see, however, the same Valesius's annotation on the place praised above.³⁶

§ 16. Augustine, sometimes calling it oil, sometimes unguent, sometimes indeed chrism, has these words in *De Trinitate*, book 15, chapter 26: "God anointed Christ with the Holy Spirit, not, to be sure, with visible oil, but with the gift of grace, which is signified by the visible unguent, with which the Church has anointed the baptized."³⁷ He calls it Chrism in *Tracts* 33 and 118 on John, in *Sermon 47* on the words of the Lord, in the book *Contra litteras Petilian*, chapter 104, and in the *City of God*, book 20, chapter 4.³⁸ Again he designates it by the name of oil in the book *Contra Donatistas*, book 5, chapter 20, and by the name of unction in *Tract 3* on the *Epistles of John*.³⁹ There is frequent mention of this likewise among others; of whom it will suffice to have noted these places: Cyril, book 3 on John, chapter 2; Leo, *Epistle 86*; and, in his time, the Council of Orange I, canons 1 and 2; Prosper, *Sentence 142*; Pope Gelasius in Gratian, *De Consecratione*, *Distinction 4*, chapter *Presbyteros*; the Author of the *Sermon de Unctione Chrismatis* among the works ascribed to Cyprian; Gregory on the *Canticle*; Bede on *Acts 8*, and on *Exodus chapter 54*, and on *Psalms 26*, and book 6 on *Luke 10*; Faustus, *De libero arbitrio*, book 1, chapter 14. And older than these are the Councils of Carthage, the third (canon 36) and the fourth (canon 36).⁴⁰ But, before the others, Innocent III writes openly and at length about the unction, blessing, and signification of chrism in the *Decretals*, title *De sacra unctione*. To these there was finally added the clear definition of the Council of Florence in the *Decree of Eugene to the Armenians*.⁴¹

§ 17. Although we have no express mention in Sacred Scripture of chrism as it is the matter of this sacrament, nevertheless some—among whom is Rabanus—have not thought it out of place that John the Apostle alluded to it when, fortifying and instructing the faithful against the craft of heretics, he says in his first *Epistle*: "But you have an unction from the Holy One, and you know all things." And again: "The unction which you have received remains in you; and you have no need that anyone teach you, but as his unction teaches you concerning all things." In which places, in Greek, it is *chrisma*, by which the Apostle seems to have wished to signify the Holy Spirit—namely, having regard to the Church's rite by which, under the visible chrism, the Holy Spirit was given. Whence Augustine says: "The spiritual unction is the Holy Spirit himself, of whom the sacrament is in the visible inunction."⁴² There seems to be a similar allusion in the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. 1) in these words: "He who anointed us, and gave the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts."

§ 18. What must be understood by the name of chrism when the question is raised concerning the matter of this sacrament, the Synod of Florence declares when it defines that the matter of this sacrament is chrism composed of oil, which signifies the brightness of conscience, and balsam, which signifies the odor of good fame, blessed by a bishop. The words of the Council seem to be taken from the *Epistle of Innocent III* to the Patriarch of Constantinople, which is contained in the *Decretals*, title *De sacra unctione*, where this whole matter is more fully explained.⁴³ Concerning the same, thus writes the Author of the *Sermon de Unctione Chrismatis* among the works ascribed to Cyprian: "The sacred chrism is composed, in which the balsam mixed with oil expresses the unity of royal and priestly glory."⁴⁴ And, earlier than this, Fabian, in the second *Epistle*, commemorates that the manner of composing chrism from oil and balsam was handed down to the Apostles by Christ.⁴⁵ Again, concerning it Gregory writes thus (on *Canticles 1*) at that verse: "In the vineyards of Engaddi," he says, "balsam is produced, which, when blessed with pontifical benediction together with oil, is made chrism, by which the gifts of the Holy Spirit are expressed."⁴⁶

§ VI — Whether the Apostles used chrism for this sacrament (*Utrum Apostoli ad hoc sacramentum chrismate fuerint usi?*)

§ 19. Some are of opinion that the Apostles, in conferring the sacrament of Confirmation, never used chrism, but by the imposition of hands alone bestowed the Holy Spirit on the baptized; because (Acts 8 and 19), where mention is made of this sacrament, only the imposition of hands is named, and by Simon Magus it is said generally: "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I shall lay hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit." Then, because they say there was no need that any other ceremony be employed so long as the Holy Spirit was also given visibly. Third, because balsam is a most precious kind of liquid, of which the Apostles, poor and professing poverty, could not have a supply to seal all the faithful—especially since we read that on one day three thousand and on another four thousand men believed, and that, when Philip was preaching, the whole city of the Samaritans believed; upon all of whom, after Baptism, the Apostles laid hands. Fourth, because in the Decree of Florence one reads thus: "In place of that imposition of hands, by which the Apostles used to give the Holy Spirit, Confirmation is given in the Church," which words seem to signify that that imposition of hands employed by the Apostles was a rite different from the Confirmation which the Church uses.⁴⁷

§ 20. The opinion of others is that the Apostles—although this is not expressed in Scripture—even then, when they are said to have handed on the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands (Acts 8; 19), used chrism; and that they never laid hands upon the faithful for receiving the Holy Spirit without chrism as the proper and necessary matter (*materia*) of this sacrament. They strive to prove this, first, because if the Apostles were not using the same visible sign as that which the Church now uses, then the sacrament which the Church now gives and that which the Apostles gave in the beginning would not be the same. For the external sign belongs to the substance of a sacrament, namely, the matter and the form (*forma*). Next, because it is certain from the testimonies of the Ancients that the Apostles handed down to their successors this rite of Confirmation, which is done by the inunction of chrism. For this is attested by Fabian, already cited repeatedly, by Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 4, last chapter), by Clement (Epistle 4), and by Innocent I in the Epistle to Bishop Decentius.⁴⁸ Nor is it likely that the Apostles would have handed down to posterity, in the rites of the sacraments—especially those that are essential—what they themselves had not first confirmed by their own use and practice.

§ 21. To this doubt it seems one can give a probable reply, namely, that the Apostles, in ministering this sacrament, used chrism neither always nor never. For the arguments of the former side require nothing other than that, in the very first beginnings of their preaching, the Apostles were not commonly using chrism for confirming the whole multitude of the faithful. But that afterwards, when the affairs of the Church had been established and ordered, they employed the unction of chrism, nothing prevents; indeed it is very probable and almost certain.

§ 22. But to that which is objected on the other side, we can answer that this was done by the Apostles for that time by dispensation, so that, the matter being omitted—which was less readily at hand and could not so easily be procured—they should employ some common ceremony for imparting the effect of the sacrament; especially when, concerning the very effect, on account of the external and divine marvel which was happening among the faithful, its being conferred was held as indubitable. Whence those who think thus say that, in the very beginnings of the Church, fiery tongues or the gift of tongues supplied the place of a visible element, which things, after they had ceased, the Apostles began to use that which they had received as

instituted by Christ. And although, in external rite, what was done at the beginning through the Apostles was different from what was afterwards celebrated by the same and handed down to the Church to be perpetually observed, nevertheless it was not different as regards the principal matter—that is, as regards the thing (*res*) of the sacrament, or the spiritual effect; and thus it ought not to be reckoned a wholly different sacrament, in the way that Baptism, Confirmation, and the other sacraments of the Church are diverse from one another, which are all distinguished, besides by ceremonies, also by their proper effects.

§ 23. Yet it must be known that the argument placed in the first rank concludes but feebly; for since those things which pertain to the rites of the sacraments were held most secret and were handed down almost solely by word, as it were from hand to hand, one can easily reply that Luke did not wish to disclose in writing either the element or the word of this sacrament, and therefore used the term "imposition of hands," which is a kind of general ceremony wont to be employed in various ways—as is manifest from several places of Scripture. Whence it comes about that it signifies not only this sacrament of Confirmation, but the sacrament of Ordination and of Reconciliation, and sometimes certain other solemn acts of this kind, as is evident to anyone reading the writings of the Ancients. Concerning which matter we shall say more when we come to the sacrament of Order. Indeed, although the Ancients very often call this sacrament the imposition of hands, nevertheless from the same it is clear that the unction of chrism was also employed; but after the manner of Scripture, under a general and well-known ceremony they willed those things which are particular and more hidden to be understood.

§ VII — The resolution of two questions arising from what has been said (Duarum quaestionum ex dictis emergentium dissolutio)

§ 24. In light of what has just been said, two questions arise: one concerning the fiery tongues, the other concerning the imposition of hands. The prior question is whether at some time the fiery tongues pertained to any part of this sacrament. This can seem so because it was said above that in the beginning the fiery tongues took the place of a visible element in this sacrament and were received on the day of Pentecost. For then neither the imposition of hands nor anything at all humanly applied to them was present, by which—as by an intervening external sign—the Holy Spirit might descend upon them; but, "there came," says Scripture, "suddenly from heaven a sound as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting; and there appeared to them parted tongues as if of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit," and so forth. From which words someone might suspect that neither the form nor the matter was lacking there—namely, that the sound of the vehement wind supplied the place of the audible word, and the fiery tongues the place of the visible element; unless perhaps someone should prefer that the very speaking with tongues, of which it follows straightway, "And they began to speak with various tongues," was in the manner of a form.

§ 25. We reply that the Apostles on the day of Pentecost received not the sacrament of Confirmation, but the reality (*res*) of that sacrament, from Him whose power is not bound to sensible signs. And the same must be said of Cornelius and his companions, who before Baptism were filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 10), where, however, there is no mention either of a sounding wind or of fiery tongues, but it is only said that the Holy Spirit fell upon them; and this was recognized by the sign that those who were present "heard them speaking with tongues and magnifying God." Nor can it be proved that the Spirit fell upon others than upon

the Apostles on the day of Pentecost with the sound of wind and fiery tongues; to which, nevertheless, neither the notion of matter nor of sacramental form properly belonged, although in some way it can be said that those things were in the place of matter and of form. For no such institution had been made that by those outwardly exhibited signs the Holy Spirit should descend upon men, but only this: to signify and make known to the whole people that which within, in the hearts of the Apostles, was then being wrought by the Holy Spirit, God willed that something of this sort should be heard or seen outwardly. The very speaking with tongues indeed also signified that the Apostles had been filled with the Holy Spirit, but in the way that an effect signifies its cause—although that effect was neither proper to that cause nor was it going to be perpetual, but was extraordinary and only for a time, to pre-signify something future, namely that that same Church which was then beginning would speak in the tongues of the Gentiles; which we have long since seen fulfilled, and even today we see being fulfilled.

§ 26. The latter question is whether the ceremony of the imposition of a hand or of hands has been, or is, at some time necessary to the substance, or at least to the integrity, of this sacrament. To this we reply that, granted (which is the more common opinion) that the Apostles at the beginning of their preaching did not use chrism in the administration of this sacrament, it also seems probable that at that same time the imposition of hands held the place of matter, and prayer the place of form; so that both were then to be employed necessarily for handing on through human ministry the Holy Spirit, until, the use of chrism having been introduced together with a form suited to that matter—these alone being the essential parts of this sacrament—the necessity of the imposition of hands ceased, at least as regards the essence or integrity of the sacrament; since now it is neither its form nor its matter, nor a part of the form or of the matter, but only a certain sacramental ceremony received from apostolic tradition, and therefore by no means to be omitted, as retaining still the necessity of a precept, though not of the sacrament.

§ 27. This doctrine is conformable to the Decree of Florence on the sacraments, in which one reads that "in place of that imposition of hands, by which the Apostles used to give the Holy Spirit, in the Church Confirmation is given, whose matter is chrism," and so forth. From which words both are gathered: both that at the beginning the imposition of hands was necessary with the necessity of the sacrament, and that the same necessity ceased with the introduction of the seal of the chrism. Now this ceremony of the imposition or overshadowing of hands, employed both here and elsewhere, signifies either divine protection and guardianship, as Dionysius wills,⁵⁰ or the invocation of grace and of divine favor upon a man, as Tertullian and Augustine hold; of whom the former, in the book *De Baptismo*, chapter 3, says: "The hand is imposed by blessing, calling upon and inviting the Holy Spirit"; while the latter, in book 3 *De Baptismo*, chapter 16, says that the imposition of hands is nothing other than prayer over a man, because, namely, that external sign is a certain ceremonial prayer, signifying the internal prayer of him who imposes the hand for him upon whom the hand is imposed.⁵¹

§ VIII — Whether the admixture of balsam is necessary for this sacrament (Utrum ad hoc sacramentum admixtio balsami sit necessaria?)

§ 28. It is asked whether for the substance (*substantia*) of this sacrament (*sacramentum*) it is necessary that balsam (*balsamum*) be mixed with the oil, or whether it can be effected without balsam, with olive oil alone being had as the matter (*materia*). The necessity of balsam seems to be proved by the things said above about

the matter of this sacrament. For there, both from the Fathers and from the definition of the Council of Florence, it was established that the matter of this sacrament is chrism (*chrisma*) composed of oil and balsam.⁵² But the matter is one essential part of the thing, which if it be lacking, according to that same Council, the sacrament is not perfected. It likewise seems to be shown from the form (*forma*) of this sacrament, in which it is said: "I confirm you with the chrism of salvation."⁵³ Which truly cannot be said, when only oil is applied; since chrism signifies ointment composed of oil and balsam.

§ 29. However, on the opposite side there are not to be despised arguments. First: The matter of a sacrament which is to be given commonly to Christians and without exception ought to be common and readily available, or at any rate of such a sort as can be had everywhere, even if the sacrament is not altogether necessary for salvation. But balsam is the product of a certain shrub, most precious and most rare, granted, as it were, to the lands of Judaea, and formerly found only in two gardens of that land, as Pliny reports, Natural History book 12, chapter 25; now indeed by the frequent invasions of wars it is said to have been almost rooted out and exterminated from that region.⁵⁴

§ 30. Second: The matter of a sacrament ought to be easy to recognize, like water, bread, wine, which are easily recognized for what they truly are; but balsam is adulterated in many ways, as Pliny relates in that same place, so that it is doubted most earnestly even by experts whether that balsam which is brought from the western New World is genuine; and before it was brought from there, there was great scarcity of balsam in these parts.

§ 31. Third: Dionysius, in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 4, when he treats of the matter of this sacrament, makes no mention of balsam, but writes in general that the composition of that ointment is a certain assemblage of sweet-smelling, fragrant materials. Which words indicate that not one single kind of fragrant material, but several, used to be mixed with the oil of chrism; yet it is certain that these do not pertain to the substance of the sacrament.⁵⁵

§ 32. Fourth: The Fathers often call this matter simply "oil": as Tertullian, book 1 Against Marcion; St. Augustine, book 15 On the Trinity, chapter 26; likewise book 5 Against the Donatists, chapter 20; and Tractate 118 on John, and others.⁵⁶

§ 33. Fifth: Although wine mixed with water is everywhere the matter of the Eucharistic sacrament, nevertheless water is not necessary to its substance; therefore similarly, although oil mixed with balsam is appointed as the matter of the sacrament of Confirmation, it does not follow from this that balsam is required as necessary for its substance.

§ 34. Lastly and chiefly, an argument is taken from Innocent III (Decretals, De sacramentis non iterandis, chapter "Pastoralis"), where, being consulted concerning a man who through error had been anointed not with chrism but with oil, the Pontiff replies that in such cases nothing is to be repeated, but cautiously supplied which had been incautiously omitted. Where, by saying that it is not to be repeated but supplied, he plainly signifies that it was a sacrament, and therefore that chrism, insofar as it includes the admixture of balsam, was not necessary to its substance; otherwise, that would have had to be repeated which previously had not stood, just as he would have to be baptized again who had been baptized not in water but in wine. By this chief argument Cajetan (on III, q. 72, aa. 1 and 2) and Domingo Soto (in this Distinction) are moved to think that balsam is not absolutely necessary—no more than imposition of hands is necessary for conferring the diaconate; for of that, under the same wording, the Pontiff similarly speaks.⁵⁷ According to this not

improbable opinion it is easily replied by all to the things objected in the contrary, that balsam is required as necessary with the necessity of precept and of Christ's institution, but not with the necessity of the sacrament. In this way St. Cyprian, in Epistle 68 (to Caecilius on the sacrament of the Lord's chalice), teaches that, from Christ's very institution, water must necessarily be mixed with wine in the chalice, which nevertheless, if it is omitted, the substance of the sacrament will nonetheless stand, as we shall teach in its proper place.⁵⁸

§ 35. To that which is objected from the *ratio* of the matter it is answered: that indeed matter is necessary for the substance of the sacrament, but not every part of the matter, as in composites, both natural and artificial, and in the very sacrament of Penance, it is easy to show. Nor does the argument drawn from the words of the form have a difficult solution. For "chrism" in general signifies unction, or ointment. Whence also Innocent I, in his Epistle to Decentius, called the oil of the sick, to which balsam is not mixed, "chrism"; and St. Augustine, book 17 of the City of God, chapter 10: "In the Old Testament," he says, "kings were called 'Christs,' consecrated by that mystical chrism"; where by the name of chrism he signifies the unmixed oil with which kings were anointed.⁵⁹

Whether the blessing of the chrism by a bishop is necessary (Utrum necessaria sit chrisma per Episcopum benedictio?)

§ 36. There is no doubt that chrism, before it comes into the use of this sacrament, ought to be blessed or consecrated, and not by anyone other than a bishop—if indeed the question be of the necessity of precept (*necessitas praecepti*). For, besides the definition of the Council of Florence, there are extant frequent canons and decrees of the ancients, as well Pontiffs as Councils, by which, lest anything else be attempted, it is strictly prohibited; as is in the decrees of Sylvester, and in Leo (Epistle 86, alias 88), and in the decrees of Gelasius (Distinct. 25, chapter "Presbyteros"). The same is established by the Second Council of Carthage (ch. 3) and the Third of Carthage (ch. 36), the First of Toledo (ch. 20), the Council of Hispalis (ch. 7), and of Braga (ch. 37). To these Bede agrees, writing on Acts 3.⁶²

§ 37. But whether it is equally necessary by the necessity of the sacrament (*necessitas sacramenti*), not all have the same opinion. For some simply affirm that there will be no sacrament if the chrism has not been consecrated, and indeed by a bishop. Others think that for the substance of the sacrament is required indeed the consecration of the chrism, yet not necessarily effected by a bishop: for they suppose that its consecration done even by a simple presbyter would be valid. There are finally those who think that the sacrament subsists even without any prior consecration of its matter.

§ 38. The first opinion is held by many, leaning on the constitutions of canons and decrees which so grant the blessing of chrism to the bishop alone that they altogether remove it from the simple presbyter. Most especially they press the decree of the Council of Florence, by which it is declared that the matter of this sacrament is chrism blessed by a bishop, and in which, moreover, it is said that although it is read to have been done by Apostolic dispensation that a simple presbyter confer this sacrament, yet not otherwise than with chrism blessed by a bishop.⁶³

§ 39. The middle view is Cajetan's, writing on III (q. 72, a. 3), who is moved by this reason: There is no greater consecration than that by which the Eucharist is consecrated; since that can be done by a simple presbyter, every other non-sacramental consecration can be effected by him as well. Favoring this opinion seems to be Jerome, in the Epistle to Rusticus of Narbonne "On the seven grades of the Church", in which he

openly asserts that this power of consecrating chrism is not held by the bishop alone, as was proved above by the custom of many Churches; likewise that which is read in the decrees of Sylvester, that he ordained that the chrism be confected by the bishop—as if it had also previously been common to presbyters.

§ 40. But these do not conclude certainly. To the argument it can be answered that it does not follow that he who can do what is greater can therefore also do absolutely what is lesser, since the power of each person is confined within those limits which the Giver of graces, the Distributer the Holy Spirit, has set; therefore, although the power of consecrating the Lord's Body is more excellent than the power of conferring sacred orders, and the power of working miracles, and every angelic power, it does not follow that all of this power is competent to any priest whatsoever. As to the authority of Jerome and of Sylvester it is answered that the Epistle alleged is not by Jerome but by an uncertain Author, who—which is manifestly false—makes the simple presbyter the ordinary minister of the sacraments, and, by a corrupt reading in certain places, supports his claim by appeal to custom. But Sylvester, by his decree, did not attribute some new privilege to bishops, but rather, against the presumption of certain presbyters, fortified with a new constitution that which was owed to them from Apostolic tradition.⁶⁴ And as to what Cajetan adds by way of presupposing the Pope's power—that he can dispense so that a presbyter confer this sacrament (about which we shall see below)—this is no reason for doubting whether he could also dispense so that a presbyter consecrate chrism; nor does it seem altogether true. For the confection of the matter is proper to higher orders, although the use of it is also conceded to lower, as is easily shown concerning the Eucharist and chrism itself. Nor is it of consequence whether in a sacrament, or outside a sacrament, someone uses the consecrated matter, provided only he has the power to do so; but for consecrating, not everyone has that power. For a deacon, because he is able to handle the Lord's Body, is not therefore able to consecrate. And indeed concerning Confirmation itself many grant that, although it is lawful for a presbyter, by dispensation, to administer it in defect or absence of a bishop, nevertheless it must be done with chrism blessed by a bishop; and they think it would be less tolerable to commit to a presbyter beforehand the consecration of chrism than the very conferral of the sacrament.

§ 41. The third opinion, which at least as regards the oil of the sick is held by Francisco de Vitoria, and which Emanuel Sa follows, relies on a line of reasoning common to both sacraments: It is true Baptism is a sacrament from a font not consecrated, and the Eucharist is a true sacrament from bread not previously blessed; therefore there is also true Confirmation from oil sanctified by no prior blessing. But if you should reply that by this blessing the oil is determined to the matter of this sacrament, it is asked what the necessity is of this determination in this sacrament more than in Baptism and others, especially since by the minister's intention and the application to the use of the sacrament and by the very utterance of the form the matter seems sufficiently determined. They reply that Christ Himself, by the contact of His most pure flesh, when He was baptized in the Jordan, sanctified all waters; likewise bread and wine, when He made from them His Body and Blood; and therefore no other sanctification, whether by a bishop or by a presbyter, is necessarily required for those things; but oil is nowhere found to have been sanctified by Christ in this way by His very use.

§ 42. To which it is objected in turn: if Christ is judged to have sanctified by that use all water and bread and wine for the future, then to those same things the blessing of a priest, when it is afterward added, would seem to be done in reproach of Christ. Besides, just as Christ is read to have been washed with water by John, so He is read also to have been anointed with oil more than once—once by a woman, and again by Nicodemus after His death. Nor does it seem to stand in the way if you say that those anointings were neither sacraments

nor sacramentals. For both the Baptism of John with which Christ was washed in the Jordan was not a sacrament nor a ceremony of a sacrament, and nevertheless it did not lack a certain general *ratio* of sacrament; and likewise those unctions were not without a mysterious import.

§ 43. But it must be answered otherwise. One must say that the matter of a sacrament is as it were a certain instrument (*instrumentum*) which the minister uses in sacraments that consist in the use and application of the matter to the recipient; wherefore the matter ought to be congruent to the minister, and the minister to the matter. In whatever sacrament, therefore, the minister is determined by some ordination, the matter is determined by some blessing; and where the one is not, neither is the other; as is evident in Baptism, whose minister is not determined by a certain ordination—for anyone at all can baptize. Hence neither does the matter need any blessing. But in the sacrament of Confirmation the minister is determined by a certain ordination, namely episcopal; and therefore it is necessary that the matter be determined by a certain blessing. Wherefore by unblest chrism no one could be confirmed. So he (Durandus) says.⁶⁵

§ 44. But neither does that explanation seem solid enough, and therefore with good reason it is impugned by Domingo (Soto). For the sacrament of the Eucharist, although it has a minister determined by a certain ordination, nevertheless does not necessarily require matter previously blessed. Nor is it of any moment that Durandus restricts his explanation to the sacraments which consist in the use and application of the matter to the recipient; first, because no reason is given why the same ought not to have place in the sacrament of the Eucharist, if, as he wishes, the reason for determining the matter is to be sought from the determination of the minister; next, because in the sacrament of Order—which without doubt consists in application—although the minister is determined by episcopal consecration, nonetheless it is not necessary, in order that the sacrament subsist, that its matter be determined by a certain blessing, especially since in it certain things take the place of matter which are not wont to be blessed, as the Book of the Gospels, by the handing over of which the deacon is ordained. It seems, therefore, that one should say, if the first opinion, which is that of the majority, is to be held, that its reason is to be sought from the sole will of the institutor, who willed no other to be the matter of this sacrament than that which had been blessed by a bishop. But that the matter of Baptism, on account of the surpassing necessity of that sacrament, ought not to have been bound necessarily to some consecration. For the same reason also both its mystery is very broad, and the matter appointed is of all things most readily available. But if the last opinion pleases, therefore also the substance of this sacrament would consist without the prior blessing of the matter; besides the reason set above, no light argument for it is taken from the decree of Innocent III (*De sacramentis non iterandis*, chapter "Pastoralis"), where the Pontiff holds as ratified this sacrament done with the unction of oil alone, which indeed is not very likely to have been blessed at least with that blessing which is given to chrism, since the blessings of simple oil and of chrism are different and appointed for different purposes. Add that Augustine, Tractate 118 on John, speaks similarly of the blessing of the baptismal water and of the chrism, as if each with respect to its sacrament had an equal consideration.⁶⁶ But to the things objected one can reply that those canons prove nothing other than the necessity of precept; and the Fathers, for that reason, urge more studiously the necessity of the blessing of chrism than of water, both because the former descended from divine institution, not the latter, and lest they seem to narrow the way of salvation if they were to press more vehemently the necessity of blessing water, although that too is under precept. Moreover, what is said about the blessing of chrism, the same also holds of the oil of the sick, as we shall say in its own place.

§ X — What is the form of this sacrament (Quae hujus sit Sacramenti forma)

§ 45. The Council of Florence hands down the form (*forma*) of this sacrament in these words: "I sign you with the sign of the cross, and I confirm you with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Nor does it matter that "I sign" is commonly today said as "I seal," just as in some Churches "of salvation" used to be said "of sanctification," as St. Thomas and Scotus testify: for the same is signified.⁶⁸

§ 46. Nor is there to be any doubt that the form of this sacrament, as of the others, was handed down to the Church by the Apostles from Christ's institution, as regards those words without which the sacrament is not perfected. But what those words are is not entirely clear because of the variety found therein among the writers. For the First Synod of Constantinople and Simeon, Bishop of Thessalonica (On the Divine Mysteries), as Turrianus cites, set down this form: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen." In the Acts of Sylvester and in the Edict of Constantine concerning his conversion is read this form: "May God seal you with the seal of His faith, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." But perhaps that is less authentic, for Pope Gelasius does not dare simply to approve the Acts of Sylvester. Nor is it very probable that the First Synod of Constantinople made public the form of this sacrament, since the ancients took diligent and solicitous care that such Mysteries not be divulged, as we warned when we treated of the forms of the sacraments in general. Whence Innocent I, in his Epistle to Decentius, when, having been consulted about this sacrament, he had given certain replies, added: "But the words indeed I cannot say, lest

§ 47. "...I seem to be betraying it rather than replying to the consultation." To that form of words, indeed, which the Fathers of Florence hand down, Ambrose comes very near⁶⁹ when he addresses the one confirmed, among other words, thus: "God the Father has sealed you; the Lord Christ has confirmed you; He has given the pledge of the Spirit in your hearts."⁷⁰ Cyprian also, in an Epistle (to Jubaianus), intimates that the name of sealing is wont to be heard in the conferring of this sacrament, when he says that those baptized in the Church obtain the Holy Spirit by the imposition of the hands of the bishops and are consummated by the Lord's seal.⁷¹ And among other writers too the name of sign, and of seal, is not infrequently attributed to this sacrament—taken, as is plain, from the fact that the bishop declares that he seals with the Lord's sign the one whom he anoints. Moreover, that that final clause "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" is wont to be added, Athanasius indicates in a book On the Trinity and the Holy Spirit, and Augustine likewise (Sermon 99 on Various Matters, ch. 2), saying that Stephen had on his forehead the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit.⁷² Which passage also suggests that from the very beginning the Apostles signed the forehead of the faithful with the invocation of the Trinity. For it must not be thought that Stephen received this seal from any other than an Apostle.

§ 48. Now from what has been said it is sufficiently clear that, to the substance of the form (*forma*) there belongs chiefly the word that signifies the act of sealing, and then also the expression of the person to be sealed; but not also the person of the one sealing—just as neither in Baptism does there belong the expression of the person baptizing. And although nothing of the rest which the customary form contains should be omitted for the sake of its integrity, yet, just as this form of Baptism suffices: "I baptize you in the name of the Father," etc., so not without reason this form of Confirmation can seem likewise to suffice: "I seal you in the name of the Father," etc., or, "I confirm you in the name of the Father," etc. For both the word "to seal" and the word "to confirm," by the Church's usage, signify the ministerial act of this sacrament, just as the word "to

baptize" in the sacrament of Baptism; nor is any cogent reason adduced why, on that account, anything must of necessity be added by necessity of the sacrament.

§ 49. But this too is asked: whether the final words which contain the explicit naming of the Trinity are of the essence. For although without them Baptism is not accomplished, Absolution, however, and the other sacraments stand without them, as is the received opinion of many, because Baptism alone is the sacrament of the profession of faith. Although one could also reply to this: since Confirmation is a certain perfection and complement of Baptism, it may rightly be judged also a sacrament of the profession of faith—especially since it is conferred for this, that the baptized may profess the faith fearlessly. But those who think otherwise establish this difference between Baptism and the other sacraments: that in Baptism the invocation of the Trinity is operative, and not any power of the minister received through consecration, as in the others, which necessarily require a definite and determinate minister. In which, therefore, they deny that the invocation of the Trinity is necessary as in Baptism, but they think it sufficient for the sacrament to be valid if the act of that power toward the recipient is expressed. Which opinion is not improbable, although the other is safer.

§ IX — By what rite Confirmation is conferred (Quo ritu confirmatio fiat)

§ 50. This sacrament is conferred not on the body as such, but on the forehead, where modesty has its seat—lest, as the Fathers of the Council of Florence say, the faithful be ashamed to confess the name of Christ, and especially His cross, "which to Jews is a scandal, but to Gentiles foolishness" (1 Cor. 1).⁷⁴ Wherefore also he is signed with the sign of the cross, namely while the chrism is applied to the forehead in the form of a cross, meanwhile while the ceremonies are being said; and there is another signification, namely that by that sign by which Christ triumphed over the proud powers, he who was previously baptized is now enrolled in the number of His soldiers.

§ 51. To this ceremony of signing the ancients look back and allude very frequently, and most of all Augustine, when he says that all the faithful, nay even kings and princes themselves, "bear the sign of the cross on their foreheads," as in Ps. 56; other places are Tractates 11, 53, and 118 on John; Homily 31 among the Fifty; Sermon 22 on the Words of the Apostle; Sermon 19 on the Saints; Sermon 99 on Various Matters, ch. 2.⁷⁵ And the reason why the sign of the cross is fixed on the forehead—namely, because there is the seat of shame—he expressed in Sermon 8 on the Words of the Apostle, in the last Fragment, chs. 2–3.⁷⁶ Prudentius also (in Hymn 9) sang thus of the Sign of the Cross: "Unfurl the banner that shines upon brows that are marked." And that this is wont to be done with chrism he teaches in another hymn whose beginning is: "Servant of God, remember that you were made known by chrism."⁷⁷ Finally Innocent III, in the Decretals (On Sacred Anointing, ch. 3, § Quia vero), says: "The baptized is anointed on the forehead, that he may freely confess what he believes; because 'with the heart one believes unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation'."⁷⁸

§ XII — What is the proper effect of the sacrament of Confirmation (Quis sit proprius effectus Sacramenti confirmationis)

§ 52. That the proper effect of this sacrament (*sacramentum*) was not the gift of tongues (*donum linguarum*). At the oft-cited question, article 7, the sectarians of our time want there to have been no other effect of the

imposition of hands (*impositio manuum*) in the beginnings of the Church than the gift of tongues or of prophecy (*prophetia*), or some similar thing, marvellous and manifesting itself outwardly, by which, in those first times, the Christian Faith—still new among men—would be commended. This error is easy to refute both from Scripture and by reasons. First: the faithful received the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands for that effect for which He had previously been promised through Christ; but the promise of Christ is contained in these words at the end of Luke: "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high"; and in Acts 1: "You shall receive power, and you shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem and in all Judea," etc.⁸⁰ Therefore the Holy Spirit, as He was promised, so also was given to the faithful—not particularly for the gift of tongues or something similar, but for power, that is, fortitude (*fortitudo*) and strength, by which they might stand unconquered in the confession and profession of the Faith. Moreover, that the effect of this promise pertains not to the Apostles alone but to all the faithful Peter (Acts 2) proves from the prophecy of Joel, in which indeed the Lord had promised that He would pour out the Holy Spirit upon all flesh; and he shows it more clearly by those words with which he says to those who believed and were pricked to the heart: "Let every one of you be baptized for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," namely that very same gift which "you now see that we have received. For to you is the promise and to your children and to all that are far off, whomever the Lord our God shall call."⁸¹

§ 53. Second: the Apostles acted with great care and solicitude that hands should be imposed upon the baptized for receiving the Holy Spirit, as is clear in Acts 8, where for this very reason there are sent from Jerusalem to the Samaritans the chief of the Apostles, Peter and John; and in Acts 19, where Paul first indeed asks certain disciples at Ephesus whether they had received the Holy Spirit when they believed; then, when he understood that they had not even been baptized, he ordered them to be baptized, and presently, with hands laid upon them, he imparts to them the Holy Spirit.⁸² But it is evident how little solicitous the Apostles were that the faithful should have the gift of tongues—as being one from the number of those which are given for the utility of others, not properly of the one to whom it is given, and which is not reckoned among the better charismata, and is set after prophecy, and in comparison with charity is counted as nothing, as is clear to one reading 1 Cor. 12, 13, 14. Third: Peter (Acts 2), after Baptism and the remission of sins, promises to believers, as something great, the gift of the Holy Spirit; therefore it must have been something greater than the remission of sins given by Baptism. Fourth: all the baptized without distinction ought to receive the Holy Spirit by the Apostles' imposition of hands; yet not all either spoke with tongues or prophesied, even if they were fervent in faith, hope, and charity—"Are all prophets? do all speak with tongues?" (1 Cor. 12). Fifth: by the same Apostle's witness (1 Cor. 14) tongues are "for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers"; but who will say that the Holy Spirit from on high was promised not for the sake of believers but for the sake of unbelievers? Sixth: the same Apostle (Heb. 6) numbers imposition of hands together with Penance, Baptism, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and other things which were prescribed or delivered to catechumens as the elements of the Christian Faith; therefore it does not pertain to the grace (*gratia*) of miracles, which is not even present to all who, in the Faith, have their senses exercised. Seventh: in Acts 8 the deacon Philip among the Samaritans was casting out unclean spirits from many, curing many paralytics and the lame, and was doing other signs and very great wonders; therefore he had the grace of miracles. Nor does there appear any reason why by that same imposition of his hands he could not have obtained for the Samaritans the gift of tongues—if some greater effect, reserved to the ministry of the Apostolic Order, to be expected by imposition of hands, had not been in question. Finally: the gift of tongues was temporary and

necessary only in those first times for spreading the Church; but Christ promised to the faithful the Holy Spirit "who," He says, "shall abide with you for ever."⁸³ Therefore, besides the gift of tongues, there is some effect of the imposition of hands which is principal and abiding in the Church. Hence St. Augustine, book 3 against the Donatists, ch. 16, says: "For now the Holy Spirit is not given by imposition of hands with temporal and sensible miracles bearing witness, as formerly He used to be given for the commendation of untrained Faith and for spreading the beginnings of the Church. For who now expects this, that those on whom hands are imposed for receiving the Holy Spirit should suddenly begin to speak with tongues? But it is understood invisibly and secretly that by the bond of peace divine charity is inspired into their hearts, so that they can say: 'Because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts'." ⁸⁴ Thus he. Things like this, and even more, can be seen in him in the Tractates on the First Epistle of John.⁸⁵

§ 54. Therefore, just as on the day of Pentecost the disciples indeed were given the Spirit together with the outward gift of tongues, yet that same Spirit, as the finger of God, wrote His law inwardly in their hearts and clothed them with power from on high; so the Samaritans and others on whom the Apostles laid hands for receiving the Holy Spirit, besides the outward gift of tongues or of prophecy, received the inward grace of the Holy Spirit, that is, power and strength, by which, confirmed, they might confess without fear what they believed. And so, finally, those who either at the same time or in later times of the Church, by the imposition of hands of the Apostles or of bishops, did not receive the gift of tongues were by no means defrauded of the inward gift of the Holy Spirit which God promised as perpetual to His Church. For that remains for which the sacrament was instituted principally by its grace, even if that fails which at some time was an accessory. Whence, just as sometimes through Baptism health of body has been restored—although that was not the proper nor the principal effect of that sacrament—so also the gift of tongues, although for a time it was given to many of the faithful in the Church by the imposition of hands, was nevertheless not the proper nor principal effect which it was fitting to expect as great through the sacrament of imposition, nor was that sacrament given on account of that effect.

§ XIII — What is the proper effect of the Sacrament of Confirmation (Quis sit proprius effectus Sacramenti confirmationis)

§ 55. The proper effect of this sacrament is the strength of the Holy Spirit (*robur Spiritus Sancti*), that is, grace (*gratia*), by which, the Christian soul being confirmed by the Holy Spirit (*Spiritus Sanctus*), it may persist in piety and may resist assailants—both as the things just now said show, and as it can be shown yet more fully from elsewhere. For in the end of Luke and in Acts 1 power is promised to the Apostles, that is, fortitude of the Spirit; which promise we have already shown pertains not to the Apostles alone but to all the faithful.⁸⁶

§ 56. Hence among the Ancients we read everywhere that perfection, consummation, confirmation, increase, constancy, strength, and fortitude are ascribed to this sacrament as its effects. Among whom the most ancient Dionysius says that the gift of Sacred Regeneration is perfected by the most holy consummation of the Anointing of Grace.⁸⁷ Likewise the Apostolic Constitutions say that the anointing is the confirmation of profession; and in the fourth Epistle: that when one is signed, he is confirmed by the sevenfold grace of the Spirit, and that otherwise a Christian cannot be perfect nor have a seat among the perfect.⁸⁸ Tertullian, in the book On the Resurrection of the Flesh: "The flesh," he says, "is signed, that the soul may be fortified." [^88] Pope Fabian, in the second Epistle to the Eastern Bishops, affirms that Baptism is perfected and confirmed by

the anointing of holy chrism.⁸⁹ Urban I, speaking of this sacrament in an Epistle to all the Bishops: "When the Holy Spirit is poured in," he says, "the faithful heart is enlarged unto prudence and constancy."⁹⁰ Cornelius, in an Epistle to Fabius of Antioch (in Eusebius, book 6, chapter 35), writes that Novatus had not been sealed with the seal of the Lord by the Bishop, and therefore had not received the Holy Spirit, although he had been baptized. For the Pontiff is speaking of the reception of the Holy Spirit as Scripture does (Acts 8:19).⁹¹ Melchiades, in an Epistle to the Bishops of Spain, among other things attributes to this sacrament that it gives to the baptized a warrant unto Grace, that it strengthens and confirms for the combat, and that for the contests and battles of this world, reserved to be endured, it arms and equips—drawing an argument also from this, that the Holy Spirit wrought in the Apostles on the day of Pentecost.⁹² Ambrose, book 3 On the Sacraments, chapter 2: "After the font," he says, "it remains that perfection be brought about," and then he enumerates the seven gifts, or virtues as he himself calls them, of the Holy Spirit to be given through the signing.⁹³ Jerome, or whoever is the author on Psalm 67, on that verse "Confirm, O God," says that by this seal that is confirmed which was received in Baptism.⁹⁴ Augustine, Sermon 47 On the Words of the Lord, and Tractate 33 on John, speaking of the anointing of chrism: "For this reason Christ anointed us," he says, "because He made us wrestlers against the Devil"—which likewise pertains to fortitude.⁹⁵ And the same thing is repeated by Prosper in the Sentences of Augustine (Sentence 342).⁹⁶ Leo, in an Epistle to Bishop Nicetas, testifies that the baptized are continually confirmed by invocation; and Bede also, writing on Psalm 26, says that after Baptism we are made more firm by the anointing of chrism.⁹⁷

§ 57. Nor is there need of many proofs for this, since both the very name of Confirmation (*Confirmatio*), almost from the beginning attributed to this sacrament, sufficiently declares this effect of firmness and strengthening, and, moreover, the form of the sacrament, in which it is said: "I confirm you with the chrism of salvation" (*Confirmo te chrismate salutis*), proves this very thing. And finally the Council of Florence pronounces thus about it: "The effect of this sacrament is that in it the Holy Spirit is given for strengthening, just as He was given to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost."⁹⁸

§ XIV — Which strength is the effect of this sacrament (Quae Fortitudo sit effectus huius sacramenti)

§ 58. It is asked whether every kind of strength of a Christian man pertains to the effect of this sacrament, or only that by which he is made steadfast against the visible enemies of the Faith and of Religion. For the testimonies of the Fathers lately adduced seem to speak without distinction of whatever Christian strength and perfection there is. We answer that this sacrament of Confirmation avails directly and in a peculiar way for strengthening the faithful against the enemies, that is, the visible persecutors of the Faith—namely, to the end that they may freely and steadfastly profess their faith before them. This is proved as follows. First, because Christ promised such a power to His Apostles (Acts 1), as is clear from the words immediately following: "And you shall be witnesses to Me in Judea," etc. Next, this is shown by the sealing of the very forehead, the rationale of which we gave above, lest the Christian should be ashamed to confess the Cross of Christ in the presence of His enemies and of the mockers of the Cross. Third, to this also pertains the signification of the balsam; by it there is signified the odor of good repute, in that the Christian is made to bear a good reputation not only for the innocence and integrity of manner of life which is common to all the reborn, but most of all for the free and immovable confession of the Christian name and of the faith before all. Finally, there is added the Decree of Florence, in which, after the words set down above, there is consequently read thus: "That the

Christian may boldly confess the name of Christ, and therefore he is anointed on the forehead, where modesty has its seat, that he may not blush to confess the name of Christ, and especially His Cross, which is to the Jews a stumbling-block, but to the Gentiles foolishness."¹⁰⁰

§ 59. Moreover, indirectly and in a general way this sacrament also instructs the faithful against invisible enemies, and against whatever other evils are opposed to piety. For this strength is not without charity; but charity, according to the Apostle (1 Cor. 13), "is patient, is kind," and, among the other works of virtues that are ascribed to it, "bears all things, endures all things." For there is a linkage of all the virtues in charity; yet still, a fortitude against all things that assail piety is attributed so much the more to this sacrament than are the acts of the other virtues, because all these are referred to one common virtue of fortitude. Therefore, the Pontiffs and the other Fathers cited in the preceding chapter rightly speak sometimes more generally of the effect of Confirmation, ascribing to it the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit, and, expressly, Pope Melchiades in his Decretal enumerates many things among the effects of Confirmation by which a faithful man is instructed not only against the external enemies of the faith but also against the internal ones, and against all vices and temptations. For Scripture too from time to time speaks thus without distinction about the effect of this sacrament, saying that the Holy Spirit is given, without adding for what particular effect He is given (as in Acts 2, 8, and 19). But still someone will object that a greater strength is needed against the invisible enemies, as being stronger, than against the visible ones; and therefore that the sacrament of Confirmation ought rather to have been instituted against those than against these.

§ 60. Likewise, that by Confirmation the Holy Spirit is given for this—that the grace begun through Baptism may grow and be perfected—and therefore that the grace of Confirmation extends as widely as that of Baptism. To the first objection we answer that every Christian combat is against invisible enemies, as the Apostle bears witness when he says (Eph. 6) that it is "against principalities and powers," and "against spiritual wickedness." But the invisible enemy assails us sometimes by the mere internal suggestion of sin, sometimes through the allurements of the world and of the flesh, and sometimes indeed by an external and manifest persecution through evil men as most apt instruments of his—namely, diabolical—malice. And this third kind of assault is the gravest of all, against which, therefore, the Christian had to be fortified by the sacrament of Confirmation. To the second objection it is answered that an increase and perfection of grace considered in general is not properly attributed to this sacrament (for these are also attributed to the sacraments of the Eucharist and of Orders), but only in this respect, insofar as grace increased and perfected renders a man robust and constant against the visible assailants of the faith; that is, insofar as that grace regards the aforesaid act of fortitude. Whence also, if it is asked what that virtue is—namely, the strength—of which the Lord says, "Be clothed with power from on high" (Lk. 24:49), and which we have said to be proper to this sacrament, nothing more probable seems to be answered than that the fortitude is understood which is one of the cardinal virtues, yet insofar as it is peculiarly ordered to the act spoken of above. Nor do we posit a fortitude different from that which is numbered among the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as was said in the book above, nor yet from that which corresponds to the eighth beatitude, of which it is said: "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake" (Matt. 5).

§ XV — That this sacrament imprints a character and cannot be repeated (Sacramentum hoc characterem imprimere & iterari non posse)

§ 61. Among those sacraments which imprint a character, and therefore cannot be repeated in the same person, Confirmation is to be numbered—as we showed above around Distinction 1 when we treated of the sacraments in general—but let us now briefly and in particular prove the same thing of this sacrament; and it is proved both by reason and by authority. By reason, indeed, in a twofold way. First, because this sacrament is given after the manner of a consecration; but the nature of a consecration does not admit repetition. The Master urges this reason from St. Augustine in the Text.¹⁰² Next, because it is a sacrament of a perfect and, as to the spirit, manly age. Wherefore, just as in this life we come to a manly age only once, so also we are confirmed by this sacrament only once.

§ 62. But by multiple authorities. For Clement, book 3 (of the Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 16), calls this sacrament "an unbreakable seal"—which is almost the same as what is wont to be called by the Doctors "an indelible sign." Cyprian, or whoever is the Author (in the Sermon on the Washing of Feet), taking an argument from the nature of consecration, shows among other things that this sacrament too cannot be repeated. Gregory I (book 12 of the Epistles, ch. 31) does not allow Confirmation, like Baptism, to be repeated, except when it cannot be proved by written document or by witnesses that it was done.¹⁰³ Gregory II (in the Epistle to Bishop Boniface) altogether prohibits the repetition of this sacrament, as is had in Gratian (On Consecration, Dist. 5, ch. De homine). The same is established by Innocent III in the Decretals (On Sacraments not to be repeated, ch. Idem pastoralis).¹⁰⁴ Thereafter the same decree is read first in provincial councils, then in general ones; these are Châlons II under Charles [the Great],¹⁰⁵ and, earlier than these, the Council of Tarraco, held in the time of Felix III,¹⁰⁶ and the general Councils of Florence (in the Decree given to the Armenians) and of Trent (Session 7, on the sacraments, canon 9).¹⁰⁷ How consonant this doctrine is with Holy Scripture is understood from this: that Paul (Acts 19) would not beforehand give the Holy Spirit to those disciples at Ephesus by the imposition of his hands until he had ascertained that they had not yet received the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁸

§ XVI — How the character of Confirmation differs from the character of Baptism (Quomodo character confirmationis a caractere baptismi differat)

§ 63. The question, whether the character (*character*) of this sacrament differs from the character of Baptism (*Baptismus*), has some difficulty: namely, whether this character differs from that specifically, or only according to the formal character (*ratio*) of the perfect and the imperfect.

§ 64. That they differ specifically from one another is clear from this, that in Baptism there is imprinted the character of citizenship, but here the character of soldiery; now the citizen and the soldier differ specifically and in their proper formal character, although they may coincide in the same person. Then too, the same subject does not at the same time receive several accidents of the same species, unless from them there be made one—something which here is not to be said; because the faithful who are confirmed do not have one single character, but two distinct ones. Furthermore, the sacraments themselves are distinct in species; therefore the characters also differ in species—especially since it is indubitable that the character of Orders is also distinguished in species from the other two. Add to this, that consecrations to the same thing are not repeated;

if therefore the character of Confirmation were one and the same power in species with the character of Baptism, it would follow that the one is wrongly superadded to the other, because thus the consecration of a man to the same thing would be repeated.

§ 65. But on the contrary they bring forward that not only in Confirmation but also in Baptism one is enrolled into the Christian soldiery. This in the first place they prove from St. Ambrose, who in book 1 (*On the Sacraments*, ch. 2) refers the anointing between the shoulder-blades of him who is to be baptized to the signification of combat: "You have been anointed," he says, "as a wrestler of Christ, as one who is going to wrestle the contest of this age." The same they confirm from Melchiades, whose words (in the *Epistle to the Bishops of Spain*) are these: "As the military order requires that, when the Emperor has received anyone into the number of soldiers, he should not only mark him as received, but also equip him with suitable arms for one who is about to fight; so in the baptized that blessing is a fortification: you have given a soldier; give him also the support of soldiery," etc.¹¹¹ Again they prove the point by this argument: The whole Christian life is nothing else than a soldiery upon the earth; since therefore by Baptism a man is consecrated to the Christian life, by that very fact he seems to be consecrated to soldiery. Likewise, in Baptism a man renounces the devil and all his pomps—which surely is nothing else than by open denunciation to declare war upon the devil. Finally, the spiritual power which is called a character is either active or passive; the character of Baptism is passive; therefore through the sacrament of Confirmation no character different from the former is given, since it is certain that it does not coincide with the character of Orders.

§ 66. Although by these arguments some are moved to think that the character of Confirmation is not distinguished in species but only by a certain superadded perfection from the character of Baptism, yet the reasons for the former position seem really to have more weight. Wherefore, according to St. Thomas (III, q. 72, a. 5), we reply that as one action befits a man newly born, and another befits one who has reached perfect age, so too one power is given in Baptism, as man's spiritual birth, and another in Confirmation, whereby the baptized advances to manly strength. For there a man receives the power unto those things which regard his own salvation; here, however, unto those things that pertain to the spiritual fight against the enemies of the faith—which St. Thomas there shows by the example of the Apostles.¹⁰¹

§ 67. Therefore to the foregoing arguments one must answer that all the baptized are in a certain sense soldiers, inasmuch as the spiritual fight against invisible enemies—or against the common and daily temptations from the world, the flesh, and the devil—belongs to all; but that those alone who are confirmed are in a special way enrolled in the soldiery which is undertaken against visible enemies, that is, the persecutors of the faith, as those who, already brought to manly age, are reckoned fit for such soldiery, according to that saying (1 Jn. 2): "I write to you, young men, because you are strong; you have overcome the evil one."

§ 68. Lastly it is answered that the character of Confirmation is a certain power—not for receiving the things that belong to religion as is the character of Baptism, nor for handing them on as is the character of Orders, but for resisting contraries and doing the things which such a combat requires. Then too, nothing hinders that within the same general kind of power, active or passive, there be contained several and distinct species of power, as is manifest in natural powers.

§ XVII — Whether Confirmation necessarily presupposes Baptism (*An confirmatio baptismum necessario praequirat*)

§ 69. Concerning this question, namely whether Confirmation (*Confirmatio*) requires or presupposes Baptism (*Baptismus*), one may ask in four ways: whether the character (*character*) [of Confirmation presupposes] the character [of Baptism]; whether the effect (*effectus*) [of Confirmation presupposes] the effect [of Baptism]; whether the effect [of Confirmation presupposes] the character [of Baptism]; and finally whether the character [of Confirmation presupposes] the effect [of Baptism]. Of which questions the first, beyond doubt, demands an affirmative answer: namely, that the character of Confirmation so necessarily presupposes the character of Baptism that, if the sacrament of Confirmation were conferred upon one not baptized, it would be altogether null, and it would have to be conferred again after Baptism. St. Thomas gives the reason for this: because Confirmation stands to Baptism as increase to generation; wherefore, as it is impossible that a man be increased before he has been born, so it cannot be that he receive the sacrament of Confirmation before he has been baptized. There is also this general reason, that Baptism is the gate of the sacraments; without it, therefore, no true sacrament is received, whose substance consists in application to the recipient.

§ 70. But what is read (Acts 9) of Paul, that a hand was laid upon him by Ananias before he was baptized, is not contrary to this doctrine. For Ananias was not a bishop, but a deacon, as Oecumenius, writing on that passage, attests; and he laid his hand upon Paul not to impart to him the Holy Spirit, but, as Scripture speaks, that he might receive his sight. For what is afterwards added, "that you may be filled with the Holy Spirit," is not to be referred to the imposition of hands, but to the Baptism that was about to follow at once, as is evident to one who carefully considers the passage.

§ 71. Concerning the second question St. Thomas likewise thinks one must answer thus; his words are these (at the end of article 6, question 72): "For as the effect of Confirmation, which is spiritual strength, presupposes the effect of Baptism, which is justification, so the sacrament of Confirmation presupposes the sacrament of Baptism."¹¹³ If to this reply you object the example of Cornelius the centurion, who, before Baptism, received the Holy Spirit, as Scripture testifies (Acts 10), it can easily be answered that Cornelius and his companions, just as they received the effect of Confirmation without the sacrament, so also received the effect of Baptism—either at the same moment, or already before—though they had not yet received the sacrament of Baptism.

§ 72. And this is signified by these words of the Apostle Peter (Acts 11): "But when I had begun to speak, the Holy Spirit fell upon them, as also upon us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how He used to say: 'John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.' If therefore God gave to them the same grace as also to us who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that could hinder God?" Which words signify that they then and there received not only the effect of Confirmation but also the effect of Baptism without the visible sacrament—inasmuch as, although not yet with water, yet they had already been baptized with the Holy Spirit.

§ 73. But however the case stand as to what was done concerning Cornelius (about which matter St. Augustine does not speak in altogether one and the same way, as we annotated above at Distinction 4, where it was asked what Baptism confers upon a man previously justified), more doubt is brought by the examples of certain catechumens, in whom there was such fortitude that they both fearlessly confessed the faith of Christ

before the enemies of the faith, and for it also steadfastly met death, and thus, not yet baptized with water, were baptized in their own blood. For it does not seem one should say that all of them had already received the effect of Baptism before they received, that is, the effect of Confirmation—spiritual strength—for confessing the faith of Christ. For, as we showed in the same Distinction, very Martyrdom itself, or the passion undertaken for Christ, supplies in them the place of Baptism, and avails them for the remission of sins as much as if they were washed in the sacred font of Baptism, as St. Augustine says in book 13 (*City of God*, ch. 7).¹¹⁴ And otherwise it would have to be admitted that all of them were baptized not with the baptism of blood but with the baptism of the Spirit, which plainly conflicts with the distinction of the threefold Baptism, of which we have treated sufficiently in its own place.

§ 74. From which it appears that the effect of Confirmation does not of necessity require the previous effect of Baptism; and this is also the opinion of Thomas Waldensis in book 2 (*On the Sacraments*, ch. 113).¹¹⁵ But if you object: Increase presupposes being, and therefore this strength of spirit cannot subsist without a previous spiritual generation, which is the effect of Baptism. We can answer that in the aforesaid catechumens there precedes a certain spiritual being, although separated from the remission of sins, namely through prior faith and a sincere conversion to God, which pertain to the beginning or birth of the spiritual man, although they do not yet constitute him a son of God.

§ 75. The third question has no difficulty. For there is no doubt that the effect of Confirmation can exist without the prior sacrament of Baptism—as is evident in Cornelius and in catechumens prepared for Martyrdom.

§ 76. The same answer holds for the last question. For just as, if someone approaches the sacrament of Baptism with pretense, he receives the sacrament without the reality of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*), so that same man, if he likewise thrust himself upon the sacrament of Confirmation, will indeed be marked with the character of this sacrament, yet he will obtain the reality neither of Baptism nor of Confirmation, until after he has sincerely been converted to God through penance.

§ XVIII — Whether this Sacrament is necessary for salvation (An hoc Sacramentum sit ad salutem necessarium?)

§ 77. Whether the sacrament of Confirmation (*Confirmatio*) is absolutely necessary for all unto salvation has among the Doctors no question at all. For it is certain that Baptism (*Baptismus*) suffices of itself for this, that it free a man from sin, bestow righteousness, make him a son of God and constitute him an heir of the Kingdom. Accordingly, one departing from this life in that state—whether he be a little one or an adult—cannot be defrauded of the reward of righteousness and of the promised inheritance, even if he has not been fortified by the seal of chrism. Hence Melchiades (in the Epistle oft cited) says that for those who are straightway to pass away the benefits of Regeneration suffice for salvation: and again, he says, "Regeneration of itself saves those who are presently to be received in the peace of the blessed age"; and below: "But he who after Baptism, with innocence acquired, arrives immaculate at death, is confirmed by death, because after death he cannot sin." He says, however, that he is confirmed by death, not on account of the sacrament or the proper effect of the sacrament, but—as he himself explains—because one cannot sin after death; that is, he passes over into that state in which there is no longer any danger of sinning, in the way that we say all the Blessed are confirmed in good.¹¹⁷ Likewise St. Jerome, in the Dialogue against the Luciferians: "If you ask," he

says, "why in the Church one baptized does not receive the Holy Spirit unless by the hands of the Bishop, the Holy Spirit whom we all affirm to be conferred in true Baptism, learn that this observance descends from that authority, that after the Lord's Ascension the Holy Spirit came down upon the Apostles; and in many places of Scripture we find the same judged to be expedient, for the honor rather of the priesthood."¹¹⁸ By these words at the same time he removes the objection about the Holy Spirit, without whom no one is saved. For also in Baptism the Holy Spirit is given, but—as Melchiades says—unto innocence; whereas in Confirmation He is given unto strength. Of which effects the former is absolutely necessary, not the latter. Whence the difference between Baptism and Confirmation with respect to necessity is clearly evident. For Baptism is absolutely necessary by reason of its proper effect, because no one can obtain salvation unless he be reborn; and the same judgment holds of the sacrament of Reconciliation with respect to those who have fallen; but Confirmation is not so, since not only the strong but also many of the weak attain salvation through true righteousness.

§ 78. To this there is added canon 77 of the Council of Elvira, which reads thus: "If any Deacon, governing a people without a Bishop or a Presbyter, shall have baptized some, the Bishop must perfect them by blessing; but as for the one who has already departed this world, he may be just by the faith in which he believed."¹¹⁹ Similarly Innocent III teaches in the Decretals (*De consuetudine*, cap. Quanto).¹²⁰ But even if no other proof of this matter were at hand, the mere universal custom of the Church would have sufficient force to prove it: inasmuch as She does not take care to apply this sacrament to the baptized—whether little ones or adults—when they are in the necessity of death and are not yet confirmed, which assuredly the pious and solicitous Mother would by no means omit if she thought it necessary for salvation.

§ 79. But the greater question is whether, since this sacrament was instituted for fighting bravely against the enemies of the faith, it be at least necessary for those who are going to live and to fight, lest in the battle they succumb. For this can not without reason seem to be so. First, from the fact that Pope Melchiades says that the helps of Confirmation are necessary for those who are going to live, and that the one should not be separated from the other—that is, Confirmation from Baptism—unless death prevents. Then, because just as Baptism is unto regeneration, so the help of Confirmation has been by God properly instituted to strengthen man against the persecutors of the faith: wherefore, as a man is not regenerated without Baptism, so neither is he strengthened without Confirmation. To the first St. Thomas not obscurely subscribes, saying that just as no one attains the effect of Baptism without the vow of Baptism, so no one attains the effect of Confirmation without the vow of Confirmation.¹²¹

§ 80. Whatever, however, be thought of the opinion of St. Thomas, it surely seems one must say that for those who are going to live and to fight this sacrament is to be received in such wise necessarily that, if someone should omit it knowingly and advisedly, or when its reception is opportune should neglect to receive it—even if he does not despise it—he cannot be excused from sin: just as he is without doubt sinning who, without the sacrament of Extreme Unction—peculiarly instituted for this, that it should prepare a man who is about to die for the age to come—when he can easily obtain it, nevertheless consents to depart from this life without it. The reason of which thing can be given on two grounds. One, because although no express precept concerning it is anywhere read, nevertheless that peculiar ordination of the sacrament unto such an end seems to contain a tacit force of precept, at least for those to whom the convenience of receiving it is not lacking. The other, because even if we do not deny that that strength of spirit can be had without this sacrament and its desire, nevertheless it is a kind of presumption not to follow the ordinary way which is shown through the

sacrament for obtaining so great a good, or utterly to suppose that one has already obtained that good, the sacrament not yet having been received.

§ 81. But if you ask whether its omission, when it can conveniently be had, is a mortal or a venial sin, the answer is that it cannot be omitted without mortal fault in the time and place of persecution of the faith, where namely there is for a man, by reason of weakness, a danger lest he either deny the faith in word or deed, or at least—where need is—be ashamed to confess it; but otherwise the fault seems to be only venial, provided contempt be absent. Moreover, the said necessity is also proved from this, that of old it was carefully provided by the holy Pontiffs that all the baptized, either immediately in the presence of the Bishop, or at the first opportunity, should be sealed—as can be shown from various decrees and canons—and this is plainly established by the deed of the Apostles. For Paul laid hands on the Ephesians who had been baptized (Acts 19). Likewise it is evident that the other Apostles did so at the beginning from those words of Peter (Acts 2): "Let every one of you be baptized, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." But to the Samaritans who were far distant, as soon as it was first heard that they had received the word of God, Peter and John hurried forth that they might lay hands on them (Acts 8). Whose alacrity and zeal in conferring this sacrament all Bishops ought to imitate, especially because, by neglect of this help, it happens that in time of persecution many fail or slide—as, according to the testimony of Pope Cornelius, befell Novatian.¹²²

§ XIX — Reply to those things that seem to establish the absolute necessity of this sacrament (*Responsio ad ea quae absolutam huius sacramenti necessitatem statuere videntur*)

§ 82. We must now reply to those things which seem to teach that this sacrament is altogether necessary for salvation. The first objection is from Clement, who (in Epistle 4) says: "All must hasten without delay to be reborn unto God, and finally to be sealed by the Bishop—that is, to receive the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit—for otherwise he cannot be a perfect Christian, if not by necessity, yet by negligence or will he should so remain; which we received from Blessed Peter, and the other Apostles taught." The second is from Urban, whose words are these: "All the faithful, through the imposition of the hands of Bishops, ought after Baptism to receive the Holy Spirit, that they may be found plainly Christians." The third is from Melchiades, who says that Baptism and Confirmation, unless death prevents, ought by no means to be separated from one another. The fourth is from St. Cyprian who (Epistle 70 to Januarius) has these words: "It is also necessary that he who has been baptized be anointed, that by receiving the Chrism, that is, the Unction, he may be the Anointed of God, and may have in himself the grace of Christ." The fifth is from the Council of Laodicea, whose canon 48 reads thus: "Those baptized ought after Baptism to receive the most holy Chrism, to be made participants of the heavenly Kingdom." The sixth is from Sylvester who, as Damasus reports (in the Pontifical), decreed that the Presbyter should anoint the baptized with chrism lifted up on the crown.¹²⁴ The seventh is from the Council of Orange I, cap. 2, where concerning heretics placed in the necessity of death, if they desire to be Catholics, the same is decreed; and in cap. 1, where the word "Chrismation" is not even used.¹²⁵ The eighth is from the Council of Paris (cap. 33), which wills that to those in danger of death the gift of the Holy Spirit be handed on without delay.¹²⁶ The ninth is from Hugh of St. Victor, who (De sacramentis, part 3, ch. 7) says: "What profit is it to be erected from a fall, if you are not confirmed to stand? And let those be in fear who by negligence lose episcopal visitation and do not receive the imposition of hands, lest perhaps on that account

they be condemned; for they ought to have hastened while they could. For for those whom the straitness of time prevents there was instituted that unction of the sacred chrism, by which the priest straightway anoints the head, to show by this very thing how necessary this sacrament is unto salvation, since the Church everywhere solicitously takes precautions, lest perchance without the Bishop they incur peril." The tenth is from Jerome, who (on Ezek. ch. 9) writing says that allowance is to be made for age if they believe anything without the seal of Christ. The eleventh is from Gregory, who (book 12, ch. 31) wills that Confirmation, which when once done cannot be repeated, like Baptism, be not repeated, lest such doubt become a ruin for the faithful. The twelfth and last is from reason: for the proper effect of this sacrament is that strength by which one is prepared for Christ's sake, if the matter should require it, to meet death; but such a disposition of soul is necessary for salvation. For he who is not so disposed does not love Christ above all things, and therefore is not in the state of righteousness, which requires such love.

§ 83. To these objections replying, we say first that from them it is sufficiently clear that in some manner there is a precept to receive this sacrament; either because—as was said above—there is contained in the peculiar ordination of this sacrament unto receiving the strengthening of the spirit a tacit force of precept proposed to the faithful; or because the Popes and Councils thought it even necessary lest this sacrament be neglected. Which law, however, does not seem otherwise to bind than—as was said in the preceding chapter—seeing that it is established by reason that this sacrament is not absolutely necessary, especially since it is probable that its effect can be had even without the sacrament and without its desire. Secondly, it must be noted that when the Fathers seem to require this sacrament as necessary, they do not add this reason: because otherwise salvation cannot be had; but because otherwise Christians cannot be perfect. For ordinarily, apart from this sacrament, manly perfection and the strength of the Christian man are not obtained—as Dionysius indicates (*Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4, part 3) and St. Ambrose also (*De sacramentis*, book 2, ch. 2).¹²⁷ It is to be observed as well that in such sayings the Fathers almost always allude to the name of Christ, which signifies "anointed." Whence they do not call those fully Christians who have not yet received the episcopal Unction—namely, they press the force of the word "Christian," by which St. Augustine rightly says all who have been anointed with the chrism are called Christians (*De civitate Dei*, book 17, ch. 4).¹²⁸ From these things it is clear in what sense the words of Clement and Urban are to be understood. But Melchiades bids Bishops to fortify the baptized immediately with the sacrament of Confirmation, unless perhaps danger of death compel someone to be washed by a presbyter in the absence of a Bishop outside the appointed times—whom, however, he also testifies to be confirmed by death. By the "grace of Christ" St. Cyprian understands the richer abundance of grace corresponding to the Unction, which he says answers to the sacramental unction and makes the man the Anointed of God; or he understands the grace of Christ by which "Christ" is "anointed," that is, anointed with a spiritual unction which corresponds to the external sacramental unction. As for the Council of Laodicea, it wills nothing else than that by the unction of chrism the faithful be made kings, and therefore, as regards the signification of chrism, be made participants of the heavenly Kingdom. As to the decree attributed to Sylvester by Damasus in the Pontifical, it enacts that the Presbyter should anoint the baptized on the crown with chrism lifted up;¹²⁹ but the Fathers are speaking about the anointing of the crown which the presbyter made in the absence of the Bishop—not on account of the necessity of salvation, but lest one baptized should depart without any unction of chrism. Which anointing, however, the Fathers call neither Confirmation nor consignation. The same seems to be answered to the words of Hugh, whom others accuse of error in this part, but without cause, as it seems to us. For that he is not speaking of absolute necessity is plain from the fact that in the same place he says that infants who have been confirmed will have a

greater glory; whence it is clear that he does not simply exclude from Glory those who after perfect Baptism have not been confirmed.

§ 84. Jerome in that place does not interpret the "seal of Christ" as the chrism impressed on the forehead, but as the fulfilling of the law. To Gregory the answer is that the lack of Confirmation becomes a ruin to the faithful when, a persecution having been stirred up, they lack the strength necessary to resist. To the argument set last in order one must reply that, although every Christian ought to be so disposed that he would rather die than deny the faith, nevertheless a strength so great that he actually accomplish this is not always necessary, but then and only then when the matter requires that one contend for the faith even unto death.¹³⁰

§ XX — That only the Bishop is the ordinary minister of this sacrament (Solum Episcopum esse hujus Sacramenti Ministrum ordinarium)

§ 85. The proper and ordinary minister of this sacrament is the Bishop, as was defined in the Council of Florence and repeated in the Council of Trent (Session 7, canon 3 on Confirmation; Session 13, chapter 4; canon 7), whose doctrine has its foundation in Sacred Scripture.¹³² For in order to confirm those who in Samaria had been baptized by Philip, there are sent even to the lowest of the people the chief of the Apostles, Peter and John (Acts 8), although this same Peter willed to have Cornelius, a distinguished man and divinely commended to him, together with his household, baptized not by himself but by the ministry of others (Acts 10). Again (Acts 19), when certain Ephesians had been baptized at the order of Paul by others, Paul himself forthwith laid hands upon them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit—although otherwise he could have entrusted the ministry of this sacrament, as of Baptism, to others.

§ 86. Taught by these examples of Scripture, and especially by that which is contained in Acts 8, the ancient Pontiffs and Fathers with one voice handed down that the administration of this sacrament pertains to the Bishop alone. Thus teach Clement, book 3 of the Apostolic Constitutions, chapters 15 and 16; Eusebius the Pope, in Epistle 7 to the Bishops of Tuscany and Campania; Melchiades, in an epistle to the Bishops of Spain; Damasus, in Epistle 4 issued against the Chorepiscopi; and John III, in a decretal epistle on the same subject.¹³³ Likewise Innocent I, in the epistle to Decentius, chapter 3; Leo, Epistle 88; Gelasius, as cited by Gratian, Distinction, chapter 25, "Presbyters"; Gregory the Great, book 3, epistle 9; Innocent III, in the Decretals, De sacra unctione, chapter Unico, and De consuetudine, chapter Quanto.¹³⁴ With whom other Fathers agree: Cyprian, in the epistle to Jubaianus; Jerome, in the Dialogue Against the Luciferians; Augustine, De Trinitate, book 15, chapter 26; Isidore, Etymologies, book 7, chapter 12; Bede and Oecumenius on Acts 8; and the Second Council of Seville, chapter 7; and the Council of Constance, in the condemnation of the 28th article of John Wyclif.¹³⁵ The unbroken custom of the Church declares the same thing—namely, that the administration of this sacrament has never been granted to any but Bishops—which custom, next after Sacred Scripture, is chiefly relied upon by the authors just cited, as one may see in their writings. And this reason can be given: because by this sacrament the faithful are perfected, as the Fathers teach; therefore it was fitting that it be conferred by none other than him who is set in the order of those who perfect. Now the episcopate is the Order of those who perfect, just as the presbyterate is the Order of those who illumine, and the diaconate the Order of those who purge, as Dionysius the Areopagite teaches.¹³⁶ Jerome indicates another reason in the Dialogue Against the Luciferians, saying that this has been established for the honor of the priesthood, that is, of the episcopal dignity, upon which the Church's safety depends.

"For if," he says, "some power not detached and outstanding above all be not given, there will arise in the Churches as many schisms as there are priests," and so forth.¹⁵

§ XXI — *Whether the conferral of this sacrament can be committed to a simple presbyter (Utrum simplici Presbytero committi possit hujus Sacramenti collatio)*

§ 87. The question is variously disputed among the Doctors, at least as regards the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, whether by the commission of a superior the sacrament of Confirmation can be conferred by one other than a Bishop. And indeed St. Thomas's opinion is (III, q. 72, a. 11, ad 1) that the Supreme Pontiff, by the plenitude of power which he has in the Church, can commit certain things which belong to higher orders to some who are inferior—just as he grants to certain presbyters to confer the minor orders. And, he says, from this plenitude of power Pope Gregory conceded that simple priests should confer this sacrament, "until the scandal be removed."¹³⁸ Scotus feels similarly, saying that when the Pope commits to a presbyter the power of confirming, he makes him a Bishop so far as that office is concerned.¹³⁹ But not a few others have followed this opinion; among whom, however, there is this diversity—that some think presbyters have power to confer this sacrament even without apostolic commission, and truly confer the sacrament, although they sin gravely, just as a Bishop truly ordains a man not subject to him; while several others think that he accomplishes nothing at all, no more than if he should attempt to absolve someone not subject to him.¹⁴⁰ Durandus, however, dissenting from these, thinks that by no commission of a superior can it come about that this sacrament be valid when conferred by a simple presbyter. And Bonaventure seems to think the same; and this opinion, as truer, is vigorously defended by Adrian VI (In IV Sentences).¹⁴¹

§ 88. There are, moreover, not-to-be-despised arguments for this opinion drawn both from authority and from reason. First, Eusebius the Pope, speaking of this sacrament in Epistle 3: "What cannot be perfected by others except by the highest priests, neither in the time of the Apostles is read or known to have been performed by any others than by the Apostles themselves; nor can it ever be perfected, nor ought it to be done, by any others than by those who hold their place. For if it be presumed otherwise, it is held to be void and empty, nor will it ever be reckoned among the ecclesiastical sacraments."¹⁴² Likewise Damasus (Epistle 4, On the Chorepiscopi) says that the blessing which the aforesaid Chorepiscopi gave before their prohibition was "void." He proves this from the principle that "no one can give what he does not have," indicating that Chorepiscopi by their own ordination simply do not have the power of conferring this sacrament. He then concludes: "And therefore whatever they presumed from the aforesaid pontifical ministries was void, and profited not at all those who were touched; and on that account it is necessary that what is not approved as legitimately done or conferred be repeated."¹⁴³ And no less clear is what is read as written by Pope John III, around the year of the Lord 560, before the times of Gregory, where after other points he says: "Especially since none of the seventy disciples—whose type the presbyters bear—is read to have handed down the gift of the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands." And after a few words: "But the Apostles, at the Lord's command and with His warning, that their successors should hand on the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands alone, never allowed any of the seventy to hand on the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands, knowing it to be unlawful for them, giving to their successors the example that they should never presume such things." And immediately subjoining the words of Acts 8, he adds: "Therefore they did not send any of the seventy—

although the Apostles were few—to carry out this work, but Peter and John the Apostles, whose place Bishops bear in the Church, not Chorepiscopi," and so on.¹⁴⁴

§ 89. Likewise Innocent III, in the Decretals (*De consuetudine*, chapter *Quanto*), writes in these words: "It has come to our hearing that certain simple priests at Constantinople presume to exhibit to the faithful those sacraments which from the time of the Apostles were reserved to Pontiffs alone, as is the sacrament of Confirmation, alleging custom alone." And presently: "Which things, although they are not to be despised by the faithful, yet it pertains wholly to their safety that, out of necessity—which has no law—they be omitted without danger, rather than that, by those to whom it is not permitted to confer them, they be temerarily conferred, which rashness is condemned by law, and not without grave peril be conferred to no purpose—since some shadow is shown in the act, but the truth does not come forth in the effect."¹⁴⁵ From these decretals of the Pontiffs it is first clear that nothing is effected if a presbyter should attempt to confer this sacrament without a superior's commission. Next, this also appears: that it was never conferred by any other than Bishops, so as to be valid and a true sacrament. Whence it is further gathered that it was never committed to a simple presbyter, at least before the times of John III—which indeed his very words just now cited sufficiently indicate. For when he denies that the Apostles, although they were so few, committed the administration of this sacrament to any one of the seventy disciples, he signifies that neither can the successors of the Apostles do this, adding this reason absolutely: because the Apostles knew this to be unlawful for presbyters—namely, by divine law—in which they recognized that they could not dispense.

§ 90. Now the same opinion seems clearly proved also by reason. For either the Bishop's power of confirming belongs to him by reason of jurisdiction, or by reason of order, that is, of his consecration. But if by reason of jurisdiction, many absurdities will follow. First, that a Bishop not yet consecrated could confirm. For if he be elected and confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff, he already holds jurisdiction even before consecration. Next, that that Confirmation will be null, and therefore must be repeated, which a Bishop shall have conferred upon someone not his subject. Third, it will follow that not only a presbyter but also a deacon, indeed even a simple cleric, by commission could confirm, just as by commission he can excommunicate. Fourth, that a presbyter could do this not only by commission of the Supreme Pontiff, but also by commission of a lower, namely of his own Bishop—unless perhaps some special reservation stood in the way, which, however, is nowhere found; and if it did exist, it would be merely of human law. It remains, therefore, to grant that the Bishop's power of confirming belongs to him by reason of consecration. Either, then, it belongs to him by reason of priestly consecration, or by reason of episcopal consecration. The former cannot, it seems, be said. For thus this power would be common to all priests, just as the power of consecrating the Body and Blood of the Lord; wherefore the sacrament of Confirmation would be validly conferred by any presbyter whatsoever, even without commission, just as he truly consecrates the Eucharist even when suspended and deposed—albeit not without grave sin. But this has already been disproved by the manifest words of the Pontiffs cited above. Then, it might seem to pertain to an injury of the order of priesthood, if the bishops by a perpetual law were to reserve to themselves a power of confirming that had been annexed by Christ to the priestly order. Concerning which matter John Wyclif brought a slander against the Bishops of the Church. Nay more, that power might seem to be given in vain, since he cannot use it. Add that there is no mention of that power in the ordination of presbyters. But if, on the other hand, it belongs by reason of episcopal consecration, then one who does not have that consecration cannot by any commission of a superior imprint the character of Confirmation—just as neither can a deacon, by commission, consecrate the Body of the Lord, nor absolve from sins, nor can a presbyter or a deacon confer sacred Orders—since all these things

belong to Order and necessarily presuppose a definite consecration. Hence, just as the Pontiff cannot make void and null what a Bishop or a presbyter does in ordaining, confirming, consecrating—because he cannot tear up an order once given—so neither can he make valid what a simple priest shall have attempted in conferring the sacrament of Order or of Confirmation. The reason for which is that by a mere commission he cannot give an Order, whose acts those are. From which the opinion of Scotus, set forth above, seems also to be refuted. For by commission alone that cannot be given which is conferred only by consecration, whether it be the whole power of the episcopal Order, or a part of it. Nor indeed does any solid reason seem able to be adduced why, in the ministry of Sacred Ordination and of the Eucharist and of Absolution, the Pontiff should not have the same power of committing, if he has it with respect to the ministry of Confirmation. Finally, that sentence is opposed to this opinion which is contained (in the Decretals) *De consecratione ecclesiae vel altaris*, chapter next to last: "Things that belong to consecration cannot be committed to one not consecrated."¹⁴⁶ And by this line of reasoning the Pontiffs in the decrees cited above seem chiefly to rely upon consecration, when they teach that the office of confirming is unlawful to presbyters. Which Leo also not obscurely indicated in Epistle 88, when he says: "All these things are unlawful to Chorepiscopi or presbyters, because although they have consecration (understand: priestly), yet they do not have the summit of the pontificate"—which words are found almost the same in Innocent I.¹⁴⁷ Lastly, if by some dispensation the conferral of this sacrament could be committed to presbyters, at least in those places where there are no Bishops, and to which they scarcely ever come, it would sometimes be committed to presbyters for the great good of the people and for a certain necessity of the sacrament—which, however, we ought not to grant.

§ XXII — Reply to the arguments of the contrary opinion (Ad argumenta contrariae opinionis responsio)

§ 91. For the opposing view different arguments of this sort are commonly brought forward. The first and most important is from Gregory, who, after he had forbidden (Book 3, Epistle 9, to Januarius) that priests should mark with chrism on their foreheads the baptized, afterwards, when scandal had arisen from that prohibition, granted this same thing in Epistle 26 (to the same Januarius), written in these words: "It has also come to us that some were scandalized because we forbade priests to touch with chrism on the forehead those who are to be baptized. And indeed we acted according to the ancient usage of our Church; but if absolutely some are saddened about this matter, where bishops are lacking we grant that priests also ought to touch with chrism on the foreheads those who are to be baptized." Thus Gregory; and it is found in Gratian,¹⁴⁸ where however, in place of "who are to be baptized" there is read "the baptized".

§ 92. One must answer: if Gregory is speaking of those to be baptized, there is no question, because, in whatever part of the body those to be baptized are anointed, whether by a priest or by a bishop, it cannot be a sacrament, since Baptism is the gate of the sacraments. But if, with Gratian, we understand Gregory to speak of the baptized, it can be replied that Gregory allowed—indeed on account of the scandal which had arisen—that what priests, by a certain usurped custom, did before his prohibition, they might still do, that is, they might anoint the baptized on the forehead with chrism, yet not so as to confer the sacrament of Confirmation (*Confirmatio*), which previously they were not conferring. For it seemed to Gregory, for the sake of avoiding scandal, that that ceremony of signing the forehead with chrism should be permitted to priests for a time, whereas otherwise they were ordered not to sign the forehead but the crown of the head—or, as other copies have it, the breast—with chrism. Nor does it seem that anything else was done by the priests of whom Gregory

speaks than that they were signing the baptized not on that part of the body on which they ought; but it does not appear that they used the form of words proper to this sacrament.

§ 93. Second: the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent make the bishop the ordinary minister of this sacrament, as was said above; therefore they acknowledge another as extraordinary. I reply that for this reason they were unwilling to speak otherwise than they did speak about the minister of the sacrament of Order, on account of the controversy about the minor orders.¹⁴⁹

§ 94. Third: These words of the Council of Florence press the point yet more: "Nevertheless it is read that at some time, by dispensation of the Apostolic See and for a most reasonable and very urgent cause, a simple priest administered this sacrament of Confirmation with the chrism compounded by a bishop." But it is replied that the Council does not assert that this was ever done (for indeed it cannot be proved to have been done), but that this is read either in Gratian's Decree or among the scholastic Doctors, who interpreted Gregory's deed according to their own opinion; and for that reason the Council added "ordinary", because it did not wish to prejudice those who so opined.¹⁵⁰

§ 95. Fourth: Jerome in the Epistle "On the seven grades of the Church" openly teaches that Confirmation and the making of chrism, and once-for-all the administration of all the sacraments with one exception of ordination, pertain to the office of the priest and not of the bishop alone. I reply that that Epistle is not Jerome's, but of an uncertain author. What Jerome himself thinks can be understood from his Dialogue Against the Luciferians.¹⁵¹

§ 96. Fifth: nonetheless from that same Dialogue it is objected that Jerome says that the administration of this sacrament in bishops pertains more to the honor of the priesthood than to the necessity of the law. Whence it may seem that the bishop is not absolutely necessary as the minister of this sacrament. But it is answered that Jerome does not deny the necessity of the minister, but of the sacrament; which the words that follow declare: "Otherwise those are to be mourned who..."¹⁵²

§ 97. Sixth: Ambrose (on Eph. 4): "In Egypt," he says, "priests give the seal if the bishop is not present." I reply that that commentator (whom it is quite clear is not Ambrose) merely reports what is done in Egypt, and he neither approves nor disapproves the deed itself.¹⁵³

§ 98. Seventh: the Council of Orange I (ch. 1–2) and of Toledo I (canon [abbreviation as in source]) permit priests to anoint the baptized with chrism in the absence of the bishop. But this is to be understood of that anointing which is done in the ceremonies of Baptism, which, when the bishop was present, the priest of old was not accustomed to perform when he baptized.¹⁵⁴

§ 99. Eighth: Damasus relates concerning Sylvester that he granted to bishops the privilege that they should seal the baptized, but that he allowed priests to smear with chrism the baptized who were in danger of death. I reply that Sylvester conferred this privilege not by instituting something new, but by recalling, with a new constitution, what had been instituted by Christ, and which by the rashness of certain priests had been weakened, to the observance of the first institution. In this sense also some other things are read as either instituted or enacted by Roman Pontiffs. But he permits to priests only that anointing, in the absence of the bishop, which pertains to the ceremonies of Baptism.¹⁵⁵

§ 100. Ninth: Priesthood and episcopate are one order; therefore, if by reason of Order the ministry of this sacrament belongs to a bishop, it will also belong to a priest. I reply that from this argument the

consequence would be that a simple priest also could confer even the major orders. One must say therefore that a bishop, although he does not differ from a priest by some different Order, nevertheless differs by a more perfect excellence of Order, and by a certain excellence which a consecration different from the prior one confers upon him; by reason of which excellence and perfection there belongs to him both the power of ordaining and of confirming.

§ 101. The tenth argument is taken from the fullness of power which the Roman Pontiff has in the Church. But it must be answered that that fullness of power does not extend to this, that the proper ministers of the sacraments can be changed—just as it does not extend to changing anything touching the matter and the form and the other things required for the substance of the sacraments. But whether, and to what extent, the Supreme Pontiff can commit the collation of the minor orders (since from that too an argument is taken for Confirmation), we reserve the explanation of that difficulty for its own place.¹⁵⁶

§ XXIII — At what age this sacrament should be received (Quæ ætate suscipiendum hoc Sacramentum)

§ 102. That the sacrament of Confirmation (*Confirmatio*) of old was also wont to be applied to infants, witnesses are Innocent I (in the Epistle to Decentius, ch. "De consignandis vero infantibus &c."), and Gregory (Book 3, Epist. 9, to Januarius). Likewise there stands a similar decree in Gratian,¹⁵⁸ "If indeed there are little children, that is, infants, who do not grasp the doctrine, let those who present them answer for them."

§ 103. Some think that this can also be proved from Sacred Scripture, both from Acts 2, where Peter, speaking to Jews who already believed, about the effect of this sacrament, was saying: "For to you is the promise and to your children and to all who are far off, whomever the Lord our God shall call"; and from Acts 8, where hands are imposed by the Apostles upon all who had been baptized by Philip—among whom we rightly believe that infants also were included, offered by their parents; and finally from the fact that in the Gospel Christ is read to have imposed hands upon children, as bearing a certain figure of this sacrament. There is added this, that by the ancient custom of the Church hands were at once imposed upon all the baptized when bishops were present, as we warned at the beginning. And that custom even in our time still remains in some places, nor is it to be reprov'd, James of Vitry bears witness in the Western History (ch. 37) with these words: "Some so conjoin this sacrament of Confirmation with Baptism that they wish it to be conferred immediately after Baptism, because by this the faith which is received in Baptism is confirmed. Which custom is quite to be approved where the supply or presence of a greater priest can be had."¹⁵⁹

§ 104. Reason also seems to persuade that the same should be done. For since none of the Catholics doubts that infants are capable of Confirmation just as of Baptism, it follows that, having received by this sacrament an increase of grace, they will have a greater glory also in the future age, if they depart in infancy, than if they had not received this sacrament, as Hugh of St. Victor clearly hands on, and St. Thomas likewise where he treats these matters.¹⁶⁰

§ 105. Moved, however, by these arguments, some think that even today this sacrament ought to be administered to infants, and that one ought not to wait for the age of discretion, lest, death forestalling, they be deprived both of grace and of the greater glory to which Confirmation advances. Others, though they do not condemn the custom of the ancients, nevertheless judge it more fitting that one wait even to the seventh or eighth year. For since this sacrament is not necessary to salvation, especially for infants, as we have shown

above, it is surely enough fitting to wait for that time at which, as someone wrote, it is most opportune, most apt, and most useful that it be received. And indeed that time is seven years or thereabouts. For it is received most opportunely at that age, because then, the use of reason first emerging, man begins to be tried by the temptations and assaults of the world. Most aptly indeed, because before that age a man is hardly wont to be fit for fighting, and therefore he is not to be equipped with arms for fighting. Most usefully, finally, because both the gift of grace is greater and more tenaciously inhering, which shall have been received with faith now awake and by one's own movement of mind and with prior preparation, than that which, in the age of infancy, in which none of those things can be performed, shall have been infused. Some also bring this reason, that those who in infancy were baptized and cannot remember the Baptism received, may at least remember throughout their life this sacrament received, which is the consummative of Baptism. And for that cause they say that also the slap is, by custom, gently given by the bishop to those confirmed, although the reason of this ceremony rather pleases us which Domingo de Soto hands down: namely, that the one who is confirmed is struck with a slap, in order to be admonished that for the faith insults and blows are to be endured, if need be, even unto death. For both Christ and Paul are read to have been struck with a slap for the confession of the truth. And the Apostles "rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer contumely for the name of Jesus." Now a slap is clearly more pertinent to contumely than to the penalty of pain or to a lesion of the body.¹⁶¹

§ 106. Moreover, moved by the said reasons, the later men established that boys are not to be confirmed below the seventh or eighth year or thereabouts. Thus in a certain statute of Liège under Bishop John, approved by Pope Nicholas, and in several more recent synods, and expressly in the most recent Synod of Cambrai; and the usage of the Church generally approves the same.¹⁶²

§ 107. Finally it must be known that, although for those who are already at the point of death this sacrament is not necessary on account of the peril of a present combat, where death or the fear of death is not brought on account of the faith—as Pope Melchiades admits—nevertheless it will not be useless, nor inconvenient, that even they be confirmed, that as perfect Christians they may depart hence to the Lord, and that they may obtain a greater glory, and—as St. Thomas says—"that they may appear perfect in the resurrection." Whence the Council of Paris (ch. 33), prescribing the times for giving Confirmation the same as of Baptism, namely Easter and Pentecost, makes an exception for the sick and those in danger of death, to whom, just as the grace of Baptism is to be brought in aid, so it wills that the gift of the Holy Spirit be unhesitatingly handed on. And this is in conformity with the opinion of Clement—if, however, he is the author—who, in Epistle 4, warns that all should hasten to be signed by the bishop, because, he says, the outcome of each person's life is uncertain, nor otherwise will he be able to be a perfect Christian, nor have a seat among the perfect, etc.¹⁶³

§ XXIV — With what preparation one must approach this sacrament (Qua praeparatione ad hoc sacramentum accedere oporteat)

§ 108. Since by this sacrament of Confirmation (*sacramentum Confirmationis*) there is bestowed in the Church upon the faithful the same thing that on the day of Pentecost was given to the one hundred and twenty disciples—namely, that each, according to his measure, be endued with power from on high—it is evident that a certain similar preparation with them is rightly required of all who are to receive it. Now it is read of the Apostles (at the end of Luke) that, having been commanded to await the promised Holy Spirit,

they were continually in the temple praising and blessing God; and again (Acts 1) that "they were all persevering with one accord in prayer"; and (ch. 2) that "they were all together," or, as the Greek has it, "with one accord," in the same place. These passages signify that the Apostles received the Holy Spirit prepared by divine praises and prayers and by mutual charity, that is, by concord of minds. And since the saints are wont to add fasts to their prayers whenever they desire to obtain some great thing from God—as can easily be shown by examples from Scripture—it is likely that the Apostles, while waiting, also fled for refuge to the help of fasting.

§ 109. It must also be noted that in John 16 the Lord says to the disciples: "If I go not away, the Paraclete will not come to you," as though their carnal attachment, by which they were still held toward Christ, hindered them from receiving so great a gift in a manner worthy of it. Whence it is understood that the mind ought to be raised to things above and be free from carnal affections, in order that this sacrament may be received with fruit worthy enough. Therefore it was rightly decreed in a certain Council of Orléans, as is read in Gratian, that the faithful are not to approach Confirmation unless fasting, and that they be first admonished to make confession, that they may be able to receive the pure gift of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁵ And in the Council of Paris under the Emperors Louis and Lothair it is further prescribed to the bishops themselves that they confer this sacrament while fasting—and both points are diligently observed even today in reformed churches.¹⁶⁶ Yet what is prescribed concerning the confession of sins to be premised was not so observed of old, nor was it then necessary to observe, because the faithful were wont to be signed straightway after Baptism and afterward to approach the Table of the Lord; but to those newly baptized the remedy of Penance was not necessary. But if you ask whether now it is necessary that confession be premised by one who is subject to mortal sin, so that without it he be defrauded of the fruit of the sacrament, Ruardus and Domingo de Soto answer not improbably in the negative, thinking that that preparation suffices for obtaining the fruit of the sacrament (especially as regards the divine law) whereby one approaches this sacrament with pious devotion and a contrite heart.¹⁶⁷ For the case of this sacrament is not the same as that of the Eucharist, since the Eucharist is the bread of the children; and therefore a greater and special self-examination and preparation is required for it—namely that which the Council of Trent sets forth—which alone is not required for the other sacraments.¹⁶⁸ You will say that adoption is required beforehand, according to that saying: "He poured out the promised Holy Spirit upon the sons of adoption." I reply: there it is not said that this is necessary, but only what was done on the day of Pentecost; next, it must be granted that adoption is required in desire and in vow, for that it is not required in reality appears from the example of Cornelius and his companions.¹⁶⁹

§ 110. Moreover, as to the precept of fasting, it obliges; yet from it are excused especially the sick and those in danger of death, as St. Thomas shows from the Melense Council.¹⁷⁰ Then, because of the multitude of the faithful, and imminent dangers, or other necessities, it is sometimes tolerated that this sacrament be either given by, or received from, one not fasting, because one bishop—especially in a large diocese—would not suffice to confirm all within the time or hour of fasting, and it often happens that he arrives late at the place where those who are to be confirmed are, and is soon to depart.

**§ XXV — *That a sponsor is to be provided for him who is confirmed*
(*Patrinum ei qui confirmatur adhibendum esse*)**

§ 111. The perpetual custom of the Church has this, that just as for those who are baptized, so also for those who are confirmed their own sponsors or receivers are provided. Whence in Gratian (*De consecratione*, Distinction 4, chapter "Si qui"), where it is a question of children to be confirmed, or the dull of understanding, it is prescribed that those who present them should answer for them, and that according to the manner of Baptism.¹⁷² The same also is evident from the decree of Innocent which is (30, Question 4, "Si quis ex conjugio").¹⁷³ Again, in *De consecratione*, Distinction 4, chapter "Non plures": "Let not more than one, whether a man or a woman, approach to receive an infant from Baptism. In Confirmation likewise let this very thing be done."¹⁷⁴ And long ago it was established by Pope Hyginus, who flourished about the year 104, as is had in *De consecratione*, Distinction 4, chapter "Catechismum," and in the *Decretum* of Ivo, book 1, that just as in catechism so also in Confirmation individuals should have individual sponsors according to the custom of the Roman Church, unless necessity compel that one receive several.¹⁷⁵ But also the present custom does not have it that more than one approach to receive the confirmed; and this the Council of Trent seems to presuppose (Session 24, chapter 2, On the Reformation of Matrimony), where the "holder" is named only in the singular.¹⁷⁶

§ 112. And although he who is confirmed, as it were entering already upon adult age, receives the strength of the Holy Spirit, and therefore ought to be more instructed for the Christian life than he who is baptized—whom Scripture compares to a newborn infant—nevertheless it is not without reason that to him also a receiver is given. For just as in warfare the new Recruit, even when received and enrolled in the number of soldiers, ought to be instructed by a veteran, so the newly confirmed ought altogether to be one whose sponsor is chosen such that he has himself for some time already been confirmed. The other conditions required in sponsors we have sufficiently set out when we treated of Baptism.

§ I — *Which in order the sacrament of the Eucharist is among the sacraments, and what are its names and the reasons for the names* (*Sacramentum Eucharistiae quotum inter Sacramenta, quae ejus nomina, & nominum rationes*)

§ 113. After Baptism and Confirmation it follows that we should treat of the august and venerable sacrament of the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*), which by reason of the thing contained, that is, the Body and Blood of the Lord, is first among all the sacraments in dignity and excellence. Yet it is accustomed to be numbered and treated in the third place by writers, because of this, that of old the Faithful, after baptism and sealing, immediately, with no other sacrament intervening, used to be admitted to the participation of this divine Mystery—as is evident from Dionysius (*Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 2, part 3), from Tertullian (in the books *On Baptism* and *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*), from Ambrose (*On the Sacraments*, book 1, ch. 2; and *On the Initiated*, ch. 6), and from other Authors and places indicated by us when we were treating of the order which the sacrament of Confirmation has in relation to the other sacraments.¹⁷⁸

§ 114. Now various are the designations of this sacrament, by which its different effects or properties, or other circumstances, are denoted. First, most commonly it is called "Eucharist," thus named either from "good

grace," because in it we receive Christ, the fount of all graces—as the Master, St. Thomas, and other Schoolmen interpret this name—or rather from thanksgiving. For it descends from the verb eucharistein, which both in sacred and in profane letters signifies "to give thanks," and is read in the three Evangelists together and in Paul, when, describing the institution of this sacrament, they say that Christ, having taken bread and the chalice, "gave thanks"; which also the words of the Canon of the Mass contain.¹⁷⁹ Whence too, in the very preparation of the Sacrifice, at the point where the Mass of the Faithful begins, the Priest exhorts those standing by, saying: "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God." Therefore this sacrament is called of "thanksgiving," because by its oblation and reception we give thanks to God for all His benefits toward us, chiefly for the benefit by which He has redeemed us from eternal death. Whence it is said: "Do this for a commemoration of me." Likewise: "As often as," etc., "you shall announce the death of the Lord."¹⁷⁹

§ 115. Then too, for this very sacrament and its fruit. Of the same origin is the word eucharisterion (which is read in the Nicene canon 13), as though you were to say "the symbol of thanksgiving." It is also called Synaxis (which word signifies a gathering, assembly, or joining together), either because this sacrament is wont to be celebrated and received when Christians come together into one, or because it is the sacrament of peace and union—by which indeed it comes about that the Faithful, as members of one body, are more closely glued to one another and to Christ the Head. For both reasons it has received also the name of "communion," to such an extent that those who, on account of crime, were forbidden its reception were called "excommunicated." But this name is read in Greek in the Apostle (1 Cor. 10), where our interpreter sometimes renders it "communion," sometimes "participation."¹⁸¹ It is also called Bread and Wine, both from the prior matter and from the present species, and from the effect, because it nourishes and refreshes both bodily and spiritually. It is also called "Viaticum," because, as the Master says, on the way it refreshes us and brings us to the Homeland, and then especially when one is to depart from this life. For it has always been observed in the Church that the Faithful should not depart from life without this sacrament.

§ 116. Furthermore, it is called everywhere Sacrifice, Oblation, Victim; because it was instituted not only to be received but also to be offered. There are also other names with which this sacrament was adorned by the Ancients to show its dignity. Whence it came about that just as among the Jews the most secret and most venerable place of the Temple was called the "Holy of Holies," so this sacrament, which among Christians merits the highest veneration among all Mysteries, was called the "Mystery of Mysteries," the "Perfection of Perfections," and also the "Holy of Holies." On these and the like see Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3, part 1) and Damascene (book 4, ch. 14).¹⁸³ To the same veneration of this sacrament pertains that about it the Ancients spoke with the greatest secrecy, and especially Augustine; with whom that most frequent manner of speaking is found in the Sermons to the Faithful, who thus, as if by an enigma, knew it, chiefly in the Sermons—lest such great sacrament should by any means seem to be betrayed to unbelievers, nay, not even to the Catechumens themselves, to whom it was in no way permitted to be present at the celebration of the divine Mysteries.

§ 117. Moreover, it must be noted that the Sectarians of our time hardly deign to honor this sacrament by any other name than "the Supper of the Lord," abusing to this the testimony of Paul, who (1 Cor. 11) thus named it. But they use this name the more readily, because they think that name most agrees with their false doctrine which they hand on about this sacrament. For if it is only a supper, as they wish to prove from that name, then it is neither a sacrifice, nor ought it to be reserved, nor is it to be taken fasting, and the like, but it is accomplished by a mere reception, and that only on the last day. Wherefore Catholics must either entirely

abstain from this name, or use it only soberly, lest they provide occasion for error. But as to the place of the Apostle, it is much more probable that by "the Supper of the Lord" there he did not understand the reception of the Eucharist, but the banquet which Christians in those earliest times of the Church were accustomed solemnly to celebrate in common; which banquets, because they were instituted for the fostering of charity, were called by the Greek name *agapae*, as it were "charities." Of which there is frequent mention among the most ancient Authors—Justin, Tertullian, Clement, Ignatius.¹⁸⁴

§ II — That the Eucharist is a sacrament of the new law instituted by Christ, and concerning its signification (Eucharistiam esse sacramentum novae legis a Christo institutum & de ejus significatione)

§ 118. Just as for bodily life, besides generation by which a man begins to live, and growth by which he is brought to a state and perfection, there is also required nourishment, by which he is fed and preserved in life, so for spiritual life, besides the sacrament of Baptism and of Confirmation—of which the former is a certain spiritual generation, the latter a spiritual increase—there had to be instituted a sacrament by which, as by spiritual food, man should be preserved in that life; and this is the sacrament of the Eucharist. Which can briefly be defined by saying that it is the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, instituted by Christ Himself. Now the institution of this sacrament stands out most openly in the Scriptures, namely in Mark and Luke in the description of the Lord's last supper, and in Paul (1 Cor. 11). In which places the Lord not only commanded what He wished thereafter to be done, but at the same time also celebrated this sacrament and commanded it to be perpetually celebrated by the Church.¹⁸⁶ And since it was instituted in certain external and sensible signs, through which invisible grace is not only signified but is also conferred—as will be shown more fully in what follows—it follows that it is a true and properly so-called sacrament of the new law. And that it is so has never been doubted in the Church to such a degree that not even the heretics of this time, although they call very many other things into doubt, can deny that the Eucharist is to be received into the number of the sacraments of the new law, as we showed above at the First Distinction, where the number of the sacraments was treated. Whence there is no need to bring forward the testimonies of the Fathers for the proof of this matter, which are almost infinite.

§ 119. Now as regards the signification of this sacrament it must be noted, from Hugh of St. Victor (book 2 of *On the Sacraments*, part 8, ch. 7)—whose doctrine in this Distinction the Master follows—that in this sacrament three things are to be considered: one which is only sacrament (*sacramentum tantum*), another which is at once both thing and sacrament (*res et sacramentum*), and a third which is thing and not sacrament (*res non sacramentum*). The "only sacrament" is the visible species (*species*) of bread and wine. For this is a sign of some reality in such a way that it is not itself further signified. But it signifies the true Body of Christ which is contained under it, and besides, the mystical Body of Christ which is the Church: the former indeed by reason of nourishment or refreshment, because as bread above other foods nourishes man bodily and wine cheers him bodily, so the Flesh and Blood of Christ nourish and recreate man spiritually; the latter, by reason of union, because as out of many grains one bread is made, and as out of many grapes wine flows together into one, so out of all the Faithful, as it were out of diverse members compacted by charity, one mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, is constituted—as Augustine declares (*Tractate 26 on John*, and in the *Sermon to the little ones*; the Master cites his words in this place).¹⁸⁷ The "thing and sacrament" is the very Body and

Blood of the Lord, because it is signified by the visible species, and it signifies the mystical body and invisible grace. The "thing and not sacrament" is the very mystical Body of Christ, which is not contained in this sacrament but is only signified; and, besides, the invisible grace which this sacrament virtually contains and confers upon those who receive worthily. From which it is sufficiently understood what, and how manifold, is the signification of this sacrament.

§ III — What that is which is properly called the Sacrament of the Eucharist (Quid sit quod proprie vocatur Sacramentum Eucharistiae)

§ 120. But the question is raised among the Schoolmen, what that is which is properly called the sacrament of the Eucharist (*sacramentum Eucharistiae*), or, for what thing the word "sacrament" (*sacramentum*) stands in this matter—whether for some action or motion, or for the visible species (*species*) themselves, or indeed for the Body and Blood of the Lord.

§ 121. Some think that either the consecration (*consecratio*), or the reception (*sumptio*) of the Eucharist, or both together, is itself the sacrament. For consecration there is this argument: the other sacraments consist in that action by which the form is applied to the matter—as Baptism, Confirmation, and the rest; therefore so too the sacrament of the Eucharist. But that action is the consecration, by which the words are pronounced over the matter; therefore in that action the Eucharistic sacrament consists. For reception there is this argument: the other sacraments consist in that action by which grace (*gratia*) is conferred, as in the washing, the anointing, the absolution, and the like; but the action of this sort in the sacrament of the Eucharist is the reception; therefore in it this sacrament consists. For both together joined, the same reasons conjoined make for it. For the other sacraments consist in the action by which the form is applied to the matter and at the same time grace is conferred, as is clear in each; therefore the same must be said of the sacrament of the Eucharist. But in it there are two actions, of which one is that the form be applied to the matter, namely the consecration; the other is that he who receives the sacrament obtain grace, to wit the very reception; therefore in those two actions conjoined the formal character of this sacrament will seem to consist. This opinion is held by Gabriel on this place and Cajetan above; and St. Thomas himself (in IV on this Distinction).¹⁸⁸

§ 122. Nevertheless, it must be said that, although consecration, or even the reception of the Eucharist, can be taken for the sacrament, inasmuch as it is a certain mystical action, yet properly the name of "sacrament," as it is used in the present subject when the seven sacraments of the Church are treated, belongs to neither of them. Whence also St. Thomas (in the Summa) withdrew from that opinion. The reason is that a sacrament is a visible and efficacious sign of invisible grace; which befits neither the consecration of the Eucharist nor its reception.¹⁸⁵

§ 123. For the declaration of this matter and the dissolution of the foregoing argument, one must note in this place the difference of the sacrament of the Eucharist from the remaining sacraments, which St. Thomas hands on and the Council of Trent indicates. For it differs from them in this, that whereas the others consist in the use of matter, or at any rate in some external action, in them the very action or use of matter is and is called the sacrament, as the washing, the anointing, the absolution, and the like; for by those actions grace is conferred. But this sacrament does not consist in a use or in any action, nor in a "being-made" (as they say), but in a "being-already-made." Wherefore consecration is not the sacrament conferring grace, but is an action, that is, a way to that which contains and confers grace; which accordingly is properly called the sacrament,

namely that which is perfected by the consecration—and this is a permanent thing. Therefore neither is the reception the sacrament, nor does it of itself produce grace, but it is only the application of the sacramental power to the recipient—just as in natural things the application of fire is not properly the cause of heat, but the fire which is applied. In the other sacraments, in which after the action nothing remains which contains grace, the actions themselves are so instituted as to confer grace; and therefore they are properly, and are called, sacraments.¹⁸⁹

§ 124. But you will object: chrism, and the water of the font once consecrated, have in themselves power from their consecration. Of chrism it is proved by the second canon of the Council of Trent on Confirmation. Of the water of the font, because in its consecration it is said: "May the power of the Holy Spirit descend into this water." Therefore the consecration of these also is a sacrament, because by the consecration the thing receives power so that afterwards it can be applied to the recipient. I answer: properly it does not receive power, but is appointed to use by the priestly blessing; nor does application afterwards suffice, but there is need of words efficacious by divine institution for producing the effect—by which words the efficacy is not attributed to the mere application as such, but to the form divinely appointed. By contrast, the Eucharist by itself is efficacious as a thing already existing, and the efficacy is attributed, not to the recipient's act as such, but to that which is received. From these points that argument also is solved: "In the other sacraments grace is conferred while the form is pronounced over the matter; therefore in this one too." For one must say that in this sacrament, by the pronouncement of the words, more is effected than in the others. For by them the Body and Blood of the Lord are presently exhibited, which in themselves contain the power of grace to be conferred upon those who receive; so that as often as they are received worthily, so often grace is received.¹⁹⁰

§ 125. Further, there are others who think that the visible species of bread and wine have the proper formal character of a sacrament. This seems to be the opinion of the Master (in Distinction 6), where he accommodates the definition of a sacrament to the visible species with these words: "Therefore the form of bread and wine which is seen there is the sacrament, that is, the sign of a sacred reality; because, besides the appearance which it puts before the senses, it causes something else to come into cognition." The same St. Thomas seems to hold (in the Summa in the place cited), whom very many follow. And they think it is proved by this reason, that a sacrament ought to be an external and visible sign; if therefore the Sacrament of the Eucharist is not some external action, as has just been proved, it follows that it is the very species visible to the eyes, since in this sacrament nothing else external and sensible can be designated.¹⁹¹

§ 126. Nevertheless, the opinion of others—very probable, moreover—is that the Body and Blood of Christ in this Mystery have the true and proper formal character of a sacrament, not indeed considered absolutely, but inasmuch as they exist under the visible species of bread and wine; so that Christ is truly said to be visible in this sacrament, namely under an alien species; just as his Body is said to be broken, eaten, and ground by the teeth, and his Blood to be poured out and drunk; for all this is truly said by reason of the species, with which the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore Christ himself, is joined in an ineffable manner.

§ 127. Now this opinion is proved, first, from the common usage of speech among the faithful; who call this sacrament not the species of bread and wine, but the very Body and Blood of Christ. Next, because this sacrament is adored by the faithful, and the Fathers of the Council of Trent teach that it must be adored. But this is undoubtedly understood not of the species, but of the very Body and Blood of Christ.¹⁹²

§ 128. Third, from the Decretum: "It is said to consist of two things, namely of the visible species of the elements and the invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord," because namely the Flesh and Blood of Christ, invisible of themselves to us, are by those external species made and exhibited visible to us. Fourth, the same is proved more clearly by the chapter "Multi, Causa 1, quaest. 1," taken from St. Gregory, where the Body and Blood of Christ is expressly called the sacrament, just as Baptism and "chrism," that is, unction. And St. Augustine speaks likewise, in Epistle 23 to Boniface.¹⁹³

§ 129. Fifth, because the sacrament of the Eucharist comes to be and begins to be on the altar by the consecration; but this is truly said not of the species of bread and wine (for they exist also before the consecration), but of the very Body and Blood of Christ. Sixth, because in the Profession of Faith it is said: "I confess that under one only species the whole and entire Christ, and the true sacrament, is received"; therefore the species itself is not the sacrament. Lastly, because a sacrament is that which contains and confers grace; which in the present case is not the species of bread and wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ veiled by those species. Moreover, Thomas of Walden hands on this opinion openly. Nor does it prove anything different that we most commonly call this "the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord," as though one thing were the sacrament and another the Body and Blood of the Lord. From this, rather, the contrary is set down. For just as the "sacrament of Baptism" is nothing other than Baptism itself, and the "sacrament of Confirmation" is nothing other than Confirmation, and so in the others; so the "sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord" is understood to be nothing other than the very Body and Blood of the Lord. Nor is that an obstacle, that the Fathers sometimes say the Body of Christ to be "in this sacrament," as the Council of Trent also sometimes speaks. For this is said in the way that God is said to be in Christ. For as in Christ the man God was made visible, and the same Christ is God, so in the sacrament of the Eucharist Christ is rendered visible to us, and the same sacrament is really Christ.¹⁹⁴

Eucharistic sacrament to be one and not many.

§ 130. The Eucharist constitutes, in the number of the sacraments, one sacrament, not many. This is manifestly shown from those testimonies of the Fathers in which they enumerate this sacrament along with the others. For they reckon it among the rest, not as two sacraments but as one—as may be seen in the aforesaid chapter "Multi," and elsewhere in Augustine: in book 19 Against Faustus, ch. 14; or in book 5 Against the Donatists, ch. 20; and in On Christian Doctrine, book 3, ch. 9; likewise in the sermon on Ps. 103, discourse 1; and in others. Whence also in the ecclesiastical Office it is called "the sacrament" in the singular number; and by Pope Gelasius, in Gratian, it is openly called "one mystery," that is, one sacrament.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, the same is proved from this, that the Eucharist is the sacrament of ecclesiastical unity, according to the Apostle (1 Cor. 10): "We, though many, are one bread, one body, we all who partake of the one bread and of the one chalice." Since therefore a sacrament bears the likeness of the thing of which it is a sacrament, it follows that the sacrament itself is one. It must be noted, however, that this sacrament is one, not as indivisible or as continuous, but as a certain whole complete, consisting of parts that concur to the integrity of the whole and are required for the same end and perfection—just as St. Thomas rightly declares. For this sacrament is ordered to a spiritual refection corresponding to bodily refection. Whence, as for bodily refection one thing requires two, food and drink, so likewise for the integrity of spiritual refection two concur, namely spiritual food and spiritual drink; whose outflow, although perhaps it is not diverse, as in bodily refection (of which in its place we shall speak), yet the external species, according to which they have the formal character of food and drink, is diverse. Wherefore materially indeed, by reason of the parts, this sacrament of the Eucharist can

be called in the plural "sacraments," as also very often in the ecclesiastical Office it is so called, for it consists of parts, of which each...¹⁹⁶

-
1. Tertullian, *De Resurrectione carnis*; St. Cyprian, Ep. 1 (or Book 1), Ep. 12 [abbreviations as in the source].
 2. Theophylact, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 12.
 3. Fourth Council of Toledo, canon 55.
 4. St. Jerome, *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*, ch. 8.
 5. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John*, Book 2, ch. 36, on Jn. 2:24: "Ipse autem Jesus non credebat semetipsum eis."
 6. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 1.
 7. Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 1 (On Confirmation). For earlier witnesses: Aeneas Sylvius (Pius II), *De Origine Boemorum*, ch. 35; on Wyclif, see the same.
 8. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4, part 3.
 9. Tertullian, *De Resurrectione carnis*.
 10. Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermon De Unctione chrismatis* (among the sermons *De Operibus cardinalibus*). On authorship see Pamelius, who attributes it to Salvian.
 11. Eusebius (of Vercelli), Ep. 3 to the bishops of Tuscany and Campania; Pope Melchiades, response to Spanish bishops on Baptism and Confirmation.
 12. Innocent I, *Epistle to Decentius*, ch. 3.
 13. St. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*; and *De mysteriis*.
 14. St. Hilary, at the end of the *Canons on Matthew*.
 15. St. Jerome, *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*.
 16. St. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, ch. 104; Ps. 132:2.
 17. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XIX, ch. 11.
 18. St. Augustine, *Tract. 3 and 118 on John*; *De Trinitate* XV, ch. 26; *Contra Donatistas* III, ch. 16; *Sermon 19 De Sanctis*. On the sermon's attribution see the editors' notes [abbreviation as in source].
 19. Pope Urban, decretal epistle to all bishops; Pope Fabian, Ep. 2 to the Eastern bishops; Cornelius in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI, ch. 33; Leo I, Ep. 86; Gregory I, Book 3, Epistles 9 and 26; Gregory III to Boniface; Innocent III, *De sacra unctione*, cap. *Perunctio*; Cyril (on *Leviticus*, Book 9) [abbreviation as in source]; Bede, on Acts 8 and *Quaest. 54 per Exodum*; St. Bernard, *Life of St. Malachy*; Council of Laodicea, ch. 48; and other particular councils.
 20. Council of Florence, *Decree for the Armenians*; Council of Trent, as cited.
 21. Acts 8:14–19.
 22. Acts 10:47; Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:8; Acts 10:45.
 23. Acts 2:11; Acts 10:46; Acts 19:6; Acts 8:14–17 (on Philip and the Apostles).
 24. Joel 2:28–29 as cited in Acts 2:17–18; Acts 2:38–39.
 25. Is. 44:3; Acts 19:6; Eph. 1:13; Eph. 4:30; Heb. 6:1–5; Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, *Commentaries ad loc.*
 26. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 1, ad 1.
 27. Pope Fabian, *Epistle to the Eastern bishops*; Clement, *Epistle IV*; the quotation is as in the source. Editorial note: "In Editione Valesiana cap. XLIII. quo in Capite Versione Rufini ita vertit: neque ad Episcopo consignatu..." [abbreviation as in source].
 28. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 2.
 29. Tertullian, *De baptismo*; *De resurrectione carnis*.

30. St. Cyprian, Epistles, book 1, ep. 12.
31. Pope Fabian, Epistle 2 to the Eastern bishops.
32. Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History VI, ch. 33 or 34, trans. Rufinus.
33. Theodoret, *De haereticorum fabulis*.
34. St. Pacian, *Epistulae*, book 3, to Sempronianus.
35. Prudentius, Hymnus "Cultor Dei memento"; and elsewhere as in the source: "lotus procul absit et unctus."
36. Henricus Valesius, note on the words of Cornelius [abbreviation as in source].
37. St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* XV, ch. 26.
38. St. Augustine, Tractates on John 33 and 118; Sermon 47 *De verbis Domini*; *Contra litteras Petiliani*, cap. 104; *De civitate Dei*, book and chapter as in source [abbreviation as in source].
39. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas*, book 5, ch. 20; Tract. 3 in *Epistolas Ioannis*.
40. St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem, book 3, ch. 2; St. Leo the Great, Ep. 86; Council of Orange I, can. 1–2; Prosper of Aquitaine, *Sententia* 142; Pope Gelasius, in Gratian, *De consecratione*, dist. 4, cap. "Presbyteros"; [Ps.-]Cyprian, Sermon "De unctione chrismatis"; St. Gregory the Great, In Canticum; the Venerable Bede, In Act. 8; Super Exod. c. 54; In Ps. 26; In Luc. X, book 6; Faustus of Riez, *De libero arbitrio* I, ch. 14; Third Council of Carthage, can. 36; Fourth Council of Carthage, can. 36.
41. Pope Innocent III, Decretals, title *De sacra unctione*; Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians (*Decretum Eugenianum*).
42. St. Augustine, Tract. 3 in *Epist. Ioannis*. Scripture cited: 1 John 2:20, 27.
43. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians; cf. Pope Innocent III, Epistle to the Patriarch of Constantinople, in Decretals, *De sacra unctione*.
44. [Ps.-]Cyprian, Sermon "De unctione chrismatis."
45. Pope Fabian, Ep. 2.
46. St. Gregory the Great, In Canticum, on Cant. 1.
47. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians: "Loco illius manus impositionis ... datur in Ecclesia Confirmatio."
48. Pope Fabian, Ep. 2; (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4 (last chapter); St. Clement, Epistle IV; Pope Innocent I, Epistle to Bishop Decentius.
49. Ad S. Thom. *ibidem* [abbreviation as in source].
50. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 2 (part 3) [abbreviation as in source].
51. Tertullian, *De baptismo*, ch. 3; St. Augustine, *De baptismo (contra Donatistas)*, book 3, ch. 16.
52. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians (*Decretum Eugenianum*), on Confirmation.
53. The Latin form cited is the received Western formula of Confirmation; see below at § X.
54. Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* XII, ch. 25.
55. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4.
56. Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem* I; St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* XV, ch. 26; *Contra epistulam Parmeniani (Contra Donatistas)* V, ch. 20; Tractates on the Gospel of John, Tract. 118.
57. Cajetan, Commentary on the Summa, III, q. 72, aa. 1–2; Domingo de Soto, In IV Sent., Distinct. 7 (ad locum) [abbreviation as in source].
58. St. Cyprian, Ep. 68 ad Caecilium, *De sacramento dominici calicis*.
59. Pope Innocent I, Epistle to Bishop Decentius; St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XVII, ch. 10.
60. Editorial note in the source: "Many things ought here to be noted about the Authors of this sacrament and the things that can be gathered from several writers; but since all of them, most fully, most learnedly, and in the clearest method, are handled by a most celebrated writer in the Apologetic-Analytical Dissertation On the Sacraments, Dissertation II, Question on the Matter, and

Question 3 throughout where he treats of the Form, let beginners in theology consult that same writer if they wish to be very fully informed; for our part we assent to the whole treatment: namely, we agree neither with the opinion which, on the authority of certain canons, makes only the imposition of hands essential to this sacrament, nor with that which holds that only the chrism is essential. By many arguments we are convinced that both belong to it. Bellarmine, Tom. 3 of the Controversies, book 2 De Sacramentis, judges that both the solemn words and the prayer over the chrism answer to the unction with the hands; which judgment Natalis Alexander defends (book 2, the sole chapter), although he wrote otherwise in Dissertation X ... We gladly pass over other matters; we add only that among the Latins, in these very times, the use of confirming with the hands alone is not in place; further reasons could be added." [Editor's note condensed from the printed apparatus.]

61. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 3.
62. Decrees as cited: Pope Sylvester (Decretals); St. Leo the Great, Ep. 86 (alias 88); Pope Gelasius, Decretals, Dist. 25, cap. "Presbyteros"; Second Council of Carthage, ch. 3; Third Council of Carthage, ch. 36; First Council of Toledo, ch. 20; Council of Hispalis (Seville), ch. 7; Council of Braga, ch. 37; the Venerable Bede, In Actus Apostolorum, on Acts 3.
63. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians, on Confirmation.
64. The Epistle "ad Rusticum Narbonensem de septem gradibus Ecclesiae" is spurious; see critical editors. The note in the source observes that it falsely makes the simple presbyter the minister of the sacraments and appeals to corrupted readings.
65. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In IV Sent., dist. 7 (ad locum) [abbreviation as in source].
66. Innocent III, Decretals, De sacramentis non iterandis, c. "Pastoralis"; St. Augustine, Tract. 118 in Ioannem.
67. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 4.
68. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians; St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 4; Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 7 (ad locum) [abbreviation as in source]. Turrianus cites Simeon of Thessalonica, De mysteriis; the "Acts of Sylvester" and "Edict of Constantine" are apocryphal pieces noted already by Pope Gelasius as not simply to be approved.
69. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians.
70. St. Ambrose, De initiandis, ch. 7.
71. St. Cyprian, Epistle to Jubaianus.
72. Athanasius, De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto [abbreviation as in source]; St. Augustine, Sermon 99 on Various Matters, ch. 2. On the placement and numbering of this sermon in the Benedictine edition, see the editors' note: "Sermonem alias XCIX... in Appendicem Tom. V." [abbreviation as in source].
73. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72.
74. Council of Florence, Decree to the Armenians; cf. 1 Cor. 1:23.
75. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos 56; Tractates on the Gospel of John 11, 53, 118; Homily 31 among the Fifty [abbreviation as in source]; Sermon 22 on the Words of the Apostle; Sermon 19 on the Saints; Sermon 99 on Various Matters, ch. 2.
76. St. Augustine, Sermon 8 on the Words of the Apostle, Fragmentum ultimum, chs. 2–3.
77. Prudentius, Cathemerinon, Hymn 9 ("Pange vexillum notatis quod refulget frontibus"); and another hymn beginning "Cultor Dei memento te chrismate innotatum."
78. Pope Innocent III, Decretals, De sacra unctione, cap. 3, § Quia vero; quoting Rom. 10:10.
79. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 7.
80. Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8.
81. Acts 2:16–21; 2:38–39.
82. Acts 8:14–17; Acts 19:1–7.
83. John 14:16.
84. St. Augustine, De baptismo contra Donatistas III, ch. 16; Rom. 5:5.
85. St. Augustine, Tractates on the First Epistle of John [general reference].

86. Luke 24; Acts 1.
87. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 4, part 3.
88. Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 17; and Epistle IV [as in the source]. Editorial note: Estius adds that the books of the Apostolic Constitutions attributed to St. Clement are at least much depraved and corrupted (though some defend them), and that, together with learned men, he judges the Decretal Epistles that go under Clement's name to be spurious; only the first to the Corinthians, and another to the Corinthians which some cite, are debated as to whether they are truly Clement's.
89. Pope Fabian, Second Epistle to the Eastern Bishops.
90. Pope Urban I, Epistle to all the Bishops.
91. Cornelius, Epistle to Fabius of Antioch, in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI, ch. 35. The reference to Scripture is Acts 8:19.
92. Pope Melchiades, Epistle to the Bishops of Spain.
93. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* III, ch. 2.
94. St. Jerome (or the author under his name), *On Psalm 67*.
95. St. Augustine, Sermon 47, *De verbis Domini*; Tractates on the Gospel of John 33. Editorial note: Estius remarks that this sermon is not included in the Benedictine edition.
96. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Sentences of St. Augustine*, sentence 342.
97. St. Leo the Great, Epistle to Bishop Nicetas; Bede, *On Psalm 26*.
98. Innocent III, *Decretals*, *De sacra unctione*, cap. unicum, "Per frontis chrismationem"; Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians (on Confirmation).
99. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 1 and a. 7.
100. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians (on Confirmation).
101. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 5.
102. The Master of the Sentences (Peter Lombard) adduces St. Augustine to this effect in the Text on the non-repetition proper to sacramental consecrations.
103. Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, XII, ch. 31.
104. Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 5, ch. De homine; Innocent III, *Decretals*, *De sacramentis non iterandis*, ch. Idem pastoralis.
105. Council of Châlons II under Charlemagne; Estius alludes to the provincial enactments that repeat the prohibition of repeating Confirmation.
106. Editorial note on the historical reference: Estius cites a Council of Tarraco as celebrated under Felix III; the Acts of that Council are reported by collectors, and Gratian cites from it in *De consecratione*. Later canonists such as Burchard and Ivo cite the same matter. The dating and exact wording vary in the manuscript tradition, but the tenor is that Confirmation is not to be repeated.
107. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 7, *De sacramentis*, canon 9.
108. Acts 19: St. Paul did not first give the Holy Spirit to the Ephesians by laying on of hands until he learned they had not yet received the Holy Spirit.
109. Extended editorial note on Greek practice and the non-repetition of Confirmation. Estius adds that the sacrament of Confirmation imprints a character and is therefore indelible, as is clear both from the Fathers and from the very name by which it is called the "seal of the Holy Spirit." Arcudius, *De concordia occidentalis et orientalis Ecclesiae* II (esp. chs. 16, 22–23), refutes the error of certain modern Greeks who asserted that Confirmation should be repeated in those who had received it among heretics and afterward returned to the Church; he shows, even from the express testimonies of the Greek Fathers, that the sacred chrism of the Church is not to be iterated. On the wider question of the reception of those baptized by heretics, Joannes Morinus, *De poenitentia*, argues at length that it was the constant judgment of the Catholic Church that Baptism conferred by heretics, provided it was done with the evangelical words and the intention of doing what the Church does, was to be received by Catholics—this he confirms by many testimonies of ancient councils and Fathers. He admits, however, that in later times it was unheard of in the Catholic Church to repeat Confirmation for those already confirmed in the Catholic Church who had gone over and then returned; hence the general determination of the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, *De sacramentis in genere*, can. 9) that a sacrament which confers a character is indelible and therefore not to be repeated, is to be understood of Confirmation conferred

- by a Catholic bishop. Besides the testimonies of the ancients, Estius notes that some modern writers also treat this matter: for example, John Maldonatus of the Society of Jesus clearly teaches that a character is given in Confirmation; Alegambe in his *Bibliotheca*, and Dupin in his *Bibliothèque* of the sixteenth century, raise some doubt, which Christianus Lupus, in his notes on the Eighth General Synod and in the *Dissertatio* appended thereto, deems excessive and refutes together with the calumnies of Photius against the Roman and all the Latin Church. Lupus shows that the Latins have always been most averse to admitting Confirmation conferred by a heretical bishop; although he does not deny that in the time of Pope St. Nicholas certain Greeks maintained the re-anointing as necessary and tried to invalidate the earlier rite. Estius recalls especially the Council of Constantinople and other acts in which it is determined that heretics coming to the Catholic Church are to be received, and he weighs whether the imposition of hands used among the Greeks was penitential rather than confirmatory; moreover, he observes that among them the use of an anointing was not the same as in Rome and the Catholic Churches, and adduces many reasons in support of the Latin usage; and he concludes that the Catholic tradition has been fixed and established, namely, that sacred chrism is not to be repeated. On this question he deems it sufficient to have reported and indicated these things.
110. S. Thom. ubi sup. [abbreviation as in source].
111. St. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* I, ch. 2; Melchiades, *Epistle to the Bishops of Spain*.
112. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 6.
113. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 6 (end).
114. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XIII, ch. 7.
115. Thomas Waldensis, *De Sacramentis* II, ch. 113.
116. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 1, ad 3; a. 6, ad 1.
117. Melchiades, *Epistola* (saepe citata) [abbreviation as in source].
118. St. Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*.
119. Council of Elvira, canon 77.
120. Innocent III, *Decretals*, *De consuetudine*, cap. Quanto.
121. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 6, ad 1.
122. Acts 19: Paul laid hands on the Ephesians who had been baptized; Acts 2: Peter, "Be baptized... and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"; Acts 8: Peter and John went down to the Samaritans to lay hands on them; Cornelius, *Epistle concerning Novatian* [abbreviation as in source].
123. St. Thomas, *ibid.*
124. Damasus (attrib.), in the *Pontifical*, on Sylvester's constitution; see also the long note below on the Pontifical's authorship and value.
125. Council of Orange I, cap. 2; and cap. 1 (where "Chrismation" is not named).
126. Council of Paris, cap. 33.
127. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 4, part 3; St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* II, ch. 2.
128. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XVII, ch. 4.
129. On the "Pontifical" or *Lives of the Pontiffs* from Peter to Liberius, once attributed to Damasus: by the judgment of all the learned it is denied to him and ascribed to Anastasius the Librarian, who flourished in the ninth century and who wrongly confounds the Presbyter Anastasius, Cardinal of the Title of St. Marcellus, with Gregory's Librarian. Some have said that up through Pope Liberius the brief collection was by Damasus and that later lives were added by Anastasius; others that only the life of Nicholas I was composed by Anastasius and that the lives of Adrian II and Stephen VI were added by another; others, again, ascribe them all to him. Louis Ellies Du Pin inclines to attribute to Anastasius both the life of Adrian II and the lives of the others. Be that as it may, those lives are not Damasus's. [This footnote translates the author's long critical note on the Pontifical as in the source.]
130. On ancient ecclesiastical custom: that it was ancient in the Church's practice to give the newly baptized the Eucharist immediately is attested by well-nigh innumerable ecclesiastical histories; Dionysius the Areopagite, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, last chapter; St. Augustine, *Tractate 6 on the First Epistle of John*; Alcuin, disciple of Bede, and many others relate the same rite as a Paschal solemnity; these authorities, together with many more cited by Petrus Arcudius in his *Concordia Orientalis et Occidentalis de ritibus* (and by others), sufficiently establish the point. As to the necessity of precept proposed by the Author—

namely, that only in the time and place of persecution, when there is danger lest one deny the faith by word or deed, or at least be ashamed to confess it, does obligation obtain under mortal sin, otherwise only under venial, contempt being absent—first, the authority of St. Thomas in the places alleged by the Author does not require the vow of this sacrament in order that one obtain its effect; it suffices that, by God's intention, man is spiritually advanced into perfect age by the sacrament, and that, provided it can be had conveniently by those capable of it, it is grave negligence scarcely not contempt to refuse to seek the strength of faith and perfection divinely instituted. Certainly no one will be excused from grave fault. Read St. Hilary of Arles and St. Gregory the Great on Pentecost; St. Peter Damian, Book II, ch. 3, and many Provincial Synods in which this is enjoined upon adults. These things pertain to the necessity of receiving the Eucharist and will be spoken of in their proper place.

131. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 11 (frequently cited).
132. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 7, can. 3 (On Confirmation); Session 13, ch. 4; can. 7.
133. Clement, *Apostolic Constitutions* III, chs. 15–16; Eusebius (Pope), Epistle 7 to the Bishops of Tuscany and Campania; Melchhiades (Pope), Epistle to the Bishops of Spain; Damasus (Pope), Epistle 4 (issued against the Chorepiscopi); John III (Pope), Decretal epistle on the same subject.
134. Innocent I (Pope), Epistle to Decentius, ch. 3; Leo I (Pope), Epistle 88; Gelasius (Pope), as cited in Gratian, *Distinct.*, cap. 25, "Presbyters"; Gregory the Great, Book 3, Epistle 9; Innocent III (Pope), Decretals, *De sacra unctione*, cap. Unico; and *De consuetudine*, cap. Quanto.
135. St. Cyprian, Epistle to Jubaianus; St. Jerome, *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*; St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* XV, ch. 26; St. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies* VII, ch. 12; the Venerable Bede, and Oecumenius, on Acts 8; Second Council of Seville, ch. 7; Council of Constance, condemnation of article 28 of John Wyclif.
136. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 5.
137. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 11, ad 1.
138. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 11, ad 1; "Gregory the Pope conceded that simple priests should confer this sacrament, until the scandal were removed."
139. Scotus, In IV Sent. [abbreviation as in source].
140. Various canonists and scholastic theologians cited by Estius ad locum.
141. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In IV Sent.; St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent.; Adrian VI, In IV Sent.
142. Eusebius (Pope), Epistle 3.
143. Damasus (Pope), Epistle 4, *De Chorepiscopis*.
144. John III (Pope), Decretal letter on Chorepiscopi; citing Acts 8.
145. Innocent III (Pope), Decretals, *De consuetudine*, cap. Quanto.
146. Decretals (Gratian/Extra), *De consecratione ecclesiae vel altaris*, cap. penultimum: "Quae consecrationis sunt, ea non consecrato committi non posse."
147. Leo I (Pope), Epistle 88; cf. Innocent I (Pope), parallel wording.
148. St. Gregory the Great, Epistles, Book 3, ep. 9, to Januarius; and ep. 26 to the same. Cf. Gratian, *Decretum*, Dist. 95, c. Pervenit, where some copies read "baptizati" instead of "baptizandi".
149. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 7, *De Confirmatione*. The Councils call the bishop the ordinary minister, as also is said with respect to the minister of the sacrament of Order amid the controversy concerning the minor orders.
150. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: "Legitur tamen aliquando per Apostolicæ Sedis dispensationem..." The Council relates that this is read (in Gratian or among the scholastic Doctors), not that it was in fact done.
151. The Epistle "De septem gradibus Ecclesiæ" is not by St. Jerome but by an uncertain author. For Jerome's mind, see St. Jerome, *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*.
152. St. Jerome, *Dialogue Against the Luciferians*, where after saying that this pertains more to the honor of the priesthood than to the necessity of law, he adds: "Otherwise those are to be mourned who..." (continuing as in the context).
153. The comment on Ephesians 4 attributed to Ambrose is by a later commentator, not by St. Ambrose.

154. Council of Orange I, chs. 1–2; Council of Toledo I, canon [abbreviation as in source]. The permissions concern the baptismal ceremonies performed in the absence of the bishop.
155. Pope Damasus, reporting about Pope Sylvester's concession that bishops should seal the baptized, while priests might anoint with chrism the baptized in danger of death [abbreviation as in source].
156. A longer apparatus could be appended here, gathering testimonies pro and con; see, among others: Natalis Alexander, *Theologia Dogmatica*; Cardinal Bellarmine, *De sacramento Confirmationis* II, ch. 2, nn. 1, 11–12; Christian Lupus, *Dissertationes* (Major difficultas); Emanuel González, notes and commentaries on Epist. III "ad Lucium Vicarium apud Constantinopolim" [abbreviation as in source]; Gaspar Juenin, *Commentarius scholastico-historicus*; Petrus Arcudius, *Concordia*, ch. 12; Cardinal Pallavicino, *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, Book 9; "ad cap. Quanto de consuetudine" [abbreviation as in source]. Estius refers the reader to these for the historical-dogmatic discussion.
157. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 8, ad 2.
158. Pope Innocent I, Epistle to Decentius, ch. "De consignandis vero infantibus"; St. Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, Book 3, ep. 9, to Januarius; Gratian, *Decretum*, De consecratione, Dist. 4, c. Si qui.
159. James of Vitry, *Historia Occidentalis*, ch. 37.
160. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis*; St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, on Confirmation (see esp. q. 72).
161. Domingo de Soto, In IV Sent., on the ceremonies of Confirmation; cf. the examples of Christ and Paul struck with a blow, and Acts 5 on the Apostles rejoicing that they suffered contumely for the name of Jesus.
162. A statute of Liège under Bishop John, approved by Pope Nicholas; several recent synods, and expressly the most recent Synod of Cambrai, to the same effect.
163. Council of Paris, ch. 33; cf. the Epistle 4 attributed to Clement, urging all to hasten to be signed by the bishop because the end of life is uncertain. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 8, ad 2: "ut perfecti in resurrectione appareant."
164. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 7, ad 2.
165. Gratian, *Decretum*, De consecratione, Dist. 5, citing a Council of Orléans.
166. Council of Paris under Emperors Louis and Lothair.
167. Ruardus Tapper; Domingo de Soto, In IV Sent., on the preparation for Confirmation.
168. Council of Trent, on the Eucharist and its preparation [abbreviation as in source].
169. Acts 10, on Cornelius and his household receiving the Holy Spirit.
170. St. Thomas, citing the Melense Council [abbreviation as in source].
171. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 72, a. 10.
172. Gratian, *Decretum*, De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. "Si qui".
173. Decretal of Pope Innocent, 30, q. 4, "Si quis ex conjugio".
174. Gratian, *Decretum*, De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. "Non plures".
175. Gratian, *Decretum*, De consecratione, Dist. 4, cap. "Catechismus"; Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum*, book 1.
176. Council of Trent, Session 24, ch. 2, On the Reformation of Matrimony.
177. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 73, a. 4.
178. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 2, part 3; Tertullian, *De baptismo*; idem, *De resurrectione carnis*; St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* I, ch. 2; *De initiandis* (De mysteriis), ch. 6.
179. Cf. Matt. 26; Mk. 14; Lk. 22; 1 Cor. 11; and the Roman Canon of the Mass.
180. Council of Nicaea, canon 13.
181. 1 Cor. 10, where the Vulgate renders *koinonia* now as "communio," now as "participatio."
182. Peter Lombard, *Sentences* (on the names of the Eucharist) [general reference, as in source].
183. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, ch. 3, part 1; St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. 14.

184. 1 Cor. 11, where the expression "Coena Domini" occurs; Justin Martyr; Tertullian; Clement; Ignatius—on the agapae or love-feasts [general patristic witnesses, as in source]; On the disciplina arcani in Augustine's Sermons to the Faithful [general reference, as in source].
185. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 73, a. 1.
186. Mk. 14; Lk. 22; 1 Cor. 11.
187. St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, Tractate 26; St. Augustine, Sermo ad infantes (cited by Peter Lombard).
188. Gabriel (Biel), In IV Sent., on this Distinction [abbreviation as in source]; Cajetan, on St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 73, a. 5; St. Thomas, In IV Sent., on this Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
189. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 3; The scholastic contrast between "in fieri" and "in facto esse" is explicit here.
190. Council of Trent, Session 7, can. 2, On Confirmation; Roman blessing of the baptismal font: "Descendat in hanc aquam virtus Spiritus Sancti" [abbreviation as in source].
191. The Master (Peter Lombard), In IV Sent., dist. 6; St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 73, a. 1; Their general argument from the visibility required of a sacrament.
192. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 5; canon 6.
193. Gratian, Decretum, De consecratione, Dist. 2, cap. "Hoc est"; Gratian, Decretum, Causa 1, quaest. 1, cap. "Multi" (from St. Gregory); St. Augustine, Epistle 23 to Boniface [abbreviation as in source].
194. Profession of faith ("juramentum fidei") cited in scholastic manuals [abbreviation as in source]; Thomas Netter of Walden, Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei catholicae, tome 2, De sacramentis, ch. 21; On sacramental titles such as "sacrament of the Body and Blood" being synonymous with the thing signified; Council of Trent, Session 13.
195. Gratian, Decretum, Causa 1, quaest. 1, cap. "Multi"; St. Augustine, Contra Faustum XIX, ch. 14; Contra epistolam Parmeniani (or Contra Donatistas) V, ch. 20; De doctrina christiana III, ch. 9; Enarrationes in Psalmos, on Ps. 103, concio 1; Gelasius I, in Gratian, Decretum, De consecratione, Dist. 2, cap. "Comperimus".
196. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 73, a. 2.

DISTINCTIO VIII — ON THE MATTER OF THE EUCHARIST (*DE MATERIA EUCARISTIAE*)

§ 1. Formally, however, or perfectly, as they say, the whole of it itself is one sacrament. Likewise, the same judgment holds of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which likewise consists of its own integral and discontinuous parts.

§ V — What is the matter of the Sacrament of the Body of Christ (Quae sit materia Sacramenti corporis Christi)

§ 2. The matter (*materia*) of this sacrament (*sacramentum*) is not to be understood as that which remains in it, or out of which it consists, but that out of which, as matter passing over (*materia transeunte*), this sacrament is made—namely the Body and Blood of Christ. Therefore this matter, that is, the element (*elementum*) out of which the Body of the Lord is consecrated, is bread; and this is certain and indubitable from the Gospel history and the perpetual usage of the Church. Moreover, the reasons why both bread and wine were appointed in this sacrament as matter are most fitting. The first is on the part of the present effect. For just as by bread and wine, as food most well known to all, the body is nourished and refreshed, so by the Body and Blood of the Lord in this sacrament the soul is nourished and refreshed; and all the faithful know this, the Lord saying: "My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink" (Jn. 6). The second is on the part of the reality commemorated. For by these symbols the passion and death of Christ are suitably recalled and set before the eyes, in which the blood was separated from the body by effusion, just as here the species of bread and the species of wine are presented separately. And a suggestion of that signified separation is made by the words of the consecration of the chalice, both in the three Evangelists and in Paul, and in the Canon of the Mass. The third is on the part of the mystical body. For just as bread is made from many grains and wine is gathered from many clusters, so by this sacrament the faithful are gathered into the one body of the Church by a tighter bond of charity, as Bede hands on from St. Augustine on that text (1 Cor. 10): "We many are one body," etc.² The fourth is on the part of the future effect. Because, just as by bread and wine men are brought to satiety and even to inebriation and overflowing joy, so by frequenting this mystery the faithful are at length brought there where, by the contemplation of the divinity, they are perfectly satisfied and are made drunk from the abundance of the house of God.

§ 3. But if someone should ask why the Lord chose rather the fruits of the earth than the flesh and blood of animals as the symbols of this sacrament—since in these a more explicit representation of the passion and death of Christ could have been made (for flesh more expressly represents flesh, and blood blood, and an effusion an effusion, and a slaughter a slaughter, and death death, than the symbols of bread and wine, separately offered or presented, could represent any of those things)—St. Thomas answers (III, q. 74, a. 1) that although the flesh of slain animals would represent Christ's passion more expressly, yet it is less suited to the

common use of this sacrament and to the signifying of the unity of the Church.¹ Another reason also can be given: because the old law would not have seemed to be abolished if still, in the time of the new law, the flesh of animals were slaughtered for sacrifice. Again, because it was fitting that, just as in the time of the old law the flesh and blood of animals were offered without the Flesh and Blood of Christ, so now in turn the Flesh and Blood of Christ should be offered without the flesh and blood of animals; and, indeed, under the symbols of those things which are most apt for eating and drinking, and which consist of homogeneous parts, and hence are taken whole with no part rejected—by which the purity of this most holy victim is far more perfectly represented; whereas, conversely, the immolation of cattle has much of impurity. Finally, this reason also can be added: that man in the state of innocence fed on the fruits of the earth; whence to the dignity of that state he ought to be recalled, nay even raised above it, by the Body and Blood of the Lord taken under the species of the fruits of the earth.

§ 4. Moreover, against certain persons who of old tried to offer something other than bread and wine in this Christian sacrifice—of which sort were the Artotyrites, the Cataphrygians, the Pepuzians, the Aquarians, and the Manichees—there exist decrees of Popes and Councils, which provide that nothing other than what Christ instituted is to be assumed as the matter of this sacrament, since otherwise there is no consecration. Thus decree Alexander I (in the Letter to all the Orthodox), the Third Council of Carthage (can. 24), the Council of Tribur (can. 19), the Council of Florence (in the Union of the Greeks and Armenians). Likewise in Gratian (*De Consecr.*), Dist. 2, cap. *Non oportet*, and cap. *In sacramento*; and in the Decretals, *De summa Trinitate*, cap. *Firmiter*; *De celebratione Missarum*, cap. *Cum Marthae*.³

§ 5. What bread, how much, and of what sort can be the matter of this sacrament. St. Thomas, III, q. 74, a. 1, 3. It must be said briefly of what substance, quantity, and quality the bread ought to be from which the Body of Christ is consecrated. A fuller explication of these matters must be sought from the Summists. As regards the substance, then, we say that the proper matter of this sacrament is wheaten bread, so that only from wheat, and from wheat alone, bread can be made which is a suitable matter of this sacrament. The reason is, first, because there is no doubt that Christ assumed wheaten bread as the matter of this sacrament—He is also read in the Gospel to have compared Himself to a grain of wheat. Then because, as St. Thomas says (a. 3) in the place cited above, for sacramental use such matter is assumed as commonly comes among men into such use; but men commonly use wheaten bread. For other breads seem to have been introduced in the defect of this bread, as is evident concerning those which are wont to be prepared when the pressure of dearth is urgent. Add that wheaten bread strengthens man more than the others and therefore more suitably signifies the effect of this sacrament. To these there is added the perpetual custom of the Church, and finally the express definition of the same Church in the Decree of Florence. It is therefore plain, and it is sufficiently agreed among the Doctors (although Cajetan dissents somewhat), that bread made from barley, oats, millet, panic grass, peas, beans, and the like, which differ from wheat either in species or genus, is not the matter of this sacrament.⁴

§ 6. But a question is chiefly handled about three kinds of grain related to wheat—siligo, far (which is properly called *adoreum*), and zea, which in the common tongue is called spelt—whether out of these bread can be made which is the matter of this sacrament. To which an affirmative reply is probable. And concerning siligo indeed, according to that signification which it has in Pliny and other Latin authors, there is no doubt. For it signifies the most white and most choice kind of wheat, namely so called from "selecting," as Isidore attests in book 17 of the *Etymologies*, ch. 3.⁵ But neither does it seem that one ought to doubt concerning

siligo as it is now commonly taken, which is known to be inferior to wheat. For, as St. Thomas reasons (III, q. 74, a. 3), the generator generates something like itself in species, although it be made degenerately on account of the weakness of the generative power or on account of the defect of the matter. Whence if certain grains can be generated from the seed of wheat—just as from wheat sown in poor soils siligo grows—then bread made from such grain can be the matter of this sacrament. So he. But that between siligo and wheat there is a mutual interchange of generation Pliny and Columella also testify, saying that the one can pass into the other in the second or third sowing.⁶ Nevertheless, as this argument is probable, so it is not utterly irrefragable. For if we believe Pliny, wheat can at length even degenerate into oats, from which, however, bread that is the matter of this sacrament cannot be made. Wherefore, that the argument be firm, it ought to be understood of those which, according to shape, powers, and properties, do not have such great distance that either the species or the proximate common genus seems to be changed. The same reason, moreover, seems to hold concerning far and spelt, although there is greater dispute among the Doctors about these, and many think diversely, as may be seen in Domingo de Soto (Dist. 19 in IV). The reason, I say, seems the same, both because in accidents these differ little from wheat, and because, as Paludanus attests, it has been found that between these and wheat there is mutual passage of generation.⁷ If you object that bread made from these is not wheaten bread, since they are species of grain diverse from wheat, the reply must be that the three things said above really pertain to the nature, species, and definition of wheat, although the common folk do not include them under the appellation of wheat. Nor does it matter for the present discussion whether wheat is an ultimate species or a subalternate one. For if it is ultimate, those kinds of grain already mentioned will pertain to it as distinguished only by accidents; but if it is subalternate, wheat will be the genus of those species.

§ 7. But what if grains of some other grain are mixed with wheat, as of barley or oats, or even legumes? Will bread made from this admixture be able to be the matter of this sacrament? The reply, with St. Thomas, is that a small admixture does not dissolve the species. For what is small is, as it were, absorbed by that which is in great quantity. Wherefore, if a small amount of another kind has been mixed in, bread can be made therefrom suitable for this sacrament; but if by reason of the abundance of an alien kind mixed in, the species has been changed, it will not be able. It must finally be noted, according to the received and safer opinion of the same Doctor (although Cajetan calls it into doubt), that for the making of bread which is the matter of this sacrament it is required that natural water be mixed with the flour, and not any other whatsoever, as rose-water or the like. For otherwise, very probably, there would be a different species on account of the diversity of the matter.⁸

§ 8. Now as regards quantity, first a distinction must be made between what is lawful and what is valid and holds as done, even if it be done unlawfully. For someone could consecrate a greater quantity of bread than is needed for the probable use of the faithful according to the custom of the Church; which consecration indeed would be valid, although the deed would be unlawful. Second, it must be established that the quantity of the matter of this sacrament is not so determined that a certain quantity can be designated above or below which consecration cannot be made; nay, any quantity whatsoever, however small, does not hinder consecration, provided the essential form is preserved. Third, it is required that the matter be present to the consecrator—present, I say, in human fashion, by which, namely, that is said to be present which, as if to be taken up into human use, can be pointed out by saying: "This is." For since this sacrament has been bestowed upon men for their own use, the pointing out also must be done in human fashion. That a presence of the matter of this sort is required is evident from the form of the sacrament both of the Body and of the Chalice, in which the pronoun is demonstrative of a thing present. From these things a fourth point is established, that so much

matter in fact can be consecrated as by human judgment is reckoned present to the consecrator. And because this cannot always be determined exactly, it follows that consecration, on the part of the quantity of the matter, is not always certain, but is sometimes doubtful, when namely it cannot be estimated for certain whether the matter is present to the consecrator or not. For since presence is to be estimated from the judgment of men alone, a doubtful case could occur, whether the matter ought to be reckoned present or absent to the consecrator—on which case indeed to attempt a consecration would be a great sacrilege. But on this matter there are, among certain Scholastics, more and subtler points not necessary to the present undertaking.

§ 9. There remains quality, about which it must be briefly noted that with all diligence one must beware lest the bread which is taken to be consecrated either be corrupted, or begin to be corrupted and spoiled, but rather that it have in itself the quality and properties of good bread, which is recognized from the color, smell, and other accidents. For if it has already been corrupted to the point of the dissolution of its substance, consecration cannot be made from it; but if it is tending toward corruption, the consecration indeed will be valid, but it would not be done without grievous sin of irreverence toward the sacrament, unless perhaps necessity excuses and fear of scandal.

§ VII — Whether this sacrament should be confected from unleavened or from leavened bread (Utrum ex azymo, an fermentato confici debeat hoc sacramentum?)

§ 10. By the doctrine of the Church it is certain and indubitable that the sacrament of the Lord's body can be celebrated both in unleavened bread (*panis azymus*) and in leavened (*panis fermentatus*). For since nothing else is required for the matter of this sacrament than that it be wheat bread, as has been shown above, and in no way ought it to be doubted that it is truly wheat bread, whether it be leavened or unleavened, it is evident that the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) can be consecrated from either. About this there was never any doubt in the Catholic Church of Christ, although in it there was a certain diversity of custom. For the Latins have been accustomed to consecrate in unleavened bread, the Greeks in leavened, each side keeping the custom of its own Church and not at all condemning the different one. On which matter Pope Leo IX writes at length and weightily in his Letter (against the presumptions of Michael, Patriarch of Constantinople).¹⁰ But when on that matter contentions of the Greeks against the Latins, arising on the occasion of the schism, swelled more and more, at length in the Council of Florence, with both parties consenting, it was clearly defined that the consecration made in either way is valid, and that in either way it is done rightly and reasonably, but in such wise that each is bound to keep the custom of his own Church, as one may see in the letters of union of the Greeks with the Latins, drawn up and approved by decree of that same Council.¹¹

§ 11. Now these are the reasons for the Latin custom. First, because in this the Latins imitate Christ, who, as is clear from the Gospel, instituted and celebrated the sacrament of His body and blood after the supper of the Paschal lamb, which according to the Law was performed with unleavened breads. Second: because in leaven there is a signification of sin and of corruption, not only in the Old [Testament] but also with the Apostle (1 Cor. 5 and elsewhere). But the flesh of Christ was altogether free not only from sin, and, when dead, saw no corruption. Third: because Christians communicating in this sacrament ought, according to the

Apostolic admonition in the same place, to feast, not in the old leaven, nor in the leaven of malice and wickedness, but in the unleavened breads of sincerity and truth.

§ 12. Moreover, the Greek custom also has its reasons. For, first, the Greeks seem therefore to have chosen leavened bread, that by the very deed they might declare how greatly they detested the Judaizers, who were teaching that the Law must be observed together with the Gospel, inasmuch as they were unwilling to be like the Jews even in this outward rite. Then, on account of signification, considering namely that the Son of God assumed mortal and wretched flesh, as it were a certain leaven not of malice but of misery.

§ 13. The rationale of each custom is set forth somewhat differently by Gregory (in the Register), as he is cited by St. Thomas (III, q. 74, a. 4):¹² "The Roman Church," he says, "offers unleavened breads, because the Lord received flesh without any commixture; but certainly the other Churches offer leavened, because the Word of the Father was clothed with flesh, just as leaven is mixed with flour." In the same author one may see the mystical signification of unleavened bread (Homily 22 on the Gospels).¹³ If here it be asked which custom is the more reasonable, it must altogether be admitted that there is more reason and congruity in the custom of the Latins—both because of the institution and example of Christ, about which more presently, and because bread is more the sacrament of the Body of Christ (which was conceived without corruption) than of His divinity as though mixed with flesh; and finally because it is more suited to the sincerity of the faithful who use this sacrament. And indeed these two significations, which favor the Latin custom rather than that single one which is produced for the Greek custom, are founded in Scripture, as is clear from what has been said.

§ VIII — Reply to the arguments of the Greeks against unleavened bread (Responsio ad argumenta Graecorum contra azymum)

§ 14. The diversity of custom which exists between the Greeks and the Latins with respect to unleavened bread (*azymum*) and leavened bread (*fermentatum*) does not seem to have arisen at the beginning. For, as Innocent III relates and St. Thomas likewise, at the outset the whole Church, both Eastern and Western, used unleavened bread in the Sacred Mysteries, and this from the institution of Christ and of the Apostles.¹⁵ But afterwards, when the heresy of the Ebionites and Nazarenes arose, who taught that along with the Gospel the legal observances were to be kept, the whole Church, in detestation of these, putting aside the unleavened breads, adopted leavened loaves for the Mysteries. Hence among the Greeks—St. John Chrysostom, Origen, and others more ancient—no trace appears of this diversity or discord. Later, however, that heresy having been extinguished, the Latin Church returned to its former custom of consecrating unleavened bread; the Greeks meanwhile retained the custom which they had taken up on that occasion. This was the first diversity of custom between the two.

§ 15. Furthermore, when the later Greeks began to make a schism from the Roman Church, they also began to defend their own custom in such a way as to condemn the Latins, who followed a different custom, as though they were transgressors of the divine institution. Whence they began to gather arguments against them, by which they would show that Christ instituted the Eucharist not in unleavened bread but in leavened. And the malice of some went so far that they said unleavened bread is not bread, and therefore that we do not truly consecrate. But this fabrication is so absurd that no one fails to see it, since Scripture everywhere calls the unleavened loaves breads, as in Exodus 12 and 29, Numbers 6, Joshua 5, Judges 6, Luke 24, and elsewhere. To

this is added the agreement of all believing nations, who both believe and call unleavened bread bread, and that without any trope or impropriety of speech; for neither has anyone thought that leaven ought to be put into the definition of bread.

§ 16. But as to Christ's deed, a greater question is raised by them. For they plainly contend that at the Last Supper Christ used not unleavened loaves but leavened, from this: that He made that most recent supper with His disciples not on the evening of the fourteenth day of the moon but on the thirteenth, that is, the day before that day on which the Passover of the Jews began. And to prove this they use four testimonies of Scripture. The first is what is read in the three first Evangelists—namely, that in the council of the Jews it was decreed that Christ should not be apprehended and put to death on the feast day, lest a tumult should arise among the people, because a very great multitude was flocking to the paschal solemnity. The second is from those words (John 13): "Before the festival day of the Passover, Jesus, knowing that His hour had come." The third is from these words of the same Evangelist (ch. 18): "They themselves did not enter into the Praetorium, that they might not be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover." The fourth is from the same (ch. 19), where it is said: "Now it was the Preparation of the Passover," and again: "Since it was the Preparation of the Jews," and so forth. On that same day too—as is clear from that same chapter and from the other Evangelists—Joseph and Nicodemus, together with the pious women, were buying and preparing spices for anointing and burying the Body of Christ, which on the day of the Passover was not lawful.

§ 17. To these Greek arguments there is not one and the same reply for all. First, indeed, it is manifest from the three first Evangelists that on the first day of unleavened bread—which was the paschal feast itself—Christ made with His disciples the supper in which He instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood. For thus it is read in Matthew 26: "But on the first day of unleavened bread the disciples came," etc.; and in Mark 14: "On the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover, His disciples say to Him," etc.; and in Luke 22: "Now came the day of unleavened bread, on which it was necessary that the Passover be slain." From which it is clear that on the very day of the Passover—whose beginning was at evening—Christ ate the paschal lamb and instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist. Nor does it seem that the Fathers doubted about this matter.

§ 18. Therefore, in order to reply to the objections of the Greeks, some Latins say that Christ did indeed observe the legitimate time of eating the paschal lamb, which is the fourteenth day of the moon at evening; but that the Jews, from eagerness to kill Christ, deferred their Passover to the next day. But this with respect to the Jews is little probable. First, because not the whole multitude of the Jews, but their rulers, had secretly conspired for Christ's death; and they would not have dared to transfer the feast day—which drew together an immense multitude of men—on account of a private crime. Then because from the pious men of whom above it seems that the Passover was not celebrated before the evening of the following day. Therefore others agree that the Jews celebrated the Passover at exactly the same time as Christ, and that the paschal lamb was immolated according to the law at that time. And since the Evangelists speak quite in accord, not only of the Passover celebrated by Christ, but in general naming the first day of unleavened bread, on which the Jews immolated the Passover, as Mark says, and on which it was necessary that the Passover be slain, as Luke says, they think it is efficaciously proved. This was the fairly common opinion of the Fathers. For although St. John Chrysostom (Homily 85 on Matthew) says that the rulers of the Jews, from their desire of killing Christ, were transgressors of the law and ate the Passover on another day, he does not think the same of the Jewish people, but rather signifies the contrary. More expressly, Augustine hands this down in Epistle 86 (to the Presbyter

Casulanus), and Jerome on Matthew 26, and most plainly Bede in the book *On the Nature of Things*, ch. 63. In a special way against the Greeks this opinion is confirmed by Innocent III (book 4 of *On the Mystery of the Sacred Altar*, chs. 2 and 4), Leo IX in the Letter to Michael of Constantinople, Anselm in the book *On Leavened and Unleavened Bread*, Gennadius Scholarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the *Defense of the Council of Florence*, ch. 2, and many others.¹⁶

§ 19. But these writers labor in solving the arguments of the Greeks, especially those which are brought from the Gospel of John. For to that which is read in the other Evangelists—namely, that the Jews, taking counsel about Christ's death, said, "Not on the feast day"—there is no difficult reply: He who suffered because He willed, suffered also when He willed, notwithstanding the counsels of the Jews, who, to avoid a tumult of the people, would have preferred to kill Him after the paschal solemnity. To the passage therefore (John 13) they reply that Christ made the supper "before the festival day of the Passover," that is, on the day before the civil day which was called the Passover, although the natural day of the Passover had already begun from that very evening in which Christ made the supper. And this reply has probability. But what they reply to the other passage, which is (ch. 18), when they say that by "Passover" there the unleavened breads are understood—so that the sense is that the priests were unwilling to enter Pilate's praetorium lest they be defiled, that is, contract legal uncleanness, and thus be prohibited from eating the unleavened breads—is altogether improbably said, both because nowhere in the Sacred Scriptures is "Passover" taken for "unleavened breads," and because the unleavened breads could be eaten even by the unclean during the whole paschal time, which comprised seven continuous days; whereas to eat anything leavened was capital for the Jews, as is clear from Exodus 12; and yet legal uncleannesses were contracted for very slight causes, and some of them lasted for many continuous days, as from Leviticus. Nor is that probable which they reply to the passage (ch. 19), namely that the Friday is called the "Preparation of the Passover," that is, the Preparation or getting-ready of the Sabbath, because it fell within paschal time. For by the "Preparation" of some day nothing else is to be understood than the getting-ready for that very day whose Preparation it is called. Wherefore "the Preparation of the Passover" is nothing else than the getting-ready for the Passover. Since therefore from these things the sense of John's words, as compared with the other Evangelists, is not yet apparent, there remains that it be said that Christ celebrated His Passover on the day before the Jews celebrated theirs, and yet that neither did Christ, as the Greeks wanted, anticipate its legitimate time, nor did the Jews, as they surmise, on account of the desire of killing Christ, defer their own to the following day; but for another reason they deferred that same feast to the next day. Now what that reason was Rabanus briefly indicates, writing on Matthew (26), where he says that by the tradition of the Fathers it was never lawful that, when two feasts came together, men should abstain from servile work for both days; since it is difficult that the bodies of the dead be buried, or that vegetables and foods be cooked, up to the third day without corruption, because of the heat of that region; and therefore the solemnity of the Passover, as often as it fell on Friday (as happened at the time of the Lord's Passion), they would transfer to the next day, namely the Sabbath.¹⁷

(Here Father Bernard Lamy of the Congregation of the Oratory, by learned writings on that argument as well as in his *Harmony of the Evangelists*, chapters 17 and 18, vigorously contends and strengthens the opinion that Christ our Lord, in the year in which He suffered, did not celebrate the Jewish Passover, nor eat the paschal lamb; and he went so far, that—if we may believe Sebastian Tillemont, who has deserved very well of sacred history—he seems to have advanced beyond the limits of probability and of an unprejudiced judgment. But the plan we have undertaken does not allow us to dispute and to refute with vehemence. Let readers therefore consult among others the *Ecclesiastical Writers of the first six ages*, tome 1, part 1, where in a

few pages he comprehends the whole matter and dissolves all the arguments invincibly. This one thing it is enough to warn here: that he takes away from the Latins the arms with which they are accustomed to defend themselves against the Greeks. For if Christ did not celebrate—as Father Lamy judges—there is nothing which may compel us to believe that, at the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist, He used unleavened bread and not leavened; this is weighed by Tillemont in the place just cited. Moreover, with the opinion rejected—namely that Christ the Lord, although not on the day prescribed by the law, nevertheless performed the paschal supper of the priests by whom He was condemned—)¹⁸

§ 20. Since the Jews had introduced this custom contrary to the law of God merely for the sake of their own convenience—as they had many other things—Christ was unwilling to take account of it, especially since on that very day on whose evening the Jews were going to eat their paschal lamb, He Himself was to be immolated on the gibbet of the Cross, the true Lamb who takes away the sin of the world; who therefore rightly judged that His most recent legal Passover should be celebrated on that day which the divine law had prescribed, namely the fourteenth day of the moon; whereas the Jews, as we have said, deferred its celebration to the fifteenth day of the moon. Nevertheless, one must concede that both celebrated it at a legitimate time: Christ indeed according to the law of God; the Jews, however, according to the law or tradition of the Elders. Nor ought the just—as were Nicodemus and Joseph and the devout women who followed Christ—to have differed from the common observance of the whole people; since the fault of transferring the feast to another day had to be imputed to the rulers and chiefs of the people, not to the subjects. This opinion, as being very suitable for reconciling the Evangelists and refuting the Greeks, is followed by almost all recent writers, although Domingo de Soto strongly opposes it; yet his reasons are not of such weight that one should seem to depart from it. Augustine also seems to have indicated the same (Tractate 120 on John), where he writes that the "Preparation" of which John makes mention is called by the Jews the "pure supper" of the unleavened breads—that is, as I think, the supper of the azymes.¹⁹

(And a certain Presbyter J. C., in an Historical Treatise on the Jewish Passover—set in front of that book a special Disputation on the Rites which were observed by the Jews in making the Passover—excels in the very learned writings he has published; he, drawing from a genuine and ancient Greek author, one of two Anonymous men whom some believe to be John Philoponus numbered among the heretics in the catalogue of Photius, with all force exerts himself and would by every kind of argument prove and establish the common opinion of the Fathers which is adverse to his own. We, constrained by lack of time and by our small talent, will not here list the arguments of that author; nor does confidence in our own small ability urge us to contend with so great a man about so great a matter. Let readers therefore consult Sebastian Tillemont—who has deserved very well in historical matters—in the Memoirs, in the Notes to the Life of Jesus Christ, Note 26, where, by a clear method, he very easily unties all those things which seem in some measure to support Father Lamy's system. From this it is evident that, so that they might avoid the reproaches of the Greeks and protect themselves against their calumnies, the Latins have nothing else left than to say that Christ our Lord used unleavened and not leavened bread when He instituted the Eucharist; this Tillemont weighs in the place cited. With the opinion rejected which says that Christ the Lord, although not on the day prescribed by the law, nevertheless took part in the paschal supper of the priests by whom He was condemned:)²⁰

§ 21. To what is objected by the Evangelists—that the day at whose evening Christ ate the Passover with His disciples is called the first day of unleavened bread, on which the Passover had to be sacrificed—Euthymius on Matthew replies that "on the first day of unleavened bread" is the same as if it had been said "on

the day before the unleavened breads." But it is more consonant, if it be said that the Evangelists in those words partly looked to the deed and observance of Christ and His disciples—little anxious about the Jewish tradition—and partly wished to signify what, according to the law of God, it behooved the people themselves also to do. Whence it is notably said by Luke: "on which it was necessary," or "it behooved," "that the Passover be slain."

§ 22. Finally, against the Greeks it must be noted that even if Christ, as they wish, had been willing for some cause to anticipate the legitimate time of its celebration, that is, the fourteenth day of the moon, nevertheless it would not yet follow that He used leavened bread in that most recent supper. For just as the immolation and eating of the paschal lamb, so too its whole rite prescribed in the law—which among other things contains this, that it be eaten with unleavened breads and bitter herbs—He is to be believed to have willed to observe. Whence Chrysostom says (Homily 82 on Matthew) that by His deed the Lord showed that from the beginning of His circumcision up to the last day of the Passover He was not contrary to the divine law. That this is so is proved also by the example of the Apostle Peter, most familiar to Christ, who (Acts 10) protests that he had never eaten what is common and unclean.

§ IX — From what matter the Blood of Christ is consecrated (Ex qua materia consecratur Sanguis Christi)

§ 23. The matter (*materia*) of the other part of this sacrament is wine of the vine, as the Decree of Florence speaks; and that both from the Gospel, where the Lord says that He will no more drink of the offspring of the vine, and from the Third Council of Carthage (canon 24), where it is evident that wine from grapes is required for this sacrament.²² There exist on this matter several chapters in Gratian (De Consecratione, dist. 2), and the same is contained under the title De summa Trinitate et fide catholica, ch. Firmiter.²³ Cyprian also at length proves this very point in the Epistle to Caecilius, which is the third of book 2, where he argues against the Aquarii heretics, so called because, under the pretext of sobriety, they used water alone in the Mysteries; of whom Augustine too makes mention in the book On Heresies.²⁴ And Chrysostom, Homily 83 on Matthew, writes thus: "Of the offspring of the vine," he says, "which surely produces wine, not water"—in which he wished to tear up by the roots the heresy of those who use water in these Mysteries.²⁵ So he.

§ 24. From these things it is clear that every wine and only wine of the vine is the matter from which the Blood of Christ can be consecrated. Nor does it matter whether in the wine there is a diversity of species, or indeed all are of the same species, just as we said about wheat. For what suffices and is required is the true nature of wine, whether that be generic or specific. Wherefore whatever liquids are expressed from elsewhere, or made by any art whatsoever, do not pertain here, such as the juice of apples, beer, and the like; although the audacity of certain heretics of our times has burst forth to this point, that they say that where a supply of wine is lacking, another customary drink, as beer, can be assumed. I recollect that I read this indeed in a certain Calvinist. Yet this is not so very surprising: for to those for whom the Eucharist is only a sign of the Lord's Body and Blood, other things besides bread and wine can also, at pleasure, be employed for such signification.

§ 25. But for us Catholics firmly retaining the institution of Christ, at this point there arise doubts—first about vinegar, then about omphacium, which the common folk call verjuice, third about must, fourth about the grape, fifth about mixed wine, lastly about frozen wine—whether each of these can be a suitable matter of this sacrament; about which we reply briefly in order.

§ 26. As to the first, if the wine have been perfectly changed so that its species is altered, and it has ceased to be wine, it cannot be the matter of the sacrament. But if it has indeed turned sour, yet not so that it has now been converted into the nature of vinegar, consecration can be made from it, although not without sin, unless perhaps necessity excuses. And this is what Innocent III says (book 4, On the Mystery of the Holy Altar, ch. 31): that sour wine, which is called vinegar, can be the matter of this sacrament. He understands this of that which, although by reason of sourness it can be called vinegar, nevertheless has not yet perfectly passed into the nature of vinegar. Wherefore one must not listen to that opinion which is read alongside the canon *Sicut in sanctificando* (De Consecrat., dist. 2), saying that vinegar, provided it be from wine, is the matter of this sacrament—unless it be understood in the manner in which we have expounded Innocent.

§ 27. As to the second, the reply is similar: for omphacium is the juice of an unripe (sour) grape; although it is in the way of generation toward wine, nevertheless it has not yet attained its species. Hence consecration cannot be made from it—unless it be expressed from grapes that are ripening. Then indeed, as its species would be doubtful, so too would be the consecration, which therefore would not be able to be done without sin, because no doubtful matter may be used in the sacraments, and especially in this most august sacrament of the Eucharist.

§ 28. As to the third, the reply is affirmative: must is truly wine, both in the judgment of the common folk and of the Doctors. And it is proved by the authority of Pope Julius, who in Gratian, De Consecratione, dist. 2, ch. Cum neque, permits that, in case of necessity, a cluster of grapes be pressed into the chalice, and that from it, water having been added, consecration be made; but that this is not to be done outside of necessity, because on account of the admixture of flowers, that is, of particular small parts pressed out together, must is still impure, and is wont gradually to be purified and clarified by muddy waters settling out.

§ 29. As to the fourth, the reply is negative. A grape is not wine, nor anything potable, but rather something eatable, although by expression it can forthwith become wine; nor does it make a difference that perhaps the species of the liquid which is expressed is not changed by the very expression.

§ 30. As to the fifth, a distinction must be applied. For whether water has been mixed with the wine, or any other liquid whatsoever, if the admixture be so great that the species of the wine perishes, consecration cannot be made; but if, the species not yet changed, there be a small admixture—judgment of which is to be taken from the accidents of taste, color, odor, and the like—it can indeed be consecrated, although not without sin, because of the danger of scandal, unless perhaps necessity excuses.

§ 31. As to the last, they similarly reply by making a distinction. For if the freezing is recent, as when it is made in the chalice a little before consecration, the power and the species of wine still remain preserved, wherefore they hold it to be apt for consecration; but if it has been so long frozen that by the force of the cold both the power and species of wine have perished together, it is certain that it is unfit for consecration. But against the first part of this reply there can be objected what was said a little before about the grape: for frozen wine, even if it retain the species of wine, is not something potable. To which objection although something probable can be answered—namely, that frozen wine becomes potable, not by expression or any separation, but by resolution alone, just as water—nevertheless it is altogether safer to abstain from its consecration, as from a doubtful thing, until resolution has taken place. Let other matters pertaining here be sought from the Summists.

§ 32. To what extent the admixture of water is necessary. Not by necessity of the sacrament, it is certain that water ought to be mixed with wine when it is offered in the chalice, as the Council of Trent admonishes (Session 22, ch. 7, and a canon of the same session). On which matter the Decree of Florence thus determines: that before consecration the most minimal water should be mixed with the wine.²⁶ There exist moreover on this point very ancient decrees both of Pontiffs and of Councils: of Alexander I (Epistle 1), and of Julius I in Gratian (*De Consecrat.*, dist. 2), and of Cyprian (book 2, Epistle 3), a good part of which is also read in Gratian; likewise the Third Council of Carthage (canon 24), and the Third of Braga (ch. 1), and that of Tribur (canon 19). Upon whose doctrine Bernard insists (Ep. 69), and Innocent III, book 4 (*On the Mystery of the Holy Altar*, ch. 32), and in the Decretals, Title *On the Celebration of Masses*, ch. *Cum Marthae* and ch. *In quadam*.²⁷ Nor indeed is this constitution by those proposed as though it were only of human law, but as though it were of divine institution, namely, transmitted by Christ through the Apostles to us.

§ 33. Now three or four reasons of this precept are adduced, both by others and expressly by the Councils of Florence and Trent. Of which the first is that, according to the testimonies of the holy Fathers, and especially Augustine, Christ Himself instituted this sacrament in wine mixed with water. The second, that this suits the representation of the Lord's Passion. For, as Pope Alexander, fifth from Peter, says: In the offerings of the sacraments wine mixed with water ought to be offered, because both, that is blood and water, are read to have flowed from the side of Christ (John 19). Which passage, treating it, Augustine says: "Water tempers the saving cup."²⁸ The third, that it suits to signify the effect of this sacrament, which is the union of the Christian people with Christ the Head. For water signifies the people (Rev. 17), and Christ calls Himself the true vine (John 15). Now the mixing is made in the chalice, because we are joined to Christ by the power of His Passion. This last reason St. Thomas adds: because it suits to represent the ultimate effect of this sacrament, which is entrance into eternal life. Whence Ambrose says, book 5 (*On the Sacraments*, ch. 1): "Water overflows into the chalice, it leaps into life eternal."

§ 34. But if one asks about the necessity of the sacrament, the reply is negative—which is gathered first from Cyprian, who in the Epistle just now cited thus says: If any one of our predecessors either through ignorance or simplicity did not observe to mix water with wine, forgiveness can be granted to his simplicity. By which words he signifies that the fault was venial; which assuredly it would not have been, if the sacrament altogether could not subsist without the admixture of water. But clearer is the statement of Bernard (in Ep. 69) and Innocent III, book 4 (*On the Mystery of the Holy Altar*, ch. 32), whom almost all the Scholastics follow.

§ 35. It is proved also by reason: because, both from the custom and from the precept of the Church, so small a quantity of water is mixed in that it can be converted into wine before consecration is made. Whence neither is water offered separately, as separately bread and wine are offered, but water is offered mixed with wine—or rather wine mixed with water. For never is consecration made from water, but from wine alone. Now that a small quantity of water should be mixed with wine, besides the Decree of Florence just above cited, is handed down by Honorius III, *Extravagants* (*De celebratione Missarum*, ch. *Perniciosus*), and by Innocent III, *ibid.*, ch. *Cum Marthae*. And the same is sufficiently insinuated by Pope Julius (*De Consecrat.*, dist. 2).

§ 36. But the things that are adduced on the contrary from the decrees of Pontiffs or of Councils are all to be referred to the necessity of a precept, not of the sacrament. Nor otherwise are those words of Cyprian to be taken in the aforesaid Epistle: "So the chalice of the Lord is not water alone or wine alone, unless each be

mixed; just as neither can the Body of the Lord be flour alone or water alone, unless each has been united into the solid framework of one bread." For in both cases is signified the necessity of the precept, not of the sacrament. For Cyprian urges the institution of Christ, which must altogether be observed; and in this way the Master (dist. 11, toward the end, where he discusses this matter) signifies that both the words of Cyprian and those of others are to be taken. But if from Cyprian's words you should argue thus by a likeness: From flour alone the Body of Christ is not made, therefore from wine alone the Blood of Christ is not made—the dissimilitude must be denied. For flour, before it can be the matter of the Body of Christ, ought to be substantially changed; but wine, even if water be mixed with it, does not undergo substantial change, but remains wine, and the water is converted into it, not it into water, nor both into some third thing. But it is not so with water into flour; since water is so mixed with flour that from them by the baker's art there is made some third thing, namely bread, which is the matter of the Body of Christ, just as wine is of the Blood.

§ X — With what words the Eucharist is consecrated (Quibus verbis consecretur Eucharistia)

§ 37. The form (*forma*) of this sacrament—namely the words by which bread and wine are consecrated into the Body and Blood of the Lord—is clearly handed down to us by the Gospel history. For they are those by which, after the blessing of bread and wine, Christ expressly and plainly testified that He was giving His Body and His Blood to His disciples, saying: "This is my body; This is my blood." For by these same words both Christ once, when instituting this sacrament, consecrated His Body and Blood, and He consecrates through priests instituted by Him. Since indeed consecration is made by the priests by imitation of those things that were then done by Christ, and the very words of consecration are pronounced in the person of Christ, by no reasoning does the opinion of some stand, who admit indeed that the priests, ministers of Christ, consecrate the Eucharist by the aforesaid words, but claim that Christ Himself did not consecrate by them, but either by some words spoken secretly and omitted by the Evangelists.

§ 38. Assuredly the Fathers, when they speak of the words of consecration, indifferently attribute the same words both to Christ and to the priests. For Chrysostom (Hom. 5 on Matthew) says: "Christ said, This is my Body; He perfected the thing together with the word." And in a certain homily (On the Betrayal by Judas): "The words are uttered by the mouth of the priest; they are consecrated by the power of God's grace. He says, This is my Body; by the word set forth they are consecrated." And as that Voice which says, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth," was indeed once uttered, yet at all times feels its effect, with nature working toward generation; so also that voice was indeed once spoken, but through all the tables of the Church even to the present day, and unto His coming, it gives to the sacrifice firmness—so he. To which Ambrose's words plainly agree, book 4 (On the Sacraments, ch. 4): "Consecration," he says, "by what words is it, and of whose utterances? Of the Lord Jesus. For all the other things that are said, praise is offered to God, prayer is made for the people, for kings, for the rest: when it comes to the point that the venerable sacrament is to be effected, the priest now no longer uses his own words, but uses the words of Christ. Therefore the utterance of Christ effects this sacrament." And other things which follow both in the same and in the next chapter. The same, in the book On Those Initiated into the Mysteries, ch. 9: "If," he says, "a human blessing availed so much as to change nature, what shall we say of the divine consecration where the very words of the Lord and Savior operate? For this sacrament which thou receivest is effected by the utterance of Christ." Tertullian likewise, book 4 Against Marcion, clearly attests that Christ made the bread to be His Body by saying: "This is my

body." The same opinion is confirmed by Alexander I (in the first Decretal Epistle), Damascene, book 4 (On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 14), Innocent III, in the Decretals (On the Celebration of Masses, ch. Cum Marthae), and most clearly by the Master in this eighth distinction, whom all later writers follow.³⁰ Lastly, in the Council of Florence, with the Greeks consenting, it was defined that this sacrament is effected by those words of Christ, as is clear from the acts of the last session; and again it was approved in the Decree given to the Armenians, where it is read thus: "The form of this sacrament is the words of the Savior, by which this sacrament is effected. For the priest, speaking in the person of Christ, effects this sacrament. For by the power of those very words the substance of bread is converted into the Body of Christ," etc. And then this same doctrine, although it did not express it, the Council of Trent nevertheless sufficiently indicated and even presupposed (Session 13, ch. 1, and ch. 7).³¹

§ 39. Finally, it is proved by an excellent reason. For Christ wrought other miracles by words signifying the effect, whether enunciative or imperative, especially where we read that He spoke such words, as when He said: "Thy son lives"; "Thou art loosed from thine infirmity"; "Be thou made clean"; "Receive thy sight." Therefore, since here too He most plainly pronounced such words as are handed down to us by the three Evangelists and by the fourth, the Apostle Paul, it plainly follows that by those words Christ made of bread His Body and of wine His Blood.

§ 40. Moreover, it ought not to seem strange that neither the Evangelists among themselves, nor with the Apostle Paul, nor the same with the Canon which the Roman Church uses, nor even with the Greek liturgies, agree verbally in all respects in handing down the form of consecration. For besides the fact that it was not the purpose of the Evangelists to hand down fixed formulas which all ought to use in confecting the Mysteries, it was also enough for them, both for the truth of the evangelical narrative and for designating the form of consecration, to express what was sufficient for the substance (*substantia*) of this sacrament, or of its consecration, such as the words which we set at the beginning. Whence neither do we think that any one of them, as neither the Apostle Paul, omitted anything in these words which is necessary for the consecration either of the Body or of the Blood of the Lord.

§ 41. And indeed, for the consecration of the Body, not only those words which are put by all, namely, "This is my body," but also these, "This is my flesh," seem able to suffice; since the same thing is signified by each of the words, as is sufficiently gathered from John 6, notwithstanding that there, very probably, spiritual manducation is signified. For the signification of "flesh" and "blood" is not therefore changed.

§ 42. But as to the words of the consecration of the chalice, although some—among whom is St. Thomas (III, q. 78, a. 3)—think that all those which are read in the Canon of the Mass are necessary, nevertheless the opinion of St. Bonaventure, Scotus, Cajetan, and others is much more probable: that by the necessity of the sacrament these alone are necessary, "This is my Blood." This is proved in three ways. First, by a likeness: because for the consecration of the Body of Christ, besides the aforesaid words, nothing further is required, although it is gathered from Luke and Paul that Christ, moreover, added something—namely, "which is given" or "shall be delivered for you." Second, by this reason: The forms of the sacraments signify what they effect; but this effect which is the conversion of wine into the Blood of Christ is sufficiently signified by these words spoken in the person of Christ, just as by those the conversion of bread into the Body of Christ is sufficiently signified: therefore these words suffice to effect the sacrament. Nor indeed is it necessary that the effect of the remission of sins be signified by the form; for that effect belongs to the sacrament itself, not to the words by which the sacrament is confected, nor is it conferred precisely in the very consecration, but either in

the reception, or during the Sacrifice. Whence also there is no mention of that effect in the words of the consecration of the bread. Third, by authority and example: for Ambrose, book 4 (On the Sacraments, ch. 5), expressly treating of the words by which the consecration is accomplished, set down only these words of the consecration of the chalice: "This is my blood." Nor does the Master add more than this in the text treating this very point. The Greeks too in their liturgies of Basil and of Chrysostom, although they add some things as we do, nevertheless not all the things which are added in our Canon, but only those which are in Matthew—unless that from Luke they add that "for you." From which it is very manifest that those words "of the new and eternal covenant" and what follow do not pertain to the form of consecration.

§ 43. From which it is sufficiently manifest that those words, "new and eternal testament" and the things that follow, do not pertain to the necessity of consecration, but were thus added by Christ in continuous discourse for the sake of explanation and teaching, just as those were added, "which is given for you," as Luke has it; or "will be delivered," as Paul has it according to the Vulgate version; or "is broken," as the Greeks read in Paul; or "will be broken for many," as Ambrose reads—added, I say, for a reason of explanation and doctrine. Wherefore, whether it is said: "This is my blood," or "This is the chalice of my blood," or "This is the cup of my blood," or "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood"; or even if the other words that are with the Evangelists and in the Canon of the Mass are added—by all these ways we judge the consecration to be made valid. Yet it would not be without damnable presumption if someone should attempt either to omit or to change the words prescribed in the Canon. Concerning which Innocent III writes thus in the place cited above: "We believe that the form of the words, as it is found in the Canon, the Apostles themselves received from Christ, and their successors from the Apostles." So he.³²

§ 44. Finally, in this place we add that the power which the Florentine Decree attributes to the words of consecration is more probably to be understood with St. Bonaventure and Scotus and very many other Scholastics as uncreated and assisting, rather than created and inhering. Some of the reasons for this were set forth when we treated of the sacraments in general; others, and more fully, can be read in those authors themselves. On this matter see also Cajetan on article 4.³³

§ XII — The solution of the objections brought against the foregoing doctrine (Solutio eorum quae superiori doctrinae obiiciuntur)

§ 45. The arguments by which the foregoing doctrine about the form of the consecration (*forma consecrationis*) of this sacrament is attacked are partly of such a sort that by them it seems to be taught that Christ did not consecrate His Body and Blood with those words which we have said; partly they are put forward to prove this very thing concerning the priests instituted by Christ. The first objection is from the Gospel. For it is read first that the Lord, having taken bread, blessed and broke and gave to the disciples, saying: "Take and eat," before He said: "This is my body." Likewise, before He said "This is my blood," it is read that, having taken the chalice, He gave thanks and gave it to the disciples, saying: "Drink from it, all of you"—an order that appears most clearly in Matthew.³⁵

§ 46. But Mark also seems to have signified this much more, when he writes thus of the chalice: "And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is my blood," etc. Whence it can seem that the disciples drank of the chalice before these latter words were

spoken by Christ. But if this is so, the consecration was made not by these words, but either by other words or by none, by the mere command of His will.

§ 47. The second objection is that of certain Greeks, who contend that priests do not, by those Evangelical words uttered in the person of Christ—or at least not by those words alone—but further also by certain subsequent prayers, confect the Body and Blood of the Lord. For in the Mass of Basil and of Chrysostom, which the Greeks use, after the words of the Lord have been recited by the priest, there follow these prayers: "Bless, O Lord, the holy bread; bless, O Lord, the holy cup." Then the priest says in response: "Make this bread indeed the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ; changing them by thy Holy Spirit."

§ 48. The third: St. Augustine (on Ps. 10, Sermon 11; likewise in the tract *On the Words of the Lord*, ch. 11) says that the Eucharist was consecrated by the hands of Christ. By which words this seems to be hinted—that Christ, as soon as He took the bread and the chalice into His hands, changed them by the very, as it were, contact of His hands.³⁶

§ 49. The fourth: St. Jerome in the Epistle to Evagrius, speaking of priests, says: "At whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ are confected." And, under Jerome's name, in the tract *On the Seven Grades of the Church*, last chapter, it is said that visible things, sanctified by word and prayer, were made the body of Christ. And St. Augustine also, book 5 *Against the Donatists*, ch. 20, seems to ascribe the consecration of the Eucharist to the prayers of priests. For he says that God hears even a homicide priest praying over the Eucharist.³⁷

§ 50. The fifth: Odo, Bishop of Cambrai, who lived about 460 years ago, writing on the Canon of the Mass (dist. 3), thinks that Christ by that blessing which preceded the words "This is my body" changed the bread into His body; and he thinks similarly about the chalice, although he admits that the priests instituted by Him consecrate only by those words. Nor does Innocent III disapprove this opinion, book 4 *On the Mystery of the Sacred Altar*, ch. 6. The same opinion Jacob of Vitry, Cardinal of the Roman Church, contemporary with Innocent, judges to be rather reasonable, book *On the Affairs of the Western Church*, last chapter. To whose opinion subscribe Ambrosius Catharinus (in the Prologue to his *Commentary on Genesis*) and Francis Titelmann in his exposition on the Canon of the Mass.³⁸

§ 51. Some solve the first of these objections thus: they say that the Evangelists, in narrating, did not keep the order of the deed that was done; and they want the participle "saying" to be referred to the verb "he blessed," so that here the order would be: "He blessed, saying, 'This is my body,'" etc. For they think that "to bless" is the same as "to consecrate," and hence that Christ by that very blessing consecrated, that is, converted the bread into His body. But, on the contrary, those words "saying" and "he blessed" sufficiently show that they cannot be joined as belonging to the same time. The very term "blessing" also signifies not the consecration, but a prayer poured out over the symbols set forth and an invocation of divine beneficence that preceded the consecration, as is sufficiently understood from a mutual collation of the places of the three Evangelists and of Paul to the Corinthians, and as the Fathers of Trent expressly declare (Session 13, ch. 1), saying that after the blessing of the bread and wine Christ by express words testified that He was giving His Body and Blood to His disciples.³⁹ One must therefore say that Christ first broke the bread, then, while giving it, said: "This is my body." For at once He was both inviting the disciples to take and eat, and by those words

"Take and eat, This is my body" He was changing the bread into His body. But that place in Mark, "And they all drank of it," must be taken as said by anticipation, as is clear from Matthew.⁴⁰

§ 52. How the second objection is to be answered is clear from the Acts of the last session of the Council of Florence, where one reads thus: When the Latins were asking, concerning the transmutation of the bread, why the Greeks, after these words of the Lord, "Take and eat," and below, "Drink of this, all of you," etc.—by which words assuredly the sacrament is believed to be confected—also use this prayer: "And make this bread indeed the honorable body of thy Christ, and what is in this chalice the honorable blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit," the Greeks replied that they firmly believe the sacrament to be made by those words of the Lord; but, just as the Latins, after the sacrament has been confected, are wont to use this prayer: "Command that these things be borne by the hands of thy holy Angel to thine altar on high," so too the Greeks are accustomed to utter those words, to the effect that the most sacred Body and Blood of Christ may be "for the remission of our sins and for the salvation of our souls." Thus there. Others answer that prayers of this sort, whether they precede the consecration itself or follow it, must all be referred to one and the same instant of consecration. On this matter Cardinal Bessarion treats copiously in the book published expressly *On the Words of Consecration*, and Nicholas Cabasilas in the *Exposition of the Liturgy*, chapters 27, 28, and 29.⁴¹

§ 53. To the former passage of Augustine the reply is that the Eucharist was confected by Christ while He was holding it with His hands. But to the other passage of Augustine and to Jerome one must reply that by "prayers" among the ancients there are commonly understood all the mystical words which the priest utters in the celebration of the Mysteries, whether they have the form of prayer in the strict sense or not. For the forms of the other sacraments also are not rarely designated by the Fathers with the name of "prayers."

§ 54. Lastly, the reply is that the opinion proposed by those authors—Odo, Innocent, and Vitry—not so much by asserting as by opining, is in truth improbable, as we showed above both from Scripture and the Fathers, and also from the evidence of reason.

§ XIII — What meaning and what power the Words of Consecration have (Verba Consecrationis quem sensum & quam vim habeant)

§ 55. About the words by which the consecration both of the Body and of the Blood is effected, many questions can be raised that pertain to tracking down the true sense of those words—such as, whether that proposition: "This is my body," is an identical proposition (*propositio identica*), or rather consists of diverse extremes; and what the pronoun "this" demonstrates, and what the substantive verb "is" signifies, and when that proposition has truth. And what is signified by the name of "body," and other such things. And likewise about the words of the consecration of the Blood. In order that all these may come to light, and that an understanding of these true words may be grasped, it must be noted that simple true enunciations (*enunciationes simplices verae*), in which one thing is enunciated of another through the copula (*copula*) "is," are twofold in kind. For most such enunciations are uttered with the intention of asserting that which is, or so stands as is signified at the very time of the utterance, as when I say: it is day; Paul is speaking; a stone is a body; what flows from a wound is blood. Others, however, are uttered not with the intention of asserting that which is, or so stands as is signified at the very beginning of the utterance, or meanwhile while they are uttered; but with the intention of making that which is signified by such an enunciation, and which only then will be, or

will so stand as it is signified, when the enunciation shall have been brought to completion. For example, if someone should point with his finger to his own house and say to another, "This is your house," it is not with the intention of asserting what is not, but of making that to be which he says—namely, that the house which is now his become that other's. In the same sense in jurists' formulas a transfer of ownership of some thing to another is sometimes understood to be made. Thus one who manumits his slave says: "You are free." Thus a man and woman can reciprocally say with effect: "You are my wife," "You are my husband." Thus too Christ in the Gospel said: "Thy son liveth";⁴³ and elsewhere: "Thy sins are forgiven thee"; and again: "Behold thy son," and, "Behold thy mother." Not indeed did Christ wish by such words to enunciate the truth of a matter already so standing as it is signified, but he wished by enunciating to effect that which the words signify.

§ 56. In the same way, if Christ, wishing to make wine out of water, had said: "This is wine"; and if he had wished to make bread out of a stone and had said: "This is bread," those propositions would not have been enunciative of that which already beforehand was, but rather operative enunciations (*enunciationes operatoriae*) of that which, at the end of the said propositions, would be, signifying that same thing. The sense, namely, would be: That which I make out of this water is wine; and that which I make out of this stone is bread. A certain similar judgment is to be made about the imperative discourse, which, although properly it does not have truth or falsity, nevertheless brings in obligation; but that obligation does not arise save when the utterance of the commander has been completed.

§ 57. These things being so, it is not difficult to judge how these words of Christ, "This is my body," are to be taken. For by them Christ does not intend to assert that the bread which he held in his hands is his body—a claim which contains manifest falsehood—but he intends, as he often does otherwise, to effect something by his speech, namely, to make from bread his Body, and to signify that by an operative enunciation. Wherefore blessed Ambrose in book 4 (*De Sacramentis*, ch. 4) affirms that this discourse of Christ is operative, just as operative was the discourse by which in the beginning he made all things.⁴⁴

§ 58. Accordingly the pronoun "this" is not to be referred to the bread which existed before the utterance of the words and even while the utterance itself was in progress, but to the Body of Christ which by those words is made from bread, so that the sense is: "This which from this bread I intend to make and do make is my Body."

§ 59. Now, in order that the distinction of enunciations said above may be more fully understood, it must be noted—as St. Thomas has left written weightily and acutely (III, q. 78, a. 5)—that since this discourse of Christ has the factive power of the conversion of bread into the Body of Christ, therefore it is compared to other locutions which have power, as the conception in the act of the practical intellect is compared, which is factive of a thing, to the conception of our speculative intellect, which, received from things, is only significative of them; for voices are signs of concepts. Wherefore, just as the conception of the practical intellect does not presuppose a thing as already made, but makes it, so the truth of the words of Christ does not presuppose that which is signified, as other locutions do, but effects it.⁴⁵ Cajetan also noted about this place, that as in the eternal Word, the Son, there is truth and omnipotence, so in the temporal and transitory word uttered from his mouth there is truth and efficacy; and that such a word befits the sacraments of the new law, in which that which is said is made, or is in some way or other signified. The Lord could indeed have used imperative discourse for effecting the said conversion, by saying: "Let this be my body," just as at the beginning of the world he is read to have said: "Let there be light," and, "Let there be a firmament"; and as in the Gospel he said: "I will; be thou made clean"; "Arise, and walk"; "Lazarus, come forth." But he preferred the indicative

and enunciative discourse, both because this discourse more aptly cohered with the words preceding, and also so that by the lay people there would be no doubt of any interval of time being interposed, but that at once, with the utterance of the word and its completion, there would be that which is signified. For it would not be apt to say: "Take and eat, for let this become my body," as it is said: "Take and eat, this is my body." For there too, when the discourse was finished, it could be doubted whether what the word commands to be done were already done or still future; but here that doubt has no place.⁴⁶

§ 60. That this discourse of Christ is operative we now for the present suppose as true. Its truth, however, is partly evident from the things said above, where it was shown, by the authority of Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others, that by these words of Christ the consecration is made; partly it will be evident from those things which below will be said about the conversion which is effected in the sacrament. Furthermore, from the statement already given it is plain what was sought about the pronoun. For it does not point out the bread, but that singular thing to which what is predicated truly belongs by the proposition. But that thing is the Body of Christ. Nor on that account is this proposition, "This is my body," an identical one. For we call an identical proposition not that in which the attribute and the subject are taken for the same singular thing—even though, unless both attribute and subject were taken for the same singular, it could not be true—but that in which the same thing is enunciated of itself by the same word or by another synonymous, as "man is man," "a sword is a blade." This enunciation therefore, "this is my body," although it cannot be true unless the attribute and the subject are taken for the same singular thing, nevertheless ought not to be called identical. For the sense is not, "my body is my body"; but it is the enunciation of a common attribute of a singular subject, just as this: "this is my book." For although Christ had one body only, nevertheless even if he had had ten bodies, of each of them he could have said: "this is my body." The sense therefore of such a proposition is to be assigned such as belongs to any other propositions of a like form—namely, that this thing is such, that is, that to this singular thing truly belongs that which is signified by the attribute; with this difference, however, remaining, that an operative proposition does not require truth save at the last instant of the utterance, to which instant the whole proposition is referred. This is not so in any other propositions whatsoever, although in some others it may obtain.

§ 61. Moreover, from what has been said it is evident that the verb in this proposition retains its proper and customary signification, by which indeed it signifies substantiality—that is, that one thing simply and truly belongs to another. In this signification it has always been taken by the ancients in this discourse of Christ.

§ 62. However, in this place a certain opinion of Catholics must be subjoined, who think that in these words, "this is my body," the pronoun "this" demonstrates the bread; which they wish to be proper to operative propositions, namely, that the subject signify the term from which there is a transmutation. But when it is asked of them how such a proposition is true, since the subject repugns the predicate, they answer in conformity that the copula "is" must somehow be amplified, so that the sense be: this bread—that is, the thing which, while I am speaking and pointing out, is bread—at the term of the utterance is my body. According to these, not only would it be said truly here, "This thing, or this, is my body," but it would also be said truly: "This bread is my body"; and when converting water into wine he would truly say: "This water is wine," that is, that which at the term of the utterance will be wine. Likewise he could say truly in those propositions: "The blind see, the lame walk," especially if by those propositions the Lord had willed to do

those miracles. Likewise also someone giving to another his garment would truly say: "This my garment is yours."

§ 63. Whether these things are rightly accommodated to the present discourse of the Lord, and whether such an exposition of the Lord's words involves any error or absurdity—since there does not remain there the same subject, of which now bread, now body, may be verified; or at least that it should receive successively the form of each—let the studious weigh. Certainly the former exposition which we have given, as it is handed down by almost all Catholic Doctors, is so much the farther removed from every peril of error.

§ 64. It remains to ask what is signified by the name "body" in the words of consecration. Some, among whom is Titelmann in his writing on the Canon of the Mass, think that "body" is taken for the whole man and not only for one part of man, because under the species of bread the whole Christ, not flesh without soul, ought to be firmly held to be present. But the error of these is proved from the fact that "body" is here manifestly distinguished from "blood"; and that in the same way as here "body" and "blood" are named distinctly, so also in John 6 "flesh" and "blood" were promised distinctly—the former to be eaten, the latter to be drunk.⁴⁷ Likewise, if "body" signifies the whole man, then by those words no consecration could have been made in the triduum of Christ's death, because then Christ was not man. Add that this form of words, according to that acceptance of "body," would not be fitting for representing the Passion of Christ, in memory of which, however, this sacrament was instituted. Wherefore there is no doubt that "body" in this place signifies the other substantial part of man, as distinguished from the soul, and also from the blood; which will be shown most of all by the authority of the Council of Trent (Session 13, ch. 3), where it is said that the soul and the blood are under the species of bread only by the force of that natural connection and concomitance by which the parts of the Lord Christ are coupled among themselves.⁴⁸

§ XIV — That the words of Christ are to be taken not in a figurative but in a proper sense (Christi verba non figurato sed proprio sensu esse accipienda)

§ 65. Those who deny the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and therefore do not assent to the proper and open sense of the words of Christ by which He said: "Hoc est corpus meum" and "Hic est sanguis meus"—have twisted these words to various, foreign, improper, and figurative senses, by which above all they have tried to show that by those words and by the institution of this sacrament Christ left not His true body and blood, but a sign or figure of His body and blood; so that most truly of this sort of men St. Augustine said in book 3 of *De doctrina christiana*, ch. 10: those whose mind has been occupied by the opinion of some error think that whatever Scripture has asserted otherwise is to be taken figuratively.⁵⁰ For thus Origen, by allegorical interpretations, in many places removed the true sense of Scripture. Therefore, so that we may say nothing of the other, and those more absurd, interpretations of the words of Christ, there are two upon which the adversaries especially insist: one by which they interpret the verb "est" as "signifies"; the other by which they wish "body" to be put for "figure of the body." Before we refute their arguments, it must be shown how improperly they act who try by forced interpretations to obscure—indeed to pervert—these most manifest words of Christ, and how the words themselves do not admit interpretations of that sort.

§ 66. And first, of a truth it is very much worthy of consideration that Christ left this sacrament to the faithful as after the manner of a testament, when He was about to depart out of this world to the Father. But the words of a testament, lest afterwards suits arise from them, ought to be open and plain; and that is what

men in human affairs are wont to take the utmost care to effect. How much more, then, is it to be thought that Christ, in the institution of this sacrament as of His testament, wished by a proper, plain, and open speech to declare to His whole Church His last will. Second, there was no cause why Christ, who, just as He could not lie, so neither could He deceive, should speak so obscurely and perplexedly of a matter serious and still unknown to the Apostles, when, indeed, without any trope He could most easily have explained the matter by saying: "This is a sign of my body," as He had said of circumcision (Gen. 17) that it was "a sign of the covenant" between Himself and the posterity of Abraham.⁵¹ Third, since the Holy Spirit, through three Evangelists and then through a fourth witness, the Apostle Paul, expressly affirms that Christ said, "Hoc est corpus meum," if there had been any impropriety in those words by which the faithful might be led into error, at least one of those would have explained that impropriety and obscurity, since it was fitting for them to hold the truth concerning that matter.

§ 67. Fourth, Christ instituted this Mystery not before the crowds, to whom He was wont to speak in figures and parables, but before the Apostles alone, to whom He was accustomed separately to explain what He had elsewhere spoken obscurely, and to whom He says (Matt. 13): "To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to the rest it has not been given."⁵² Fifth, if there had been any obscurity in the words of Christ, the Apostles would straightway have asked what that parable or figure of speech might mean, as they did elsewhere not once, as St. John Chrysostom notes (Homily 83 on John), and St. Cyril, book 3 on John.⁵³ Sixth, for this very reason especially Christ ought to have used plain and proper speech, and not obscure and figurative, lest, on the occasion of His words, the whole Church should fall into horrendous idolatry, and should persist in it for so many ages. Now to think and to say this of her—as the heretics do—is an intolerable blasphemy against the spouse of Christ and therefore against Christ her spouse.

§ 68. Seventh, if Christ had wished to signify this which Catholics believe that He signified—namely, that He gives to us His true and natural body for food—He could not have done it by other words plainer according to the manner of men than by the very ones which He has now used. If therefore by those words He did not institute the real presence of His body, He could by no other words—even had He wished it most greatly—have instituted it. Eighth, just as the heavenly Father testified openly and without figure concerning Jesus the man, saying: "Hic est Filius meus dilectus"; and from the same revelation Peter confessed this very thing; and from both testimonies the whole Church, instructed thereby, simply and plainly, without trope or other impropriety of speech, confesses this to be true, namely that Jesus is the Son of God: so Christ, of that which in the last supper He gave to the disciples to be eaten and drunk, although it had another appearance, openly said: "Hoc est corpus meum; hic est sanguis meus." From which testimony of Christ, understood simply as the words sound, the whole Church has always believed that Christ handed to the Apostles His true and natural body and blood, and that He left them for the faithful thereafter as food and drink. Ninth, these words of Christ, "Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti," plainly answer to those words of Moses (Exod. 24): "Hic est sanguis testamenti quod mandavit ad vos Deus."⁵⁴ Since therefore those words of Moses have a proper and open sense, the same must be thought also of the words of Christ, which are entirely similar, and are expressed, as is evident, in a certain imitation of those.

§ 69. Tenth, the words of Christ, taken in their proper sense, contain nothing impossible, nothing absurd, but they signify that an inestimable treasure was left by the bridegroom Christ to His spouse the Church; nor is there any other Scripture to which they even apparently are opposed; therefore they are not to be twisted to an improper sense. Eleventh, the circumstances of the deed performed—the preparation going before, the

figures preconfigured, the most ardent desire of accomplishing this Mystery declared in those words: "With desire I have desired," the separate benediction of each element, and the most careful narration of the three Evangelists and of Paul—all these sufficiently argue that Christ did a matter of the greatest moment; and therefore that He ought not, by any obscurity of speech which would be an offense for the whole Church, to have shut out the understanding of a matter so necessary. Twelfth, when Christ had said "Hoc est corpus meum" and "Hic est sanguis meus," He not only did not add any words by which He might signify that He spoke improperly, but He straightway subjoined those which altogether require the proper sense of the preceding words, namely these: "which shall be delivered for you," and "which shall be shed for you." Which words in no way suit a metonymical or figurative body of Christ, but only His proper and natural body: namely that very body which, born of the Virgin and suspended on the cross, underwent death; and to His true blood, poured from that body.

§ 70. Thirteenth, you will scarcely ever find in the whole of Scripture the verb "est" set for "signifies," since not even among the Latins has it that signification. So far is it from being the case that, in these words, in which the institution of a sacrament of the greatest moment and forever enduring is contained, we should imagine such a thing. Fourteenth, if in these words "Hic est calix sanguinis mei" "est" is put for "signifies," the sense will be: "This wine signifies the chalice of my blood." But this sense does not even fit the adversaries, who want not "the chalice of blood" but "blood" to be represented by the wine which is in the chalice. Fifteenth, the metonymy by which they want "body" to be put for "figure of the body" does not fit this discourse. First, because indeed metonymically we put the sign for the thing signified—e.g., "the gown" for "peace," "arms" for "war," as in the sentence "let arms yield to the gown"; but we are not wont to say that the gown "is" peace, that arms "are" war—namely, by enunciating the thing signified of the sign—indeed such speech would be judged inept. Wherefore, even if it be granted that bread signifies the body of Christ, and is put somewhere for the body, still it will not be aptly said "the bread," or "this bread, is the body of Christ." Then, this kind of metonymy has its place when the sign is expressed and the thing signified is understood, as is evident from the example already given. But in this proposition, "Hic panis est corpus meum," both are named. Finally, in the metonymy of the sign the sign and the thing signified do not reciprocate; that is, not in such wise that, as the sign is put for the thing signified, so in turn the thing signified should take the place of the sign. For even if we use "arms" for "war," and "the gown" for "peace," yet no one conversely would say "war" for "arms," "peace" for "the gown." But in the words of Christ the adversaries want not the sign for the thing signified—that is, not bread for the body—but the thing signified for the sign—that is, the body for bread—to be put as if the sign of the body. To this there can be added the plain testimonies of the Fathers who expressly exclude the figurative sense and affirm that the words of Christ are to be taken in the proper sense. But let these be seen below (Distinctio 10), and there the words of Damascene and of the second Council of Nicaea.⁵⁵

§ XV — Reply to the arguments of the heretics (Responsio ad argumenta haereticorum)

§ 71. We must now reply to the arguments by which the heretics try to establish their figurative interpretation. First and chiefly there is wont to be objected by them that saying of the Apostle (1 Cor. 10): "Petra erat Christus," to which they want this to be the sense: that rock which was struck by Moses at Horeb signified Christ, or was a sign and figure of Christ; and from that they think it shown that these words of Christ also, "Hoc est corpus meum," ought to be rendered with a similar sense. Then they adduce other places

of Scripture in which a sign bears the name of the thing signified, as when the lamb is called phase—that is, "passage" (Exod. 12)—and elsewhere; circumcision "covenant" (Gen. 17); the waters "peoples" (Rev. 17); the dove "the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 3); sacrifices "expiations of sins" (Lev. 4 and 17); the ark "of the testimony" "God," or "the presence of God" (Exod. 32); "blood" "soul" (Deut. 12).⁵⁷ Third: "It is perpetual," says Calvin, "in Scripture, whenever it is a question of sacraments, that the sign is put for the thing signified." And this also seems to be proved by the authority of St. Augustine, who in book 3 against Maximinus, ch. 22, says that in sacraments one always attends not to what they are, but to what they show.⁵⁸ Fourth: in ordinary speech signs are called by the names of the things signified—just as a picture of a lion is called "a lion," and a statue of Caesar "Caesar," and an image of St. Antony "St. Antony." Nay more, when each of these is pointed at with the finger we say: "Hic est leo; hic est Caesar; hic est S. Antonius." Fifth: Tertullian, book 4 against Marcion, ch. 40, seems to render this sense of the Lord's words, when he thus speaks of Him: "Having taken bread, He distributed it to the disciples; He made it His body, by saying, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' that is, 'figura corporis mei'." Whence the same man, in the book *De anima*, ch. 7, says that Christ consecrated wine in memory of His blood.⁵⁹ Sixth: St. Augustine, in the book *Contra Adimantum*, ch. 12, says: "The Lord did not hesitate to say, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' when He gave the sign of His body." In this argument the Sacramentarians marvelously exult.⁶⁰ Seventh: the same, Epistle 23(a) to Boniface: after he had shown that certain signs are called by the names of the things signified, he subjoined: "If sacraments did not have a certain likeness to the things of which they are sacraments, they would by no means be sacraments. From this likeness of the things, therefore, they for the most part also receive the names of the things. Thus, according to a certain mode, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ; the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ; so also the sacrament of faith is faith." [^61] Eighth: again the same Augustine, book 3 of *De doctrina christiana*, ch. 16: "If Scripture seems to command something shameful or a crime, or to forbid usefulness or beneficence, it is a figurative expression." And, illustrating the matter by an example: "'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you will not have life in you' seems to command a crime or a shameful thing; it is a figure, therefore, commanding that there be communion with the passion of the Lord, and that it be sweetly and profitably laid up in memory that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us."⁶¹ Ninth, again Augustine, on Ps. 3, testifies that the Lord in the supper commended the figure of His body and blood; and he speaks similarly in book 20 against Faustus, ch. 21, and Tractate 45 on John—where in the former place he says that in the passion of Christ His flesh and blood were given in very truth, but after the ascension they are celebrated in memory by the sacrament; in the latter, that the Eucharist is Christ just as the rock is Christ. Finally, other Fathers are brought forward, from time to time bearing witness that the Eucharist is a sign or symbol or figure or image of Christ—such as St. Ambrose, book 4 *De sacramentis*, ch. 5; book 1 *De officiis*, ch. 43; *De initiandis*, ch. 9; and on Ps. 30; and in that Commentary ascribed to him on 1 Cor. 11; likewise St. Basil (in the Liturgy), who calls them the antitypes of the body and blood of the Lord, which also is read in Clement, book 5 of the Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 16; and Epiphanius in the seventh Council. To all these things we reply thus in order.

§ 72. To the place of the Apostle, "Petra erat Christus," there is a manifold reply ready to hand. First, it does not follow that, if perchance somewhere in the whole of Scripture the verb "est" can be found put for "signifies," therefore immediately it must also be so taken in this place—or even can be so taken. Otherwise, by this license of interpreting we would undermine the very foundations of our faith—so that, for example, it would be permitted to interpret that which was said by the voice descending from heaven from the Father, "Hic est Filius meus," in this way: "Hic repraesentat Filium meum," as an adoptive son represents a natural

one. Then, that expression of Paul is not similar to this one about which we are now dealing. For here it is not said, "Panis est corpus meum," but demonstratively, "Hoc est corpus meum." Now a demonstration is applied so that the one to whom the demonstration is made may know some singular thing that was unknown; nor can a thing proposed be more clearly made known to someone than if it be said: "this is such." But if the context of the Apostle be more carefully weighed, it will be evident that there is not, in those words of Paul, the trope which the adversaries want—namely that "est" should be taken for "signifies," or that "Christ" should be taken for "the figure of Christ"—but that, simply, that rock of which the Apostle speaks is to be understood to be Christ. For immediately before it is said: "And they were drinking from the spiritual rock that followed them." Where by "spiritual" is to be understood not that the rock was spiritual by nature, but that a spiritual grace, not a natural one, was signified and conferred by it; nor was that rock following the people in the desert by local motion—for it remained unmoved—but Christ Himself is to be understood, who, as God, accompanied that people in the desert, by whose benefit waters gushed forth for the people from the rock.

§ 73. Moreover, it can not improbably be said that, in the said sentence of the Apostle, not "the rock" but "Christ" is the subject of the enunciation—that thus it was said by Paul: "Christ was the rock," just as (Acts 4) it was said of Christ by Peter: "Hic est lapis qui reprobatus est a vobis aedificantibus."⁶² Thus also John, pointing out Christ, says: "Ecce agnus Dei," as if he were saying: "This is the lamb"; and Christ of Himself: "Hic est panis de caelo descendens"; and, "Ego sum panis vitae"; and elsewhere: "Ego sum vitis and you the branches"; and, "Ego sum ostium"; and, "Ego sum via"; and to the disciples, "Vos estis sal terrae"; and many other things of this kind—in which expressions it is not that the thing signified is said of the sign, or is put for the sign, but that, to designate a certain property of the subject, a word taken metaphorically is attributed to the subject. Nor will it be permitted immediately in these to invert the speech, so that, in particular things demonstrated, we should say, "this lamb is Christ," or "this door is Christ," as it was said, "Hoc est corpus meum"; for neither do we read that Moses, with that rock demonstrated, said: "Haec petra est Christus." But that in the Apostle's words "petra," on the side of the attribute, is most correctly construed, can be understood from those places where the construction is similar: "I believe the Son of God to be Jesus" (Acts 8); and again, "showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ"; and especially from that (John 1): "Et Deus erat Verbum," where it is manifest that "Deus" has the place of the attribute and "Verbum" of the subject.⁶³ Now that by the "spiritual rock" the Apostle means Christ Himself, St. John Chrysostom and St. Ambrose are authorities in their Commentaries, and St. Augustine, book 12 against Faustus, ch. 26, and Tractate 26 on John. See also our Commentary.⁶⁴

§ 74. To the examples of Scripture adduced in the second place we reply that none of them is like the proposed example; because in none of them is there a demonstration of some singular thing. Then, the paschal lamb was called pasch not so much by a figure as by a proper name peculiarly impressed upon it, as that most frequent appellation of it in the Scriptures sufficiently shows. And the reason or etymology of the name was drawn from this, that it was eaten in memory of the passage of the Lord. He calls circumcision the "sign of the covenant" (Gen. 17). But those words, "Hoc est pactum meum," are not said of circumcision, but of the agreement which God entered into with the seed of Abraham, whose sign, namely of that agreement or pact, He wished circumcision to be. Further, "the waters are peoples," just as "the rock [is] Christ": that is, the "waters" are to be understood "spiritual"; Scripture does not call the dove the Holy Spirit, but testifies that the Holy Spirit, "as a dove," that is, "in the appearance of a dove," descended upon Christ. Nor does the Apostle call the two sons of Abraham "the two testaments," but allegorically interprets their two births as "the two

testaments." Nor are sacrifices anywhere called "expiations," but are said to be offered "for expiation," or "unto expiation," or "to expiate." Neither do we read that the ark, although it signified the presence of God, was called "God," unless perhaps by the Philistines, who did not think rightly of God, when, the ark having been brought to the army of the Israelites, being afraid, they said: "Deus venit in castra" (1 Kgs 4).⁶⁵ Finally, neither is "blood" said to "be the soul," but "for the soul"; and conversely the soul is said to "be in the blood": because, namely, the life of the animal so consists in the blood that, the blood being poured out, it perishes (Deut. 12). What Calvin says in the third place—that this is perpetual—is false. For although water or external washing is rightly said to signify internal purification, nevertheless Scripture does not so speak as we are wont to speak: "external water or washing of the body is the internal purification of the soul"; and so in other things. But Augustine does not mean in that place that the sacraments are called by the names of the things signified; rather he says that in sacraments one always attends to what they signify, not always, however, to what they are; not denying, meanwhile, that sometimes what they are can be attended to in them. To the fourth we reply that those expressions have another character. For in them a mark of analogy between the sign and the thing signified is manifest, not so in the present case. For in the bread set on the table the very image of the body of Christ does not shine forth, from which analogy might be straightway understood, according to which Christ might have said: "Hoc est corpus meum"—as in the picture or the statue the image of the thing shines forth, whence the analogy is straightway understood, according to which it is said to be the "likeness" of this or that one. Nor had Christ, before these words, admonished the Apostles that, as often as they saw bread set on the table, they should think of His body and should look upon Him as if present to sight; wherefore, those hearing these words of Christ, "Hoc est corpus meum," would not straightway have thought that He wished to signify nothing other than that the bread which He held in His hands is a sign and memorial of His body.

§ 75. As to Tertullian, we reply first that, both from that very place and from others which will be cited below, it is clearly evident that he did not wish what those words of his at first sight seem to bear. But how they are to be taken is not agreed among all: most take them thus—that Tertullian does not say that the symbol of bread is only the figure of the body, but interprets "body" in this sense, "the figure of the body," because even the true body of Christ and His blood, as they subsist in this sacrament under the symbols of bread and wine, are a figure of the body and blood of Christ as these were offered on the altar of the Cross. And they say that Tertullian used this exposition so that from it, against Marcion, he might gather that Christ did not have a phantastic body but a true one. Whence he straightway subjoins: "It would not have been a figure unless His body had been a reality; for a void thing, which is a phantasm, could not receive a figure." Others, considering more accurately both the place and the scope of Tertullian, have discovered that he wished something far different. For, by saying "that is, the figure of my body," he did not wish to explain a trope that lies in the words "corpus meum," but he referred that his explanation to the pronoun "hoc," so that the sense should be: "this, that is, the figure of my body."⁶⁶

§ 76. The sense of Tertullian is this: when Christ, after taking bread, said, "Hoc est corpus meum," He made this—that is, the bread which in the Old Testament had been the figure of His body—now His body, namely by fulfilling the ancient figure. The aim of the Author shows this sense. For in that book his set purpose is to show against Marcion the concord of the Old and New Testament, from the fact that the figures of the Old Testament are fulfilled by the truth of the New Testament. Whence also, in the words that follow there, "Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus," the distinction of the times must be noted; for he does not say, "figura non esset," but "non fuisset," namely looking to the time of the Old Testament, when the bread was only a figure of Christ's body, and was not being changed into Christ's body. And he adds certain

like things about the blood; rehearsing the ancient figures, he at length concludes: "Ita et nunc in vino sanguinem suum consecravimus, qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuravit." From which it is clear that Tertullian does not call the very mysteries of the Eucharist figures, but affirms to be figures of these those things which were in the Old Testament.⁶⁷

§ 77. The other passage of Tertullian proves nothing. For by the "memorial" he does not exclude the thing itself, as will presently be explained more fully. Whence also the same Tertullian, who in one place says that Christ consecrated the wine in memory of His blood, elsewhere says that He consecrated His blood in the wine.⁶⁸

§ 78. Further, for the understanding of the passages alleged from St. Augustine and other Fathers, one must know that it is by no means repugnant that the same thing be both sign and thing signified; for it can happen that the same thing signs or represents itself, and thus be a figure of itself, insofar as it is under one species and another. Therefore the sacrament of the Eucharist is indeed sometimes called by the Ancients a sign and figure of the Body of Christ, but of such sort as is also the very thing itself signed and figured. For the Body of Christ, truly existing in the Eucharist, yet hidden under an alien species, is a sign of itself when once upon a time it conversed in this world under its proper species, suffered on the cross, and now stands before the Father in heaven. Therefore, whenever the Ancients say that this sacrament is a sign and figure of the Body of Christ, they do not deny that the true body of Christ is there, but they understand that it is not there under its proper species, in the way it appeared when He dwelt upon earth, and in the way He is now beheld in heaven. Most of all for this reason is the Body of Christ called a sign, because it sets before our eyes the Body of Christ under that quality in which it was in the passion and on the cross, as is sufficiently understood from the words of institution and from the very distinction of the symbols. That this is St. Augustine's mind is clear from the words which, under the title "Sentences of Prosper," are cited by Gratian: "Corpus Christi," he says, "and truth it is and figure; truth while the Body of Christ and the Blood, by the power of the Spirit in His word, are effected from the substance of bread and wine; figure, however, what is perceived outwardly." And other things in the same place, in the chapter "Hoc est."⁶⁹ Tertullian likewise, in book 5 against Marcion, in the next-to-last chapter, shows that nothing hinders the same thing from being both truth and figure, since Christ is said to be "in the form of God" and is called "the image of the invisible God," who nevertheless is true God; and the same, "made in the likeness of men" and "found in habit, or figure, as a man," was nonetheless true man. Therefore those who say, "The Eucharist is a sign of the Lord's Body; therefore it is not the Lord's body," argue after the fashion: "He was found 'in habit' or figure as a man; therefore He was not true man."⁷⁰

§ 79. To the first passage of Augustine, therefore, the reply is now evident. For he wishes the Eucharist to be a sign of the Body of Christ in the way in which, in an animal, blood is said to be a sign of the soul—that is, not a bare sign, but one which also contains the very thing signified. Nor does Augustine say that the sense of this sentence, "Hoc est corpus meum," is "id est, hoc est signum corporis mei"; but he says that that very thing which is the body of Christ is a sign of His body, as though he were saying: "The Lord did not hesitate to say, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' although He was giving the sign of His body." For it is not incompatible that what He gave should have been His body and a sign of the body.

§ 80. A reply is also clear to the second passage of Augustine. For the sacrament of the Body of Christ, insofar as it has the species of bread, is a sign of the Body of Christ having its proper species, but it has this peculiarity, that it also contains the thing signified. Which, although Augustine does not express in that place, neither does he deny it. Elsewhere, indeed, he very expressly affirms it.⁷¹

§ 81. To the third passage from Augustine it is answered that it would be a crime or atrocity if it were understood that the flesh of Christ is to be eaten and His blood to be drunk in their proper species, so that His flesh be torn and His blood poured out, as are the flesh and blood of beasts when they are slain—as Augustine both in that same place and in writing on John 6 and elsewhere sets forth his mind. For that he does not judge this simply to be absurd and atrocious, namely if it be understood in that way in which the Faithful understand it, is shown from another passage of his. For in book 2 against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, ch. 9: "Christ Jesus," he says, "giving His flesh to be eaten and His blood to be drunk, we receive with faithful heart and mouth, although it seems more horrible to eat human flesh than to kill, and to drink human blood than to shed."⁷² Moreover, it must be noted that when Christ said those words, "Nisi manducaveritis," and so forth, He had not yet instituted the Sacrament of His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine; and therefore those words, taken properly, seemed to signify a crime or atrocity. But at the Last Supper, where under the species of bread and wine Christ instituted that His body and blood be received, He did not seem to be enjoining an atrocity by words taken properly, because under those species He...

-
1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 74, a. 1.
 2. Bede, In 1 Corinthians 10 (on "We many are one body"), citing St. Augustine.
 3. Pope Alexander I, *Epistola ad omnes Orthodoxos*; Third Council of Carthage, canon 24; Council of Tribur, canon 19; Council of Florence, Decree for the Union of the Greeks and of the Armenians. See also Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, cap. Non oportet; cap. In sacramento; Decretals, *De summa Trinitate*, cap. Firmiter; *De celebratione Missarum*, cap. Cum Marthae.
 4. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Cajetan, Commentary on ST III, q. 74 (dissent noted).
 5. Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*; Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* XVII, ch. 3.
 6. Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*; Columella, *De re rustica*.
 7. Domingo de Soto, In IV Sent., Dist. 19; Paludanus [Peter of Palude], testimony as in source.
 8. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 74, a. 3; Cajetan, Commentary on ST III, q. 74.
 9. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 74, a. 4.
 10. Pope Leo IX, *Epistola* [adversus praesumptiones Michaelis Constantinopolitani Patriarchae] [abbreviation as in source].
 11. Council of Florence, letters of union of the Greeks with the Latins, drawn up and approved by decree of the Council.
 12. St. Gregory (the Great), *Registrum* (Register), as cited by St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 74, a. 4.
 13. St. Gregory (the Great), *Homilies on the Gospels*, hom. 22.
 14. St. Thomas, "as above," and St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 46, a. 9 [abbreviation "ubi sup." as in source].
 15. Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* IV, ch. 2; St. Thomas, probably referring to *Summa theologiae* III, q. 74 (as cited above).
 16. St. John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 85; Origen, *passim*; St. Augustine, Ep. 86 to Casulanus; St. Jerome, Comment. on Matt. 26; the Venerable Bede, *De natura rerum* ch. 63; Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* IV, chs. 2, 4; Pope Leo IX, Letter to Michael, Patriarch of Constantinople; St. Anselm, *De fermentato et azymo*; Gennadius Scholarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, *Defensio Synodi Florentinae* ch. 2.
 17. Rabanus Maurus, on Matt. 26.
 18. Bernard Lamy of the Oratory, esp. *Harmonia Evangelica* chs. 17–18; cf. Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont, "Vie de Jésus-Christ," *Mémoire*, Note 26.
 19. St. Augustine, *In Ioannem* Tract. 120.

20. J. C., Presbyter, Historical Treatise On the Jewish Passover, with a special Disputation On the Rites observed by the Jews in making the Passover, set at the beginning of that book; Photius, *Bibliotheca*, on two Anonymous Greeks (one of whom some take to be John Philoponus).
21. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 74, aa. 1, 5.
22. Matt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18. Council of Carthage III, canon 24.
23. Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 2; Fourth Lateran Council, ch. 1, "Firmiter de summa Trinitate et fide catholica" [abbreviation "titulo De Summa Trinitate fide Catholica Cap. Firmiter" as in source].
24. St. Cyprian, Ep. to Caecilius (book 2, ep. 3); St. Augustine, De haeresibus.
25. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 83 in Matt.
26. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians: on mixing a very little water into the wine before consecration; Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 7; Session 22, canon 9.
27. Pope Alexander I, Epistle 1; Pope Julius I, in Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 2; St. Cyprian, book 2, ep. 3; Council of Carthage III, canon 24; Council of Braga III, ch. 1; Council of Tribur, canon 19; St. Bernard, Ep. 69; Innocent III, De sacro altaris mysterio IV, ch. 32; Decretals, De celebratione Missarum, ch. Cum Marthae; ch. In quadam.
28. John 19:34; St. Augustine, In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus 120; the phrase cited: "Aqua salutare temperat poculum." The attribution "Alexander Papa quintus a Petro" designates Pope Alexander I.
29. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 78, aa. 1–3.
30. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem IV; Pope Alexander I, first Decretal Epistle; St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 14; Innocent III, Decretals, De celebratione Missarum, ch. Cum Marthae; Peter Lombard, Sentences, book IV, dist. 8.
31. Council of Florence, last session (union with the Greeks), and Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 13, chs. 1 and 7.
32. Innocent III, Decretals, De celebratione Missarum, ch. Cum Marthae; ch. In quadam.
33. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians (on the form and efficacy of the consecratory words); St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., dist. 8; Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 8; Cajetan, Commentary on St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 78, a. 4.
34. St. Thomas, locis supra citatis [abbreviation as in source].
35. Cf. Matt. 26; Mk. 14.
36. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos 10, serm. 11; idem, De verbis Domini, ch. 11.
37. St. Jerome, Epistle to Evagrius; Pseudo-Jerome, Tractatus De septem gradibus ecclesiae, last chapter; St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas, V, ch. 20.
38. Odo of Cambrai, In Canonem Missae, dist. 3; Innocent III, De sacro altaris mysterio, IV, ch. 6; James of Vitry, De rebus occidentalis Ecclesiae, last chapter; Ambrosius Catharinus, Prologue to the Commentary on Genesis; Francis Titelmann, Exposition on the Canon of the Mass.
39. 1 Cor. 11; Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 1.
40. Mk. 14; Matt. 26.
41. Council of Florence, last session (Acts); Bessarion, De verbis consecrationis; Nicholas Cabasilas, Expositio liturgiae, chs. 27–29.
42. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 78, a. 4–5.
43. Jn. 4.
44. St. Ambrose, De sacramentis IV, ch. 4.
45. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 78, a. 5.
46. Gen. 1; Mk. 1:41; Mk. 2:9; Jn. 11:43.
47. Jn. 6.
48. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 3.

49. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 5, and following.
50. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 10.
51. Gen. 17.
52. Matt. 13:11.
53. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 83 in John; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joannem*, bk. 3.
54. Exod. 24:8.
55. See below, *Distinctio* 10; St. John Damascene; Second Council of Nicaea.
56. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 78, cited above.
57. 1 Cor. 10:4; Exod. 12; Gen. 17; Rev. 17:15; Matt. 3:16; Lev. 4; Lev. 17; Exod. 32 (Vulg. numbering); Deut. 12:23.
58. St. Augustine, *Contra Maximinum Arianum* III, ch. 22.
59. Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem* IV, ch. 40; *De anima*, ch. 7.
60. St. Augustine, *Contra Adimantum*, ch. 12.
61. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 16.
62. Acts 4:11.
63. Acts 8:37–38 (Vulgate tradition); cf. Acts 18:28; John 1:1.
64. St. John Chrysostom, *In 1 Cor.* 10 homilies; St. Ambrose, *Commentaries*; St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XII, ch. 26; *Tract.* 26 in John.
65. 1 Kgs 4:7–8 (Vulgate numbering).
66. The intended paraphrase of Tertullian's expression: "hoc, id est figura corporis mei."
67. Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem* V, cap. penult.
68. Tertullian, *Contra Marcionem* IV; cf. V, cap. penult., "in vino sanguinem suum consecrasset."
69. Gratian, *Decretum*, *De consecratione*, dist. 2, citing the Sentences of Prosper; *ibid.*, cap. "Hoc est".
70. Allusions to Phil. 2:6–7 and Col. 1:15.
71. For Augustine's explicit affirmations, see e.g. St. Augustine, *Tractates on John*, on John 6 [abbreviation as in source].
72. St. Augustine, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* II, ch. 9.

DISTINCTIO IX — ON THE MODES OF EATING THE BODY OF CHRIST, AND THAT EVEN THE WICKED RECEIVE IT

As to the remaining objections, from what has been said the solution is plain; and as regards the passage of St. Ambrose, from that very passage the opposite is most plainly established.

§ I — In how many ways the eating of the Body of Christ is to be understood (Quot modis intelligatur manducari corpus Christi)

§ 1. Rightly, after St. Augustine, the Master teaches that there are two modes of eating the Body of Christ (*Corpus Christi*): one, sacramental (*sacramentalis*), by which it is eaten by the good and the wicked; the other, spiritual (*spiritualis*), by which it is eaten by the good alone. These modes also are handed on by the Ordinary Gloss upon that passage (1 Cor. 11), "He who eats and drinks unworthily."² But for the fuller understanding of this doctrine, it must be known that in Scripture and in the Fathers four modes are found in which it can be understood that someone eats the Flesh, or the Body of Christ, and drinks His Blood—namely, carnally, cruelly, and sacramentally, and spiritually; which last mode is in turn subdivided into a few members.

§ 2. The carnal mode of eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ is not handed on by Scripture; but from Christ's words (Jn. 6) the Capharnaite men, through a bad understanding, thought it was being promised by Christ that His flesh would be eaten after the manner of the flesh of slaughtered animals, which, torn or cut up into parts, are either devoured raw by beasts or, when cooked, are eaten by men; and with regard to the Blood, similarly.³ This mode both the Lord in the Gospel rejects as carnal, and the Fathers explode and condemn as barbarous and flagitious, St. Augustine expressly, in book 3 of *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 16.⁴

§ 3. To eat the Lord's flesh cruelly (*crudeliter manducare carnem Domini*) they are said in Scripture to do who slew Christ, the Jews, and rejoiced over His death. For thus Christ says (in Ps. 26): "Whilst evildoers draw near against me to eat my flesh"; and elsewhere (Ps. 21): "They have opened their mouth upon me, as a lion ravening and roaring"; and again (Ps. 34): "Let them not say, We have devoured him"; and that passage (Job 31) is by some understood thus: "Who will give of his flesh, that we may be filled?"⁵

§ 4. To eat the Lord's flesh sacramentally (*sacramentaliter manducare carnem Domini*) and to drink His blood is to receive them in the sacrament of the Eucharist (*sacramentum Eucharistiae*), in which truly His flesh and blood are contained under the species (*species*) of bread and wine. To this mode of eating and drinking the Lord invited His disciples, when He said: "Take, eat"; "Drink ye all of this."⁶ That this is common to the good and to the wicked is shown by Paul (1 Cor. 10; 1 Cor. 11); and this will presently be proved more fully.⁷

§ 5. Further, spiritual eating (*spiritualis manducatio*), which, to wit, is understood according to the fruit, some spiritual one, is manifold. First, St. Augustine, writing on John and in some other places which are cited in this Distinction 2 by Gratian, takes "to eat the Lord's flesh and drink His blood" for that which is "to be incorporated into the mystical body of Christ," whether that be done through Baptism, or through the Eucharist, or in any other way whatsoever. For he even attributes this mode of eating to infants in that they are baptized. Whence, in book 1 On the Merits and Remission of Sins, chapter 20, he alleges that Scriptural text (Jn. 6), "Except ye shall have eaten," to pertain without doubt even to infants, and that they cannot have life in themselves without the participation of the Body and Blood of the Lord.⁸ And in book 3, chapter 4, he says: "Unless, to wit, men shall have eaten His flesh, that is, shall have been made partakers of His body, they will not have life." Where immediately he subjoins also concerning infants: "Nor can they have eternal life except through the body of Christ, into which they are incorporated by the sacrament of Baptism." Writing also on John and expounding that passage, "Except ye shall eat," he says: "He wills this food and drink to be understood as the fellowship of His body and of His members, which is the Church in the predestined," etc.⁹ Similarly, Innocent I, in the letter written to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis, which stands among St. Augustine's letters as 93(a), interprets the Lord's sentence in the same sense, and bears witness that it is fulfilled in infants when they are baptized.¹⁰ Now those who handed down this mode of spiritual eating, and interpreted the passage of John 6 thereof, had regard to the thing signified by the Eucharistic sacrament and not contained (*res significata et non contenta*), which is the mystical body of Christ, that is, the Church, outside of which no one can be saved; not, however, to the thing both signified and contained (*res significata simul et contenta*), which is the true body of Christ, without the real participation of which salvation does come to pass.¹¹

§ 6. But in the second way spiritual eating is understood which is by faith in the flesh of Christ delivered up for us on the cross, and in the blood poured out for us. Which mode some, moved by probable arguments, think to have been properly signified by the Lord in that discourse which He held (Jn. 6). And St. Augustine teaches the same in the place already cited with these words: that "Except ye shall eat," etc., is a figure in which it is enjoined that one must have communion with the Lord's Passion, and that it must be sweetly and profitably laid up in memory, that for us His flesh was crucified and wounded.¹²

§ 7. The third mode of spiritual eating is when someone receives the effect of the sacrament of the Eucharist, whether he receive the sacrament itself in very deed, or by vow and desire only, as when either he is hindered by some necessity, or out of reverence abstains from the actual reception of the sacrament. "Nor, however," says St. Thomas (III, q. 80, a. 1), "is the sacramental eating applied in vain, if desire alone suffices to obtain its effect; because the reception of the sacrament itself brings in the effect of the sacrament more fully than desire alone."¹³

§ 8. The fourth mode is that by which it is received in figure, as the Fathers of the Old Testament received it by eating the manna from heaven and by drinking water from the rock. Whence the Apostle says (1 Cor. 10): that "our fathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea"; that they "all ate the same spiritual food," they "all drank the same spiritual drink."¹⁴

§ 9. The last is the one St. Thomas hands on (article 2 of the aforesaid question), by which Christ, subsisting in His own appearance, is spiritually eaten by the Angels and the other Blessed in heaven—namely, inasmuch as they are united to Christ the man by the enjoyment (*fruitio*) of perfect charity and by the manifest vision. Whence also the man Christ is called the bread of Angels.¹⁵ Yet although the Angels are said,

according to that mode, to eat Christ spiritually, still it does not befit them to eat this sacrament spiritually, that is, Christ under the species of bread and wine, a thing which is proper to wayfarers alone.

§ II — That the true Body of Christ is taken also by the wicked (Verum Christi corpus sumi etiam a malis)

§ 10. The other head of this distinction is the question, whether even by the wicked the true body of Christ is taken in this sacrament. In which question there is presupposed, first, that which in part has already been proved, in part remains yet to be proved more at large—namely, that the body of Christ is truly and really contained in this sacrament. Then "the wicked" are to be understood, not as in those words of Christ (Matt. 7), "If you, being evil," etc.—for thus we all are evil on account of daily offenses—but as those who are in an affection of mortal sin.

§ 11. In times past some men (as on that place of John 6, "Unless you shall eat," etc., and on similar [places] they have been wont to harp) denied that the body of Christ is eaten by sinners. Which sentiment afterwards John Wyclif held, as is in Thomas Waldensis, tome 2, On the Sacraments, chapter 60. Undoubtedly, however, it must be held with both Thomases and with all the Scholastics, that the body of Christ is truly eaten in the sacrament of the Eucharist, not by the good only, but also by the wicked and sinners.^[17] Which is openly proved by the testimony of Truth Himself, who, handing this sacrament to all His disciples, among whom to Judas the traitor, said: "Eat; this is my body. Drink; this is my blood."

§ 12. Likewise by the testimony of Paul (1 Cor. 10). Where, when he had said: "The bread which we break, is it not the participation of the body of Christ?" he subjoined that all do partake of that one bread; among whom, however, certain wicked men were manifestly [to be numbered] (from chapters 5 and 6 of that same Epistle).¹⁷ The same is sufficiently shown from this, that in that same chapter the Apostle says: "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. You cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils." For the sense is that this by no means is lawful, which the Apostle would not forbid if it could not at all be done.¹⁸

§ 13. But most plainly is this doctrine proved from chapter 11 of that same Epistle: "Whosoever," he says, "shall have eaten this bread or drunk the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." And again: "For he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord." Therefore the wicked truly take the Body and Blood of the Lord; whom for that reason the Apostle reproves, because they take them unworthily, and, in taking, do not discern them from common foods, and thus are held to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ evilly handled.¹⁹

§ 14. This doctrine, moreover, the Fathers with one voice hand down. Among whom it is particularly to be seen in St. John Chrysostom, on the aforesaid place of the Apostle and elsewhere, and in other authors who have commented on the Apostle. In which place also St. Augustine uses it to prove that point when he says (Tractate 26 on John): "Many receive from the altar and die, and by receiving they die. Whence the Apostle says: He eats and drinks judgment to himself," etc. The same, in book 5 Against the Donatists, chapter 8, says thus: "One receiving unworthily the Body of Christ does not bring it to pass that, because he is evil, that which he receives be evil; or, because he receives not unto salvation, that he receive nothing. For the Body and Blood of the Lord are nonetheless [there] in those who eat unworthily," etc. And in the letter 162(a) he thus writes about Judas the traitor: "The Lord Himself tolerates Judas, the devil, the thief, His seller. He permits

him to receive among the innocent disciples that which the faithful know to be our price." He repeats the same about Judas in letter 163(b), in Tractates 6 and 26 on John, on Psalm 10, and in Sermon 11(c) On the Words of the Lord, chapter 11. Elsewhere again he teaches that the carnal and the proud eat the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist; whom he interprets as "the rich of the earth" in that verse of Psalm 21, "All the rich of the earth have eaten and adored," as in Enarration 1 on that Psalm, and more fully in the letter (d) 230 to Honoratus, chapter 27. Similar places are Tractate 7 on the Epistle of John, and Fragment 7(e).²⁰

§ 15. And in St. Gregory there is a most open passage (book 2 on 1 Kings, chapter 1): "There is indeed," he says, "in sinners and in those receiving unworthily the true Flesh of Christ and the true Blood, but in essence, not in health-giving efficiency."²¹ Nay, even the public voice of the Church bears witness to this, when she sings in the Divine Office: "The good receive, the wicked receive," etc. Rightly, therefore, the Master in the text asserts it is to be held without doubt that the Flesh of Christ and the Blood are received by the good indeed both sacramentally and spiritually at once, but by the wicked only sacramentally. The same is taught by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (session 13, chapter 8).²²

§ 16. Which doctrine also it is permissible to confirm by these arguments. First: because to the truth of this sacrament it pertains that, for so long as the sacramental species endure, the Body of Christ and the Blood also remain under them, with which they are finally taken, or wheresoever they be laid aside, or howsoever they be handled.

§ 17. Second: Evil priests truly consecrate the Body of the Lord, as will be taught in its place; therefore even sinners of whatever sort truly receive it.

§ 18. Third: From the fact that the heavenly Father over the Jordan bore witness that Jesus is His Son, it followed that He was the Son of God even afterwards, when He was handled ignominiously by the Jews, even to the punishment of the cross and death; because assuredly the thing and the substance were the same. Therefore, since the Lord has so openly said: "This is my body," it must be confessed that that substance of which He spoke remains, for as long as it has endured according to that species; and wherever it shall have been found, and by whomever taken, it is the Body of Christ.

§ 19. Lastly: The faithful have always taken diligent care that this sacrament should not by any means come into the hands of unbelievers, and indeed lest perchance anything of it should fall to the ground. And if at any time by chance or by human malice it would happen, it is not wont to be heard by them without horror and grief. Which would by no means be the case unless they were most certainly persuaded that even by unbelievers and other sinners the very body of Christ is truly received and evilly handled.

§ III — Certain arguments to the contrary are dissolved (Diluuntur argumenta quaedam in contrarium)

§ 20. Against the foregoing Catholic doctrine certain things are objected, chiefly from St. Augustine, who in some places seems to make the reception of the Body and Blood of the Lord proper to the good. For in Tractate 25 on John, on that [place] John 6, "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom He has sent," he says thus: "Why dost thou prepare teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." He understands, however, living faith, as he declares in the things that follow; therefore they who do not believe with faith working through charity do not eat.²⁴ And Tractate 26: "To believe in him," he says, "this is to eat the living

bread. He who believes in him eats"; and below: "He who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, without doubt neither eats spiritually [as some copies add] His flesh nor drinks His blood, although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; but rather the sacrament of so great a thing he eats and drinks to judgment for himself."²⁵

§ 21. Likewise (Tractate 59), speaking of the Apostles and of Judas: "They were eating the Lord's bread; he, the bread of the Lord against the Lord." By which antithesis he seems to signify that Judas did not eat the Lord's bread. And in book 21 (On the City of God, chapter 25) he says that outside the Church the Body of Christ is not truly eaten. Thus too Prosper (sentence 339): "He who is at variance with Christ neither eats His Flesh nor drinks His Blood, even if he daily and indifferently receive to the judgment of his own presumption the sacrament of so great a thing."²⁶

§ 22. Moreover, Hilary, writing on Matthew, denies that Judas received the Body of the Lord: "He was not worthy," he says, "of the communion of eternal sacraments; nor indeed could he drink in the Kingdom with Him, since He afterwards promised that all who drink of this fruit of the vine should drink with Him."²⁷

§ 23. Third, "It is not fitting," they say, "that so great majesty and so holy flesh be put into a body subject to sins; God by no means permits it."

§ 24. Fourth, the sentence of the Master is (Dist. 13) that by brute animals the body of Christ is not received, even if it seems to be received; with whom Hugh, book 2 On the Sacraments, part 8, chapter 13, and Innocent [III], book 4 On the Mystery of the Mass, chapter 16, seem to agree. And openly Bonaventure in 4, Distinction 13, and Thomas Waldensis, tome 2 On the Sacraments, chapter 60, agree.²⁸ And indeed Bonaventure pronounces this opinion the more common, the more becoming, and the more reasonable; and it is held by certain Glosses upon Dist. 2, De Consecratione, in Gratian, chapter Tribus. But a sinner is abominable to God more than a brute animal is; therefore much less ought a sinner to receive the body of Christ.

§ 25. But it is not difficult to answer these things. For as to St. Augustine, it is plain from those things which we said above about the manifold mode of eating the body of Christ, in what sense he sometimes denies that unbelievers and the wicked eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ. For he understands the spiritual eating, in which he is said to eat the Body of Christ who is conjoined and incorporated to Christ through faith and charity, and is numbered as a living member of Him. Which is manifestly not common to the wicked. That this is truly Augustine's meaning is perceived from the circumstances, and is more clearly explained by him himself, where he asks himself the question from those words of the Lord: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him"—how very many wicked men and dissemblers, such as Judas, can truly eat His very flesh and very blood, since they do not abide in Christ nor Christ in them? He answers that it is certain there is a certain pure mode of eating that flesh and drinking that blood, by which mode whoever shall have eaten and drunk abides in Christ and Christ in him—namely, the mode of eating and drinking spiritually. But the sacrament of so great a thing each of them calls the mystical body of Christ. Moreover, Hilary was of that opinion, to be sure, that he thought Judas had not been present at the institution and distribution of the Eucharist, as being already before that gone out to perpetrate a certain crime of betrayal. Which, however, is not very probable,³⁰ nor consonant with the Gospel history. Nowhere, moreover, does he say that Judas, or any sinner, on receiving this sacrament of the Eucharist, does not receive

the true body of the Lord. Only by those words which have been adduced he signifies that Judas was unworthy to be present at the participation of such great mysteries.

§ 26. To the third it is answered, that this is not unfitting to the divine goodness, whereby in the sacrament He deigned to present Himself to us really and corporally, as far as regards that He does not distinguish between the good and the wicked—since this is not the time of discrimination, but of mercy, to which pertains the use of the sacraments. Add that properly neither is the body of the Lord stained or struck, but all those external injurious actions are properly inflicted only on the species themselves; since the body of Christ in its proper species is not touched.

§ 27. To the last it must be said with St. Thomas where above, that the substance of the Body of Christ does not cease to be under the species while the species themselves remain, that is, as long as the substance of bread would remain if consecration had not been made; whatever at length may be done concerning it either by men or even by beasts. Nor does this verge to the detriment of the dignity of the Body of Christ, who willed also to be crucified by sinners; especially, he says, since a mouse or a dog does not touch the body itself according to its proper species, but only according to the sacramental species. Wherefore in this part the sentence of the Master is not to be held, nor of others who feel with the Master.

§ 28. Second: from the authority of Cyprian, who in Book 1 (Epistle 10 to Eucratius) writes thus: "Out of your good will you have thought that I ought to be consulted as to what I think about a certain mime who, being established among you, still perseveres in the disgrace of that same art of his—whether such a one ought to communicate with us. Which I, for my part, do not think to be congruent either with the Divine Majesty or with evangelical discipline, that the shame and honor of the Church be defiled by so foul and infamous a contagion."³¹ Third: this sacrament, just as it is life to the good, so it is death to the evil, as the Church sings; and the Fathers very often testify, and the Apostle himself declares (1 Cor. 11); therefore—

§ 29. ...no more than a physician would [give] a drug to a sick man, from which he knew he would die. Fourth: from two evils the lesser must be chosen; and it is the lesser evil that the sinner be put to shame, or that he be given a host not consecrated, than that by receiving the Body of Christ he take to himself the judgment of death. Fifth: it is not permitted to return a sword to a madman who demands it; therefore neither is it permitted to give the Body of the Lord to a sinner who asks, although perhaps he may have some right to it. But on the contrary is the example of Christ, who gave His body to Judas the traitor, as above has been proved. Next, that passage of Augustine on this verse (Ps. 21): "Manducaverunt et adoraverunt omnes pingues terrae," and it is had in the Decretum of Gratian (On Consecration, Dist. 2): "Let not the dispenser forbid the fat ones of the earth," that is, sinners, "to eat at the Table of the Lord."³³

§ 30. Likewise that of the same Augustine, Book (The Medicine of Penance, ch. 3): "We are not able to prohibit anyone from communion, unless either he has confessed voluntarily, or has been named and convicted in some ecclesiastical or secular court."³⁴ For the explanation of this question a twofold distinction must be applied. For either the sinner is occult or manifest; or—which comes to the same thing—either his crime is secret or notorious. And again: either he asks in secret, or in public. Now manifest sinners are said to be such either by the evidence of the deed, as public usurers, mimes, prostitutes, or by some ecclesiastical or secular judgment having convicted and condemned them. To these also must be numbered those notoriously excommunicated. From this twofold distinction there arises a fourfold consideration. For either an occult sinner asks in secret, or in public; or, finally, a manifest [sinner asks] in secret. If the first, the sacrament can be

denied to him—indeed, it ought to be—even if perhaps by confession alone his crime, or his impenitence, is known to the Priest, unless he seek it at that time when all the faithful are bound to receive communion. The reason is that no injury is done to the one asking, since he is neither made infamous, seeing that it is denied to him in secret; nor is he defrauded of his right, since in truth he does not have a right to receive the Body of the Lord, although he has it according to the judgment of the Church as long as his sin is not known to the Church. Wherefore, since in that case the Priest is not bound to give, assuredly he is bound not to give—both to prevent the neighbor's sin and lest he ill dispense the food of the Lord.

§ 31. If the second [case], it is also certain that it is not to be given, according to the cited opinions of Cyprian and Augustine, although Cyprian seems not to speak particularly of the communion of the Body of the Lord, but in general of ecclesiastical communion. The reason is manifest, because such sinners, being in a notorious crime—that is, one publicly sufficiently known—do not have a right to the table of the Lord, not even in the face of the Church. And therefore, if the Priest were to make them participants of the table of the Lord, he would become guilty of an unjust dispensation and would provoke the wrath of the Lord against himself, as Chrysostom attests.³⁵

§ 32. If the third [case], he ought not to deny, as is proved from the above-cited testimonies of Augustine and from the example of Christ. The reason of this is: first, lest he betray the occult crime and so defame his neighbor; second, lest he scandalize others; third, lest he defraud the one asking of the right which he still has in the face of the Church. It is then confirmed by the authority of Chrysostom, who in the same Homily says: "But if someone should come with filth ignorantly," that is, an occult sinner, "it is not the fault of the minister to minister to him."³⁶ This is proved more fully by the canons "Si tantum" and "Si placuit," 6, quæst. 3, and "Sacerdos," Extra (On the Office of the Ordinary).³⁷

§ 33. As to the last [case], what is to be done is sufficiently clear from the first and second cases. For it is most certain that it must be denied, both because the sinner is manifest, and because he asks in secret—nor would it be given to the occult sinner.

§ 34. Generally, however, one must note concerning the present question that the Priest cannot licitly give the Body of the Lord to a sinner unless in that case in which he is bound to do so: both because, when someone can by right deny to another what he unjustly seeks, if he bestows it, he bestows it of his own accord, and thus he becomes a participant in that man's crime; and because the Priest is not the lord of a sacred thing, but a dispenser, and it pertains therefore to his office to handle the sacrament worthily. Hence, he ought not to minister to one who will receive unworthily, unless he be bound to this by some law. According to the declaration already stated, then, the arguments on both sides are to be weighed. For to that sentence of the Lord: "Do not give what is holy to dogs," various responses are made.³⁸ Some say that what is forbidden is to give—that is, to offer of one's own accord—but not to hand back, namely, as to one who has the right. Others answer that that precept is to be understood when it can be fulfilled by juridical route. Others by "dogs" understand manifest sinners. But what is most probable is that, in proverbial speech, by "holy" and by "pearls" Christ wished to signify the evangelical doctrine, so that the sense be: that the doctrine of truth is not to be proposed to those who seem more likely to despise and to tear it, like dogs and swine, than by it to be enlightened unto right faith and holy conversion. For although before such people truth must sometimes be preached, as Christ is read to have done, yet not on their account, but for others in whom some fruit is reasonably hoped for.

§ 35. To the third argument it is answered that this sacrament is turned into harm for no one except by the fault of the one receiving. It is otherwise with a drug, which operates of itself and naturally. Then too the sick man has no right to a drug that will harm him, just as the sinner [has no right] to the sacrament.

§ 36. To the fourth it is answered: just as evils are not to be done that goods may come, so neither are lesser evils to be done that greater be avoided. For it is permitted to no one to sin, not even venially, in order to free another from sin, however grave. For, as Augustine says: "Most perilously is this compensation admitted, that we should do something evil lest another do something worse."³⁹ Although therefore it is a lesser evil that a sinner be defamed than that he approach the sacrament unworthily, nevertheless it is not permitted to the Priest to commit that evil, in order to forestall this evil in the sinner.

§ 37. But as to the remedy of a host not consecrated, that is by no means to be approved—even if regard be had to the very honor of the sinner consenting that it be so—because the Priest, as far as lies in him, would cause the others present there to commit idolatry, while they adore the host, as is the custom of the Faithful. Then, as in other things, so most of all in the sacraments simulation is to be avoided. Whence Innocent III, in the Decretals (On the Celebration of Mass, cap. De homine), says that, since false remedies are to be cast aside which are more grievous than the true perils, although he "who, on account of the prompting of his criminal conscience, thinks himself unworthy, sins gravely if he thrust himself irreverently upon the sacrament," nevertheless "he seems to offend more gravely who has presumptuously taken it upon himself to simulate fraudulently."⁴⁰

§ 38. To the fifth Bonaventure replies that, just as in court one would be bound to return a sword to a man [accused of] madness whom it did not appear was in fact insane, so to the sinner whom it is not publicly established to be such, his right is to be rendered concerning the reception of the sacrament, which in the external forum is owed to him.⁴¹ Another solution of this argument, and a subtler one, is to be seen in Domingo [de Soto].⁴² If it be asked whether the Body of Christ may rightly be given sometimes to suspects of a crime for its manifestation, it is answered: nor is that permitted. For this sacrament was not instituted that anyone's sin be manifested. Wherefore neither is it rightly dispensed in that way, especially since a dispensation of this sort is not made without tempting God, as St. Thomas says. Likewise, by this is manifestly given occasion for an unworthy reception of the Eucharist, while he who has committed the crime, being unwilling to betray himself, comes with the others to the Table of the Lord. Nor indeed is there any necessity of doing this, for occult sins are to be reserved to the divine judgment. And although some canons seem either to command or to permit this, nevertheless they have been abrogated, or rather were never received. Whence Pope Stephen writes thus (On Consecration, Dist. 2, cap. Consuluisti): "The sacred canons do not permit the confession of anyone to be extorted by examination of red-hot iron or boiling water. For by spontaneous confession, or by the approbation of witnesses, published crimes are committed to our governance to be judged. But occult and unknown [things] are to be left to Him who alone knows the hearts of the sons of men." Thus he.

§ I — That in the Eucharist there is the true Body and Blood of Christ proved from Scripture (Esse in Eucharistia verum Christi Corpus & Sanguinem ex scripturis ostentatur)

§ 39. Let us now, therefore, approach to the proving of the true and real presence (*praesentia*) of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, as the Catholic Church has openly and without doubt always held and taught. The first proof is from the Scriptures, in which the three Evangelists—Matthew, Mark, Luke—and a fourth Evangelist fulfilling that office here also, Paul, as they commemorate the most recent supper of the Lord, have so openly attested that the Lord, concerning that which He was holding in His hands and was handing to the disciples to be eaten and drunk, said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," that they have left no place for evasion; especially since they also attest that Christ on both occasions added determining words by which He might indicate about what body and about what blood He is speaking, namely these: "Which will be delivered up for you," "Which will be poured out for you"; and moreover not only did they attach to the said propositions the attributives, but also they added articles to the words, a doubling of articles which has great force among the Greeks. But because above, at Dist. 8, when we were treating of the form of this sacrament, we showed by many arguments that these very words of Christ are to be taken, not in a figurative, but in their proper sense, whence it plainly follows that the body and blood of Christ are truly and properly contained in this sacrament, there is no need to linger longer in explaining those words.

§ 40. Another place is 1 Cor. 10, where the Apostle, speaking by way of question as of a thing confessed and most certain, says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the participation of the body of the Lord?" as if he had said: "So are you instructed in the Church that none of you should be ignorant of this." Truly, then, and really in this sacrament the faithful participate in the Body and Blood of the Lord. For otherwise the Apostle ought to have said: "The bread which we break is a participation of the Spirit of the Lord," in that neither His very Body nor Blood of Christ would we receive in this sacrament, but only the Spirit by Christ's merit. Then too those following words of Paul: "Because one bread, one body are we many, all who partake of the one bread," have not a little weight for proving the same. For if the body of Christ is not truly received in the Eucharist, but common bread, it will be false that all Christians partake of one bread; nay rather it must be admitted that by diverse men diverse loaves are eaten, and that as many loaves are taken as there are eaters—just as under the old law, from the one paschal lamb all did not communicate, even if that lamb signified the one Christ, but as many lambs were eaten as there were families; but if we understand the Apostle to be speaking of consecrated bread, which is the body of Christ, it is manifest that all the faithful, wheresoever they are upon the earth, partake of the one bread which is the body of Christ, that is, they eat that one and the selfsame bread.

§ 41. Another place is 1 Cor. 11, where the Apostle, repeating the institution of this sacrament almost in the same words in which Luke described it, in place of what is in Luke, "Which is given for you," and what in the Vulgate edition is read in the Apostle, "Which will be delivered up for you," according to the faith of all Greek codices has "Which is broken for you." Therefore that same body which Luke, reporting Christ's words, says was to be delivered up for us—namely unto death—Paul asserts to be broken for us, as Chrysostom, writing on the passage of the Apostle, reasons (Homily 24).⁴⁴ It follows, therefore, that the very Body of Christ, which was delivered up unto death, is truly contained under the species of bread, so that on account of those species it can truly be affirmed of it that it is broken. Moreover, from the Apostle's following words in

the same chapter another proof is taken—brighter at that—"Whosoever," he says, "shall eat this bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, will be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." And again: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the cup. For he who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord." Which words of the Apostle by many considerations confirm that not common bread, but the very Body of Christ is received in this sacrament. First, because he says that the one who receives unworthily is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, that is, he is held liable for an injury done to the Body and Blood of the Lord; and thus he takes to himself "judgment," that is, the condemnation of eternal death. For that this judgment is to be understood he indicates shortly after when he says: "That we may not be condemned with this world." But this cannot by any means be said of the acceptance or use of a bare sign. For neither, if someone without due preparation of soul had eaten of the paschal lamb, would he on that account have been guilty of the Body of the Lord which was signified by the lamb, or have incurred mortal sin by that very fact. Then too, because he requires a certain special proving which certainly was not required for the use of a bare sacrament.

§ 42. Furthermore, in that same place he says that the one unworthily approaching does not discern the Body of the Lord—that is, he thus approaches this food as if he did not discern it from common foods. Now the Apostle wishes this to be the discernment, namely, that this is the Body of the Lord, but the others are not. For this is "to discern the Body of the Lord." It is also to be noted in the Apostle's words that, since that sentence, "Therefore whosoever, etc.," is inferred from the preceding [account], it is necessary that the Body and Blood be taken in both places in the same way, lest the argument be fallacious. But manifestly they are taken in that sentence for the very Body and Blood of Christ; therefore also in the preceding, where the words of institution are recounted. Lastly, to prove this catholic truth, a place is adduced by many (Jn. 6), where the Lord promises that His flesh is to be eaten and His blood to be drunk by these words: "The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." And again: "Unless you shall have eaten the flesh of the Son of Man and shall have drunk His blood," etc. Likewise: "My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink. He who eats my flesh," etc. But this proof, on account of the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and Doctors by which they expound that passage—as the Council of Trent acknowledges (Session 21, ch. 1)—is not so effective as the former. Nor yet is the sense, if that passage be understood of spiritual reception, alien from this argument. For according to that interpretation it will not be denied that the Lord used that trope of "eating the flesh" and "drinking the blood" the more willingly in that discourse, because at some time He would hand over flesh and blood really in the sacrament to be received; and hence, even if He does not there seem to have spoken chiefly of sacramental perception, nevertheless He also looked to it, and wished to allude to it in His very words.

§ II — Proof of the same doctrine from the Fathers (Ejusdem doctrinae probatio ex Patribus)

§ 43. There is no Catholic dogma of the Church buttressed by so great a number of witnesses and testimonies as this dogma of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, to such a degree that, even if it were destitute of the authority of the Scriptures, it could not nevertheless fail to be held as most well proved and most certain from the consensus of all the Fathers so frequently and so clearly speaking of it. But since it would be a task almost infinite to cite all the testimonies, it will suffice for us here to note but a few, and those principal—beginning from the very times of the Apostles. The blessed Apostle Andrew, as is read in

his Passion written by the Presbyters of Achaia, replied to the judge who commanded him to sacrifice to idols that he sacrifices daily on the altar to the omnipotent God the immaculate Lamb: "whose flesh, after all the people of believers has eaten and His blood has drunk, the Lamb who has been sacrificed remains entire, living."⁴⁵ Ignatius, the disciple of John, in the Epistle to the Romans: "I desire the bread of God," he says, "the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God living. And I desire drink, namely His blood." And in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, thus he writes concerning certain heretics: "They do not admit Eucharists and oblations, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His benignity raised up." Theodoret cites these words as of Ignatius writing to the Smyrnaeans (Dialogue 3).⁴⁶ Dionysius the Areopagite (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3), among other things which he hands on concerning the divine, most holy, and most august—so he himself calls it—mystery of the Eucharist, testifies that by it Christ is signified and at the same time received, and that He is to be shown by the Pontiff to the faithful to be adored. Clement, Book 3 (Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 61), admonishes that Christians should approach this sacrament as to the Body of the King, and that the Priests should apply diligent care to the fragments of the Eucharist. Anacletus (Epistle 2) calls the Priests "handlers of the sacred Body of the Lord." Alexander I (Epistle 1) testifies that in the Sacrifice of the Mass the Body and Blood of Christ are made, and commending the virtue and dignity of that sacrifice says: "Nothing can be greater in sacrifices than the Body and Blood of Christ, nor is any oblation more excellent than this, but this surpasses all." Telesphorus in an Epistle to all the Bishops says that the "Priest with his own mouth makes the Body of Christ." Which afterwards was repeated word for word by Jerome in Epistle 1 to Heliodorus. Justin Martyr in Apology 2 to Antoninus: "That food," he says, "which among us is called Eucharist, when it has been blessed, we have been taught to be the flesh and blood of Jesus Himself made flesh." Irenaeus, Book 4, ch. 32, against the heresies of Valentinus, holds this dogma so certain that from the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ in this sacrament he contends even against the unbelief of the fact and the common resurrection of all. And he repeats similar things in Book 5. Tertullian in the book On the Resurrection of the Flesh, ch. 8: "The flesh," he says, "feeds on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul may be fattened on God." Elsewhere, namely in Book 2 To His Wife, he counts it an abomination to show this sacrament to unbelievers, who do not this bread...⁴⁷

§ 44. ...Christ but believe it to be common bread; and in the book On Idolatry, ch. 7, he says that even by the hands of those who fashion idols the very Body of Christ is handled.⁴⁸ And in Book 1 Against Marcion, ch. 14, he calls the bread by which in the sacraments He represents His very body, that is, makes it present. For to "represent" with Tertullian means "to present," as is easily shown from other places.⁴⁹ Origen, Homily 38 on Luke, says: "Manna was food in figure; but now in reality the flesh of the Word of God is true food."⁵⁰ Other testimonies of his no less clear are Homily 6 On Various Subjects, Homily 13 on Exodus, Homily 2 on Joshua, and Book 8 Against Celsus, as well as Homilies 7 and 16 on Numbers.⁵¹ Cyprian, in the Sermon On the Lapsed, among other things says of those who communicate unworthily: "Violence is done to the Body of the Lord, and with their hands and mouth they sin more against the Lord than if they had denied the Lord."⁵² Other places are in Book 2, Epistle 2, and Book 4, Epistle 6.⁵³ Finally, under the title Sermon on the Lord's Supper he speaks most plainly of this matter.⁵⁴ Hilary, Book 8 On the Trinity, by set purpose proves that Christ remains in us not only spiritually but also carnally and corporally—for he uses these very words—saying, among other things, that He remains in us; "Concerning the truth of His flesh and blood no room for doubting is left. For now, both by the Lord's own profession and by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly blood." And then from this truth he proves that, just as we in this sacrament are one with Christ by substance, so

Christ is one with the Father by substance.⁵⁵ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catechesis* 4: "We are not bidden to taste bread, but what under the species of bread is the Body of Christ." And again: "Since therefore He Himself has pronounced, saying, 'This is my body,' who will dare henceforth to doubt? And since that same One has so assertively said, 'This is my blood,' who will ever doubt so as to say it is not His blood?" And what follows to the very same purport; where finally he subjoins that "what seems to be bread is not bread, although to taste it appears so, but is the Blood of Christ."⁵⁶ Gregory of Nyssa, in the *Life of Moses*: "The bread of this body was brought about not by ploughing, not by sowing, not by the work of farmers."⁵⁷ And in the *Catechetical Sermon on the Divine Sacraments*: "We believe that the bread sanctified by the word of God is changed into the body of the Word of God."⁵⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, in the *Oration on Holy Pascha*, thus says: "Without confusion eat the body, and drink the blood, if you are held by desire of life, nor deny faith to the discourses that are about the flesh."⁵⁹ Ambrose, *Book 4 On the Sacraments*, chs. 3 and 5: "This bread," he says, "is bread before the words of the sacraments; when the consecration has been added, from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ." And soon after: "Therefore, to answer you, it was not the Body of Christ before the consecration; but after the consecration I tell you that it is now the Body of Christ." And what follows, in which he most clearly asserts this truth, so that no room is left for evasions.⁶⁰ Likewise *Book 6 On the Sacraments*, ch. 1, after he had said similar things, he finally adds that Christ for this reason left the likeness or species of bread and wine, lest the species of blood should beget horror.⁶¹ No less clearly do Hesychius (*Book 6 on Leviticus*, ch. 22) and Optatus (*Against the Donatists*) write.⁶² Moreover Jerome, besides the place indicated above, in the *Epistle to Damasus on the Prodigal Son*: "The fatted calf," he says, "which is immolated for the salvation of penitence, is the Savior Himself, whose flesh we eat daily, whose blood we drink." Similar places are in the *Commentary on Ezekiel*, chs. 36 and 45.⁶³ The same Jerome, to Hedibia, question 2, after other things says: "The Lord Jesus is Himself the guest and the banquet; He Himself the eater and He who is eaten. We drink His blood," etc.⁶⁴ Chrysostom (*Homily 60 to the People of Antioch*, and *Homily 83 on Matthew*), among many things by which he most manifestly asserts the real presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, also has this, by which he in a special way blocks the path to the crafty subterfuges and interpretations of heretics: "That Christ mixes Himself with us, and makes us not only sharers, but in very deed makes us His body." And in the *Homily on the Betrayal by Judas*: "Judas," he says, "bargains for thirty pieces of silver to sell Christ, and Christ was offering to him the blood which he was selling." There are also very many other places in him—*De sacerdotio*; *Homily 45 on John*; *Homily 24 on that passage 1 Cor. 10*, "The cup which we bless," etc.; *Homily 3 on the Epistle to the Ephesians*; *Homily 2 to the People of Antioch*; and *Homily 21 on the Acts of the Apostles*.⁶⁵ Epiphanius, in the *Anchoratus*, alleges the faith of this truth as indubitable to this end, that it might not be doubted that man has been made to the image and likeness of God.⁶⁶ Augustine—whom the Sacramentarians shamelessly and perversely claim for themselves—although he sometimes speaks more obscurely, the reason for which we shall give below, yet elsewhere, and indeed most frequently, speaks in such a way that nothing clearer could be said. These passages, a few out of many, are: *Book 12 Against Faustus*, ch. 10: "The faithful," he says, "in the sacraments drink the same blood by which they were redeemed."⁶⁷ And on *Psalm 33*, after some things, thus he says: "O how great is the Lord, who has given us to eat His body, in which He suffered so greatly."⁶⁸ And on *Psalm 65*: "The Jews by grace drank the very blood which in madness they had shed." And on *Psalm 93*, on the same: "They shed their price, and they drank their price." He repeats the same thing elsewhere about the converted Jews from time to time, as on *Psalm 94* and in the *Preface to Psalm 96*; *Sermon 59 On the Words of the Lord*; *Homily 27 among the fifty*; and *Tracts 31, 38, and 40 on John*.⁶⁹ Again, writing on *Psalm 98*: "Christ," he says, "took flesh from the flesh

of Mary and in that very flesh walked here, and He gave that very flesh to us to be eaten for salvation; but no one eats that flesh unless he has first adored."⁷⁰ And in Book 2 Against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, ch. 9, he teaches that by this sacrament we are made not only one spirit with Christ, but even one flesh, according to that saying of Paul to the Ephesians, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones," and he repeats the same writing on Psalm 39.⁷¹ Likewise, Book 3 On the Trinity, ch. 4, he says that this sacrament signifies Christ, as others also signify; but before the rest it has this proper to it, that it is also the Body and Blood of Christ.⁷² And of the same book, ch. 10, he says with most weighty authority that it has been handed down to the faithful that what is on the altar is the Body of Christ: to such a degree that if nowhere else were that species seen except on the altar, nothing else would be believed than Christ in such a...

-
1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, aa. 1–2.
 2. Glossa ordinaria on 1 Cor. 11: "Qui manducat et bibit indigne..."
 3. Jn. 6.
 4. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 16.
 5. Ps. 26:2 (Vulg. 27:2): "Dum appropriant super me nocentes, ut edant carnes meas."; Ps. 21:14 (Vulg. 22:13): "Aperuerunt super me os suum sicut leo rapiens et rugiens."; Ps. 34:25 (Vulg. 35:25): "Ne dicant: Devoravimus eum."; Job 31:31 (as some interpret).
 6. Institution words: Matt. 26:26–28; Mk. 14:22–24; Lk. 22:19–20.
 7. 1 Cor. 10; 1 Cor. 11.
 8. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 20; Jn. 6:53.
 9. St. Augustine, *Tractates on John*, on Jn. 6:53–56: "Hunc itaque cibum et potum societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est Ecclesia in praedestinatis."
 10. Innocent I, *Epistola to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis*, in St. Augustine, Ep. 93(a) [abbreviation as in source].
 11. On the distinction of *res significata et non contenta* (the mystical body) versus *res significata simul et contenta* (the true body of Christ).
 12. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 16: on Jn. 6:53 understood figuratively as participation in the Passion.
 13. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 1.
 14. 1 Cor. 10:2–4.
 15. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 2; Ps. 77:25 (Vulg. 78:25): "Panem angelorum manducavit homo."
 16. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 3.
 17. 1 Cor. 10:16–17; 1 Cor. 5–6.
 18. 1 Cor. 10:21.
 19. 1 Cor. 11:27–29.
 20. St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* (on chs. 10–11) and elsewhere; St. Augustine, *Tract. 26 in Joann.*; St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* (or *Contra Donatistas*) V, ch. 8; St. Augustine, Ep. 162(a) [abbreviation as in source]; St. Augustine, Ep. 163(b) [abbreviation as in source]; St. Augustine, *Tract. 6*; *Tract. 26 in Joann.*; *Enarr. in Ps. 10*; *Serm. 11(c) de verbis Domini*, ch. 11; St. Augustine, *Enarr. 1 in Ps. 21*; Ep. 230(d) ad Honoratum, ch. 27; St. Augustine, *Tract. 7 in Ep. Joannis*; *Fragmentum 7(e)* ["*Fragmentum VII, incipit Quid voluit Simon*" — authenticity discussed in Benedictine editors].
 21. St. Gregory the Great, *Moral or Homilies*, lib. 2 on 1 Kings (1 Samuel), ch. 1.
 22. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 8.
 23. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 3, ad objections ("ibidem").

24. St. Augustine, Tract. 25 in Joann., on Jn. 6:29: "Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? crede et manducasti."
25. St. Augustine, Tract. 26 in Joann.: "Credere in eum... hoc est manducare panem vivum... Qui non manet in Christo... procul dubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem eius... licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi..."
26. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XXI, ch. 25; Prosper of Aquitaine, Sententia 339.
27. St. Hilary of Poitiers, In Matthaum (on the Last Supper): Judas "dignus... coeternorum sacramentorum communione non fuerat; neque sane bibere cum eo poterat qui non erat bibiturus in Regno..."
28. St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., dist. 13; Thomas Waldensis, De sacramentis, tom. 2, cap. 60; cf. the teaching of "both Thomases" (St. Thomas Aquinas and Thomas of Vio [Cajetan]) and the common Scholastics; Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis II, pars 8, ch. 13; Innocent III, De mysterio Missae IV, ch. 16.
29. Glossa (super De consecratione, dist. 2, apud Gratianum), cap. Tribus.
30. Editorial note: "The opinion of Hilary many—and those indeed nearer the times of the Apostles—have handed down, and they have strengthened it by weighty reasons, says Salmeron, Tom. IX, Commentarius in Evangelicam Historiam, Tract
31. St. Cyprian, Ep. 1 (Ep. 10), to Eucratius.
32. Editorial note in the margin (as printed): "What the Author here says—namely that the Eucharist is to be denied to the delinquent whose crime is known only through confession, that is, sacramental confession—seems altogether improbable; for so strict is the obligation to keep silence about the sin that it is by no means permitted to reveal the crime even to one's own penitent without his express leave. Wherefore it seems necessary that... Although St. Thomas somewhere seems to favor that opinion which the Author [follows] (art. 5, quaestiuncula 2), nevertheless with good right he appears to have departed from it... no more than a physician would give a drug to a sick man from which he knew he would die." [abbreviation and text as in source]
33. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos on Ps. 21; cited in Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 2.
34. St. Augustine, De poenitentiae medicina, ch. 3.
35. St. John Chrysostom, Homilia 83 in Matt.
36. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 83 in Matt., on the minister not being at fault when the sinner is occult.
37. Gratian, Decretum, Causa 6, quaest. 3, can. Si tantum; ibid., can. Si placuit; Decretals, Extra, De officio ordinarii, cap. Sacerdos.
38. Matt. 7:6.
39. St. Augustine, Quaestiones in Heptateuchum, on Genesis, q. 42.
40. Innocent III, Decretals, Extra, De celebratione Missarum, cap. De homine.
41. St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., dist. 1, q. 1, a. 6.
42. Soto (Domingo de), In IV Sent., dist. 1, q. 1, a. 6.
43. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 75, a. 1.
44. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 in 1 Cor.
45. Passio S. Andreae Apostoli, by the Presbyters of Achaia [ancient Acta, of debated authenticity].
46. St. Ignatius of Antioch, Ep. ad Rom., and Ep. ad Smyrn.; cited by Theodoret, Dialogus 3.
47. Tertullian, De resurrectione carnis, ch. 8; idem, Ad uxorem, II.
48. Tertullian, De idololatria, ch. 7.
49. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem I, ch. 14.
50. Origen, Homilies on Luke, hom. 38.
51. Origen, Hom. 6 in diversos; Hom. 13 in Exod.; Hom. 2 in Ios.; Contra Celsum, VIII; Hom. 7 and 16 on Numbers.
52. St. Cyprian, De lapsis.
53. St. Cyprian, Ep. II in Book 2; Ep. 6 in Book 4.

54. [Attributed] St. Cyprian, *Sermo de Coena Domini*.
55. St. Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate*, VIII.
56. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catechesis* 4.
57. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Moysis*.
58. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica (De divinis sacramentis)*.
59. St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio in sanctum Pascha*.
60. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*, IV, chs. 3, 5.
61. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*, VI, ch. 1.
62. Hesychius, *In Leviticum*, VI, ch. 22; Optatus of Milevis, *Contra Donatistas*.
63. St. Jerome, *Epistle to Damasus (De filio prodigo)*; *Commentary on Ezekiel*, chs. 36 and 45.
64. St. Jerome, *Epistle to Hedibia*, quaest. 2.
65. St. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 60 ad populum Antiochenum*; *Hom. 83 in Matt.*; *De sacerdotio*; *Hom. 45 in John*; *Hom. 24 on 1 Cor. 10 ("Calix cui benedicimus")*; *Hom. 3 in Eph.*; *Hom. 2 ad Pop. Antioch.*; *Hom. 21 in Acts*.
66. St. Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*.
67. St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, XII, ch. 10.
68. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Ps. 33.
69. St. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 65*; *Enarr. in Ps. 93*; *Enarr. in Ps. 94*; *Praef. in Ps. 96*; *Sermo 59 De verbis Domini*; *Hom. 27 (inter quinquaginta)*; *Tractatus in Iohannem* 31, 38, 40.
70. St. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 98*.
71. St. Augustine, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*, II, ch. 9; *Enarr. in Ps. 39*.
72. St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, III, ch. 4; *ibid.*, ch. 10.

DISTINCTIO X — ON THE TRUE AND REAL PRESENCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST (*DE REALI PRAESENTIA CORPORIS ET SANGUINIS CHRISTI IN EUCHARISTIA*)

§ I — The same doctrine attested by the Fathers (Eadem doctrina Patrum testimoniis comprobata)

§ 1. Cyril of Alexandria says in book 4 (on John, ch. 13): "We, putting firm faith in the mysteries (*mysteriis*), let us never, in affairs so sublime, either think or utter that 'how' (*quomodo*). For this word is Jewish." And a little after: "When God works, let us not ask 'how' (*quomodo*), but let us grant to Him alone the way and knowledge of His work." And, with certain matters interposed: "They are innumerable, in which, if you seek a 'how' (*quomodo*), you will need the whole of Scripture." And, after many things: "Since the Savior's flesh is conjoined to the Word of God, in whom life is naturally, it has been made life-giving; when we eat it, then we have life in ourselves, being conjoined to that by which it has been made life." And again: "But if only by the state of Christ's flesh the corrupt are reintegrated, how shall we not live, who both thirst for and eat that flesh?"—and many other things which follow.[^1]

§ 2. The same author in book 10 (ch. 13) says that "Christ, by the communication of His flesh, dwells in us corporally by the power of a mystical blessing, and is received into our body"; and in book 11 (ch. 27) that "Christ is corporally and substantially united to us through the mystical blessing."[^2] Leo, Sermon 6 (On the fast of the seventh month): "Thus, you ought to communicate at the holy table so that you doubt not at all about the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ. For that is taken by the mouth which is believed by faith; and 'Amen' is answered in vain by those by whom what is received is disputed against." The same, Epistle 23, testifies that this, in the Church of God, is so harmonious and on everyone's lips that "not even from the tongues of infants is the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ among the common sacraments of the faith kept silent."[^3]

§ 3. Gregory of Rome (Hom. 22 on the Gospels): "What does it profit to receive the Body and Blood of the Lord with the mouth, if by perverse habits one is in opposition?" And at the end of the Dialogues, speaking of the offering of Christ on the altar: "There His body is taken; there His flesh is distributed for the salvation of the people; there His blood is now not poured into the hands of the unfaithful, but into the mouths of the faithful," and so forth.[^4] As for the opinions of others, which are very many, we shall refrain from reciting them. It will suffice to have pointed out a few passages with their Authors. Accordingly, besides those named above, these hand on this doctrine: Eusebius, book 1 (Demonstrations of the Gospel, ch. 10); Athanasius (in the Oration on the Faith); Juvenius, book 4 (The Gospel History); Basil (Treatise on Baptism);

Prudentius (in the Paschal Hymns), Maximus (Hom. 5 on the Nativity of the Lord), "For Christ," he says, "in the manger, where the food of animals is, permits His own members to be placed; for the eternal refreshment He shows to mortals His body to be eaten." Paulinus (in a Homily on Penance); Sozomen, book 6 (Ecclesiastical History, ch. 24); Eucherius of Lyons (on 2 Kings, ch. ...); Sedulius, books 4 and 5 (The Divine Marvels); Euthymius (on Matt. 26); Theodoret (On the Decalogue, books 2 and 3); Peter Chrysologus (Serm. 5 on the Prodigal Son); Victor of Utica, books 1 and 3 (On the Vandal Persecution); Fulgentius, book 2 (To Monymus); Cassiodorus (on Ps. 109); Isidore, book 1 (On the Ecclesiastical Offices, ch. 18); Bede (Homily on those words of the Gospel: "John saw Jesus coming to him"); Damascene, book 4 (On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 14); Theophylact on Matthew and Mark around the institution of this sacrament—where, in words so clear, he affirms and inculcates that what Christ, consecrated, gave to the disciples is not only a figure and exemplar of the Lord's body but the very body of Christ Himself, so that nothing could be said more openly by a Catholic. He speaks likewise on John 6. Likewise are to be added Alcuin (on John 6) and Paul the Deacon, book 13 (of the Roman Affairs). From those, moreover, who lived in later centuries still, there is no need to cite anyone's testimony; since not long after the Berengarian heresy arose, it was exploded by all Catholics with one voice and with execration.[⁵]

§ II — The same doctrine confirmed by the authority of the Councils (Eadem doctrina Conciliorum auctoritate confirmata)

§ 4. That it may be more certainly established how Catholic this dogma of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist is, we shall bring forward the Councils of the Fathers, especially the general ones, in which the sentence of the whole Church is most clearly declared. The First Nicene Synod says thus in its doctrine: "Let us by faith understand that on that holy table is placed that Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, bloodlessly immolated by the priests; that we truly receive His precious body and blood, believing that these are the symbols of our resurrection," and so forth; and the same is openly signified in that synod's canon 24 (or, as others count, 18), which afterwards the Council of Arles renewed (can. 15). The Council of Ephesus (in the Epistle to Nestorius) has thus: "As we have been made partakers of the mystical blessings of the holy Body and precious Blood of Christ, we do not receive them as common flesh (far be it), but as truly life-giving and as the proper flesh of the Word Himself." The Sixth General Synod (ch. 3) thus determines: "Whoever from the sacred chalice, in which the Blood of Christ is received, shall drink anything other than the blood of Christ, let him be deterred by the example of Balthasar, who, profaning the sacred vessels, lost both life and kingdom." To this there is added canon 101 among those ascribed to the Sixth Synod, in which an equally clear testimony of this matter is read. The Seventh Synod, which is the Second of Nicaea, bears witness to the same matter in this manner (Act. 6): "None of the Apostles or Fathers ever called our unbloody sacrifice an image of that body. For the Lord says: 'Take, eat, This is my body'; He did not, however, say: 'Take, eat the image of my body.'" And below: "Read as much as you will; you will nowhere find that either the Lord, or the Apostles, or the Fathers called that unbloody sacrifice which is offered by the priest an image; but [they called it] the very body and blood." Then it adds, among other things, that Basil in his Liturgy before consecration indeed called the offerings "antitypes" (*antitypa*) of the body; but after consecration, it says, it is "the very Body of the Lord," and both is called and is believed to be.[⁶]

§ 5. Moreover, to recount all the particular Councils of those same times in which this truth is either expressed or indicated would be too long and is not necessary. Further, it must be known that around the year

of the Lord 1040 a certain Berengarius first—one who indeed had some repute—after so many ages dared to dispute against that Catholic truth, and to say that the Lord's Eucharist is not truly and substantially the Body and Blood of the Lord, but that it is so called only because it is His sign and figure. Against which error various Councils were assembled: the first Roman under Leo IX; the second at Vercelli under the same Pontiff; the third at Tours under Victor II, in which Berengarius, present, convicted of his error, recanted. But since shortly after he relapsed into his former perfidy, a fourth and general Council as well was held at Rome by Nicholas II, in which again both the error itself was condemned and, when its author had a third time returned to his vomit, a fifth Council, again at Rome, was assembled by Gregory VII, in which for the third time Berengarius sang a palinode of his error, plainly and expressly confessing that "not only by the sign and power of the sacrament, but also in the property of nature and the truth of substance, the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the Eucharist after consecration," as may be seen in the formula prescribed for Berengarius by that Council.[^7]

§ 6. And indeed, not only by Councils, but also by the writings of most learned men of the same time, was that heresy labored against and fought down, as is proved by the books composed and published by Paschasius, Lanfranc, Alger, Guitmund, Anselm, Rupert, Peter of Cluny, and others. To all these, finally, for confirmation we add the General Councils that followed thereafter—Lateran under Innocent III (ch. 1), Constance (Sess. 8), Basel (Sess. 1), Florence (in the Decrees of Union both of the Greeks and of the Armenians), and Trent (Sess. 13). Behold, therefore, the cloud of witnesses proposed to us out of the whole past antiquity—chief and most approved—who both held and taught this faith and have handed it down to us recorded in books. Now let the Reader consider of how great rashness and of how great peril it is, with the authority of so many Fathers, Doctors, and Saints agreeing, set aside, merely because sense resists, to be unwilling to believe what the Universal Church, taught by Christ and the Apostles, proposes as to be believed. [^8]

§ IV — The same truth is shown by several additional arguments (Aliis aliquot argumentis eadem veritas ostenditur)[^9]

§ 7. Besides those arguments by which we showed, under Distinction Eight, that the words of Christ "This is my body" are to be taken in their proper sense, there are also other noteworthy considerations by which the Catholic truth that Christ by those words expressed to us and left to be believed is much illustrated.

§ 8. The first is, that before Berengarius—namely, for a full thousand years from the institution of the sacrament—no one called this doctrine into doubt, unless perhaps a certain presbyter Bertramus, who after the year 800 very covertly and without any success began to write against it. For those whom Ignatius notes (in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans) are said to have adopted that error from another source.[^10]

§ 9. The second, that, not even when Berengarius had arisen, did that heresy have great success; for all the rulers of the Churches with one mind resisted it, so that not even one Bishop is read to have agreed with its dogma—on which count the Arian heresy was far more specious, which was held by innumerable Bishops. Then he himself recanted it thrice, and died in detestation of that his heresy and in a confession of the Catholic faith, having left scarcely any followers of his error after him.

§ 10. The third, that among the Doctors of the Church of old this matter was held so certain that from it they refuted other heresies arising in their time, or declared some otherwise obscure doctrine. Hence, indeed,

Irenaeus refutes those who denied the resurrection of the flesh; Ignatius (in the aforesaid Epistle), and Amphilochius in Theodoret (Dialogue 2 and 3), and Leo (Sermon 2 on the Fast of the seventh month), and again Irenaeus, book 5, from this dogma refute those who denied the flesh of Christ. Likewise Hilary and Cyril fight the Arians thereby; the Council of Ephesus the Nestorians; Leo against the same, and at once also the Eutychians, in the places cited above, attack by this reasoning. Augustine, moreover (book 3, On the Trinity, ch. 4), from this, as from what is better known, declares how otherwise the Holy Spirit by the dove and the Father by the voice were signified and represented, and otherwise the Son of God by the son of Mary. [^11]

§ 11. The fourth, that by miracles almost without number this truth has long since been divinely confirmed, many of which are read in most approved Authors—Cyprian (Sermon On the Lapsed), Ambrose (in the funeral Oration on the death of his brother), Amphilochius (in the Life of Basil), Optatus, book 2 (Against the Donatists), Nazianzen (in the Funeral Oration on his sister Gorgonia), Chrysostom, book 6 (On the Priesthood), Augustine, book 22 (City of God, ch. 8), Sozomen, book 8 (ch. 5), Nicephorus, book 13 (Hist., ch. 7), Gregory of Rome, book 3 (Dialogues, ch. 3), Bernard (in the Life of Malachy), Caesarius (in the Dialogues), and others. And indeed very many of these miracles are of such a sort that, unless we are forced to confess that Christ truly and really is in the Eucharist, we must confess that God (which it is impious even to suspect) has led men into the sin of idolatry, or at least greatly confirmed them in that most grave error.[^12]

§ 12. The fifth is taken from adoration, which, even by the adversaries' own witnesses, is due not to a sign but to God alone. Now that the Eucharist is to be adored, Augustine's words, cited above on Psalm 98, clearly teach, and we shall show below.[^13]

§ 13. The sixth, from the fact that the pious Faithful have always with all zeal taken care that this sacrament should by no means come into the hands of Infidels, being ready to meet death rather than either betray it or even permit it to be snatched away and badly handled; and that for no other reason than that they were firmly persuaded that that is truly the body of Christ, and the very Holy of Holies. Tertullian mentions this (book 2, To His Wife), and we have an example in the Roman acolyte Tarcisius, who for that cause underwent martyrdom, as is in the Roman Martyrology on the 15th day of August.[^14]

§ 14. The seventh, that the greatest caution has always been provided, lest this sacrament, or any particle of it, should either fall to the ground or in any way perish through negligence; likewise, lest anything of the Blood of the Lord should drip either on the ground, or upon the altar, or upon a linen cloth, with even severe punishments established for delinquents. Concerning which one may see Clement of Rome (Epistle 2), the Decree of Pius I as found in Gratian (On Consecration, Dist. 2, "Si per negligentiam"), the Council of Arles cited there in the same place (cap. "Qui bene"; Toledo III, can. 11) and Mâcon II (can. 6). The same are witnesses Tertullian (On the Crown of the Soldier), Origen (Hom. 13 on Exodus), Cyril of Jerusalem (Mystagogical Catechesis 5 or 8), Augustine (Hom. 16 among the fifty) and others. To this also pertains that Athanasius (in the Life of Antony), Chrysostom (in the Epistle to Pope Innocent, which is read in Nicephorus, book 13, Hist. ch. 19), and Victor of Utica, book 1 (Vandalic Persecution, ch. 30), so gravely complain of injuries inflicted by impious men upon the Body or Blood of Christ.[^15]

§ 15. The eighth, from the fact that Christians of old were accused by Gentiles as though they ate human flesh—a notion born of the rumor which they had received about this sacrament, that Christians in their Mysteries were wont to eat flesh and blood. Of which matter Eusebius writes (book 5, History, ch. 1) and

Justin (in the Apology). To this too is to be referred that the same unbelievers objected to Christians that they said they saw Christ in hidden places, as is in the Epistle of a certain Maximus the Pagan, 43 among the Letters of Augustine; and that of the profane judge in Prudentius (in the Hymn of Lawrence): "In silver goblets they carry to drink the sacred blood."[^16]

§ 16. The ninth, that the Fathers require faith about this sacrament, and withdraw us from sense, and flee to the omnipotence of God, and forbid the mode to be inquired into, by which they teach that it is the Body and Blood of Christ. Of which there would be no need, if in it there were not the Body and Blood of Christ except as in a sign. The passages are cited above from Dionysius of Alexandria, from both Cyrils, Ambrose, Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Leo, and others.[^17]

§ 17. The tenth, from the fact that the Fathers here acknowledge a conversion or transmutation and transubstantiation, as we shall teach below; and they declare that matter by examples of substantial transmutation, as of water into wine and into blood, and of the very creation of things, as may be seen in Ambrose. But a thing is not said to be transmuted or converted into another, much less to be transubstantiated (*transsubstantiari*), when it receives a new relation only; especially if that relation is not real but of reason only, such as is the relation of sign to signified, which depends upon the operation of the intellect alone.

§ 18. The eleventh, that by a most ancient phrase priests are said to "make the Body of the Lord," as in Alexander, Telesphorus, Jerome in the places noted above, and in others, and in Chrysostom (Hom. 2 on Timothy) repeatedly. For this would be said ineptly of that which is assumed only for signifying.

§ 19. The twelfth, that in the Liturgies of Basil and of Chrysostom, once celebrated through the whole Eastern Church, nay also in that of the Apostle James, there are contained those prayers, invocations, and ceremonies which are either foolish or impious, if in this sacrament the true Christ, the Son of God, is not present. On which see also Basil (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 27 or 25), Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3 or 2), and Origen (Hom. 6 on various places of the Gospel), where he also reports that saying used by those about to receive the Eucharist: "Lord, I am not worthy..."[^18]

§ 20. The thirteenth, that of old the Faithful, when receiving the Eucharist, professed that they were receiving the very Body and Blood of the Lord. For it was the custom that, when the priest or deacon handed this sacrament and said, "The Body of Christ," and again, "The Blood of Christ," the communicant should answer to each, "Amen." Whence Ambrose, book 4 (On the Sacraments, ch. 4): "The priest says to you, 'The Body of Christ'; and you say, 'Amen'—that is, 'true': what the tongue confesses, let the affection hold." In the same sense write Dionysius of Alexandria in Eusebius, book 7 (ch. 8); Leo (Sermon 6 on the fast of the seventh month); Clement of Rome, book 8 (Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 20); Cyril of Jerusalem (Mystagogical Catechesis 5 or 8). Likewise Cornelius (in the Epistle to Fabian of Antioch in Eusebius, book 6, ch. 35), that when Novatus or Novatian handed the Eucharist to the people, he ordered that, instead of "Amen," which ought to have been said, they say: "I will no longer return to Cornelius"—namely, Novatian binding his followers with an oath of this sort upon the Body and Blood of the Lord.[^19]

§ 21. The fourteenth, that the vessels by which this sacrament is administered have always been held in such honor that it was not permitted to touch them except to ministers peculiarly consecrated to this, as can easily be proved from various decretals of the Pontiffs and the sentences of other Fathers. One of whom, Jerome (in the Epistle to Theophilus of Alexandria), thus says: "Let those who are ignorant learn with what

majesty the sacred chalices and veils ought to be venerated"; and again: "Temples, altars, vestments, chalices, and the like things are venerated with great reverence on account of the fellowship of the Body of the Lord." Hence it is that Nazianzen and Optatus with almost the same words—he against the Arians in an Oration, this one against the Donatists, book 6—exclaim thus: "The crime has been doubled, when you have broken the chalice, the bearer of the Lord's Blood—O nefarious deed, unheard-of wickedness!" That chalice Chrysostom calls "terrible and most to be feared" (Hom. 24 on 1 Cor. 10).^[^20]

§ 22. The fifteenth, that to the celebration of this Mystery the Angels, Archangels, and other heavenly Powers are present, ministering with immense veneration, fear, and trembling to their king, and worshipping Him; not in one place alone does Chrysostom bear witness to this, as in book 6 (On the Priesthood), reporting a certain notable vision of which above, and likewise in the Homily to the People of Antioch 65, in Homily 21 on the Acts of the Apostles, Homily 3 on the Epistle to the Ephesians, Homily 3 Against the Anomoeans, and a certain Homily delivered at a Dedication. Such too is what, at the end of his Decalogue, Gregory says: "For who of the infidels could have the hearing to believe that at the very hour of the immolation, at the priest's voice, the heavens are opened and the choirs of Angels are present...?"^[^21]

§ 23. The sixteenth, that if the Eucharist were only the symbolic Body of Christ, it would not then differ from the blessed bread which of old was given to Catechumens. For even that was a symbol of the Body of Christ and was given in memory of His Passion. But Catechumens were of old kept away not only from the taking of the Eucharist, but also most strictly from even looking upon the Eucharist or being present at the sacrifice, as is evident from the Councils and other decrees of the Fathers. And Augustine himself in many places attests that what was given to the Catechumens, though it be blessed bread, is nevertheless not the Body of Christ; indeed, that Catechumens altogether do not know what the Christians eat. The passages are in Tracts 11 and 26 on John; book 2 On the Merits of Sinners, ch. 20 and 26; book 10 City of God, ch. 6; Hom. 42 among the fifty; on Psalms 39 and 109; Sermon 46 on time. Hence also is that so often repeated by Augustine: "The faithful know," or "Let the faithful know," as in Epistle 162; Tracts 22, 26, 45, 47 on John, and elsewhere; but the faithful for Augustine are only the baptized, with not only the Infidels excluded, but even the Catechumens.^[^22]

§ 24. Lastly, the very titles and those most honorific designations by which the Ancients used to name this sacrament and sacrifice abundantly convince the same thing. For Dionysius in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy calls it "awful, august, and venerable Mysteries"; Eusebius calls it "full of God"; "to be approached with fear"; "holy things of a most holy Sacrifice"; Chrysostom calls it the Mystery of all mysteries, most to be feared, venerable, to be trembled at, dreadful Sacrifice—places which occur among them frequently. Similar expressions are found in Nazianzen, Cyril, Damascene, and others. All which attack with too great force and impudence is absurd and quite naked of any foundation.^[^23]

§ V — Reply is made to the adversaries' arguments taken from authority (Adversariorum argumentis ab auctoritate petitis respondetur)^[^24]

§ 25. The truths of Catholic doctrine are commonly attacked by the adversaries' many arguments from authority, some of which it will suffice to propose here with their reply, using the sense of the words of Christ Himself. "This is my body," say they, "ought to be taken figuratively," and other things are also alleged from authority; but other arguments are from natural reason. The authorities are answered thus.

§ 26. First: Christ (John 6), when He had promised that His flesh was to be eaten and His blood drunk, and when many of those hearing Him were scandalized, say: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" and again: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" Christ replies: "It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh profits nothing; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." Which, say our adversaries and many of the ancient expositors—carnal and Judaizing interpreters—are to be understood as excluding any corporal manducation, saying that the spiritual alone is to be understood; that is, to be understood spiritually and not carnally; or of spiritual and sacramental manducation only. And they add diverse Fathers' interpretations: the carnal senses according to the Jews; the spiritual sense according to us. But we, following the norm of Augustine, reprove such a mode and say that those very words of Augustine are to be understood conformably, that is, in this way: the words "My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink" are to be understood by you not of the carnal (the carnal are, as he says elsewhere, to be understood carnally), but of the spiritual; and in this way the intellect begets life.[^25]

§ 27. We are not ignorant that the proper words of the sacred banquet exclude carnal manducation, but not spiritual; indeed, this too is said there (as in Disp. 9). To the second it is answered that Christ in that place warned the faithful beforehand against false prophets and pseudo-teachers, of whom each one boasted himself to be the true Christ and that he had with him the true Church of Christ and the doctrine truly handed down from Christ. That sense the following words clearly propose: "For false Christs and false prophets shall arise," and so on.

§ 28. To the third, it is answered that the Scripture there is speaking not of any and every corporal presence of the Lord. For, after the Resurrection, the Lord was present to His disciples in body, as it is written, showing Himself to them; but, since at that time He was present, He did not say that He would then be present; nor does He deny, as Luke says: "Here and there; behold, I am with you," but "Lo, I am with you always." The Lord therefore speaks of that presence which, though He had, according to human necessities, when He dwelt familiarly with men, He would no longer have in that way, since after the Resurrection He would not be subject to human ministries.

§ 29. In what way Christ is nevertheless present to us in the sacrament.

§ 30. To the fourth it is answered that, if by "flesh" He had wished to signify the flesh as such, and to be contemplated as that which was seen in this place in the flesh when He was present, and that one would have in heaven to see by an astronomical reason, then they who have a mind filled with spiritual goods would hardly be able to understand such a thing in a body. Yet it is to be held also that by the very nature of the thing divine we must allow that, wherever the matter is in question, whether in soul or in body, it is as to divine status; and thus that the Blessed Mary, the Magi, and the disciples worshipped Christ, and many others; and even that when Christ was still walking on earth some worshipped.[^26]

§ 31. Moreover Augustine and some of the Ancients sometimes used more oblique expressions or wrote obscurely about this Mystery, for the cause that they wished the hearers to have a sense not only of Christians but also of infidels, before whom the Mysteries of our religion had to be concealed. Of this matter Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy) admonishes, and the same thing, which we shall produce below, Ambrose admonishes; and Estius himself remarks. Likewise Augustine himself...[^27]

§ 32. What is first objected from Augustine signifies in no way that the true Body of Christ is not in the Eucharist; since in that very place Augustine most expressly affirms it to be taken. "Not that the Body of

Christ is to be taken in its own species," he says, "as it appeared then on earth and as it now appears to the Blessed in heaven." But he adds: "It is not that body which you see, nor that blood which they who crucified Him shed." He therefore excludes by those words the carnal manducation of the body of Christ, not the sacramental, nor the true. Thus too Christ says (John 6): "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." And note that Augustine says elsewhere expressly that it is not the same body which was handed over to death that is drunk and eaten in the sacrament as it hung on the cross, and, in the Exposition on Psalm 33: "The great Lord," he says, "gave us to eat His body and to drink His blood."[^28]

§ 33. Why Augustine and also certain of the Ancients sometimes either introduced or wrote obscurely on this Mystery—this is the cause: that they wished their hearers to have a sense not only of Christians but also of infidels, for whom not only the Christian but even the infidel senses might be scandalized if the things of our religion should be made manifest. About the Mysteries of religion, Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy) admonishes that they are to be occulted; and what follows he also explains more fully. Likewise Ambrose, in a certain admonition... and Estius himself...[^29]

§ VI — Reply to the arguments which are taken from reason; and first, to the positive one which contends that the same body cannot be in many places (Respondetur ad argumenta quae ex ratione petuntur; et positivum, quod contendit idem corpus esse non posse in pluribus locis)[^30]

§ 34. We answer the adversaries' arguments which attack the truth of this sacrament from natural reason. Among which the first and chief is this: that it cannot be done, not even by a miracle or by divine power, that the same body should be in several or distinct places; and therefore that it is impossible that the Body of Christ should be at once in heaven and on earth, and since it is on so many altars on which it is consecrated. Therefore, they say, in the symbol we confess that Christ assumed a human nature into heaven, to sit at the right hand of the Father, whence He is to come to the judgment universal. And "Men of Galilee," Peter is testified to have said: "Why do you stand looking up to heaven? This Jesus shall so come as you have seen Him going into heaven" (Acts 1).[^31]

§ 35. The proposition is variously proved. First, by the words of the Angel said to the women at the Lord's sepulcher (Matt. 28): "He is not here, for He hath risen." Which words seem to carry this argument: Christ rose from this place; therefore He is not in this place. Next, by some sayings of Augustine: in his Epistle to Dardanus he disputes that, since God the Word is everywhere, he teaches Christ indeed, inasmuch as He is God, to be everywhere; yet not in one place, that is, not contained by a place: "Do not," says he, "doubt that the man Christ Jesus is now where He shall be forever, and lives, and is immortal as to the humanity now in heaven"; and in Tractate 30 on John he says: "This place you will not always have [Me in]." And in Tractate 50 on John: "Not here; for He sits at the right hand of the Father. By which words he indicates this argument: that Christ is in heaven; therefore He is not in the earth. And in another place: Christ is not otherwise present with us than according to the sublimity of His majesty."[^32]

§ 36. The force of the present proofs is easily loosed, if one attend to the words of the Angel; for either they are to be taken as said of the body of the Lord naturally in a place, or they are simply to be taken of the natural mode of existing. The question is asked about the natural mode. Whence the question about the natural behavior of Christ's body in place is investigated; whence the reply is better.

§ 37. The latter reply is also better. For Augustine wishes to show, according to a certain mode of existing, that Christ is nowhere else than in heaven, and he determines that to a certain place, near where He will come to judgment; although afterwards he adds no limitation of this sort to His nobility: "How great, therefore, is Christ in the altar, so great is He in heaven; how great He is not in this way, yet by place He is moved, as we have shown above, the absolutely true Christ whom we worship, not is He from heaven."^[33]

§ 38. Besides, certain arguments of reason are further proposed thus: First, if the same body were at once in various places, the same nature could at once be in various places and in infinite places; but this is false, since the nature of a thing is proportioned to one place to fill all. Second: if a body were at once in several places, it would exist outside the proper bounds of place—for place is the proper bound and measure of a body—and hence it would exist outside bounds. Third: from the same position it would follow that the same body could be moved by contrary motions—namely, to will to run upward and downward, rightward and leftward at the same time. But this is impossible, as it involves contrariety against the nature of motion. Fourth: from the same there follows that the same body could suffer contrary qualities at once—so that at once it could be hot and cold, dry and wet, savory and bitter. Fifth: by no power could it be done that the same thing be at once in different times, since what could be is not in different places.

§ 39. But now, besides these arguments and others of the same kind taken from the very position of the places, certain arguments are adduced from other places taken up and are answered elsewhere; and others are taken from the sense, which are set forth elsewhere. Wherefore the solution is to be made here.

§ 40. Indeed, since the change by which the Body of Christ begins to be in this sacrament is terminated immediately to the substance of the Body of Christ, when the priest says: "This is my body," it is to be followed that the very Body of Christ and its quantity and other accidents are in it not by the mode of quantity but by the mode of substance, although that mode be incomprehensible to us.

§ 41. With these premises, the first and most principal objection we proposed is to be answered: that it is indeed possible by divine power for the same entire body by number to be in the several members of the human body, although the members are distant among themselves in place. And there is the same judgment about the quantities. The hand is not the body; and thus it is more miraculous and more unintelligible to find such a virtue divine in a body; but nevertheless also from the nature of a compound's substance it follows that the entire water is so as to such quality; and that as to that of the dimensions of its parts it is connected—indifferently, whether the dimensions themselves are divided, or indivisible, or divided by the potency of quantity, as St. Thomas explains.^[34]

§ 42. For the first of the proofs we reply that the argument is good in the words of the Angel; for that naturally a body can be, or that the same body in various places, is simply impossible, and what is simply impossible by the natural mode be of the simple nature of Christ's body is asked in particular. Whence the latter reply is better.

§ 43. The latter reply is also the better. For Augustine wishes, according to the aforesaid mode of existing, that Christ is nowhere else than in heaven, and he adds that a certain place is determined where He will come to judgment; although afterwards he adds no limitation of this sort. How great is Christ in the altar, so great in heaven; as He is in this way not by place; and by the place He is moved, as we have shown above. The absolutely true Christ whom we worship is not in no place, nor can He be enclosed by a place; since by the place it is not shown where He is not truly.^[35]

§ 44. From the second principal argument, there is also a clear reply: Just as the Body of Christ and its quantity are in this sacrament, not by the mode of quantity, but by that of substance—whose proper totality, as St. Thomas says (q. 76, art. 3, ad 3), is contained indifferently in small and great quantity—so therefore here too a great quantity can be contained in a small, which is not inconvenient.

§ 45. The solution of the third argument is likewise obvious from the same: where, however, it is still said that by divine virtue the quantity corporeal can be separated from the body corporeal substantially, since it is not essential to it.

§ 46. Lastly, it is shown from Christ's own act and words that in the Supper He then gave His blood to be drunk when He was about to be handed over to death, and that He handed over His own Body as then living to be handed over. For even at that time His flesh was with blood mixed and His blood with flesh was not separated. For when Christ gave us then His body and blood, that very union which on the cross appeared—what the soul joined to the body accomplishes, then the union of body and blood—was old and remained joined and, in the species of wine, the animated blood of Christ is said to have been.[^36]

§ 47. Moreover, in the triduum of the death of Christ it is agreed, whether on each Lord's day, as if the Eucharist had then existed, or that in the exchange of the species the Body of Christ remained under the species of bread, as it lay in the sepulcher; similarly the blood, similarly the soul: not, however, was then the true separation real. Let no one then here scruple whether the blood properly is the proper blood of human bodies, or the blood of the dead, because of difference of violence—as Thomas and Scotus, whose sentences Cajetan expounds, explain: it suffices to our present doctrine that that entire integrity of the body remained, and that absolutely the living body and soul remained or did not remain (Lev. 17: "The soul of the flesh is in the blood").[^37]

§ 48. We therefore judge with all the Fathers that the substance and the rest of the accidents of Christ are absolute. For, in this sacrament, while Christ is in heaven, no real change is made about Him. Wherefore we understand that He Himself in His human nature, concomitantly with all the accidents, are really conjoined, as St. Thomas teaches (q. 76, art. 1, ad 4). And thus to the unlearned—since a comparison is had by the Ancients as to human reasonings, who do not know how to judge about substance, but only about the appearance of accidents...[^38]

§ 49. Enough has been indicated about Augustine's doctrine (Tract. 30, 50, on John).

§ 50. To these may be referred those things we said above (ad 2, Disp. 9, b.), namely that it is to be inquired how Christ is everywhere.

§ 51. The contrary, however, has no force at all; and what pertains to the first: in the hypostatic union of two natures in Christ it follows that whatever is attributed by nature is attributed in Christ in the mode of the Person of God; if anything is attributed equally in the immutable and divine nature, that is another which is absurd and impossible; and only the communication of idioms follows of each nature in the eternal supposit; as is Christ the man omnipotent, and God equal to the Father and God. Likewise, Christ the man is nowhere other than with a man, or than God, as we have explained above.[^39]

§ 52. The second argument of inefficacy we answer in like manner: "If I shall ascend into heaven, there is the hand of God"; the hand of God is everywhere; therefore it is everywhere just. Likewise, creation is in God: God is everywhere; therefore every creature is everywhere. But not everything that is contained is necessarily

that which is contained in that place. Whence Augustine (in Epist. to Dardanus): "Nor does it therefore follow," says he, "that, because it is in God, it is everywhere God. For the most faithful Scripture says of us that in Him we live and move and are; and yet we are not everywhere." These Augustine. Although we may deny to sit at the right hand to be everywhere; for by the right hand of God is understood the glory which Christ's humanity has at the right hand of the Father in the heavens; which is not everywhere. But we also say that senses are to be held on earth of the blessed to whom the goods have been prepared by God; not however everywhere do they descend.

§ 53. The third is to be responded to as follows; and already long ago the reply was from Augustine in the said Epistle by his words: "Nor," he says, "do we say that Christ is in the earth, the man separated from the man, or that we divide the same Christ the Son of man, that is, from a part of man, not in heaven but on earth," which is absurd; "No one ascends into heaven but He who descended from heaven; the Son of Man who is in heaven," and so forth: No one ascends into heaven except he who descended; those sons who are in heaven, and we sons by adoption; Christ however the true Son of God was in heaven; He on earth was to be everywhere.[⁴⁰]

§ 54. That Christ in this world had not, by comparison with other men, an external ministry is evident; yet that omnipotent Christ was able to be at the right hand of the Father; wherefore He nowhere taught place otherwise than to His humanity, or to God, as we have just explained in a fuller reply.

§ IX — That in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is there even apart from use (Esse in Eucharistia corpus Christi etiam extra usum)[⁴¹]

§ 55. It has also been received, even among the Lutherans, that under the Eucharistic sacrament the Body of Christ and Blood are there even with respect to use—that is, when it is taken up and consumed. But some of them deny that it is there except during the very act of consumption; others, until the consumption be finished; whence, when the finished consumption is done, then the species would cease, and so the

§ 56. Eusebius calls the ecclesiastical hierarchy "the sacrosanct, most august, and most venerable Mysteries," "full of God and bringing awe," and "the most holy Sacrifice."¹ St. John Chrysostom calls it "the Mystery above all most dreadful and most to be revered," and again "ineffable, venerable, tremendous, most horrendous Mysteries," "a terrible and formidable Sacrifice."² Passages are everywhere and obvious in him. Similar things occur in Nazianzen, Cyril, Damascene, and others.³ All of which it is far too inept and absurd to refer to a bare sign.⁴

§ V — Responses to the adversaries' arguments from authority (Adversariorum argumentis ab auctoritate, petitis respondetur)

§ 57. The truth of the handed-down Catholic doctrine is attacked by many arguments by the adversaries, some of which were long ago answered when the sense of the words of Christ, "This is my body," was being treated. Others, however, are drawn from authority, and still others from natural reason. Those which rest on authorities are for the most part these. First: When Christ in John 6 had promised that His flesh would be eaten and His blood drunk, and at that discourse many of the hearers, offended, were withdrawing, saying: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" and again: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?", He

corrected their perverse understanding by these words: "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life." By which reply He recalls the hearers from the understanding of a carnal eating to the understanding of a spiritual eating, according to St. Augustine, who treats that passage thus (Tractate 27 on John): "What is it, 'spirit and life'? Spiritually are they to be understood. If you have understood spiritually, they are spirit and life. If you have understood carnally, even so they are spirit and life, but not so to you."⁶

§ 58. Second: The Lord saying, "If anyone shall say to you: Behold, here is Christ, or there, do not believe," and again, "If they shall say to you: Behold, in the desert, do not go out; behold, in the inner rooms, do not believe," therefore Christ is not corporally in the sacrament, so that He can be pointed out and it be said, "Here He is." Third: In John 12 it is said expressly by the Lord to the disciples and to their successors: "You always have the poor with you, but me you do not always have." This is understood of bodily presence. For of spiritual presence He speaks thus (Matt. last): "I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the age." Fourth: The Church warns the faithful, during the very solemnities of the Masses, that they have their heart on high; and the Apostle (Col. 3) says: "Seek the things that are above, not the things upon the earth." Therefore Christ is not here upon the earth in the sacrament. Fifth: In the Secret of the second Mass of the Nativity of the Lord the priest prays that "this earthly substance may confer what is divine." Therefore it does not pass into the substance of the Body of Christ. Sixth: Augustine, writing on Psalm 98 at those words, "Adore the footstool of his feet," teaches—speaking in the person of Christ—thus: "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. Understand spiritually what I have spoken to you; you are not to eat this body which you see, nor to drink that blood which they who will crucify me will shed. I have commended to you some sacrament, to be understood spiritually; it will quicken you. And if it is necessary that it be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly." From which words it appears that Augustine understands nothing except that the Body and Blood of Christ are eaten and drunk spiritually by the faithful.⁷

§ 59. Seventh: The same Augustine (Sermon 2 On the Words of the Lord) says that the body of Christ is not "the bread that goes down into the belly," and yet in book 3 (On the Trinity, ch. 10) he says that the bread of the Eucharist is consumed by eating; therefore the bread of the Eucharist is not the Body of Christ. Eighth: The same (Tractate 25 on John) shows that the body of Christ is eaten only by faith, by these words: "Why do you prepare teeth and belly? Believe, and you have eaten"; therefore what is ground by the teeth and sent into the belly is not the body of Christ. Ninth: The same (Sermon 50, speaking of the preaching of the Gospel): "What seems to you to be more, the word of God or the body of Christ? If you wish to answer the truth, this assuredly you ought to say, that the word of God is not less than the body of Christ." And a little after: "He will not be less guilty who shall have heard the word of God negligently than he who by his negligence shall have allowed the body of Christ to fall to the earth." These are things which would not be true, if the body of Christ in the Eucharist were true and not symbolic. Tenth: The same Augustine (Homily 1 on Psalm 30) says that no man touches Christ sitting in heaven; therefore He is not upon the altar in such a way that He can be touched, namely, corporally. Lastly: Cyril of Jerusalem (Catechesis 14) says: "If anyone shall say, 'Behold, here is Christ, behold, there,' do not believe; nor hereafter look down upon the earth." In the same way also Maximus speaks (Homily 4 on the Burial of the Lord), saying that Christ is to be sought neither "upon the earth" nor "in the earth." To these arguments we reply thus in detail.

§ 60. And first indeed, Christ did not signify by those words that His flesh profits nothing to men for righteousness and salvation. For if the flesh profited nothing, says Augustine (Tractate 27 on John), the Word

would not have been made flesh, that it might dwell in us. But "the flesh profits nothing," in the way the Capharnaïtes understood; namely, as flesh is torn in a corpse, or sold in a butcher's stall, not as it is enlivened by the Spirit. So also in the exposition of the same matters (on Ps. 98) he says: "They received it foolishly, they thought of it carnally, and they supposed that the Lord would cut off certain particles from His body and give them." He writes similarly, book 3 (On Christian Doctrine, ch. 16), and again (Tractate 11 on John). Moreover Augustine wishes it to be thus said: "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing," as it is said: "Knowledge puffs up, but charity builds up"; so that, just as by that sentence it is signified that knowledge, without charity, puffs up, so by this it is signified that flesh, without the Spirit—namely the divine—profits nothing. Hence neither did the Lord say: "My flesh profits nothing," that is, flesh conjoined to the Word; but absolutely, "the flesh profits nothing." This sense also Cyril gives on John, writing the same.⁸ Moreover, in Chrysostom and those who follow him there is received a twofold understanding, spiritual and carnal; spiritual, namely, according to which the words are understood either of spiritual eating alone, or of spiritual and sacramental eating together, and that according to the diverse interpretations of the Fathers; carnal, however, according to which they are understood in the manner which a little before we reproved in Augustine's words. Whence what follows must be taken correspondingly in this way: "The words which I have spoken to you"—about my flesh to be eaten and the Blood to be drunk—"are spiritual and are to be understood spiritually, and understood in that way they confer life." Therefore by these words a bodily or sacramental eating is not excluded, but the carnal one is, of which also it was said above (at Distinction 9).

§ 61. To the second it is answered that in that place Christ is forearming the faithful against pseudo-prophets or false teachers, each of whom will boast that he is the true Christ, and that with him is the true Church of Christ, and that the true doctrine concerning Christ is delivered by him. Which sense the following words clearly show: "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets," etc. But if you take the Lord's words crudely, that no one is to be heard who says, "Here is Christ," you will be forced to admit that not even God is to be heard when He said, "This is my beloved Son."

§ 62. To the third passage of Scripture it is answered that the Lord is not speaking of any and every bodily presence. For even after the resurrection, although He presented Himself to the disciples as present in body, nevertheless because He was not then with them in the way He had been before, hence He denies that He is present, when He says in Luke last: "These things I spoke when I was still with you." Therefore the Lord is speaking of that presence by which, as man subject to human necessities, He had familiar conversation with men, and received from them the ministries of human necessity. In which way Christ is by no means present to us in the sacrament.

§ 63. To the fourth it is answered: if "to have the heart on high" were this, to contemplate the things that are in a lofty place, by this reasoning astrologers would above all "have the heart on high"; but those are truly said to "have the heart on high" who have their mind intent upon spiritual and divine things, wherever those things may be: in which way the Blessed Mary and the Magi and the disciples of Christ and many others had their heart on high, even then when they were adoring Christ as still dwelling upon the earth. And that "to seek the things that are above," or "the things that are upon the earth," is to be understood morally is easy to declare from the very context of the Apostle (Col. 3). According to which sense one must also grant that Christ is not "upon the earth," because He is a divine and heavenly food, by which the soul is fed, not by which the body is fattened.

§ 64. To the fifth it must be answered that in that prayer "earthly substance" is understood insofar as it is about to be changed into a heavenly. For that prayer is recited before the consecration. Nevertheless by "earthly substance" the flesh of Christ can also be understood, which by its origin indeed is earthly, as having been taken from the earth, as Augustine attests writing (on Psalm 56); yet the same, insofar as it is conjoined to the Word, confers on us a divine effect.⁹ What is first objected from Augustine signifies in no way that the true Body of Christ is not in the Eucharist, since in that very place Augustine most openly affirms it; but it must be taken in this sense: that the Body of Christ is not there in its proper appearance, in the way it appeared when He was dwelling upon the earth, and in the way it now appears to the Blessed in heaven. For this is what he says: "Not this body which you see, not that blood which they are going to shed"—that is, not in that appearance in which then both the body and the blood appeared. He therefore excludes by those words a carnal eating of the body of Christ, not the sacramental, nor a bodily one in the sense in which also Christ (John 6), saying, "The words which I have spoken to you," etc., to which Augustine in this place has regard. And note that Augustine elsewhere expressly says that we eat that same body which was delivered to death, and drink that same blood which was poured out on the cross, as in the Exposition (on Psalm 33): "Great is the Lord, who has given us to eat His body, in which He endured so much."¹⁰ But why Augustine and certain others of the Ancients sometimes spoke or wrote more obscurely concerning this Mystery, this was the cause: that they knew they had hearers not only of Christians, but also of unbelievers, for whom the more secret Mysteries of our religion were to be concealed. On which matter Dionysius (in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy) diligently warns and adjures Timothy not to publish everywhere what had been written by him concerning the divine Mysteries. A similar admonition is that of Ambrose (at the beginning of the book On those who are initiated into the Mysteries). Basil also makes mention of this, book (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 17). And Augustine himself, whenever almost mention occurred of this sacrament, was wont to say, "The faithful know," "He who reads, let him understand," or something similar; by such a word intimating to the Faithful, as to those in the know, of what Mystery he was speaking: yet not disclosing it either to the unbelievers, lest perhaps they should despise it, or to the Catechumens, in order that, the Mysteries of our religion being hidden, they might the more eagerly desire them, and by desiring might hasten to the grace of Baptism. The reason for the Catechumens he himself gives (Tractate 96 on John) by these words: "Because although the Sacraments of the Faithful are not disclosed to them, it is not so much because they cannot bear them, as that they may by them be the more ardently desired, when they are more honorably concealed from them."

§ 65. To what was objected seventh from the two places of Augustine we reply that those places are at variance neither with one another nor with Catholic doctrine. For the former place signifies that the Body of Christ is not a bread appointed to this, that, once sent into the belly, it nourish the body, but that it feed the soul. Whence there also it is called the bread "of eternal life," which sustains the substance of our soul. Although that Sermon is not Augustine's, but Ambrose's, namely, entirely the same as chapter 4, book 4 (On the Sacraments). The latter place wishes to say nothing other than that that bread is consumed by eating by reason of the species that remain after consecration, under which the body of Christ is.

§ 66. To the eighth, first, one can answer that Augustine in that place is not treating of the Eucharist but of common bread. For he is explaining these words of Christ: "You seek me because you ate of the loaves and were filled. Work not for the food that perishes but for that which remains unto life everlasting." Which food the Lord Himself presently interprets as the work of faith. In which place no mention had yet been made of the flesh and blood of Christ to be appointed for nourishment. Yet because Augustine's interrogation is

general, which can be extended to everything that is eaten carnally, and therefore both the Master (at Dist. 9) and Gratian (De Consecratione, Dist. 2, cap. Ut quid) and very many others understood it also to pertain to the sacramental reception of the Eucharist: hence in a general way too it is answered that Augustine by those words exhorts to what is chief and per se the thing to be done, and without which that which profits carnally does not profit—namely, to charity formed; and that he would prefer a spiritual eating to a carnal. In which sense elsewhere Scripture compares mercy to sacrifice, spirit to letter, charity to knowledge.

§ 67. To the ninth we answer that that Homily is not Augustine's; yet, whoever's it be, it contains nothing contrary to Catholic truth. For just as that author does not say that the Body of Christ is "more" than the word of God, so neither on the contrary does he affirm that the word of God is more than the Body of Christ—which, however, according to the doctrine of the adversaries should have been said—but only denies that it is "less." For he understands the word of God according to the things signified through it, that is, divine things, among which is God Himself and the Word. In regard of which realities great reverence is owed to the very word of preaching, which he wished to signify hyperbolically when he said: "He will be no less guilty who shall have heard the word of God negligently," etc.; namely, wishing to persuade this, that with the highest diligence and attention that which is so greatly commended be heard.

§ 68. To the tenth it is answered that "no one touches Christ sitting in heaven" in a human way, namely, so as to be able to inflict hurt or bodily harm. For of such a way of touching Augustine is there speaking, although it can also be understood thus, that, according to the proper qualities of His body, Christ cannot now be touched by a man placed on earth. For in the Eucharist He is touched only according to alien species.

§ 69. To the last we answer that Cyril signifies the same thing which Christ signifies in the Gospel; namely, that according to human conversation and visible bodily presence He will no longer be with us on earth; and therefore, if anyone shall wish to show Christ present to us here in that way, he is not to be believed. The words of Maximus have not a dissimilar sense: for Christ, after He once ascended into heaven, is not now to be sought "upon the earth," in the way He was sought by the disciples and by the Jews and by His own Mother while He was still mortal; nor "in the earth," that is, in the sepulcher, in the way He was sought by the women when already dead; namely, according to the human appearance in which He could then be beheld by men. For according to that appearance, withdrawn from the eyes of mortals, He now reigns immortal in the heavens.

§ VI — Reply to the arguments drawn from reason, especially that which contends that the same body cannot be in many places (Respondetur ad argumenta quae ex ratione petuntur, ea potissimum, quae contendit idem corpus esse non posse in pluribus locis)

§ 70. Now we reply to the arguments of the Adversaries, which assail the truth of this sacrament (*sacramentum*) on the ground of natural reason. Among which the first and chief is this: that it cannot be done, not even by a miracle, that is, by divine power, that the same body should be in many and distinct places; and therefore it is impossible that the body of Christ should be at once in heaven and on earth, and at once also on so many altars on which it is consecrated. Since therefore in the Creed we confess that Christ according to the human nature ascended into heaven, and there sits at the right hand of the Father, and from thence shall come to the general judgment; and in Acts 3 Peter bears witness concerning Him, saying, "Whom

indeed it behooves that heaven receive until the times of the restitution of all things"; it seems a consequence that He is not corporally present to us in the Sacrament, especially on so many altars on which at the same time there is consecration. But they prove the proposition in various ways.

§ 71. First, from the words of the Angel saying to the women concerning the Body of Christ (Matt. 28): "Non est hic, surrexit enim sicut dixit." These words seem to contain this argumentation: Christ has risen from this place; therefore He is not in this place. Next, from certain sayings of St. Augustine. For in the Letter 57 to Dardanus he debates how God is everywhere, and teaches that Christ, as man, is not everywhere, but is contained in a certain place, namely heaven: "Noli," he says, "dubitate ibi tunc esse hominem Christum Jesum unde venturus est ad vivos, mortuosque judicandos." Likewise in Tractate 30 on John he says thus: "Donec saeculum finiatur sursum est Dominus, sed etiam hic est veritas Dominus. Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexit uno loco esse potest, veritas ejus ubique diffusa est." And in Tractate 50 on those words "Me autem non semper habebitis" he says: "Non est hic, abiit enim sedere ad dexteram Patris." By which words he indicates this argumentation: Christ is in heaven; therefore He is not on earth. And in the same place he acknowledges Christ present here in no other way than according to the presence of majesty.

§ 72. First: if the same body could at once be in different places, by the same reasoning it could be in all places, even in infinite places; but this is false, since it is proper to the Deity to be everywhere and to fill all things. Second: if the same body were in many places, it would exist outside its proper boundaries (for a proper place is the boundary and measure of a body), and hence would be outside itself. Third: from the same supposition it would follow that the same body could at once be moved by contrary motions, as upward and downward and to the right and to the left. But this is impossible, inasmuch as from contrariety it involves contradiction. Fourth: again it follows that the same body can at once be affected with contrary qualities, and thus it will be able to happen that it is at once hot and cold, healthy and sick, alive and dead, which is most absurd. Fifth: By no power can it be brought about that the same thing be at once in different times; therefore neither can it be brought about that it be in different places. Now besides this argument taken from the diversity of places, there are brought forward others of the same kind, such as this: If the body of Christ is in the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*), it follows that what is greater is contained by what is less, for the body of Christ is greater than that species of bread. But that is impossible and repugnant to the nature of things.

§ 73. Likewise: The body of Christ in the Eucharist is either quantified (*quantum*) or not quantified (*non quantum*). If quantified, then, as has been said, a lesser quantity will comprehend a greater. If not quantified, then the same body would be both quantified and not quantified; namely quantified in heaven, not quantified in the Eucharist. Nay rather it will follow that He is not a body in the Eucharist, since the formal character (*ratio*) of body does not subsist without quantity. To this is added what Augustine says (in the Letter called to Dardanus), that the parts of a body of necessity are at a distance from one another and cannot be together at the same time, because, he says, each holds its own spatial intervals of places, the lesser smaller, the greater greater, and so on; and further below: "Take away the spaces of places from bodies, and they will be nowhere; because they will be nowhere, they will not be." Nay rather Augustine (in the Sermon "to the infants") by that argument proves that the body of Christ is not on the altar, because it is received into heaven. "Illuc," he says, "levavit corpus suum, unde et venturus ut judicet vivos et mortuos. Ibi est modo sedens ad dexteram Patris. Quomodo est ergo habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus?"

§ 74. Lastly, Calvin argues thus: Christ says, "Palpate et videte, quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet"; therefore, in the judgment of Christ, the truth of the flesh is proved from the fact that it can be handled and

seen: take these away, and it ceases to be flesh. They object also that the corporal presence of Christ is an impediment to enjoying His spiritual presence, and to receiving the Holy Spirit, according to that saying (Jn. 16): "Expedit vobis ut ego vadam: si enim non abiero, Paraclitus non veniet ad vos," as if He were saying—so Augustine says on that place (Tract. 94)—"Expedit vobis ut haec forma servi auferatur a vobis"; and again: "Non potestis capere spiritum quamdiu secundum carnem persistitis nosse Christum." Whence he who had already received the Spirit: "Etsi noveramus," he says, "secundum carnem Christum, sed nunc jam non novimus" (2 Cor. 5). To these arguments that we may reply, first of all it must be established that many things are possible to God which cannot be comprehended by the human intellect, and among them without doubt is also this which the Church's faith hands down concerning the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

§ 75. Nor therefore must we labor that the marvels which are in this sacrament be understood by us—such as, how Christ is in this sacrament, how it can be that the same is in many places, how the whole is in the whole sacrament and in any part whatever, how the very conversion takes place, and other things of that sort; but for the unlearned it is enough simply to believe that these things are so; for the learned, if besides this they can in some measure set forth and confirm the truth itself by suitable arguments and testimonies, and defend and vindicate it against every absurdity of the infidels' arguments, as Augustine admonishes in *De Trinitate*, book 14, chapter 1.¹³ But those who have for a foundation that they are unwilling to believe anything other than what they understand, and therefore deny that these things which we have just said are possible to God, are like those who said: "Numquid poterit Deus parare mensam in deserto?" and, "Quomodo potest hic nobis carnem dare ad manducandum?"; and like the Sadducees who, denying the resurrection of the dead to be possible, heard from the Lord that they "err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God"; and like the pagans who spat out the Birth of the Virgin as impossible. Against whom Augustine (Letter 3 to Volusianus) says: "If here reason be sought, it will not be wonderful; if an example be demanded, it will not be singular. Let us grant that God is able to do something which we profess ourselves unable to investigate; in such matters the whole account is the power of the doer." Thus he. And not dissimilarly Gregory (Homily 26 on the Gospels): "We must know," he says, "that the divine operation, if it be comprehended by reason, is not admirable; nor does faith have merit, to which human reason affords experiment."¹⁴

§ 76. Now that it is not impossible to God to make the same body be in different places is proved first from this, that it involves no contradiction, and therefore is by no means to be removed from God's omnipotence. Then it is confirmed by a like instance which we have manifestly declared in Holy Scripture, namely that diverse bodies can by God's omnipotence be at once in the same place: for Christ rose with the sepulcher closed (Matt. 28), and entered to the disciples, the doors being shut (Jn. 20); to omit meanwhile those things concerning which there could in some manner be doubt—namely, whether He came forth into the light with the maternal womb entirely closed, and whether He ascended into heaven without the rending of the celestial spheres. For as to the two former examples, after the most clear Scripture and concordant testimonies of the Fathers they leave us no matter for disputation. For thus expressly bear witness Ambrose (on Luke, the last), Origen (Homily 17 on Luke), Augustine (Sermon 102 on Various Matters, chs. 8, 12), where he says: "Our Lord did also with His body what the ray of our eye cannot, namely, passed through closed things, that is, through shut doors; and what we cannot see, He also could both enter and go forth." The same affirm and teach Gregory (the already mentioned Homily 26), Bede (Homily 1 among the Summer homilies on the Season), Theophylact (on John 20), and all others whoever have touched this argument.¹⁵ Since therefore among natural philosophers the penetration of bodily dimensions—by which it comes about

that two bodies are in the same place—is no less impossible than that the same one and the selfsame body should be in many places; if the former is possible to God, the latter will be as well. And indeed a certain number of the adversaries even concede the former.

§ 77. "...scribens on John 20" says: "It is indeed variously disputed among the Schoolmen whether by divine power the same body can be circumscriptively, that is, locally, in many places. And although, moved by certain reasons, some deny it—such as St. Thomas and those who follow him, whose opinion has great probability from reason—Scotus, however, and certain others affirm it not improbably; both because neither does it include a contradiction, and because it is established that by divine power two bodies can even circumscriptively be in the same place, as has just been proved." Meanwhile it is indubitable among all the theologians that sacramentally the same body can be in many places, or in one locally and in another or others sacramentally—and that suffices for the present disputation. For although one must hold by faith, according to the doctrine of the Fathers and the definition of the Council of Trent (Session 13, chapter 1, canon 1), that truly, really, and substantially in the sacrament of the Eucharist the body of Christ is contained, nevertheless He is not there locally or circumscriptively or naturally, and therefore neither passibly nor sensibly. Whence it does not follow that the same body exists in different places in any such manner. But these do not clash among themselves, as in the same place the Tridentine Synod declares, to wit, that Christ the Savior now always sits at the right hand of the Father in the heavens, according to the natural mode of existing; and that nonetheless in many other places He is sacramentally present, that by His substance He be present to us in that mode of existing which, although we can scarcely express it in words, yet we can, with knowledge enlightened by faith, grasp to be possible to God, and must most constantly believe. Thus the Synod. But this mode of existing the Doctors, together with the Synod, call sacramental, and say that Christ is in the Eucharist sacramentally. By which phrase it is not signified that Christ is there only as in a sign, although the sacrament is in the genus of sign; but that the body of Christ is therein according to the mode proper to this sacrament, as St. Thomas says.¹⁶ But since that mode cannot be fully understood by us, it must be explained more by negation than by affirmation. Now there are four or five things which befit other bodies and yet are removed from the body of Christ, as He is in this sacrament.

§ 78. Of which the first is, to be somewhere circumscriptively. For He is not bounded either by the species themselves, or by the place of the species, nor is He commensurated to it according to extension. For in this way He would be in the place just as much as He is in the heavens. The second is, to be passibly, the negation of which follows from the first. For if the body of Christ is not locally in this sacrament, therefore in it He can neither act nor suffer anything according to nature. For no natural action or passion can be terminated except to something extended in place, to which natural agents must draw near in order to act. Whence it is most rightly said that here the body of Christ is by the mode of substance (*substantia*), which indeed does not lose liability-to-passion except according to the extension of accidents. Wherefore neither did the mortal body of Christ, when it was consecrated by Himself at the Last Supper, suffer anything in this sacrament, nor could it suffer, for instance when it was divided and eaten by the disciples. For He was not there in such a mode as to be able to suffer. Whence although Christ then gave His passible and mortal body to the disciples, yet in the sacrament He could not then suffer or die, except per accidens, inasmuch as passion or death could be brought upon Him according to His proper species and natural mode of existing.

§ 79. The third is, to be sensibly. The negation of which likewise follows from the first negated. For in order that something be touched, or seen, or perceived by some other sense, it is necessary that it have

extension of the sensible qualities themselves. But in this sacrament, although the accidents are present, yet they have no immediate ordering to place, but to substance. Wherefore extension according to place does not befit them. From which it is also inferred that not even by a glorified eye can Christ in this sacrament be seen properly, as St. Thomas rightly teaches.¹⁷

§ 80. The fourth is, to be moved per se according to place. The negation of which similarly follows upon the negation of the first. For local motion per se presupposes per se being in a place. Wherefore, if per se the body of Christ is not in this place (because He is not there circumscriptively), neither per se will He be moved in it or according to it. But He is moved per accidens along with the motion of the species, in the way that along with the motion of a man the knowledge which is in him is moved.

§ 81. The fifth is, to be able per se to cease to be. Which likewise coheres with the foregoing. For if the body of Christ, as it is in this sacrament, can be made to suffer by no agent, surely it cannot per se cease to be there—namely by some prior change of itself—but only per accidens, as it were by the corruption and, so to speak, the ceasing of the species. Finally, since the change by which the body of Christ begins to be in this sacrament is terminated immediately to the substance of the body of Christ, when the priest says, "Hoc est corpus meum," one must hold that both the very Body of Christ and His quantity (*quantitas*) and the other accidents are in it not by the mode of quantity but by the mode of substance; although that mode is incomprehensible to us.

§ 82. These things being thus premised, we answer to the first and principal objection proposed at the beginning, that—however the opinion of Scotus and of others who think it possible by divine power that the same body be in many places circumscriptively may stand—yet it is certain, in the manner already said, that this is possible to God; just as without any doubt we confess that the same rational soul is whole in each of the members of the human body, although those members have between themselves a local distance. For this is in a manner somewhat like it. For although the soul is not a body, and therefore such a thing found in a body by divine power is more marvelous and less intelligible, nevertheless it must be known that even according to the nature of some bodily substance, as of air or of water, the whole is under each part of the dimensions under which it is contained, and that indifferently whether the dimensions themselves be actually divided or not divided, divisible however in potency, as St. Thomas explains.¹⁸

§ 83. To the first proof it is answered that the inference is good in the words of the Angel, either because naturally it cannot be brought about that the same body be in different places, or because it is simply impossible according to the natural mode of existing. On which ground the body of Christ was sought in the sepulcher. Whence the latter answer is the better.

§ 84. To the latter [Augustinian texts] there is a like reply. For Augustine wishes that, according to the said mode of existing, Christ be nowhere else than in heaven, and in His own certain and determinate place, nor that He come from elsewhere to the judgment—although this latter needs no limitation of this kind. For although Christ is on the altar, nevertheless it is not so that He is moved per se through place, as we have now shown; therefore it is absolutely true that Christ will not come from thence to the judgment.

§ 85. Now as to the subordinate little reasons proposed: to the first we reply that it is not impossible to God that, at least according to the sacramental mode of existing, the same body be in all places—yet not in infinite places actually, since neither can infinite places actually exist. But the Deity in a certain peculiar and incommunicable mode is everywhere, as is taught above (Distinct. 37, book 1).¹⁹

§ 86. To the second: neither is it impossible to God that, according to the mode just said, He make the body be also outside that place to which it is commensurated according to quantity, and hence outside the proper boundary which it there has. Nor thus will it be outside itself, but it will be the same self in different places, just as the soul is not outside itself but is the same in different members.

§ 87. To the third and fourth, although perhaps these reasons destroy the opinion of Scotus (about which for the present we do not labor), yet they do not [destroy] that mode of existing in different places which we attribute to the body of Christ. For, as we said in setting it forth, the body of Christ, as it is in the sacrament, neither can suffer, nor be corrupted, nor be moved per se through place, nor per se cease-to-be. But for something to be moved per accidens by contrary motions, or to cease-to-be while it still exists elsewhere, is nothing absurd, and the matter can be sufficiently made clear by the example of the rational soul.

§ 88. As to the last, it is evident that it is not similar. For, unlike places, times cannot be many at once, since the proper formal character of time consists in succession. And yet neither does that seem altogether impossible. For God can make two worlds, and place the same body in both, and thus it would be at once in different times, because of different worlds there would be different times, although running simultaneously.

§ 89. To the second principal argument also the reply is plain from what has been said. For just as the Body of Christ, so also His quantity is in this sacrament not by the mode of quantity, but of substance: whose proper totality, as St. Thomas says, is contained indifferently in a small or in a great quantity. Therefore in this way it is not unfitting that a great quantity be contained under a small.²⁰

§ 90. The solution of the third argument is likewise obvious from what has been said. Where, however, we add that by divine power bodily quantity can be separated from bodily substance, since it is not to it essentially conjoined.

§ 91. The Epistle to Dardanus is adduced; we have already warned above that this is to be understood of the natural mode of existing of bodies. For St. Augustine is not there inquiring what God can do, but is expounding what belongs to bodies by nature.²¹ Moreover, how weak Calvin's argument is is shown by this, that Christ at times made Himself invisible, and vanished from the eyes of those standing by, as in Luke 4 and 24 and John 8, and yet did not on that account cease to have a true human Body.²² Of the same sort also is that He walked upon the sea (Matt. 14; John 6).²³ Nay more, He granted to Peter that he do the same, although this is contrary to the nature of a heavy body. Likewise, too, He could make Himself impalpable. How much more, then, can He bestow these same effects upon His Body in the sacrament, where it has, not a natural mode of existing as in the said examples, but a certain peculiar one? Wherefore, to the argument the reply is, indeed rightly, as Christ Himself did, to infer affirmatively: "He is handled and seen; therefore it is a body, not a spirit nor a phantasm." For these signs were in their kind sufficient to show the truth of a human body, especially where other, more efficacious proofs concurred, as St. Thomas explains in III, q. 55, a. 6.²⁴ But negatively, as Calvin argues, it is not rightly inferred, unless perhaps the consequent be understood of a body according to its natural mode of existing and with miracle excluded. For otherwise the contrary is proved by the examples just mentioned.

§ 92. What is objected in the last place must be taken of that presence only by which someone is said to be present according to the manner of human converse in this life. For such a presence is wont to be an impediment, lest we think of someone with sufficient honor and nobility. Whence they are called blessed who were not scandalized at Christ's lowliness; and the Apostle Paul's bodily presence was weak, and his speech

contemptible, as he himself bears witness in 2 Cor. 10.²⁵ But in the Eucharist Christ is after an invisible and, as it were, spiritual mode, and therefore more admirable than contemptible. Nay further, in heavenly glory, of which this sacrament is in a way a pledge, we shall always have Christ bodily and visibly present, nor does that fact hinder us from enjoying Him perfectly according to the spirit. The things which could here be objected and treated concerning the accidents or species of bread and wine remaining will be handled by us in a more fitting place.

§ VII — That the whole Christ is contained under either species and in every part (Totum Christum sub utraque specie & qualibet parte contineri)

§ 93. This faith has always been in the Church of God, say the Fathers of the Council of Trent,²⁷ that immediately after the consecration the true body of our Lord and His true blood exist under the species (*species*) of bread and wine, together with His very soul and divinity. But the body indeed under the species of bread and the blood under the species of wine by force of the words; yet the same body under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread; and the soul under each by the power of that natural union and concomitance (*concomitantia*) by which the parts of Christ the Lord—who now, risen from the dead, dies no more (Rom. 6)—are coupled among themselves; and the divinity, moreover, on account of that wonderful hypostatic union (*unio hypostatica*) of it with the body and soul. Wherefore it is most true that as much is contained under either species as under both. For whole and entire Christ exists under the species of bread and under any part of that species; so too whole under the species of wine and under its parts. This is the most evident doctrine of the Synod, which it then repeats;²⁸ similarly before this the Council of Constance had defined it,²⁹ and the Council of Florence as well in the Decree of Eugene to the Armenians.³⁰ But that this faith, as the Tridentine Synod attests, has always been in the Church of God, is not difficult to show.

§ 94. First, the Apostle Andrew, as is read in the Epistle of the Priests and Deacons of Achaia, affirms before the judge that he daily sacrifices on the altar the immaculate Lamb; who, although He is eaten by the whole people of the faithful, nonetheless remains entire and living.³¹ Therefore the Apostles handed down this faith to their successors. Whence we read everywhere among the Ancients not only that the Body of Christ, or the Blood of Christ, is contained in this sacrament, is offered, and is taken by the faithful, but that Christ Himself, the Son of God and the Lamb taking away the sins of the world, is so contained and offered and received—which would not be properly true unless the whole Christ were contained under either species. For the Body of Christ and the Blood of Christ are not Christ. Thus St. Augustine, writing on Ps. 33, teaches that in the Supper Christ held Himself in His hands, and that that which is written of David, "portabitur in manibus suis," which in others would seem impossible, was properly fulfilled in Christ; therefore according to Augustine's mind Christ Himself, God and man, was carried in His own hands.³² St. Ambrose moreover says in the book *On Those Who Are Initiated into the Mysteries*, ch. 9: "In that sacrament Christ is, because it is the Body of Christ." This proof has force from the fact that in Christ neither can the divinity be separated from the humanity, nor, after His resurrection, the soul from the body.³³ Therefore the Council of Ephesus rightly defines in the letter written to Nestorius that those who approach the mystic blessings partake of the flesh of Christ, not as of common flesh, but truly life-giving, as being the proper flesh of the very Word and united to the divinity; and it bears the same witness concerning His Blood.³⁴ Many like things are read in St. Cyril of Alexandria, for instance in book 4 on John, ch. 13 and the following, and in book 12, ch. 32, where he writes that by the seamless tunic of Christ it is mystically signified that the four parts of the world, restored to

salvation, have divided among themselves His flesh impartibly. "For the Only-begotten," says he, "passing into individuals in a manner capable of participation, and sanctifying their soul and body through His flesh, is impartibly and wholly in all, since, being one everywhere, He is in no way divided."³⁵ To these testimonies there may be added those found in Gratian in *De Consecratione*, Dist. 2, through several chapters, and the place under the title of Eusebius Emisenus, Homily 5 on Easter.³⁶

§ 95. Again, the same point is proved from the fact that the Fathers call this sacrifice unbloody, which it would by no means be if the consecration should make the body to exist apart and the blood apart in this sacrament.³⁷ Likewise from the fact that the Fathers—and among them expressly St. Augustine in *De doctrina christiana*, bk. 3, ch. 16, in Tractate 27 on John, and on Ps. 98—reprove that understanding of the Capharnaite hearers who thought that Christ promised that His flesh would be divided limb by limb or in little pieces and eaten in that fashion. Therefore the Fathers are of the mind that neither in the eating, nor in the breaking, nor in the very consecration of the distinct species is any such division made. Add that if in the Eucharist the flesh of Christ were without the divinity, its eating would profit us nothing. For "Spiritus"—that is, according to Augustine's interpretation, the divinity—"est quae vivificat; caro autem sine Spiritu," that is, without the divinity, "non prodest quicquam" (Jn. 6).³⁸

§ 96. Moreover, He who in the Supper gave His body was the same as that which was about to be delivered to death, and the very blood which was about to be shed in the Passion. Now that body was then living, and that blood was then mingled with a living body. Wherefore, since even now Christ hands over to us the body and blood which He offered for us on the cross, and since these are now joined to the soul, it follows that under the species of bread the soul and the blood, joined to the body, are contained, and that under the species of wine the body of Christ, animated by the blood, is by no means absent. But if in the triduum of Christ's death this sacrament had been consecrated, or had been kept from the Lord's Supper, then too the Body of Christ under the species of bread would have been dead and bloodless, such as at that time lay in the sepulchre. Likewise the blood, without the body and the soul, would have been under the species of wine, as in very truth it was then separated by effusion. Nor do we here scrupulously inquire whether blood is properly a part of the human body or of the man himself, about which matter St. Thomas and Scotus seem to differ, whose opinions Cajetan sets forth. For it suffices for the present doctrine that blood so pertains to the integrity of the body that without it the body cannot be living and animated, according to that of Leviticus 17: "Anima carnis in sanguine est."³⁹

§ 97. Now that under any part of either species there is the whole Christ—as the Council of Trent defines—becomes clear from the things said in the preceding chapter. For since in this sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ are present after the mode of substance, not after the mode of quantity, but the nature of substance is that it is whole under any part of the dimensions of a body, it is manifest that the whole Christ is contained under whatever part of the species of bread and of wine, even while the species remains whole, and not only when it is broken or divided, as St. Thomas learnedly explains.¹⁸

§ 98. The same judgment moreover is to be made concerning the quantity and the other absolute accidents (*accidentia*) of Christ. For in this sacrament He is the same Christ who is in heaven, with no real change made in Him. Wherefore, wherever He is in the human nature, concomitantly every accident really conjoined to Him is present, as St. Thomas there also teaches.⁴⁰ For the understanding of which matter the comparison of the rational soul again serves: which not only according to its own substance, but also

according to its accidents, is in every part of the body, namely on account of the natural conjunction of accident (*accidens*) with its subject.

§ VIII — The Body of Christ is not everywhere (Corpus Christi non esse ubique)

§ 99. Concerning the dogma of the bodily presence of Christ, Luther, Brentius, and certain others, while they wish to withdraw as far as possible from the heresy of the Sacramentarians, have fallen into the contrary error, when they have taught that Christ according to the human nature is present not only in heaven and in the sacrament of the Eucharist, but everywhere, moved by these arguments. First: because the human nature in Christ is hypostatically united (*unita hypostatice*) with the divine; therefore, wherever the one is, there also is the other. Second: because Christ according to the human nature sits at the right hand of the Father; therefore, if the right hand of God is everywhere, the Humanity of Christ will be everywhere. Third: because Christ, being on earth, says (Jn. 3): "No one has ascended into heaven, except him who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven"; therefore the Son of Man, that is, Christ the man, was then at once on earth and in heaven, and by like reasoning in every other place. Fourth: because of Christ the Apostle says (Eph. 4): "He who descended into the lower parts of the earth, he it is who ascended above all the heavens, that he might fill all things." Which, since it cannot be understood of His Divinity, according to which from the beginning of the world He fills all things, in accord with that (Jer. 23): "Heaven and earth I fill, says the Lord," must be taken of the humanity, according to which also He had descended to hell and had ascended into heaven. In which sense Theophylact also interprets that passage, namely taking what is said of Christ according to the flesh.

§ 100. But this doctrine is proved in many ways to be false and absurd. First, indeed, that Christ according to the human nature be everywhere, since this is above the nature of a human body, as is clear from what was said above, would assuredly be a great miracle, and the same perpetual. Which, certainly, is not to be posited without great authority and reason. But there is no authority which recommends this, as will presently be clear from the solution of the arguments. Nay rather, it manifestly clashes with the authority of Scripture and with reason; for in vain is the Humanity of Christ posited as present everywhere, since a peculiar operation or effect, which it would have in places everywhere, cannot be ascribed to it. Indeed it would even be against its dignity, if the Body and Soul of Christ were in any most vile creature, and in any sordid places, and in hell with the demons and the damned always, and, together with the earth, be said to be trampled under our feet, and the like. The indignity of which is declared from this fact: that if something of that sort at some time happens to the sacrament of the Eucharist through the malice or negligence of men, the Faithful are wont rightly to shudder and to be gravely moved.

§ 101. Second: if everywhere and in all things is the Body of Christ, nothing peculiar is left to us in the sacrament of the Eucharist; for equally in all other foods and drinks the Christian, nay even any unbeliever (to say nothing for the moment of beasts), will take the Body and Blood and the whole Humanity of Christ. Third: those who so think, these same teach that the Body of Christ is not really present in the Eucharist unless use be added. Granted this hypothesis of theirs, it manifestly follows that the Body of Christ is not everywhere, since not even in the Eucharist itself—where, according to the Lord's institution, it ought especially to be—does it always be present. Therefore they contradict themselves and overthrow their own

doctrine. Fourth, from Scripture. For in Jn. 3 Christ is said to have left Judaea, and in Jn. 11 He says to the disciples: "I rejoice for your sakes that I was not there," and in Jn. 16: "I leave the world and go to the Father." And in Lk. 5: "When the Bridegroom shall have been taken away from them, then they will fast." And at the end of Mark: "He is risen; He is not here." All which it is evident must be understood of the presence of His Humanity. Nor must these be limited, where no other Scripture occurs to the contrary.

§ 102. Finally, from St. Augustine, who (in Epistle 57 to Dardanus) expressly teaches that, although Christ as God is everywhere, yet according to the human nature He is not everywhere: "He will come," he says, "to the judgment in the same form and substance of flesh to which He gave immortality, He did not take away its nature. According to this form He must not be thought to be diffused everywhere. For one must beware lest, in asserting the Godhead of the man, we take away the truth of the body," etc. The same doctrine he teaches in Tractates 30 and 50 on John. To this also are to be referred the things we said (at Distinction 22 above, Book 3), where it was asked whether Christ the man is everywhere. But the things that have been brought forward on the contrary in no way conclude.

§ 103. As to the first: from the hypostatic union (*unio hypostatica*) of the two natures in Christ it by no means follows that whatever is attributed to the one nature is also attributed to the other. For thus the human nature in Christ would be omnipotent and eternal and immutable and equal to the divine nature, nay would be the very divine nature—which are absurd and impossible; but only the communication of idioms (*communicatio idiomatum*) of each nature in the eternal supposit (*suppositum*) follows; of the sort that Christ the man is omnipotent and eternal and equal to God, and likewise that Christ the man is everywhere—yet not as man or as God—just as at the Distinction already named it has been more fully explained. The ineffectiveness of the second argument is shown by this likeness: "The souls of the just are in the hand of God"; the hand of God is everywhere; therefore the souls of the just are everywhere. Likewise, "every creature is in God"; God is everywhere; therefore every creature is everywhere. For it is not the case that, wherever the containing is, there the contained must of necessity be. Whence St. Augustine (in the Epistle to Dardanus): "Nor does it follow that what is in God is therefore everywhere as God is. For also of us the most true Scripture says that in Him 'we live and move and are'; yet we are not, as He is, everywhere." So Augustine. And one can also deny that the right hand of God, in the sense of the Creed, is everywhere. For there, by the right hand of God, there seems to be understood that glory with which the humanity of Christ is endowed by the Father in the heavens, which is not everywhere. Thus also, in a certain sense, all the blessed are at the right hand of God, because they enjoy the goods prepared for them by God, yet they are not to be said to be everywhere.

§ 104. What is to be answered to the third is clear from the solution of the first; and long ago it was answered by Augustine in the said Epistle in these words: "Nor yet, when we call Christ the Son of God, do we separate the man; or when we call the same Christ the Son of Man, do we separate God; for according to the man He was on earth, not in heaven where He now is, when He was saying, 'No one ascends into heaven except He who descended from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven'; although, according to that whereby He was the Son of God, He was in heaven; but according to that whereby He was the Son of Man, He was still on earth," and what follows.

§ 105. What is objected in the fourth place we do not deny must be taken of Christ as man, but in this sense: because Christ as man received a certain universal power and dominion, of which He Himself says: "All power has been given to me in heaven and on earth." To take possession, however, of that power He descended

into the lower parts of the earth and ascended above all the heavens, that thus He might "fill all things" by power—just as some king, by reason of his power, is said to be in his whole kingdom. And this sense is confirmed by the interpretation of Theophylact. Meanwhile we add this: that if Christ "ascended above all the heavens, that He might fill all things," as the Apostle says; then He did not previously fill all things; and therefore that "to fill all things," however it be understood, does not befit Him by reason of the hypostatic union, as the first argument was supposing. Which line of reasoning also can be drawn from the second argument. For if, by this, that ascending into heaven He sat at the right hand of the Father, Christ according to the man began to be everywhere; then this was not bestowed on Him by the hypostatic union, which had come long before.

***§ IX — That in the Eucharist the body of Christ is present even outside of use
(Esse in Eucharistia corpus Christi etiam extra usum)[^82]***

§ 106. Among the Lutherans the doctrine is most received, that under the sacrament of the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ are only in the use, as they speak, and through the use, that is, while it is being taken and by the force of taking. But the falsity of this doctrine can be refuted more than sufficiently from the foregoing. First, from those things which were said about the form of consecration and its efficacy. For if in this sacrament the Body of Christ is there by the force of consecration, therefore it does not then begin to be there by taking, since the taking follows the consecration; whence neither, when the taking is finished, does it cease to be there, but it remains as long as the species endure. Then, from most of the arguments by which we were showing that even by the wicked the true Body of Christ is taken; and, thirdly, from the general doctrine by which it has been proved absolutely that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is truly contained. Which doctrine indeed does not admit this limitation of use or taking. Again, the same will be evident from the doctrine concerning the adoration and the reservation of the Eucharist, which below.

§ 107. But its most certain proof is from the words of Christ by which He said: "This is my body." And that properly and not figuratively, as the Lutherans grant, and before the taking or use of that which He was handing. For since He uttered these words only once, as is sufficiently clear from the Gospel narrative, yet not at the same time did all the disciples, but one after another, take that which was being handed. Therefore the true Body of Christ was there by virtue of His words, even before it was taken by each one. Second: if the Body of Christ is only in the use of the faithful, it will follow that its presence, nay even the truth of Christ's words, depends upon the choice and changeable will of him to whom the Eucharist is offered; so that also if perchance that man, having changed his plan, should not wish to take what before he willed, the words spoken by the Priest in the person of Christ are now false. But these things are exceedingly absurd. Third: if, besides the consecration, the taking is also necessary in order that the Body of Christ be present, therefore the consecration, that is the utterance of the words, should never precede the taking, but should always be done together with it, just as happens in the other sacraments, which consist in the use or application to the recipient. In which indeed, if someone should first utter the words, but afterwards, an interval of delay having been interposed, should bring on, for instance, the washing or the anointing, he would effect nothing. But neither do the authors of this opinion observe that, nor even if they wished could they always observe it, especially when someone communicates himself. Fourth: Christ fixed no time at which this proposition should begin to be true: "This is my body"; therefore its truth must be judged from the nature of an operative proposition, which requires that, at the term of the utterance, that which is said should exist. Fifth: Cyril of

Alexandria (in the Epistle to Calosyrius), concerning certain Nestorians who were denying that the true Body of Christ remains in the Eucharist outside the use, says: "You rave, saying that the mystical blessing ceases from its sanctification if any remnants of it should remain to the following day. For the most holy Body of Christ will not be changed, but the power of the blessing and the life-giving grace is perpetual in it." Sixth: the same is confirmed by all those sentences of the ancients by which they assert that by the words of the Lord, or by the prayers of the Priest, or by the mystical blessing, bread is made, effected, consecrated, transmuted into the Body and the wine into the Blood. Since such sentences have partly been cited elsewhere and are partly yet to be cited, it is not to be lingered over this point here. Seventh: Cyprian, or whoever is the author (in the Sermon on the Supper of the Lord), and St. Augustine in book 19 (Against Faustus, ch. 19; Tractate 26 on John), teach and by reasons prove that, after the action of each sacrament—which consists in a certain consecration—the effect of the sacrament or of consecration always remains in that which has been consecrated, as a character remains in the baptized. Therefore also in this sacrament the effect of consecration remains, that is, the Body of Christ, as long as the sensible species themselves remain. Lastly to these there has been added the clear definition of the Council of Trent (Session 13, ch. 3 and canon 4), where anathema is pronounced upon those who teach otherwise.[⁸³]

§ X — That Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist (Christum in Eucharistia adorandum esse)[⁸⁴]

§ 108. Whatever either reason or authority teaches about God's being to be adored, the same teaches also about Christ—who is true God—that He is to be adored. Whence in the Scriptures there stand witness not only testimonies in general about God, but also in particular about Christ, that is, about God-man being adored or having been adored, as in Psalms 21, 44, 71, 98; of which last Psalm is also cited by the Apostle concerning Christ (Heb. 1). Wherefore with good reason in particular, from this place of the Psalm, the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 13) decree the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. The same Apostle (Phil. 2) writes that to Christ there has been given a name above every name, "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow," and so forth. Moreover we frequently read that He was adored; and indeed while still dwelling on earth, as by the Magi while He was yet an infant (Matt. 2), by the leper (Matt. 8), by the disciples (Matt. 14; Luke 24), and by the man born blind who was illumined (John 9), by the Canaanite woman (Matt. 15), by the other women (Matt. 28), by the Apostle Thomas (John 20). Therefore, if, as is here supposed and above abundantly proved, Christ Himself is truly and bodily contained in this sacrament, it is most manifestly consequent that He is rightly adored in it, and that He is to be adored also in place and time.

§ 109. Since the outward or bodily protestation of the believed divinity—by genuflection, by inclination of the head, or by some other reverent gesture—must be exhibited, it is sufficiently clear that to Him as to God the worship of adoration, which the theologians call "latria" (*latría*), is to be exhibited no less in this sacrament than elsewhere: for both His body and His blood and His soul and His humanity, both in the sacrament and outside the sacrament, wherever they shall be, ought to be adored with the same kind of worship. For although none of these is Christ Himself, just as neither the hand nor the head of a king is the person of the king himself; nevertheless, as he who kisses or strikes the hand or the head of the king is truly said to kiss or to strike the king himself: so he who adores the Body and the Soul of Christ, and His humanity altogether, must be judged to adore none other than the Son of God, and God Himself. For those realities subsist in the Person (*Persona*) of the Son of God and have no subsistence diverse from Him. Whence also the

Jews, by wounding and crucifying the Body, wounded and crucified none other than the Lord of glory, as the Apostle taught (1 Cor. 2). And indeed enough was said on this matter (Distinct. 9, book 3), where it was taught that the humanity of Christ, on account of the hypostatic union, is to be venerated with the same adoration as the divinity. Now let us prove a little more fully what we have said concerning Christ according to His body being adored in the Eucharist.

§ 110. Here first Scripture presents itself, 1 Cor. 11, which severely reproves certain men because they "did not discern the Body of the Lord," that is, because they did not esteem it with the singular veneration due to it above other foods, as St. Augustine says (in an Epistle). But that veneration singularly due to the Body of the Lord is indeed that by which someone, knowing with his mind that it is the Body of the Lord, by the outward adoration of the body also makes this very thing his protestation. But even if no Scripture existed which expressly bore witness to this, nevertheless the constant and perpetual tradition of the Church would suffice, by which, just as it has always been believed that Christ Himself is to be adored, so He has always been adored. For, as Augustine in the same place writes: "If anything is frequent in the Church spread throughout the whole world, to dispute that it is to be done thus is most insolent madness."

§ 111. And the most lucid testimonies of this tradition are found among the ancients, and especially in Augustine, who, writing (on Psalm 98) and inquiring how that is done by us which the Psalm says, "Adore His footstool," whereas (in Isaiah 66) the Lord says: "The earth is My footstool," and to adore the earth would be a sacrilege—answers that by us the earth is to be adored, that is, the flesh of Christ taken from the earth. "And because," he says, "in that very flesh He walked, and that flesh He gave to us to be eaten unto salvation, and no one eats that flesh unless he shall first have adored, it has been discovered how the footstool of the feet of God, of the Lord, is to be adored; and not only do we not sin in adoring, but we sin if we do not adore." After this he shows that that flesh is not to be considered by itself, but is to be adored by reason of the Spirit, that is, of the divinity conjoined. Augustine seems to have taken this commentary on that verse from Ambrose, who (in book 3 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 12), after other matters, says: "Let us see whether the Prophet says that that earth is to be adored which the Lord Jesus took upon Himself in the assumption of the flesh. Therefore by the footstool the earth is understood; but by the earth the Flesh of Christ, which even today in the Mysteries we adore, and the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus," and so forth. The same indeed Augustine also teaches elsewhere, as (in the Exposition of Psalm 21, Discourse 1, and Epistle 120 to Honoratus, ch. 27), in both places treating that, "They have eaten and adored, all the fat ones of the earth"; again, in book 20 Against Faustus, ch. 13, and in Sermon 58 On the words of the Lord, he teaches the same. To the same opinion, very frequently and also most openly, St. John Chrysostom writes—now setting forth the Angels who stand in a circle about the sacrifice in adoration, now proposing the example of the Magi who adored Christ the Child in the stable, now the example of the Priest who ought to stand at the mysteries in fear and trembling and in them adore Christ. The places are: Homilies 24, 36, 41 on 1 Corinthians; Homily 8 on Matthew; Homily 4 Against the Anomoeans; Homilies 6 and 61 to the People of Antioch; the Homily 1 on the words of Isaiah, "I saw the Lord"; the Homily delivered at the Dedication; and another On the Incomprehensible Nature of God; in the Sermon On St. Phlogonius; in book 6 On the Priesthood. Basil too numbers among the unwritten traditions the invocation of Christ in the Eucharist (On the Holy Spirit, ch. 24). And both, in their own Liturgy, frequently adore the Eucharist and admonish that it is to be adored, which also Dionysius does (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3). In like manner teach Clement, book 2 of the Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 5, and book 8, ch. 2; Pope Alexander (Epistle 1); Origen (Homily 5 on various places of the Gospel); Cyril (Mystagogical Catechesis 5); Eusebius of Emesa (Homily 5 On the Passion); and

Theodoret (Dialogue 2, "The Polymorph"). Wherefore in the Council of Vienne it was with good reason acclaimed: "O most excellent sacrament, to be adored, to be venerated," as is in the Clementine, Title On Relics and the Veneration of Saints. And it was defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, under anathema, that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist the Only-begotten Son of God is to be adored with the worship of latria even externally, and that for the sake of this thing it is right that this sacrament also be publicly proposed and exhibited to the people (Session 13, ch. 5, canon 6). But the things which are objected here by the adversaries are not of great moment and can be easily dissolved from the things said (above, at Distinction 9, book 3).^[^85]

§ II — The adversaries' objections are refuted (Objectiones adversariorum diluuntur)

§ 112. ...but only to have eaten bread to which in a certain manner the Body of the Lord had been joined; just as neither would it be true that the Son of God suffered, was crucified, died, if that man who suffered, was crucified, died, had had a different personality from the Son of God, joined to Him by friendship alone or by some accidental relation, as the Nestorians wished. But besides these arguments drawn from Sacred Scripture, let us also subjoin some testimonies of the Fathers, by which they expressly deny that the common and usual bread remains in the Eucharist. Cyril says (Mystagogical Catechesis 4): "Let it be firmly persuaded to you that what is seen is bread is not bread, although to the taste it seems so, but the Body of Christ; and that what is seen as wine is not wine, although the taste so judges, but the Blood of Christ."⁵⁰ Gregory of Nyssa (in the Catechetical Discourse on the Divine Sacraments) says: "The bread is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, not by which it is eaten, advancing so as to become the body of the Word, but straightway by the word it is changed into a body."⁵¹ Ambrose, in the book On Those Who Are Initiated into the Mysteries, ch. 9: "Perhaps you say, 'I see something else; how do you assert to me that I should receive the Body of Christ?' With how many examples, then, do we make proof that this is not that which nature formed, but what the blessing has consecrated! I teach."⁵² And in book 4 On the Sacraments, ch. 4: "You perhaps say, 'My bread is the usual sort'; but this bread is bread before the words of the sacraments; when the consecration has intervened, of bread is made the Body of Christ."⁵³ And on the Psalms: "Although the figure of bread appears, nevertheless after the consecration nothing else must be believed than the Flesh of Christ and His Blood."⁵⁴ Augustine expressed the same sentiment in those words which Gratian recites: "It is the Flesh of Christ which, veiled under the form of bread, we receive in the sacrament, and it is His Blood which under the species and flavor of wine we drink."⁵⁵ The same (Sermon 28 on the words of the Lord) says: "Before the consecration, what is offered is called bread; but when the words of Christ have been pronounced, now it is no longer simply called bread, but 'epiousios,' that is, supersubstantial, because it is not bread which goes [into the belly...], but that which sustains our substance."⁵⁶

§ 113. Many more witnesses from antiquity could be adduced here; but since we shall presently treat of the substantial conversion (*conversio substantialis*) which is effected in this sacrament, from which it most certainly follows that the bread does not remain but passes into something else—and such a conversion all antiquity acknowledges—we shall add nothing further here beyond the authority of two ecumenical Councils, Constance and Trent: of which the former, in condemning the articles of John Wyclif, and the latter (canon 2, Session 13), condemns with anathema that doctrine which asserts that the substance (*substantia*) of bread and wine remains in this sacrament together with the Body and Blood of Christ.⁵⁷

§ 114. Against the foregoing doctrine the adversaries are wont first and chiefly to oppose this, that in the Scriptures the Eucharist is at times called bread. For the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 10: "The bread which we break, is it not a participation of the Body of the Lord?" and in ch. 11: "As often as you shall eat this bread..." Likewise: "Whoever shall eat this bread..." And again: "Let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread." And Christ in John 6: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man shall eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."⁵⁸ Likewise, in Acts the communion of the Eucharist is called the breaking of bread.⁵⁹

§ 115. Then they object that the chalice consecrated by the Lord is called wine by the three Evangelists with these words: "I will not drink from now on of the fruit of the vine," etc.⁶⁰ Moreover, from the words of the Evangelists and of Paul they argue thus: Christ gave into the hands of His disciples that which He had taken into His hands, saying: "Take and eat." But He took bread, as all expressly attest; therefore He gave bread to the disciples to be eaten. Likewise, of that which He took into His hands He said: "This is my body"; therefore He said that bread is His body. And this again they confirm thus: the pronoun "this" (*hoc*) denotes some existing thing, namely that which Christ held in His hands. But that was no other than bread; therefore He called bread His body.

§ 116. Fourth, certain passages are usually brought forward from the Fathers. For Irenaeus, book 4 Against Heresies, ch. 34, says that the Eucharist consists of two things, earthly and heavenly; to which also that prayer of the Church looks, wherein over the set-forth symbols it prays that "this earthly substance may become for us what is divine."⁶¹ Tertullian, book 1 Against Marcion, ch. 14, calls it the bread of the Eucharist.⁶² Origen (Homily on Matt. 15) says that the Eucharist, inasmuch as it has what is material, descends into the belly and is cast out into the privy.⁶³ Cyprian, book 2, Epistle 3, when treating of the sacrament of the Lord's chalice, says that the Eucharist consists of flour and water.⁶⁴ Cyril of Jerusalem (a Mystagogical Catechesis) teaches that the Eucharist after the consecration is not mere and common bread, just as oil after the blessing is not profane common oil.⁶⁵ Ambrose, book 4 On the Sacraments, teaches that in this sacrament the things which they were are changed into another thing.⁶⁶ Augustine, book 16 On the City of God, ch. 37, signifies that corn remains in the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and book 3 On the Trinity, speaking of the Eucharist, says that bread is consumed by being eaten.⁶⁷ The same (in the Tractates on John) bears witness that Christ commended His Body and Blood in those things which are reduced into one thing, as is bread, which is made from many grains—not what flows together from many clusters—out of a reason of definite signification. But such signification cannot be considered without the accidents (*accidentia*). This argument especially the adversaries press, as it were leaning upon the Apostle's words, 1 Cor. 10: "The bread which we break," etc. Also the place of Gregory (Dialogues, ch. 58) is adduced, where he says that in this sacrament the highest things are associated with the lowest, earthly things are joined to the heavenly, one thing is made out of visibles and invisibles; therefore it is evident that this is made out of bread and the Body of Christ.⁶⁸

§ 117. Lastly, they employ such a line of reasoning: there is one and the same operation, therefore one and the same nature and substance (*substantia*). But the Eucharist is that which savors, nourishes, refreshes, strengthens bodily, and which we take as food and drink; therefore there is in it the true substance of bread and of wine. They confirm the major by experience in all other things, as in plants, metals, and other mixed bodies. Then also by the opposite proposition: for the nature of each thing is recognized and distinguished from every other by the aggregation of natural properties and of operations, as a cause by its proper and

adequate effect. Hence Augustine, in the Preface to the Second Enarration on Psalm 29, shows by this that Christ had a true body, because He walked, sat, and did the other things which belong to a body; and by the same is shown that He had a true soul, because He thirsted, hungered, was saddened—things which are proper to the soul. And he adds: If from that [it is] a true body, because the true activities of a body; from that [it is] a true soul, because the true activities of a soul. It will therefore be permitted to us in like manner to say: from this [it is] true bread, because the true operations of bread. In which way indeed Theodoret seems to reason (Dialogue 1 against Eutyches), teaching that in the Eucharist the nature of bread remains, from the fact that its natural operations remain. Whence he further proves that in Christ there is each nature, divine indeed and human, because in Him are found the properties of each nature. Other Fathers also, for proving the truth of the two natures in Christ, not rarely use this same argument—especially Pope Leo and Cyril of Alexandria.⁶⁹ There are also wont to be produced other reasons taken from the accidents remaining in the Eucharist; but the solution of these will be plain from the next distinction, in which there will be a special treatment concerning those accidents in the bread.

§ 118. To the objections, however, we reply in order. To the first, indeed, that the Eucharist in Scripture and by the Fathers is sometimes called bread—not because the substance of bread remains in it, but for another reason, and that manifold. First, because the Eucharist is made or consecrated out of bread; just as in Exodus the serpent is called a rod in these words: "The rod of Aaron devoured the rods of the magicians," because, namely, as is said above, the rods had been turned into serpents; and therefore even after the substantial change they retained their former name. By the same reason Eve is called bone and flesh of the man, man [is called] dust of the earth, Christ is said to be the seed of Abraham—namely, the names of the things out of which these were made are attributed to the things which are made out of them. Second, because it retains altogether the same visible form of bread...⁷⁰

-
1. Eusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica* I, ch. 10.
 2. St. John Chrysostom, *passim* [abbreviation as in source].
 3. St. Gregory Nazianzen; St. Cyril; St. John Damascene, *passim* [abbreviation as in source].
 4. The source prints the marginal note "(d)"; the note's content stands in the printed margin [abbreviation as in source].
 5. St. Thomas, "ibid." [abbreviation as in source].
 6. St. Augustine, *Tractates on John*, Tract. 27.
 7. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 98; *Tractates on John*, Tract. 27.
 8. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John* [abbreviation as in source]; St. John Chrysostom and followers, *passim* [abbreviation as in source].
 9. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 56.
 10. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 33.
 11. Editorial note in the margin of the source: "It will not be useless for a novice theologian to read cap. XIII, 'Dogmata VI saeculi,' by Jeremias the Patriarch of Constantinople, rendered into Latin, and the learned and erudite annotations of Cabasilas, a man eminently pious and far most learned, in the book of D. Oecolampadius. From it indeed it is evident with what consent then the Dogma concerning the real existence of the Lord Christ in the Eucharist was held in the Greek Church. Jeremias moreover adds the same in the chapter on the Primacy of the Church, which Secotovius refutes, subjoining Gennadius, *On the Primacy of the Pope*; which it will not be unpleasing to read with attention." [abbreviation as in source]
 12. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 1; q. 76, aa. 1, 3, 5–7.

13. St. Augustine, De Trinitate XIV, ch. 1.
14. St. Gregory the Great, Homiliae in Evangelia, Hom. 26.
15. St. Ambrose, Expositio in Lucam, at the end; Origen, Hom. 17 in Lucam; St. Augustine, Serm. 102 de Diversis, chs. 8, 12; St. Gregory the Great, Hom. 26 in Evangelia; Bede, Hom. 1 inter estivales de Tempore; Theophylact, In Joannem 20.
16. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 1; can. 1. Cf. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 75, a. 1, ad 3.
17. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 76, a. 7.
18. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 76, a. 3.
19. "Distinct. 37. lib. 1." [abbreviation as in source].
20. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 76, a. 1, ad 3.
21. St. Augustine, Epistle to Dardanus.
22. Lk. 4; Lk. 24; Jn. 8.
23. Matt. 14; Jn. 6.
24. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 55, a. 6.
25. 2 Cor. 10.
26. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 76, a. 1–4; also III, q. 81.
27. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 3.
28. Council of Trent, Session 13, can. 1 and 3; Session 21, ch. 3; can. 3.
29. Council of Constance, Session 13.
30. Council of Florence, Decree of Eugene IV to the Armenians (Decretum pro Armenis).
31. Epistola Presbyterorum et Diaconorum Achaiae, under the name of St. Andrew the Apostle.
32. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos, Ps. 33 (34).
33. St. Ambrose, De iis qui mysteriis initiantur, ch. 9.
34. Council of Ephesus, Epistle to Nestorius.
35. St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem, bk. 4, ch. 13 and following; bk. 12, ch. 32.
36. Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 2; Eusebius Emisenus (attrib.), Homily 5 De paschate.
37. See the patristic use of "incrumentum sacrificium" in the liturgical writers; cf. the testimonies gathered in Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 2.
38. St. Augustine, De doctrina christiana III, ch. 16; Tractatus 27 in Iohannem; Enarratio in Ps. 98; cf. Jn. 6:63.
39. St. Thomas and Scotus differ on whether blood is properly a part of the human body; see Cajetan's exposition. Cf. Lev. 17:11: "Anima carnis in sanguine est."
40. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 76, a. 1 and a. 4.
41. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 52, a. 3, ad 3.
42. Jn. 3:13.
43. Eph. 4:10.
44. Jer. 23:24.
45. Theophylact, on Eph. 4:10 [abbreviation as in source].
46. St. Augustine, Epistle 57 (to Dardanus).
47. St. Augustine, Tractates on John, Tract. 30 and Tract. 50.
48. Matt. 28:18.

49. St. Thomas, "ubi sup." [abbreviation as in source].
50. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catechesis 4.
51. St. Gregory of Nyssa, Catechetical Discourse on the Divine Sacraments.
52. St. Ambrose, De iis qui initiantur mysteriis, ch. 9.
53. St. Ambrose, De sacramentis, IV, ch. 4.
54. St. Ambrose, In Psalmos, "in Ps. 134" [abbreviation as in source].
55. St. Augustine, as cited by Gratian, De consecratione, Dist. 2, c. 48.
56. St. Augustine, Sermon 28 on the words of the Lord; cf. the editorial note: "Seu LXXXIV inter Sermones I Classis in Appendix; who note that that whole sermon is excerpted from De sacramentis, ch. 4." [as in source]
57. Council of Constance, condemnation of the articles of John Wyclif; Council of Trent, Session 13, canon 2.
58. 1 Cor. 10:16; 1 Cor. 11:26–28; Jn. 6:51.
59. Acts 2:42, 46.
60. Matt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.
61. St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses IV, ch. 34; and the Church's prayer "ut haec terrena substantia fiat quod divinum est" [abbreviation as in source].
62. Tertullian, Contra Marcionem I, ch. 14.
63. Origen, Homily on Matt. 15.
64. St. Cyprian, Epistles, book 2, ep. 3.
65. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catechesis.
66. St. Ambrose, De sacramentis, IV.
67. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XVI, ch. 37; De Trinitate III; Tractates on John.
68. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogi, ch. 58.
69. Theodoret, Dialogus I contra Eutychen; St. Leo the Great; St. Cyril of Alexandria.
70. Exod. 7:12; cf. above.

DISTINCTIO XI — ON THE CONVERSION OF BREAD AND WINE INTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST (*DE CONVERSIONE PANIS ET VINI IN CORPUS ET SANGUINEM CHRISTI*)

§ 1. Just as Angels in Scripture are sometimes called youths or men, and God the Ancient of Days, namely on account of an external appearance of that sort set before the senses, so too the Body of Christ is sometimes called bread and His Blood wine, first on account of the external and sense-presented appearance (*species*) of the same; third, on account of the same operations, of the sort to refresh, to nourish, to strengthen. For thus we call what is made from rye or barley bread, although properly speaking it is not bread. Fourth, on account of an analogy: for as bread nourishes bodily, so the Body of Christ quickens spiritually; and as wine makes glad bodily, so the Blood of Christ intoxicates spiritually. And for this reason Christ (in John) calls Himself the living bread who came down from heaven, who gives life to the world.¹

§ 2. Yet it must be noted that in Scripture and in the Fathers the Body of Christ is not so simply called bread that there is not very often added some determination signifying that no common bread, properly so called, is understood, but a certain outstanding bread, to which that name is attributed improperly for the reasons recalled. For the Apostle says: "The bread which we break"; and, "As often as you shall eat this bread"; and, "Let him eat of that bread."^[^2] Similar determinations are found in John 6,³ although those statements by which Christ calls Himself the living bread are also true outside this sacrament; namely, they must be understood in the way in which the other statements are understood by which He is called light, lamb, shepherd, door, stone, vine, on account of a mere likeness of certain properties.

§ 3. Likewise too the Fathers, when they call the Eucharist bread, for the most part add something by which they signify that they are speaking of that singular bread which is the Flesh of the Son of God: as Ignatius (in the Epistle to the Philadelphians), Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory of Nyssa (in the exposition of the Lord's Prayer), Ambrose, book 5 (On the Sacraments, ch. 8), Cyril of Jerusalem (Catechesis 8), Augustine (Sermon 28 On the Words of the Lord), and Theodoret (Dialogue 2).⁴

§ 4. To the second argument of certain persons the reply is that those words were not spoken by the Lord after the sacred chalice, but of that chalice of which Luke makes mention earlier, which they will have to be different from the latter, that is, from the sacred chalice, with which, namely, Christ drank with the Apostles after the eating of the paschal lamb, before He instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood. Thus Cajetan understands it, whom Jerome seems to favor when, writing (on Matt. 26), he says that in Luke there are read two chalices presented to the disciples. Therefore what is said of "the fruit of the vine" they refer to the former chalice, which had not been consecrated, not to the latter.⁵ But this interpretation is not admitted by Matthew and Mark, who, although they recount the same words of the Lord by which He says that He will no longer

drink of the fruit of the vine, nevertheless made no mention at all of the former chalice. Wherefore more probable is the opinion of Augustine, who in book 3 (On the Harmony of the Evangelists, ch. 1) acknowledges one single chalice, which Luke mentioned twice, once by anticipation, and again in its place after the blessing of the bread. Euthymius likewise thinks thus on Luke, and very many others besides.⁶

§ 5. According to this opinion one must say that when the Lord said "of this fruit of the vine," He did not wish precisely to point out that which had been in the chalice after the consecration, but wine in general, which had been on the table, and from which the chalice had been filled both before and after the consecration, so that, according to the manner of Scripture, the name of wine may also embrace that which has been made from wine and retains the appearance (*species*) of wine—namely, the Blood of Christ—just as we said that the Body of Christ is sometimes called bread in the Sacred Letters.

§ 6. What are objected in the third place are sophistical, to which therefore we answer briefly, that Christ took bread, and, what He had taken, He truly consecrated by these words: "This is My Body"; and, once consecrated, that is, changed into His Body, He gave it to the disciples to be eaten. Therefore He did not give to the disciples to be eaten the same thing according to substance (*substantia*) which He had taken, but between the taking and the giving it was substantially changed. Neither did He say of that which He took into His hands: "This is My Body," but of that which He was holding in His hands at that instant of time at which it was necessary that the proposition be true, namely, at the end of the utterance, as was said (above, Distinction 8), when the sense of that proposition was being treated. Whence it is also evident what must be answered to the confirmation subjoined. For the pronoun "this" (*hoc*) points out a thing as existing not at the moment when the pronoun itself is uttered, but at that at which the proposition ought to be true, as we have just said. But precisely similar things could be objected if Christ, whether at the wedding, had changed the water received in His hands into wine by saying, "This is wine," or in the desert had wished to change the stone received in His hand into bread by saying, "This is bread," and in this way had handed both to those wishing to drink or to eat; which whole thing, who would doubt could have been done by Him?

§ 7. Let us come to the passages of the Fathers. Of these, Irenaeus wills nothing other than that the Eucharist consists of an earthly thing, namely bread, as of a certain matter partly passing over, partly remaining: passing over indeed according to substance, but remaining according to accidents (*accidentia*), in which the whole force and operation of the substance nevertheless persists. And in a similar sense what is objected from the Prayer of the Church can be understood, although we showed above, around the earlier Distinction, that a different reply can also be given to that.⁷

§ 8. Tertullian, against Marcion, teaches that created things are by no means to be rejected to such a point that even Christ, in the celebration and institution of the sacraments, willed to assume created things, such as water, oil, and bread. But that in the sacraments all these remain, he does not say; rather, with respect to bread, he indicates the contrary.⁸

§ 9. Origen's opinion is to be understood of the accidents, and of that into which the accidents are dissolved.

§ 10. Cyprian without doubt wished to signify matter that passes over; since neither in the bread itself do flour and water remain actually.

§ 11. Cyril's comparison between blessed oil and consecrated bread is general, by which it is signified that each is sacred. In what sense, moreover, the saying about bread, "This is My Body," can be understood, we

showed (on Distinction 8), where we treated of the sense of these words. But that Cyril does not think the substance of bread remains has been shown above from his most manifest words.

§ 12. Ambrose's sense is that in the sacrament neither is there creation nor annihilation, but a change of such a kind that that which is in its substantial being is converted into something else—being (*ens*) into being—so that in this way the "to-be" (*esse*) remains in the genus, although it is changed in species.

§ 13. Augustine's passages are to be understood of the matter that passes over and of the accidents of the same that remain. For the grain does not remain, even in the bread itself, according to its own substance; while the accidents that retain the whole operation of the bread itself are consumed by eating. That signification also which Augustine considers upon John and elsewhere is sufficiently retained in this, that both the Body and the Blood of the Lord are confected from those things which are reduced to one thing, even if those things do not remain according to substance. For surely otherwise neither in the bread itself do the grains remain, nor in the wine the clusters from which each has coalesced.

§ 14. Gregory's passage must likewise be understood of the appearances (*species*) or accidents which remain and are, in an ineffable way, joined to the Body and Blood of the Lord.

§ 15. To the argument adduced finally, one answers that from proper properties and operations the nature or substance of a thing is rightly inferred, unless by a singular miracle both the properties and the operations subsist and are preserved without the nature, and that in a foreign nature—as happens in this admirable sacrament. Rightly therefore do Augustine and the other Fathers reason when, from the properties and from the operations of the soul, of the body, and of the whole human nature, they teach that Christ had a true soul and a true body, and consequently that there was in Him a true and entire human nature. For the heretics, against whom they disputed, did not wish to say that those properties and operations had been separated from their proper substance by some miracle; nor, even if they had said this, ought they to have been heard, since neither Scripture nor tradition teaches it.

§ 16. But Theodoret understands by "nature" the natural forces and properties—just as the name of "nature" is not rarely taken by the physicists in this way.

§ III — The bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of Christ (Panem & vinum converti in Corpus & Sanguinem Christi)

§ 17. Holy Scripture, in set words, does not hand down in the sacrament of the Eucharist that the bread is converted, passes over, is transmuted into the Body of Christ, and the wine into the Blood; nevertheless the Church teaches with most certain faith that this very thing is to be held, both as instructed from the Sacred Letters understood in this way, and as equipped with the perpetual consent of the Fathers and the authority of the Councils. For since (to speak first of Scripture) it has been shown above at Distinction 8 that the speech of Christ is not figurative but proper, and therefore operative, by which, holding the bread in His hands, He said, "This is my body" (*Hoc est corpus meum*), and since it is utterly absurd and unheard-of in the Church, as we have already shown, that the Body of Christ be truly and properly called bread, it follows of necessity that by those words it be brought about that the bread be converted into the Body of Christ; just as, if while holding in His hands a rod, or water, or a stone, He had said, "This is a serpent," "this is wine," "this is bread," beyond doubt words of this sort, uttered efficaciously by Christ who is truthful and omnipotent, would have

converted those things into these; nor will anyone, while the propriety of the expression is retained, be able to contrive any other probable sense of such words. Whence also Calvin, disputing at a certain place against the Lutherans who wish to retain the proper sense of Christ's words and yet deny a transmutation, openly attests that the simplicity of Christ's words does not stand unless the bread be converted into the body, as the Papists teach.¹⁰ Now it is beside the purpose here whether, according to the propriety of speech, the sense of the words in question be rendered thus: "This thing (namely, that which from this bread I intend to make, I make) is my body"; or rather thus: "This bread becomes, or straightway will be, my body," or "passes into my body." Assuredly the Lord might suitably have used such words, and operative ones at that, in giving sight to a blind man: "This blind man sees," just as, with a stronger assertion, it is said by Him, "The blind see, the lame walk." Which words, indeed, would have this sense: "This one who is now blind, by the completion of my utterance, sees." Whence it can be seen that the words "This is my body" (*Hoc est corpus meum*) can without absurdity be rendered with a similar sense, as it has seemed to certain Catholics. About which matter we said something at Distinction 8 above. Meanwhile it suffices in this place, from either interpretation, to understand with sufficient certainty that for the truth of that proposition it is required that what previously was should not remain, but be changed into another. Which also has its place in those sentences which signify only an accidental, modal, and relative change. For he who, holding your book in his hand, says to another, "This is your book," does not by that proposition intend to bring it about that a book still remaining his own should become another's, but that from being his own it should become another's—namely, so that it cease to be his own. To this point, moreover, there are of the greatest relevance those passages of the Fathers in which they teach that in this sacrament the bread is converted, or transmuted, into the Body of Christ; in the way in which Christ converted the water into wine, and as the rod of Aaron was turned into a serpent, and conversely the serpent into a rod, and the water of the Nile into blood. But now let us subjoin some clearer testimonies of the Fathers, by which they acknowledge plainly and clearly this conversion, called by Catholics by that name, even with the comparisons which I have mentioned being adduced.

§ 18. Irenaeus, book 5 (Against Heresies, near the beginning), affirms that the bread receives the Word of God and becomes the Body of Christ.¹¹ Justin, in the Second Apology, says thus: "The food which has been consecrated by the prayer of the words of Christ, from which, a change having been made, our blood and flesh are nourished, we say to be the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."¹² Cyril of Jerusalem (Mystagogical Catechesis 4), among other things, says thus: "Christ once changed water into wine, which is near akin to blood; and shall He not be trustworthy enough for us to believe that He changes wine into blood?"¹³ Basil (in the Liturgy) invokes the Holy Spirit that He may "make this bread the precious Body of Christ, and what is in the chalice the precious Blood of Christ, changing them by His Holy Spirit."¹⁴ Gregory of Nyssa (in the Life of Moses; and in the Catechetical Discourse on the Divine Sacraments) most plainly testifies that by the Word of Christ the bread is so turned into the flesh of Christ that bread, that is, the former substance, ceases to be.¹⁵ The same (in the Sermon to Catechumens) reasons thus: "If the bread which Christ ate was converted by natural power into His divine body, why do we not believe that the sanctified bread by divine power is transmuted into the divine body?"¹⁶ Ambrose (ch. 9, On those Initiated into the Mysteries), wishing to prove that in the Eucharist there is not what nature formed, but what the blessing consecrated, adduces this likeness: "Moses held a rod, he cast it down and it was made a serpent. Again he took hold of the serpent's tail and it returns into the nature of a rod. You see, therefore, that by prophetic grace the nature both of the serpent and of the rod was changed twice." And presently he subjoins: "If a human blessing availed so much as to change nature, what shall we say of the divine consecration?" and what follows.¹⁷ Likewise in book

4 (On the Sacraments, ch. 4): "When the consecration has come, of bread is made the flesh of Christ."¹⁸ And in book 4 (On the Faith, ch. 5) he says that the bread is "transfigured, that is, transformed into the Body of the Lord." For it cannot be referred to the outward figure, as is clear of itself.¹⁹

§ 19. Jerome (in the Epistle to Heliodorus, another to Evagrius, and a third as in the source) testifies that the priests consecrate the Body of Christ—surely from nothing else than from bread. Which same is elsewhere said by him, that from wheat bread is made (Commentary on Isaiah 63; and on Ezekiel 26); likewise that wine is consecrated into the Blood of Christ (Commentary on Galatians 5).²⁰ Hesychius, book 6 (on Leviticus 22), says that the sanctification of the Mystical Sacrifice, as a translation or commutation from sensible things to intelligible, is to be ascribed to Christ, who is the true priest.²¹ John Chrysostom (Homily 83 on Matthew) says: "We hold the order of ministers; but He who sanctifies and changes these things is Christ." The same bears constant witness that God changes the visible elements into the Body of Christ (Homily on the Eucharist; Homily 60 to the people of Antioch; Homily on the Betrayal by Judas; in the Liturgy).²² Nor does Augustine in this part think differently from what in the foregoing he held. For in a certain Sermon on the Words of the Gospel (which Bede cites on 1 Cor. 10) he says: "The faithful know what I am saying, Christ in the breaking of bread. It is not every bread; but the bread receiving the blessing of Christ becomes the Body of Christ."²³ And in book 3 (On the Harmony of the Evangelists, chs. 4 and 10) he signifies that from the earth, namely wheat and wine, the Body and Blood of Christ are confected.²⁴ But he most clearly asserts this in a certain Sermon whose beginning is, "The Truth which is Christ"—and the same is cited both by the Master and by Gratian with these words: "As by the Holy Spirit the true flesh of Christ was created without marital union, so by the same from the substance of bread is made the same Body of Christ and Blood; and again: The Body of Christ and His Blood by the power of the Holy Spirit are made from the substance of bread and wine."²⁵ See also Sermon 28 (On the Words of the Lord), and the place cited by Gratian (De Consecratione, Distinction 2, cap. Nos autem).²⁶ Eusebius of Emesa, in the sermon entitled On the Body and Blood of the Lord, says that the visible creatures are changed by the words and secret power into the substance of His body and blood; and in Homily 5 On Easter: "Mortal and earthly things are converted into heavenly and into the substance of Christ. Why marvel at things if He who could by the word create them, by the word could convert the things created?"²⁷

§ 20. Cyril of Alexandria (in the Epistle as in the source), establishing this conversion by many testimonies and reasons, among other things says: "Lest we should shudder at flesh and blood placed upon the sacred altars, God, condescending to our frailty, poured Himself into the oblations, converting them into the truth of His flesh."²⁸ Peter Chrysologus (Sermon 160) attests that Christ by that power by which He converted the water into wine, afterwards changed the wine into blood.²⁹ Gregory the Roman (Homilies on the Gospels, as in the source) says that Christ so loved us, so, that in the sacramental oblation "He should turn our Sacrament into His Body and Blood, and should satisfy with the nourishment of His flesh the sheep which He had redeemed." What he says, "He should turn His Body and Blood," is said with that phrase with which we are wont to say of an interpreter that he "turns" that expression—for "λόγον" they know the word "verbum." Therefore the Lord "turned" His Body and Blood, because He made the term of a certain wondrous conversion.³⁰ John Damascene, book 4 (On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 14): "The bread and wine," he says, "are transmuted into the Body and Blood of God." But if you ask the manner, in what way it is done, let it suffice you to hear, "by the Holy Spirit"; and, adducing also an example of a natural conversion, by which food and drink pass over into the substance of the one eating and drinking, he says thus: "So the bread and the wine, by the invocation and advent of the Holy Spirit, are supernaturally transmuted into the Body and Blood of

Christ. And they are not two, but one and the same."³¹ Theophylact (on Mark 14: "This is my body")—"this," I say, "the very thing which you take." "For the bread is not a figure and some exemplar of the Lord's Body, but the visible bread is itself converted into the Body of Christ."³²

§ 21. Moreover we add Origen, book 8 (Against Celsus); Theodoret (Dialogue 2); Isidore, book 1 (On the Ecclesiastical Offices, ch. 18); and Euthymius (on Matthew 26). And all these, since they wrote before the heresy of Berengar arose, are to be held pre-eminently suitable to be adduced as witnesses to convict it. Finally to these there was added the authority of those Councils which, held against the heresy already arisen, by the unanimous consent of the Fathers defined this very doctrine as catholic. These are: one at Vercelli in Italy, two at Tours in Gaul, and three celebrated at Rome, as is evident from the acts of those times. Likewise four general Councils afterwards held. Of which the first, the Lateran under Innocent III (in the definitions of the Faith, ch. 1), has thus: "In the sacrament of the altar the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood, by divine power."³³ The second, Constance, in the condemnation of the first and second articles of John Wyclif, and in the interrogatories prescribed in the Diploma of Martin V.³⁴ The third, Florence, in the Decree on the Sacraments, where it is said that "by the power of the words of Christ the substance of bread is converted into the Body of Christ, and the substance of wine into the Blood."³⁵ The last, Trent, whose definition on the same matter is most explicit (session 13, ch. 4; canon 2).³⁶

§ IV — What is the mode of the said conversion (Quis sit modus dictae conversionis)

§ 22. The conversion (*conversio*) which, by the power of the words of Christ, takes place in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the Council of Trent calls marvellous and singular; marvellous, because its mode cannot be comprehended by human ingenuity, and therefore is believed rather than understood; singular, because no change like it is found in the whole of nature. Yet nevertheless, if, in accordance with the things handed down to us in Scripture and in the doctrine of the Fathers, the mode of that conversion be in some measure explained and brought within our understanding, we will attempt to do this briefly and in due order, as it were point by point.

§ 23. First, let this be set down. In this sacrament the bread is converted precisely into the Body of Christ, and the wine into blood, but not into the soul, nor into the divinity, nor into the whole Christ. Nor is the bread converted into blood, nor the wine into the Body. This is manifestly clear from the words of consecration: "This is my body," "This is my blood." And this is what the Council of Trent teaches (Session 13, ch. 3): that by the force of Christ's words the Body is contained under the species of bread, and the Blood under the species of wine; but that all the other things together exist under each species partly by the power of that natural connection, or concomitance, by which the parts of the Lord Christ are joined among themselves, and partly by reason of the hypostatic union.³⁸

§ 24. Second: in this sacrament the whole substance (*substantia*) of the bread is converted into the Body, that is, into the substance of the Body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, that is, into the substance of His Blood. Thus does the Council of Trent hand down (the same session, ch. 4 and can. 2). Add that this conversion is made into the whole Body and into the whole Blood, as St. Thomas rightly

teaches (III, q. 75, a. 8). Also, that it is a conversion of the whole substance into the whole substance; in the same place.³⁹

§ 25. Third: this conversion is neither a generation nor a corruption, and much less does it belong to any other kind of natural change. This follows from the second point. For here no subject remains the same, not even prime matter; but, as has been said, the whole substance of the thing is converted into another.

§ 26. Fourth: this conversion is wrought in an instant, not only in that way in which natural generations are said to be instantaneous, but altogether without any previous alteration. For by the power of the words of Christ no alteration here occurs, because none is signified; rather, at the term of the utterance itself the conversion is effected, which the signification of the words requires. For in natural things alteration serves to prepare the matter for receiving the form; but here no same subject remains.

§ 27. Fifth: in this conversion all the accidents of the prior substance remain. This indeed is known to sense and needs no proof. But upon what they are founded, being destitute of a subject, will be explained in the next Distinction.

§ 28. Sixth: the bread and the wine are not resolved into pre-existing matter. This follows from the second, third, and fourth points. And further it is proved because the resolution of a mixed body is into elements, not into bare matter: but after the consecration no element remains here, no substance at all except the Body and Blood of Christ.

§ 29. Seventh: the bread and the wine are not reduced to nothing. The reason is that, although it does not seem to be absolutely deniable that God can make the Body of Christ be present somewhere neither by local motion, nor by creation, nor by the conversion of another thing into it (about which matter there is controversy between the followers of Aquinas and of Scotus), nevertheless it must be admitted that in very truth the Body of Christ does not become present in the sacrament of the Eucharist otherwise than by the conversion of the bread into it, and that by virtue of the words, which require this conversion. Now what is converted into another is not annihilated, whether it be converted by change of the whole substance or only of part; for the term of annihilation is nothing, but the term of conversion is that into which the conversion is made. Therefore, although the bread cease to be and the Body of Christ begin to be there, yet because this takes place by the conversion of the one into the other, it cannot be said that the bread is annihilated, or that the Body of Christ is created out of nothing, even if it were supposed that it had not previously existed anywhere. And this is not obscurely indicated by those words of Ambrose, wherein he says: "that the things which were should be, and be converted into another," book 4 On the Sacraments, ch. 4. For the sense is, that the things which were are not reduced to nothing, but still are, converted into another thing. Nor by those words is a common matter or subject signified, but the common genus of being.¹⁸

§ V — How one should speak about this conversion (Quomodo de hac conversione loquendum sit)

§ 30. To signify this conversion (*conversio*), the Fathers speak for the most part in three modes, as can easily be noticed from the testimonies set forth above and elsewhere. First, indeed, they use locutions of this sort: "it becomes, is effected, is wrought, is consecrated the Body of Christ." Sometimes, moreover, they employ the preposition "of" for signifying the same thing, saying that "of the bread is made the Body or Flesh of Christ."

Thus Ambrose, book 4 On the Sacraments, ch. 4.¹⁸ Then they speak in this way: "The bread is converted, is transmuted, passes over, is transelemented into the Body of Christ." Finally, also in this way: "The bread becomes the Body of Christ." But St. Thomas teaches that it is not properly said of this conversion, "the bread will be the Body of Christ," for the reason that in this change, as also in creation, no same subject remains under both terms. For which reason he judges that these propositions too are not properly true: "the bread becomes the Body of Christ," or "of bread is made the Body of Christ"; since they also require some one and the same subject. Yet, he says, because in this sacrament, once the conversion has been made, something the same remains, namely the accidents of bread (*accidentia*), these locutions can be conceded according to a certain likeness; so that by the name "bread," not as singular but universally, there is understood that which is contained under the appearances (*species*) of bread, under which previously the substance (*substantia*) of bread is contained and afterwards the Body of Christ. So he. But this explanation is opposed, in the first place, by the fact that such modes of speaking are also most frequent among the Fathers, as is to be seen in the places cited above, and elsewhere, and by name in Ambrose, book 4 On the Sacraments, ch. 4, and Irenaeus, Against Heresies, book 5.⁴² Indeed, both in the canon of the Mass, which the whole Church now uses, and in the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, the priest expressly prays that the offerings, namely bread and wine, may become the Body and Blood of Christ.⁴³ Likewise, in Berengarius's confession, both the earlier and the later, which both the Supreme Pontiffs in a Roman Council prescribed to him, it is read that the bread and wine after the consecration are the true Body and Blood of Christ—which is nothing else than to say that the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ.⁴⁴ So too the Master in this Distinction says that the substance of bread and of wine, which before had not been the Body and Blood, is made by the word of Christ the Body and Blood; and he also declares this in more words.⁴⁵ And Innocent III, book 4 On the Office of the Mass, ch. 6: "Incomparably greater is it that God was so made man that He did not cease to be God, than that bread be so made flesh as to cease to be bread." And below: "What had been bread when He took it, was His body when He gave it."[^45] Likewise Guilmundus speaks, book 2 Against Berengarius, where: "This is my body."[^46] And Thomas of Walden, Tome 2 On the Sacraments, ch. 68: "It is manifest, moreover, that in all these places bread is taken properly, so as to signify that which is said in the Gospel: 'Accipit Jesus panem'.".⁴⁸ Moreover, although it is thus, that in every natural change some same subject does truly remain, nevertheless that does not seem necessarily to be included in the speech by which we say "this becomes that," but only, that one is after the other by way of change or conversion. Wherefore it is not improbable, as Cajetan notes upon St. Thomas, that propositions of this kind too are to be conceded as properly true; nor do they derogate in anything from the true understanding which one ought to have concerning the conversion of the whole substance into the whole substance.⁴⁹

§ VI — That the said conversion is rightly called transubstantiation (Dictam conversionem recte vocari transsubstantiationem)

§ 31. Since in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the bread is converted (*convertatur*) into the Body of Christ, and indeed its matter does not remain—because the Body of Christ, already existing beforehand, has as its own both form and matter, which, once assumed, He never lays down nor changes—and thus, as was said above, the whole substance (*substantia*) of the bread is transmuted into the whole substance of the Body of Christ, namely as to matter together with form; and since, moreover, all the accidents (*accidentia*) of the bread remain, and therefore no alteration precedes this change, but only there takes place a conversion

(*conversio*) of one substance into another: assuredly, most fittingly and properly did the Fathers signify that change by the name of transubstantiation (*transubstantiatio*) in the Lateran Council under Innocent III, this very thing being approved by the Synod of Trent (Session 13, ch. 4).⁵⁰ In coining this word, the Fathers seem chiefly to have aimed at this: that by such a term—under which heresy could not hide its poison—the Catholics might be distinguished from the Sacramentarians as by a certain watchword.

§ 32. Nor indeed should anyone rightly be offended at the novelty of this word, since the reality signified by it is most ancient, as being founded on the doctrine of the Fathers and on Sacred Scripture, as we have shown above; although those did not fall far short of this word who said that the bread is transfigured and transelemented, as Ambrose and Theophylact, cited long ago, said.⁵¹ But nothing prevents the Church, for the sake of teaching and declaring, from devising and using some new word when in the reality itself there is nothing new. For thus of old it did in these words, homoousion (that is, consubstantial), unbegotten, Trinity, person, catholic, Mother of God, and the like; by which it willed both to profess its faith more manifestly and to bar the way to the hidden and insidious senses and subterfuges of heretics—just as Athanasius (in the Disputation with Arius),⁵² Nazianzen (in the book On the Faith),⁵³ Fulgentius (in the Seventh Reply against the Arians),⁵⁴ and Vincent of Lérins (in the little book Against the profane novelties of heresies)⁵⁵ hand down. Of these, Athanasius addresses Arius in these words: "Do you take offense at the novelty of the name, or even at the truth of the thing itself, on account of which, having obtained this word, you shun it? For the ancient reality receives a new name; by a new word there has not come a new truth of the thing." And finally he adds that "as many names of new words have arisen for the religious understanding of ancient truth as occasions were supplied." But Vincent says thus: "The Church for the most part, for the light of understanding, does not mark a new sense, but by the propriety of a new appellation signifies it." In the same place he interprets as "profane novelties of words" those which are alien to sacred doctrine and contrary to antiquity—such as the Gnostics and Manichaeans of old used to bring forward; and likewise such as those nowadays devise who fabricate new dogmas, for example, "imputed righteousness," that Christ justifies by imputation, that Christ is impanated in the Eucharist, and the like of this sort.⁵⁵

§ VII — That communion under both species is not necessary for all (Communione utriusque speciei omnibus necessariam)

§ 33. That in the earliest times of the Church the faithful people commonly had communion under both species is manifest from ancient history and from the writings of all the Fathers; who continually bear witness that the Blood of Christ was drunk: as Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and St. Augustine frequently do, as if they were writing, "Come, let us adore" (Ps. 94; 96); also Maximus in Sermon 59,⁵⁷ Damasus in Homily 27 among the fifty,⁵⁸ and among the works on John, in Questions on Leviticus. Likewise St. John Chrysostom very often, in the Homilies to the People,⁵⁹ and St. Gregory (Homily 22 on the Gospels) says thus to the Roman people: "What the blood of the lamb may be you have learned, not now by hearing, but by drinking." And in book 4 (ch. 58) he says of Christ: "His blood is now poured out, not into the hands of unbelievers, but of the faithful." The same, book 3 (ch. 36), relates that the faithful in time of peril carried about with them the Body and Blood of the Redeemer. Nay, even today the Church sings in the person of the newly-initiated: "By tasting the rosy stream of His Blood, whose Body we have received, we render thanks to God."⁶⁰ Moreover, that both species were given by the Lord to the very Apostles at the Supper is most well known from the

Gospel history; nor is it obscurely gathered from St. Paul (1 Cor. 11) that the people of Corinth celebrated this sacrament with the communion of both species.

§ 34. Yet, in like manner, from the history and monuments of the Church it is manifest that the Fathers held the opinion that whoever ate the Body of Christ was not, by Christ's precept, equally bound of necessity to drink of the chalice. For it is to be noted that in the Apostolic time, on account of the frequent and, as it were, continual persecutions, assemblies were able to be held by Christians but rarely; yet, when they were gathered, they were by no means left without the help of communion in the Eucharist. For the Eucharist used to be handed to them to be taken home privately, and this indeed not otherwise than under the species of bread; for to entrust to laymen the removal of the species of wine and its keeping for use was most perilous.

§ 35. Tertullian bears witness to this (*Ad uxorem*), and Cyprian (*On the Lapsed*), and Ambrose (in the first Oration on the death of his brother). Something similar concerning a certain Tarsicius is related by Bede in the Martyrology at August 15, and after Bede by Algerus, book 2 (*On the Sacrament of the Eucharist*, ch. 10). St. Augustine also makes mention of the same custom, book 2 *Against the Letters of Petilian* (ch. 23), and after him St. Jerome in the *Apology against Jovinian*. Another passage too is found in Bede, book 2, *Ecclesiastical History* (ch. 5), and again another in book 4 (ch. 21); the former also signifies that the Eucharist used to be given in certain places to the whole people in Masses of less solemnity, and only under the species of bread. Nicephorus, moreover, book 18 (ch. 6), relates that innocent children, fasting, were accustomed at Constantinople, according to custom, to be admitted to eat the sacred remains of the immaculate Body of Christ. To these add that the ancients, while granting to the deacon authority to dispense the Body of Christ to the people, for the most part did not entrust him with the dispensing of the Blood, as of a thing necessarily conjoined with the priestly office: as the Fourth Council of Carthage (ch. 38), and St. Jerome in the *Epistle on the Paschal Cycle*, testify.⁶¹ Finally, to these things belong those which we said above about reserving the Eucharist and carrying it under that species to the sick; which reservation and carrying is not, nor can it conveniently be, done except under the species of bread.

§ 36. These things therefore sufficiently declare that, from the very beginning, the Church felt that no one was held by Christ's precept to receive always under both species whenever he wished to partake of this sacrament, even if the custom of distributing under both species prevailed from the beginning and then endured for some ages.

§ 37. However, when afterwards the multitude of the faithful increased, and the dangers of irreverence and of the spilling of the Blood of the Lord began to occur more frequently—especially since in a great crowd there are many who are but little cautious and provident, and very many too who are but little religious—the whole Church, about five hundred years ago, began, not so much by a law enacted as by a tacit and insensibly received custom among all, to be content with the one species. To which custom, it seems, some occasion also was given about that time by the heresy of Berengarius; for since he acknowledged in this sacrament only a sign of the Body and Blood of the Lord, not His very Body and Blood themselves, the faithful began to exercise their liberty, namely, to be content with the one species (since they recognized no precept enjoining both species), that by this they might profess that the true and living Body of Christ together with the Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Christ, that is, the whole Christ, is contained under the one species, and therefore that they are defrauded of no part of the reality contained, even if they did not receive both signs.

§ 38. Another reason was added, to wit, the conversion of the northern peoples, among whom wine is neither produced nor easily imported, nor bought except at a great price, and therefore can be had only by the wealthier; so that the Roman Pontiff was once consulted whether it were permitted to sacrifice in those regions only in the species of bread. Of which matter we shall speak in its place. And indeed among the English, because they are northerners, that custom of communicating under the one species seems to have gained strength already before the times of Bede, as is gathered from his History, above cited. The Church ought not to have allowed that, when in other regions, on account of lack of wine, they were content with the one species, other regions might enjoy both species; lest that difference of custom in partaking of this most divine sacrament should by any means dissolve the unity of faith and of mutual charity, which is uniquely commended to us therein; while those to whom there is not a supply of wine would suspect that they had less in this sacrament, and that Christ had cared less for them, than for other Christians.

§ 39. Finally, no small weight has this reason, that in the Christian people many are abstinent and altogether shrink from the use of wine—such as certainly there is no doubt existed even in the first ages—whom nevertheless it is in no wise to be believed that Christ willed to bar from the reception of this sacrament. These reasons sufficiently show both that there is no precept of Christ laying upon communicants the necessity of both species, and that the Church was moved by most just causes to introduce little by little the custom of communicating under the one species only.

§ 40. But after certain persons, out of hatred for the Roman and Catholic Church, began, from Scriptures ill understood, to teach that by communion under the one species the precept of Christ is violated, the Church, wishing to resist the falsity of that dogma, defined the contrary—namely, that the custom of communicating only under the species of bread is not opposed to Christ's precept; and she enacted that that custom is not to be changed by private authority. She did both things in the Council of Constance (Session 13) and in the Council of Trent (Session 21, chs. 1–2; canons 1–2).⁶²

§ 41. But that there is no precept of Christ which imposes upon one who is to communicate the necessity of both species (although this is a negative, and therefore its proof ought not to be demanded), nevertheless we briefly establish from the evangelical and apostolic Scripture as follows. When Christ instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood, He gave no precept for future times except that concerning His Body: "Do this in memory of Me," as Luke and Paul have it; and that concerning His Blood: "Do this, as often as you shall drink it, in memory of Me," which is read in Paul alone. For the words, "Take, eat; drink ye all of this," manifestly pertain only to those who were then present, namely the twelve Apostles, whom the Lord was by those words inviting to receive what was offered. Whence concerning that which is read in Matthew, "Drink ye all of this," Mark carefully added that it was straightway in that same supper fulfilled, saying: "And they all drank of it."⁶³

§ 42. From which it follows that, if either species was prescribed by the Lord, the species of wine was not prescribed, but the species of bread—since it is said absolutely after the distribution of the Lord's Body: "Do this in memory of Me," and by that precept the Apostles were first held, and their successors, to consecrate and to offer; then both they themselves and all the other faithful to receive. For what the Apostle records that the Lord said after the consecration of the chalice—inasmuch as the clause "as often as you shall drink" is added—does not simply oblige anyone to the use of the chalice, but only to this, that as often as he drinks of the chalice, he do it in His memory.

§ 43. As formerly in the Old Law, although there was a precept for all about the eating of the paschal lamb, and, according to custom, the paschal lamb was not taken without wine, as the Evangelists, describing the Lord's Supper, insinuate, and as Bede, writing on Luke, has noted, yet there was not a precept that those who ate the paschal lamb should drink wine. And although in the ancient sacrifices wine too was wont to be offered, nevertheless no portion of the libation ever came back to the people, although they were partakers of the thing immolated, as is clear from Leviticus.

§ 44. Moreover, from Paul a probable argument can be taken, by which it is shown that even then the sacrament was sometimes wont to be taken under one species. For he says: "Whoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord." The Greek and the better Latin have the disjunctive "or"; therefore Paul did not employ a disjunctive conjunction without purpose; it follows that it is not always necessary by Christ's precept to receive both species. Unless one should say that he who has received the species of bread and, because of an intervening sin, cannot worthily receive the other, may abstain from the species of wine; and to signify this Paul employed a disjunction of speech. But if even this be the sense, at least it will follow from Paul's words that there is some case in which, the species of bread having been received, one abstains from the species of wine; and therefore it is not always to be communicated under both species, as if Christ's precept required the use of both. If you except one case, there is nothing to prevent many more also being excepted.

§ 45. Another proof is taken from the deed of Christ and of the Apostles. For both the Institutor of the Sacrament and the Apostles are found sometimes to have broken bread and to have administered the Lord's Supper without any mention of the chalice: Christ indeed to the two disciples at Emmaus (Luke, at the end), according to the interpretation of St. Augustine, book 3 *On the Harmony of the Gospels*, sermon series 2, sermon 3; whose words Bede relates in Luke. Which interpretation Theophylact also follows. The Apostles, moreover (Acts 2; 20; 27), according to the exposition of the ancients—on behalf of which see Chrysostom, Homily 17 of the imperfect work—are sometimes said, by the expression "the breaking of bread," to have communicated the Body of Christ. And indeed sometimes by "the breaking of bread" the communion of the Lord's Body is understood, as is plain from 1 Cor. 10.

§ 46. Finally, it is thus proved: because this species or that pertains not so much to the substance as to the mode of the sacrament. For the whole Christ is received under either species and under any part, as was shown above. But as to the mode and order of celebrating this sacrament, Christ left it to the Apostles to determine. Whence Paul says: "The rest, when I shall come, I will set in order." Citing which words, St. Augustine, Epistle 118 to Januarius (ch. 6), says: Christ, he says, did not prescribe that which He did not wish to be observed unchangeably, so that through the Apostles, by whom He was going to arrange the Church, He might reserve this place. For if He had enjoined this so that after other foods the Eucharist should always be taken, no one would have varied from that custom. So also we can say: if Christ had prescribed, or even only admonished, that the Eucharist should always be taken by all under both species, certainly the Church would never have varied from that custom.

§ 47. But it suffices that it be done by the priest, and, in a certain way, by all; inasmuch, namely, as by the consent and devotion of mind all offer one Sacrifice together with the priest. Now that by the taking of the body alone a commemoration of the Lord's Death is made, is gathered from the Apostle, who twice makes mention of this commemoration, first after the bread, then after the chalice has been consecrated; by which it is signified that in either species severally the memory of the Lord's Passion can be made. It can also be said

that the Apostle does indeed require of those who eat and drink a commemoration of the Lord's death, yet does not wish them by the very act of eating and drinking to represent the Lord's death, but that they understand that representation to be made by the priest in the very sacrifice, of which sacrifice they afterwards partake by eating or drinking.

§ 48. To the fifth, the Council of Trent answers in these words: "But neither from that discourse (in John 6) is it rightly gathered that communion under both species was commanded by the Lord, however it be understood according to the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and Doctors."⁶⁴ For He who said, "Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis, et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis," said also, "Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in aeternum." And He who said, "Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam," said likewise, "Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita." And finally He who said, "Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet et ego in illo," nevertheless said, "Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in aeternum."

§ 49. By which words the Fathers of Trent judged they had sufficiently shown that nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine follows from those words of the Lord, since whether they be understood of spiritual taking or of sacramental, according to the diverse expositions of the Fathers, from that same chapter the objections can easily be refuted. For whatever there is attributed to both, taken jointly—namely to the Flesh and to the Blood of the Lord—is in the same discourse read as attributed to bread, or to flesh, named severally. Moreover, the sentence "Nisi manducaveritis" and so forth brings no difficulty if it be taken of spiritual or mystical eating, of which we treated above at Distinction 9, in the manner in which St. Augustine interprets that whole passage (Tracts 25, 26, 27 on John).⁶⁵ In the same way also Augustine elsewhere, namely in On Christian Doctrine III, ch. 16; On the Merits of Sinners and Forgiveness I, ch. 20; Questions on the Gospels III, q. 4; the Sermon 11 On the Words of the Lord; and the Sermon to the Infantes (cited by the Venerable Bede on 1 Cor. 10), and likewise in the places recited by Gratian (On Consecration, Dist. 2, chs. Quid est Christus; Qui discordat; Qui passus est; and the Sentence 339 in Prosper), and by many other Fathers, as Innocent I in the epistle to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis (which is among Augustine's letters as Ep. 93); St. Basil (Ep. 141); St. Bernard (On Loving God, and in the Exposition of Ps. 90); and Alcuin (on John).⁶⁶ For the same interpretation several probable reasons too can be brought forward from the very text, which we omit here for brevity.

§ 50. Others, as well ancient as recent, understand that discourse of the Lord from the place "Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est," and so on, of sacramental taking—namely, that which is taken in the sacrament of the Eucharist under the species of bread and wine. According to which understanding one can reply to the argument in three ways. First, because the Lord does not say: "If you shall have eaten this bread and drunk the chalice of the Lord," in which manner, had He so spoken, perhaps each external sign would be signified to be necessary; but He said: "Nisi manducaveritis carnem." Now flesh is eaten and blood is drunk even then when the species of bread alone is received, because under it Christ is whole, and therefore the blood also. Wherefore, according to this reply, the sense will be: "Unless you shall have taken, or received within you, the flesh and blood of the Son of man, you shall not have life"—that is to say, the act of eating and drinking as such is not being urged in particular, which indeed ought not to be urged, since even the faithful do not so much chew the Body of the Lord as rather swallow it lightly. Second, this sense can here be given: "If you shall neither eat the flesh of the Son of man, nor drink His blood," and so forth; according to which explanation the copulative conjunction will be put for a disjunctive, which is not infrequent in the Scriptures. Third, it is

answered that he who receives Christ under the species of bread is rightly said both to eat and to drink, not by reason of the exterior act, which is only eating, but by reason of the interior—namely by reason of faith, which tends to both, to the flesh, namely, that suffered on the cross, and to the blood that was poured out—or he speaks of sacramental eating, insofar as it has spiritual eating joined to it.

§ 51. Some answer that those words "Nisi manducaveritis," and so forth, were said to the Church, not to individuals; and hence that the Church is bound to retain and receive both species, though not each and every individual. This, they say, is fulfilled in priests. But that sense is agreeable neither to Christ's scope nor to the context. For the other sentences of the same passage pertain to individuals. Likewise it is said: "Nisi manducaveritis," and so on, as "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua," and it is the same as if it were said: "Nisi qui manducaverit," and so on.

§ 52. To the sixth argument it is answered that, as regards the thing contained, no more is received by him to whom both species are handed than by him to whom only one is given; for each receives one and the whole Christ. But as regards the external species, that man receives something more than this one. And only in this respect can it be said that he who receives a single species receives the sacrament imperfectly or not integrally. Yet if one has regard to the Sacrifice (*sacrificium*), of which both this man and that are equally partakers, it will be understood that he is not excluded from a participation of the integral sacrament. For since in the Sacrifice both species are offered, he who receives one species has the plenitude of the sacrament; because by the reception of one part it is signified that he is a partaker of the whole sacrament. Thus in the old law he who ate a part of the Sacrifice was held a partaker of the whole Sacrifice.

§ 53. To the seventh we reply that the effect of bodily food and drink is indeed diverse, but not the spiritual, because, as we have already said, it is entirely one and the same reality which is received under either species. But as to the question concerning a greater or lesser fruit from the reception of both or of one species, the Fathers of Trent (Session 21, ch. 3) judged it fitting to answer that they who receive only one species are defrauded of no grace (*gratia*) necessary for salvation.⁶⁷ Besides this, it is further answered that, since the whole Christ is under either species, there is just as much power and efficacy for conferring grace in either one species as in both. Nay, even if flesh alone were under the species of bread, separated, namely, from blood and soul, as it was during the three days of death, it would nevertheless have no less power unto life; for the power of the flesh and blood of Christ comes from the Divinity wonderfully united to them hypostatically. Hence Christ, now attributing life to flesh and blood, now to flesh or to bread alone, ascribes one and the same life. So too Paul (1 Cor. 10) attributes full communion to the taking of bread alone when he says: "Unus panis et unum corpus multi sumus, omnes qui de uno pane participamus." Finally, as flesh profits nothing without the Spirit, so neither blood nor soul without the Spirit, that is, the Divinity, gives life. Lastly, this equality was prefigured by that saying (Exod. 16), cited by Paul (2 Cor. 8): "Qui multum, non abundavit; et qui modicum, non minoravit."

§ 54. Now, for the dissolving of those objections which are brought from the Fathers, one must weigh diligently both at what time they wrote and what was the scope of the writers; likewise the occasion of the writings and, namely, what the circumstances were. For some simply report the custom then in the Church, with no precept of necessity indicated—such as Chrysostom, Augustine, and Theophylact in the places cited, and Cyprian (Ep. 2 of the fourth book). Some urge only the institution of both species, as Cyprian (Ep. 3 of the fourth book) and Damascene. Others speak of spiritual eating and drinking, as the author of the Sermon On the Lord's Supper, as Cyprian, and Augustine frequently. Others truly contend properly against those

who, when they were receiving the Body of the Lord, abstained from the Chalice out of a certain superstition, thinking either that Christ had not blood, or that wine was a creature of the devil—at which Gelasius looked when he said that it is a very great sacrilege if anyone should divide the Mysteries of the Eucharist, namely, by approving one species and reproving the other. That this is Gelasius's sense is clear from the Sermon 4 of St. Leo on Lent. Pope Gelasius, having only two means, followed the safer. To the same point looks also the opinion of certain others, by Paschasius and Algerus transmitted.⁶⁸ Again, others—as the Synod of Braga and a certain decree of Pope Julius—do not will absolutely that the chalice be named in the precept, but, with the taking of the chalice presupposed, teach that the Body and Blood are to be handed to the people severally, not, however, that both together are to be proffered, that is, by dipping the host into the chalice. Others finally do not so much interpret the Scriptures as accommodate them to the use of their own time; thus Paschasius extends those words "Bibite ex hoc omnes," which were spoken to the disciples then present, to "all believers"—whom, since the Church did not yet in his time invite to the public use of the chalice, he applies to the Fathers of old.⁶⁹

***§ IX — Whether it is expedient today that the chalice be granted to all
(Utrum expedit hodie calicem omnibus concedi)***

§ 55. Since it has been sufficiently proved that the right of the Lord's Chalice does not, by Christ's mandate, pertain to all Christians, nevertheless it can still be asked whether it is expedient that the use of the chalice be today restored and granted to all the faithful; and, if it seem fit to be granted, under what conditions it ought to be done. This question the Fathers of the Council of Trent left undecided, referring the whole matter to the Apostolic See, that by it that be constituted which it should judge to be both useful for the Christian commonwealth and salutary for those petitioning—as may be seen in the special decree upon the petition for the chalice (at the end of Session 21).⁷⁰ However, afterwards, when the orators and legates of certain princes had proposed that petition to the Supreme Pontiff, they then returned so instructed by him that, laying aside their petition, they agreed with the Roman Pontiff and the Christian world.

§ 56. As for those reasons on account of which first the Church's custom was changed and the use of the chalice removed—all those reasons still hold today; indeed, some of them obtain place in our age even more than formerly, as is easily evident to one who weighs them. Then new reasons have been added. One, that we profess that the whole Christ is contained under either species. Another, that we profess that all the faithful are not bound by Christ's precept and by the necessity of salvation to both species. A third, that uniformity of custom be kept throughout the Church, since today there are many regions recently converted to the faith, to which it is very difficult and almost impossible to communicate the use of wine. Finally, since they who ask for the use of the chalice ask from an error contrary to the Scriptures and to sound doctrine, while that error lasts, by no means does it seem one should acquiesce to such a petition. For to assent to those who petition out of heresy—what is it except, by the very fact, to approve heresy? Wherefore, just as once, against the Nestorians, it was decreed that the Blessed Virgin should be called not christotokos but theotokos, although truly she was christotokos; and just as, against certain heretics, it was sometimes established that Baptism should be conferred not by a triple but by a single immersion, although a triple immersion is in itself licit and good: so in our age, because of those who contend that both species are commanded by Christ and are necessary for salvation, the Church ought to persist in that custom by which now for four hundred years and more she has

communicated the faithful under one species—even though she certainly knows and professes that communion under both species is not in itself unlawful, and was formerly frequent among the faithful.

§ X — Whether priests are bound by divine law to both species (An sacerdotes jure divino teneantur ad utramque speciem)

§ 57. The question is disputed among Catholics, whether priests by divine law, or by the mandate of Christ, are obliged to the taking of both species (*species*), namely when they are discharging the priestly office. For if they do not offer sacrifice, but only communicate, there is no doubt that, like all others, they ought to be content with a single species, as is evident from the Council of Trent (from ch. 1 and can. 2 of Session 13).⁷² Nor does the question arise whether it is everywhere permissible for priests to consecrate in one species only. For it is certain that this is not permissible; nor is there need to ask whether the Church can by a general statute abrogate the consecration and oblation of the chalice, and consequently also its reception which takes place in the Mass. For it is certain that she cannot. There is, however, another question closely allied and almost connected with the present one, namely whether by divine law a priest is bound to consecrate under both species (*sub utraque specie*). For the affirmative of both questions these arguments persuade.

§ 58. First, because it has been said by the Lord to the Apostles and to their successors: "Do this in memory of me." How this is to be understood is declared by the Council of Trent (Session 22, ch. 1), when it says: Christ offered to God the Father His body and blood under the species of bread and wine, and under the symbols of those same things He handed it over to the Apostles—whom at that time He was constituting priests of the New Testament—to take; and He commanded them, and their successors in the priesthood, to offer, in these words: "Do this in memory of me," as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.⁷³ And presently it subjoins that Christ instituted a new Passover, Himself to be immolated by the Church through the priests under visible signs. Then in canon 2 it thus decrees: If anyone shall say that by those words, "Do this in memory of me," Christ did not institute the Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His body and blood, let him be anathema.⁷⁴

§ 59. Second. St. Cyprian, in the Epistle to Caecilius on the Sacrament of the Lord's Chalice, says: "Thus, in the sacrifice which Christ offered, Christ alone is to be followed, nor ought we to obey and do anything other than what Christ did and what He commanded to be done." And below: "If Christ first offered Himself to the Father, and commanded this to be done in His memory, surely he truly performs the office of a priest in the place of Christ who imitates that which Christ did. And then he offers to God the Father in the Church a true and full sacrifice, if he begin to offer in such manner as he sees that Christ Himself offered."⁷⁵

§ 60. Third. The Sacrifice of the Mass is a divine representation of the Lord's Death. But that is not represented perfectly unless both species are offered.

§ 61. Fourth. The rubrics of the Roman Missal will that the consecration of the chalice be repeated if it be discovered that there was not wine but some other liquid in the chalice.⁷⁶

§ 62. Lastly. Whoever offers a sacrifice is bound to become a participant of it—and that by the law of nature—because the outward sacrifice is a sign of the inward, by which a man offers himself to God. Hence, unless he partake of the sacrifice, he will not show that the inward sacrifice pertains to himself; and unless he communicate of each part of the oblation, he will not seem perfectly and integrally to apply it to himself.

Hence in a certain Council of Toledo, cited by Gratian (*De Consecratione*, Dist. 2, ch. Relatum), one reads thus: "It must in every way be maintained, that as often as the one sacrificing immolates the Body and Blood of the Lord on the altar, so often he show himself a participant of the reception of the body and blood." And in the same place: "What sort of sacrifice is that, of which not even the very one sacrificing is known to be a participant?"—which sayings the preceding words show are to be understood of both species.⁷⁷

§ 63. Moreover, some judge the negative part to be probable from this, that it is read that at some time the Supreme Pontiff dispensed with certain northern peoples, that among them it should be permissible for the oblation of the Mass to be made in the species of bread alone. For Raphael Volaterranus is witness that this was granted to the Norwegians by Innocent IV on account of the scarcity of wine among them.⁷⁸ But it is evident that a dispensation cannot be made by the Church from divine law. They further prove it because, if the Eucharist— as at times has happened by a small miracle—were to appear on the altar in the species of flesh and blood, the priest would not be bound, nor ought he, to take it; just as neither ought he to drink the chalice if after the consecration he understood that poison had been inserted. Alexander of Hales, Ruard Tapper, and several others favor this opinion. By whom also not improbable solutions are rendered to the arguments brought for the contrary.

§ 64. For to the first one can reply that indeed there is a precept to the Apostles and to their successors to offer, but that there is not a precept to each and every one of them, that as often as they offer, they do it in both species. For as in communion, so in oblation, the substance of the thing is enjoined upon all, not the mode; and in the words of the Council there is no need to refer that phrase "under the symbols of the same things" to every single celebrant.

§ 65. It could also be said that the oblation and reception of each species was so commanded by Christ, that it is not permissible to the Church simply to omit or abrogate one species—while nonetheless the discussion stands in certain cases.

§ 66. Moreover, Cyprian, disputing against the Aquarians, urges the Lord's precept not so much on behalf of the oblation of both species as lest water be offered without wine, which the Aquarians on the pretext of sobriety were pretending to be in keeping with Christ's institution.

§ 67. To the third one can reply that a perfect representation is not so necessary that, on a just cause, even an imperfect representation may not be tolerated in the Sacrifice.

§ 68. To the fourth, that those rubrics are not of divine institution and enjoin what is safer.

§ 69. To the last, that although it is consonant with the law of nature that one partake of the sacrifice, yet that law does not require that it be done by all perpetually. Hence too in the old law, in the holocaust which was wholly consumed by fire, neither did the priest eat nor the people. But the Toledan Council makes no mention of divine law, and therefore does not exclude a dispensation.

§ 70. Yet if some other opinion please someone more, he will be able to answer that that example of pontifical dispensation is not altogether certain. But a miracle, because it is effected by God, releases a man from the precept whereby otherwise he would be bound to partake of the sacrifice; and this St. Thomas sufficiently signifies in the reply to the third objection (of the aforesaid question 82, article 4).⁷⁹ Likewise he is not bound if the cup be poisoned, because of the law of nature which forbids one to kill oneself. Yet in both

these cases it is provided as a counsel that the consecration be repeated, so that thus the priest may fully and perfectly partake of the sacrifice. St. Thomas in the same place.⁷⁹

§ XI — To what extent in the Eucharist there are accidents without a subject (Quatenus in Eucharistia sint accidentia sine subjecto)

§ 71. That the accidents (*accidentia*) of bread and wine—such as color, taste, weight, quantity, and the like—remain in the sacrament of the Eucharist, does not need proof; for partly it is known by sense, as regards those things which fall under sense; partly it is held as certain by an argument from parity of reasoning.

1. Gen. 18; Tob. 9; Acts 1 — Angels called men or youths. Dan. 7 — God "the Ancient of Days" (Vulg.). [Abbreviations as in source.]; Jn. 6 — "I am the living bread, who came down from heaven, who gives life to the world."
2. 1 Cor. 10:16 — "The bread which we break"; 1 Cor. 11:26 — "As often as you shall eat this bread"; 1 Cor. 11:28 — "And so let him eat of that bread."
3. Jn. 6.
4. St. Ignatius, Epistle to the Philadelphians; Tertullian; St. Cyprian; St. Gregory of Nyssa, exposition of the Lord's Prayer [abbreviation as in source]; St. Ambrose, De Sacramentis V, ch. 8; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis 8; St. Augustine, Sermon 28, De verbis Domini; Theodoret, Dialogue 2.
5. Cajetan; St. Jerome, Commentary on Matt. 26.
6. St. Augustine, De consensu evangelistarum III, ch. 1; Euthymius Zigabenus, Commentary on Luke.
7. Above, Distinction 8.
8. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem.
9. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 75, a. 4.
10. Calvin, disputing against the Lutherans, acknowledges that the plain sense of Christ's words requires conversion of the bread into the body [abbreviation as in source].
11. St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses V (near the beginning).
12. St. Justin Martyr, Second Apology.
13. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catechesis 4.
14. St. Basil, Anaphora of the Divine Liturgy.
15. St. Gregory of Nyssa, In Vita Moysis; Sermo catecheticus de divinis sacramentis [abbreviations as in source].
16. St. Gregory of Nyssa, Sermo ad Catechumenos.
17. St. Ambrose, De mysteriis, ch. 9.
18. St. Ambrose, De sacramentis IV, ch. 4.
19. St. Ambrose, De fide IV, ch. 5.
20. St. Jerome, Epistle to Heliodorus; Epistle to Evagrius; and a third epistle [as in source]; Commentary on Isaiah 63; Commentary on Ezekiel 26; Commentary on Galatians 5.
21. Hesychius, In Leviticum VI, on ch. 22.
22. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 83 in Matth.; see also Homily on the Eucharist; Hom. 60 ad populum Antiochenum; Homily on the Betrayal by Judas; and the Liturgy [abbreviations as in source].
23. St. Augustine, Sermon on the Words of the Gospel, cited by Bede on 1 Cor. 10.

24. St. Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* III, chs. 4 and 10.
25. The sermon beginning *Veritas quae est Christus* is cited by the Master and by Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, cap. *Nos autem*; the text attributes to the Holy Spirit the making of Christ's true flesh from the substance of bread and wine. The Benedictine editors, however, do not list this among Augustine's genuine works; see the editorial note below.
26. St. Augustine, Sermon 28, *De verbis Domini*; Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, cap. *Nos autem*.
27. Eusebius of Emesa, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*; Homily 5 *De Paschate*.
28. St. Cyril of Alexandria, Epistle cited in the source [abbreviation as in source].
29. St. Peter Chrysologus, Sermon 160.
30. St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels (no. 14 as in the source) [abbreviation as in source].
31. St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* IV, ch. 14.
32. Theophylact, Commentary on Mark 14 ("Hoc est corpus meum").
33. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), in the definitions of the faith, ch. 1.
34. Council of Constance, condemnation of the first and second articles of John Wyclif; and the interrogatories prescribed in the Diploma of Martin V.
35. Council of Florence, Decree on the Sacraments.
36. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 4; canon 2.
37. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, aa. 2–4, 7–8.
38. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 3.
39. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 4; canon 2; St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 8.
40. [Editor's marginal note in the source] "Almost numberless testimonies of the Fathers could be brought forward to confirm this matter; but both because they are set forth by many authors, polemical and dogmatic, concerning the real presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, and because they are more than sufficient, we omit them; content to have cited one alone of the East, the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose words are: 'The judgement of the Holy Church is this: that the bread is that very Body of Jesus Christ, and that the wine, after the consecration and blessing, passes over and is changed into the very Blood of the Lord by the power of the Holy Spirit.'" (Jeremiah II of Constantinople, *Censurae*, ch. 10) [abbreviation as in source].
41. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 8.
42. St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* V.
43. Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom.
44. Berengarius of Tours, the earlier and the later professions prescribed to him by Supreme Pontiffs in a Roman Council [abbreviation as in source].
45. the Master (of the Sentences), In IV Sent., dist. 11.
46. Innocent III, *De officio Missae* IV, ch. 6.
47. Guitmundus of Aversa, *Contra Berengarium*, II.
48. Thomas Netter of Walden, *De sacramentis* II, ch. 68.
49. Cajetan, Commentary on St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 8.
50. Fourth Lateran Council under Innocent III; Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 4.
51. St. Ambrose and Theophylact, cited above.
52. Athanasius, *Disputatio cum Ario*. On the authenticity of the two Disputations with Arius found among the works of Athanasius (vol. 1), Bellarmine hesitates; many assign them rather to Vigilius of Tapsus (whom some reckon a bishop); Dupin, in his study on Athanasius, judges the second to have been delivered at Laodicea; and both Bellarmine and many others refuse them to Athanasius, the Greeks especially, while some refer to a Latin version by the presbyter Rufinus [abbreviation as in source].

53. Gregory Nazianzen, *De fide*. Many ascribe this book or sermon to Nazianzen; others judge it to be by a Latin author, not a Greek —an Aquileian, as they say [abbreviation as in source].
54. Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Responsio septima contra Arianos*.
55. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* (against the profane novelties of heresies). Vincent explains "profane novelties of words" as those alien to sacred doctrine and contrary to antiquity.
56. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 12.
57. Maximus of Turin, *Sermon* 59; Benedictine editors number it *Sermon* 87 among the sermons [abbreviation as in source].
58. Homily 27 among the fifty; elsewhere numbered *Sermon* 352 among the sermons [abbreviation as in source].
59. St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies to the people*; see also his *Homilies on John*, and *Questions on Leviticus* [abbreviation as in source].
60. The Church's hymn for the neophytes: "Cujus corpus... cruore ejus roseo gustando Deo" [abbreviation as in source].
61. Council of Carthage IV, ch. 38; St. Jerome, *Epistola de Cyclo Paschali*. On the epistle: some judge that the epistle found in the Hieronymian edition of Marianus Victorius is by another author; Philippus Labbe reports differing opinions [abbreviation as in source].
62. Council of Constance, Session 13; Council of Trent, Session 21, chs. 1–2; canons 1–2.
63. Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24–26. St. Augustine, *De consensu Evangelistarum* III, and Ep. 118 to Januarius, ch. 6.
64. Council of Trent, Session 21, ch. 1.
65. St. Augustine, *Tractates* 25–27 on John; cf. above, *Distinction* 9, on spiritual or mystical eating.
66. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III, ch. 16; *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 20; *Quaestiones evangeliorum* III, q. 4; *Sermon* 11 On the Words of the Lord; *Sermon to the Infantes* (as cited by the Venerable Bede on 1 Cor. 10). Gratian cites various places: *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, chs. *Quid est Christus*; *Qui discordat*; *Qui passus est*; and Prosper, *Sententia* 339. Also Innocent I, *Epistle to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis* (among Augustine's letters as Ep. 93); St. Basil, Ep. 141; St. Bernard, *De diligendo Deo*, and *Expositio in Psalmum* 90; Alcuin, *In Joannem*.
67. Council of Trent, Session 21, ch. 3.
68. On these strands of patristic testimony and later writers, see also the surveys of Eastern and Western practice: Petrus Arcudius, *Concordia Ecclesiae Occidentalis et Orientalis* III; Leo Allatius, *De Ecclesiae Occidentalis ac Orientalis perpetua consensione* III, chs. 56–57, 59; Cardinal Bona, *Rerum liturgicarum* II, ch. 18; and further references in the same. [abbreviation as in source]
69. Paschasius Radbertus interprets "Bibite ex hoc omnes" as addressed to the apostles then present but extends it to all believers; see also the note of the same on the distribution of the chalice and related places. [abbreviation as in source]
70. Council of Trent, Session 21, *Decree on the Petition for the Chalice*.
71. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 12; and III, q. 82, a. 4.
72. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 1; canon 2.
73. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 1.
74. Council of Trent, Session 22, canon 2.
75. St. Cyprian, *Epistle to Caecilius on the Sacrament of the Lord's Chalice*.
76. Roman Missal, rubrics concerning defect of matter in the chalice [abbreviation as in source].
77. Council of Toledo (cited by Gratian), *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, ch. *Relatum*.
78. Raphael Volaterranus, under Innocent IV and the Norwegians [abbreviation as in source].
79. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 82, a. 4, ad 3.
80. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 5; q. 77, a. 1–2.

DISTINCTIO XII — ON THE SACRAMENTAL SPECIES AND THEIR PROPERTIES (*DE SPECIEBUS SACRAMENTALIBUS ET EARUM IDIOMATIBUS*)

§ 1. Therefore, since the other things also are such as to remain, it is consistent that all the rest likewise remain, whose permanence no more clashes than theirs with the absence of the subject (*subjectum*) and the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, so far as regards the divine power. Since then by faith we believe that bread and wine in the Eucharist do not remain, but are converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, as was proved in the distinction above, it plainly follows that in this sacrament the accidents (*accidentia*) remain without a subject. And whatever avails to prove that conversion, by the same token serves to demonstrate this present truth.

§ 2. It is then proved by this sentence of St. Augustine, from the book of the Sentences of Prosper, cited by Gratian: in the species of bread and wine which we see, we venerate invisible things, that is, the flesh and blood; nor do we in like manner comprehend these two species as we comprehended them before consecration: since we confess in faith that before consecration it is bread and wine which nature formed, but after consecration the flesh of Christ and blood which the blessing consecrated.¹ And there in the same place from St. Gregory: Species, likeness are names of those things which were before, namely of bread and of wine.² Whence at the end of a certain Mass it is prayed and said: "May Thy sacraments, we beseech, O Lord, accomplish in us what they contain, that what we now enact in species, we may receive in the truth of the realities."³ From which words also is understood why the accidents that remain—especially those which are grasped by sense—are wont to be called the species of bread and wine: because assuredly they bear the appearance or likeness of bread and wine, under which, as it were covered over by alien wrappings, the Body and Blood of Christ are in a certain manner contained. In this sense also St. Ambrose in book 4 (On the Sacraments, ch. 4) makes mention of the species of bread and wine.⁴ The same is the confession of the great Lateran Council under Innocent III, in ch. 1, when it hands down that the true Body and Blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine.⁵ Whence in the Council of Constance this article of Wyclif was condemned: The accidents of bread do not remain without a subject in the sacrament of the altar.⁶ The same faith is confirmed by the Synod of Florence (in the Decree on the Sacraments), and most recently by the Council of Trent (session 13, chs. 1, 3, 4, and canons 2, 3).⁷

§ 3. These things, moreover, are not to be so understood as if that which has the character of a subject were therefore lacking, and thus that all the accidents which remain are utterly bereft of every subject whatsoever. For although it is defined that the substance (*substantia*) of bread does not remain, nor even its matter, and on that account no subject of quantity remains—as that which was immediately in prime matter, and by that mediation in the whole composite—nevertheless quantity itself is the subject of color, of taste, and of the other accidents: before consecration indeed such a subject as by whose mediation the accidents are

received into the substance, but after consecration such as by a divine miracle sustains the accidents by itself, and in which ultimately they inhere, so that quantity then in a certain manner takes the place of substance in sustaining the accidents. Therefore if it is at any time said in a general way that in the Eucharist all the accidents of bread remain without a subject, either an exception must be made of quantity, or by the name of subject substance is to be understood, which by its own nature underlies all the certain [accidents]. But as for the opinions of certain persons, who place all those accidents either in the surrounding air or in the Body of Christ as in a subject, there is no need here to refute them; since they plainly conflict with natural philosophy and rely on no divine authority, as by St. Thomas and other Scholastics has been luminously shown.⁸ But why Christ willed to leave to us His Body and Blood under alien species, three reasons are gathered from the Fathers. Of which the first is, lest this sacrament—which has been instituted for the use of the faithful—should be a horror to us: for it is held a dreadful and inhuman thing to eat human flesh and blood in their own species. This reason is indicated by St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. John Damascene, and others in the places cited elsewhere. The second, because it was instituted for signification: for bread and wine, by which we are corporally nourished as by the best foods—the one solid, the other liquid, that is, food and drink—signify that that which is covered by their species is our spiritual nourishment, and that this is by far the most excellent of all, as being the fount of all graces. The third, that faith (*fides*) might have a place, and that by the exercise of faith merit might increase.

§ III — To what extent the idioms of the species are attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ (Corpori et Sanguini Christi quatenus tribuantur specierum idiomata)

§ 4. One can doubt in this place whether the idioms or properties of the remaining species, and thus the species themselves, that is, the accidents (*accidentia*) of bread and wine, are truly and rightly attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ which are contained under them. Such properties of the accidents are quantity, color, figure, taste, odor. Likewise local motion, division, fracture, attrition, to be seen, to be touched, to be chewed, to be drunk, to be tasted, and other things of this sort. That these, or some of these, are rightly attributed to the things contained appears from the Apostle, who says concerning the breaking of bread: "The bread which we break, is it not the participation of the Body of Christ?" and in the next chapter according to the Greeks: "This is My Body which is broken for you."¹⁰ Luke also in the Acts assigns the breaking to that bread.¹¹ But that the Body or Flesh of the Lord is eaten, and His Blood drunk, is indubitable from the Evangelists and from John 6 according to the interpretation of many, likewise from the manner of speech of the Fathers and of all the faithful. But St. John Chrysostom even affirms more when he says: "What now they do, they even behold His very form, the figure, the garments, the sandals. Behold, you see Him, you touch Him, you eat Him," and so forth.¹² He adds besides, both he himself and Cyril of Jerusalem, that we taste the Body and Blood of Christ.¹³ If these things are truly said, the consequence will be that to Christ, or to His Body and Blood, there belong the very sensible qualities, by reason of which they are said to be seen, touched, and tasted. Furthermore St. John Chrysostom writes, in so many words, of Christ: "What He did not suffer on the cross, that He suffers in the oblation; and for your sake He endures to be broken, that He may satisfy all."¹⁴ And the same author says that the flesh of Christ is divided by us.¹⁵ And St. Ambrose says that in the ministry of the Apostles, that is, of those distributing the loaves to the reclining crowds, there was promised the future division of the Lord's Body and Blood.¹⁶ And St. Gregory: "The flesh of Christ," he says, "is

distributed for the salvation of the peoples."¹⁷ And St. Augustine in a certain Sermon (On the Words of the Gospel), as the Master cites: "The faithful know, when they eat the flesh of Christ, that each one receives his part."¹⁸ And far later than they, Odo of Cambrai, writing on the Canon of the Mass, says: "Christ Himself was broken between His priests' fingers and divided into parts." In which passage he also makes mention of attrition and consumption.¹⁹ Similar sentiments are to be found also elsewhere among the Fathers. Which there is no need to produce here, since we have the very plain confession of Berengarius in the Roman Council under Nicholas II, by which he expressly condemns the heresy which says that the Body and Blood of Christ cannot be sensibly handled or broken, or ground by the teeth of the faithful, except only in the sacrament on the hands of the priests. Rather, he professes that the Body and Blood of Christ are sensibly, not only in the sacrament, but in truth handled by the hands of the priests, broken, and ground by the teeth of the faithful.²⁰ By which words indeed nothing could be said more express.

§ 5. However, a contrary seems to be shown from this, that it is certain that Christ, just as He no longer dies, so neither any more suffers—namely, being endowed with an immortal and impassible body. In which, therefore, no breaking, division, or attrition seems to have a place. Whence it was proved above (Distinction 10) that Christ whole and entire is contained under both species and under every part of a species. It is also evident from the foregoing that the accidents of bread and wine after the conversion do not inhere in the very Body and Blood of Christ, but remain without a subject. Whence it appears that they are not rightly attributed to them.

§ 6. But for the clearing up of the doubt it must be noted, first, that singular, admirable, and ineffable is the conjunction by which the sacramental species are conjoined to the Body and Blood of Christ; so that deservedly by reason of that conjunction the accidents of bread and wine—even if not all, at least some—and the motions or operations which are done in them or about them, are attributed to the things contained: just as to God and to the Son of God, by reason of the humanity personally conjoined, all the idioms of human nature are attributed, whether this be done by an external denomination, or per accidens. Whence St. Gregory, after the words cited above, that he might signify that he had said those things on account of that admirable conjunction of the symbols of bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, subjoins that in this sacrament the highest things are made companions to the lowest, earthly things are joined to heavenly, and, moreover, from visible and invisible things there is made one; one, I say, not by nature, but by sacrament.²¹ Because of which unity, nevertheless, it is in no way absurd that many things proper to the species be attributed also to the things contained. Yet it must be known that some of these are said properly of the Body and Blood of Christ, but others less properly. For local motion is properly attributed to them, albeit per accidens; as when it is said that the Lord's Body is elevated, is carried about, is reposed, and the like. Of the same kind, it seems, is it when it is said that the Body or Flesh of Christ is eaten and that the Blood is drunk. For these consist in a certain motion. But the rest are said less properly and only by reason of the species, namely to be touched, seen, tasted, broken, divided, and the like—because assuredly the species themselves are touched, are seen, and so on, with which in a certain and admirable manner the Body of Christ is conjoined, and, according to the authority of Gregory, is made one and associated.

§ 7. But the Scholastics, as their mode of speaking is more proper, therefore also more sparing in such matters, for the most part follow it. Whence St. Thomas, in the Sequence of the Mass of the Most Venerable Sacrament, speaks distinctly thus: "By the receiver He is not cut, not broken, not divided; whole He is received." And again: "At the breaking of the sacrament do not hesitate, but remember that as much is under a

fragment as is covered under the whole. No rending of the thing takes place: the fracture is only of the sign," and so forth.²² St. Augustine too, leaning upon this propriety of speech, holds it for an absurdity that the flesh of Christ should be cut to pieces and torn by the teeth.²³ Finally, it must be noted that in the second confession of Berengarius, made in another Roman Council under Gregory VII, no mention at all is made of fraction or attrition of the Body of Christ. Which sufficiently intimates that in the former confession those things were not set down altogether properly. Otherwise, indeed, there had been no need to change the words of the confession. But that which in the same place is said, that not only in the sacrament, but in truth and sensibly the Body of Christ is handled, broken, and ground by the teeth, has this sense: that the Body of Christ is in truth, and not only as in a sign, contained under those species; by reason of which it is truly (although less properly) said to be sensibly handled, broken, and ground—especially since after the breaking He does not remain under one part only, but by that breaking it comes to pass that He truly exists separately under diverse particles of the species, who before existed under one entire species. Nor does Augustine wish anything else, as is plain from the words following his, which are read in the Master. Furthermore, St. John Chrysostom understands passion not as that which inflicts pain and is proper to animals, but that which is the genus to division or to fracture. And also that which is brought from Odo, in what sense it should be received, is made sufficiently clear by the subsequent words from the same author.

Reply to those things which are objected on the other side (Responsio ad ea quae contra obiiciuntur)

§ 8. Since heretics—both those who deny the presence in the Eucharist, and those who wish bread to remain together with the Body of Christ—among other things lean much on this foundation, which is taken from the permanence of the accidents, namely that it is incredible that accidents exist without a subject, therefore we must briefly reply to their arguments. First, then, they say it is impossible and deny that the nature of things can allow it, that an accident at any time exist outside its subject. To whom it is answered that indeed this is impossible according to the natural order of things. But for God, who is the author of nature, and therefore is not subject to the laws of nature, this is by no means impossible, but is no less than anything else that does not involve a contradiction, seated within His omnipotent power. Which is so far from being denied that even certain natural philosophers—Plato, Anaxagoras, and others—have posited certain accidents outside subjects, as Thomas of Walden has learnedly shown.²⁵ Among Christians, moreover, St. Basil in Homily 6 on the Hexaemeron, and after him St. John Damascene in book 2 On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 7, think that that light which is read to have been made on the first day existed in no body.²⁶ Which, even if they be not exactly thus, yet tend to this, that we understand it to be not alien to the opinion of most learned men, nay, even of Doctors of the Church, that an accident can exist without a subject by supernatural power.

§ 9. But it is objected on the contrary that it cannot be done even by divine power that the definition of a thing be separated from itself; for from that there would manifestly follow a contradiction: namely that a thing is not what it is. Since, therefore, the definition of an accident is to be in a subject, and that saying too is commonly trite, that the being of an accident is to be in another, this which is to be in a subject cannot be separated from an accident: for the consequence will be that an accident is not an accident. To which it is answered that the definition of an accident is to be thus understood: An accident is that to which it naturally befits to inhere in some subject. Just as also this definition of substance, A thing subsisting by itself, is to be taken in this sense: Substance is a thing to which by its own nature it befits to subsist by itself. Therefore, just

as the definition of substance is not separated from substance when the substance does not subsist by itself but is sustained in an alien supposit, namely the divine, so neither is the definition of an accident separated from the accident when by divine power and in a supernatural mode the accident subsists, not in another, but by itself. For to each its definition remains intact, namely to subsist by itself by its own nature, or to be in a subject.

§ 10. In like manner it must be answered to those who think that at least those accidents which are called proper passions—and are said to proceed from the very essence of the subject—cannot be supernaturally separated from the subjects. For since the subjects are not of their essence, and therefore from a separation of this sort no contradiction follows, nothing hinders but that this also be subjected to the divine omnipotence, especially since sense and experience teach that all the properties of bread and wine remain. Whence neither must there be doubt—about which among some of the Scholastics there was doubt—that just as God in the Eucharist preserves quantity without any subject, so He can preserve the other accidents without quantity and, simply, without any subject at all.

§ 11. Again they argue thus: God can neither be deceived nor deceive; but if the accidents—especially those which affect the senses—are separated from their subjects, there follows a manifest deception of the senses, nay of man himself, who judges of things through the sense; therefore such a separation cannot be ascribed to God. If you answer that there is no deception on God's part when God Himself by His word testifies that there is not bread there but the Body of Christ, nor ought man to give faith to the senses against the word of God, it is objected in reply that at least he is deceived by God who invincibly is ignorant that the host is consecrated. And indeed the opinions of some Doctors so sound as if in this sacrament there really happened a delusion of the senses. For the rhythm attributed to St. Thomas, whose beginning is "Adoro te," has thus: "Sight, taste, touch are deceived in Thee; but by hearing alone is there belief in Thee."²⁷ And before him Odo of Cambrai, Bishop, on the Canon of the Mass (Dist. 3), thus writes: "Within is true blood by true faith; outwardly is false wine by true species. One thing is felt and is not; blood does not appear and yet is; sense is deceived as to the quality, steadfastly is held the certain truth of the thing by faith; and therefore blood is called the mystery of faith, because this faith believes the blood as if it were hidden." Thus he. Likewise a certain John says: "The voice is Jacob's, but the hands are Esau's: just as the touch of Isaac was deceived, and not the hearing, so in this sacrament both sight and taste and smell are deceived, because according to the judgment of those senses nothing seems to be there except bread and wine; but hearing is not deceived: for we hear, 'This is My Body,' and so it truly is."²⁸ To the same tends these words of Cyril (in the fourth Mystagogical Catechesis): "For even if sense reports something else to thee, nevertheless let faith confirm thee; do not judge the thing by taste, but let faith without any hesitation render thee certain." And below: "What is seen bread is not bread, although it seems so to taste; what is seen wine is not wine, although thus taste judges."²⁹ Such too is that of Ambrose in the book *On Those Initiated into the Mysteries*, ch. 9: "Perhaps you say, I see something else; how do you assert to me that I receive the Body of Christ?"³⁰ Yet from the same Ambrose the Master (in text f. B.) cites for a different mind these words: "Nothing false is to be thought in the Sacrifice of truth, as happens in the prestidigitations of magicians, where by a certain illusion the eyes are deceived, that they may see that to be which is not."³¹ To the explanation of this doubt there conduces the handling of the question treated by some Scholastics, whether, just as after consecration the accidents remain, so the same sensitive as well as intellectual knowledge about bread and wine remains. On which question one may see Domingo Soto, *In II*, Dist. 9, q. 2, a. 1.³² Meanwhile, so far as the present objection is concerned, we reply that in this sacrament there happens no deception or illusion properly so called. For if Christ appeared,

without any deception, to the two disciples going to Emmaus in another form (Mk. 16)—which example the Master alleges—and if the Angel Raphael, putting on the appearance of Azarias the son of Ananias, did not deceive those who looked upon him, as neither did other Angels whenever they appeared to men in human form, by so much the less ought it to be believed that in this sacrament any deception happens, where species assumed from elsewhere are not set before the senses, nor is there only a change either in the medium, or in the eye, or in some other instrument of sense, as perhaps in other cases sometimes it was made; but the very same accidents of bread and wine remain which existed before, and therefore are by nature adapted to affect or, if you will, change the sense in altogether the same way. Since therefore sense is properly and of itself of accidents, namely of sensible qualities, but of substances only by accident, it follows that sense is not properly deceived when it perceives sensible accidents bereft of their subject. Whence St. Thomas in the Sermon On the Venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist (Opusculum 57): "The accidents," he says, "exist without a subject, that faith may have a place, while the invisible is visibly received, hidden under an alien species, and the senses be rendered immune from deception, which judge about the accidents known to them."³³ And in the Third Part, question 75, article 3, when this argument is set before him, In the sacrament of truth there ought not to be deception, and so on, he replies that here there is no deception: "For the accidents which are discerned by the senses are there according to the truth of the thing. But the intellect, whose proper object is substance, is preserved from deception by faith. And faith is not against the senses, but is about that to which the senses do not attain."³⁴ These are his words. Now if someone invincibly is ignorant that the host has been consecrated, he is indeed deceived, but by himself through the proper judgment of his mind—yet without his fault on account of invincible ignorance. But authorities which intimate a deception of the senses about this sacrament seem to be understood of the judgment of the intellect, which estimates the thing from sense without the aid of faith. For if we consult sense alone, we shall judge that it is bread and wine which we receive, not because the sense itself is properly deceived, but because from the accidents perceived by sense we are accustomed to judge about the substance. But if, the sense set aside, we believe the word of God, there will be no deception either in the intellect or in the sense, but only from the accidents will there be able to be formed a bare apprehension, as it were, of the subjects as present, with which, nevertheless, there coexists faith about the same things as absent or as not existing. And in this sense nothing also hinders our understanding those authorities, or some of them.

§ IV — Some other things to be noted concerning the sacramental species (Alia quaedam notanda circa species sacramentales)

§ 12. Now the other points which are commonly handed down as worthy of consideration concerning the accidents (*accidentia*) that remain in the Eucharist, we shall comprise in a certain enumeration.

§ 13. Of which the first is this: since by sense it is manifest that the remaining species (*species*) can change something placed outside, as air, the eye, the palate; and some indeed think that this does not occur without a new miracle, especially if together with that change there follows another substantial change; nevertheless it seems more probable that the species, once by a divine miracle separated from their subjects, thereafter change the senses without a new miracle, and do the things which they would do if they inhered in their subjects, namely by their own proper and natural power, which is not taken from them by the separation from the subject: so that whatever they were able to do with the substance (*substantia*) of bread and wine remaining,

consequently they can do the same with these absent; nor are two miracles here to be recognized, to subsist of themselves and to act, but the second follows from the nature of the thing once the first is granted.

§ 14. Second: Just as the species could be corrupted together with their own subjects, so also without them. But they are corrupted by the same causes by which they would be corrupted if they inhered in their subjects: namely by contraries, or by other causes acting naturally upon them. However, just as quantity (*quantitas*) is not corrupted when conjoined to a subject, so neither is it when separated from a subject.

§ 15. Third: Since by Christ's institution His Body and Blood are only under the species of bread and wine, when these are corrupted, the Body and Blood of Christ are not indeed corrupted, but at that very moment of the corruption cease to be there.

§ 16. Fourth: It is known by experience that, from the sacramental species, when they are corrupted, something is generated. But how that generation (*generatio*) takes place, since neither the substance nor the prime matter (*materia prima*) of bread and wine remain in the sacrament, is difficult to explain; whence also the opinions of the Doctors vary. For some have said that that generation is made from the surrounding air; but this is disproved by many reasons. Others have thought that by miracle the substance of bread and wine returns, so that generations are made from these. This seems to have been the opinion of Innocent III in book 4 of *De Officio Missae*, ch. 11, which also Alexander of Hales follows; but St. Bonaventure judges it probable. Yet this, too, many rightly reject as improbable. Others hold that that generation is made from the quantity of bread and wine remaining in the Eucharist, which, just as during the sacrament it is the subject of the other accidents, so also it is and remains the first subject of the subsequent forms, not an accident—inasmuch as that which is generated from the species at once takes on the role both of matter and of quantity and of place. This is St. Thomas's view, although his followers set it forth in another way, as may be seen in Cajetan and Domingo de Soto, in order to avoid certain absurdities which they think are said in that opinion.³⁶

§ 17. There therefore remains the more common opinion, by far more probable than the others, which St. Thomas followed when writing his *Sentences*, and for some reason unknown later abandoned; according to which one must say that, at the corruption of the species, the substance of bread and wine does not, as it were, return—for this would be a strange thing, indeed it cannot be, since the corruption of the species does not consist in the substance of bread and wine—but that prime matter is restored, not newly created, but rather that which had been the prime matter of the bread and wine. We do not think it impossible for God in an instant to repair this, and, so to speak, to replace it, into which the substantial form (*forma substantialis*) of that which is generated is introduced, and in which thereafter the quantity together with the other accidents may inhere. The reason of this opinion is that God ordained those species to exist without a subject only in the Eucharist and there at the altar. Wherefore, once the Eucharist ceases, quantity is no longer to be acknowledged as there present. Otherwise it would follow that in every such quantity there were a perpetual being without a subject, undergoing various changes, and one would have to admit that this lasted to the end of the age, indeed even into eternity—whose absurdity is evident. And what has been said about generation, the same must be said also about nutrition (*nutritio*), which is the generation of a part.

§ V — What is the effect of the sacrament of the Eucharist (Quis sit effectus sacramenti Eucharistiae)

§ 18. Since the sacrament (*sacramentum*) is food and drink in the Eucharist and the drink of the faithful, and therefore nourishment, it is rightly called by the Fathers of the Council a spiritual food; and, in those who receive it worthily, it produces spiritually the effect which food and drink produce corporally in men; yet with this difference, that bodily food is converted into the substance (*substantia*) of the one nourished, but this food, which is Christ Himself, is not converted, but, quite to the contrary, converts us into Himself, and, uniting us to Himself, conforms us to Himself, not Himself to us. Thus St. Augustine in his Confessions brings in God speaking to him to this effect: "Not I shall be changed into thee, but thou shalt be changed into Me." And, whereas in bodily things the function of food and of drink is not the same, here, however, since under each species the whole Christ is contained, the effect of food is not to be distinguished from the effect of drink, as we said elsewhere (above, Dist. 11).³⁸

§ 19. But, in order that we may understand what and how manifold that very effect is, it must first be set down what in this matter the Fathers both of the Council of Florence and of the Council of Trent teach. In the Florentine Decree on the sacrament of the Eucharist, among other things it is read thus: "The fruit of this sacrament which one who receives it worthily works in his soul is the union of man with Christ. And since by grace man is incorporated in Christ and is united with His members, it follows that through this sacrament in those who receive it worthily grace is increased, and every effect which food and drink work with respect to temporal life, this same thing with respect to spiritual life is wrought through this sacrament."³⁹ But the Council of Trent (Session 13, ch. 2) spoke thus concerning the effect of this sacrament: that it was willed by the Lord to be taken "as a spiritual food of souls, by which they may be nourished and strengthened who live by His life who said, 'He who eats Me, he too shall live because of Me,' and as a most marvelous antidote, whereby we may be freed from daily faults and be preserved from mortal sins," and so forth; and (canon 5) it decreed thus: "If anyone shall say either that the chief fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that from it no other effects arise, let him be anathema."⁴⁰ From these things it follows that the proper effect of this sacrament is the nourishment of man according to spiritual life.

§ 20. Therefore, in general, four or five effects of this most divine sacrament can be reckoned. The first is our union with Christ; for since here there is truly present, as it were in nourishment, Christ, that is, His flesh and blood, soul and divinity, it follows that by the reception of this sacrament we are joined to Christ and become one with Him both according to the spirit, according to that saying of the Apostle (1 Cor. 6), "He who is joined to the Lord is one spirit," and according to the flesh, according to that saying (Eph. 5), "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." This effect by another name is called our incorporation and transmutation into Christ. Whence Leo says (Sermon 14 on the Passion of the Lord): "For the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ does not work anything else than that we should pass into that which we receive."⁴¹ And the Fathers of the great Lateran Council, as it were echoing the same, say (cap. 1): "That the mystery may be brought to perfection, we receive of His own, which He Himself received of ours."⁴²

§ 21. From this effect another follows, namely the union of the faithful among themselves. For those who are united to a third are also made one among themselves. Hence the same Apostle says (1 Cor. 10): "We, being many, are one bread, one body, all we who partake of the one bread." And although this also is ascribed

to Baptism, that it unites us to Christ and among ourselves, as the Apostle says (1 Cor. 12): "We have all been baptized into one body," nevertheless by a special *ratio* this belongs to the sacrament of the Eucharist. For the unity which Baptism begins, the Eucharist in a certain manner perfects, and communicates to us with a certain more excellent *ratio*, while it unites us to Christ not only in spirit but also in flesh. But how great a good it is to be one with Christ, and consequently with His whole body which is the Church, is not for this place to explain. For this pertains to the exposition of the article of the Creed on "the communion of saints." It will here suffice to note that he who is united to Christ and to the Church is made a partaker of all the goods both of Christ and of the whole Church, that is, of all the saints. And how great a thing this is to be esteemed, it is easy to learn from civil unity, where no one, however industrious and wise otherwise, suffices for himself for all the necessities of life, but has need to be aided by the rest of the body of the city, namely, others furnishing different things suited to the common use.

§ 22. The third effect is increase or abundance of grace (*gratia*). For since from the passion of Christ every spiritual fruit or grace accrues to us, it is consonant that in this sacrament grace should be conferred on us so much the more copiously, by how much more than the other sacraments the passion of Christ is here recalled and represented. For the other sacraments were instituted to obtain some particular effect of the passion of Christ; but this one chiefly for this, that His passion may continually be brought to mind, and be offered and received; as is clear from the Gospels and from Paul. Whence with a public voice the Church bears witness that "in this sacred banquet of Christ the memory of His passion is recalled and the mind is filled with grace." And in the Canon of the Mass it is said: "that as many of us as by participation at this altar shall have received, we may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace," that is, with every kind of heavenly gifts by which one tends unto God. And Augustine, book 2 (Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 6), says: "He who eats and drinks worthily, eats and drinks grace for himself." And in the Treatise On the Fourth Feria, ch. 4: "See how thou receivest this blood; for he who receives it well receives a blessing." Although these places can also be extended to the other effects. For every effect of this sort is in the general name grace and blessing expressed in the Canon of the Mass.⁴³

§ 23. The fourth effect is spiritual nourishment. Of which effect we spoke at the beginning. Hence it follows that, since bodily food and drink nourish, preserve, strengthen, gladden the outward man, this same sacrament works these same things spiritually in the inward man. Which analogy of bodily food, and of His body and blood as of spiritual food, the Lord expressed sufficiently (Jn. 6), both in other sayings and especially in this: "My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."

§ 24. The last is the purification or remission of past sins, and the preservation from future sins. For this sacrament is offered not only as the food of a man who is healthy and strong, but also as medicinal food for the sick, whereby whatever is vitiated is expelled and purged, and whatever is crude and undigested in a man's soul is consumed; and he himself thereafter is fortified, as it were by an antidote, against temptations as they occur. For which reason Ambrose rightly called this Venerable and Heavenly Sacrament "medicine"; and in book 5 (On the Sacraments, ch. 4), and in book 4, ch. 5, he writes thus: "He who shall have eaten this body, there shall be to him remission of sins, and he shall not die for ever." Likewise to this pertains that the pious frequency of this Sacrament blunts the sting of the flesh and enervates the law of the members. Whence Cyril, book 4 (on John, ch. 17), among other things says that it weakens "the law of our members." And for this cause (Zech. 9) it is called "wine that makes virgins sprout," that is, it arouses virginal affections in us. It is clear from Ambrose that the priest says to the faithful: "May the Body of Christ be to thee the remission of sins." Furthermore, to

the effects already enumerated are referred whatever are wont either in the Sacrament or in the sacred office of the Mass to be ascribed to it, of the following kind: to confer eternal life, to renew the mind, to protect against the ills of soul and to remit sins, to wash away faults, to invigorate, to govern, to expiate—grace in the present and in the future. To the same are referred the three utilities and twelve special advantages from the communion of this sacrament which John Gerson enumerates (in the Exposition of the Cantic of the Blessed Virgin). One may moreover add that Cyril, book 4 (on John, on ch. 13 and the following) and book 10, ch. ..., relates the blessed immortality of our bodies, indeed the very incorruption which we await in the resurrection, to have been received from the partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ; in which places also, and elsewhere, he commemorates other notable benefits of this sacrament.⁴⁴

§ VI — What preparation is necessary for the reception of this sacred thing (Quae praeparatio fit ad hoc sacrum sumendum necessaria)

§ 25. Just as Holy Communion (*Communio*) brings the greatest fruit to those who receive worthily, so do unworthy minds draw upon themselves the most grievous ruin. For that which is life to the good, is death to the evil; and that which was bread to the good disciples, was poison to the traitor—not because the thing received is evil, but because the evil man received a good thing badly, as St. Augustine says.⁴⁶

§ 26. This indeed is most clearly the meaning of the Apostle's words (1 Cor. 11): "Whoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,"—that is, of the Body and Blood of the Lord treated unworthily and ignominiously. And again: "For he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment," that is, damnation, "to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord"—that is, not distinguishing it from other foods, but approaching it as if to a food common and profane.

§ 27. Now that happens because he comes not duly prepared. What then the due preparation ought to be, the Apostle has indicated when he says: "But let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice."⁴⁷ And that "proving" is by no means to be taken of faith alone, as the heretics wish; this is shown clearly from the Apostle himself. For he did not reprove the Corinthians because they did not believe, but because they approached irreverently, with contempt or neglect of others.

§ 28. Therefore that proving must be understood which the Church has always understood and has taught to be applied, namely, by which the faithful examine themselves whether they truly are friends of Christ, clothed in the wedding garment, that is, charity (*caritas*), whether truly they seek the glory of Christ, or whether rather they come to that table either out of mere custom, or out of human respect, or from some earthly use or desire; whether they be of good will, detesting sins and wishing in all things to live well; and whether, being truly justified by faith, they have peace toward God, so that their heart does not reprove or accuse them on account of some crime on which point they have not yet been reconciled to God.

§ 29. For if anyone not yet reconciled, but still an enemy, intrudes himself upon this Table, he becomes guilty of sacrilege and renders himself liable to judgment; since by the very taking of the Body of the Lord and by communion with the holy Table he signifies that he is made a companion, friend, and closely joined to Him, from whom nevertheless by sin and by the guilt of eternal death he is still disjoined and estranged.

§ 30. Wherefore he justly acquires judgment—that is, damnation—to himself by such taking, because it is exceedingly damnable to signify one thing in a sacred sign and to have another in the heart. On which whole matter one may see St. Thomas in the Third Part (q. 80, a. 4 and 5).⁴⁸

§ 31. Moreover, that such proving is required is shown further from this: because the Eucharist is the bread of the sons and members of Christ, to which accordingly none but a son and one who is a living member of Christ ought to approach. Next, because the common table is a certain symbol of friendship, which is so much the holier the better and more precious that which is set before those whom He has invited. Third, because, since for the reception of foods there is required life in the recipient, but since this food is spiritual and sacramental—that is, both spiritual and sacramental—there ought also to precede in him spiritual life at once and sacramental.

§ 32. Whence the Fathers of the Council of Trent, not content with previous contrition alone, altogether require sacramental confession from those who are burdened in conscience with a grave crime when they are called to the sacrament. And ecclesiastical custom declares that proving to be necessary, to wit, that no one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may seem to himself, ought to approach the holy Eucharist without prior sacramental confession—a thing which, as this holy Synod has decreed, is to be perpetually observed by all Christians, even by those priests on whom by office the duty of celebrating has been incumbent, provided that a supply of a confessor is not lacking to them; but if by urgent necessity a priest has celebrated without prior confession, let him confess as soon as possible. And, repeating the same statute (can. 11), it forbids under pain of excommunication that anything contrary be taught by anyone.⁴⁹

§ 33. That this has always been the custom of the Church the writings of the Fathers testify everywhere; from which these places may be noted: St. Ambrose, book 6 (on Luke, ch. 9), where he treats of the miracle of the loaves; St. Augustine (Tractate 26 on John); and in him the Author of the book On Ecclesiastical Dogmas, ch. 53; St. John Chrysostom (Homily 83 on Matthew); and St. Cyril, book 4 (on John, ch. 17). From these it is clear that mortal sins alone impede the fruit of this sacrament, not however venial sins of whatever sort committed before reception.

§ 34. As for the extent to which present venial sins, or such as are in act—as the Divine Thomas speaks—impede the fruit of communion, as when someone does not apply an actual devotion in the very reception of the sacrament, but his soul is distracted with other thoughts, whether lawful or unlawful, one may see St. Thomas, Third Part (q. 79, a. 8), where he seems tacitly to retract what he had said somewhat differently in the writing on the present Distinction, and in the Commentary on 1 Corinthians 11. Whence among his interpreters, Cajetan and Domingo de Soto and other Doctors there has arisen a diversity of opinions concerning this question, whether by venial sins alone the fruit of communion is sometimes impeded wholly. And whereas many affirm this, Domingo nevertheless, both by reason and by the authority of St. Thomas and of Adrian VI writing on the Fourth Book, establishes the contrary as probable. The reason is this: because venial sin, since it is not an obstacle (*obex*) to the sacrament—mortal sin alone is of such sort—cannot impede its effect universally. Let the rest of the reasons on both sides be sought from those Authors themselves.⁵⁰

Quarumdam in contrarium objectionum dissolutio. "The resolution of certain objections to the contrary."

§ 35. St. Thomas, in the same place.⁴⁸

§ 36. What we have said about the preparation necessary for the worthy reception of the Eucharist is wont to be attacked by these arguments for the most part. First, there are alleged the general passages of Scripture in

which even sinners are invited to Christ, that they may receive benefits from Him; as in Matt. 9: "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are ill"; and: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you"; and: "As many as touched the hem of His garment were made whole." The same is proved by examples. For the sinful woman (Lk. 7) touched Christ by washing His feet, kissing them, anointing. Zacchaeus, not yet reconciled from his sins, received Christ into his house (Lk. 19). Whence it seems to follow that this same Christ the Lord in the Sacrament can be received by a sinner at least penitent worthily and with fruit.

§ 37. Second, they argue thus: The bread of the Eucharist is lifegiving, according to that of John 6: "The bread which came down from heaven gives life to the world," and "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world," and again, "He who eats me, the same shall live because of me." But nothing is made alive except that which lacks life; therefore the dead—that is, sinners—ought to approach this sacrament, that they may be made alive. Whence also there is that well-known saying of Augustine in a certain Sermon, that this sacrament makes the dead to live again.

§ 38. Third, from the same Augustine, who (Epistle 118, a, ch. 3) says that a man is to be separated from the Lord's Table only for those sins which deserve excommunication; which Gratian also cites under the name of Hilary (On Consecration, Dist. 2, "Si non sunt tanta"). But it is certain that not every mortal sin is punished with excommunication.

§ 39. Fourth: That same Augustine, book 2 (On Free Choice, ch. 19), says that the greatest goods are those "of which no one makes an evil use." Since therefore Christ Himself ought to be numbered among the great goods, or rather is the greatest good of all, the sinner will not be kept back from Him, since he cannot make an evil use of Him.

§ 40. Fifth: The sinner does not sin by seeing the Body of Christ. For the Church sets it before all to be seen and worshiped.

§ 41. Sixth: In the public Prayers the Church prays that this sacrament may be to us the washing away of crimes, and that it may purge us from offense and the like.

§ 42. Seventh: The Council of Trent (Sess. 22, ch. 2) affirms that by the Eucharistic sacrifice crimes and even sins are forgiven; therefore remission is not required beforehand.

§ 43. Finally: It happens that a sinner has a consciousness of sin, who, if he should set himself to receive this sacrament, would perilously fear to approach that table; for each one fears, even after his own examination of conscience, lest there still lie hidden in his heart something for which he would be condemned by God, according to that of the Apostle (1 Cor. 4): "I am not conscious to myself of anything; yet not in this am I justified." These objections we resolve briefly as follows.

§ 44. Reply to the first: Those Scriptures and examples have nothing similar to the reception of this sacrament. For since, by Christ's institution, the Eucharist signifies His mystical Body, which is the communion of the saints, whoever receives this sacrament thereby signifies that he is united and incorporated with Christ and His members, which takes place only by faith and charity and a life from Him. Whoever therefore comes to this sacrament with mortal sin by the reception of the sacrament signifies falsely, which pertains to the crime of sacrilege. Outside this sacrament Christ invited men to Himself, or showed Himself ready to be approached, not that by their approach or touch there should be signified their spiritual union

with Christ, but rather that by seeing or touching they might at length be united, and by faith and charity might adhere to Him. Moreover St. Thomas adds (q. 80, a. 4) that it was fitting for Christ to present Himself to be touched by sinners when He was still bearing "the likeness of sinful flesh"; which likeness removed in the glory of the resurrection, He forbade Himself to be touched by the woman who was suffering a defect with respect to Him. Nor is the argument from medicine cogent; for one kind of medicine is suited to the sick, and another to the healthy. Of the former kind is Penance; of the latter, the Eucharist.⁵¹

§ 45. Reply to the second: The Eucharist is called lifegiving in the manner of Sacred Scripture, not because it gives life to the dead, but because to the living it preserves, increases, and confirms life and health. And "the Flesh of Christ" is said in John to "give life to the world," according to the interpretation of Augustine, inasmuch as it is received in faith, not in this sacrament in the sense alleged, but because by faith in the incarnate and suffering Word the ungodly man is justified.

§ 46. Reply to the third: In those places there is also understood the lesser excommunication, which is incurred by any mortal sin whatsoever.

§ 47. Reply to the fourth: Augustine in that place, distinguishing the greatest, the middle, and the least goods, speaks of those goods which are in man himself. In him the least goods are those without which one can live rightly, as health and the strength and form of the body; the middle, those without which one cannot live rightly, as the powers of the soul; the greatest, those by which one lives rightly and by which no one uses evilly, as the virtues of the soul. Which is to be understood thus: that by these no one can make an evil use as by principles of operating, although one can make an evil use of them as objects; as if someone should take pride, by reason of the virtue of continence. The same in like manner can be said of the Body of Christ: since it is in itself a good, it becomes evil to him who receives badly; as Augustine clearly teaches (Tractate 62 on John).

§ 48. Reply to the fifth: By seeing this sacrament is not received, as it is by touching and tasting; and hence there is not the same account of these senses. For the sinner is said to sin when he approaches unworthily, inasmuch as by receiving this sacrament as food he signifies that he is a son and friend, whereas he is not in reality. Then too it is certain that a greater reverence is required to touch the sacred things than merely to see them; as is evident in the case of sacred vessels, because touch perceives without an external medium, whereas sight does so by a medium and at a distance. Although, too, from the vision of the Body of the Lord, by most ancient ecclesiastical custom, those who are not yet baptized are kept back; of which thing Dionysius of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy makes mention (ch. 3, in the Theory, that is, the Contemplation).⁵²

§ 49. Reply to the sixth: Such Orations of the Church are offered for the Eucharist as sacrifice (*sacrificium*), not as sacrament—that is, for those for whom it is offered, not for those by whom it is received; in which way also that which in the seventh place was objected from the Council of Trent must manifestly be understood. For it is thereby signified that the Lord grants to sinners, for whom it is offered, grace and the gift of penance, by which they may come to the remission of crimes, as the same Council declares.⁵³ But if such prayers be referred to the very recipients, they are to be understood about the remission of sins and stains only in those who are catechumens; then, too, as regards those possessing faith, about the expulsion of all terrors and phantasms in those who have not yet arrived at the stability of the divine habit and the divine life, and who, because of the sloth of sacred things, neglect the gaze of the divine Scriptures which follow thereafter, and the Mysteries to be beheld. Then, since most of those things that pertain to the matter in hand are set

forth copiously and to the purpose, when after being expelled from the temple of God those who have not been initiated into the sacred rites, and still less those who have done contraries to the divine habit, have been dismissed; and when afterwards, by the recitation of sacred Psalms, they are allowed indeed to hear, but are not summoned to sacred works, but the perfect and entirely sound are gathered together—these and the rest, as one reading the place will find evident—must be suitably applied to those who have not yet attained the full constancy of the divine habit. In brief, those orations, so far as they regard the Eucharist as sacrifice, ask that God may, for sinners for whom it is offered, deign to unite them to Himself by the gift of penance; as for catechumens, that He may lead them to perfect constancy; and, as for the baptized who are not yet fully stable, that He may inflame them to the divine contemplation and action.⁵⁴

§ 50. Reply to the last: It happens that someone after the examination of conscience fears still lest he may be guilty before God; for which reason the Apostle says: "I am not conscious to myself of anything; yet not in this am I justified." But still the same Apostle has clearly instructed that each one "prove himself," and thus let him approach; since because of that hidden fear a man ought not to abstain from so great a table, provided that he be not conscious to himself of mortal sin.

§ 51. ...of crimes as regards the temporal penalties still due for them. Note, however, that the name of "crime" is at times extended even to venial sins.

§ 52. Finally St. Thomas answers that it happens in two ways that someone does not have a conscience of sin: in one way, through his own fault, if either he has examined his conscience negligently, or labors under an ignorance of law that does not excuse, thinking that to be no mortal sin which he ought to know is such. Such a man, indeed, is not excused, since the very ignorance is a sin for him. In another way, without his fault, for instance when he has been sorry for his sin, but is not sufficiently contrite. And in such a case, he says, he does not sin by taking the Body of Christ, since a man by certainty cannot know whether he is truly contrite. For it suffices if he find in himself the beginnings of contrition, for instance if he is sorry for past sins and purposes to beware for the future.⁵⁵

§ 53. Moreover he says something further (Question 79, Article 3), namely that this sacrament works the remission of sins even when received by one who is in mortal sin, of which he has not a consciousness and affection. "For perhaps," he says, "at first he was not sufficiently contrite; but receiving devoutly and reverently, he will obtain through this sacrament the grace of charity, which perfects contrition and the remission of sin."⁵⁶ But whether that reason which St. Thomas brings forward—namely, because a man cannot know with certainty whether he is truly contrite—suffices for a total excuse, since that consideration has a place also in a man who bears within himself a hidden affection contrary to God, which he himself does not see, is not of this place to examine exactly.

§ 54. Furthermore, if someone has altogether forgotten the sin committed, a general contrition, acceding to the sacrament, suffices for its deletion.

§ 55. Now if someone asks what one ought to say about those who, after diligent preparation, feel themselves still to be led by servile fear, as being so affected that, if the fear of Gehenna did not stand in the way, they would desire to perpetrate the sin—of which sort are many among Christians—whether such rightly and with fruit approach the Table of the Lord: to me, certainly, it seems one must answer, that if one feels himself to be led by servile fear—since he is not yet a son—it is not lawful for him to approach this Table.

§ 56. Yet one must know that not all those who would be sinners if the terror of Gehenna did not stand in the way are servants and strangers to the grace of the adoption of sons. For the fear of Gehenna also usefully restrains sons, that they may not be drawn away by the delectation of sin. Hence also to the Apostles and to all the Faithful the Lord says: "Fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna"; and in the person of the just man the Psalmist says: "Pierce my flesh with thy fear."⁵⁷

§ 57. For it is one thing that someone be so affected that he would desire to commit sin if he could with impunity—which is servile; it is another thing that he be so weak that, if the precept were not set forth, he would easily slip into sin, which befalls very many even among sons, who, although they love God above all, nevertheless would not long be able to be kept in that love and in the observance of His commandments unless they were held back from sin by the bridle of fear.

§ VIII — By what precept the faithful are bound to receive the Eucharist (Quo praecepto fideles ad Eucharistiam sumendam adstringamur)

§ 58. Concerning the question of the necessity of this sacrament, first one must know and set down for certain that the taking of it is not simply necessary unto salvation in that manner in which Baptism is necessary for all, or the sacrament of Penance is necessary for the relapsed. This is proved by the testimonies of Scripture and of the Fathers, which signify that Baptism suffices for salvation, inasmuch as by it, when full remission of sins has been received, men are constituted just, holy, sons of God, and heirs of eternal life. And this, too, is shown from the very nature of this sacrament. For it is instituted as a certain spiritual food. Therefore, just as bodily food is not necessary for initiating the life of the body, but only for conserving it, indeed it necessarily presupposes the life of the body, in a certain similar way this sacrament stands to the life of the soul. Yet the difference is this: although spiritual food is necessary, not for preserving spiritual life simply, nevertheless it does not follow from this that the Eucharistic sacrament is necessary for that life; since besides this sacrament there are other means—like certain spiritual foods—by which a man can be preserved and increased in spiritual life, although among them all this most excellent sacrament holds the first place.

§ 59. Wherefore Christ so instituted it that He also commanded its taking, saying: "Do this in remembrance of me."⁵⁹ By which words He willed not only the very consecration and oblation of the Eucharist to be prescribed to the Apostles and to their successors, but also to all the faithful. The proof of which fact is from the Apostle, who shows that the taking is included also in those words, when, explaining them, he subjoins thus: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall announce the death of the Lord, until he come."⁶⁰

§ 60. It is proved next from a like place of Scripture. For in Exodus 12, where the manner of immolating and eating the Paschal lamb is described, the Lord subjoined: "The whole assembly of the children of Israel shall do it." That by those words the immolation or sacrifice of the Paschal lamb is commanded is clear from Numbers 9, where the soul is said to be cut off from the people which shall not have done the Phase, because it has not offered the sacrifice of the Lord in its time. But that by the same words the eating of the lamb is also commanded is clear from the place of Exodus, where both the things that follow and the things that precede that sentence manifestly show it. Therefore, just as in that legal precept both the sacrifice and the eating of the lamb are mandated, so in this mandate of the New Law both are to be understood as prescribed—namely, both the consecration and oblation of the Eucharist, as Cyprian understood it, and, moreover, the very taking,

as Basil and Cyril understood.⁶¹ Nay more, the circumstance of the place requires this sense. For since mention is made there not only of the oblation but also of the taking, and that too more expressly when it is said: "Take and eat," the pronoun "this" is not to be restricted to the oblation and consecration alone, but is rather to be taken so that by that "Do this" the thing is understood to be generally commanded which the Evangelists describe the Lord and the Apostles then to have done, so that the sense of the words be thus: What we have just done—I indeed by consecrating and offering, but you by taking what has been consecrated and offered—do that after my death in remembrance of me.

§ 61. Therefore, this precept, although in a certain respect it pertains to priests alone, inasmuch as the power of consecrating is given and consecration is prescribed, nevertheless in part pertains to all Christians, inasmuch as the taking of the consecrated thing is enjoined. And yet the oblation of the Eucharist also belongs to the laity in its own way, namely through the ministry of the priests, as is clear from those words of the Canon: "For whom we offer to Thee, or who also themselves offer to Thee"; and below: "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and also Thy holy people, offer." In like manner in the Law of Moses the people are said to offer, but through the priests.⁶²

§ 62. Another place containing the precept of Christ is produced from John 6: "Unless you shall eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." But of the true understanding of that place we have spoken elsewhere, and below in another place we shall speak again. For if in those words there were contained a precept of receiving this sacrament, it would follow that this sacrament is necessary for salvation in that manner in which Baptism is—namely, by a necessity of the end and not only of precept; because just as it is said: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," so here it is said: "Unless you shall eat, etc., you shall not have life in you." Therefore the precept of receiving the Eucharist is not to be founded on that place, but on that which we have named above.

§ 63. Moreover to Christ's general precept there has been added the Church's special and determinative precept. And indeed in the earlier times, when religion was still fervent, the faithful of their own accord frequented this sacrament sufficiently; the Church did not think that by any further law they ought to be bound, whereby a fixed time for receiving the Eucharist should be prescribed to them. But after the devotion of the faithful began to grow tepid, it was decreed that at least three times a year all the Faithful should communicate, namely on those days on which the principal mysteries of the Christian Religion are solemnly recalled, that is, on the feasts of Easter, Pentecost, and the Nativity of the Lord. Thus it was decreed by Pope Fabian, as is had in Gratian; and by the Council of Agde.⁶³

§ 64. Afterwards, however, as piety grew colder yet, it was established that all adults, once at least in the year—namely, at the time of the Lord's Passion and Resurrection—should receive the Eucharist in memory of that same Passion, with this penalty added: that whoever shall not have obeyed be barred from entering the Church while living, and when dying lack Christian burial. This law of the Church is altogether consonant with that Mosaic law: "That man who is clean and was not on a journey, and yet did not keep the Phase, shall be cut off from his people, because he did not offer the sacrifice of the Lord in its time" (Num. 9:13). That precept was issued in the great Lateran Council under Innocent III, in that constitution which begins *Omnis utriusque sexus*, and it was renewed in the Council of Trent (Session 13, canon 9).⁶⁴

§ 65. Besides this Church precept, there is the perpetual custom of the Church having the force of a precept, that the sick departing from this life should be careful to receive this food as viaticum. Whence it

always seemed a matter of great care that in no case the Eucharist should not be at hand, if any one of the faithful were seized by grave sickness, lest perchance he should depart without this saving viaticum—not because it was thought to be divinely commanded, or necessary unto salvation, but because they were not ignorant how much this is against the Devil's stratagem. Of which St. John Chrysostom writes, that by the power of the received Body of Christ the soul departing from the body is borne up to heaven. There is an example of this kind which Dionysius of Alexandria relates about one Serapion, as Eusebius reports. Whence it is clear how the ancients placed the hope of salvation in this viaticum, and with what solicitous care they took pains that no one should depart from life without it. Hence also in the Council of Nicaea (canon 13), and in that of Ancyra (cap. 6), and in the fourth of Carthage (canons 77, 78), and in certain others it is prescribed that sacred communion not be denied to anyone who is truly penitent and at the point of death—by which too it is almost called by the name of viaticum, as the Arausican synod indicates in a certain canon. Likewise, as Justin the Martyr is author, in the time of persecution the custom was that on each Lord's Day those who were infirm and could not be present at the public communion should yet participate, the sacrament being carried to them by the deacons.⁶⁵ Other places pertaining to the same we have noted above at Distinction 10.

§ IX — That the Eucharist is not to be administered to infants (Eucharistiam infantibus non esse ministrandam)

§ 66. The precept of receiving the Eucharist, of which we have now spoken, pertains only to adults, not also to little ones who have not yet attained the use of reason and are therefore not yet capable of precept. Nor is there anywhere prescribed by any law to adults that they should administer the Eucharist to little ones, or have it administered.

§ 67. The reason for which is, because a sacrament ought not to be received by anyone except him who has first proved himself, as the Apostle says: "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread." But it is manifest that little ones cannot do that. Likewise the Lord commands that as often as anyone eats of this bread he announce His death, which cannot equally manifestly be done by little ones; in addition this can also be gathered from the fact that the Lord instituted this sacrament in those things which newborns cannot take without peril to life or to health, namely bread and wine, whereas otherwise they can be washed with water and anointed with oil. Rightly therefore is it alien to the custom of the Church to hand this sacrament to infants and to any little ones not yet using reason—although one must not deny that formerly it was sometimes done, as is clear from Cyprian (Sermon De lapsis), and as can be seen from the chapter Si qui in Gratian (De consecr., Dist. 3). But in those times that was done—or rather permitted—by the Church, so that men might be the more withdrawn from the sacrifices of idols, in which a portion of the idolothyte used also to be thrust into the mouths even of infants.

§ 68. Assuredly from the history of Exodus 12 it is clear enough that the infants of the Hebrews were not wont to eat of the Paschal lamb; because, namely, they could not do those things which are prescribed to those who eat. But indeed since there have been some who judged the taking of the Eucharist necessary for little ones because of that sentence of the Lord (John 6): "Unless you shall eat the flesh of the Son of Man," etc.; and since not a few have thought at least that Augustine was of this opinion, on account of certain places in which

he extends that sentence of the Lord, understood of the sacrament of the Eucharist, even to little ones, a brief reply must be given to both.

§ 69. As to the words of Christ, the ways in which they can rightly and without offense be taken we have said elsewhere, when we were treating of communion under both species. But the most probable sense, and that which appears to be subject to the least contradiction, is that it be understood of the spiritual eating of the Flesh of Christ, which takes place either generally through faith and charity, or specially through a sweet and grateful recollection of the benefits of the Passion and death of Christ. This sense, besides the Authors cited in that place, namely Augustine, Innocent I, Gelasius, Basil, Bede, Bernard, is also followed by St. Bonaventure (In IV Sent., dist. 12, n. 77), and Peter a Soto (De Sacramento Eucharistiae, bk. 8), where he affirms that it is established that the sense of that place is of spiritual eating.⁶⁸

§ 70. But certain places are objected from Augustine; one of which is De peccatorum meritis I, ch. 2, where, having produced against the Pelagians that sentence of the Lord: "Unless you shall eat," etc., he subjoins: "Will anyone indeed also dare to say this, that this sentence does not pertain to little ones, and that they can have life in themselves without a participation of this Body and Blood?" and what follows in the same chapter. Similar places are of the same book ch. 24 and of book 3, chs. 4 and 12; De peccato originali, ch. 18; Contra Julianum III, ch. 12; Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum IV, ch. 4; Epistle 106 and 107; the eighth Sermon on the Words of the Apostle; and the Hypognostica V, ch. 5.⁶⁹ Into the same opinion they also wish to drag Innocent (Epistle 93) as found in Augustine.⁷⁰

§ 71. But that this was neither Augustine's sentiment nor Innocent's can be proved clearly from elsewhere. For Augustine everywhere, and the other Fathers with the whole Church, teach that Baptism alone suffices to little ones for salvation. Which is found by name in Augustine, De peccatorum meritis I, chs. 19, 21, 22; II, ch. 28; Contra Julianum III, ch. 25; Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum I, ch. 22; and in Epistle 106.⁷¹

§ 72. Therefore one must answer that Augustine indeed in those places speaks of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord—for he expressly distinguishes it from Baptism—but not of its visible and sacramental taking, rather of the spiritual, that is, of the very virtue of the sacrament: of which he says that infants become participants when through Baptism they are incorporated into the Body of Christ, which is the Church, and are one with Christ, drawing life and salvation together from Him. The Apostle ascribes continually this power of being joined and incorporated to Christ to Baptism, as in Rom. 6, 1 Cor. 12, Col. 2.

§ 73. That this is Augustine's mind—and therefore Innocent's also, who speaks altogether in like manner with Augustine—is shown most clearly by those things which Augustine has (in a certain Sermon about Infants), cited by the venerable Bede (on 1 Cor. 10), and by Gratian (De consecr., Dist. 2, cap. Quia passus est). The words are these: "Let there be no doubt at all, that each one of the faithful is then a participant of the Body and Blood of the Lord, when in Baptism he is made a member of Christ; nor is he estranged from the fellowship of that Bread and Chalice, even if, before he eat that Bread and drink the Chalice, he should pass from this world—provided he be established in the unity of the Body of Christ. For he is not deprived of the participation and benefit of the sacrament, when he himself finds that which that sacrament signifies," or, as it is better read in Gratian, "when he is found in that very thing which that sacrament signifies." These are the words of Augustine.

§ 74. As to the other places that were objected, from the very passages, when attended to, the matter is sufficiently understood—especially De peccatorum meritis I, ch. 2, and Innocent, who, explaining himself,

says this: "But those who would defend for them (that is, for little ones) this without regeneration, when they truly preach that Baptism has this, are believed to grant it only through Baptism." Thus he.

§ X — Whether it is expedient to communicate frequently (Utrum expedit frequenter communicare)

§ 75. A question is moreover wont to be raised, whether it is expedient to take the sacred Eucharist frequently; which question includes those themselves who offer the sacrifice. In favor of frequent communion there seem to be more reasons than examples of certain Saints.

§ 76. First: the Paschal lamb, a notable figure of the Eucharist, used to be eaten only once a year. Second: if frequent Eucharist brought very great fruit, the Church—most solicitous for the salvation of her children with a mother's affection—would have prescribed to communicate not once only in the year.

§ X — Whether it is expedient to communicate frequently (Utrum expedit frequenter communicare)

§ 77. Fourth: The reverence which ought to be of the highest toward the most august sacrament demands that we make use of it most rarely; for we are wont to use things most precious most sparingly. Fifth: It is safer to abstain than to approach; and again, it is safer to approach more rarely than more frequently. For he who abstains takes himself out of danger of unworthy communion, and nevertheless by a pious vow and desire for the sacrament becomes partaker of its effect, spiritually eating it. Likewise, he who approaches more rarely for the most part approaches more prepared; whereas, conversely, frequency brings negligence and diminishes devotion. For, as it is wont to be said, familiarity breeds contempt. Sixth: From Scripture there is produced the example of the Centurion, wondrously praised by the Lord on account of that humility with which, not sustaining His bodily presence, he said: "I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter, etc." Nor is that dissimilar which Peter humbly said (Lk. 5): "Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man."

§ 78. But with respect to this practice being tolerated in the East of administering the Eucharist even to the newly baptized, Peter Arcudius relates that it is to be tolerated, in his book *On the Orientals*, ch. 45, where from ch. 41 he recounts and refutes at length the error of certain Neo-Greeks who asserted that Communion is by necessity necessary unto salvation like the remedies commonly so called; and in ch. 46 he discusses the opinion of those theologians who hold that it is at least necessary in voto, which opinion he also refutes; then in ch. 47 he explains in what way it is to be understood; and, the doctrine of St. Thomas (art. [abbreviation as in source]) notwithstanding, he permits and proves it. That author is altogether to be consulted once the whole preface is thoroughly considered. We indeed, in reporting those who have written on this matter, rightly abstain, lest we seem to be taking sides. Moreover, as to St. Augustine, certain persons have affixed a calumny, as though they asserted that the holy Doctor taught in certain places that it is not possible to be saved by Baptism unless there be the real reception of the Most Holy [Eucharist]; indeed, some also strive to drag him into that opinion, as if it were asserted in a certain letter. However, the passages of Augustine were the very same which are here reviewed, as also are the words of Innocent; and this too is proved by the words of Innocent adduced. Nevertheless, read the *Vindicator of Augustine*, ch. 3, § IV, in which are brought forward the writings of Marius Mercator, which he exhibits from a manuscript of the Palatine Library in the Vatican;

likewise also Fulgentius in his Reply to two [books], and others, very learnedly drawn from other places, defending Augustine. They also bring forward examples, such as that of Mark the Evangelist, who is said to have rendered himself unfit for offering sacrifice by his thumb being cut off, and of Mary of Egypt, who is read to have received holy communion only once, and that when invited, after many years of penance accomplished, and of other hermits who, living in deserts, received the Eucharist most rarely; and of the blessed Jerome and Vincent presbyters, whose humility Epiphanius commends (in a certain epistle, the 60th among those attributed to Jerome), because, judging themselves unworthy, they abstained from the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

§ 79. Notwithstanding these things, to the question we reply articulately as follows. First: The taking or communion of this sacrament, considered in itself, that is, so far as regards the sacrament itself, ought very profitably to be frequent. For since the power of this sacrament is exceedingly health-giving to men, and since it was instituted as our daily bread and daily medicine, it is expedient and fitting that it be received frequently, indeed daily. From this consideration it was said by Ambrose, book 4, *De Sacramentis*, ch. 6: "If as often as the Blood is shed, it is shed for the remission of sins, I ought always to receive it, that my sins may always be forgiven me. If I always sin, I ought always to have the medicine." And in book 5, ch. 4: "If it is daily bread, why do you receive that after a year, as the Greeks in the East are wont to do? Receive daily that which profits you daily." And what follows. Likewise in book 6, ch. 5: "Therefore receive daily, that you may daily beg pardon of your debts." Almost the same words are found in Augustine (Sermon 28 On the Words of the Lord).⁷⁴

§ 80. Second: On account of the diversity of the disposition of those who receive, it is expedient either more rarely or more frequently to receive. For it is required on the part of the recipient, as St. Thomas says, III, q. 80, a. 10, that he approach this sacrament with great devotion and reverence. Wherefore they who daily find themselves thus prepared, do rightly and laudably if they approach daily. Whence Ambrose, book 5, *De Sacramentis*, ch. 4, after the words above, subjoins: "Live so that you may deserve to receive every day." But because to many men many impediments occur which do not allow them to approach this sacrament daily, it is expedient that they approach at set intervals of days, as each one, according to the state and profession of his life, shall have been able to find himself prepared for it. For this diverse disposition of men seems to have been regarded by him who said in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, ch. 53: "To receive the communion of the Eucharist daily I neither praise nor blame."

§ 81. Third: He who has the due devotion and reverence toward this sacrament, just as he can laudably approach, so can he also laudably abstain. The reason is that each is a work of virtue, the one indeed of love and devotion, the other of humility and reverence. And the one is proved by the example of Zacchaeus, who rejoicing received Christ into his house, to which may be joined the example of the sinful woman and of other women, who are read to have touched the feet of Christ with a certain devout familiarity; the other, by the example of Peter and of the Centurion, and of the others whom we recalled above. Hence Augustine (Epistle 118), after he had commemorated the various customs of regions concerning the frequent or infrequent taking of the Eucharist, and then had set down, as if from the person of disputants, reasons on both sides about daily communion, thus subjoins: "Perhaps someone more rightly brings the dispute between them to an end, who advises that one remain above all in the peace of Christ, yet let each do what, according to his faith, he piously believes ought to be done. For neither of them dishonors the Body and Blood of the Lord, if they vie, as it were, in honoring a most health-giving sacrament."

§ 82. And after he had set forth the examples of Zacchaeus and the Centurion, who both honored the Savior in a different and, as it were, contrary way, and an argument drawn from the ancient manna, which tasted to each one according to his own will: "Thus," he says, "in the mouth of each Christian that sacrament is to be esteemed as it is taken. For he also in honoring dares not take it any day; and he in honoring dares not omit it any day. Only contempt does not befit that heavenly food, as the manna had loathing, etc." Fourth: And each is laudable; and, according to the different good affections, one is better than the other; yet for the most part it is more laudable and safer to approach than not to approach, provided it be done with devotion and reverence. For the affection of love, by which man is led to receive this sacrament, is simply better, more congruent to the Christian state, than the affection of fear, by which he is held back from receiving it. Then too, from the very reception of the sacrament, which confers grace, a peculiar fruit is perceived. For this reason frequent communion is recommended to all Christians, at least to those living as Christians, and indeed on all the Lord's days, or certainly once every month, and on the greater solemnities of the Church, to receive the communion of the Eucharist. Whence, in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, after the words cited above, it follows: "Yet I exhort and advise to communicate on all the Lord's days." And Cyril, book 4 on John, ch. 17, with many words exhorts the faithful to frequent and almost daily communion, removing the excuses of unworthiness and danger which many are wont to pretend, and stirring them up to it by the hope of very great advantages which proceed from frequent communion.⁷⁵ Fifth: The frequency of communion belongs especially to priests, who by office are mediators between God and the People. Whence it is necessary that they live more holily and blamelessly, and be less entangled than others in those sorts of actions by which, on account of excessive distraction of mind, their affection and devotion grow tepid toward this sacrament. And that this frequency of sacrificing is commendable in bishops and priests may be learned from Gregory, who (*Hom. 37 on the Gospel*; also *Dialogues*, book 4, ch. 56) places among the praises of a certain bishop by name Cassius this chiefly, that he was wont to offer to God the daily Sacrifice, adding with how great preparation of mind and devotion it was done by him.⁷⁶

§ 83. These things, therefore, premised, we briefly reply to the objections. To the first: The paschal lamb was a figure of this sacrament chiefly by reason of the passion and death of Christ represented by it. Whence, because Christ died once, it was taken once in the year. But here is exhibited the memorial of the Lord's passion after the manner of food which is taken daily. And for this reason it was prefigured by the manna, which was taken daily by the People. To the second: Although the Church, on account of the lack of devotion and tepidity of many, willed to put nothing more concerning the taking of this sacrament into precept than that they should take it once—yet she most earnestly desires that they prepare themselves worthily for it, and that this be done. To the third: As in other things, so also in receiving the sacraments, measure and order had to be applied, and therefore the very frequency of communicating, lest perhaps it be immoderate and inordinate, ought to be contained within certain limits; for it suffices that it be taken once daily, because it is daily bread, and at the same time that by a single taking per day it be represented that Christ suffered but once. As to the rest, from what has been said the reply is evident. For although the Body of Christ is a thing most precious, yet one must remember that it has been most lovingly and most liberally left to us by Christ as food and as a daily remedy, and as a continual memorial of His passion and death by which He redeemed us from bondage. And though it be safer to abstain, yet it is more profitable to approach. Nay rather, to abstain is not really safer; for he who abstains lacks that singular antidote against the poisons of the serpent, and hence more easily succumbs to temptations. Add that, for one who after a lawful self-examination approaches devoutly, there is no danger; for the danger is of evil scarcely likely, not of evil possible. Hence one who walks along a

level way is not said to expose himself to the danger of falling, although he can fall. Moreover, a man has moral certainty that he has prepared and proved himself well, and that he is in grace, much more than he has about the fidelity of a friend known through long experience. To whom, if he entrusts money to be kept, he is not said to commit it to danger but to deposit it in good custody. And although perhaps those who approach more rarely feel actually greater devotion, nevertheless those who approach frequently and yet worthily are thereby habitually more affected toward this sacrament; as those who are more exercised in charity and the operation of the virtues, from which the progress of man is understood. Finally, very often it happens to be true what Ambrose says in the passage cited above: "He who does not merit to receive daily does not merit to receive after a year"; because indeed the causes by which most are drawn back from frequent communion—such as attachments and the habit of sinning, torpor and lack of devotion toward the sacrament—also remain after a year, nay rather are increased. For it is more difficult after many sins to repent in earnest and to prepare oneself worthily for this sacred table, than when the spirit of that heavenly [bread]—as it were—dries up, being deprived of the moisture of divine grace, according to that of the Psalmist in Ps. 101: "My heart is withered, because I forgot to eat my bread."⁷⁷

§ XI — That the Eucharist was instituted by Christ as the sacrifice of the New Law (Eucharistiam a Christo institutam esse ut Sacrificium novae legis)

§ 84. The use of the most holy Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) is not only placed in this, that it be the food of the faithful, but also that it be offered by the faithful and for the faithful to God. For it was instituted by Christ not only as the sacrament of the new law, but also as the sacrifice (*sacrificium*) of the new law, and that to be offered to God before it be received by the faithful.

§ 85. But because all the Sectarrians today most vehemently resist this Catholic dogma, it is worth the effort, that it may be understood how certain and solid that doctrine of the Church is, to linger somewhat in its proof. First, therefore, to begin from the more common, not only the positive law of God, but also the natural law teaches that some external sacrifice is to be offered to God in protestation of our subjection and of our gratitude toward Him as the supreme Lord and the author of all goods—external, I say, because we, who consist not only of soul but also of body, ought with each part to serve God and profess interior worship also outwardly, and from the things perceptible by sense to tend to the spiritual. Whence it is very probable (although some Catholics dissent) that even in the state of innocence there would have been among men the use of offering external sacrifice, as the Council of Trent sufficiently indicates in general by affirming that the nature of man requires an external and visible sacrifice (Session 22, ch. 1), and St. Thomas teaches that to offer sacrifice to God pertains to the law of nature (II-II, q. 85, a. 1). It is manifest, moreover, that the precepts of the natural law remained the same before and after sin. Furthermore, after the fall, it remained so impressed upon the minds of all that not only the faithful, but all or almost all nations have always judged that sacrifice ought to be offered, and they offered it to whomsoever they either knew, or thought, to be God—having, to be sure, the persuasion that this is the highest honor which could be exhibited by men to God. Wherefore they bestowed it on no one, not even by flattery, unless upon him whom they wished to signify to be God, whether truly or falsely; as, among other things, the example of the Lystrans teaches (Acts 14), who, wishing to honor Barnabas and Paul as gods, were bringing victims to be slain to them. And for this reason, with good cause among the faithful both of the Old and of the New Testament, those who offered sacrifice to any other

than the one true God have always been held guilty of the crime of idolatry. And in Epiphanius there are read the Collyridian women condemned because they offered sacrifices even to the Blessed Virgin (to whom, otherwise, after God, the highest honor is due); and, what is more, Augustine is authority that not even to Christ as man is sacrifice to be offered (Serm. 101, de Diversis). Since these things are so, and since sacrifices ought to be established and offered not by the private opinion of each one, but by a public and common consent or law, lest there be any discord in the chief act of Religion from diversity, God, in that first people of the Hebrews, peculiarly chosen for His worship, instituted certain sacrifices to be offered by certain ministers with certain rites, in a certain place, and at a certain time. Nay, also other nations, although ignorant of the true God, yet by a certain impulse of the law of nature in like manner decreed by public law that certain sacrifices with ministers, rites, and other things should be offered to those whom they worshipped as gods.

§ 86. Since, therefore, the Lord Christ did not come to dissolve the law, either of nature or of Moses, but to fulfill both by His new law; and by fulfilling to take away what was faulty, and to lead to perfection what was imperfect and to transfer it into a better form: it is necessary that also in the new law and in the new people, that is, the Christian, we recognize some external sacrifice, by which that people may satisfy the law of nature, and into which the sacrifices of the law of Moses may be understood to have been translated and changed. Lest anything be established disorderly, indecently, or superstitiously, God willed that it should be provided no less for the new people than for the old; namely, that, as in the old law, so also in the new, that external sacrifice should receive its institution not from man, but from God Himself. Which indeed was done by Christ, true God, the author of the New Testament, at the Last Supper, when, the old Pasch having been celebrated, He put an end to the old institutions and instituted the new Pasch, offering to God the Father His body and blood, and handing them to His disciples to be received, and commanding that what He Himself had done should thenceforth, in memory of His death until the end of the age, be done by them and their successors by these words: "Do this in memory of me." For as to the old people it had been commanded that, in memory of their liberation from Egyptian servitude, they should offer the paschal lamb each year, so Christ commanded that, in memory of the liberation brought about by Himself—that is, the redemption of the human race by His death—what He Himself was doing before His disciples at the supper should thenceforth be...

§ 87. Hence, from the analogy which obtains between the paschal lamb and the Eucharist, it is sufficiently understood that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. For just as in truth and properly there was a sacrifice not only in that first lamb that was slain—not, to be sure, in memory of the deliverance from Egypt, which at that time had not yet taken place, but of which deliverance the Israelites were first, when the destroying Angel struck, to be preserved by the sprinkling of its blood on their houses, and then were to be freed from Egypt—but also in all the other lambs that in succeeding times were slain in memory of that deliverance; so Christ, the true Lamb and the true Pasch, is in truth and properly a sacrifice, not only inasmuch as He was offered on the cross for the redemption of the human race, but also inasmuch as, in memory of the redemption once accomplished on the cross, He is daily offered under the species of bread and wine, on the altar, by Christ's own institution.⁷⁹

§ 88. But if someone should say that the analogy does not hold, on the ground that there, as at the beginning so also thereafter, the lamb was truly slaughtered and killed, whereas here Christ, once only slaughtered and killed, neither dies nor suffers thereafter: I answer that, setting aside for a little the difficulty how Christ is sacrificed on the altar (of which we shall speak below), at least this is shown sufficiently from the declaration just made, namely, that just as the paschal lamb, instituted in memory of a benefit once received,

was a sacrifice, so too the Eucharist, likewise instituted in memory of the benefit received through the cross, may be sacrifice or oblation, and is understood to be fittingly so. That it is thus is proved by this: because just as by the rite of the paschal lamb a solemnity was made to the Lord (Exod. 12), so by the rite of the Eucharist the famous remembrance of the Lord's Death is enacted—or, as the Apostle says, is announced—to God, not that He should remember it as though forgetful, but that thanks may be rendered by us to Him for so great a benefit, whence also the Eucharist received its name.⁸⁰ Now by the outward gift of the Eucharist thanks are not rendered to God, unless this very thing, together with a grateful remembrance and protestation of the benefit received, be offered to God—after the manner in which the Israelites of old, offering the first-fruits of their produce with a set profession of God's benefits pronounced in prescribed words, and then finally feasting upon them in the sight of the Lord, as is prescribed (Deut. 26). For thus also now, in the name of the whole people, the Eucharist is offered as first-fruits, that is, as the first and most excellent fruit of the whole creation, and that with a profession of the benefits of Christ's redemption; and at length both the Priest and the People are made sharers of the thing offered by eating it and, in a certain manner, feasting.

§ 89. From this it is understood that by those words of the Lord, "Do this in memory of me"—Latin: "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem"—He did not command a bare recollection of His death, but insinuated that the whole Eucharist, that is, His body and blood, which He was leaving under sensible signs, was to be offered to God in memory of so great a benefit. Nor does the Church understand it otherwise, when in the Canon of the Mass she subjoins immediately after the aforesaid words: "Wherefore, mindful, O Lord, we Thy servants, of the blessed passion of Christ Thy Son, we offer to Thy most excellent majesty..." Likewise the Fathers of the universal Council of Ephesus in their Letter to Nestorius understood those words thus. For they write as follows: "Announcing, as regards the flesh, the death of the Only-begotten Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ, and confessing likewise His resurrection and His ascension into the heavens, we celebrate in the Churches the unbloody service," and so forth.⁸¹ Moreover, this same point will appear more clearly when we shall have shown that Christ at the Last Supper offered to the Father His body and blood, and thus fulfilled the office of Priest. For that being posited, it manifestly follows that by those words, "Do this," there is commanded an oblation and sacrifice, since Christ commanded to be done what had been done by Himself.

§ 90. Now that some of the Moderns think force must be put upon the word "do" (*facite*), as though it signified the same as "sacrifice," because "to do" is sometimes set for "to sacrifice" both in profane authors and even in the Sacred Scriptures, seems to us but little solid; nor anywhere among the ancient interpreters is that exposition found, nor indeed does it suit the purpose proposed. For it is not an absolute "Do," but "Do this," that is, what is now being done by me and by you, or what has been done, that thenceforward you, and your successors, do in my memory. In which manner of speaking Abimelech said to his soldiers (Judg. 9): "What you have seen me do, make haste and do ye the same." Whence in the Canon of the Mass it is said in the plural: "As often as you shall have done these things, you shall do them in memory of me." And Paul (1 Cor. 11) refers that "doing" also to the people eating and drinking; for he says: "Do this; for as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall announce the death of the Lord." In which statements it is manifest that "to do" is not the same as "to sacrifice," but retains its customary signification. From other places of Scripture, therefore, a fuller proof must be sought by us.

§ 91. The Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 10), wishing to draw the faithful away from the sacrifices of idols and the fellowship of demons: "Behold," he says, "Israel according to the flesh; are not they that eat the victims partakers of the altar?" And presently: "But the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and

not to God; and I would not that you should be made fellows of devils. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils. You cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils." By which words, comparing the Lord's Table—that is, the Table of the Body and Blood of the Lord (for from what precedes it is evident that Paul is speaking of it)—with the altar of the Jews and the table of demons, he signifies quite openly that by "table" he understands "altar." Whence it then follows that the thing set upon the table—namely, the Eucharist—is a sacrifice which is first offered to God before it is partaken by the faithful, just as also was done in the sacrifices of Jews and Gentiles. In this manner the Council of Trent, according to the Parisian interpretation, understands that place.⁸² The same Apostle (in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews) recalling the faithful from the eating of Jewish sacrifices, says that "we have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle," that is, who still cling to the Mosaic ceremonies. But whereas that sacred food, of which power of eating is had not by the Jews but by Christians, is no other than the holy Eucharist, from which all unbelievers are so far kept back that not even Catechumens are admitted so much as to see it, and whereas the Apostle attests that we receive that food from the altar, he consequently shows that it is first offered to God on the altar; otherwise here too he would make mention of an altar to no purpose.⁸³ Another place is (Acts 13), where, concerning the Prophets and Doctors that were at Antioch, it is said: "As they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said..." In which place, for "ministering," the Greek is leitourgountōn, that is, "sacrificing," as Erasmus also translates. For it is the word from which "Liturgy," that is, "sacrifice," takes its name; and seeing that by those words there is signified a sacred action rendered to God, there is by the same token signified an external sacrifice offered to God by the faithful, so that fit ministers might be designated for the work of evangelical preaching. But this sacrifice can be understood as no other than the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord.⁸⁴ Again, from the Gospel there are arguments for this matter. For (Lk. 22) Christ calls the Eucharist "the Pasch," saying: "With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you." For this is to be understood, not of the typical lamb, but of the true lamb, that is, of the Eucharist, as the subsequent words teach: "For I say to you..." which with the other Evangelists manifestly pertain to the Eucharist. Now Pasch signifies the paschal sacrifice, as (Exod. 12) "Immolate the Pasch," and with the Apostle (1 Cor. 5): "For Christ our Pasch is immolated." Therefore the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Nor is the reply of any avail if you should say that the Eucharist, that is, the Body of the Lord, is called the Pasch because it was to be immolated on the cross. For the taking or eating of the sacrifice ought not to precede but to follow the immolation. But the sacrifice of the cross was followed on the next day by this eating. Wherefore here it is necessary to understand some preceding immolation, that is, an oblation of the sacrifice.⁸⁵ Moreover, to prove the same point avail the words of consecration as they are read in Greek in Luke: "This is my body which is given for you," that is, "is offered" at the present time; for which Paul has: "which is broken for you." Of the chalice too in the three Evangelists it is said in a verb of the present time: "which is shed for you." And from the Greek in Luke it is clear that that shedding cannot be understood of what was done on the cross. For the shedding is attributed to the chalice, not to the blood, except in so far as it is contained in the chalice. Wherefore all these things have a certain, and by no means obscure, signification of a sacrificial action which was done in the very Supper.⁸⁶ There is also another probable argument from the words of consecration. For as Moses said of the blood of the calf, "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you," so Christ of His blood: "This is the blood of the new covenant," or "testament," and so forth. But Moses said that of the blood of a sacrifice that had been offered, as is evident (Exod. 24); therefore also when Christ said those words He offered His own blood.⁸⁷

§ 92. There are extant open testimonies of this doctrine, among which that is most clear which David, in Psalm 109, brought forth concerning Christ, saying: "The Lord hath sworn, and He will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech." For Christ is called a Priest according to the order of Melchisedech on account of the likeness of the thing offered. For just as Melchisedech, when he was "priest of the most high God," offered bread and wine (Gen. 14), so Christ sacrificed in bread and wine, and by changing them into His body and blood, with, nonetheless, the likeness and the whole operation of bread and wine remaining. Now that this was signified by those words of the Prophet the Fathers constantly affirm; among whom St. Cyprian, at length treating this Scripture and disputing concerning the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech, says among other things: "Which order surely is this, coming from that sacrifice and descending from it, that Melchisedech was priest of the most high God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more the priest of the most high God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered this same thing which Melchisedech had offered, that is, bread and wine—namely His own body and blood?" And a little after: "Therefore that in Genesis by the priest Melchisedech the blessing around Abraham might duly be celebrated, there first precedes the image of a sacrifice, set, to wit, in bread and wine; which thing perfecting and fulfilling, the Lord offered bread and a chalice mixed with wine, and He who is fullness fulfilled the truth of the foreshadowed image," and so on.⁸⁸ To this interpretation of that Scripture there consent Eusebius of Caesarea,⁸⁹ Eusebius of Emesa,⁹⁰ St. Ambrose,⁹¹ St. Epiphanius,⁹² St. Jerome,⁹³ St. John Chrysostom,⁹⁴ and St. Augustine in several places,⁹⁵ as well as Eucherius,⁹⁶ Arnobius,⁹⁷ the Venerable Bede,⁹⁸ St. John Damascene,⁹⁹ and Theophylact;¹⁰⁰ and as many besides as handle that verse of the Psalm, even incidentally—so that with good reason the Fathers of the Council of Trent confirmed the same interpretation by their suffrages, defining that Christ, "declaring Himself to be constituted a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech," in the Supper "offered to God the Father His body and blood under the species of bread and wine." [^99]

§ 93. Another prophetic testimony stands (Mal. 1) in these words: "I have no will in you, saith the Lord of hosts; and I will not receive a gift at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, great is my name among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation, because my name is great among the Gentiles." This Scripture the ancients, with great agreement, interpreted of the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, which, the sacrifices of the old law rejected, is offered throughout the whole Catholic Church: as St. Irenaeus,¹⁰² St. Justin,¹⁰³ St. Cyprian,¹⁰⁴ Eusebius,¹⁰⁵ St. Jerome and Theodoret,¹⁰⁶ St. Augustine,¹⁰⁷ St. John Chrysostom,⁹⁴ and St. John Damascene.⁹⁹ Indeed the prophetic manner of speaking itself shows that the discourse is about some sacrifice new and unwonted in earlier times—yet so instituted that it be done everywhere with frequency; that it have surpassing holiness; that it be of the same kind everywhere; and finally that it be conspicuous with illustrious external ceremony. All which agree with nothing other than the Sacrifice of the Mass.

§ 94. There is, besides, another testimony (in Daniel 11 and 12), where it is foretold that the continual sacrifice will at some time be taken away for a while. Which cannot be understood of anything other than that wherein the Apostle bids the death of the Lord be announced continually until He come. For the legal sacrifices now do not cease for a time, but have been abolished forever. And the sacrifice of the cross, once offered, has passed in act; but in effect it is so perpetual that by no outward force can it be hindered or interrupted; whereas the Sacrifice of the Mass is continual and, according to Daniel, to be taken away—not as though during that period foretold by the Prophet it should not be offered at all, but because on account of the tyranny of Antichrist it will not be able to be offered openly and publicly.¹⁰⁸

§ 95. To these add the chief Prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah: the former (ch. 19) prophesies thus, "In that day there shall be an altar of the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt," which can be referred to nothing other than the sacrifice of the new law, now frequented among all the Gentiles—whose type in the Scriptures is Egypt. The same (in the last chapter) prophesying of the sons of the New Testament, says: "And I will take of them to be priests and Levites, saith the Lord." But Jeremiah (ch. 33) speaks thus of the same: "And from the priests and from the Levites there shall not fail a man from before my face to offer holocausts and to burn sacrifice"; and presently he affirms that his covenant shall never be made void, so that there may not be Levites and Priests as His ministers. That this promise pertains to the Church of Christ is not doubtful. Therefore in the new law there are Priests and Levites—that is, Deacons who minister to the Priests. Therefore there is also a Sacrifice. Nor can those places be taken of the internal sacrifice; for this is not common to all the faithful, whereas the Prophets manifestly speak of a priesthood and a ministry, which is not common to all. Finally—to pass over other like passages of Scripture—this sacrifice of the Church, which is first offered to God and afterward passes into the food of the Faithful, is not obscurely insinuated (Ps. 21), where Christ, speaking in the person of the head and the body, after commemorating His passion and deliverance, at last subjoins: "With thee is my praise in a great Church; I will pay my vows"—that is, I will offer votive sacrifices—"in the sight of them that fear Him: the poor shall eat and be filled"; and a little after: "All the fat ones of the earth have eaten and have adored." For that these things are said of the Eucharist and its oblation St. Augustine, writing upon that place of the Psalm, understood.

§ 96. Now to descend to the Fathers and the tradition of the Church, the testimonies of the Fathers, Pontiffs, and Councils that make mention of an external sacrifice to be celebrated by certain ministers with certain rites, and in a certain place and time, are almost without number; which therefore most openly show that the Eucharist was instituted by Christ not only as a sacrament, but also already as the sacrifice of the new law. And since the places are innumerable and scattered, the priestly order in the Church proves this same office; for without sacrifice a priesthood is not constituted. And although to prove the sacrament of Order is not the business of this place, yet even briefly it can be said that it is most certain that in the earliest times of the Church Presbyters and Bishops were called Priests and Pontiffs, whose proper office it is to offer sacrifices, as the Apostle also bears witness (Heb. 8). It is certain that altars were always from the beginning in the Church, and that they are dedicated with a solemn rite; but the use of altars is none, the sacrifice being taken away. Perhaps, a heretic will say, they are called altars by catachresis, because they are tables on which the Body and Blood of Christ—our food—are set forth to be taken; and that in the same way by catachresis that of the Reubenites and Gadites is called an altar, although erected as a monument and testimony, not however for sacrifices to be offered, as they protest. But this evasion is vain—both because no one of the holy Fathers ever handed down this metaphorical exposition, and because things are called by such names as answer to their use: as a table is called an altar only if sacrifice is offered upon it, which the Fathers everywhere and most frequently attest. Therefore it must be noted that the heretics who deny an external sacrifice in the Church take away not only the altars, but even utterly the whole Church. For a temple, if it be properly understood, is nothing other than a house of sacrifice. Lastly, the same is proved by the most ancient Liturgies of James, Mark, Basil, Chrysostom, and others through diverse nations, whose prayers and ceremonies, though they vary somewhat, yet all agree in that which is substantial, namely, in the oblation of the one and the same Body and Blood of the Lord; to say nothing for the moment of the Canon of the Mass which the Roman Church uses, and of the "secret" prayers and the like.¹⁰⁹

§ XII — How the Eucharist is in truth a sacrifice (*Eucharistia qua ratione verum sit sacrificium*)

§ 97. How the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*), or its oblation (*oblatio*), consecration (*consecratio*), fraction (*fractio*), consumption (*sumptio*), is rightly called a sacrifice (*sacrificium*) according to the general acceptance of sacrifice admits of no doubt. For since sacrifice, taken most broadly, is, as St. Augustine defines it, "every work that is done that we may cleave to God in holy fellowship," it is manifest that the actions just named—as also every other good work referred to God—are contained under that general definition; of which sort in the Scriptures the sacrifices and victims acceptable to God are said to be "a contrite spirit" (Ps. 50), "a chaste body and one made subject to the spirit and not to the flesh" (Rom. 12), "a body delivered unto death for Christ" (Phil. 2), alms bestowed upon the poor for God's sake (Rom. 15; Phil. 4; and Heb. 13).¹¹¹

§ 98. But how, according to the special acceptance of sacrifice (*sacrificium*), the Eucharist or any action about it can be said truly and properly to be a sacrifice—as indeed the Council of Trent has defined must altogether and indeed rightly be said (can. 1, sess. 22)—is not equally clear.¹¹² For specially and properly a sacrifice is called the oblation of an outward thing in recognition of the Divine Majesty and of the supreme Lord, with a fixed rite, with a change wrought in the very thing; or, what comes to the same, of the very thing which in such wise is offered and is changed. How this, therefore, is found in the Eucharist or in some action about it, must be considered.

§ 99. For if the Eucharist is only offered to God, with moreover no change made about it—just as of old the first-fruits of corn and of other things used to be presented to God, which were offered by the people, and yet were not forthwith consumed, but being laid aside for the uses of God's ministers were kept for necessary uses—then indeed the Eucharist may in this respect be called an oblation, yet not a sacrifice, just as also those things which I said were oblations, not sacrifices.

§ 100. Some, with whom in this Distinction the Master seems to agree, teach that the Eucharist is called a sacrifice in no other respect than because it is a memorial and representation of the true sacrifice and the holy immolation made on the altar of the cross. For with these words the Master strives to explain the rationale of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and then subjoins: "And Christ once died on the cross, and there was immolated in Himself. But what is said to be immolated in the sacrament, is so said because in the sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was once done." So he; confirming this his view by the words of Augustine and Ambrose, or rather of Chrysostom. For the things which he cites from Ambrose are read in Chrysostom (Homily 17 on the Epistle to the Hebrews).¹¹³ But in truth the sacrifice in the proper sense is not yet explained in this way. For according to that explanation, a picture or scenic action representing to us the Passion of Christ would be properly called a sacrifice. What, however, the sayings of the Fathers cited by the Master intend, we shall say afterwards.

§ 101. One must say, therefore, that just as the things offered in the Old Law were called sacrifices on account of certain acts by which some change was made about those things—and that in recognition of the Supreme Majesty—of which sort acts were slaughter, division, burning, eating: so Christ, under the species of bread and wine, offered in the Mass, is called and is a sacrifice on account of certain definite actions which are done about Him. The first and foremost of which is the consecration, by which out of bread and wine there is made the Body and the Blood of Christ. This it was that Chrysostom wished to intimate to us (in the Homily

on Judas; Homily 6 to the people of Antioch), when he says that that voice, "This is my body," gives firmness to the sacrifice.¹¹⁴

§ 102. But if you object that by the consecration it is not so much the Body and Blood of Christ that undergo any change as bread and wine, which in it are transmuted; it can be answered that it is sufficient for something to be said to be sacrificed, that it be the terminus of the transmutation either from which or to which. But the Body of Christ is the terminus to which of the consecration, just as in the slaughter of a beast not only the living thing which is slain, but also the dead thing which has been slain, and indeed more properly, is called the sacrifice.

§ 103. Yet someone will still object: The sacrifice is to represent to us the immolation made on the cross; but that is not represented by the consecration, but either by the fraction or by the consumption of the Eucharist. We reply that by the consecration the Passion of Christ on the cross is represented, while separately the body and separately the blood are consecrated, or the one without the other. For by this it is signified that the one was separated from the other on the cross, and that the blood was poured out for us. Whence St. Thomas says upon 1 Corinthians 11, Lecture 5, that in this sacrament "the blood is offered separately from the body."¹¹⁵ Therefore the chief formal character (*ratio*) of the Sacrifice of the Mass is constituted in this, in so far as it is on the part of the consecration, whereby, when it is said, "This is my body; This is my blood," the body and blood of Christ are presented as separated, and consequently Christ is as it were slain and immolated.

§ 104. For that which the Ancients say, that in the Sacrifice of the Mass Christ is slain or immolated, but unbloodily, does not seem to pertain to the change of bread and wine into the body and blood considered in itself, in so far namely as it is merely a certain transmutation of substance into substance, but rather to this, that by the consecration the Body and Blood of the Lord are presented and represented as separated, which were in very truth separated in the Passion and death. According to this explanation, if there were made a change of bread into the whole Christ by such words: "This is Christ," such a consecration would not be a sacrifice, because Christ would not be exhibited as immolated. Nor, indeed, does it follow that Christ is not immolated upon the altar because He suffers nothing. For this immolation is mystical, and such as can now befit Christ. For, as far as regards the words of the consecration, Christ is immolated, that is, His blood is separated from His body. For even if a beast were thus immolated that nevertheless by a miracle the divided parts still lived, or the whole substance remained in both, it would still be said to have been immolated; and if an animal were cut into parts in which by a miracle life still remained—as, so to speak, in the parts of the sacrament after the action—it would nonetheless be said that such an animal had been immolated or sacrificed, provided such change or division were made in acknowledgment of the supreme dominion.

§ 105. Accordingly, those seem rightly to speak who teach that the rationale of this Sacrifice consists in the consecration, because Christ is set forth upon the altar after the manner of a victim (*hostia*), that is, is presented. And so much about the consecration.

§ 106. As to whether the fraction of the Eucharist represents the Passion of Christ, and consequently constitutes some part of this sacrifice, it can be asked. Some deny it, because the fraction seems to have been instituted only for distribution. But others more rightly affirm, and they prove it because at the fraction there is an express commemoration of the Passion, the priest saying: "Lamb of God, who takest away the sins [of the world]," and the Apostle (1 Cor. 11) says that Christ said at the institution of this sacrifice: "This is my body

which for you is broken," as the Greeks read. In place of which in Luke it is read: "Which is given for you," that is, is offered, that we may understand that that fraction constitutes a part of this oblation or sacrifice. Whence also Chrysostom (Hom. 24 on that 1 Cor. 10), "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" manifestly refers the fraction to the representation of the Passion of Christ.¹¹⁶ And other Fathers likewise recognise in the fraction of the Eucharist which is made in the Mass the mystery of Christ's Passion. And St. Thomas, II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3, among the actions in which this sacrifice consists, also enumerates the fraction.¹¹⁷ But that that fraction which is made by the priest after the Lord's Prayer is not instituted for distribution is clear from this, that no one of those parts is distributed to the people, but all three fall to the priest. Nay more, the rite of the Mass requires that one of them be let down into the chalice and be mingled with the blood, not without signification of a mystery.

§ 107. Moreover, the outpouring of the blood seems also to pertain to some part of this sacrifice, in like manner as of old the effusion of the blood of animals upon or beside the altar was a certain part of the action of the ancient sacrifices. For as at present it has been said of the body, "which for you is broken," and "which for you is given," so of the blood it is said by Matthew and Mark, "which for you is poured out." Lest anyone should think this is to be understood of the effusion of blood which was made on the cross, and take the present tense of the verb as put for the future: Luke enounces concerning the very cup of blood, saying, "which for you is poured out," as is clear to anyone inspecting the Greek codex, in which the article to (το) is by necessity referred not to the blood but to the cup.¹¹⁸ Nor does it stand in the way that in all three it is added that that effusion is made "unto the remission of sins." For, as the Prayer of the Church has it, as often as we celebrate the commemoration of this victim, the effusion of the Lord's blood made on the cross is signified by this, that the blood is drunk, that is, is taken after the manner of a drink. For this effusion those sayings of Scripture signify. For in the Old Law indeed it was unlawful to partake of blood, that is, either to eat or to drink blood, but it was commanded in sacrifices that it should itself be poured out on the ground beside the altar. But the case stands in exact contrariety in the sacrifice of the New Testament. In which it is unlawful to pour blood upon the ground, but it is lawful and sacred, by Christ's institution, to drink the blood. And this difference of the two sacrifices is pointed out by Augustine (Question 57 on Leviticus).¹¹⁹

§ 108. The last place among the actions pertaining to sacrifice is held by the taking or consuming of the thing offered, just as of old it pertained to some part of sacrifice that what had been offered should either be wholly burned with fire, or be eaten by the offerers, or in part fall to the fire, in part to the offerers for food. For it was necessary at last that the victim be consumed in some way. Wherefore in the Sacrifice of the Mass the case is similar. For although at times something of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is reserved for the use of the faithful for many days, yet that derogates nothing from the integrity or consummation of the sacrifice. For as of old something of the victim offered could be kept for the following day, which, when those then consumed it, they were still participants of the sacrifice, and by that consumption in a certain manner the sacrifice was brought to completion: so also now, when the sick or other faithful receive the Eucharist kept for one day or more, by receiving it they are made participants of the sacrifice long since offered, and by that reception in a certain manner that sacrifice is perfected and completed. Whence it is said not only that the Eucharist, but also that the Host is carried to the sick; because manifestly by receiving it they become participants of the Host that was offered. Which both the Canon of the Mass, in that part where it is said, "that all of us who by partaking of this altar ...," and certain Secret prayers, sufficiently signify.¹²⁰

§ 109. Rightly therefore also does St. Thomas in the place cited above enumerate eating among the sacrificial actions. Nor does it stand in the way that the laity have this action in common with the priests. For nothing prevents some action of the sacrifice from belonging to the laity, provided that what is principal in the sacrifice, namely the consecration, belong to priests alone; in like manner as of old in the peace-offerings the people partook, and the Levites, who were not priests, assisted the priest in the principal or more choice acts of sacrificing.

§ 110. From these things also it is clear that the taking of the chalice pertains to the sacrifice in a twofold respect—both in so far as it is a certain effusion, as we said above, and in so far as it is a taking and a consuming.

§ 111. Moreover, it should not seem strange that we assign several actions by which the Sacrifice of the Mass is performed, as though it followed that there are several sacrifices, not one. For to one total action about a thing several particular actions can concur, as happens also in the administration of the sacraments. After this fashion also of old, in the sacrifices of animals, first by slaughter the blood was separated from the body; then the body itself was cut up into parts; the blood, gathered in some vessel, was poured out; and at last those parts were either burned, or were eaten— all of which were certain particular actions as parts of the whole sacrifice.

§ 112. Now if you ask what place the oblation has among the parts of this sacrifice, one should answer that the whole sacrifice is in a certain manner an oblation, because all the actions just named are done about the thing in so far as by devout affection it is offered by us to God. Yet in a special way, just as also in the ancient sacrifices, either when the blood was brought into the Holy of Holies, or when some part of the thing slain was elevated before the Lord, so also in this sacrifice there is made by an outward rite and words an oblation of the Body and Blood of the Lord, when the priest says: "Wherefore we, mindful [of these things], offer to Thy most glorious Majesty a pure victim," etc.¹²¹ But the priest says these words not only in his own person, but also in the person of the other ministers of the altar and of the very people, because he says: "and also Thy holy people." For truly all these offer by the devotion of their minds, nor does anything hinder that they should also say in word, "we offer."

§ 113. Moreover, the elevation of the Host, which is made immediately after the words of consecration, does not have the formal character of an oblation. For it is done not with the intention of offering, but of showing the mysteries to the people for adoration.

Refutation of the things objected against the Sacrifice of the Mass (Refutatio eorum quae contra Missae Sacrificium objiciuntur)

§ 114. That the Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrifice of the altar may become more evident, there must now be treated those things which are objected against it by the adversaries. First, then, they attempt to overturn that proof of the Catholics which is taken from the sacrifice of Melchizedek. For in Genesis 14 it is said that Melchizedek "brought forth," not "offered," bread and wine; and so also have the Seventy Interpreters, signifying, namely, that Melchizedek brought these things to Abraham and his forces that they might be refreshed. Which sense Josephus has plainly expressed (in the Antiquities). And Ambrose follows (book 4 On the Sacraments, ch. 3), and Epiphanius (Heresy 55), and Chrysostom (on this place of Genesis). Then, in place of what in the Vulgate edition is read, "For he was the priest of God Most High," as though

there were signified there the cause of the sacrifice offered, in the Hebrew it is read, "And he was," in the Greek, "But he was," which conjunctions have no signification of a cause.¹²³

§ 115. Secondly, as to what is said in Psalm 109: "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek," they deny that it must be referred to the rite of oblation, because, to wit, just as Melchizedek offered bread and wine, so also Christ, the species of bread and wine being preserved, offered His body and blood—but only to the condition or dignity of the person. For the Apostle (in the Epistle to the Hebrews), when at the end of chapter 6 he had said that Jesus had been made a priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek, in consequence proving that (at the beginning of chapter 7) subjoins: "For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of the Most High God," etc., where he commemorates of Melchizedek only those things which serve to commend the dignity of his person, and in these he compares Christ with Melchizedek, with no mention made of a rite of offering or of the material of an oblation. Since therefore the Apostle's proof is full and solid, it appears as a consequence that in this, that Christ is said to be a priest according to the order of Melchizedek, it is the dignity of the person alone, not any rite of oblation, that must be regarded.

§ 116. Thirdly, from the same Epistle to the Hebrews other passages are wont also to be objected. For (in ch. 7, and the three following) the Apostle so rejects the sacrifices of the Old Law that he would have the one Sacrifice of the Cross to have succeeded in their place as the only efficacious and sufficient [sacrifice] for the remission of all sins; so that after the Sacrifice of the Cross there should be no other sacrifice to be required, nor besides the supreme and eternal High Priest Christ should any other be acknowledged in the New Law as Pontiff or Priest. This the following passages seem to signify (ch. 7): "And they indeed were many priests, because by death they were hindered from continuing, but He, because He continueth for ever, hath an everlasting priesthood; whence He is able to save for ever," etc., to the end of the chapter. And in the next chapter: "For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is necessary that this man also have something to offer. If then He were on earth, He would not be a priest," from which statement it appears that after the Sacrifice of the Cross no sacrifice remained on earth to be offered. Then (ch. 9): "But Christ, being come a high priest of the good things to come, by His own blood entered once into the holy places, having obtained eternal redemption." And below: "For Jesus did not enter into the holy places made with hands, which are the patterns of the true, but into heaven itself, that He may now appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy places every year with blood of others; otherwise He must often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once at the end of the ages He hath appeared to put away sin by His own sacrifice. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, so also Christ was once offered to take away the sins of many." Which passage of the Apostle, besides the fact that it acknowledges and inculcates a single oblation of the New Law, seems also openly to remove priests entering into the holy places "in blood of others."

§ 117. Finally (ch. 10), repeating the same in other words, he says: "And every priest indeed standeth daily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but He, offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God." Then he concludes his whole disputation with these two sentences: "For by one oblation He hath consummated for ever them that are sanctified," or to be sanctified; and: "Where there is remission of these, now there is no longer an oblation for sin." Whence it seems a consequence that after that consummative oblation which was made on the cross, by which all sanctification is, and of all sins—¹²⁴

§ VI — [continuation]

§ 118. ...oblation, with the consequence that that which looks to sanctification and the remission of sins will be going to have no more efficacy than that whole multitude of sacrifices of the Old Testament: about which the same Apostle bears witness, that "the law brought nothing to perfection," that it "cannot ever make perfect those who approach," and that "there is a setting aside of the preceding commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness," as is had in the same Epistle, chs. 7 and 10.¹²⁵ Fourth. Those passages are objected which, the legal sacrifices having been rejected, so commend to us spiritual sacrifices that they seem simply to do away with every external sacrifice, as in Ps. 49; 50; Isaiah 1 and the last; Hosea 6; Matt. 9; Jn. 4; 1 Pet. 2; and widely elsewhere.¹²⁶ Fifth. The Eucharist was instituted only for this, that it be received by the faithful in commemoration of the Lord's Passion and Death. For its institution has nothing else than: "Take, eat, drink." For what is added, "Do this in memory of me," the Apostle in 1 Cor. 11 refers to nothing else than to the reception, when he immediately subjoins: "For as often as you shall eat," etc. Therefore it was not instituted as a sacrifice or oblation. Sixth. The Fathers do not seem in the celebration of the Eucharist to acknowledge anything other than the commemoration or representation of the one Sacrifice completed on the cross; which they call the mystical immolation, and they say that Christ there is immolated not truly but only mystically, or in the sacrament. Whence St. Augustine (Epistle 23 to Boniface) thus says: "Was not Christ once immolated in himself? And yet in the sacrament he is immolated to the peoples not only on all the Paschal solemnities, but every day; nor is he telling a falsehood who, when asked, should answer that he is immolated. For if the sacraments had not a certain likeness to the things of which they are sacraments, they would not at all be sacraments. But from this likeness they very often take even the names of the very things." And the other things which there both precede and follow, where he teaches that it is rightly said that Christ is immolated daily, just as we rightly say that Christ rises again yearly, namely on account of the commemoration of a thing once done. A similar passage is found in him (in the Exposition on Ps. 21). Both are cited by Gratian ("Semel immolatus").¹²⁷ Likewise St. John Chrysostom (Homily 17 on the Epistle to the Hebrews) says that there is one only sacrifice, because Christ was once immolated; but that what we do is a remembrance of that sacrifice. The words there are cited by Gratian (in the chapter "In Christo"), and by the Master (in the text).¹²⁸ Hence elsewhere again Augustine wishes the sacrifice of the cross to be the one and singular sacrifice of Christians, besides which they have none other: as in City of God VII, ch. 31; in Contra Faustum XX, chs. 18 and 21; in Contra Adversarios Legis et Prophetarum I, chs. 18, 19, 20; in Sermon 29 on the Words of the Lord.¹²⁹ In this manner too Fulgentius speaks in the book To Peter on the Faith, chs. 2 and 10.¹³⁰ Finally: Authors and Founders of Masses after Christ are wont to be objected to us, such as James, Basil, Chrysostom, and among the Romans a certain Scholastic author of the Canon. And to this is adduced from Gratian (the chapter "Jacobus frater Domini"), and that from the Sixth Synod, where it is signified that James is the first author of the Mass; whence they wish it to follow that this sacrifice of the Mass was not instituted by Christ.¹³¹

§ 119. But to these objections let us reply in order. To the first it is answered that the force of the Catholics' argument (from Gen. 14) does not consist in the word "offered," although the old translation has it thus, for which St. Jerome renders "brought out." Nor do Catholics deny that Melchizedek brought out bread and wine for the refreshment of Abraham and his companions returning from battle, although Rabanus thinks and shows plausibly that there is no necessity for this understanding; but they teach that Melchizedek brought out bread and wine not only for a banquet, but also and chiefly for an oblation to be made to God for thanksgiving, of which afterward he would make those returning victorious from battle to be partakers—

just as we read in 1 Sam. 9 that what had previously been offered to the Lord was set before Saul and the other dinner-guests. And the same is wont to be done in the sacrifices of the Gentiles. This is the doctrine of all the Fathers, when they hand down that in this oblation of bread and wine Melchizedek bore the figure of the Priesthood of Christ. Whence too Jerome judged that what immediately follows the said sentence ought to be rendered thus: "For he was the priest of the Most High God"; understanding, namely, that by that sentence Moses wished to give the reason for what he had left to be understood—that Melchizedek not only brought out but also offered. For it is not rare among the Hebrews that the copulative conjunction has the force of a causal, as in Is. 64: "Thou wast angry, and we sinned"; in Gen. 22: "Now I know that thou fearest God, and thou hast not spared," etc.; in Ps. 59 and 107: "for the salvation of man is vain," where in the Hebrew it is, "vain," etc.¹³²

§ 120. To the second it is answered that the Apostle Paul (in the Epistle to the Hebrews), where he compares Christ with Melchizedek, proposed only to set forth the dignity and excellence of Christ above Shem and Aaron, not greatly concerning himself with treating the rite of the sacrifice between Melchizedek and Christ. For which reason the Apostle, omitting mention of the rite of sacrificing, pursues carefully those things which made for the commendation of the Person. Then too it was neither fitting nor opportune for Paul, writing to Jews who were not yet sufficiently imbued with the first rudiments of the Christian faith, to discourse of the mystery of the sacrament and sacrifice of the Eucharist. For thus he himself says (ch. 5): "Of whom" (namely, of the priest according to the order of Melchizedek) "we have much to say, and hard to be interpreted to utter, because you have become dull of hearing."¹³³ Add that mysteries of this sort, most secret of Religion, were not easily wont to be committed to writing by the Apostles and their immediate successors. Nor indeed ought the Apostle's proof for that reason to seem not full or little solid; because for that which he set out to prove, it is plainly sufficient.

§ 121. For the solution of the third argument, one must know that the Apostle in those places is disputing against the Jews, many of whom were still clinging to the legal observances as necessary unto salvation, as though, forsooth, those things availed of themselves unto salvation. He strives to distinguish the Levitical priesthood, with its sacrifices, from the Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ. Now this distinction he sets in this, that the Levitical priesthood and its sacrifices consisted in the oblation of brute animals, which of themselves could nowise cleanse souls from sins or make them perfect—since "it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins"—but availed only for a certain cleansing and righteousness of the flesh. The Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ, however, consists in the shedding and oblation of the Blood of Christ; by which, once made, a soul can always be sanctified, and the sins of all ages can be expiated. Since this is so, he teaches that there is no need of a repetition of this sacrifice, nay rather that a repetition of the same would be an argument of its weakness and inefficacy, as the repetition of the ancient sacrifices was. For those were not commanded to be repeated either daily or yearly so that by their oblation sin might at last be taken away, but so that by this frequent repetition there might be made a certain assiduous profession and commemoration of sin, and a foreshadowing of the oblation of the Blood of Christ, by which alone sins were truly to be forgiven. Moreover, it is manifest that in this comparison of each sacrifice the Apostle is speaking of the bloody oblation of Christ which was made on the cross, which he so teaches to be sufficient for the expiation of sins, that there can never be any need of a repetition of the same bloody oblation: because, to wit, for preparing the price necessary for the remission of the sins of the whole world, that single oblation sufficed most abundantly. For by the unbloody, that is, mystical oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ which is made in the Mass, according to the doctrine of the Church, this is not done, that by it there be prepared the price whereby sins

be redeemed; but that the price procured by that single Sacrifice of the Cross be applied to us for the obtaining of the remission of sins and of the other salutary gifts. Wherefore just as that single Sacrifice of the Cross does not take away the power of Baptism and the other sacraments by which we are renewed, sanctified, and cleansed from sins; nay, just as it does not derogate from the efficacy of that oblation and prayer by which Christ even now in heaven continually presents and offers himself for us to the Father, and continually intercedes for us (Rom. 8; Heb. 5; 7); so neither does it take away the unbloody oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, nor derogate anything from its virtue.¹³⁴ These things established, it is not difficult to answer to the passages which are objected from the Apostle. For the passage (ch. 7) which attributes an everlasting priesthood to Christ does not exclude, but rather includes, the daily sacrifice of the Church according to the order of Melchizedek. For the priesthood of Christ is perpetual, not only for this reason, that his single oblation made on the cross endures forever as to its efficacy, but also for this, that his priesthood, insofar as it is according to the order of Melchizedek, is exercised in the Church, his persons being borne, even to the end of the age. But the passage (ch. 8) has this sense: If Christ were not to die, he would not be a priest. For already there were other priests who according to the law offered victims and the blood of animals. That therefore he might discharge the priesthood, he had to offer his own blood to God the Father, and thus he had to die. Nor by this is the Sacrifice of the Mass taken away, whose priests offer not their own but another's blood: because the blood once offered in bloody fashion is thenceforth, by Christ's very institution, offered in unbloody fashion by the ministry of the priests of the New Testament, and that in commemoration of that bloody oblation. Again, those passages which testify that Christ once and not often offered himself speak of the bloody oblation, which of itself avails for every sanctification; not of the unbloody, which has all its force from the oblation of the cross, of which it is a commemoration. Finally, the sense of that sentence, "For by one oblation," etc., is this: As many as are sanctified through all ages are sanctified only by that one oblation made on the cross, and that independent; because, namely, on the cross Christ completed the work, by whose power every consummation or sanctification follows. "Independent" is added because even through the sacrifice which Christ offered at the Supper all sanctification is effected, but as through a sacrifice dependent on the sacrifice of the cross. But the sense of the other sentence, "Where there is remission of sins," etc., is: After that oblation which is of itself efficacious for the remission of all sins, there is now no other similar oblation to be sought. Yet nothing forbids that another be sought by which the virtue of that one be applied to us, just as sacraments also are required.

§ 122. Furthermore, as the fourth argument does not refute the Sacrifice of the Cross, so neither does it refute the Sacrifice of the Mass, since each is external. But Scripture commends the oblation of those things which are of themselves pleasing to God—of which sort were not the things that were offered in the old law, but a contrite spirit, justice, mercy, piety, and other virtues and the works of virtues—of which sort, also, is the Body and Blood of the Only-begotten Son of God as to the thing itself, though not always as to the action. As to the fifth: it has been sufficiently set forth above in its own place that what is commanded by those words, "Do this," etc., the Fathers also understand. But the Apostle does not expound the whole of what is contained in the word "do"; but only in part, insofar as was sufficient for him writing to the common folk of the Corinthians. To the sixth we answer that the Fathers often understand by "immolation" not just any offering of a sacrifice, but the slaughter or killing done for the sake of offering; and in this sense it is not a true, but only a mystical, immolation that is acknowledged by them upon the altar, which they call an unbloody immolation. Thus by Augustine and Chrysostom it is said that Christ is immolated in the Mass because his Passion and Death are commemorated in it by a certain representation. But when the Fathers say that the

Sacrifice of the Cross is the one and singular Sacrifice of Christians, by antonomasia they understand "the Sacrifice" which by its own power appeases God, which the Sacrifice of the Mass is not, inasmuch as it has all its power from the Sacrifice accomplished on the cross. To the last there is an easy reply: James and Basil are not there recounted as authors of the Office, that is, of the certain prayers and of the order which is observed in the celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass. For they composed Liturgies, as after them also Chrysostom and certain others did. Nay, even Paul himself seems to promise something of this sort when he says: "The rest when I come I will set in order," as Augustine notes (Epistle 118, ch. 6).¹³⁵ Wherefore, just as Paul, with regard to that which he testifies that he received from the Lord, established among the Corinthians the order and rite of celebrating, so we ought to think that other Apostles and their successors did so elsewhere, excepting only those things which throughout the whole Church were decreed by the Apostles to be observed in like manner.

§ XIV — The origin and signification of the word "Mass" (Vocabuli Missae origo & significatio)

§ 123. The word by which, in Catholic usage, the sacrifice of the altar is signified is by no means recent, but long ago already employed even by earlier Fathers. For, to pass over Gregory the Roman, who (Homily 8 and 21 on the Gospels, and sometimes elsewhere) uses this word, now calling it a Mass or Masses, now the solemnities of Masses, and to pass over others later than he, before him this word in this signification was used by Epiphanius the Scholastic, by Pope Vigilius (in the Epistle to Eleutherius, ch. 5), by Felix IV (Epistle 1, ch. 1), and, before these by almost an entire century, by Pope Leo (Epistle 81), and by Augustine (Sermon 237 on the Seasons); and three Synods as well—Carthage II (ch. 3), Milevis (ch. 12), and Agde (ch. 21); and again, earlier than these: Ambrose (Epistle 33), and Damasus on Sixtus, Alexander, and Telesphorus.¹³⁷

§ 124. Indeed, even before those, Roman Pontiffs Fabian, Soter, Pius, Hyginus, and Alexander make mention of the same word in their decrees, who were not so far distant from the times of the Apostles. It is read also in Ignatius, in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, and in Clement the Roman (Epistle 2), and in Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3); but since they wrote in Greek, that term is the translators', not the Authors'.¹³⁸

§ 125. Moreover, as to what is the etymon and origin of this word, writers are not of one mind. Calvin, who cannot deny the antiquity of this word, makes up that it is said to be from "sending gifts," looking, namely, to this, that the Eucharist should be supposed not to be offered to God but to be wont to be sent by men one to another for a cause of honor or piety—just as other gifts are wont to be sent back and forth among friends—so that only in this way the Eucharist may seem to have been called by the ancients also an "oblation," because, as they say, it is not offered to God but to men. But this contrivance is heretical.

§ 126. Some Catholics think that Mass (*Missa*) is so called from the Hebrew word *Missa* which is read in Deuteronomy 16, for which our Interpreter rendered "oblation." But this opinion has little probability. First, because the Hebrew word signifies neither sacrifice (*sacrificium*) nor, absolutely speaking, an offering to God, but a gift such as is wont to be offered to a friend or a prince, or rather a tribute such as is offered by freedmen to their patron in grateful remembrance of their liberty bestowed. For there the Lord commands the Israelites that on the feast-day of weeks, after the harvest is gathered, they should provide a banquet for widows and strangers in memory of their deliverance from Egyptian servitude, so that this may be for them an annual

banquet, after the fashion of a certain perpetual tribute. But the words which among the Hebrews properly signify sacrifice or oblation are altogether different from this word.¹³⁹

§ 127. Then, if *Missa* were a Hebrew word, by now not only Latins but Greeks too would use that word, as they do use the words *Amen*, *Hallelujah*, *Hosanna*, and the like. But they are nowhere read to have used it; rather they use only their own proper words, such as *Liturgy*, *Hierurgy*, and similar ones.¹⁴⁰

§ 128. Others, such as Hugh of St. Victor and the Master of the Sentences, think that *Mass* is so called as the victim transmitted by the priest into heaven. The words of Hugh are these (book 2 of *On the Sacraments*, part 8, ch. 14): "*Mass* is called the victim and oblation which, through the priest who is mediator between God and the people, is transmitted to God." The Master uses similar words (*Distinction 24* of this book). But for this derivation no foundation exists among the ancients.¹⁴¹

§ 129. Wherefore, the opinion of those is very much approved by us who wish "*Mass*" to be said as a "sending," that is, a dismissal (*missio, id est dimissio*). For just as among older Latin Fathers one sometimes reads *remissa* put for *remissio*, as in Cyprian in the book *On the Good of Patience* and elsewhere, so they used *missa* for *missio*, that is, *dimissio*. For that "to send" is often taken for "to dismiss," no one skilled in Latin is ignorant. That this is the origin of the word is clear enough from the Rule of St. Benedict, in which, repeatedly, after the Divine Office is prescribed, there is subjoined: "Let the Masses be made," that is, when the office is finished, let the dismissal of the brethren be made (as in chs. 9, 12, 13, 16, 17). And in Cassian, book 3 of *The Institutes of Monks*, chs. 7 and 8, where he names "the Mass of the congregation" and "of vigils."¹⁴²

§ 130. Now of old there was a twofold *Mass* or dismissal about the sacrifice. The prior took place after the Gospel and the Creed, and this was called the *Mass of the Catechumens* (*Missa catechumenorum*), because then catechumens—who were not permitted to be present at the Mysteries—were dismissed. Of this the Council of Carthage (ch. 84), the Council of Valencia (can. 1), and Augustine (the already cited Sermon 237) make express mention in these words: "Behold, after the sermon there is a dismissal for the catechumens; the faithful will remain." This dismissal the deacon used to announce, saying: "If anyone does not communicate, let him give place," as Gregory reports (book 2 of the *Dialogues*, ch. 23); or in this way: "If anyone is a catechumen, let him go outside," as Isidore and Durandus have noted in the *Rationale of Divine [Offices]*.¹⁴³

§ 131. The other *Mass* was when, the sacrifice having been completed, the people were dismissed, as Ambrose notes (on Matt. 25) in these words: "Whence I think also that the apostolic tradition has remained, that on the vigil of Easter it is not permitted to dismiss the people before midnight, as they await the coming of Christ; and after that time has passed, security being presumed, that all keep the day as a feast." Thus he. Hence it comes about that on days of joy, when after the Sacrifice prayer is not continued, the deacon says: "Go, it is the dismissal" ("*Ite, missa est*"), as if he were saying, "There is a dismissal; it is permitted to depart." In place of which, on days of penance, when, the sacrifice being finished, prayer is still prolonged, it is said: "Let us bless the Lord" ("*Benedicamus Domino*"). This latter dismissal was called the *Mass of the Faithful* (*Missa fidelium*), from which thereafter the whole action of the Sacrifice took the name "*Mass*"—for the reason that sometimes the whole is named from a part, especially on account of the deacon's cry, resounding in all ears when the Sacrifice is finished: "*Ite, missa est*." Witnesses of this derivation are Isidore, Durandus, and others who have set out the reasons of the divine offices.¹⁴⁴

§ 132. From these things one may also gather that by the usage of Christians "*Mass*" does not only signify the sacrifice, but the whole action of the priest, consisting of many parts, whereby he is occupied about the

sacrifice—namely, with those things also included which precede and follow the Canon: such as the Introit, the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, the prayers, and the other things which have been instituted for the worthy and honorable celebration of so great a Mystery.

§ XV — That the sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory, and for what causes and persons it ought to be offered (Sacrificium Missae esse propitiatorium & pro quibus causis & personis offerendum sit)

§ 133. The sacrifice of the Mass (*sacrificium Missae*) is not only eucharistic, that is, instituted for the making of thanksgiving, although the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) is peculiarly so called, the name being taken, namely, from the first and chief cause of the oblation; but it is also propitiatory, indeed it avails for obtaining all things that are rightly asked from God: and it is offered well and wholesomely not only for any cause whatsoever, but also for all men, the living and the dead, who can in any way become participants of our prayer. The Fathers of Trent indicate the reason²: because in this sacrifice the very same Christ is contained and is immolated unbloodily, who on the altar of the cross once offered Himself in a bloody manner. And the fruits of that bloody oblation are received most abundantly through this unbloody one; so far is it from the case that anything at all is detracted from that by means of this. Wherefore, say the Fathers, it is offered not only for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, but also, according to the Apostolic tradition, for the dead in Christ not yet fully purified; which doctrine the Council in turn confirms under anathema¹⁴⁶.

§ 134. The first point is proved as follows. For, as St. Augustine says, book 17 of the City of God, ch. 20⁴: "The sacrifice according to the order of Melchizedek, which Christ exhibited of His Body and Blood, succeeded to all those sacrifices of the Old Testament which were immolated in the shadow of what was to come. For which reason also we recognize that utterance (in Ps. 39) of the same Mediator speaking through the Prophet: 'Sacrifice and oblation Thou didst not will, but a body Thou hast fitted to me'; because, instead of all those sacrifices and oblations, His Body is offered and is ministered to the participants." Thus Augustine there. In like manner he speaks in *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*, book 1, chs. 18–19¹⁴⁸. Whence it follows that the sacred Eucharist can be offered for every end for which that whole variety of the sacrifices of the old law was instituted. But how various those causes of offering were—namely, for sins, for salvation, for averting pestilence, war, famine, and any other evils at all—is manifest to one who turns over the Scripture of the Old Instrument. Therefore for all these causes the Eucharist too is to be offered. Then this is confirmed from the fact that the Apostle, writing to Timothy (1 Tim. 2), commands that prayers, consecrations, thanksgivings, and petitions be made, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and chastity. Which passage St. Augustine¹⁴⁹, and Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius (in their Commentaries)¹⁵⁰, interpret of those prayers which, being many and various, are wont to be recited in the celebration of the mysteries. Moreover (Acts 13) it is read that the Church which was at Antioch "ministered," that is, sacrificed, to the Lord, fasting being joined, that God might send suitable ministers into the work of the Gospel. Nay, even from the Gospels it can be shown that this sacrifice is saving and propitiatory. For in Luke, in the Greek, it is read thus: "This is my Body which is given for you." And in Paul: "which is broken for you." The shedding also of the Blood—three Evangelists, referring the words of consecration in the present, have set down; and Luke also openly attributes it to the chalice or cup, saying, "which is poured out for you." Add to these the Apostle's general sentence in Heb. 5: "Every high priest taken from among men is appointed that he may offer

gifts and sacrifices for sins." The public prayers of the Church too, among the solemnities of the Masses, bear witness to the same, which are in part eucharistic, in part petitions that through the sacrifice to be offered or already offered there be granted the necessities which are profitable to the salvation of the faithful—of which kind, chiefly, is the propitiation of sins. Whence in the Canon of the Mass it is said that this sacrifice is offered "for the redemption of souls, for the hope of salvation and safety of the faithful." And in a certain Secret, which is read on the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost, it is said that "as often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is performed, the work of our redemption is carried on"; and again, in another which is read for the commemoration of the Four Crowned Martyrs on the eighth of November, the Priest prays that "the gifts set forth may become the sacrament of redemption." And Epiphanius, in the Epistle translated by Jerome to John of Jerusalem (which in Jerome is the sixtieth), speaking about the celebrating of the Mysteries, says that in this part of the ministry is the chief salvation of Christians¹⁵¹. Most clearly indeed Gregory writes of this matter in book 4 of the Dialogues, ch. 55 and the following¹⁵², where among other things he teaches that this sacrifice is therefore propitiatory, because by the Mystery it renews for us the death of the Only-begotten, who, although He is immortal, yet for us in this Mystery of the sacred oblation is again immolated. And below he says: "Let us consider what manner of sacrifice this is for us, which for our absolution always imitates the Passion of the Only-begotten Son." Again, in Homily 37 on the Gospels¹⁵³, when he was exhorting that sacred victims be offered for sins, he subjoined in this way: "For in a singular manner the victim of the sacred altar, when offered with tears and with kindness of mind, avails for our absolution; because He who, rising again in Himself from the dead, now dieth no more, yet through this, in His Mystery, again suffers for us. For as often as we offer to Him the victim of His Passion, so often do we renew for us His Passion for our absolution." And other things which follow.

§ 135. Wherefore the Tridentine Synod rightly teaches (sess. 22, ch. 2) that that sacrifice is truly propitiatory, through which, if with true heart and right faith, and with fear and reverence, we who are contrite and penitent approach unto God, we obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable help⁵³. For the Lord ratified this oblation, as is there subjoined, that the gift of penance might be granted and even very great sins be remitted⁵³.

§ 136. Moreover, that this sacrifice avails for other saving effects besides those stated above is shown by the perpetual tradition of the Church, being sealed by her prayers. Hence Augustine¹⁵⁴ admonishes that the sacrifice be celebrated at the succession of a peaceful episcopate. And in the City of God he records that once a sacrifice was offered against the infestations of demons¹⁵⁵. And the ancient custom obtains that for the good and happy success of any affair, work, congregation, council, office, or public function, and other like things which are of great moment, the Sacrifice be offered and thereafter repeated and frequently iterated. Finally, the Tridentine Synod confesses that the Church celebrates Masses in honor and memory of the Saints, and chiefly of the Martyrs (ch. 3 of the same Session)¹⁵⁶—not indeed that she may offer the sacrifice to them, which is in no wise permitted, since not even to Christ when He was in the form of a servant was it lawful to sacrifice, according to Augustine, book 10 of the City of God¹⁵⁷; but because, giving thanks to God for their victories, she implores their patronage; and such a sacrifice is in part eucharistic and in part propitiatory. Augustine makes mention also of that custom, book 8 of the City of God, ch. 27; and with Eusebius one may see Constantine, in the Oration to the Assembly of the Saints, ch. 12¹⁵⁸.

§ 137. Now, as to the persons for whom it is to be offered, part of this is manifest from what has been said; namely, that this sacrifice is offered for all men. For since, during this life, there is no ground for despairing of

any individual, but for any whatsoever there is hope that, joined to our faith, we may obtain from Jesus Christ, even Him crucified, that is, offered on the cross for us, mercy by His oblation, and since the Eucharistic sacrifice is a memorial of this oblation, the consequence is that the Eucharist is to be offered for every man. Hence it is that the Apostle (1 Tim. 2) admonishes that, in celebrating the Mysteries (as we showed above that passage to have been expounded by the Fathers), prayer be made not only for the faithful but for all men, and therefore for kings and all who are in high station, most of whom were at that time, as is well known, unbelievers and persecutors of the faithful. For thus also of old the priests of the old law were wont to do, as Scripture attests. For in the books of Baruch and Ezra we read that sacrifices were offered for Nebuchadnezzar and his sons and other unbelieving kings. And in 2 Macc. 3, for Heliodorus; likewise St. Job (in the last chapter) is said to offer sacrifice for his friends. By which deed of his it was signified, as Gregory explains¹⁵⁹, that the Church should pray and sacrifice even for heretics. Cyprian likewise intimates this in the Epistle to Demetrianus, in these words: "For your peace and salvation making propitiation and appeasing God"¹⁶⁰. The prayers of the Church also testify abundantly to the same, which the Priest recites before and after the sacrifice, some of which are in general for enemies, others for kings, whether they be faithful or unbelievers, others for persecutors of the Church. Nor indeed is there any doubt that even for the excommunicate it is to be sacrificed, that, their obstinacy of mind being laid aside, they may be converted and return to the bosom of Mother Church, although, nevertheless, their names, as also the names of other enemies of the Church, ought not to be expressed by the one sacrificing, according to the ancient discipline of the Church¹⁶¹.

§ 138. But if, moreover, for those who are still alien from the society of the saints the Church rightly offers the sacrifice, that they may be aggregated to the saints and elect of God, much more ought she to do this for the faithful departed in faith and charity, who still, on account of sins which they neglected here to purge and fully redeem, are in need of purification and satisfaction; since both to pray for them, and to bestow alms, and to exercise other works of piety, has always been customary and frequent in the Church. For those for whom these things are rightly done, by no means ought to be excluded from the fruit of the sacrifice: because, as we have said, this sacrifice of the Eucharist is a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross, from which every saving good flows.

§ 139. This sound and catholic doctrine is shown by the perpetual custom of the Church, derived not only from the Apostles—as Tertullian testifies in the book *On the Soldier's Crown*¹⁶², Augustine in the book *On the Care to Be Taken for the Dead*, ch. 1, and in *Sermon 32 On the Words of the Apostle*¹⁶³, and Chrysostom in *Homily 69 To the People of Antioch*, and *Homily 21 on the Acts*, and *Homily 3 on the Epistle to the Philippians*¹⁶⁴—but even observed by the faithful of the Old Testament. For in 2 Macc. 12 Judas Maccabeus, leader and high priest of the Jewish people, ordered oblations to be made at Jerusalem for the sins of the dead who had with piety received sleep. Wherefore, deservedly, Aetius, who denied that oblations ought to be made for the dead, along with his followers was counted among the heretics, as may be seen in Epiphanius and Augustine writing on heresies¹⁶⁵. The testimonies of the Fathers and Councils by which this doctrine is strengthened, since they lie open everywhere to those who read, and have been diligently collected by others, we omit for brevity's sake.

§ XVI — The arguments seemingly contrary to the foregoing doctrine are resolved (Argumenta doctrinae superiori in speciem contraria dissolvuntur)

§ 140. The arguments that are in appearance contrary to the foregoing doctrine are resolved. Wherefore those things must be resolved which, in defense of the foregoing, are wont to be brought by opponents. They are of this sort. First: Christ, instituting this sacrament, brought forward no other cause than commemoration or grateful remembrance, saying: "Do this in commemoration of me," that is, in memory of my Passion and death, as Paul interprets; therefore no other cause is to be acknowledged. Second: The Apostle (Heb. 10) testifies that Christ "by one oblation has perfected forever those who are sanctified"; but he speaks of the oblation of the Cross; the oblation of the Eucharist does not sanctify, but is done for mere commemoration. Third: In the same place the Apostle says, "For those who sin voluntarily there now remains no host for sins, but a certain terrible expectation of judgment"—therefore at least for those who sin voluntarily the Eucharist will not be able to be offered. Fourth: A full and perfect redemption of all sins was once made on the Cross, the Apostle saying in the same Epistle (Heb. 9) that "Christ by his own blood entered once into the holy places, having obtained eternal redemption"; therefore redemption is not repeated by the sacrifice of the altar. The consequence seems manifest, because redemption is a payment of a price, and hence full redemption is full discharge of the price, after which nothing further can justly be exacted. Fifth: In the sacrifice of the Mass the sacrament of unity is offered; therefore it should be offered only for those who are in the unity of the Body of Christ. This reason seems firm, since from it it is proved that the Eucharist ought not to be received except by those who are members of the Body of Christ, because it is the sacrament of unity. Sixth: The opinion of St. Augustine is explicit in book 1 (On the Origin of the Soul, ch. 9): "Who offers the Body of Christ except for those who are members of Christ?" Seventh: The same Augustine in book 4 (On the Trinity, ch. 14) denies that the sacrifice is rightly offered unless it be received by those for whom it is offered; whence it seems to follow that it should be offered only for those who participate in it. Eighth: St. John Chrysostom (Hom. 3 on the Epistle to the Philippians) does not wish the sacrifice of the altar to be offered for catechumens who have died, but only advises that alms be given for them. Ninth: The Canon of the Mass makes no mention of unbelievers. Tenth: Likewise the Council of Trent (Session 22, ch. 2) makes mention only of the faithful, and again (ch. 6), with this added as though a reason: "who belong to the Body of Christ." Eleventh: Odo of Cambrai in the Canon of the Mass (Dist. 3) thus writes concerning this sacrifice: "It is accepted for the holy; it is not accepted for the impious. It helps the pious; it condemns the impious; it benefits the pious unto salvation; it harms the impious unto damnation." Twelfth, and last: The sacrifice of the Mass avails from the work worked in the same way as the sacraments; but the sacraments are not to be conferred upon those who set up an obstacle; therefore this sacrifice is not to be offered for those who set up an obstacle, such as all the impious and unbelievers; and if it be offered, it profits no more than a sacrament conferred upon one who has set up an obstacle.

§ 141. To these objections we reply in order as follows. What is alleged first can be solved in a twofold way. For both what is assumed is false, and the consequence is faulty. For above we showed—according to that which all the Greek exemplars uniformly have in the three Evangelists and in Paul—that Christ, when instituting the Eucharist, attests that there his Body is given and broken for us; and that His Blood, or the chalice of His Blood, is poured out "unto the remission of sins." Therefore He does not make mention of commemoration alone, not even in that which He says: "Do this in commemoration of me." For in saying, "Do this," He commands that those words be said which signify propitiation. And even if He had named

commemoration alone, He would not thereby have excluded other causes. For commemoration is named as the first and chief cause of the oblation, by which this sacred action is referred to the glory of God. But this cause also straightway draws others along with it. For while with a grateful mind we set ourselves to acknowledge the redemption bestowed, we cannot but at the same time also ask for the efficacy and operation of that same redemption in whatever things we have recognized that we need it. Whence the Church, in the Tenth Sunday after Pentecost, has conjoined both in the Collect with these words: "May to you, O Lord, the sacrifices dedicated be rendered, which you have granted to be offered to the honor of your name, in such a way that by the same you would deign to make remedies for us."

§ 142. The solution of the second argument is evident from what has been said above. For the only oblation made on the Cross is the source of all sanctification of all ages, sanctifying of itself all as many as are sanctified. But just as that effect of sanctification is applied to men through Baptism and the other sacraments, so also through the Sacrifice of the Mass; which therefore works sanctification not of itself, but through that sacrifice offered on the Cross—just as Baptism and the other sacraments cleanse us in the Blood of Christ.

§ 143. The third argument concludes no less against the Sacrifice of the Cross than against the Eucharist. Wherefore we say that the sense of the Apostle is this: that if, after the faith has been received and the knowledge of the truth, someone should fall into voluntary sin, "there now remains no host for sins"; that is, now it is not permitted to be baptized again—and thus to be absolved at once and in a single stroke from guilt and from punishment. For this is "for a host to be left," namely one that simply and without any condition of satisfaction removes every guilt of sin, as happens in Baptism. Instead there remains for them "a certain terrible expectation of judgment," that is, a hard and toilsome satisfaction, which is a kind of foreshadowing of the terrible judgment that God will exercise against the impious. This sense is confirmed by a like place of the same Epistle (ch. 6).

§ 144. To the fourth, it is answered that the most complete redemption made on the Cross is applied to us by certain modes and means, as by faith, the sacraments, and the sacrifice of the altar. Hence one must not say that the redemption once made on the Cross is repeated by this sacrifice, but that it is only applied. Nor does the sentence of the Council of Trent intend anything else when it is said that the sacrifice of the Mass is rightly offered "for our sins, punishments, and satisfactions." For in the unbloody sacrifice the price or satisfaction for sins is not paid, since there is there no suffering; but the Passion made on the Cross, as the fullest price and satisfaction, is applied to us through the sacrifice of the Mass for the removal of guilt, or also of the punishments remaining. Therefore on the Cross a full and perfect redemption was made as to sufficiency; not as to the very effect of redemption, which partly preceded, partly follows—once the instruments instituted by God are employed, through which the Passion of the Cross is applied. Among which one and chief is the Sacrifice of the Mass.

§ 145. To the fifth, one must answer that the Eucharist is not offered as a sacrament, but as a sacrifice. Since therefore it is as a sacrament the sacrament of unity, it ought not to be received except by those who are united to Christ through charity. Insofar however as it is a Sacrifice, it can as well be offered on the altar for the impious as it was offered on the Cross for them. And if somewhere it be called the sacrifice of unity, this is said no less of the Sacrifice of the Cross, because, namely, the effect of both is to reconcile man and unite him to Christ, not because it is offered for those only who are already united to Christ—just as by those alone it is rightly received in the sacrament.

§ 146. As to the words of Augustine adduced in the sixth place, others answer in other ways, but the true sense of Augustine is evident from the circumstance of the place. For he is speaking of prayer and oblation for the dead—who, unless they are members of Christ, that is, unless they have departed in charity, neither the prayers of the Church nor oblations avail them—and in the next chapter likewise, speaking of the dead, he says that even those sacrifices which are mentioned in 2 Maccabees as having been made for sinful dead men would have profited them nothing if they had not been circumcised: because without circumcision they could not be justified, and thus could not receive with piety the sleep of death. But that for unbelieving persecutors still living this sacrifice ought to be offered, Augustine plainly teaches from the Apostle in 2 Timothy 2, in Epistle 59, question 5.¹⁶⁶

§ 147. And what in the seventh place is again objected out of Augustine—of what sense it was said—will be declared below, where private Masses are treated.

§ 148. To the eighth, it is answered that Chrysostom is speaking of those catechumens who did not depart in living faith. For this sense is clearly indicated by the words immediately preceding: he speaks namely of those catechumens whom there then were many—namely those putting off Baptism from year to year, so that they might more freely give themselves to their pleasures, not yet having received Baptism. Of those dying in such a state it is not doubtful that they perish, and this the same Chrysostom also testifies more expressly (Hom. 24 on John). But as to his saying that such at least receive some refreshment from alms given for them, his opinion is not to be accepted.

§ 149. To the ninth we say: the Canon of the Mass does not indeed make mention, by express name, of unbelievers; yet, when it makes mention of the king or prince (whom today many Christians hold to be a heretic or unbeliever; and formerly some also held him so), it sufficiently signifies that oblation can be made for unbelievers. Add that the mental mode of praying through the "Memento," as John Gerson says (on the Canticle of the Virgin), seems to have been instituted so that even for those the fruit of the sacrifice might be obtained who are unworthy to be named—such as most of all are the excommunicated, of whom Bernard says in the book *On the Degrees of Humility*, at the end: "Let them look to it, and in how great peril they are, for whom the Church does not dare to pray publicly."

§ 150. To the tenth it is answered that the Council of Trent in that place sufficiently intimates that it is to be offered also for the impious and unbelievers, when it says that by the oblation of this sacrifice the Lord, being appeased, grants the gift of penance and also remits even enormous sins; likewise, when it says that the fruits of that bloody oblation are by this unbloody one most abundantly received. For by this it is signified that any kind of effect which is expected from the Cross of the Lord can be received through the Sacrifice of the Mass. But why in that chapter there is only mention of the faithful and of penitents, the reason is this: because in that chapter the Synod teaches that the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory—that is, that it avails unto the remission of sins. Now the remission of sins presupposes faith and penance. Whence it proves that it is propitiatory, because by it it comes about that, if with true heart and right faith we, being contrite and penitent, approach unto God, we obtain mercy and the like. Whether however it avails to obtain for unbelievers faith itself is a different question, which the Synod is not treating there; yet it says enough when it says that by that oblation the gift of penance is granted. For this cannot be obtained for the faithful unless faith be first obtained; which indeed belongs to the same order of saving goods.¹⁶⁷

§ 151. To the eleventh, those words are not to be understood of all for whom it is offered, but of the offerer, if he be evil. For thus he had said before: "What then? do we pray that an acceptable host become that which cannot displease? But that which is acceptable in itself displeases on account of the offerer." And again: "What God knows not, neither does He receive his oblation."

§ 152. To the last, it is answered that, although it has some difficulty how the sacrifice avails from the work worked, yet the judgment concerning the sacraments is other than concerning the sacrifice. For the sacraments, in order to be received, require a due preparation from divine institution; which if it be lacking, they do not profit to salvation. But the sacrifice, in order to profit for that for which it is offered, does not necessarily require any preparation in him, because by it there is also obtained the very beginning of faith, of conversion, and of good will. Whence in this respect it much more belongs to it to avail from the work worked than to the sacraments.

§ XVII — That Masses which are called private are rightly celebrated in the church (Missas quae privatae vocantur recte fieri in ecclesia)

§ 153. A Mass celebrated according to the intention of the Church ought not to be called private, but each of them in many ways is public and common and can be so called, as the Fathers of the Council of Trent signify (Session 22, ch. 6). First, because it is always offered in thanksgiving for the death of the Lord, which is a public benefit. Then, because it is always offered for the salvation of the whole faithful people. Third, because it is always offered in the way Christ instituted it to be offered, the prince of the whole Christian people. Fourth, because it is offered by the public minister of the Church, who surely has been deputed to this by public authority from the public institution of God. And lastly, because from the communion of the sacrament, at least spiritual, absolutely no one is excluded in any sacrifice of the Church.

§ 154. Nevertheless usage has obtained in the Church that some Masses be called private, either because in them the priest alone communicates sacramentally; or rather because they are not done in a solemn and public assembly of the faithful people, but outside such an assembly—whether in a church to which otherwise the people is wont to assemble, or in a private oratory or some such place. For those that are celebrated in a public assembly we read in the canons to be called public Masses—whether some from the people might communicate or not—just as, on the contrary, those that are without a public assembly have been called private, even if perhaps some were to communicate in them.

§ 155. And that private Masses of either sort—both those that are done without a public assembly and those in which the priest alone communicates—were already long ago and from the beginning in use in the Church, and therefore are unjustly blamed by the sectaries, is easily shown from antiquity. Gregory the Great relates (Hom. 37 on the Gospels) that Cassius, bishop of Narni, at the point of death celebrated in the oratory of his episcopium. And the same, in book 2 (Epist. 9), orders Christ, bishop of Rimini, to consecrate an oratory for a certain devout matron, forbidding in the meantime that public Masses be done there or a baptistery be constructed. Augustine, book 22 (City of God, ch. 8), narrates that in a certain rustic house which evil spirits were troubling, the sacrifice offered brought a remedy to that evil; and in that place he also relates other things looking to the same. The same also in another place says that "Christ is sacrificed daily for the people," namely in the daily Sacrifice of the Mass. And yet elsewhere (Epist. 118, ch. 2) he says that it is

more pleasing to him that the faithful people receive communion only on the Lord's days than daily. Therefore the sacrifice was often offered with the people not communicating.

§ 156. Likewise Paulinus, concerning St. Ambrose (in his Life), relates that at Rome, when he had been asked, he offered the sacrifice in certain private houses. But also Prudentius makes mention of a private Sacrifice in the Hymn on St. Hippolytus. Among the Greeks, Chrysostom (Hom. 3 on the Epistle to the Ephesians; Hom. 61 to the people of Antioch), rebuking the negligence of the people because they came more rarely to communion, nevertheless testifies that, although there were lacking those who might communicate, he did not abstain from celebrating the sacrifice. Gregory Nazianzen, as is related in book 9 (*Historia Tripartita*, ch. 8), when he was at Constantinople, celebrated the sacred things in a certain small oratory. John also, patriarch of Alexandria, as Leontius writes in his Life, once said to the people: "I go down to the holy Church on your account. For I could celebrate Masses for myself in the episcopium." Pope Soter, much more ancient than these (in a decretal epistle), lays down only this, that no presbyter presume to celebrate the solemnities of the Masses unless two be present; adding nothing about communion. And yet this very thing later the Council of Mainz moderated (can. 43), requiring only the presence of one minister who could respond to the priest. And that we may bring forward something from earlier councils: the Council of Agde (can. 14) permits that there be oratories even outside the parishes, in which Masses may be celebrated for some private household; and (can. 31) demands nothing else of the laity than that on the Lord's day they hear the Masses entire, and not presume to go out before the blessing. The same is established by the Council of Orléans (can. 28). And Gratian recites these canons, together with some others pertaining to the same, in *De Consecratione*.

§ 157. And indeed, if it had not been permitted to offer the sacrifice unless those who are present also communicate, Fabian the Pope, cited there by Gratian (*Cap. Et si una*), and the Council of Elvira there (*Dist. 2, Omnis homo*), and the First Council of Toledo (ch. 13), would not easily have approved the faithful who communicate only at certain times; whom by this they in no way intend to bar from the daily sacrifice, so as to keep them from being present to it. Whence for this doctrine such a reason can be constructed: Christ nowhere commanded that the priest not communicate except with the people, nor that he sacrifice only in an assembly of the people. But neither are the Apostles found to have commanded any such thing; and consequently it has always been free in the Church of God for the faithful either to communicate daily or at set intervals of days and times; it has nonetheless always been free also for priests, if they wished, to offer the sacrifice daily. And this so far has already obtained in the Church that, for this reason, both by Augustine and by others it has been adorned with this epithet, that it be called the "daily sacrifice." Therefore, if a priest wished to offer this daily and continual sacrifice, but the faithful were unwilling to communicate, on account of this neither ought he to be forbidden to offer, nor they to be forbidden to be present at the oblation not communicating—since by no law were they bound to communicate, as it is most rightly said by Augustine in Epistle 118, where, discussing such matters, he says that this whole kind of things has free observances.

§ 158. To these considerations there is added that this sacrifice is wont also to be offered for particular benefits, either received or to be received, and that not by the whole people but by the friends either of the deceased or of any other person; as is evident from Augustine, *On Care to Be Taken for the Dead*, ch. 1 and 4; and book 9 of the *Confessions*, ch. 11 and 12; and from the book *On the Predictions of the Half-Time* under Prosper, ch. 6; and from the *Ambrosian Commentary* on 1 Tim. 2. But it is plain that these were not so

public that they could not be done without a gathering of the people, since it is not likely that the people was wont to be convoked for such things.¹⁶⁹

§ XVIII — The adversaries' objections are refuted (Adversariorum objectiones diluuntur)

§ 159. Against the foregoing doctrine, first it is objected from the words of Christ, who, when He had celebrated supper with His disciples, straightway instituted the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) and ordered that it be done thereafter by these words: "Do this," that is, this very thing which you now see me doing, as St. Cyprian interprets, saying that we are not found obedient to the commandments of the Lord unless we do the same things which He, Jesus, did.¹⁷¹ Second: the Apostle (1 Cor. 10) calls the bread and the blessed chalice a participation or communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and similarly (Acts 2) it is called "the communion of the breaking of bread"; therefore that bread and chalice in every Mass (*Missa*) ought to be communicated to many. Third: the same Apostle (1 Cor. 11) contrasts the Lord's supper with a private supper, when, reproving the Corinthians, he says: "This is not to eat the Lord's supper. For each one takes before others his own supper to eat." On which passage St. John Chrysostom writes thus: "What was the Lord's they had made private. For the supper of the Lord ought to be common," and so forth. Similar things are had in Theophylact.

§ 160. Fourth: the Paschal lamb, after it had been immolated, according to the law had to be eaten by many; therefore, that the truth may answer to the figure, Christ, who is the true Lamb, mystically immolated, ought always to be partaken by many. Fifth: the tenth canon of the Apostles excommunicates, as disturbing the peace of the Church, those who, while Mass is being celebrated, do not receive holy communion. And adhering to this apostolic canon Pope Anacletus (in a Decretal Epistle) thus decreed: "After the consecration is completed let all communicate who are unwilling to be deprived of the thresholds of the Church. For thus also the Apostles established, and thus the Holy Roman Church holds." And (canon 2 of the Council of Antioch) likewise commands that those be rejected who do not receive the Lord's Sacrament together with the people. But also in St. Gregory the Roman, book 2 of the Dialogues, ch. 23, it is read that during the solemnities of the Mass the Deacon was accustomed to cry aloud: "If anyone does not communicate, give place," that is, "let him go out of the Church." For thus a little later in the same place it is expounded.

§ 161. Sixth: both the Liturgies of diverse Churches and the Roman Missal sufficiently show that the Mass was at the beginning so instituted that in it many should communicate. This is proved as well by the very words of the Canon, "That as many as by the participation of this altar ...," as especially by those prayers with which the action of the Mass is concluded, and which are in the plural number. For never in these does the Priest say, "the sacrament which I have received," but "the sacrament which we have received," "which we have taken with the mouth," and the like, in the plural number. Seventh: St. Ignatius (in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans) says: "The Eucharist is held firm which has been granted by the Bishop; when the Bishop is present, there let the people be gathered," and so on. Eighth: St. Basil (on Ps. 115) on that verse, "I will pay my vows in the sight of all his people," thus writes: "Not skulking in corners will I sacrifice, but I will offer to thee a public sacrifice, having with me as partner in adoration the whole people." Lastly: St. Augustine (*De Trinitate*, ch. 14) testifies that a true sacrifice cannot be rightly offered unless through a Priest holy and just, nor can that which is offered be rightly received except by those for whom it is offered.

§ 162. These arguments partly tend to this, that in every Mass either all or many should communicate; partly, that Masses should not be celebrated except in the public assembly of the people. We will refute them briefly and in order.

§ 163. To the first it is answered: Christ so instituted this sacrament and sacrifice (*sacrificium*) that whatever was done by Him at that supper should thereafter always be done by the Priests. Otherwise, it would have to be celebrated and distributed only toward night, with only twelve present and those sitting. But He so instituted it that the Priest consecrating should himself first partake of the sacrifice. For thus Christ did, as Jerome testifies, though Scripture does not say it, in the Epistle to Hedibia, question 2, saying that the Lord Himself was both guest and banquet, Himself the one who eats and who is eaten; and then, if any of the faithful are present, he should, after the example of Christ, dispense and distribute to them. But Christ did not will this, that if perchance besides the minister no other be present, or if indeed someone be present, yet does not ask for communion, then the Priest should of necessity be bound both to communion and consecration at once. Wherefore in those things which Christ, when instituting this sacrifice, did, one must diligently distinguish between the things which He did as to be observed by perpetual imitation, because they in some manner pertained to the substance of the sacred action—such as to give thanks, to bless, to consecrate, to offer, for the one sacrificing to partake of the things offered, and to do these in commemoration of the Lord's Passion—and the things which He always did only on account of the circumstances of time and place—such as to dispense to others present, and to those sitting, and at such a time or hour, and that after they had taken supper. And among these, I reckon, is to dispense under both species. For these things were thus done by the Lord, yet He bound not the faithful by any precept to their perpetual imitation; indeed concerning some of those things He declared afterwards through His Church that they are not to be imitated. Although, however, it is not to be denied that distribution also is commanded, yet in the manner which we have said, namely, if some are present and lawfully ask.

§ 164. Whence also the solution of the second argument is evident. This sacrament is called a Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, not because it is necessary that as often as it is offered it be communicated to many, but because to those present and lawfully asking its communion ought not be denied, since it was instituted as common food for all the faithful.

§ 165. To the third it is answered, that both the Apostle and his interpreters, Chrysostom and Theophylact, by the Lord's supper understand not the actual taking of the Eucharist, but the celebration of the banquet which was employed for the representation of that first supper of the Lord—namely, either following upon the very participation of the Eucharist, as the said Authors will; or preceding it, as Augustine seems to think (Epistle 118). Therefore, because from the communion of this banquet the rich excluded the poor, Paul, rightly reproving them, says that the Lord's supper was not being done by them—that is, that they were not celebrating a common banquet after the likeness of the supper of the Lord which He had last with His disciples, but were making a private supper, others being shut out or not waited for. For the rich were not excluding the poor from the participation of the Mysteries, since this was not then taken by each one severally, but the Ministers of the Church, as was fitting, dispensed equally to all; and on that account there was not confusion. But if one should even think that something of that sort was done, nothing of this pertains to private Masses, in which from the participation of the sacrament neither does the Priest ever exclude a layman who wishes to be a partaker, nor does a rich man repel a poor man.

§ 166. To the fourth it is answered that that figure does not in all things answer to the truth. For Christ is taken whole by individuals, which equally could not be done in the case of that lamb; and therefore it was necessary that it be eaten by many. Note, too, that not the whole people convened, but single families in single houses: so neither ought it to seem incongruous, if Masses are not always in the assembly of the whole people, but sometimes in private oratories to which few come, they are celebrated.

§ 167. To the fifth we answer that the canons nowhere reprehend a priest if he offers or communicates without the people, but were published against the negligence of the clergy or of the people, if at least on the Lord's days or more solemn days they do not together partake of the Mysteries. And it must be noted that the apostolic canon, as it reads in Greek, only prescribes that the faithful remain at the sacred rites until the end, with no mention made of communion. But Anacletus, as is clear from the words preceding his decree, speaks of solemn days, and makes no mention of laymen, but of clerics only. And the canon of Antioch was written against those who, on account of heresy, abhor the communion of the Lord's Sacrament. But what is objected from Gregory seems to have this sense: "If anyone does not communicate," that is, if anyone is excommunicated, so that it is not permitted him to communicate—just as one is said not to eat flesh or not to drink wine, because by vow it is not permitted him. For Gregory relates how, at that Deacon's cry, two dead nuns were seen to go out, who before death had been excommunicated by St. Benedict.

§ 168. To the sixth it is answered that in the Liturgies there is rightly made mention of many, either because formerly many were wont ordinarily to approach to communion; or because the Priest ought to be ready to minister to many; or finally because very often even today many share in the Sacrifice at least spiritually—whom we rightly include under those words of the plural number which are recited by the Priest.

§ 169. Furthermore, St. Ignatius inveighs only against those who, without the Bishop's authority and consent, hold assemblies and either celebrate or partake of the Mysteries, as is the custom of heretics and schismatics. St. Basil likewise speaks against the hiding-places of heretics, which he opposes to the frequency and public assembly of the Church—with which, however, he communicates who does not depart from unity, even if in solitude or almost in solitude it be done, as is known to have been done of old by pious Pontiffs in the time of persecution.

§ 170. Finally, Augustine wills nothing else than that the sacrifice is not rightly offered unless it be taken by those, or by some of those, for whom it is offered. And this indeed is done in every sacrifice of the Mass, when the Priest himself takes the host offered for himself and the people, as one and the chief of those for whom it was offered.¹⁷²

1. St. Augustine, cited from Prosper of Aquitaine, *Sentences*, in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 2, cap. "Nos autem" [abbreviation as in source].

2. St. Gregory the Great, cited in the same place of Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 2 [abbreviation as in source].

3. "Perficiant in nobis, quaesumus, Domine, tua sacramenta quod continent, ut quae nunc specie gerimus, rerum veritate capiamus" — prayer noted "at the end of a certain Mass" [as in source].

4. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis*, IV, ch. 4.

5. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), ch. 1, under Innocent III.

6. Council of Constance, condemnation of Wyclif, article 2: "Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto in sacramento altaris."

7. Council of Florence, Decree on the Sacraments; Council of Trent, Session 13, chs. 1, 3, 4; canons 2, 3.

8. St. Thomas Aquinas and other Scholastics, various places; cf. the Angelic Doctor on the Eucharistic species, especially *Summa theologiae* III, q. 77 [general reference as in source].
9. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 77, a. 7, ad 1 [abbreviation as in source].
10. 1 Cor. 10:16; and 1 Cor. 11:24 according to the Greek reading: "This is My Body which is broken for you."
11. Cf. Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7 concerning the "breaking of bread."
12. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 83 on Matthew; and Hom. 60 to the People of Antioch [abbreviation as in source].
13. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 61 to the People of Antioch; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catechesis 4.
14. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 on 1 Corinthians 10.
15. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 60 to the People of Antioch.
16. St. Ambrose, Commentary on Luke, VI (on Luke 9).
17. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogues, IV, ch. 58.
18. St. Augustine, Sermon On the Words of the Gospel, cited by Peter Lombard, the Master, in the text [as in source].
19. Odo of Cambrai, on the Canon of the Mass, Dist. 3.
20. Confession of Berengarius, Roman Council under Nicholas II; condemnation of the contrary error [as in source].
21. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogues, IV, ch. 58 (the sacramental union: "unum ... non natura, sed sacramento").
22. St. Thomas Aquinas, Sequence "Lauda Sion," for the Feast of Corpus Christi (Prosa Missae Venerabilis Sacramenti).
23. St. Augustine, Tractates on John, Tract. 27 (and elsewhere).
24. St. Thomas, in the same place as above ["ubi sup.", abbreviation as in source].
25. Thomas of Walden [Thomas Netter of Walden], Tom. 2, De Sacramentis, ch. 76 and following [abbreviation as in source].
26. St. Basil, Hexaameron, Hom. 6; St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa II, ch. 7.
27. Hymn "Adoro te devote," traditionally attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas.
28. "A certain John" — author not clearly identified in the source; analogy of Gen. 27:22 ("the voice is Jacob's, but the hands are Esau's").
29. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogical Catechesis 4.
30. St. Ambrose, De mysteriis, ch. 9.
31. St. Ambrose, as cited by Peter Lombard, the Master, in the text [as in source].
32. Domingo de Soto, *In II Sententiarum*, dist. 9, q. 2, a. 1.
33. St. Thomas Aquinas, Sermon "De venerabili sacramento Eucharistiae," Opusc. 57.
34. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 75, a. 3.
35. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 77, aa. 3–6.
36. Innocent III, De Officio Missae IV, ch. 11; Alexander of Hales [as in source]; St. Bonaventure [as in source]; Cajetan [as in source]; Domingo de Soto [as in source].
37. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79 [per: cum — abbreviation as in source].
38. Above, Distinctio 11.
39. Council of Florence, Decree on the Sacrament of the Eucharist.
40. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 2; Session 13, canon 5.
41. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 14 on the Passion of the Lord.
42. Fourth Lateran Council, cap. 1.

43. St. Augustine, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* II, ch. 6; Pseudo-Augustine, *Tractatus De Quarta Feria*, ch. 4. Editor's note in the source: the Benedictine Fathers, in their edition of St. Augustine's works, reckon this treatise as genuine and printed it accordingly, although Erasmus had relegated it among the doubtful.
44. St. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* V, ch. 4; IV, ch. 5. St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem IV, on ch. 17; also IV, on ch. 13 and following; and X, ch. ... [abbreviation as in source]. John Gerson, *Expositio Cantici Beatae Virginis*.
45. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 8; III, q. 80, a. 4–5.
46. St. Augustine, *Tractatus* 26 in Iohannem.
47. 1 Cor. 11:28.
48. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 4–5.
49. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 7; Session 13, canon 11.
50. Cajetan [abbreviation as in source]; Domingo de Soto [abbreviation as in source]; Adrian VI, In IV Sent. [abbreviation as in source].
51. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 4.
52. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 3, section "Theoria seu Contemplatio." On the interpretation of this passage see Denis Petau (Petavius), *Theologica Dogmata* IV, on Public Penance and the Energumens, cap. XVI, and the critique of Antoine Arnauld in his work on Frequent Communion; Petavius argues that Dionysius, by those whom he calls "not yet altogether cleansed, and not uniform," means the "Second Order" penitents (*Audientes*) and Energumens, whom the Bishop dismissed with blessings and certain rites, whereas Arnauld had rendered "those not yet perfectly pure" as "not yet entirely freed from phantasms" and applied it to an interior state. Petavius contends that Dionysius refers to canonical ecclesiastical grades; see also Petavius, *De Poenitentia Publica* I, 3, and the remarks gathered there against Arnauld's opinion. We record Petavius's view without adjudicating the whole question; what matters for Estius's point is that, by ancient practice, even mere vision of the sacred rites was not indiscriminately granted to all.
53. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 2.
54. The long Dionysian paraphrase and its application to catechumens, penitents of the various orders, and energumens are condensed here from Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 3, "Theoria" (contemplation), and from later commentators. Estius appends extended notes on Petavius's refutation of Arnauld's reading of Dionysius and on the discipline regarding the presence of catechumens and penitents during the sacred mysteries; see Petavius, *Theologica Dogmata* IV; also Alexander VII's censures on propositions about frequent communion and sacramental confession [abbreviations as in the source].
55. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* I-II, q. 19, a. 6; and see III, q. 80, a. 4 [abbreviation as in source].
56. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 3.
57. Matt. 10:28; cf. Ps. 118[119]:120 Vulg.: "Confige timore tuo carnes meas."
58. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 73, a. 3; III, q. 80, a. 11.
59. Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24–25.
60. 1 Cor. 11:26.
61. St. Cyprian, Ep. II (Ep. 3) [abbreviation as in source]; St. Basil, *Regulae morales* 21, ch. 3; St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Joannem XII, on Jn. 6:58.
62. Roman Canon: "Pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt... Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui..."; cf. Lev. 17; 2 Chron. 30; 2 Chron. 35.
63. Pope Fabian, decree as in Gratian, *De consecratione*, Dist. 3, "Non frequentius" [abbreviation as in source]; Council of Agde, canon 81 [abbreviation as in source].
64. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), constitution *Omnis utriusque sexus*; Council of Trent, Session 13, canon 9.
65. St. John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio*; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI; Council of Nicaea I, canon 13; Council of Ancyra, cap. 6; Council of Carthage IV, canons 77–78; Arausican Synod [abbreviations as in source]; Justin Martyr, *Apology* ["Dialog. 2" in source].

66. Many noted and distinguished Authors indeed teach that there is a precept of divine law that the faithful who are adults receive the Eucharist; a sentence we judge so probable that, as they say, we count it almost among morally certain ones. We refrain from setting out the reasons both lest we be too long, and because those things which we write here and above at Distinction 10 sufficiently demonstrate our view and show it to have been that also of the Church from the very beginning. Among others, see the very learned Gaspar [abbreviation as in source], *De Sacramentis*, Dissert. 4 (Quaest. IX, cap. ...) [abbreviation as in source].
67. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 73, a. 3; III, q. 80, a. 9.
68. St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent., dist. 12, n. 77; Peter a Soto, *De sacramento Eucharistiae*, bk. 8.
69. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, ch. 2, 24; III, chs. 4, 12; *De peccato originali*, ch. 18; *Contra Julianum* III, ch. 12; *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* IV, ch. 4; Ep. 106; Ep. 107; *Sermo 8 de verbis Apostoli*; *Hypognosticon* V, ch. 5.
70. Pope Innocent I, Ep. 93, cited in Augustine [abbreviation as in source].
71. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I, chs. 19, 21, 22; II, ch. 28; *Contra Julianum* III, ch. 25; *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* I, ch. 22; Ep. 106.
72. The old custom about Infants—by which they were sometimes given the Sacrament of the Eucharist—is brought in by some modern Writers to prove a precept of divine law and the necessity of the Eucharist, as if, equally as with the Latins, the same opinion had long prevailed in the East, that is, that the Eucharist must be given to infants after Baptism; which error some Theologians call the necessity of the Eucharist in voto for infants already baptized. The same Author refutes this error in the place cited, where he teaches that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is not necessary to infants by divine law, and that the Fathers defend this in a different way, and with different reasons: some indeed say that the Eucharist is necessary in voto (as is taught in St. Thomas, III, q. 73); others that in the Orient certain modern Writers have taught this error, that even infants who have received Baptism must also receive the Eucharist, which opinion he shows at large to be alien from the clearest places of Augustine and from his mind; see furthermore Gaspar [abbreviation as in source], and Estius's notes on the Sacrament [abbreviations as in source].
73. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 80, a. 10; q. 83, a. 2 [abbreviation as in source].
74. St. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* IV, ch. 6; V, ch. 4; VI, ch. 5. Cf. St. Augustine, *Sermon 28, De verbis Domini*.
75. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John*, book 4, ch. 17.
76. St. Gregory the Great, *Hom. 37 in Evangelia*; *Dialogues* IV, ch. 56.
77. Ps. 101: "Aruit cor meum, quia oblitus sum comedere panem meum."
(a) The author's doctrine about communion either more rarely or more frequently, so exact, so consonant to the mind and practice of the Church, strengthened by the testimonies of all the Fathers and Doctors—would that the writers of our age, whether too rigid and almost severe, or too indulgent and well-nigh lax, had attended to it. The former so far reduced the law of first communion that they judged it was not to be granted even once a year, or at Easter, to those who take no care to purge themselves, although they had not attained the height of sanctity, denying it even to the relapsing, to those turning back into a proximate occasion, to the negligent, indeed even to those living after the manner of the Gentiles, and failed to dwell upon the instruction to be given in refuting these. Against both, the Holy See has provided by its Decree on Daily Communion of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, issued 12 February 1679, which by its authority it confirmed and by its command ordered to be published and printed. Likewise the most holy Pontiff, to meet the too great laxity of certain Casuists, affixed the black theta to propositions which accompany that license; among which is to be reckoned proposition LVI, of this tenor: "To live like the Gentiles is a mark of predestination." See Dionysius Petavius, *Theologica Dogmata* IV, On Preparation for Communion, concerning Frequent Confession and Communion, even in those who are less sensibly moved, and on the interpreter of the Council of Trent.
78. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 85; likewise III, qq. 82–83. Also the Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 85, a. 1. Acts 14. St. Augustine, *Sermon 101, De diversis*.
79. Exod. 12.
80. 1 Cor. 11:26. On the etymology of "Eucharist" as thanksgiving.
81. Council of Ephesus, Epistle to Nestorius (the Fathers of the universal Synod).
82. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 1; on 1 Cor. 10.
83. Heb. 13:10. On the discipline excluding catechumens from the mysteries, see ancient liturgical practice.

84. Acts 13:2; the Greek leitourgountōn ("ministering") = "sacrificing"; Erasmus, ad loc.
85. Lk. 22:15; Exod. 12:21; 1 Cor. 5:7.
86. Lk. 22:19–20 (Greek: "which is given for you"; "which is shed for you"); 1 Cor. 11:24.
87. Exod. 24:8; cf. Matt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20.
88. St. Cyprian, Ep. 63 (old numbering lib. 2, ep. 3): On the Sacrament of the Lord's Chalice.
89. Eusebius of Caesarea, Demonstratio evangelica V, ch. 3; VIII, ch. 2.
90. Eusebius of Emesa, Homily 5 De Paschate [homily so titled].
91. St. Ambrose, De sacramentis IV, chs. 3 and 7; De initiandis, ch. 9.
92. St. Epiphanius, Panarion (Haer.) II, 55.
93. St. Jerome, Quaestiones in Genesim 14; Commentary on Matt. 26; and the commentary ascribed to him on Ps. 109.
94. St. John Chrysostom, Oration 4 Against the Jews.
95. St. Augustine, Exposition on Ps. 33, Sermon 1; on Ps. 106; on Ps. 109; City of God XVI, ch. 35; Contra adversarios legis et prophetarum II, ch. 20; Epistle 95.
96. Eucherius of Lyons, lib. 2 In Genesim.
97. Arnobius the Younger, on Ps. 109.
98. The Venerable Bede, on Lk. 22.
99. St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 14.
100. Theophylact, on Heb. 5.
101. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 1.
102. St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses IV, ch. 32.
103. St. Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho.
104. St. Cyprian, Adversus Judaeos, ch. 16.
105. Eusebius of Caesarea, Demonstratio evangelica I, ch. 6, and the last chapter.
106. St. Jerome and Theodoret, on Malachi 1.
107. St. Augustine, City of God XVIII, ch. 35; XIX, ch. 25; Contra adversarios legis et prophetarum I, chs. 20 and 22; on Ps. 106.
108. Dan. 11:31; 12:11.
109. On the antiquity of the Liturgies of James, Mark, Basil, and Chrysostom: John Cardinal Bona, Rerum liturgicarum libri, esp. De Apostolorum Liturgiis (cap. VIII), discusses the most ancient monuments; he judges several of those liturgies, under those names, to be at least doubtful in their present form. See also his treatment of Eastern and other Churches' liturgies (ibid., lib. 2, cap. XI).
110. St. Thomas, "locis supra citatis" [abbreviation as in source].
111. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei X, ch. 6. Ps. 50[51]. Rom. 12. Phil. 2. Rom. 15. Phil. 4. Heb. 13.
112. Council of Trent, Session 22, canon 1.
113. The Master of the Sentences, IV, dist. 12 (sense cited); St. John Chrysostom, Homily 17 on Hebrews.
114. St. John Chrysostom, Homily on Judas; Homily 6 to the people of Antioch.
115. St. Thomas, In I ad Corinthios, cap. 11, lect. 5.
116. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 24 on 1 Cor. 10: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?"
117. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3.
118. Matt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20.

119. St. Augustine, Quaestiones in Leviticum, q. 57.
120. Roman Canon of the Mass, "ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione..."; see also the Secret prayers of the Roman Missal.
121. Roman Canon of the Mass: "Unde et memores... offerimus praeclarae majestati tuae hostiam puram..."
122. St. Thomas, "ubi sup." [abbreviation as in source].
123. Gen. 14; Josephus, Antiquitates [abbreviation as in source]; St. Ambrose, De sacramentis IV, ch. 3; St. Epiphanius, Haer. 55; St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on Genesis; Ps. 109[110]:4.
124. Heb. 6:20–7:28; 8:3–4; 9:11–28; 10:11–14, 18.
125. Heb. 7; 10.
126. Ps. 49; Ps. 50; Is. 1; Is. 66; Hos. 6; Matt. 9; Jn. 4; 1 Pet. 2.
127. St. Augustine, Epistula 23 [to Boniface]. Gratian, *Decretum*, c. "Semel immolatus."
128. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 17 on Hebrews. Gratian, *Decretum*, c. "In Christo." The Master of the Sentences, in the text on this place [abbreviation as in source].
129. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* VII, ch. 31; *Contra Faustum* XX, chs. 18, 21; *Contra adversarios legis et prophetarum* I, chs. 18–20; Sermon 29 on the Words of the Lord.
130. Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, chs. 2, 10.
131. Gratian, *Decretum*, c. "Jacobus frater Domini," citing the Sixth Council [Constantinople III].
132. Gen. 14. St. Jerome's Vulgate rendering "protulit." 1 Sam. 9. Is. 64:5. Gen. 22:12. Ps. 59:13; 107:13.
133. Heb. 5:11.
134. Rom. 8:34; Heb. 5; 7.
135. 1 Cor. 11:34. St. Augustine, Epistle 118, ch. 6.
136. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 83, a. 4, ad 9.
137. St. Gregory the Great, Hom. 8 and 21 on the Gospels; Epiphanius Scholasticus [abbreviation as in source]; Pope Vigilius, Epistle to Eleutherius, ch. 5; Pope Felix IV, Epistle 1, ch. 1; Pope Leo I, Epistle 81; St. Augustine, Sermon 237 on the Seasons; Council of Carthage II, ch. 3; Council of Milevis, ch. 12; Council of Agde, ch. 21; St. Ambrose, Epistle 33; Damasus, on Sixtus, Alexander, and Telesphorus [abbreviation as in source].
138. Popes Fabian, Soter, Pius, Hyginus, and Alexander, in their decrees [abbreviation as in source]; St. Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Smyrnaeans; St. Clement of Rome, Epistle 2; (Pseudo-)Dionysius, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3.
139. Deut. 16.
140. On Greek terms see the usage Litourgia, Hierourgia, etc. [general reference].
141. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis II, part 8, ch. 14; the Master of the Sentences, Dist. 24 of this book [abbreviation as in source].
142. St. Cyprian, De bono patientiae; Rule of St. Benedict, chs. 9, 12, 13, 16, 17; John Cassian, De institutis coenobiorum III, chs. 7–8.
143. Council of Carthage, ch. 84; Council of Valencia, can. 1 ["Valentinum (can. 1.)" in the source]; St. Augustine, Sermon 237; St. Gregory the Great, Dialogues II, ch. 23; St. Isidore of Seville and Durandus, Rationale of Divine Offices [abbreviation as in source].
144. St. Ambrose, on Matt. 25 [abbreviation as in source]; St. Isidore of Seville; Durandus, Rationale of Divine Offices; and others who treat the reasons of the divine offices [abbreviation as in source].
145. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 83, ad 1.
146. Council of Trent, Session 22, canon 3.
147. St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei XVII, ch. 20.
148. St. Augustine, Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum I, chs. 18–19.

149. St. Augustine, Epistle 50, quaest. 5.
150. St. John Chrysostom; Theophylact; Oecumenius, Commentaries on 1 Timothy 2 [abbreviation as in source].
151. Epiphanius, Epistle to John of Jerusalem, translated by St. Jerome; in Jerome, Epistle 60.
152. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogues IV, ch. 55 and the following.
153. St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels 37.
154. St. Augustine, Epistle 110; cf. alternate numbering: CCXXIII in the same collection [editorial note as in source].
155. St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei VIII, ch. 8.
156. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 3.
157. St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei X.
158. Eusebius of Caesarea, Oratio ad coetum sanctorum, ch. 12.
159. St. Gregory the Great, Moralia in Iob XXIII, ch. 1.
160. St. Cyprian, Ad Demetrianum.
161. Editorial note in the source: The author's doctrine is to be understood in this way when he says that sacrifice can be offered for the excommunicated, provided their names are kept unmentioned—according to the doctrine he proposes in this book (Dist. XVIII, Quest. 3), and according to St. Thomas, whose view is commonly received by the commentators (cf. ad 1 in the place cited): namely, that for the excommunicated no public prayer is made among the prayers that are made for the members of the Church; yet for them some suffrage may be made for their conversion by the intention of the priest as a private person. Hence it is commonly added that the priest, as a private person, can direct his intention on their behalf, though, as the person of the Church, he ought to pray for the faithful departed in faith and charity.
162. Tertullian, De corona militis.
163. St. Augustine, De cura pro mortuis gerenda, ch. 1; and Sermon 32, De verbis Apostoli.
164. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 69 ad populum Antiochenum; Hom. 21 in Acta; Hom. 3 in Epist. ad Philippenses.
165. Epiphanius, Panarion; St. Augustine, De haeresibus.
166. St. Augustine, Epistle 59 (= Epistle 143 in the Benedictine edition), question 5.
167. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 2; ch. 6.
168. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 83, a. 5, ad 12.
169. St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels 37; St. Gregory the Great, Epistles II, ep. 9; St. Augustine, City of God XXII, ch. 8; St. Augustine, Epistle 118, ch. 2; Paulinus of Nola, Life of St. Ambrose; Prudentius, Hymn on St. Hippolytus; St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on Ephesians 3; Homilies to the People of Antioch 61; Gregory Nazianzen as cited in Historia Tripartita IX, ch. 8; Leontius, Life of John the Almsgiver; Pope Soter, Epistola decretalis [abbreviation as in source]; Council of Mainz, can. 43; Council of Agde, can. 14 and 31; Council of Orléans, can. 28; Gratian, De consecratione [abbreviation as in source]; Pope Fabian, Cap. Et si una [as cited by Gratian]; Council of Elvira, Dist. 2, Omnis homo; First Council of Toledo, ch. 13; John Gerson, on the Canticle of the Virgin; St. Bernard, De gradibus humilitatis, at the end.
170. S. Thom. ubi sup. [abbreviation as in source].
171. St. Cyprian, Epistles II, ep. 3.
172. St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on 1 Corinthians (on 1 Cor. 11); Theophylact, Commentary on 1 Corinthians (on 1 Cor. 11); Apostolic Canons, canon 10; Pope Anacletus, Decretal Epistle [abbreviation as in source]; Council of Antioch, canon 2; St. Gregory the Great, Dialogues II, ch. 23; St. Jerome, Epistle to Hedibia, q. 2; St. Augustine, Epistle 118; St. Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Smyrnaeans; St. Basil, Homily on Psalm 115; St. Augustine, De Trinitate IV, ch. 14.

DISTINCTIO XIII — WHO IS THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST (*QUIS SIT MINISTER SACRAMENTI EUCARISTIAE*)

§ 1. The ministry (*ministerium*) of the sacrament of the Eucharist (*Sacramentum Eucharistiae*) is twofold, one which consists in consecrating and offering (*consecrando, offerendo*), the other in distributing or dispensing (*distribuendo seu dispensando*). The power for the former ministry is had by every priest and by him alone who has been ordained according to the rite of the Church, inasmuch as to him, and to no other, in his ordination it is said: "Receive the power of offering sacrifice," and the rest, as is in the Florentine Decree on the Sacraments.² The most certain foundation of this doctrine is in the Gospel, where Christ, instituting this sacrament, conferred the power of its consecration and offering upon the Apostles alone, saying: "Do this," through whom thereafter, by legitimate ordination, He willed it to be communicated to their successors, that is, to all and only presbyters. Of this there is read in the Lateran Synod under Innocent III as follows: "This sacrament of the Eucharist no one can confect, unless he be a priest duly ordained according to the keys of the Church which Jesus Christ Himself granted to the Apostles and to their successors." Thus there.³

§ 2. Nor indeed must it be doubted that this is the perpetual doctrine of the Church, and so certain that not even deacons, who are by dignity next to presbyters, are ever read to have usurped to themselves, even out of ambition, this office of consecrating and offering—though in some other matters they sometimes preferred themselves to presbyters, as is clear from the canons and from St. Jerome. But if testimonies of this matter be required from Councils and from earlier Fathers, first there occurs the third canon of the Apostles, which, prescribing what is to be offered upon the altar, prescribes it to bishops and presbyters alone.⁴ Next, the First Nicene Synod (canon 18) forbidding that a deacon should hand the sacred communion to presbyters: "This," it says, "neither rule nor custom has handed down, that those who have not the power of sacrifice should hand the Body of Christ to those who offer." A similar thing is decreed by canon 25 of the Council of Laodicea.⁵ In this way all the Fathers also have taught, by name Dionysius (cap. 5 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy), Tertullian (book On the Crown of the Soldier), Justin (in the Second Apology), Epiphanius (Heresy 57, and in the Letter to John of Jerusalem), Jerome (in the Letter to Evagrius, and in the Dialogue against the Luciferians), Hesychius (book 2 on Leviticus 8), Chrysostom (book 3 On the Priesthood, ch. 5), where he says that this office is so proper to priests alone that not even to the heavenly spirits has it been granted.⁶ There also exists the Letter of Cyril of Alexandria to Atticus, in Nicephorus, book 14 of the Histories, ch. 27, in which he most expressly teaches this very thing.⁷

§ 3. Now as concerns the other ministry, namely of dispensing the Body and Blood of the Lord, that too is proper to the priest. For since the priest consecrates the Eucharist in the person of Christ, reason shows that, just as Christ Himself not only consecrated but also handed it to the disciples, so likewise the priest should do, being appointed in the stead of Christ. Nevertheless, because the deacon, as the one nearest to the priestly

Order, partakes of something of its office, it was granted to him formerly—especially where the multitude of the people was greater—to dispense to the people the Body and Blood of the Lord; yet, as some are willing to have it, the blood rather than the body, for the reason that the blood is contained in a vessel, so that it was not necessary to touch it with the hands (which the deacon does not have consecrated), as it would be necessary to touch the body, although this difference—though St. Thomas urges it in the Third Part (q. 82, a. 3)—is not found to be founded in the sacred canons, inasmuch as they grant indifferently to deacons the dispensation of either species.⁸ Which ought by no means to seem a wonder, since it is read that even laymen at times were permitted to carry the Lord's Body home with them and, when it was opportune, to take it, as is clear from the Oration of St. Ambrose on the death of Satyrus his brother, and from other things which above at Distinctio 10 were said about keeping the Eucharist.⁹ Moreover, the places of the Fathers which commit the dispensing of either or of one species are Justin (at the end of the Second Apology), Cyprian (in the Sermon On the Lapsed), Ambrose book 1 of the Duties, ch. 41, treating of Lawrence, and Prudentius (in the Hymn on the same), and likewise Pope Leo (in the Sermon delivered on the solemnity of the same Lawrence), and also the Fourth Council of Carthage, at which St. Augustine was present (canon 38). To these add the Letter or tract of an uncertain Author On the Seven Orders of the Church, found under the name of Jerome, although that Author seems to attribute too much to deacons—namely, that which the Nicene canon 18, and thereafter the Laodicean 25, abrogated as not to be borne.¹⁰ But what is read in Tertullian (ch. 3 of On the Crown of the Soldier): "The sacrament of the Eucharist we receive from no other hands than those of the presidents," some so take as to include under the name "presidents" the deacons also. Yet Justin, using the same word (in the Second Apology), manifestly signifies that the "President" is different from the deacons or ministers.¹¹ Wherefore the sense of Tertullian seems to be that the Eucharist is to be received only from the hand of priests—since even deacons could not dispense it to the people except when received from a priest as the proper minister for dispensing it, and only by his order, as the Carthaginian canon has it. Whence the Fathers of the Council of Trent (session 23, ch. 1) reckon the power of ministering the Body and Blood of the Lord among those things that are proper to the priestly Order.¹² But concerning both ministries already mentioned, some points will also have to be said below at Distinctio 24, in which the sacrament of Order is treated.

§ II — A reply to certain arguments to the contrary (Ad quaedam in contrarium argumenta responsio.)

§ 4. Leaving aside the arguments of the heretics, who so commend that internal priesthood which is common to all Christians that by it they try to abolish this external priesthood of which we are now speaking (for a more fitting place for discussing this is around the sacrament of Order), we shall now reply to those arguments which would persuade us that the power of consecrating and offering the sacrament of the Eucharist can belong to others besides Presbyters. First, they say, that saying, "Do this," etc., is not the concern of the Apostles and their successors alone, but of all the faithful, as the Apostle to the Corinthians seems to give occasion to interpret; therefore, if by those words the power of consecrating was given, it will be common to all the faithful. Secondly: Just as it was said to the Apostles alone, "Do this," etc., so it was said to them alone, "Go, baptize." Yet notwithstanding that, this power of baptizing can be committed to others; therefore so too that of consecrating. Thirdly: St. Ambrose in book 1 of the Offices (ch. 41) makes the Deacon Lawrence thus eloquent in speech to Pope Sixtus: "Make trial whether you have chosen a fit minister, to whom you have

committed the consecration of the Lord's Blood; to whom you grant a share in the consummating of the sacraments, to this man you deny a share in your blood?"¹⁴ Fourthly: the Master in the text, citing St. Augustine, recites these words: "It is called a 'Mass' because the heavenly envoy (for which other copies have 'the heavenly messenger') comes to consecrate the life-giving body." The same the Master repeats in his own words at the end of Distinction 14; therefore it seems to belong rather, or more principally, to an Angel than to a man to consecrate this sacrament.¹⁵

§ 5. But to these we briefly reply. To the first: in those words of the Lord, "Do this," etc., there is contained something which pertains to the Apostles alone and their successors the priests, namely to consecrate, offer, and minister the Body and Blood of the Lord; there is also contained something which pertains indiscriminately to the faithful, namely to receive, to eat, to drink, and to do this in commemoration of the Lord's death. And in this part the Apostle so interpreted those words of the Lord that they also pertain to the laity.

§ 6. To the second: Baptism and the Eucharist do not have a like account. For Baptism, on account of its supreme necessity, has been instituted in such a way that its ministry can both be committed to others, and, moreover, is valid even if someone has attempted to administer it without a lawful commission—as we have shown in its proper place. But since the Eucharist is not of such necessity, but on the contrary is a sacrament of much greater reverence, it ought to have been instituted in such a way that it could not be committed to others, but that the power of confecting it would depend on ecclesiastical ordination.

§ 7. To the third it is answered that Ambrose's words are to be taken transitively, and have this sense: "To whom you have committed the consecration of the Lord's Blood," that is, the Lord's Blood, once consecrated, to be dispensed to the faithful. Whence, as if expounding this, the Church in the Divine Office changed the name "consecration" into "dispensation"; according to the Roman use: "that the consecration of the body and blood may be for us who receive unto life eternal." The "share in the consummating of the sacraments" is understood of the ministry of assisting at the sacred altar and of dispensing the Mysteries to the people; which Leo (in the sermon cited above) calls "the ministry of the sacraments."¹⁶

§ 8. To the last: those words are not Augustine's, but are taken from a certain sermon of an uncertain author On the Body of Christ. Yet Innocent III rightly, and according to the Master's mind, so interprets them as said not of just any angel, but of Christ, who is the Angel of great counsel and the supreme Priest, by His invisible power assisting, for the perfecting of the sacrament, him whom He has as His vicar and minister in that office.¹⁷ That the Master wishes this is clear from this, that he names "the heavenly envoy" (for thus the more correct copies have it), namely Him who, in John, is signified by Siloam, that is Christ the Lord, of whom Augustine: "Unless He had been sent, no one would be dismissed from iniquity."¹⁸

§ III — That the Eucharist is confected by any evil priest whatsoever (Eucharistiam a malo quocumque sacerdote confici.)

§ 9. Since, when treating of the sacraments in general (as above also in Distinction 1), we have shown that the effect of the sacraments does not depend on the quality of the minister, this must be understood not only of the grace which is conferred on those receiving the sacrament, but also of the effect of consecration, such as this sacrament of the Eucharist requires. Therefore, to the question which the Master treats as the chief one in this Distinction, one must answer simply that priests of every sort, and however evil, even heretics and

schismatics and excommunicates—although they sin grievously, in such a state thrusting themselves into the divine Mysteries—yet truly do confect or consecrate this sacrament, provided that neither on the part of the words which they use for consecrating nor on the part of intention does any impediment exist. For we have likewise shown above (at Distinction 1) that even heretics and unbelievers can have the intention necessary to the substance of the sacrament, that is, the general intention of doing what the Church does.

§ 10. Now the reason of the present doctrine is that the priest does not confect this sacrament by his own power, but by the power of Christ, who is a Priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek, and he consecrates as minister in His person. Nor does one cease to be a minister of Christ as regards the external dispensation of the mysteries of God because he is evil—since Scripture acknowledges not only good but also evil ministers of God (Matt. 24; 1 Cor. 4). Then, as to those who are outside the Church: if they are truly priests, ordained according to the rite of the Church, since the consecration of the Eucharist is an act consequent upon the power of Order, they consecrate just as truly as if they were within the Church. And the same judgement is to be made of the degraded; for just as the power of Order once conferred can be taken away neither by heresy, nor by schism, nor by excommunication, nor, finally, by degradation, so neither can any other power impede it—although, with the prohibition of a superior supervening, as has been said, they who consecrate in such a state sin most grievously. Indeed, nor can it be the case that what they do is less valid, since it is impeded by no power of the Church.

§ 11. Moreover, this doctrine, both generally concerning evil men, and specially concerning those who are separated from the Church, can be proved from the Fathers in various ways, and most of all from Augustine, who defended against the Donatists the truth of the sacraments which are conferred by heretics. But because (above, at Distinction 2) this argument was treated expressly, it will suffice here to add only a few points proper to this place. Augustine, book 5 (Against the Donatists, ch. 20), refuting among other things the sentence of Cyprian objected to him by his adversaries, says: "Now as to the words which proceed from the mouth of a murderer, nevertheless God can be present with the oil of the sacrifice upon the altar which the heretics have set up—this I do not know, unless perhaps that the heart of a man, turned deceitfully within, is not impeded by the wood (that is, the altar) deceitfully placed without, so that the sacrament be present—He who is hindered by no deceit of men deigns to be present." And what follows; in which the Eucharist also is expressly named. Augustine is speaking of heretics, that is, of those constituted outside the Church: a fact which not only the very words plainly signify, but even the writer's intent clearly proves. For he is arguing against those who, following Cyprian as their authority, were maintaining that the things which were done in the Church by evil ministers were not ministered by the Church, but by those who were evil.

§ 12. On this rock (in this Distinction) even the Master strikes, but only as regards this sacrament of the Eucharist; for he thinks that those, indeed, who are within truly consecrate the Eucharist, but that the excommunicates or those manifestly branded with heresy do not; because, he says, no one in the very consecration says "I offer," but "We offer," as from the person of the Church. "And therefore, whereas other sacraments can be celebrated outside the Church, in the case of this one it does not seem so." And again: "If a heretic dared to usurp this Mystery, would God send an Angel from heaven to consecrate his oblation?" And what follows. This opinion of the Master cannot, assuredly, be defended from error. Now the argument by which he is moved, together with the other arguments that are wont to be objected, we have dissolved above (at the Distinction named).

§ 13. Another passage of Augustine is found in Epistle 48 (to Vincent the Donatist), in which he thus addresses the Donatist heretics: "From the Catholic Church are all the Lord's Sacraments which you have and give, just as we had and gave them before you went out from there."²⁰ He writes similarly in book 2 (Against the Epistle of Parmenian, ch. 13). Still other numerous places, partly from Augustine, partly from others, are gathered by Gratian in his Decretum, Causa 1 (Quaest. 1); add also the final chapter of Quaest. 15 and the chapter Utrum, in De Consecratione, Distinct. 2.²¹ All these clearly show that sentence of John Wyclif, in which he said that a Bishop or a Priest existing in mortal sin does not ordain, does not consecrate, does not confect, does not baptize, was rightly condemned by the Fathers of the Council of Constance as one of his articles. Which condemnation the Fathers of Trent repeated (Session 7, canon 12) with these words: "If anyone says that a minister being in mortal sin—provided he has observed all the essentials that pertain to the confecting or the conferring of a sacrament—does not confect or confer a sacrament, let him be anathema."²²

§ IV — Whether the Mass of a good priest is better than that of a bad (An melior sit missa boni quam mali sacerdotis)

§ 14. It is commonly, and not without profit, asked here whether in the Mass (*Missa*) the Mass of a good priest is better, that is, avails more for spiritual fruit (*fructus spiritualis*), than that of a bad priest. In reply to this question St. Thomas applies a twofold distinction.²³ First, in the Mass two things can be considered: the sacrament (*sacramentum*), which is the principal thing; and the prayers which in the Mass are poured forth by the priest for the faithful, living and dead. Therefore, as regards the sacrament—since in every Mass one and the same thing is consecrated and offered, namely the very Body and Blood of the Lord—the Mass of a good priest does not avail more than that of a bad priest. But as regards the priest's prayer, again there is need of a distinction. For the prayer that is made in the Mass can be considered in a twofold way. In one way, insofar as it has efficacy from the devotion of the priest who prays. In this respect there is no doubt that the Mass of a good priest is better, that is, more fruitful. In another way, insofar as the same prayer is uttered by the priest in the person of the whole Church, of which he is a minister, even if he is bad. Hence in this respect the prayer of a bad priest (whom in this place we understand to be one who is in mortal sin) is fruitful not only in the Mass but also at other times whenever he prays as a minister of the Church.

§ 15. From which it follows that, although both on the side of the sacrament and on the side of the Church, in whose person the prayers are made, there is equality, nevertheless on the side of the one who offers and prays inequality arises; so that, all things simply considered, one must admit that the Mass of a good priest is better than that of a bad. Moreover, by the same reasoning it is shown that the Mass of a better priest is better than that of one less good, and indeed it can happen that of the same priest one Mass is better than another—not only because at a different time he himself is better or less good than himself, but also because at one time he prays and offers more devoutly than at another.

§ 16. Alexander the Pope confirms this doctrine with the words found in Gratian, Causa 1, Quaest. 1, chapter Ipse Sacerdotes: "The priests themselves intercede for the people, and they eat the sins of the people, because by their prayers they blot them out and consume them. And the more worthy they are, the more easily in the necessities for which they cry out they are heard."²⁴ For it is clear enough that the Pontiff there is speaking of the prayers that are made in the Mass, from that statement: "they eat the sins of the people." For just as under the Old Law the priests were said to "eat the sins of the people" when they lived off the sacrifices

that were offered by the people for sins, so under the New Law the priests "eat the sins of the people" when they receive alms from the faithful to offer for their sins the sacrifice of the Mass (*Missae sacrificium*).

§ 17. But against these things there seems to stand the general doctrine concerning the sacraments (*sacramenta*), whose effect in no way depends upon the quality of the minister—just as we showed above in Distinct. 1, where we treated of the ministers of the sacraments.²⁵ Now the same reason seems to apply to sacrament and sacrifice (*sacrificium*). For just as the sacrament works not from the minister's merit but from the power and merit of Christ, so too does this sacrifice. But one must answer that the formal character is not the same in both. For the sacrament signifies the bare action of the minister toward the recipient, insofar as it has been instituted by Christ—such as a washing, an anointing, and the like. But sacrifice not only includes the consecration of the Eucharist, but also the oblation of the same, and, besides, those prayers which by the institution of the Church the priest recites in the Mass. And if these be considered as they are recited in the person of the Church, with the quality of the minister bracketed, they are of equal value when recited by a good and by a bad minister. But because in reality a good minister, as a member of the same Church, also adds to them his private devotion and pious affection, it comes about that in truth, simply speaking, they avail more. And this suffices for the Mass of a good priest to be accounted simply better, even insofar as it is a sacrifice—not indeed insofar as this name signifies the Host itself which is offered, but insofar as it denotes the action of the priest offering the Host; and this action has several parts, as we have said elsewhere. If, however, someone should doubt about the name "sacrifice," certainly there seems to be no room for doubt about it insofar as it is called "Mass" (*Missae*), a name which—as we noted above in the preceding Distinction—signifies the whole action of the priest as he is occupied about the sacrifice, which without doubt includes the prayers.²⁶ Whether moreover, and to what extent, even the effects of the sacraments receive some accession from the goodness and devotion of ministers, was said by us above in Distinct. 1, where we were treating of the ministers of the sacraments, and in Distinct. 4, where it was asked whether the effect of Baptism is equal in all.²⁷

§ V — Of which priests it is not permitted to hear the Masses (Quorum Sacerdotum Missas audire non liceat)

§ 18. What in general could be asked concerning the sacraments—by which ministers it is not permitted to receive them—this is opportunely asked in this place concerning the sacrifice of the Mass (*Missae*), because in the Church it is so daily and frequent that, with respect to it, far more than with respect to the other sacraments, this question finds its place. Therefore it is asked whether it is permitted to hear the Mass of a bad priest. Indeed, because it is not doubted that it is permitted to hear the Masses of certain bad priests and it is presupposed that of some it is not permitted to hear, the more precise question is: who are they from whose Masses one ought to abstain from hearing? To which, answering by a distinction, we say: For there are some who are cut off by the Church either through heresy or schism, or are otherwise by name excommunicated. From such, therefore, as it is not permitted to receive the sacraments, so neither is it permitted to hear their Masses. And a similar judgment is to be made of those who through ecclesiastical censure are suspended or degraded. The reason for this is evident, because by the fact that by the Church's sentence they are deprived of the exercise of Orders, at the same time it is forbidden to the faithful to receive the sacraments from them or to hear their Masses. It must, however, be noted that the Council of Constance adds to those who are by name excommunicated the notorious striker of a cleric, even if he has not been excommunicated by name. Now

"notorious" it understands of one whose deed is so manifest that by no pretext can it be concealed. And indeed, as regards heretics cut off from the Church, there exist many sacred canons that severely forbid their communion both in the sacrifice of the Mass and in the other sacraments—such as in 24, Quaest. 1, the chapters *Si quis dederit*, *Si quem forte*, *Coepit*; and in 1, Quaest. 1, *Superveniente*.²⁹ To this pertains what Gregory relates in book 3 of the *Dialogues*, chapter 31, and which is set down in the said canons: that Hermenegild, or Hermenegild, the son of the Arian king, when he would not admit to himself on the feast of Easter an Arian bishop who had been sent that he might receive from him the communion of the Lord's Body, was slain by his impious father and made a martyr.³⁰ Likewise what Theodoret relates, book 4 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 21, that a certain holy man named Moses could in no wise be induced to receive from an Arian bishop.³¹

§ 19. Moreover, there are others who indeed are evil, yet are still tolerated by the Church in their ministry; from whom, therefore, whether they be hidden sinners or manifest ones, it is not unlawful to receive the sacraments or to hear their Masses. For since their ministry is still tolerated, the one who communicates with them in the participation of the sacraments is to be judged not to be communicating with their sins, but rather with the Church herself, which uses them as ministers. Concerning this kind of evil ministers of the Church—that in the communion of the sacraments they are not to be avoided by us—St. Augustine teaches in various places, and most openly in book 1 against the *Epistle of Parmenian*, chapter 5.³² But here a twofold doubt occurs: one about the former part of the answer. For the same Augustine says in book 1 "*Against the Donatists*," chapter 2: "If perchance extreme necessity has compelled someone, where he has not found a Catholic by whom he might receive, and, with Catholic peace kept in his mind, he has received through someone placed outside the Catholic unity what he was going to receive in that same Catholic unity, and he has forthwith passed even from this life, we reckon him as nothing but Catholic. But if he shall have been delivered from bodily death, when to the Catholic congregation he shall also have rendered his bodily presence, whence he had never withdrawn in heart, not only do we not disapprove what he does, but we most securely and most truly also praise it," and so forth.³³ From which words it appears that at least in extreme necessity it is permitted to receive the sacraments from a heretic or from anyone cut off. The other doubt concerns the latter part. For Pope Nicholas, in Gratian (*Distinct. 32, cap. Nullus*), says: "Let no one hear the Mass of a priest whom he knows without doubt to have a concubine."³⁴ The same is confirmed by Alexander II (in the chapter immediately following, and by the things that are cited there from Urban).³⁵ From which it appears that among those whom the Church tolerates, some—namely public concubinarians—are to be avoided in the communion of the sacrifice.

§ 20. To the first doubt some reply that in extreme necessity this is altogether and simply licit, because, they say, necessity has no law. But it is more correct to reply by distinguishing. For if there is manifest danger of scandal, one ought rather to die without the sacrament—since in that case the reception of the sacrament is counted as impossible, because without the sin of scandal the opportunity of the sacrament cannot be had—

1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 82, a. 1 and a. 3.

2. Council of Florence, Decree on the Sacraments (*Decretum de sacramentis*).

3. Lateran Synod under Innocent III [abbreviation as in source]: "*Hoc Eucharistiae sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi Sacerdos fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves Ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit Apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus.*"

4. Apostolic Canons, canon 3.
5. Council of Nicaea I, canon 18; Council of Laodicea, canon 25.
6. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, ch. 5; Tertullian, *De corona militis*; Justin Martyr, *Apology II*; St. Epiphanius, *Panarion* (Heresy 57) and *Epistle to John of Jerusalem*; St. Jerome, *Epistle to Evagrius*; *Dialogue against the Luciferians*; Hesychius, *In Leviticum*, book 2, on ch. 8; St. John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio*, book 3, ch. 5.
7. St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle to Atticus*, in Nicephorus Callistus, *Historiae*, book 14, ch. 27.
8. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae III*, q. 82, a. 3.
9. St. Ambrose, *Oratio de obitu Satyri*.
10. Justin Martyr, *Apology II* (end); St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*; St. Ambrose, *De officiis I*, ch. 41 (on St. Lawrence); Prudentius, *Hymnus in S. Laurentium*; Pope St. Leo the Great, *Sermon on the feast of St. Lawrence*; Council of Carthage IV (canon 38); *Epistola or tract De VII Ordinibus Ecclesiae*, of uncertain authorship, found among the works of St. Jerome.
11. Tertullian, *De corona militis*, ch. 3; Justin Martyr, *Apology II*.
12. Council of Trent, Session 23, ch. 1.
13. St. Thomas, "ibidem" [abbreviation as in source].
14. St. Ambrose, *De officiis I*, ch. 41.
15. The Master, Peter Lombard, citing St. Augustine in the text and repeating the sense at the end of Dist. 14 [abbreviation as in source].
16. Pope St. Leo the Great, *Sermon on the feast of St. Lawrence*.
17. Innocent III, interpretation cited by Estius [as in source].
18. St. Augustine, "Nisi ille esset missus, nemo esset ab iniquitate dimissus" [quotation as in source].
19. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae III*, q. 82, a. 5, 7, 8.
20. St. Augustine, *Epistle 48 to Vincentius* (the Donatist).
21. Gratian, *Decretum*, Causa 1, Quaest. 1; also cap. ultimum of Quaest. 15; and cap. Utrum, *De consecratione*, Distinct. 2.
22. Council of Constance (1415), condemnation of Wyclif's articles; Council of Trent, Session 7, canon 12.
23. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae III*, q. 82, a. 6.
24. Gratian, *Decretum*, Causa 1, Quaest. 1, cap. Ipse Sacerdotes: "Ipse Sacerdotes pro populo interpellant..."; see also the continuation cited by Estius.
25. See above, Distinctio I of the present Book, on the ministers of the sacraments [reference as in source].
26. See above, the preceding Distinction [superior Distinctio, as in source].
27. See above, Distinctio I (on sacramental ministers), and Distinctio IV (on whether the effect of Baptism is equal in all) [references as in source].
28. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae III*, q. 82, a. 9.
29. Gratian, *Decretum*, 24, Quaest. 1, cap. Si quis dederit; cap. Si quem forte; cap. Coepit; and 1, Quaest. 1, cap. Superveniente.
30. St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi III*, ch. 31; the same narrative is reported in the canons cited.
31. Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica IV*, ch. 21.
32. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani I*, ch. 5.
33. St. Augustine, "Contra Donatistas," I, ch. 2 [abbreviation as in source].
34. Gratian, *Decretum*, Distinct. 32, cap. Nullus.
35. Alexander II, cap. proxime sequenti; and what is cited there from Urban [as in source].

DISTINCTIO XIV — ON THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE (*DE SACRAMENTO POENITENTIAE*)

§ 1. Peter of Palude holds and teaches this strictly.¹ We, however, say that St. Augustine is speaking of an extreme necessity outside the case of scandal.² It could also be said, saving the authority of Augustine, that such a one ought rather to die without Baptism than to receive it from a manifest heretic. Reply to the latter: that this had been established by ancient law, but that that rigor was remitted for just causes by a decree of the Council of Constance.³ Yet here one must carefully consider what in matters of this sort the law of nature counsels. For if the positive law of God or of the Church does not press a man to receive the sacrament or to hear the sacrifice of the Mass, very often even those who in the Church are notoriously criminal and living scandalously are to be avoided by the Faithful—both lest they be infected by the contagion of morals, and so that those men themselves may be put to shame for their evil way and be converted to the Lord through true penance, of which it is now henceforth ours to treat.

§ I — To explain the various appellations of the Sacrament of Penance (Sacramenti Poenitentiae variae appellationes explicare)

§ 2. Since such is the frailty of human nature contracted from the sin of the first parent, that few preserve the grace of Baptism received inviolate unto the day of death, and by no mortal sin repel it from themselves, the divine goodness in this part too of our salvation has mercifully taken counsel; appointing, namely, for the reconciliation of those who after Baptism had relapsed, the Sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum poenitentiae*). Of which we now treat actually in detail, and first we shall set forth by what names it was called among the Ancients, and what the reasons of the names are.

§ 3. Its most frequent name among the Latins is Penance (*poenitentia*), or the Sacrament of Penance, just as among the Greeks, metanoia (*metanoia*). And indeed the Latin vocable poenitentia does not properly signify a change of life, according to those who say that the best penance is a new life; but rather a displeasure at the deed conjoined with the effort to destroy what has been done. Hence, properly and directly, penance regards a past deed as to be abolished—as, in our case, the sin committed; and because it cannot be abolished and destroyed unless God remit it, but God has not decreed to remit unless man do those things which have been ordained by Him for obtaining the pardon of sin, the chief of which is to be converted to the Lord and to change one's life for the better: from this it follows that indirectly and by consequence penance also regards the newness of life.

§ 4. The Greek word metanoia, which in Latin you could scarcely render "trans-mentation," some think signifies the same as "repentance" (*resipiscentia*), that is, that affection of soul by which a man, after an error, comes to himself—namely, changes his life for the better. Urging this signification, the heretics have tried

from that word to teach that no other penance is required of us than that which consists in a change of life. To whom it can easily be answered that from the etymology of a name an efficacious argument is not to be sought, since it often happens that a word is used more broadly or more narrowly than its etymological account allows; and therefore one must rather look to the usage of that word, that is, to what is wont to be signified by it among the Greeks; and if this be inquired into, nothing else will be found than what among the Latins is signified by *poenitentia*, as can be shown both from sacred and from profane authors. A truer answer, however, is that even according to the etymon this word does not properly signify "repentance" (*resipiscentia*), but a change of mind from complacency—so to speak—in any deed whatever to displeasure at it, when namely that which pleased begins to displease, whether it was good or evil. For sometimes there is even "repentance" of a good thing. Whence what in the Gospel (Matt. 3) is said, *metanoete*, by force of the word does not have this sense: "Come to your senses," or "Change your life for the better," as some have translated, but this: "Let your soul be displeased with the life heretofore led, which until now has pleased." But that properly is to do penance. In which way our translator has rendered it most exactly.

§ 5. Therefore this sacrament is called the sacrament of penance (*sacramentum poenitentiae*), or *metanoia*, because it requires that sin be displeasing to a man, and that by true contrition and the other prescribed means a man destroy his sin. It is also called the sacrament of reconciliation from its effect. And the sacrament of confession from the conspicuous part, and one necessary before remission. At times it is also called the sacrament of absolution, as by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 14, canon 10), the name being taken from the act of the priest who utters the form of the sacrament—when he says: "I absolve you"—just as Baptism is named from the act of the baptizer saying: "I baptize you."⁵

§ 6. Furthermore, both Greeks and Latins call it "imposition of hands," from the external ceremony of the minister; which, however, just as it is not necessary by the necessity proper to the sacrament, so neither is it proper to this sacrament. For both Confirmation and Ordination are often called by the same name. And outside of the sacrament the same ceremony is wont not infrequently to be used. They ascribe that appellation to this sacrament Leo (Epistle 3), and the Lateran Council (canon 9).⁶

§ 7. Moreover, the more ancient writers, such as Tertullian and Cyprian, call it by the Greek name *exomologesis*, that is, confession; likewise "communication" or "communion" and "peace," because those reconciled through the work of penance were restored to the communion of the sacraments. The passages of Cyprian are in book 3 (Epistles 15, 16, 17). The Council of Trent likewise (Session 14, ch. 2) bears witness that penance was called by the Fathers a "laborious Baptism," on account of the rigor of satisfaction which this sacrament requires of penitents in comparison with Baptism.⁷

§ 8. Finally, it is often called by the Fathers "the second plank after shipwreck." Thus Jerome calls it (On Isaiah 3; and in Epistle 65 to Pammachius and Oceanus; and in the Epistle to Demetrias on preserving virginity); Ambrose (To the Fallen Virgin; at the beginning of the Exposition of Psalm 3); Pacian (Epistles 1 and 2 to Sympronianus); Tertullian (book On Penance); and, on Jerome's authority, the Master in the Text, Gratian (Cause Two, De Penance, Dist. 1), and the Ordinary Gloss (on Isaiah 3). It is called thus, according to the exposition of many, because since the first plank after shipwreck is Baptism, the second is nothing other than the penance of those who have relapsed. Which appellation of this sacrament the Fathers of the Council of Trent approve (Session 6, ch. 14), and they judge that it must altogether be retained against the sectarians of this age, under anathema (Session 14, canon 2).⁸

§ 9. But you may ask why Penance is called the second plank after shipwreck, and not also the third or fourth and so on, since it happens that men relapse more often, and thus are restored more often by penance. I briefly answer that Penance is for this reason always called the second plank: because, no matter how often it may befall a man to relapse, one and the same kind of remedy, and that different from Baptism, is always prepared for him for reconciliation—namely, the Sacrament of Penance.

§ II — The distinction and definition of penance as virtue and as sacrament (Distinctio & definitio poenitentiae ut est virtus, & ut sacramentum)

§ 10. Of the things which, for a fuller understanding of the Sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum poenitentiae*), must be said, one must consider what difference there is between the penance (*poenitentia*) which the pages of both Scriptures most frequently commend to us, and that which is numbered in the middle place among the seven Sacraments of the Church. For that penance is a virtue or the act of a virtue, but this is a sacrament of the New Law instituted for the repairing of those who have lapsed after Baptism (*Baptismus*), requiring something more than any sort whatsoever of that virtue's act. That also is required of those to be baptized, this of those alone who are baptized. Whence the Fathers of Trent (Session 6, ch. 14) say, as it were: It must be taught, say they, that the penance of a Christian man after a fall is very different from baptismal penance, and that it contains not only a cessation from sins and their detestation, or contrition together with acts of humility, but also sacramental confession of the same and satisfaction by fastings, etc.¹⁰ Then there follows: Of which penance it is written: "Be mindful therefore from whence thou art fallen, and do penance, and do the first works" (Rev. 2). And again: "The sorrow that is according to God worketh penance steadfast unto salvation" (2 Cor. 7). And again: "Do penance, and bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance" (Matt. 3 and Luke 3). That last testimony of Scripture is not for this reason to be thought not to serve our purpose, because those words were not spoken to the baptized. For they were being said to those who, according to the Law, had received circumcision, which was to the Jewish people in the place of Baptism, and afterwards had fallen into grievous sins. To whom therefore there was to be preached not any sort whatsoever of penance, but that which by right is required of all who relapse.

§ 11. Again (Session 14, ch. 1) the same is handed down: that penance is necessary for all men, who have stained themselves with some mortal sin, at whatever time, for attaining grace and justice, even for those who have received the sacrament of Baptism, so that, casting away perversity and amended, they may detest with hatred of sin and with pious sorrow of soul so great an offense of God. Then, after several testimonies of Scripture are recounted, it follows: Moreover, before the coming of Christ penance was not a sacrament, nor is it after His coming to anyone before Baptism. So there. To the same pertains also what (ch. 4 of the same session) is said, that the movement of contrition was at every time necessary for obtaining the pardon of sins.¹¹

§ 12. The same difference is proved from the definitions of each. For penance, inasmuch as it signifies the virtue or its act, is nothing other than the effort to appease God for a sin committed, arising from the love of God and hatred of sin; or, as the Master (of the Sentences) defined in the Text: Penance is the virtue by which we lament evils committed with a purpose of amendment, and, as for things that ought to be lamented, we are unwilling to commit them further; or, as the Fathers of the Council of Trent in the place already mentioned defined contrition (for contrition is properly an act of penance), in this way: Penance is the sorrow and detestation of soul for a sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning thereafter; or finally, as St. Ambrose

and St. Gregory, cited by the Master, rather denote it than describe it: Penance is to weep over sins past, and not to commit things to be wept over. But the penance of those who have relapsed includes, besides these already said, something more, and can in this manner be defined: Penance is sorrow for sin together with the endeavor to appease God through means divinely ordained for this, namely through confession and satisfaction. But the Sacrament of Penance is thus defined, in which to those who have relapsed—and who truly do penance and confess, with at least the purpose of making satisfaction—priestly absolution from sins is bestowed.¹²

§ 13. From all these it is clear that penance in general does not differ from the penance of those who have relapsed otherwise than as genus from species. But from both that very Sacrament of Penance is distinguished, as a sensible sign instituted for the reconciliation of those who after Baptism have lapsed, and therefore requiring the penance of those who have relapsed as a necessary disposition. Yet it agrees with the Sacrament of Penance in this, that each is a cause of salvation and justification, though in a different manner. For the virtue of penance, or its act, prepares and disposes for justification. But the sacrament confers the grace of justification itself from the work worked, after the manner of the other sacraments.

§ 14. And to that which the Scholastics discuss in this place—whether penance is a general virtue or a special one, and whether it is theological or moral, and in what part of the soul it resides—we briefly answer that it is a special virtue, by which a man detests sin inasmuch as it is an offense against God, and strives for its destruction. Moreover, it pertains to the species of commutative justice, as St. Thomas teaches (although others think otherwise), inasmuch as the one striving grieves for the sin committed with a purpose of amendment; but its subject is the will, in which also the other powers are subordinated.

§ III — That the Sacrament of Penance is one of the sacraments of the New Law (Poenitentiae Sacramentum unum esse e Sacramentis novae legis)

§ 15. That there is some sacrament (*sacramentum*) of the New Law (*nova lex*) by which those who have relapsed after Baptism are reconciled to God by penance (*poenitentia*)—which is called the sacrament of Penance—although most of today's heretics deny it, asserting that by a mere recalling of Baptism all sins committed after Baptism are taken away, is by no means to be doubted, since both from Sacred Scripture and from Apostolic Tradition the whole Church has always acknowledged it and by perpetual use has borne witness to it.

§ 16. One place of Scripture is Matt. 18, where the Lord says to the Apostles: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." By which words He promises that He will endow the Apostles and their successors with that power whereby they can both bind sinners and loose them from sins by penance, to be had as ratified in heaven, that is, before God. How the Fathers always understood that passage is clear, as among others Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, and Augustine attest.¹⁴

§ 17. Another passage is Jn. 20, where to those same Apostles He says: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." These words likewise signify that, before the tribunal of God, whatever the Apostles and their successors shall have done legitimately in forgiving or in retaining sins will be ratified. Although it must not be denied that there is some difference between that former and this latter saying of the Lord. Which distinction will be explained elsewhere. But this latter the

Fathers and the Council of Trent judged should especially be urged for establishing the sacrament of Penance, both against the ancient Novatians and against the heretics of the sects of our times; where also they condemn the feigned interpretations of those who draw the institution of this sacrament back to the power of preaching the word of Christ and proclaiming the Gospel, denying that it was instituted.¹⁵

§ 18. To the same power of remitting sins some refer 1 Tim. 5: "Lay not hands lightly upon any man, neither be partaker of other men's sins;" yet we judge that passage to pertain to Sacred Ordination. Likewise some refer Gal. 6: "If a man be overtaken in any fault, you who are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness"—that is, they say, endowed with the same power along with me—which word "restore" more properly signifies "reinstate." By this word of reinstating the Apostle is indicated to have pointed out the business of penance, whereby the sinner is restored, so far as may be, to his former state. For the same Apostle, in 2 Cor., admonishes the rulers and presbyters of Corinth that to the fornicator formerly excommunicated, after penance has been done, they should grant pardon in the person of Christ. But more correctly this is understood of the condonation of the remaining penalty by indulgence.

§ 19. What, moreover, the judgment of the holy Fathers has been on this matter is most clearly evident from their statements, of which we shall recount some places: Dionysius the Areopagite; Tertullian, in the book *On Penance*; Cyprian, in the book *On the Lapsed* and in his letters; Origen, in *Homilies on Leviticus*; Basil, in *Epistle 288*; Pacian—or rather an ancient author—in the *Letters to Sympronian*; John Chrysostom, in the book *On the Priesthood* and on *Jn. 20*; and after the Apostle John, Cyril and Theophylact on the same place of John; Augustine, in the *Sermons On the Words of the Lord*, and in a homily that is the last or next to the last among the fifty, likewise in *Tractates on John*, and in *Letters 48 and 180*, which is to Bishop Honoratus, and in the second discourse on *Ps. 10*, and in *City of God*, book 20, chapter 9; Leo, in *Letter 91* to Theodorus; and Gregory, *Homily 26* on the Gospels.¹⁶

§ 20. In which places those Fathers clearly testify that the power of remitting sins after Baptism was left by Christ in the Church, and that it was committed not to all Christians, but peculiarly to priests.

§ 21. To these could be added the canons of various councils and the decrees of popes. But since in former times, by the public consent of the whole Church, Novatian was condemned because he usurped the power of remitting sins and took away from the prelates of the Church the reconciling of penitents, there is no need to handle this matter at greater length—especially as below, where confession (*confessio*) will be discussed, many testimonies are to be brought forward to the same point.¹⁷

§ 22. Now that in the execution of this power there is found the formal character (*ratio*) of a sacrament of the New Law is shown briefly thus. A sacrament of the New Law is defined as a sensible sign, and one effective of invisible or insensible grace (*gratia*). But in the present case the sensible sign is the act of the priest exercising the aforesaid power by solemn words recited over the penitent, by which the very execution of that power is signified, when he says: "I absolve you," and the like. Wherefore, just as the act of the minister baptizing and pronouncing the prescribed words is the sacrament of Baptism, so the act of the priest absolving and likewise pronouncing the prescribed words (which act we can call the absolution, *absolutio*) is the sacrament of Penance.

§ 23. The matter (*materia*) of the same sacrament is either sins, or the acts of the penitent required for the remission (*remissio*) of sins, namely for confession and satisfaction (*satisfactio*); concerning which diversity in the consideration of the matter, it will be explained in its own place.

§ 24. Now it is evident that both the external act itself of the priest, and the words which he pronounces, and the acts themselves of the penitent, whereby he manifests and professes his inmost sorrow of soul either by confessing or by making satisfaction, are something set forth to the senses; so that there is here no need to have recourse to the ceremony of the imposition of hands, which is clear not to pertain to the substance of this sacrament, as we shall show below.

§ 25. But the invisible grace which by Christ's promise this sacrament both signifies and effectively brings with it is the remission of sins, according to that saying: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them"; or, as the Florentine Decree speaks, the absolution from sins, according to that saying: "Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth..." And since this remission or absolution is a gratuitous gift of God necessary for the justification (*justificatio*) of man, it is most rightly called grace, yet by no means to be separated from habitual grace (*gratia habitualis*), which makes the penitent before God truly just and God's own son and an heir of the Kingdom.

§ IV — That this Sacrament of Penance is different from Baptism (Diversum esse a Baptismo hoc poenitentiae Sacramentum)

§ 26. Since the sectarians of our time, confounding the sacraments (*sacramenta*), teach that Baptism itself is the sacrament of Penance, as though Baptism once received availed also, by a mere recollection of itself and without another sacrament, for the remission of all subsequent sins, it therefore seemed good to the Fathers of the Council of Trent to distinguish these two sacraments more exactly (Session 14, ch. 2), and to sanction that distinction by the interposition of an anathema (canon 2 of the same session).¹⁹ Now this difference is manifold. First, on the side of substance. For the elements by which the substance of each sacrament is effected—that is, the matter and the form—differ greatly, as is clear from what has been said above. Second, on the side of the minister. For, besides the fact that Baptism can be administered by any man whatsoever, if necessity demand it, and is always also, even outside necessity, held to be a ratified and true sacrament when administered by anyone at all, the sacrament of absolution has the priest alone for its minister; there is another difference also on the part of the minister, namely that the minister of Baptism need not be a judge, since the Church exercises judgment upon no one who has not first been incorporated into her through the gate of Baptism—"For what have I to do to judge them that are without?" (1 Cor. 5)—but those who once through Baptism have been made domestics of the faith, and afterwards have fallen into some crime, Christ willed to be brought as guilty before this tribunal of Penance, so that, once the case has been heard, by the judicial sentence of the priests they may be able to be absolved from sins. Third, on the side of frequency. For Baptism is in no wise permitted to be repeated; but the sacrament of Reconciliation may be repeated as often as penitents, from the sins they have committed, flee for refuge to it—of which below there will be fuller teaching. Fourth, on the side of effect. For the fruit of Baptism and of Penance is different. For by Baptism, putting on Christ, we are made in Him altogether a new creature, obtaining full and entire remission of all sins; but to that newness and entirety, by the sacrament of Penance, we can by no means attain without great weeping and labors of ours, divine justice so requiring; wherefore, with good reason, Penance has been called by the holy Fathers a certain toilsome Baptism. And in these almost ways did the Fathers of the Council of Trent, in the place already mentioned, distinguish between these sacraments. For the confirmation of which difference, this first may be adduced from the Fathers: that, as we showed at the beginning, they are wont to

call the sacrament of Penance the second plank after shipwreck—one which assuredly must be different from the first plank, or rather from the very ship itself, which is Baptism.

§ 27. Then too the sentences of the Fathers, plainly distinguishing between these sacraments, manifestly prove that difference. For, to pass over Tertullian, who published two books, one On Baptism, the other On Penance, as upon distinct subjects; Origen,²⁰ answering certain men who said that Christians had only one way of the remission of sins, namely Baptism, replies that it is not the only one, but, besides it, he enumerates six other modes, the last of which is through the sacrament of Penance. Ambrose, book 1 On Penance, ch. 7, and book 2, ch. 2, teaches that first through Baptism, then through Penance by the ministry of priests, sins are remitted, with the power of God working in both.²¹ The same he teaches in the Apology of David, ch. 9.²² Augustine, Enchiridion 46: "Therefore," he says, "whatever sin there is with which a man is born, since the sins which afterwards he has contracted by ill-doing can also be healed by doing penance, if we see that this is done after Baptism."²³ And in Letter 23 to Boniface he says, speaking of one who, though not yet baptized, has come to the end of life: "Then," he says, "he will even begin to have those first sins which are taken away by regeneration, but the others will be cured."²⁴ And book 20 of the City of God, ch. 9, on the judicial power of the priests, he sends forth words altogether agreeing with the doctrine of the Council of Trent: "The judgement given" (Rev. 20) "seems to be no other than that which is"—namely—"Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."²⁵

§ 28. Hence also the Apostle: "For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not you judge them that are within?" (1 Cor. 5). Forthwith he subjoins things by which he clearly marks the difference of the sacraments of Baptism and of Reconciliation, saying: "Otherwise in dangers it would not profit to run to Baptism lest without it this life be ended, nor to Reconciliation, if perchance by penance a man with evil conscience has been separated from the same body."²⁹ The same difference he signifies in book 1 On Adulterous Marriages, ch. last; more clearly in Letter 180 to Bishop Honoratus, and book 1 On the Creed, ch. 6.²⁶ Likewise also others: Pacian, in the Letters and in the book Against the Novatians; Jerome, Dialogue 2 Against the Pelagians; Cyril on John 20; Bede on Mark 1; and Isidore, Etymologies, book 6, ch. 9.²⁷

§ 29. Finally, the examples of Scripture show this sufficiently. For neither that fornicator of Corinth, nor Simon Magus—when after Baptism they had gravely sinned—were sent back to the recollection of the Baptism previously received, that in that way they might obtain pardon of their crimes; but to the Magus it was said by Peter: "Do penance from this thy wickedness," etc. (Acts 8); while the Corinthian, having been excommunicated, Paul drove to weighty satisfaction. But what reply ought to be made to certain arguments of the heretics, which they chiefly bring forward to the contrary from certain places of Augustine, we said when we treated of Baptism, discussing the question how every subsequent renewal is attributed to Baptism. Moreover the Fathers of Trent briefly indicated, in the place cited above, a certain kinship of this sacrament with Baptism by these words: "Now this sacrament of Penance is necessary for salvation for those who have fallen after Baptism, just as Baptism itself is for those not yet regenerated." Of which necessity we shall speak below.²⁸

**§ V — The reply to the arguments by which the Novatians attacked Penance
(*Solutio argumentorum quibus Novatiani Poenitentiam oppugnarunt*)**

§ 30. Therefore now one must answer the arguments by which both the Novatians of old and more recent heretics have relied in order to remove from the Church this most health-giving sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*). The Novatians pressed especially the passage of the Apostle in Heb. 6, where he says: "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, have tasted also the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, have moreover tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and are fallen away, to be renewed again unto repentance, crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, and making him a mockery." By these words they wanted it signified that those once baptized (who by the Apostle are called "enlightened") and fallen back cannot at least by any visible sacrament or by the ministry of the Church be restored by penance to their former state and be reconciled to God. They also brought forward another passage of the same Epistle (ch. 10), which reads thus: "For if we sin wilfully after having received the knowledge of the truth, there is now left no sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment" and so forth.

§ 31. But to these things Catholics long ago replied. To the former passage indeed in two ways. In one way, by interpreting it of not repeating the remedy of Baptism (*Baptismus*), even if someone should fall back into the same or graver sins. For Baptism is called in a special way a sacrament both of illumination and of renewal: both because it perfectly removes all sins as to guilt and as to punishment, and because the righteousness which is acquired through it is a perfect newness with respect to the whole previous state, not so the righteousness which is acquired through the sacrament of Penance, since the newness of Baptism was more perfect. This sense is further favored by what the Apostle says, "once enlightened," as if he were saying that they are not able to be enlightened more often than once, that is, to be baptized. And by what he subjoins: "again crucifying to themselves the Son of God," and so forth. For since Baptism contains a representation of the Lord's Death, he "crucifies again to himself the Son of God" who repeats Baptism. Whence in like manner, from the fact that Christ no longer dies (Rom. 6), he shows that those baptized, as once dead to sin, ought thereafter to walk in newness of life. Nor does it militate against this understanding that he says "to be renewed unto repentance"; for he understands by repentance here the first disposition which precedes Baptism and tends toward it, whence he immediately adds: "Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works." This sense is handed down and pursued by St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. John Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius in their expositions on the Epistle to the Hebrews; likewise by Gennadius in *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, by Cyril (as cited by Oecumenius), and most others.³¹ Therefore, according to this exposition, the Apostle wills that those who after Baptism have lapsed into graver sins cannot again flee to Baptism, or at least to any other remedy equally easy, which would afford them the same effect as Baptism, that is, a perfect newness with every liability to punishment removed; but that, if they come to their senses and are willing to be received back into the communion of the Church, they must necessarily undergo and endure another kind of remedy, harsher and more difficult.

§ 32. Others, however, think that when the Apostle says "are fallen away," he is speaking not of any grave sin whatsoever but of the most grave sin of apostasy, whereby the faith once received is abandoned—of which Peter also speaks (2 Pet. 2), saying: "It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after having known it, to turn back from the holy commandment that was delivered to them." And they wish "impossible" to be taken for "difficult," so that the sense is that such persons are almost in despair, so that

it is most difficult to bring them back to the knowledge of the truth and so to renew them by penance. This sense too St. Ambrose has on the place already cited, yet in such a way that he prefers the former.

§ 33. This latter sense will perhaps seem more to fit the other passage of the Apostle (Heb. 10). For there he had prefaced these words: "Not forsaking our assembly," and so forth, wherein apostasy is signified—which sin he afterwards again exaggerates by these words: "How much more, do you think, does he deserve worse punishments who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and has esteemed the blood of the testament unclean?" and so forth. Therefore to those who thus sin the Apostle denies that "a sacrifice for sin" remains, because it is very difficult to recall such persons to penance, so that the Sacrifice of the Cross may thus be able to be applied to them for the remission of so great a sin; wherefore for such persons the Apostle says that there impends a terrible judgment of God to be executed upon the reprobate.

§ 34. Yet this passage too (as Chrysostom interprets it) can be understood of Baptism not being repeated for those who after Baptism have fallen into grave crimes. For to such persons there is now no longer left "a sacrifice for sins," that is, a remedy of such a sort whereby they would be freed immediately and entirely from sins—such as is Baptism, in which the Sacrifice of the Cross is applied to a man without any condition of satisfaction for the perfect remission of sins; but there is "a certain fearful expectation of judgment," that is, a laborious and hard penance, which is a kind of example of the terrible punishment and vengeance of God to be exercised upon the impious. According to which interpretation—assuredly very probable and concordant with the passage in Heb. 6—this passage not only does not take away, but even confirms the sacrament of Penance, at least as to the satisfaction which is required of those who have relapsed. But that by these statements the Apostle does not intend to abolish penance after Baptism, or the reconciliation of penitents who have relapsed, is most certain from each Epistle to the Corinthians, where he orders that the Corinthian fornicator, after heavy satisfaction, finally be received into grace "in the person of Christ"; and in 2 Cor. 12 he indicates his grief for those who had sinned previously and yet had not done penance for the uncleanness and fornication and wantonness which they had committed, threatening that if he comes he will not spare.³²

§ VI — The other arguments by which they attack this sacrament are resolved (Aliorum argumenta quibus hoc Sacramentum oppugnant, solvuntur)

§ 35. The arguments which the heretics of our age advance against the power of remitting sins granted by the Lord to priests are indeed more numerous in count, yet by no means firmer than the aforesaid Novatian arguments. The first they bring against the Catholics' argument from the passage of Matt. 18, contending that what is said there is common to all the faithful, and has this sense: whichever brother sinning you shall bind, by holding him as a heathen and a publican if he is unwilling to be corrected, or by correcting shall loose, he will be either bound or loosed in heaven. They strengthen this interpretation by the authority of St. Augustine who, in Sermon 16 on those same words of the Lord, which is contained also in Decretum, II, q. 3, c. "Cepisti," says thus: "You have begun to hold your brother as a publican; you bind him on earth; but see that you bind justly, for justice breaks unjust bonds. But when you have corrected him and been reconciled with your brother, you have loosed him on earth; when you shall have loosed him on earth, he will be loosed also in heaven." Likewise, in Tractate 58 on John: "While we mutually forgive sins, we loose them on earth in order that they may also be loosed in heaven." To the same effect he writes in Tractate 50. Something similar has Theophylact's Commentary on Matthew: "If," he says, "you, being offended, hold as a publican and a Gentile

the one who has wronged you, he will be such a one in heaven; but if you loose him, that is, forgive, it will be forgiven him also in heaven. For not only the things that priests loose are loosed, but whatever things we too, being wronged, either bind or loose, those very things are bound or loosed."³⁴

§ 36. But we reply that in those places Augustine and Theophylact do not offer the proper sense of Christ's words, but apply, by a certain extension, to all the faithful what had been properly said to the Apostles and to their successors, the rulers of the Church. This is clear enough, because Theophylact there intimates that there is a certain power of loosing proper to priests, and a little before had said that a brother's sin is to be referred to the rulers of the Church; and when writing on John, at chapter 20, he very clearly establishes the Catholic doctrine. Augustine, moreover, very often elsewhere openly teaches the proper sense of the said words, as in Homilies 27 and 49; Homily 50; Book 1 Against the Adversaries of the Law and the Prophets, ch. 17; the Tractate On the Usefulness of Penance, ch. 3; the book On the Nature of the Good, last chapter; City of God, Book 20, ch. 9; and in Tractates 22 and 49 on John.³⁵

§ 37. One can also object what St. Jerome says on Isaiah 14, where, citing the Scripture of Prov. 5, "Each one is bound fast by the cords of his sins," he subjoins thus: "These cords and bonds the Apostles can loose, imitating their Master who said to them, 'Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.' But the Apostles loosed them by the word of God, and by testimonies of the Scriptures, and by exhortation to the virtues." To this it is similarly answered that there are various modes of loosing, one of which Jerome has encompassed in those words; yet he did not intend to give the proper sense of that Scripture, nor to deny another mode of loosing that is proper to priests. And even about that mode his words can be taken so that by "the word of God" he understands the words of absolution which are uttered in the name of God; "the testimonies of the Scriptures" and "exhortation to the virtues," he wishes to be applied for the sinner's instruction and for caution in the future. But that Jerome acknowledged that power of priests, other passages of his teach plainly, as in the Commentary on Matt. 16 and on Titus 3.³⁶

§ 38. Next the heretics attack the other Catholic proof, from John 20, "Whose sins you shall forgive, etc."; for they want by those words nothing else to have been commanded to the Apostles than that they should preach the Gospel through the whole world, and that they should announce to believers the remission of sins, but to unbelievers foretell the wrath of God, and distinguish them from these by the seal of Baptism. They commend this sense thus: that what is said in John 20, "Whose sins you shall forgive, etc.," is the same as that which the Lord says in Luke 24, that "penance and forgiveness of sins" be "preached in his name unto all nations"; and that this again is the same as what he says in the end of Matthew: "Teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. And that these are the same they try to show by the testimony of Augustine, who in Book 3 On the Harmony of the Evangelists, ch. 25, refers the two former passages to the same time and the same appearance of Christ.³⁷

§ 39. But it is answered, first, that from the text of the Gospel it clearly stands forth that the Lord's words in Matthew were spoken much later than those found in Luke and John, although with Luke's words they have a certain agreement in sense; but that those found in John are most diverse in sense from these. For although, as Augustine wishes, both sayings were uttered by the Lord at the same appearance, nevertheless they do not on that account signify the same thing. For in one and the same discourse Christ could enjoin very diverse matters upon the Apostles.

§ 40. Yet further the authority of Augustine and of Cyril is objected. Of Augustine indeed, who, expounding that passage of the Gospel in Tractate 121, says that the charity of the Church forgives the sins of her members, but holds those of others; of Cyril, moreover, who in commenting on that same passage explains it of that remission of sins which is wrought in Baptism. We reply that, in Augustine's mind, both the priests remit sins and the charity of the Church accomplishes the same, but in different ways: the priests indeed by a power granted to them by Christ, but the charity of the Church by way of an impetratory cause. For just as in Baptism the remission of sins is attributed to the faith of the Church, so in this sacrament of Penance the reconciliation of penitents is attributed to the groans of the dove, that is, to the prayers of the devout faithful — which Augustine also teaches elsewhere.³⁸ But Cyril explains the place in John not of Baptism alone, but, by a certain extension, of Baptism together with Penance, as of two modes by which priests remit sins — and this on account of a certain likeness of the effect of each sacrament; which effect, however, is had in Baptism by a ministry only of one who washes, but in this sacrament by a true power of one who absolves. Hence Cyril's passage confirms the Catholic truth, showing that the sacrament of Penance is distinct from Baptism. It must be noted, moreover, that the anathema of the Council of Trent found in Session 14, ch. 1 and canon 3 does not oppose certain expositions of the Fathers, even if less proper, but is pronounced against those who by invented interpretations twist the Lord's words in John 20 to an authority of preaching the Gospel, contrary to the institution of this sacrament — which was not done by those Fathers.³⁹

§ 41. Finally, the sectarians, in order to teach that Baptism and Penance are not distinct sacraments but that the sacrament of Penance is itself Baptism, adduce that which is in Mark 1 and Luke 3, that John preached "a baptism of penance for the remission of sins." To this it is answered that John's baptism was a baptism of penance because it was a certain outward profession of doing penance; but that Christ's Baptism was not a baptism of penance but of remission of sins, because by it remission of sins was conferred — which therefore ought to be preceded by a certain penance, according to Peter's saying in Acts 2: "Do penance, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins." Nor, however, even if Christ's Baptism could perhaps in some respect be called a sacrament of penance, is another excluded forthwith which is properly called the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*). Whence what could be objected from Augustine, or rather from Fulgentius, in the book *On the Faith to Peter*, ch. 30 — that Baptism is called by him the sacrament of faith and of penance — is easily solved. For it is so called, not that no other sacrament of penance is to be acknowledged, but because, as is said in the same place, for adults coming to the Church it is necessary both to do penance for their evil deeds and to hold the Catholic faith according to the rule of truth, and to receive the sacrament of Baptism.⁴⁰

§ 42. There are also other things that are wont to be alleged against the institution of this sacrament, but these will be treated more suitably when we take up the questions: who is the minister of this sacrament, and whether it truly remits sins or rather only declares and announces them remitted, and what the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*) is that is entrusted to the ministers of the Church. Of all which in their own place.

§ VII — That the sacrament of Penance is necessary for the lapsed unto salvation (Penitentiae Sacramentum esse relapsis ad salutem necessarium)

§ 43. Just as Baptism is necessary for salvation for all who have not yet been reborn, so too the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Penitentiae*) is in like manner necessary for salvation for all who after Baptism have fallen into mortal sin; as the Fathers of Trent hand down (Session 14, ch. 2) and again intimate (canons 6 and 7).⁴² This comparison of Penance with Baptism seems to be taken from St. Augustine, Book 1 On Adulterous Marriages, last chapter, where, speaking of the sacrament to be administered in danger of death, he says: "But what is the cause of Baptism is the same of Reconciliation, if perchance the peril of a life to be ended should forestall the penitent."⁴³ For "neither ought Mother Church to wish that they themselves go forth from this life without the pledge of their peace."⁴³ Nor less clearly does he indicate this comparison in Letter 180 to Bishop Honoratus. For when, speaking of the danger of death imminent from the incursion of enemies, he had said that in such a crisis of time some ask for Baptism, others for Reconciliation, he subjoined: "Where if ministers are lacking, how great a destruction follows for those who depart from this world either not regenerated or bound? How great also is the grief of their faithful friends, who will not have them with them in the rest of eternal life?"⁴⁴ Likewise in Book 20 of the City of God, ch. 9: "Otherwise, neither would it be of any profit in perils to run to Baptism, lest this life be finished without it; nor to Reconciliation, if perchance through penitence or an evil conscience one has been separated from the body of Christ."⁴⁵ So too St. Ambrose, Book 7 on Luke 15: "I know," he says, "that some say that they reserve for death for themselves either the grace of the Laver or Penance"—plainly wishing by the name of penitence to be understood the sacrament of Reconciliation. And he indicates its necessity, just as that of Baptism, with the words that follow: "Who knows whether thy soul will be required of thee the next night?"⁴⁶ But the statement of Leo is most manifest (Letter 91 to Theodorus), which we shall shortly bring forward.⁴⁷

§ 44. Moreover, this necessity is proved by the same Scriptures which prove the sacrament itself, namely Matt. 18: "Whatsoever you shall loose..." and John 20: "Whose sins you shall remit...". For without the loosing or remission of sins it is certain that a man cannot obtain salvation. But if their loosing or remission could be had otherwise than through the priests to whom the power of loosing and remitting has been granted, the ministry would be in vain, and that power fruitlessly handed over by the Lord to certain ministers as to His vicars. Nay more, from this very fact that priests are appointed judges and ministers of this matter, it rightly follows that all who do not approach them for this, for reconciliation, remain guilty before the Lord. Just as, if a king or some prince should establish through a kingdom or province his own vicars who are to take cognizance of the crime of homicide, and, the case being known, are able to remit it, with good reason all would be judged liable to capital punishment who did not obtain absolution of the crime from those appointed by royal authority. Add that it is in vain that a difficult mode of obtaining pardon is enjoined if pardon can be obtained by some far easier way; for men are always presumed to choose that which is easier. There is added another reason: for to the ministers of the Church there has been given not only the power of loosing and remitting but also of binding and retaining. But they would have received this power in vain if what had been bound and retained by them could be loosed and remitted by other ways, and indeed by easier ones, apart from their authority and ministry. Nay, that statement would be simply false: "Whose sins you shall retain, they are retained," if what had been retained by them could be in some other way than through them remitted. Likewise there would follow among Christians the greatest neglect and contempt of the ecclesiastical tribunal, if, besides that, there were remedies at hand by which those who have relapsed could,

without the severity of priestly judgment, obtain the grace of reconciliation. Therefore, rightly does Pope Leo from the words of Christ by which He conferred this power on priests gather the necessity of this sacrament (Letter 91 to Theodorus, found in Gratian, *De Poenitentia*, Dist. 1), writing thus: "The manifold mercy of God so succors human falls, that not only by the grace of Baptism but also by the medicine of Penance the hope of eternal life may be restored, and that those who had violated the gift of regeneration, condemning themselves by their own judgment, might come to the remission of crimes; so have the aids of divine goodness been ordered, that the indulgence of God cannot be obtained unless by the supplications of the priests. For the Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, delivered this power to the rulers of the Church, that they should give to those confessing the action of penitence, and cleansing the same by wholesome satisfaction should admit them to the gate of communion through the sacraments of reconciliation."⁴⁷

§ 45. Then, with the words that follow, he exaggerates this same necessity yet more: "But if any one of those for whom we supplicate the Lord should, intercepted by any hindrance whatsoever, fall from the office of present indulgence, and, before he come to the appointed remedies, should, by the condition of man, finish temporal life, that which, while remaining in the body, he did not receive—that is, priestly absolution—he will not be able to obtain when stripped of the flesh. Nor is it needful for us to examine the merits and acts of those who have so died; since our Lord God, whose judgments cannot be comprehended, has reserved to justice that which the priestly ministry could not fulfill; willing His power to be so feared, that this terror may profit all, and that what has befallen some who are lukewarm or negligent, no one may not fear. For it is very useful and necessary that the guilt of sins be loosed by priestly supplication before the last day." These are the words of Leo, and other things which follow pertain to the same.⁴⁷

§ 46. The same Pontiff, from the power of binding and loosing given to Peter (Matt. 16), gathers that nothing is bound, nothing loosed, unless Peter either binds or looses (Sermon 3 On the Anniversary of His Pontificate; Sermon 2 On the Birthday of the Apostles Peter and Paul); and again, that in loosing and binding of whatsoever causes nothing is ratified in heaven except what has been done at Peter's arbitration; and he expressed this in that poem on the keys (on Matt. 16). Likewise, from the power given to the rulers of the Church (Matt. 18 and John 20) he concludes that nothing else is ratified in heaven than what shall have been done at their decision.⁴⁸ By the same argument, from the words of the Lord, St. Augustine too teaches that the power of loosing was given to priests in vain if sinners were not held to seek from them the action of penitence and absolution, that they may obtain the pardon of sins. Thus, addressing faithful adulterers (Homily 49 among the fifty), he says: "Do penitence, such as is in the Church, that ye may be reconciled to the Church. Let no one say to himself: I do it before God, I do it before God. God knows, He who in the heart pardons me." For to no purpose were those words spoken: "Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven"; in vain are keys given to the Church; do we thwart the Gospel? do we make void the words of Christ? do we promise you what He denies?"⁴⁹ And there is a manifest passage also in Haymo (Homily on the 15th Sunday after Pentecost), where he overthrows the error of those who thought that such penitence as is "before God" suffices. "Whose," he says, "opinion, if it were true, by no means would the Lord send the lepers, whom He had cleansed by Himself, to the priests." And below: "For, in order to show that sins are to be bound and loosed at the judgment of priests, Lazarus, whom He Himself raised from the dead, He permitted to go away, that he might be loosed by the disciples."⁵⁰

§ 47. This necessity is also proved by the fact that, as we showed at the beginning, the sacrament of Penance is very often by the Fathers called the second plank after shipwreck. By which adage it is signified that

a man who has relapsed cannot receive salvation without it, just as one shipwrecked cannot escape without a plank. Lastly, the truth of this doctrine is yet more amplified by those things which will be said in their place about the necessity of sacramental confession.⁵¹

§ 48. Since, therefore, such is the doctrine of the holy Fathers about the necessity of the sacrament of Penance, and since it is founded upon the words of Christ, by authority of Sixtus IV two conclusions of a certain Peter of Osma were deservedly condemned about a hundred years ago in the Synod of Complutum: one, that mortal sins, as to guilt and the punishment of the other life, are blotted out by contrition of heart alone without reference to the keys of the Church; the other, that evil thoughts are blotted out by mere displeasure, without reference to the keys.⁵²

§ 49. But how the aforesaid necessity is to be understood, and how far either martyrdom undergone without the sacrament, or the vow and desire of the sacrament, may supply its stead—on which point for the present let Letter 91 of Leo be understood—we leave to be gathered from the things which were said about the necessity of Baptism and the remedies that supply its stead (above, at Distinction 4).⁵³

§ VIII — Reply to certain arguments on the contrary (Responsio ad argumenta quaedam in contrarium)

§ 50. Against the necessity of the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Penitentiae*) many arguments are brought together by adversaries; but not all are proper to this place. For most of them attack directly either the necessity of sacramental confession or the power of the keys, which will be refuted in their own place (see Distinctions 17–18). Here, however, one must reply to those which seem in general to take away the necessity of the sacrament of Penance, although even those are almost such that, if true, they would no less militate against Baptism and its necessity. They are of this sort.

- First, many Scriptures signify that for pardon and salvation there suffices the sole true and sincere conversion of the sinner to God with detestation of sin, as Ps. 50: "Cor contritum et humiliatum Deus non despicies"; Is. 30 according to the Septuagint: "Cum conversus ingemueris, salvus eris"; Ezek. 18: "Si impius egerit poenitentiam ab omnibus peccatis suis, vita vivet, et non morietur: omnium iniquitatum ejus non recordabor"; and again: "Convertimini, et agite poenitentiam ab omnibus iniquitatibus vestris, et non erit vobis in ruinam iniquitas." These statements, indeed, avail no less now than in the time of the old law. Although similar are read in the New Testament also, as Matt. 18: "Si te audierit, lucratus eris fratrem tuum"; Luke 2: "Pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis"; Jas. 5: "Qui converti fecerit peccatorem ab errore viæ suæ, salvabit animam ejus a morte"; which all, if they are true, it seems that there is no necessity of the sacrament. And this Fulgentius seems to feel, who in the book To Peter On the Faith, ch. 3, where he alleges the aforesaid sentence (Is. 30), says that the penitent alone immediately obtains pardon; and Augustine (Sermon 59 On the Words of the Lord) says: "As soon as someone has been converted, all his sins are forgiven him."⁵⁵
- Second, the Scriptures everywhere attribute the same to works of mercy. For almsgiving, as Tobias attests (ch. 4 and 12), "delivers from every sin and from death, and it is that which purges sins." And Prov. 15: "Per misericordiam et fidem purgantur peccata." And Sirach 3: "Sicut ignem extinguit aqua, sic eleemosyna resistit peccatis." And the Savior in the Gospel (Luke 11): "Date eleemosynam, et ecce

omnia munda sunt vobis." Whence St. Cyprian, in the Tractate On Almsgiving, says that the remission of sins is due to individual works of mercy; and Augustine (Enchiridion 70–71) affirms that almsgiving blots out even those things which are done wickedly; and Lactantius, Divine Institutes, Book 6, ch. 12: "Great is," he says, "the reward of mercy, to which God promises that He will forgive all sins."⁵⁶

- Third, Augustine attributes the same to the petition of the Lord's Prayer, saying that by it not only light sins but even crimes are remitted (Book 1 On the Merits of Sins, ch. 14; and in the place now cited of the Enchiridion), and that according to the evangelical promise (Matt. 6): "Si dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum, dimittet vobis Pater vester coelestis peccata vestra."⁵⁷
- Fourth, the Fathers of Trent attribute the same power to the oblation of the unbloody sacrifice, saying that by that oblation God, being appeased, forgives crimes and even enormous sins.⁵⁸
- Fifth, Christ received into grace the sinful woman (Luke 7) and the adulteress (John 8) without the sacrament.
- Sixth, the Apostle Peter (Acts 8), when Simon Magus was guilty of a very grave crime after Baptism, does not remit him to some sacrament of the Church as he had done (Acts 2) when he ordered the Jews to do penance and be baptized, but only says to him: "Poenitentiam age ab hac nequitia tua."
- Seventh, sometimes another's faith and prayer sufficiently impetrate for someone the remission of sins. For Christ, looking upon the faith of those carrying him, said to the paralytic: "Fili, remittuntur tibi peccata tua"; and James, when speaking last of the remission of sins, says: "Orate pro invicem, ut salvemini"; and Simon Magus petitions the intercession of the Apostles through which his sin may be remitted. So too Augustine (on Ps. 91), speaking to the people about a man's birthday, says: "Pray for him, for we know and are sure that your prayer blots out all his impieties."[^59]
- Eighth, the Law of Grace detracts nothing from the virtue of penitence and of faith; but before Christ and before the Law the sole faith and penitence sufficed for obtaining pardon of sins; therefore now too it suffices.
- Lastly, because of the necessity of Baptism any man can be the minister of that sacrament, and for the same reason it is administered in matter most readily available; but there is nothing like this in the sacrament of Penance; therefore this sacrament is not necessary for the lapsed as Baptism is for the unregenerate.

§ 51. Replying to these arguments in order, we say first that those Scriptures which attribute pardon or salvation to a contrite and humbled heart and to the sincere conversion of heart to God neither exclude the sacrament nor take away its necessity. Otherwise, as we have already warned, by a like reason the necessity of Baptism also would be taken away, since the statements of Scripture are general, which can be accommodated also to men not yet reborn. But such Scriptures signify what is necessary before all, namely that someone grieve for his sin and be converted to God. This beginning being in place, it is then not so difficult to obtain the rest which are necessary for remission. For he who is thus truly converted to God and seriously detests sins will gladly and promptly take up those remedies which have been divinely ordered for obtaining, through Christ, the remission of sins.

§ 52. Next, true contrition blots out sin also as a part of the sacrament of Penance, if, however, the other parts too are added, which are satisfaction and confession, and to those parts, which have the character of

matter, there be added their form through the absolution of the priest. And so it is true that each of these parts blots out sin, yet not alone but conjoined with the others, and that either in fact, or at least in desire. Whence it comes about that neither is reconciliation to be ascribed to perfect contrition without the sacrament or without the vow of it which is included in that contrition, as the Council of Trent defines (Session 14, ch. 4).⁵⁹

§ 53. Now when at times the Fathers say that the sins of one who truly repents are immediately forgiven, either it is to be understood thus, provided that he complete the things that befit the penitent—among which is the reception of the sacrament itself—or it must be understood of that which is chiefly required and necessary on the part of the sinner for obtaining pardon. For that is acknowledged to be true penitence; which being present, the sinner is said both to have obtained pardon and to be saved, in a certain and proximate hope, namely with the sacrament's being approached. As the comic writer says about the youth: "He blushed; the matter is safe"—because of the hope of salvation which the disposition of one who blushes promises.

§ 54. Furthermore, neither do those Scriptures adduced in the second place, which ascribe the remission of sins to works of mercy, take away the necessity of the sacrament—no more than they take away the necessity of interior penitence and of sincere conversion to God. As Augustine teaches in the book *On Faith and Works* and in the *Enchiridion*, ch. 70, such works are prescribed as certain means most well-suited to obtaining remission. For it is very fitting that we who wish to obtain mercy from God should ourselves first show mercy to our neighbors, according to that: "Beati misericordes, quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur." But these works avail for the remission of guilt or of punishment by way of satisfaction; and since satisfaction is one part of penitence, it cannot confer that effect without the other parts required for the integrity of the sacrament.

§ 55. A similar judgment is to be made of the Lord's Prayer and other pious prayers by which we ask pardon of sins from God. For prayer too is numbered among works of satisfaction, and it has a peculiar promise, the Lord saying: "Petite, et accipietis." But every kind of pious work by which we desire to render God propitious to us is such as to impetrate pardon for us—that is, it avails for the remission of sins, even mortal ones, by way of an impetratory cause. Particularly too does the condonation of the offenses of our neighbors avail for this, according to the compact of the Lord's Prayer diligently explained by the Lord in several places (Matt. 6; Mark 11; Luke 6), and previously indicated by Sirach (ch. 28). But these things so impetrate the remission of sins as nevertheless not to exclude other remedies subordinated, such as are faith, charity, penitence, and finally the sacrament itself, through which there is actually conferred that for which the preceding works were done in order to impetrate it. Nor is this a wonder, since even in the old law certain sins were not expiated without the sacrifices prescribed by Moses.

§ 56. To the fourth it is replied that it is not that by the oblation itself of the sacrifice of the altar there is straightway effected that [remission] without the sacrament, but because, as the Council declares, by the oblation of that sacrifice God, being appeased, inspires grace and the gift of penitence to sinners, by which thereafter they may receive the pardon of their crimes through the Sacrament of Reconciliation. And this is said most truly likewise of the Sacrifice of the Cross. For, as the Council subjoins there, "one and the same is the Victim," etc. Therefore, just as the remission of crimes, to be received through the Sacrifice of the Cross, does not derogate from the sacrament, so neither if it be hoped for through the oblation of the altar.⁵⁸

§ 57. To the fifth argument there is a twofold reply. First, the sacrament of Penance had not yet been instituted before the Lord's passion. Then, even if it had been instituted, nevertheless Christ, by the power of excellence which He had over the sacraments, could confer the effect of some sacrament without the sacrament.

§ 58. To the sixth we reply that, just as the penitence which is required before Baptism does not take away the necessity of Baptism, as is clear (Acts 2), so the penitence to which Peter exhorts Simon Magus, already baptized, does not exclude the necessity of the sacrament of Penance. Nay rather, by the fact that Peter adds, "If perhaps it may be remitted to thee," there is indicated at least on the side of satisfaction this sacrament. For there is signified a certain difficulty of remission in those who relapse, greater than in those who are to be baptized, inasmuch as a toilsome action of penitence is required of the relapsed according to the prescription of those who can bind and loose, which is not required of those to be baptized. And this can be understood to be signified by those words of Simon to the Apostles: "Pray ye for me to the Lord," because, as Leo says (Letter 91), "from those who have violated the gift of regeneration, the indulgence of God cannot be obtained unless by the supplications of the priests"—under the name "supplications" he including priestly absolution itself.⁴⁷

§ 59. To the seventh it is replied that, just as another's prayers do not impetrate pardon for anyone without his own faith and prayer, if he be such a one as can pray for himself, so neither without the sacrament; for these things, as we have said, are subordinated to each other.

§ 60. To the eighth: that there is the same efficacy of faith and penitence, whether God regard it with the sacrament and accept it unto pardon through the sacrament, or whether He do it without the sacrament—just as with a rich man it is of like value for him to give an alms either through a servant or himself. But the fact that under the law and before the law even without the sacrament or the sacrifice penitence was accepted unto pardon, whereas it is not so in the time of grace, is not of divine severity so much as of goodness and clemency; because the sacrament received affords a man a certain security and certainty of pardon obtained, which is not had so without the sacrament.

§ 61. To the last: although the necessity of Baptism is not simply greater than that of the sacrament of Penance, it nevertheless extends to more subjects, namely to absolutely all men; because all must be regenerated; whereas the sacrament of Penance pertains neither to unbelievers nor to catechumens nor to little ones already reborn, nor to adults who retain their baptismal innocence, but to the lapsed alone. Therefore its ministry ought not to be extended so widely, nor its matter be so readily available, as in Baptism. Add that for the lapsed there ought rightly to be a more difficult access to reconciliation than for those first converted to regeneration, lest the remedy of penitence by its easiness become cheap.

§ IX — That penance can be repeated often (Paenitentiam saepius iterari posse)

§ 62. The Catholic doctrine which hands down that penance (*paenitentia*), whether interior (which is a virtue) or exterior (which is a sacrament), can be repeated often, presupposes another Catholic dogma as well: that a man can fall away both from baptismal grace and from the grace once recovered through penance. Since this has been proved elsewhere sufficiently (namely above at Distinctio 31 of Book III), where we showed that charity once had is lost, and that, once lost, it can be recovered at any degree, it must now be proved that grace,

lost through sin, can be recovered not once only but often through penance, and therefore that Penance can be repeated often.

§ 63. Now the most certain proof of this matter is from Sacred Scripture, which sets no measure nor term to the mercy of God, but, after whatever and however many sins, invites sinners to penance, and promises pardon to the penitent—which pardon, as was shown above, in the New Law cannot otherwise be had by those who have relapsed, except through the sacrament of Penance, joined with interior penance, and thus not by exterior penance alone; that is, the sacrament of Penance must often be repeated.⁶¹

§ 64. Next, since the Lord says (Lk. 6): "Be merciful, as your Father also is merciful," and He Himself enjoins on us that we forgive a brother not only seven times, but even "seventy times seven" when he sins against us and repents (Matt. 18), it follows much more that God forgives the sinner who does penance, however often he relapses. Whence it follows manifestly that Penance itself too can be repeated; since the repetition of remission necessarily posits a repetition of Penance, without which sin is not remitted; and Luke 17 expressly names penance, saying: "If your brother shall sin, and shall do penance, forgive him. And if seven times in a day he shall sin against you, and seven times in a day turn to you, saying: I repent, forgive him." Now the definite number is set both here in Luke and there in Matthew, by the consent of all interpreters, for an indefinite one—indeed for any amount whatsoever without a term—because the number seven in Sacred Scripture is a mark of universality. Wherefore, as long as this life lasts, no term can be set to the repetition of penance.

§ 65. Third: the Lord gave to His Apostles and to their successors (Matt. 16; Matt. 18; Jn. 20) the power of loosing sinners and remitting sins without limitation, whether of the greatness, or of the number, or of the repetition of sins. Now this argument, the interior penance that is required on the part of the sinner being presupposed, proves that exterior Penance—that is, the sacrament—can be repeated as often as necessary.

§ 66. Fourth: no sin is unremissible, nor is anyone to be despaired of in this life, as was proved above (at Distinctio 43 of Book II). And St. Leo bears witness (Sermon 4 On the Epiphany of the Lord), saying: "So long as one lives in this body, the restoration of no one is to be despaired of." But the restoration of the sinner cannot be effected without penance; therefore, after however many sins and however frequent a repetition of sins, so long as this life lasts, penance can still be done and repeated.

§ 67. Fifth: Christ, the Apostle testifying (1 Jn. 2), "is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world"; therefore also for those which are committed after penance has once been done. They can therefore be blotted out by the Blood of Christ; which, since it cannot be done without penance, it is clearly necessary that penance be repeated.

§ 68. Sixth: death alone is the term for a man's merits and demerits; therefore, up to death a man can both from good become evil and from evil become good, and hence, for sins, do penance again and often.

§ 69. Seventh: the Church prays for all sinners, however much and however often they have relapsed; and when it is opportune, she also rebukes them, lest God perchance grant them penance and they recover themselves from the snares of the Devil, as the Apostle says (2 Tim. 2). Therefore their penance too is to be hoped for, and reconciliation through penance. St. Augustine indicates this line of argument (Retractations I, ch. 19).⁶²

§ 70. Finally, the perpetual doctrine, tradition, and practice of the Church most certainly proves this: she has never taken away from any sinner, after however great a restoration and relapse, the hope of pardon, nor has she shut the gate of reconciliation, provided only that he should do true penance—which likewise she never doubted could be done. For although, for some who had grievously relapsed, on account of the severity of ecclesiastical discipline she deferred reconciliation for a long time, nevertheless to none in whom there appeared signs of penance did she deny, at least at the end of life, the imposition of hands; as Leo teaches (Epistle 91), and as provision is made by many other canons, as may be seen in Gratian (Title On Penance).⁶³ Hence Augustine (Ep. 54[a]) says: "So far does the iniquity of men sometimes go forward that, even after penance has been done, after reconciliation at the altar, they commit either the same or worse things; and yet God makes His sun rise over such as these, nor does He bestow less than before He bestowed the most bountiful gifts of life and salvation," and so forth.⁶⁴ And Chrysostom (Homily 20 on Heb. 10, on that text 'For if we sin willfully,' etc.): "On the occasion of these words some rise up taking away penance, as though by penance the sinner after a fall could not have strength to rise a second and a third time and thereafter. But indeed he does not exclude in this place either penance or propitiation, which is often made through penance, but [speaks of] a second Baptism and the Host."⁶⁵ And the same is taught (in the letter 1 to Theodore the Lapsed). This must be urged frequently against the Novatians by Ambrose both elsewhere and especially in the two books On Penance.⁶⁶ There also exists among the works of Augustine the tract On True and False Penance, in which the author of that work (ch. 5) expressly argues against those who deny that repeated penance is of avail.⁶⁷ Wherefore, between Baptism and Penance the Fathers have always acknowledged this difference, that—as the Council of Trent hands down (Session 14, ch. 2)—it is not permitted to repeat Baptism; but the sacrament of Penance can be repeated as often as, sins having been committed, penitents flee to it. To this, finally, pertains the fact that all Catholic Doctors acknowledge three sacraments which cannot be repeated in the same person—among which Penance is not numbered.

§ XI — Reply to the arguments of the latter kind (Responsio ad argumenta posterioris generis)

§ 71. Now, that a reply be made to the arguments of the latter kind (*posterioris generis*), let this be the first of them. Ecclesiasticus 21, after he had commended penance (*poenitentia*) for sins, saying: "If you have sinned, do not add again; but also pray concerning former sins, that they may be forgiven you," afterwards indicates that, if anyone should fall back, it cannot be repeated or at least cannot profit for a cure, when he says: "Every iniquity is as a sharp sword; the wound thereof has no healing."⁶⁹ The second: in Heb. 12 Esau, who sold his birthright, is said that afterwards, "desiring to inherit the blessing, he was rejected." The reason for which is subjoined: "For he found no place of repentance, although with tears he had sought it."⁷⁰ Third: the miracles of Christ the Savior, by which He cured bodily infirmities, signify the cures of spiritual infirmities, that is, of sins. But it is nowhere read that Christ cured any blind or lame or leprous person twice, or raised any dead person a second time, and so of the others; therefore neither does He restore a sinner, fallen back after his first penance, by repeated penance. Fourth: In Amos 1 and 2 the Lord says—and the same thing He repeats so many times concerning diverse peoples: "For three transgressions, and for four, I will not convert him"; therefore at least if anyone, after three crimes previously remitted, has added a fourth, he will no longer be converted by the Lord to true penance so as to obtain pardon. A certain Preface to Amos hands down this sense to us. Fifth: Frequent repetition of penance relaxes and enervates ecclesiastical discipline, because he will

be more prone to sin who shall have seen that, after sin, hope of pardon lies open to him. Whence Ambrose says (Sermon 8 on Ps. 118): "The ease of pardon offers incentive to delinquency." And in book 2 On Penance, ch. 9: "Certain people, because of the proposed hope of doing penance, suppose that a license for sinning has been extended to them."⁷¹ Sixth: From the comparison of Penance with Baptism. For, as Baptism, so also the sacrament of Penance has its power from the passion and death of Christ; but Baptism is unique and cannot be repeated, because Christ, once having suffered and died, does not suffer nor die any more; therefore likewise Penance. Ambrose employs this argument, taken from the comparison of Baptism, in book 2 On Penance, ch. 10, as will be evident presently.⁷² Finally: There exist certain sayings of the Fathers by which they deny that penance can be repeated. For Origen says (Homily 16 on Leviticus 25): "In graver crimes only once is place for penance conceded." And Ambrose, book 2 On Penance, ch. 10: "They are rightly reprov'd," he says, "who think that penance should be done often, because they luxuriate in Christ. For if they were truly doing penance, afterwards they would not think it ought to be repeated; because as there is one Baptism, so there is one penance." And, ch. 11: "If penance has once been used, it is neither lawfully celebrated nor does it obtain the fruit of the earlier, and it takes away the use of the later." Likewise among the works of Augustine (Epistle 53—which is Macedonius's to Augustine), where he says that the opportunity of doing penance is not given after the first penance. But Augustine himself (in Epistle 54, in which he answers Macedonius, and in Homily 50) seems to teach that for graver, that is, mortal sins—on account of which indeed someone is barred from the communion of the Body of the Lord—only once is one permitted to do penance in the Church. For he teaches that daily penance is to be done only for lighter, that is, venial sins. The same seems to be the sentiment of Ambrose (in the place already cited, ch. 10), when he subjoins: "For we ought to repent daily of our offense; but this is the penance of lighter sins, that one of graver." Cyril of Alexandria's authority also accrues, in whom the very words of Origen are read, book 15 on Leviticus.⁷³

§ 72. But to these objections we answer thus. To the first: Ecclesiasticus does not speak only of a sin repeated after penance, but of every mortal iniquity, for whose wound or gash he denies there is healing—or, as it is in the Greek, "a cure"—either because its wound is eternal death, which, once inflicted because of iniquity, can no longer be taken away; or because in human nature there is no remedy against sin, save from God's grace alone; or hyperbolically the difficult cure of sin is signified; or finally, the construction and sense of the sentence is such: "Every iniquity is as a sword cutting on both sides, whose wound is by no means easily healed."

§ 73. To the second: It is established from Scripture (Gen. 27) that the repentance (*poenitentia*) whereby Esau grieved over the birthright he had sold did not proceed from love of God or of justice, but from greed and ambition, whereby he grieved that his brother had been preferred to him in the blessing; nevertheless the genuine sense of the Apostolic sentence here seems to be this: Esau could not obtain that the father change the sentence and transfer the blessing from the brother to himself, even if with tears he had sought it—either the blessing, or the repentance of the father, that is, a change of sentence.

§ 74. To the third, which the Author of the book On True and False Penance, ch. 5, brings forward for the adversaries and himself answers: the reason why it is not read that any save once was cured bodily by Christ is, that each may fear to be joined to sin; but yet for this very reason it is read that He cured many blind, lame, and leprous persons, in order to show in those diverse cases that sins can often be remitted. Whence in the Gospel He even calls Himself a physician, whose office assuredly is to undertake the care of a sick person as often as he relapses into illness. And indeed, if this argument concluded anything, it would be of equal force

against first penance, which is the second plank and the second cure after Baptism. Yet the true reason why Christ is not read to have cured any man a second time bodily seems to be this to be recognized: that, death excepted—which at length must be undergone by all—none of those healed by Christ relapsed into the same infirmity; whereby the Lord willed to show the sincerity and perfection of His miracles, by which He proved Himself to be God.

§ 75. To the fourth: Scripture in Amos has this sense: "Because of the many and oft-repeated crimes of Damascus," or of Moab, or of Israel, "I will not turn him to my mercy," that is, I will not spare him, but will grievously punish him; or, "I will not turn his captivity," that is, I will not bring him back from captivity. Therefore "three and four" make up the number seven, by which multitude and frequency are wont to be signified in Scripture. The Preface set before this Prophet, which says that the Prophet announces that God is not going to give penance nor indulgence to him who a fourth time commits the same sins, since it is of uncertain authorship, is not to be greatly regarded.

§ 76. To the fifth the Author of the book On True and False Penance replies in these words: "It is established that sins displease God exceedingly, who is ever at hand to destroy them. For if He loved them, He would not always thus destroy them." But to this it is further answered that discipline is not dissolved by the repetition of penance (*poenitentia*), because, although hope of pardon is not denied, a more severe punishment and satisfaction for repeated sins is required according to the Church's discipline. But if hope of pardon were cut off, men would indeed guard themselves more from relapse; yet those whom the weakness of the flesh should have driven again into a fall, despairing of pardon would thereafter rush headlong into all sins. Which is a far graver evil than the some ease of sinning that may arise from a presumed hope of pardon.

§ 77. To the sixth it is replied that the formal character (*ratio*) of Baptism and of Penance is not the same. For Baptism is instituted as a certain spiritual rebirth, conjoined with the spiritual death of the preceding life of sins, as is evident from the Apostle (Rom. 6); but Penance is instituted as a certain spiritual medicine. Since therefore it happens only once to be born and once to die, but it often happens to be cured of illness: Baptism is to be received only once; but Penance can often be done—leaving aside meanwhile the other reasons for not repeating Baptism, which were handled in their place.

§ 78. To the last, it is replied that those Fathers who will that penance be done only once are speaking of public and solemn penance. For the fuller understanding of this matter, one must know that, besides internal penance (*poenitentia*), which is a virtue of the soul and is required for every action of penance, diverse kinds of penance are distinguished by the Fathers. For there was a baptismal penance, by which catechumens were prepared for receiving Baptism. Of this Peter speaks (Acts 2): "Do penance, and let every one of you be baptized." What sort of penance this formerly was in the Church is indicated by Augustine, book On Faith and Works, ch. 6, and book 4 On the Creed to the Catechumens, ch. 1; and by Gregory, in the Letter to Faustus.⁷⁴ Augustine again makes mention of it in Epistle 108, which is to Seleuciana, and Homily 27, ch. 1, where he says: "For neither does anyone come well to the Baptism of Christ, where all sins are blotted out, unless by doing penance for his former life. For no one chooses a new life unless he is sorry for the old," and what follows. And Homily 50, ch. 2, where he thus says: "Everyone who is now constituted arbiter of his will, when he comes to the sacrament of the faithful, unless he be sorry for the old life, cannot begin the new." From this penance, when they are baptized, infants alone are exempt, for as yet they cannot use free choice.

§ 79. There is another penance to be done after Baptism for those sins which are committed after it. But even this is manifold. One kind is private, another public. Private is twofold: one is daily, which is to be done for daily and light sins, for the remission of which many remedies have been instituted, which, provided a true displeasure for sins be present, even singly, without the ministry of the keys, have power to blot them out—such as remission of offenses against one's neighbors according to the covenant of the Lord's Prayer, and other works of mercy, both spiritual and corporal, and the like. Augustine often makes mention of this penance, as in Epistle 108; Homily 27, ch. 2; Homily 50, ch. 3; the Enchiridion, chs. 64, 71, and those that follow, and often elsewhere; and he calls it the penance of the saints and the just, because the just do not live without venial sins.

§ 80. But the other—which is for graver, that is, mortal sins, and those hidden—is to be undertaken. For for hidden sins, however enormous, public penance was never, by decree of the Church, enjoined. And if anywhere such a custom had been introduced, the Church judged it to be abolished, as is evident from the example of Leo, who forbids such a thing (Epistle 80), teaching that for hidden sins confession suffices, which is first offered to God, then to the priest, to whom the sinful penitent approaches for his offenses. This penance is handed down in all those places of the Fathers which prove secret confession of hidden crimes, of which we shall speak below.

§ 81. Public penance also is twofold, one solemn, the other not solemn. Solemn penance—which, such as it was of old, is read now more in the books than seen in the churches—is described for us here and there by the ancients. Among whom see Innocent I (Letter 1 to Decentius, ch. 7), Pope Siricius (Epistle 1, ch. 4), Leo (Epistle 92, chs. 10–11), Jerome (In the Epitaph of Fabiola), Ambrose, book 2 On Penance, chs. 10–11, Sozomen, book 9 of Ecclesiastical History, ch. 35, the Council of Arles (canons 13, 21, and 22), and Gratian, Burchard, and Ivo in their Decreta, where they have gathered canons and testimonies of the Fathers on this matter.⁷⁵ From which places is gathered, first of all, that this penance was not wont to be imposed save for graver crimes and those manifest. Likewise that those who underwent it had to stand outside the enclosures of the church, in the vestibule, and in the sight of all, praying and humbly and tearfully imploring for themselves the prayers and intercession of all, and clothed in a hairshirt or sackcloth; and they fasted likewise.

§ 82. They were not received to enter the church, except on Holy Thursday; for reconciliation, however, and to the sacraments of the Church only after the appointed time of penance had been completed—except in danger of death, or some other cause that must be approved by the bishop. Now whoever had once done this penance were not afterwards permitted either to serve in the army or to contract marriage, although sometimes in this matter a dispensation was granted on account of age. Nor could a spouse, without the other spouse's consent, undertake this penance. Finally, this kind of penance it was never permitted to repeat, even if perhaps someone afterwards had fallen into similar or graver crimes; and that for three reasons. First, lest by repetition this solemn kind of remedy be cheapened. Whence Augustine writes (in Epistle 54): "It has been provided cautiously and wholesomely that place for that most lowly penance be granted only once in the Church, lest the medicine, being cheap, be less useful to the sick—which will be all the more health-giving the less it is contemptible." Second, because of the signification. For the casting-out of the penitent outside the doors of the Church—which was done in that solemn penance at the very beginning of Lent—represented the expulsion of Adam from Paradise, which was done only once. Ambrose indicates this reason, book 2 On Penance, ch. 11. Third, because that solemnity of Penance was as it were a certain public profession of keeping it perpetually and of never committing anything for which it ought to be repeated.

§ 83. Moreover, public non-solemn penance was indeed also done for manifest crimes, and therefore was done publicly, yet not with the same public and solemn ceremonies with which solemn penance was done; but it was only required that the penitent present himself publicly, that is, before the Church, as a penitent—so that, namely, those who had been scandalized by his crime might be edified anew by this penitent's humility. And at times even clerics were ordered to do it—whom, however, the Church never either compelled or admitted to do solemn penance, on account of the dignity of Orders. On this matter see the First Letter of Pope Siricius. And indeed this public non-solemn penance had to be done as often as the Church, that is, the community of the faithful, had been scandalized by some crime. Of this kind are produced as examples two emperors, Philip and Theodosius—the former under Pope Fabian, the latter under Ambrose. Of the former Eusebius makes mention (*Ecclesiastical History*, book 6, ch. 25) and Nicephorus (book 5, ch. 25); of the latter, Rufinus (book 11, ch. 18 of the *Ecclesiastical History*), Theodoret (book 5, ch. 17), Nicephorus (book 12, chs. 40–41), and Ambrose himself (*Oration on the death of Theodosius*, and *Epistles* 21 and 28). Likewise Augustine (*Homily* 49, ch. 3), where he says that Emperor Theodosius did public penance in the sight of the people—especially for this reason, because his sin was public and could not be hidden. The histories of the Franks report something similar also of the Emperor Louis, son of Charlemagne.

§ 84. These things having been premised, to the authorities of the Fathers adduced in the last argument we answer distinctly and individually as follows. Origen's opinion is to be taken of public and solemn penance. Nor should it move us that after that phrase "only once" there is added in Origen "or rarely"; for this appears to have been added either by Rufinus, Origen's interpreter, or by some other person to whom the statement seemed absurd. For neither in Cyril—on whom the whole work on *Leviticus* is falsely fathered—nor in the Master, who in the text cites these words under Origen's name, is that addition found. But if Origen himself wrote thus, one must say that he is speaking of public penance in general, as it comprehends both solemn and non-solemn; of which the one should be unique, the other rare. But what Origen subjoins, that "the common [sins], which we fall into frequently, always receive penance and are always redeemed," the Master understands to have been said not only of venial sins but also of mortal sins which are less grave, nor does he understand this badly. For Origen, where he distinguishes between graver crimes and lighter ones—which he calls "common"—says that for the former indeed penance is done once, but for the latter more often.

§ 85. Further, Ambrose explains himself, when after those words "as there is one Baptism, so there is one Penance," he subjoins at once, "which, however, is done publicly." He understands public penance, namely solemn. What follows, however: "For we ought to repent daily of our offense," can be extended also to mortal sins less grave, in the manner in which, from the Master, we said Origen is to be understood.

§ 86. Likewise what is read, that "it ought similarly to be understood of solemn penance," is to be taken as of the solemn, as Augustine more fully declares (*Epistle* 54), where he thus replies to the objector: "Although for those who after doing penance commit even graver [sins] the place of that most lowly penance is not conceded in the Church, nevertheless on the grounds of forbearance is not cut off"—and what follows. And below: "Although therefore it has been provided cautiously and wholesomely that place of that most lowly penance be conceded once in the Church, nevertheless, shall anyone dare to say to God: Why do you still spare me, who after first penance bind myself again with the bonds of iniquity?"—and what follows. But as regards that doctrine which he delivers (*Homily* 27 and in *Epistle* 108), distinguishing a triple action of penance—of those who ask for Baptism, of the baptized their daily [penance] for lighter sins, a third of the baptized for graver [sins]—it must be known that under this third member is comprehended not only the solemn one,

which Augustine (in Epistle 54) calls the most lowly penance when it is repeated, but also the private [penance], which is for hidden crimes, and further, the non-solemn public [penance]. This, first of all, is clear in that treating this third member Augustine nowhere says that such penance is conceded only once. Next, because (Homily 50, ch. 4) he expressly affirms that the third action of penance is to be undergone for those sins which the Law of the Decalogue contains and of which the Apostle says: "Those who do such things shall not possess the kingdom of God." But these are not all of such a kind as that public and solemn Penance is wont or ought to be imposed for them—as is most manifestly evident concerning sins committed against the two last commandments. Nay in the same place he not obscurely indicates that he also includes private penance under the following words. Finally, Augustine wills that the third kind of penance be done for all those sins which are not remitted without the use and ministry of the keys of the Church; as is evident from Homily 27, ch. 3; Homily 49, ch. 3; Homily 50, chs. 4 and 5. In all which places he clearly and expressly makes mention of the keys of the Church and of their necessity for the loosening of mortal sins. It is evident, therefore, that under the third kind of penance, according to Augustine's distinction, are comprehended the third, the fourth, and the fifth kind of penance, according to the division of penance set out by us above.⁷⁶

§ XII — That good works are mortified by sin, and that the same are revived by penance (Opera bona per peccatum mortificari, eademque per poenitentiam reviviscere)

§ 87. Although it is impossible that dead works—that is, those which never had the life of grace (*gratia*) or charity (*caritas*), such as are the works of unbelievers or of those who, though having faith, are in the state of mortal sin (*peccatum mortale*)—should be so quickened by supervening grace or charity or penance (*poenitentia*) as to become living and meritorious of the heavenly kingdom (even if otherwise good), as St. Thomas teaches,⁷⁸ nevertheless it is an undoubted doctrine among the Doctors that good works which in grace and charity were good, having been mortified by subsequent mortal sin, are resuscitated and revived by subsequent penance, so that again a reward (*praemium*) of eternal life is owed to the man.

§ 88. Now that those works are said to be mortified, not as though they received some change from the supervening sin (for since they are acts that have passed away, they straightway, according to their own nature, cease to be, whether sin follows or not), but in a certain likeness which happens to things that properly live. For just as a living thing by death loses the operation of life, so good works lose, through the subsequent sin which is the death of the soul, their proper operation or effect—namely, to ordain a man to eternal life; for sin takes away grace and charity, through which good works are made meritorious of eternal life. Therefore in this sense is it said that those works are mortified by sin.

§ 89. This doctrine is most plainly proved by the Scriptures. Thus Ezekiel: "If the just man turn himself away from his justice which he hath wrought, iniquity shall be remembered against him, and in his sin he shall die" (Ezek. 18; 33). Likewise in Ecclesiasticus: "He that is washed after touching the dead, and toucheth him again, what doth his washing profit?" (Sir. 34). Whence Paul, lamenting that after noble works of virtue some fell back into sin, says (Gal. 3): "So great things have ye suffered in vain?" And John warns in his Second Epistle: "Look to yourselves, that ye lose not the things which ye have wrought, but that ye may receive a full reward" (2 Jn. 8). Likewise in the Apocalypse: "Hold fast what thou hast, that no man take thy crown" (Rev. 3). Finally, all those passages of Scripture which announce in general that they who do the works of the flesh,

that is, mortal sins, shall not obtain the kingdom of God—even if before they had been washed from such things, justified and sanctified—show the same thing (1 Cor. 6; Gal. 5; Rev. 21). The Fathers, too, teach this constantly and most surely; and by name St. Jerome, St. John Chrysostom, and other interpreters on that saying "So great things have ye suffered in vain" (Gal. 3). Gratian also adduces testimonies (De Poenitentia, dist. 3). Therefore, this dogma being established, another thing likewise must be proved—namely, that works mortified in this manner are revived by penance.

§ 90. And indeed, although—as we have said—it is, taken by itself, undoubted among the Doctors, yet, in order that the former point be first held as certain, a reason is set down, indeed the certainty of faith. Now in regard to this it must be noted that some, considering only those former works, have thought that, since they are, they can neither remain nor be recalled; and so they have supposed that by subsequent penance they cannot be revived. But this argument, if it proved anything, would prove that those works could not have been mortified, since they had already ceased to be; which is why one must answer that a power of leading to eternal life is not attributed to good works inasmuch as they exist in the nature of things, but inasmuch as they exist or remain in the divine acceptance. Now in this way they do not remain, after the man who did them has fallen into mortal sin; because then he is no longer held worthy of eternal life, a hindrance having been interposed by sin. But when this hindrance is removed by penance, and grace is restored, God accepts those works again unto eternal life and deems him by whom they were done worthy of eternal life on account of them.

§ 91. Here it must be noted that God does not change His eternal will or decree by which He wills to render eternal life to this man for his good works; for that decree remains even when the man sins, if he be among the elect, but He can judge otherwise and otherwise of the man as he is otherwise disposed. For when a man works well, He judges him worthy of eternal life—whether He will give it to him or not; and when he works ill, He judges him unworthy of eternal life; which change, however, is not in God but in man, of whom God always judges according to truth. Thus therefore, when a man, converted from sin, again cultivates justice, God judges him worthy of eternal life, not only on account of present works, but also on account of those works which had been mortified by subsequent sin. In this sense, then, one must understand that those things which were mortified by sin are revived by penance.

§ 92. For the proof of which, first of all the Scriptures avail which hand down that God so remits sins that He remembers them no more. From which it follows that the merit (*meritum*) of the former works returns before God; for otherwise He would not be said to be altogether forgetful of the sin, if, on account of the sin, his former works were deprived of their reward forever. The passages are in Ezekiel 18; 33, in Psalm 31, and very many others. To this pertains also that saying (Heb. 6): "For God is not unjust that He should forget your work." Nay rather, those general Scriptures which speak of the examination and retribution of all works on the day of judgment prove it, as that one in Ecclesiastes at the end: "All things that are done, God will bring into judgment," and others of this kind.

§ 93. Moreover, the Fathers have handed down that opinion more openly. For Jerome says (on Gal. 3): "Whoever shall have labored on account of faith in Christ, and afterwards shall have fallen into sin—as he is said to have suffered former things in vain—so again he will not lose them, if he return to his former zeal." Chrysostom likewise, treating that same passage, says that the sinner has not labored in vain, if he recall his mind and do penance. So too others on the same place. No less openly the author of the book On True and False Penance, among the works of Augustine, and cited by Gratian (De Poenitentia, dist. 3, cap. Pium est

credere), says: "It is pious to believe, and our faith demands this, that since the grace of Christ has destroyed the former evils in a man, it should also reward the good." Which is not to be understood as though that author wished this doctrine to be held by faith, but that it is most consonant with the Catholic faith.

§ 94. Another passage is in Gratian (De Poenitentia, dist. 4, cap. Intermittentes), where, after rehearsing the Apostle's words (Heb. 6), he subjoins: "By former good things the Apostle means those which through subsequent sin were dead, who, by sinning, had made the former good things void. As therefore by sinning they are made void, so by penance they are revived, and each of them begins to profit unto the merit of eternal life and beatitude, even those which are found to have been mingled with sins," and so forth. Although not rightly for this doctrine do Gratian and the Master⁷⁹ allege that saying of the Apostle: "Not laying again the foundation of penance from dead works" (Heb. 6:1), since by dead works the Apostle there understands sins, as farther down (Heb. 9), where it is said that "the Blood of Christ cleanses us from dead works to serve the living God." Which works therefore in no way receive life through penance, but rather are altogether abolished by it, as Thomas says.⁸⁰

§ 95. Lastly, this doctrine is confirmed by such a reason: in regard to good works guilt (*culpa*) does not avail more than grace; therefore, if by guilt they are mortified, by grace—which also destroys guilt itself—they are revived; especially since grace is so powerful as to remove guilt that it also removes every effect of it. Furthermore, what we have said about the resuscitation of good works by penance must be understood not of some only of the good works, but of absolutely all and each (as Gratian speaks) that were mortified by sin. For there is no reason why some should revive and others not—especially if we speak of meritorious works. Although this doctrine can also be extended to works done outside the state of grace, whether they were only morally good, or were done on account of the hope of eternal life by the Holy Spirit not yet indwelling. For these too, inasmuch as previously they were good and accepted by God unto something, so far also revive in their own manner.

§ 96. Now, as against the things said some object that it sometimes happens that the penitent does not rise again to an equal or greater degree of grace or charity, but only to a lesser; whence it would seem to follow that the former works of virtue do not revive; otherwise, just as unto an equal or greater glory, which was owed for those works, so the man ought to be recalled by penance unto an equal or greater grace corresponding to that glory. This is easily solved from what has been said above. For it has not been said that former works revive by penance in this sense, that by penance the restored man necessarily be brought to so great a glory as he would have received for those works if he had not fallen; but because again the man is rendered worthy, on account of them, of eternal life, which also he would receive for them if he persevered, as likewise for the good works done afterwards. For as regards the degree of glory, he will receive it according to the greatness of grace or charity in which he dies. And this is the express opinion of St. Thomas (In III Sent., dist. 31, q. 1, a. 4; and in the Summa, II, q. 89, a. 5, ad 3). In which place, to the objection about him who rises again to a lesser grace and in that dies, he says: "It must be said that he who by penance rises again in lesser charity will indeed obtain the essential reward according to the quantity of charity in which he is found. He will, however, have greater joy for the works done in the first charity than for the works which he did in the second, which pertains to the accidental reward." So he. But that by penance grace can be recovered in any degree whatsoever is left manifest from those things which we have said about charity's being recoverable in any degree whatsoever above (on a Distinction of Book 3).⁸¹

§ XIII — *The beginning of penance is from fear (Poenitentiae initium esse a timore)*

§ 97. Divine justice so has ordained, that no one should ever begin to hate a sin committed by himself and to withdraw from it, unless he be stirred up by fear of Gehenna, or of eternal death, as by a certain present punishment ordered to the avoiding of eternal punishment; and that by the ministry of the Law, because, as the Apostle says, "by the Law is knowledge of sin." For this catholic dogma has a manifest proof from the Scriptures. For in Sirach it is said first: "The fear of the Lord casts out sin, because he who is without fear will not be able to be justified." And the Psalmist says: "Pierce my flesh with thy fear." Likewise that of Proverbs 1, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," although it is understood otherwise by some; yet Bede, following after St. Augustine, in expounding Tractate 9 on the First Epistle of John, explains it expressly of servile fear.⁸³ And that we may take from Scripture a signal example of one penitent, Paul, whose conversion was so admirable and sudden, prostrated to the earth by heavenly fear and by the very voice of the Judge, trembling and amazed said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" (Acts 9). Of whom St. Augustine, in the Epistle 50 to Boniface, says: "He whom greater fear compelled to charity, of him perfect charity cast out fear."⁸⁴ The same St. Augustine, on the same Tractate 9 on the First Epistle of John, writes thus upon that saying, "Perfect charity casts out fear": "Fear as it were prepares a place for charity. But if there is no fear, there is not that by which charity may enter." And when he had introduced a likeness of a bristle that introduces the thread, he subjoins: "Fear first takes possession of the mind; yet fear does not remain there, because it therefore entered, that it might introduce charity." And below: "For if you are without fear, you will not be able to be justified." And he proves this from the Scripture of Sirach. He has like things in the book On Catechising the Uninstructed, ch. 5. Prosper also, in the Responses to the Chapters of the Gauls, 6. Tertullian likewise, in the book On Penance, calls this fear the instrument of penance, without which, namely, penance cannot be done. And St. Basil, on Psalm 32, among other names calls it a pedagogue unto piety.⁸⁵ Hence finally it is, that John and Christ in the Gospel, and likewise Peter and Paul in the Acts, exhorting men to penance, set before their eyes the judgment of God and the punishments of sinners.

§ 98. Although therefore this fear is neither justice, nor anything of justice, because it is servile; nevertheless it not obscurely subserves penance, justice, and wisdom, inasmuch as it leads and recalls to penance, justice, and wisdom—and consequently to God—the man alienated from God by sin. Whence it is clear how false is that saying of Luther: that fear almost leads a man away from God and makes him rather a hypocrite. The absurdity of which saying is more fully convicted by those things which we have said concerning the usefulness of servile fear, above, on Distinction 34 of Book 3 of the Sentences.⁸⁶ But what order this fear has to penance and to justice itself is briefly declared by St. Thomas in III, q. 85, a. 5; and the same was explained by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 6, where it is treated of the mode of preparation unto justification.⁸⁷

§ I — *What are the parts and what the matter of the Sacrament of Penance (Quae sint partes & quae materia Sacramenti Poenitentiae)*

§ 99. Since in this Distinction the Master treats satisfaction, which, since it is a part of the sacrament of penance, must first be explained—what parts are to be ascribed to this sacrament. For since, as was said

elsewhere, every sacrament consists of two parts, matter and form, it is necessary that in this sacrament too those parts be found. Therefore first we shall speak of its matter, then of its form.

§ 100. Scotus, Durandus, and some others assign as the matter of this sacrament the very sins of the penitent. Which is not ill said according to a certain acceptance of matter, as St. Thomas also teaches in III, q. 84, a. 2. For the sins of the penitent are the remote matter of the sacrament of penance, inasmuch namely as the acts of the penitent are busied about them objectively, not indeed as to be accepted, but as to be detested and destroyed. For the penitent is sorry for and is contrite over sins, he confesses sins, he makes satisfaction for sins. But all these things tend to this, that sins be abolished. And this account of matter the Apostle attributes to sins with respect to the sacrament of Penance when he says in 2 Cor. 12: "They have not done penance for uncleanness and fornication and wantonness which they have committed."

§ 101. But besides matter of this sort, which alone the above-named Doctors ascribe to this sacrament, there must also be acknowledged in this sacrament another matter, according to the declaration of the Councils of Florence and Trent; namely, the very acts of the penitent, which acts St. Thomas calls the proximate matter of penance, because they are its parts, of which it consists, so that they have the character of matter "out of which," not indeed of matter that passes over, as water and earth with respect to a statue, but of matter that inheres, as with respect to the same statue the metal: whereas the sins have the character of neither, but only, as we have said, of a certain matter "about which," as hay and stubble are the matter of fire.⁸⁹ And that doctrine of the parts of penance is taught by the Council of Florence (in the decree given to the Armenians) and by the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 3, and canon 4), although in those places they are called not absolutely matter, but as it were matter. The reason for which we shall explain below.⁹⁰ The words of the Tridentine doctrine are these: "But as it were the matter of this sacrament are the acts of the very penitent, namely contrition, confession, satisfaction. Which, inasmuch as they are required in penance for the integrity of the sacrament, and for the full and perfect remission of sins by God's institution, for this reason are called the parts of penance."

§ 102. Wherefore with good reason the same Tridentine Synod in both places damns with anathema the opinion of those who want there to be only two parts of penance, namely, the terrors impressed on conscience at the knowledge of sin, and the faith conceived from the Gospel or from absolution, by which one believes that his sins have been remitted to him through Christ. For the terror of conscience, or fear of Gehenna, so long as it is not yet conjoined with love of justice, is not "sorrow according to God," and is often in those who, persevering in sins, do not attain to their remission, nor approach it. And hence a terror or fear of such sort is neither true penance, nor a part of it. But the faith by which someone believes that his sins have been remitted to him is in no way necessary for obtaining their remission, nay it has no foundation in the Scriptures and in the doctrine of the Fathers, but is openly opposed to both, as also to reason itself, as must be taught more fully elsewhere, and as we in part have shown above on the First Distinction, where the effect of the sacraments in general was treated.⁹¹ Meanwhile on that matter let the Reader consult the Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 9, and canons 12, 13, 14, where that empty presumption of the heretics is at once refuted and condemned.⁹²

§ 103. Now, however, let us briefly prove from the Fathers those parts of Penance which the Church acknowledges. St. John Chrysostom, in the Homily On Penance, not only indicates strictly the parts themselves, but also their fittingness, with these words: "Penance compels the sinner to bear all things. In his heart is contrition, in confession, in work, entire humility; so that, in the ways by which we have offended God—namely by heart, by mouth, and by deed—by those same we may be reconciled to God."⁹³ St. Cyprian, in

the Sermon On the Lapsed, names confession and satisfaction, and without doubt also requires contrition as most necessary.⁹⁴ So too St. Leo, in Epistle 91 to Theodorus, enjoins confession and satisfaction expressly by name, and much more contrition, which is included in that which he says when he speaks of penitents from whom these things are exacted.⁹⁵ Likewise St. Ambrose (in the Epistle to a fallen virgin, and in the two books On Penance against the Novatians), and St. Augustine (Homilies 40 and 50), plainly require the same penitential actions.⁹⁶

§ 104. But that we may remove scruples here, we will add a passage from St. Bernard, who counts not three but five parts of penance. For thus he writes (in the Sentences, 38): "The parts of penance are five: contrition in the heart, confession in the mouth, mortification in the flesh, correction in deed, perseverance in virtue." But it must be noted that conversion of life to the better, and perseverance according to purpose, pertain to contrition, as also mortification of the flesh to satisfaction. Wherefore those five are really contained under these three. Perseverance indeed, according to the formal character of true penance, is not included, as we have shown in the above Distinction.⁹⁷

§ 105. Reply to certain arguments on the contrary is gladly given. St. Thomas in the same place, indeed, is our guide. We reply, namely, to certain arguments by which the doctrine set forth above is impugned by those who think differently. First, they say: contrition is not sensible, but lies hidden in the mind; therefore it is not a part of the sacrament. Second: Just as contrition is required here, so also in Baptism; but contrition is not a part of the sacrament of Baptism, therefore neither is it of this sacrament. Third: In order to obtain the remission of sins through the sacrament of penance, sometimes attrition suffices, as the Tridentine Synod teaches (Session 14, ch. 4); therefore contrition is not necessary as a part. Fourth: Contrition is in a certain way a part of satisfaction; therefore it ought not to be numbered as a part distinct from the other two. And the same can be objected concerning confession. But the antecedent is proved, because by the sorrow of contrition and by the shame of confession, as by certain penal works, penitents make satisfaction for their sins at least in part. Fifth: Sometimes this sacrament is administered to a man not confessing, as if he should suddenly be struck dumb, or oppressed by the violence of disease should lose even the use of tongue or of mind, provided nevertheless that signs of repentance have preceded, as St. Leo teaches in Epistle 91; therefore confession is not necessary as a part. Sixth: By a plenary indulgence there is a relaxation of satisfaction, and in the article of death no satisfaction ought to be imposed, and nevertheless in both cases the full account of this sacrament is preserved; therefore satisfaction is not a part of it. Seventh: Confession and satisfaction are not together with the form of absolution, but confession precedes, satisfaction follows; therefore they are not parts of this sacrament, nor do they constitute its matter as matter: since it is necessary that matter be together with the form for the whole to be constituted as a sacrament, as is evident in Baptism, in which it would not suffice first to wash and afterwards to pronounce the words, or conversely, but both must be done together. And thus too in the others.⁹⁸

1. Peter of Palude (Petrus Paludanus), In IV Sent. [abbreviation as in source: "in 4."].

2. St. Augustine.

3. Council of Constance, decree remitting the earlier rigor.

4. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84 and the following.

5. Council of Trent, Session 14, canon 10.

6. St. Leo the Great, Epistle 3; Lateran Council, canon 9.
7. Tertullian, *De poenitentia*; St. Cyprian, Epistles, book 3, ep. 15–17; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2.
8. St. Jerome, In Isaia 3; Ep. 65 ad Pammachium et Oceanum; Ep. ad Demetriadem de virginitate servanda; St. Ambrose, *De lapsu virginis*; Expositio in Psalmum 3 (beginning); St. Pacian, Ep. 1–2 ad Sympronianum; Peter Lombard, in the Text; Gratian, Decretum, Causa II, *De poenitentia*, Dist. 1; Glossa ordinaria on Isaiah 3; Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 14; Council of Trent, Session 14, canon 2.
9. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84; q. 85, a. 1–4.
10. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 14.
11. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
12. Rev. 2: "Be mindful therefore from whence thou art fallen, and do penance, and do the first works."; 2 Cor. 7: "For the sorrow that is according to God worketh penance steadfast unto salvation."; Matt. 3; Luke 3; Peter Lombard, in the Text; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4 ("*De contritione*"); St. Ambrose; St. Gregory, cited by the Master (of the Sentences).
13. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 1, 7.
14. Matt. 18: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Witnesses among the Fathers: St. Cyprian, Letters I, ep. 3; St. Ambrose, *De poenitentia* I, ch. 2; St. Hilary, In Matthaum; St. Augustine, Sermon 44, *De verbis Domini*, and the last or the next-to-last homily among the fifty [abbreviation as in source: "(a) Seu Sermon. XCVIII. inter Sermon. I. Classis, & CCCLI inter Sermon. IV. Classis in Editione Benedictin." and "(b) Seu CCCLII. CCCLI. & CCCLII inter Sermon. IV. Classis in eadem Edit."].
15. John 20: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1 and canon 3.
16. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ch. 7; Tertullian, *De poenitentia*; St. Cyprian, *De lapsis* and Letters III, ep. 14; Origen, Homilies on Leviticus, hom. 2; St. Basil, Ep. 288; Pacian (or an ancient author), *Epistulae ad Sympronianum*; St. John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* III, ch. 9, and on John 20; St. Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact, Commentary on John 20; St. Augustine, Sermons On the Words of the Lord 8, 11, and 44, likewise Homily 27 (last or penultimate) [ed. notes as in source], Tractates on John 49–50, Letters 48 and 180 (to Bishop Honoratus), on Ps. 10, Discourse 2, and City of God XX, ch. 9; St. Leo the Great, Letter 91 to Theodorus; St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels, hom. 26.
17. On Novatian's condemnation and usurpation of the power of remitting sins, see St. Epiphanius, *De haeresibus*; St. Augustine, *De haeresibus*; and many places in St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose. Estius notes that further testimonies will be adduced below when he treats of confession. The "Florentine Decree" mentioned below refers to the Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians.
18. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84 [as above].
19. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2 and canon 2.
20. Origen, Homilies on Leviticus, hom. 2.
21. St. Ambrose, *De poenitentia* I, ch. 7; II, ch. 2.
22. St. Ambrose, *Apologia David*, ch. 9.
23. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ch. 46.
24. St. Augustine, Letter 23 to Boniface; in the Benedictine edition this is Letter 98 [editorial cross-reference as in source].
25. St. Augustine, City of God XX, ch. 9; Rev. 20; Matt. 16:19; Matt. 18:18.
26. St. Augustine, *De adulterinis coniugiis* I, ch. last; Letter 180 to Bishop Honoratus; *De symbolo* I, ch. 6.
27. Pacian (or the ancient author) against the Novatians; St. Jerome, *Dialogus II contra Pelagianos*; St. Cyril of Alexandria on John 20; St. Bede on Mark 1; St. Isidore, *Etymologiae* VI, ch. 9.
28. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2 (the clause cited).
29. The long parenthetical apparatus in the printed edition here records at length the controversies over Montanists and Novatians; Estius refers especially to Jerome (Letter 54), who, against the rigorists, bears witness that in the Church pardon can be granted to almost every sin, writing: "Shall the doors of the Church be shut to every sin? We daily read: 'Shall he who falls not also rise

again?' says the Lord. And, "Turn you from your perversities.'" He notes that the Montanists were severe, not because it profited themselves, but because it profited us, that they should blush to confess their sins, while we by confessing merit pardon. He adds that some, as Gaspar Juenin (*Commentary on the Sacraments*, at the place cited), contend that the Montanists did not absolutely take away penance, but denied that pardon could be given by the Church for certain particular crimes; as to the Novatians, it is the common assertion of the ancients that Novatian and the Novatians took away from the Church the power of forgiving post-baptismal sins, that is, they usurped to themselves the judgment which belongs to God alone. Yet the same Gaspar Juenin (in the conclusion at the place lauded) tries to show, from Socrates (*Ecclesiastical History*, Tome 3, in the third century, ch. 3, art. 4, 9, as printed by Valesius), the contrary: namely, that the Novatians did not altogether abolish the sacrament of Penance, but only pronounced certain crimes irremissible by the Church's authority; which opinion, taken from Socrates, some recent authors approve, among whom Natalis Alexander. But, if one carefully weigh those same passages of Socrates which are reported by Valesius, it will be easy to decide which opinion is truer. For Socrates, book 4 (*Eccles. Hist.* ch. 48 in the Valesian edition), speaking of Novatian, has as follows: because for that reason he had withdrawn from the bishops who held otherwise than himself, he wrote to all the Churches everywhere that they should not admit those who after Baptism had sacrificed to idols to the sacred mysteries; but they should exhort them indeed to penance, and should leave forgiveness to God, in whose power and judgment it lies to remit crimes. By these letters, carried into all the provinces, men, each according to his customs, gave judgement about those whom he meant; some indeed deemed the rule too harsh and unfit to be promulgated; but others both accepted it as just and, as chiefly useful for amendment of life, embraced it. While this controversy was being carried on, there supervened the letter of Cornelius, bishop of the Romans, who, since even to those who after Baptism had sinned he promised indulgence, was bearing a sentence opposed to that promulgation. Another passage is from book 7 (ch. 25), where, describing the colloquy of Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, with Asclepiades, a Novatian bishop, he has these words: Atticus once said to Asclepiades: "I indeed praise Novatian, but I do not praise the Novatians." Disturbed at this saying, Asclepiades said: "How, I ask, do you say this, O bishop?" To whom Atticus: "I praise him in that, along with those who had sacrificed, he would not communicate; but I by no means approve the Novatians, who exclude even the laity from communion for slight faults. You indeed exclude laymen for small offenses; but we even clerics." From these places it is clear that the Novatians erred in this point, namely that they denied to the Church a certain power of indulgence even over lesser faults; and hence they would not admit to communion the laity on account of light sins, much less clerics; and that Asclepiades at one time also said, as Socrates records, "We remove them from communion on account of this, reserving to God alone the power of pardoning crimes."

30. St. Thomas, [as above-cited places] [abbreviation as in source].
31. St. Ambrose, *De poenitentia contra Novatianos* II, ch. 2; St. Augustine, *Expositio inchoata in Epistolam ad Romanos*, at the end; St. John Chrysostom, *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius*, on *Hebrews*; *Gennadius*, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, ch. 30; St. Cyril, cited by *Oecumenius*.
32. *Heb.* 6:4–6; *Heb.* 10:26–27; *Rom.* 6:9–11; 2 *Pet.* 2:21; 2 *Cor.* 2:10; 2 *Cor.* 12:21.
33. St. Thomas, as in the place cited immediately before [abbreviation as in source].
34. St. Augustine, *Sermon 16* on the same words of the Lord; also in *Gratian*, *Decretum*, II, q. 3, c. "Cepisti." St. Augustine, *Tractates on John 58 and 50*. *Theophylact*, *Commentary on Matthew*, ad loc.
35. St. Augustine, *Hom.* 27; *Hom.* 49; *Hom.* 50; *Book 1 Against the Adversaries of the Law and the Prophets*, ch. 17; *Tractate On the Usefulness of Penance*, ch. 3; *On the Nature of the Good*, last ch.; *City of God*, *Book 20*, ch. 9; *Tractates on John 22 and 49* [abbreviations and numeration as in the source].
36. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah 14*; citing *Prov.* 5. See also St. Jerome, *Commentary on Matt.* 16 and on *Titus* 3.
37. *Jn.* 20:23; *Lk.* 24:47; *Matt.* 28:19. St. Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* III, ch. 25.
38. St. Augustine, *On Ps.* 61; *Contra Donatistas*, *Book 3*, chs. 17–18; *Book 4*, ch. 5; *Book 5*, chs. 20–22; *Book 6*, chs. 1–2; *Homily 23* among the fifty [abbreviations as in the source].
39. Council of Trent, *Session 14*, ch. 1; *Session 14*, canon 3.
40. *St. Mark* 1:4; *Lk.* 3:3; *Acts* 2:38. St. Augustine (attrib.) or St. Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, ch. 30.
41. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 5.
42. Council of Trent, *Session 14*, ch. 2; *Session 14*, canons 6–7.
43. St. Augustine, *De adulterinis coniugiis* I, last chapter.
44. St. Augustine, *Epistle 180* to Bishop Honoratus.

45. St. Augustine, City of God, Book 20, ch. 9.
46. St. Ambrose, Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke, Book 7 on Luke 15.
47. Pope Leo I, Epistle 91 to Theodorus; preserved also in Gratian, Decretum, De poenitentia, Dist. 1.
48. Pope Leo I, Sermon 3 On the Anniversary of His Pontificate; Sermon 2 On the Birthday of the Apostles Peter and Paul; and the poem on the keys on Matt. 16 [abbreviations as in the source].
49. St. Augustine, Homily 49 among the fifty.
50. Haymo (Haymon), Homily on the Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost.
51. See below on the necessity of sacramental confession in this Distinctio.
52. Sixtus IV condemned in the Synod of Complutum two conclusions of a certain Peter of Osma: that mortal sins, as to guilt and the punishment of the other life, are blotted out by contrition of heart alone without reference to the keys; and that evil thoughts are blotted out by mere displeasure without reference to the keys [wording as in the source].
53. See above on the necessity of Baptism and on remedies which supply its stead, at Distinctio 4.
54. St. Thomas, in the same place just cited.
55. St. Fulgentius, De fide ad Petrum, ch. 3; St. Augustine, Sermon 59 On the Words of the Lord.
56. St. Cyprian, De eleemosyna; St. Augustine, Enchiridion, chs. 70–71; Lactantius, Divinae Institutiones, VI, ch. 12.
57. St. Augustine, De peccatorum meritis I, ch. 14; Enchiridion, in the place already cited.
58. Council of Trent on the holy sacrifice of the Mass and its propitiatory efficacy [as in the source].
59. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
60. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84, aa. 8–9.
61. Ezech. 18; Ezech. 33; Is. 1; Ps. 50; Matt. 11; Rom. 1.
62. St. Augustine, Retractationes I, ch. 19.
63. St. Leo the Great, Ep. 91; Gratian, Decretum, Title De poenitentia.
64. St. Augustine, Epistle 54 [as in the source's numbering].
65. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 20 on Hebrews 10; cf. also the letter to Theodore the Lapsed.
66. St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, I–II.
67. [Attributed to] St. Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 5. (The attribution is as in the source.)
68. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, loc. cit. ["ubi sup." as in the source; i.e., the same locus cited above in this Distinctio.]
69. Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 21: "If you have sinned, do not add again; but also pray concerning former sins, that they may be forgiven you." And: "Every iniquity is as a sharp sword; the wound thereof has no healing."
70. Heb. 12:16–17.
71. St. Ambrose, Sermon 8 on Ps. 118; St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, II, ch. 9.
72. St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, II, ch. 10.
73. Origen, Hom. 16 on Leviticus 25; St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, II, chs. 10–11; [Pseudo-]Augustine, Ep. 53 (Macedonius to Augustine); St. Augustine, Ep. 54 (to Macedonius); Homily 50; St. Cyril of Alexandria, In Leviticum, XV.
74. St. Augustine, De fide et operibus, ch. 6; St. Augustine, De symbolo ad catechumenos, IV, ch. 1; St. Gregory the Great, Epistola ad Faustum; St. Augustine, Ep. 108 (to Seleuciana); Hom. 27, ch. 1; Hom. 50, ch. 2.
75. Pope Innocent I, Ep. 1 ad Decentium, ch. 7; Pope Siricius, Ep. 1, ch. 4; St. Leo the Great, Ep. 92, chs. 10–11; St. Jerome, Epitaphium Fabiolae; St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, II, chs. 10–11; Sozomen, Historia ecclesiastica, IX, ch. 35; Council of Arles, canons 13, 21, 22; Gratian, Burchard, and Ivo, Decreta, ad loc.
76. On those lapsed after Baptism and on whether, after once performing public or solemn penance, any penance—private or public—was afterwards to be granted them, see the learned men who have treated the matter: Albaspinæus (Gabriel de l'Aubespine),

Bishop of Orléans, on Epiphanius, Haer. 59, p. 236; Joannes Morinus, De administratione poenitentiae; to these add Natalis Alexander, Historia ecclesiastica, and Vivenius, Commentarius historico-dogmaticus. The last two authors, together with not a few, judge that for those who after Penance returned "to the vomit" there was not to be conceded again the benefit of absolution; but Augustine, in the Epistle to Himerius of Tarragona, and elsewhere, shows rather that private absolution was afforded to mortal sins after public penance had once been fulfilled—or certainly that nowhere was the grant of absolution denied. The Schoolmen too, and indeed some Fathers, teach that sins after first penance, though even graver than the former, were not left without the Church's indulgence: cf. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84, a. 10; also III, q. 84, a. 10 ad 2; and above, Dist. 14, q. 1, a. 5 (quasi num. 2). Morinus, book 5, with many testimonies of the ancients, asserts plainly the custom of the ancient Church to have been that indulgence was imparted even for former sins, whether equally grave or graver; indeed he does not hesitate to censure the contrary. The gravity of the matter would deserve that we tarry longer; but because leisure is lacking here, let these references suffice.

77. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 86, a. 4–6.

78. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 89, a. 6.

79. The Master, In IV Sent., dist. 15 [abbreviation as in source].

80. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 86, a. 6.

81. Supra, ad Distinctionem libri 3 [abbreviation as in source].

82. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 85, a. 5.

83. Bede, following St. Augustine, Tract. 9 on the First Epistle of John [abbreviation as in source].

84. St. Augustine, Epistle 50 to Boniface.

85. St. Augustine, Tractates on the First Epistle of John, Tract. 9; St. Augustine, De catechizandis rudibus, ch. 5; Prosper of Aquitaine, Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum, resp. 6; Tertullian, De poenitentia; St. Basil, In Psalmum 32.

86. Above, on Distinction 34 of Book 3 of the Sentences [abbreviation as in source].

87. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 6.

88. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84, a. 2; q. 90, a. 1–3.

89. On the distinction between remote matter (sins) and proximate matter (acts of the penitent), see St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84, a. 2.

90. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 3; Council of Trent, Session 14, canon 4.

91. See above, on the First Distinction [abbreviation as in source].

92. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 9; Session 6, canons 12–14.

93. St. John Chrysostom, Homily De poenitentia.

94. St. Cyprian, De lapsis (Sermon).

95. St. Leo the Great, Epistle 91.

96. St. Ambrose, Epistle to a fallen virgin; St. Ambrose, De poenitentia, against the Novatians, books I–II; St. Augustine, Homilies 40 and 50.

97. St. Bernard, Sentences 38; cf. also editorial notices: "Seu Serm. CCCLXXXII"; and concerning the Sentences attributed to Bernard and appended, see Horstius and Bellarmine who place them among doubtful works on account of style, among the doubtful works of St. Bernard [abbreviations as in source].

98. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4; St. Leo the Great, Epistle 91; on the simultaneity of matter and form in Baptism, cf. the common doctrine of the scholastics.

DISTINCTIO XV — ON THE PARTS OF PENANCE AND IN WHAT SENSE THEY ARE THE MATTER OF THE SACRAMENT

§ 1. Eighth: The perfect sacrament of Penance (*perfectum Poenitentiae sacramentum*) is administered by the priest (*sacerdos*), who nevertheless does not administer these parts; therefore they are not parts of the sacrament. Ninth: No formal reason appears why in the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*) matter (*materia*) should rather be assigned on the side of the recipient than in Baptism (*Baptismus*), especially since, in baptizing, certain like acts are required, such as faith (*fides*), the purpose of a good life, and penitence or sorrow for past sins, as we were saying in the second argument. Tenth: In a sacrament Grace (*gratia*) is conferred; but in confession (*confessio*) and satisfaction (*satisfactio*) Grace is not conferred; therefore they are not parts of the Sacrament. Eleventh: If the acts of the penitent are parts of this sacrament, then this sacrament is valid by the work of the doer—namely, of the recipient himself—*ex opere operantis* (*ex opere operantis*). Finally: The Councils of Florence and of Trent, as was said above, do not call the acts of the penitent the matter of this sacrament, but quasi-matter (*quasi materia*); therefore it is not necessary to acknowledge the acts of the penitent as parts of this sacrament having the formal character of matter. But to these objections, according to the mind of the Councils of Florence and Trent, and also according to the explanation of the Doctors who handed down the said doctrine, it is not difficult to reply.

§ 2. Therefore to the first it is answered with St. Thomas that contrition (*contritio*), although according to its essence it is in the heart, nevertheless virtually pertains to outward penance (*paenitentia exterior*), inasmuch as it includes the purpose of confessing and of making satisfaction.¹ Although therefore contrition is not of itself sensible, yet it is sensible and thus perceived through the outward acts of confession and satisfaction, and other external signs of inward sorrow; just as the inward consent of those contracting marriage (*matrimonium*) becomes known and perceptible to sense through words or other outward signs. For the same reason sanctity (*sanctitas*) is called a note of the Church, inasmuch, namely, as it manifests itself in many ways through the outward acts of the Faithful. And as bodily health is seen by the eyes through the color of the face, agility, and the movements of the body.

§ 3. To the second it is answered that the formal character is not the same for the sacrament of Baptism (*Baptismus*) and of Penance (*Poenitentia*). For matter (*materia*) is not assigned to all the sacraments in the same way. For in some there is applied externally a certain bodily matter, as in Baptism, Confirmation (*Confirmatio*), Orders (*Ordo*), and Extreme Unction (*Extrema Unctio*); but in others, as in Penance and Matrimony (*Matrimonium*), the very human acts take the place of matter—just as also in bodily remedies the case stands thus, of which some are things outwardly applied or taken, such as oil, ointments, plasters, drugs; but some are the acts of those to be healed, such as movements and exercises of the body. Now St. Thomas gives the reason for this diversity among the sacraments.²

§ 4. To the third: The attrition (*attritio*) which suffices to obtain reconciliation through the sacrament is imperfect contrition (*contritio imperfecta*), as excluding the will to sin, as the Council teaches in the same place.³

§ 5. To the fourth: Contrition and confession, although they also avail for making satisfaction for sins by reason of the penalty or trouble joined to them, are nevertheless different from that satisfaction which the priest enjoins, and which properly has the formal character of a part of this sacrament, as the Decree of Florence says.⁴

§ 6. To the fifth and sixth it is answered that confession and satisfaction are indeed integral parts (*partes integrales*) of this sacrament, yet not so necessary that without them the substance (*substantia*) of the sacrament does not stand. Hence the Master calls these parts of perfect penance (*partes perfectae poenitentiae*), because, to wit, without them this sacrament can exist, yet not perfect and entire with all its parts.⁵ It must, however, be known that in place of the defect of confession certain external signs of true penitence should supply, as is clear from the passage of Leo appealed to. And also when plenary indulgences (*indulgentiae plenariae*) are granted to penitents, some satisfaction must always be enjoined by the priest according to the prescription of the Ancient Councils.

§ 7. To the seventh: The sacraments require the application of the form (*forma*) to the matter (*materia*) according to the mode of their institution. Hence the formal character is not the same for the sacrament of Penance and of Baptism, or even of other composite sacraments.

§ 8. To the eighth: The priest administers the perfect sacrament of Penance as far as pertains to his ministry (*ministerium*), which is to utter the form of absolution over the due matter, and at the same time to enjoin satisfaction. But the matter itself, as has been said, is in this sacrament peculiarly required on the part of the recipient (*suscipiens*).

§ 9. The solution to the ninth argument is evident from the answer to the second.

§ 10. To the tenth: It is not necessary that Grace (*gratia*) be conferred when any part whatsoever of a sacrament does not consist in the very application of the form to the matter, as is the case in confession; or certainly in the use of a sacrament already received, as when the Eucharist (*Eucharistia*) is taken.

§ 11. To the eleventh: Whether the sacramental action (*actio sacramentalis*) be done by the minister conferring, or by the recipient receiving, on that account it is not said that the sacrament has its efficacy by the work of the doer, that is, ex opere operantis (*ex opere operantis*). For even in the sacrament of Matrimony, according to the opinion of many, the recipients themselves make the sacrament, that is, perform the sacramental action. Yet each of the two avails ex opere operato (*ex opere operato*); because it does not depend on the material of the work, but on the divine promise and institution, which, if they did not intervene, from such a work such an effect would never follow—just as in this and in the other sacraments.

§ 12. To the last: The acts of the penitent are called quasi-matter (*quasi materia*), because, as has already been said, in this sacrament there is not some external bodily thing which is matter, such as water, oil, chrism, wine in the other sacraments, but there are the actions of the penitent, which cannot properly be called matter. And from this it is also plain that there is not in this sacrament some other more proper matter; because the Doctors too, when expressly treating this question, assign no other matter. For the Council of Florence too declares that all the sacraments are perfected by three—matter, form, and minister; and the

Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 3) expressly calls these acts parts of the sacrament of Penance. From which it is evident that the opposing opinion is contrary to the definition of the Councils.

§ III — What is the form of this sacrament (Quae sit hujus sacramenti forma)

§ 13. The Council of Florence has this as the form (*forma*) of this sacrament: "Ego te absolvo," and so forth.⁴ The Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 3) has the same.⁷ And this is most fitting to this sacrament. For since the sacraments of the New Law effect what they signify, and the proper effect of this sacrament is the absolution (*absolutio*) of the penitent (*poenitens*) from sins, most aptly has that form been assigned to it which would perfectly signify absolution—especially since in this sacrament, as there is no bodily matter (*materia corporalis*) whose application to the recipient takes place, that application has to be expressed by the form, as happens in Baptism and Confirmation.⁸ Moreover this form is applied also to its matter (*materia*), and regards it in a certain way, whether we take as its matter the sins themselves, or the acts of the penitent. For it is applied to sins in such a way as to remove, loose, and destroy them; but it is subjoined to the acts of the penitent so as to perfect them, namely by bringing them to the end on account of which they are undertaken—specifically, to the absolution and reconciliation of the penitent. Now this form has some foundation in the Scriptures, namely in that which was said: "Quaecumque solveritis super terram," and again in this: "Quorum remiseritis peccata," in a manner similar to that by which the form of Baptism is indicated by those words: "Euntes docete omnes gentes: baptizantes eos in nomine Patris," and so on.⁹ But there are wont to be raised here several questions, to which we shall briefly reply.

§ 14. The first: whether it is necessary to add something to that form, in order that the substance of the sacrament consist; or whether, the substance of the sacrament being safe, something can be taken away from it. It is answered: with the exception of the pronoun, which is sufficiently included in the verb of the first person, as was said about the form of Baptism, nothing can be taken away; because the sacramental action which is exercised by the minister must absolutely be expressed, as it is in the Decree of Florence where the form of Baptism is treated. Likewise, the person to whom the sacrament is imparted must be designated.¹⁰

§ 15. But concerning things to be added, there will be the following questions. Therefore the second is: whether it is altogether necessary that the person of the minister be expressed, at least by a verb of the first person. Certain people think that this is altogether required for the substance of this sacrament, because, they say, in this sacrament the priest does not discharge a bare ministry as in Baptism, but, though in the stead of Christ the primary judge, pronounces a sentence of absolution as a judge. But it pleases others that this is not necessary, because the reason of the Decree of Florence—even though specially accommodated to the form given for the sacrament of Baptism—holds also in the other sacraments. For in all of them the minister is the instrumental cause of grace, but the principal cause is God.

§ 16. The third: whether it is necessary to add, "from your sins" (or the like). I reply that the Council of Florence as well as the Council of Trent, in order to indicate that they do not wish to define about such little questions but leave them to be disputed by the learned, deliberately added that word "cetera" ("and the rest").¹¹ Therefore it is said with probability that that addition is not necessary to the substance of the sacrament, just as St. Thomas also sufficiently indicates where he discusses the form, adding nothing of that sort; for it is sufficiently contained in the word that is said, "I absolve," taken according to the acceptance and

understanding which the usage of the Church gives it.⁶ Nevertheless, as regards the necessity of precept, priests ought, in all such matters, to follow the custom of the Churches in which they minister.

§ 17. The fourth: whether it is necessary to add, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," as in Baptism. Durandus indeed seems to hold thus;¹² but others deny it, and more truly. And the reason for the difference is this: because Baptism is the sacrament of faith; but faith consists chiefly in the confession of the Trinity, as is evident from the Apostles' Creed; therefore in Baptism the express invocation of the Trinity is peculiarly necessary, not so in the other sacraments.

§ 18. The fifth: whether the form is valid, if someone were to say, "Ego tibi peccata tua remitto." It is answered with Cajetan and Domingo Soto that it is valid; for just as it is said, "Quodcumque solveritis," so it is said, "Quorum remiseritis."¹³ Nevertheless St. Thomas rightly teaches that the customary form is more fitting, because it is more congruent to the words with which the Lord imparted the power of the keys to Peter and the other Apostles (Matt. 16 and 18).¹⁴ In like manner it is granted that the absolution will be valid, if someone says, "Ego tibi impendo sacramentum absolutionis"; for that amounts to the same as if he were to say, "sacramentaliter te absolvo."

§ 19. The sixth: whether there is a valid absolution of one who says: "Remittuntur tibi peccata," or, "absolveris," or, "absolvaris a me," or, "absolvatur N." (this or that person named explicitly or designated by some certain property), or, "Deus te absolvat," and the like. Scotus replies that it suffices that, in whatever way it be expressed, there be the act by the sentence of the absolving person—just as in the external forum for an absolution to be deemed valid.¹⁵ But others are less pleased with the liberty of this opinion; yet among the forms proposed they agree that the first, second, and third are valid, according to what was said on the second question; but that the one in which it is said, "Deus te absolvat," or "indulgentiam, absolutionem, remissionem peccatorum tibi tribuat," does not suffice, since it is only deprecatory—a kind of form which the Church uses only in the sacrament of Extreme Unction, to be proved and explained in its own place. And this answer, although it does not rest on an irrefutable reason or authority, is nevertheless safer and in truth more probable—especially since the usage of the Church clearly distinguishes between that prayer, "Miseratur tui Deus," and the form of absolution itself, placing the former first and subjoining the latter as necessary unto the effect of reconciliation. For from this it follows that by the words aforesaid the effect of the sacrament has not yet been conferred, and therefore that the form of the sacrament is not contained in them—since it is absurd that the form of a sacrament be repeated a second time over the same matter, whether this be done with the same words or with different ones.

§ 20. Finally it must be diligently observed by all ministers of this sacrament, that in its administration they do not depart from the praiseworthy custom of their Church, and above all that they refrain from additions that are superfluous, inept, faulty, or give occasion to error. In these ways they sin concerning the form who say: "Absolvo te ab omnibus peccatis tuis confessis et oblitis, et de quibus es contritus." For although these additions do not vitiate the form, nevertheless they are superfluous, since they are sufficiently contained in the very institution of the sacrament. More gravely do they transgress who add these or those conditions: "If I have the power to absolve you," or, "if you are truly penitent," or, "if you will make restitution of what belongs to another." For the first of these conditions makes the minister of the sacrament in a certain manner doubtful whether he has administered it; the second makes the penitent doubtful whether he has received it. For these two things—namely the minister's power over the penitent, and the latter's true penitence—ought to be presupposed as certain or at least as probable before absolution is conferred; and

therefore every such condition ought to be excluded, as calling into doubt what is presupposed as true. Yet these two conditions do not seem to vitiate the form, nor do these: "If I am a priest," or, "if you are baptized." But the third vitiates the form, because such a condition is about a future thing; now an act concerning the present, when joined with a condition about a future contingent, is not valid, but is only of the nature of a certain promise, as if someone were to say: "I give to you, if you shall do that."

§ 21. In the present case a place is not had for one who says: "I absolve you by the authority of the Bishop, or of the Pope, or of the Church." For it is not by the authority of these that the priest absolves the penitent, but by the authority, power, and merit of Christ—signified by those words which, according to the custom of the Church, are wont to be added: "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui est summus Pontifex, te absolvat, et ejus auctoritate." And since that authority and power are divine, therefore they are common to the whole Trinity; and so it is rightly subjoined: "In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." Of this addition Ambrose too makes mention, Book 3 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 19, in these words: "Men have a ministry for the remission of sins; they do not exercise the right of any power. For they remit sins not in their own [name], but in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." [16] Which addition, however, we said above does not pertain to the necessity of the sacrament.

§ IV — Certain objections are refuted (Objectiones quaedam diluuntur)

§ 22. Certain objections are wont to be brought against the things we have said about the form (*forma*) of the sacrament of Penance; omitting those which heretics are accustomed to bring against the forms of the sacraments in general, they are for the most part of this sort. First: That the form of this sacrament ought to be precatory appears from the words of Leo who (in Epistle 91) says that after Baptism the indulgence of God, that is, the remission of crimes, cannot be obtained unless by the supplications of the priests; and afterward he subjoins: "For it is very useful and necessary that the guilt of sins be loosed by priestly supplication before the last day."¹⁸ Second: The assertory form by which one says, "I absolve you," often signifies something false, namely when the sinner is not truly penitent: for then it signifies that he is absolved who in reality is not absolved; therefore the precatory form ought rather to be used, as in the sacrament of Extreme Unction. Third: God alone remits sins, inasmuch as He alone cleanses man inwardly from sin, according to what He Himself says (Is. 43): "I am he who blot out iniquities," as Augustine also teaches (on John) at that text: "This is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit" (Jn. 1).¹⁹ Whence also Christ, by saying to the paralytic and to the sinful woman, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," wished to signify that He was God. Therefore, since to remit sins and to reconcile man to God are the same—each namely is a work of divine power—and the priest does not effect either, but asks God that both be done. Fourth: In the penitent contrition is required before absolution; but true contrition is not without the remission of sins; therefore the sinner has already been absolved before [the priest], and hence it is not a true sacramental form when the priest says: "I absolve you."

§ 23. A brief reply to these is as follows. The words of Leo, which were objected in the first place, have this sense: The indulgence of God after Baptism cannot otherwise be obtained except through the absolution of the priests; to which there are for the most part, and laudably, annexed supplications, that is, certain prayers: and not only for reverence of the sacrament, but also that by them the mercy and indulgence of God may be impetrated for penitents. Which not only those words of Leo signify, but Ambrose also teaches, both in the

books On Penance and elsewhere, as in book 3 On the Holy Spirit, ch. 19, and book 5 on Luke 5 concerning the Paralytic; and Cyprian in the Sermon On the Lapsed; and Augustine repeatedly, against the Donatists.²⁰

§ 24. To the second it is answered that this form, if the priest rightly discharge his office, is never false. For by it there is signified what is being done, so far as concerns both the part of the sacrament and the part of the priest, using his power lawfully according to the knowledge that he has received, or ought to have received, about the sins and the condition of the sinner. Therefore by these words the priest signifies that he exercises an act of power over the man, truly absolving him from sins, unless there be some other impediment. But the form would be false if the priest did not intend to absolve; just as one who says, "I give," speaks falsely if he does not intend to give; not so, however, if the other does not intend to receive. In like manner it would be false at least interpretatively if the priest indeed intended to absolve, yet knew that the one whom he wishes to absolve is not truly penitent or is not subject to him.

§ 25. The weakness of the third argument is sufficiently refuted by the words of Christ: "Whose sins you remit..."²¹ Wherefore it is answered that God alone remits sins and cleanses hearts by a primary power, which also Christ did on earth; the priests, however, do both by the ministry entrusted to them by Christ.

§ 26. To the last it is answered that contrition does not always have the remission of sins conjoined with it; this will have to be proved below; as also that the priest, in administering this sacrament, not only declares that sins have been remitted, but truly remits them and truly absolves the penitent from them.²²

§ V — *What use imposition of hands has in this sacrament (Manus impositio quem in hoc usu habeat)*

§ 27. To the necessity of this sacrament imposition of hands (*manus impositio*) does not pertain, nor does it pertain to the matter and form in which the whole essence of the sacrament consists. As to the matter (*materia*), about which there might be more doubt, it is now clear from what has been said above that the sacrament does not consist in the use of any matter outwardly applied, but that the acts of the penitent hold the place of matter. Just as in the Eucharist the priest by the mere utterance of words over the matter perfects the sacrament, so too, says St. Thomas (q. 84, a. 4, ad 3), by the mere utterance of the words of the priest absolving over the penitent the sacrament of absolution is effected.²⁵

§ 28. Therefore imposition of hands is not necessary to this sacrament, nor indeed to any sacraments whatsoever, insofar as it signifies a bare ceremony, whereby someone places his hand upon the head of the one upon whom he is conferring the sacrament; insofar, however, as it can be said—and in the Old [Testament] it is sometimes signified—to be in some respect necessary to some sacrament, this will be explained elsewhere (Distinct. 24) when treating of the sacrament of Orders.

§ 29. Nevertheless, since it is a most ancient custom, probably handed down by the Apostles themselves, that penitents be reconciled with imposition of hands, to such a degree that this sacrament is sometimes, by a transferred name, called "imposition of hands," or the sacrament of imposition of hands, that ceremony is by no means to be omitted without some just reason. But someone will ask what the rationale of this ceremony is. I reply that its rationale is declared by Augustine, book 3 Against the Donatists, ch. 16, who says: "What is imposition of hands other than prayer over a man?"²⁶

§ 30. Accordingly, this imposition of hands can be said to be an outward ceremony by which the one who uses it signifies that he prays, blesses, well-wishes, or intercedes with God for the one upon whom he imposes his hand or hands. It is therefore a non-vocal prayer—ceremonial, so to speak—yet conjoined with vocal or at least mental prayer or blessing. That this is what is signified is shown plainly from Sacred Scripture (see Matt. 9; Mk. 6; Mk. 7; Mk. 8 at the end; Acts 9 at the end).²⁷ These and similar places require the meaning of imposition of hands which we have stated.

§ 31. Wherefore also in the administration of sacraments it is employed; as in Confirmation, Reconciliation, and Ordination it is used in order that by it the bishop or the priest may signify that, for the obtaining of the effect of the sacrament, he also adds his own prayer, desire, and pious affection. And indeed in the sacrament of Reconciliation this is also expressed in words when the priest says: "May the Almighty be merciful to you," etc. For nothing prevents our own prayers as well from being prefixed or adjoined to the obtaining of those things which from the divine promise we expect from the sacraments or otherwise with certainty: just as it is established that Christ did, and the Church in the Canon of the Mass before the consecration of the Eucharist and in many other ways does.

§ 32. And these things indeed about imposition of hands. Rightly, moreover, just as in the other sacraments, so in this one the minister forms with the hand the sign of the cross, to designate by whose merit the remission of sins is effected—namely, of Christ crucified. For it is likewise a most ancient custom of the Church to employ the sign of the cross in all the sacraments and other mystic actions, as Augustine attests (Tractate 118 on John).²⁸

§ 33. Furthermore, although it is not permitted to absolve an impenitent man, the priest nevertheless, if he is compelled to dismiss him—especially when others are present—ought even then to employ the outward ceremonies of imposition of hands and of the sign of the cross, lest the omission of these ceremonies be a betrayal of the man's impenitent disposition. And the same judgment holds of him over whom he does not have the power of absolving on account of some reserved case, or whose absolution for whatever cause he defers to another time. Nor is there here any simulation, because, as we have said from Augustine, imposition of hands is nothing other than prayer over a man. Wherefore just as the priest can with voice and mind pray for the impenitent or for any sinner whatsoever, so too by an outward sign—provided only that he refrain from pronouncing the form (*forma*) of absolution, or from other words that in any way signify a present absolution or remission, or reconciliation—but let him only pray to God for the sinner, that He may enlighten his heart and lead him to true penance.

§ VI — What that is which is properly called the Sacrament of Penance (Quid sit quod proprie dicitur Sacramentum Penitentiae)

§ 34. There is a properly scholastic dispute as to what is called the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Penitentiae*), or, to speak in dialectical fashion, for what that phrase which we call the sacrament of Penance stands as a supposit. Scotus held that it stands precisely for the priestly absolution (*absolutio*). Hence he

defined the sacrament of Penance in this way: "Penance is the absolution of a penitent man, made by certain words uttered by the priest," and so forth. For Scotus's opinion these arguments make:

- First: A sacrament is a cause of grace. But that belongs solely to the act of the priest absolving, not to the acts of the man receiving the sacrament. For grace is not conferred in this sacrament except through the keys of the Church which the priest uses while he absolves.
- Second: The act of the minister baptizing is the sacrament of Baptism, as was said above at Distinction 3; and the act of the bishop confirming is the sacrament of Confirmation, and the act of the same ordaining is the sacrament of Orders, and likewise with Extreme Unction; therefore the act of the priest absolving is the sacrament of Penance. But that act is nothing other than absolution itself.
- Third: This sacrament is called the sacrament of absolution; therefore, just as the sacrament of Baptism is Baptism itself, and the sacrament of Confirmation is Confirmation itself, and so in the others, so too the sacrament of Penance, which is the sacrament of absolution, is absolution itself.³⁰

Moreover, almost all the reasons which seem to prove that no part of this sacrament is to be constituted on the side of the penitent support this opinion, which reasons we solved above. From these Scotus therefore concludes that the whole essence of this sacrament is placed in the absolution of the priest. To this there is added that the sacrament of Penance (as some will have it) administered to the impenitent has the nature of a true sacrament, where nevertheless that act is lacking which is chiefly required on the part of the penitent, namely contrition (*contritio*). Wherefore it seems that the whole essence of the sacrament consists without an act of the penitent. But they prove the antecedent both because Baptism is a true sacrament when conferred upon the feigning and the impenitent, and because he who, being impenitent, approaches and is absolved is guilty of a violated sacrament, just as he who approaches Baptism feigning.

§ 35. Furthermore, many others, following St. Thomas, establish a material part of this sacrament on the side of the penitent (*materia*), according to the doctrine of the two Councils expounded by us above. Whence it follows that absolution alone is not the whole essence of this sacrament, and therefore that the sacrament of Penance does not stand as a supposit for absolution alone, but either for the whole outward work which results from the acts of the penitent and the words of the priest absolving as from matter and form (*forma*); or rather for the absolution of the priest as the act of the minister applying the form to the matter, that is, pronouncing the words of absolution over a sinner contrite and confessed and having a purpose of making satisfaction (*satisfactio*). Therefore it must not be said that a mere or bare absolution is the sacrament of Penance, but an absolution made with such words and over such matter. This is declared by a likeness with the other sacraments, and most of all with Baptism. For, as we showed above at Distinction 3, Baptism properly is neither the water nor the words of the baptizer, nor something compounded from water and words, nor finally a bare washing of the body, but the washing of a man in water together with the prescribed form of words. Therefore, just as ablutio (washing) is the sacrament of Baptism, and unctio (anointing) is the sacrament of Confirmation—namely as certain sacred and visible actions of the ministers, external to the form, or to the matter of the form—so also one ought to think about this sacrament, namely that absolution considered in the manner just said is the sacrament of Penance. This opinion is sufficiently favored by the Council of Trent, when it calls this sacrament the sacrament of absolution.³⁰

§ 36. Let us therefore reply to the things brought forward for Scotus's opinion. To the first argument it is answered: not only the action of the priest absolving and the words which he uses in absolving, but also the acts of the penitent concur, each in its way instrumentally, as parts of the sacrament, to the effect of reconciliation—namely in the genus of an efficacious sign. But since form has more dignity than matter, and than both of these the agent or administrator is of greater dignity, hence it is that the remission of sins is ascribed to the keys of the Church—that is, to the power of the priest which he received from Christ—and to the words which he uses, rather than to the acts of the penitent. To the second and third arguments, the reply is evident from the declaration already given. For they do not conclude that a naked absolution is the sacrament of Penance, but [they conclude for] one clothed with certain circumstances required for the substance of the sacrament, just as the case stands in the acts of the minister of the other sacraments. To what is objected in the last place, we reply that the sacrament of Penance administered to an impenitent man does not have the true formal character (*ratio*) of a sacrament, because there is lacking to it the other part of the substance, namely the material. For since the material part has three components—contrition, confession (*confessio*), and satisfaction—among these contrition is chief, and therefore simply and altogether necessary, as the head or the heart is in a man. But the case of Baptism is different. For besides the fact that it imprints a character, even when conferred on feigners it is not deprived of its matter and form. But he is judged guilty of a violated sacrament who, being impenitent, presumes to receive absolution: not because what is conferred is a true sacrament, but because it is conferred and received as a sacrament, and because through the malice of the recipient it is impeded from being a sacrament.

§ 37. The guilt remitted, a temporal punishment most often remains to be paid (*Remissa culpa plerumque restare luendam pœnam temporalem*). Although satisfaction (*satisfactio*) holds the last place among the parts of Penance, nevertheless, lest we depart too far from the order of the Master and confound his distinctions, we too must treat of satisfaction with him in this Distinction.³¹ Therefore first, which is the foundation of this matter, we shall teach that when sin is remitted—or, as the Doctors of the Schools speak, when the guilt (*culpa*) is remitted—not always are all the punishments due to the sin remitted at the same time and immediately, but often and for the most part it happens that, the liability to eternal damnation being loosed (which loosing is understood in the remission of the guilt), there is still left some temporal punishment to be paid, either of this life or of the future life. To prove this, that we may take our beginning from Scripture, there is of greatest force what is read in 2 Kings 12, where, when David, admonished by the prophet Nathan of his sin, had said: "I have sinned against the Lord," and from the same had in turn heard: "The Lord also hath taken away thy sin; thou shalt not die," the prophet added: "Nevertheless, because thou hast made the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme by this word, the son that is born to thee shall surely die." Now that was a temporal punishment not only of the son, but also of the father, who was punished in the death of his son. Nay, the prophet's preceding words most clearly prove this, in which he says: "Wherefore the sword shall not depart from thy house, because thou hast despised me and hast taken the wife of Uriah," etc. Which punishment, although after the guilt had been remitted it was mitigated, yet was not altogether removed, as is clear from the history of the same book.

§ 38. Thus the first parents, although "by wisdom they were brought out of their offense" (Wis. 10), nevertheless bore the temporal punishment of their sin, being made subject to the curse and hardships, together with all their posterity (Gen. 3). Likewise (Exod. 32), when, through the interceding of Moses, the Lord had been appeased toward the people concerning the sin of the adored calf, nevertheless He subjoined: "But I, in the day of vengeance, will visit this their sin upon them." And (Num. 14), at the murmuring of the

people the Lord, angered and appeased by the prayer of Moses, so that He said, "I have forgiven according to thy word," added: "But all the men that have seen my majesty, and the signs that I have done," etc., "shall not see the land," etc. Likewise (Num. 12) Mary, the sister of Moses, on whose behalf Moses had prayed for the sin, is nonetheless ordered for seven days to act apart outside the camp for the sin committed against her brother. Moses himself also, and his brother Aaron (Num. 20), for the sin of incredulity at the waters of contradiction are prohibited from entering the promised land; which is repeated in the same chapter of Aaron about to die, and of himself Moses confesses it (Deut. 1); yet there is no doubt that they received pardon of that fault before death. But it also seems indicated by the Apostle (Heb. 10) in these words: "If we sin willfully after having received the knowledge of the truth, there is now left no sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful expectation of judgment," etc.—as if he were saying: for those relapsing into graver sins it does not come to pass that they are absolved from guilt and punishment all at once and in one moment, as in Baptism; but even if the guilt were remitted, there remains nevertheless for a man, on account of his sins, the expectation of a certain example of God's dreadful judgment, namely by a toilsome satisfaction in this life, or by an afflictive purgation in the future. Finally, those places of Scripture avail for the proof of this doctrine in which even the just confess that they are afflicted for their sins, as Tobias 3 and Daniel 9; the three boys sent into the furnace (Dan. 3); the seven Maccabee brothers (2 Macc. 7). And in general the Apostle teaches (Heb. 12), with the sentence cited from Prov. 3, that God chastises His sons, that is, the just, with certain scourges: "For whom he loveth he chastiseth; and he scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." And again: "For what son is there whom the father doth not correct?" etc. But correction and chastisement and scourging signify punishment for sins. Whence it is manifest that temporal punishments remain to be paid even for those who already are the sons of God, that is, are just. Nor does it matter if you say that they suffer these temporal afflictions for venial faults. For surely it is far more fitting that they suffer such things for mortal sins, even if remitted as to guilt. Otherwise—which is absurd—venial sins would be punished more severely in the just than mortal sins.

§ 39. But let us also bring forward the doctrine of the Fathers on this matter. St. Augustine, book 22 against Faustus, chapter 67, discoursing of David: "When," he says, "corrected by the prophet he said, 'I have sinned,' straightway for this one word he deserved to hear that he had received pardon. For what thing, if not for eternal salvation? For the discipline of a fatherly scourge according to the threatening of God was not omitted in him, so that it should also be proved in a temporal way." Then Augustine adds that David, although afterwards punished, nevertheless understood that the indulgence of his sins announced by the prophet had not been false: "For the holy man understood that, unless the Lord were propitious to one confessing and repenting, how great eternal punishments his sins would deserve; in view of which, while he was burned with temporal corrections, he saw that pardon remained toward him, and that the medicine was not neglected." Augustine writes precisely similar things about David's punishment in the Inchoate Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans at the words: "Grace to you and peace"—in which place he also uses Peter's testimony to prove that matter (1 Pet. 4): "For this cause was the gospel preached also to the dead: that they might indeed be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." A passage of the same Augustine about David is no less clear (on Ps. 50): "Sometimes," he says, "God, to whom He forgives in the future life, corrects him for his sin in this life. For to David himself, to whom it had already been said through the prophet, 'Thy sin is forgiven,' there happened certain things which God had threatened on account of that very sin," etc. Where also, after bringing the example of Semei's cursing against David, and of David's not willing to forbid the man that cursed, he says: "Acknowledging his own fault, he embraced his own punishment." The same (on Ps. 98), expounding that: "And taking vengeance upon all their

inventions"—which we have "Thou wast forgiving to them, O God; though thou didst take vengeance on all their devices," which he interprets of Moses and Aaron—says: "To him to whom the Lord is truly propitious, He not only forgives sins, lest they harm unto the future age, but He also chastises, lest it be ever a delight to sin." Elsewhere, however, speaking generally of death and of the common hardships of this life—namely (Tract. 124 on John)—"Temporally," he says, "the punishment deserts the man whom now the guilt does not detain unto eternal death." In the same sense writes Ambrose (On Ps. 37): "He who does penance," he says, "ought to offer himself to punishment, that here he may be punished by the Lord, and not be reserved for eternal torments; and let him not wait for the time, but forestall the divine indignation." Then, bringing forward the example of David, where he deprecates the guilt of the numbered people, he subjoins: "Therefore he does not ask that his sin be utterly remitted for himself, but that it be blotted out by a moderated payment, that is, that its memory be effaced for the future." The words of Ambrose signify that David, although afterwards he ordered the people to be numbered (2 Kgs at the end), had the temporal punishment inflicted by God in such a way that nevertheless the guilt itself had already previously been pardoned him—namely in answer to that prayer of his in which he said: "I have sinned exceedingly; but I pray thee, O Lord, that thou transfer the iniquity of thy servant." There stands also with Gregory a most clear passage about David punished after the remission of the guilt of adultery and murder, book 9 of the *Moralia*, chapter 17, where he says thus: "If the Lord transferred David's sin, what is the reason that afterwards he bore so many sufferings? But without doubt the Lord does not leave an offense without vengeance. For either the man himself, punishing in himself by penance, strikes it, or God, taking vengeance together with the man, smites it. For just as after his confession he deserved to hear, 'The Lord hath transferred thy sin,' and yet, afflicted afterwards by many torments, he paid off the debt of the guilt which he had perpetrated, so by the wave of salvation we are absolved from the guilt of our first parent, yet, washing off the debt of the same guilt, even when absolved we still undergo a carnal death." These are Gregory's words, which are read quite the same in Eucherius of Lyons (on 2 Kings 12). To this opinion moreover other Fathers agree, such as Chrysostom (at the beginning of Homily 2 on Ps. 50, and Hom. 4 on 2 Corinthians), Jerome (on Jeremiah 10 and on Ephesians 5), Leo (Sermon 8 on the Passion of the Lord), Fulgentius book 1 (On the Remission of Sins, ch. 12), Prosper (Sentences 72 and 148), Lactantius book 6 (Divine Institutions, last chapter). And Augustine himself in very many places, as in the Exposition of Psalms 34, 88, 91; in book 2 On the Merits of Sins, ch. 16; in book 1 of the City of God, ch. 9; in book 13, chs. 3, 4, 5, 6; and in the last Tractate on John—where he expressly teaches that the misery of this life, remaining even after sins are remitted, proceeds from the just wrath of God. To this pertain also the things which we noted above at Distinction 4 of this book about the penalties left after Baptism. Wherefore with good reason the Fathers of Trent judged this doctrine about the punishment of sin remaining after the guilt is remitted to be Catholic; and in chapter eight of the same they also give here the reason why punishments are not always all of them remitted together with the guilt by God—because, they say, the rule of divine justice requires that one order be observed toward those who sin before Baptism through ignorance, but another toward those who, once freed from the slavery of sin and of the devil and having received the gift of the Holy Spirit, have not feared to violate the temple of God and to grieve the Holy Spirit; and the rest that follow.³²

§ VIII — Reply to the objections of the adversaries (Ad ea, quae ab adversariis objicitur, responsio)

§ 40. The adversaries strive by many arguments to overthrow the foregoing doctrine as the foundation, as it were, of the whole Catholic teaching which the Church hands down concerning satisfaction (*satisfactio*) and its necessity; and we, for our part, will dissolve only the principal ones, set forth in order. First: the Lord (in Ezekiel 18, 33) denies that He will be mindful of the iniquity from which the sinner shall have withdrawn by repentance; and He says: "The impiety of the impious shall not hurt him, in whatever day he shall have been converted from his impiety": therefore God in no wise punishes.³⁴ Second: in Ps. 31 these things are held as the same—iniquities have been forgiven, sins have been covered, and they are not imputed by the Lord; therefore a sin once forgiven is no longer imputed unto punishment.³⁵ Third: Rom. 8, "There is now therefore no condemnation for those who are in Christ"; therefore no punishment remains, since "condemnation" in that place, and often elsewhere, signifies punishment or penal retribution.³⁶ Fourth: sin is not remitted except through Christ; but whatever is remitted through Christ is wholly and abundantly expiated by His blood; therefore nothing remains to be paid for it. Fifth: if Christ does not abolish guilt together with punishment, then Adam's disobedience, which brought in both guilt and punishment, harmed us more than Christ's obedience profited. Sixth: St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis* II, ch. 34, says that the miseries of this life before remission are indeed the punishments of sinners, but after remission are the contests and exercises of the just; and that the death of the body, which God inflicted upon man on account of sin, He nonetheless did not take away even after the remission of sin, on account of the exercise of righteousness. He has similar things in the chapter immediately preceding. The same Augustine, *Sermon 20 On the Words of the Lord*, and *Sermon 87 On the Season*: "Past evils do not hurt, if they displease"—as if alluding to that saying of the Prophet, Ezek. 33, "The impiety of the impious shall not hurt him, in whatever day...." And on Ps. 31 he says that sin is then "covered" when God does not will to punish it. And on Ps. 84, on that verse, "Thou hast covered all their sins": "What is it," he says, "thou hast covered them that thou shouldst not see them; and what is it, that thou shouldst not see them? that thou shouldst not take vengeance for them." From the same Augustine they object that well-known sentence: "It is impious to hope for half-pardon from God," which is had in the book *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 9.³⁷ Moreover, some passages are objected from Chrysostom. For he, writing on 1 Cor. 11 at that verse, "If we would judge ourselves," says: "If we are only willing to acknowledge our sins, we shall be free from the punishments of this and of the future age"; and he denies that passage of the Apostle to be understood of punishment. Similar things are found in him, *Homily 6 on Genesis*, and in the *Oration on St. Philogonius*. The same John Chrysostom, *Homily on Repentance and Confession*: "For this reason," he says, "God imposes punishment on us, not exacting retribution for sins, but correcting us for the future." And *Homily 2 on Ps. 50*: "Where mercy is besought, inquiry ceases; where mercy is asked, judgment does not rage; where mercy is, there is no questioning; where mercy is, a granted pardon is the reply." So he. Finally, the Lutherans oppose to Catholics an argument of this sort: Priests received from Christ the power of absolving from every guilt and punishment; therefore they absolve, or at least ought to absolve, from both, according to the power given to them; and consequently there will remain no place for punishment to be paid after the guilt is remitted.³⁸

§ 41. To these arguments the reply is made in this order. To the first: in what sense the Lord says in the Prophet that He will not remember the iniquity from which someone by repenting has withdrawn, is easily understood from the context of both passages. For in both there is said: "He shall live in life, and shall not die."

Which must be taken of eternal life and death. Thus far, therefore, the Lord no longer remembers the iniquities of him who shall have been turned back from his evil way, because He has remitted the punishment of eternal death. For so also it had been said to David: "Thou shalt not die." After which word of the Prophet, however, temporal punishments were inflicted upon him.

§ 42. Now there is indeed so great a distance between eternal punishment and temporal that He who has remitted the eternal may yet exact the temporal, and deservedly is then said to have forgotten the sin—especially since eternal death is the proper stipend of sin, just as the proper reward of righteousness is eternal life; and with this there is added that temporal punishments are reserved for the benefit of him from whom they are exacted. Whence it is well said: "His impiety shall not hurt him"; for that whole punishment is referred to the salvation of him who is punished. Hence the reply to the second is evident. For God "covers" sins, even if He punishes temporally, when He does not so "see" them as to will to inflict for them that eternal death which they merited. Likewise He does not impute them unto the punishment of eternal death—otherwise due to them.

§ 43. To the third it is answered that in that place by "condemnation" is understood either eternal death, or the guilt of eternal death, as in ch. 3 of the same Epistle, where it is said, "whose condemnation is just," and in ch. 13 where it is said, "they heap up condemnation for themselves." And that "condemnation" is taken thus in this place the circumstance of the passage plainly shows. For from the fact that someone serves by his mind the law of God, but by the flesh alone the law of sin, he concludes that in such a man there remains nothing worthy of condemnation or of death, as one who, incorporated into Christ by Baptism, now does not walk according to the flesh. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has delivered me from the law of sin and of death." Where one must note that what the Apostle had previously called "condemnation," he now calls "death," which without doubt he understands to be eternal; since, as regards temporal death, he testifies in that same chapter that "the body is dead," that is, subject to death, even in the reborn, on account of sin.

§ 44. To the fourth: whenever mortal sin is remitted through Christ, it is indeed expiated by His blood with respect to guilt, that is, the liability to eternal damnation; but not always with respect to temporal punishment—not because the blood of Christ is not sufficiently efficacious for the abolition of the whole punishment, but because it has seemed good to divine justice, for certain causes, to leave man, although justified, still subject to punishments and miseries, nor to admit to His friendship on equal terms him who once cast away grace received and him who had never been in the grace of God, as we showed above from the doctrine of the Council of Trent.³⁹

§ 45. It must therefore be noted here that whenever we receive remission of sins, we are all indeed sprinkled with the Blood of Christ, but not equally. I mean that the power of the Blood of Christ is applied to us through Baptism and penance (*poenitentia*), and the other sacraments, for the remission of sins, yet not equally nor in the same manner. For by God's ordinance this is brought about more perfectly in Baptism than in the sacrament of Reconciliation, as will be shown more fully below.

§ 46. To the fifth: by the same argument you would gather that death and all the miseries of this life ought to have been removed at once by Christ, lest the disobedience of Adam—through whom together with sin death and miseries entered the world—should have harmed us more than the obedience of Christ profited us. One must answer, therefore, that through Christ all that evil which Adam's transgression brought in is taken away from the elect. For "as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." Yet not at once, lest the

fault be thought slight, as Augustine says (the last Tractate on John), if together with it punishment also should straightway end; and that meanwhile the just may have wherewith they may be exercised unto the palm of the heavenly calling.³⁹

§ 47. What is adduced in the first place from Augustine has this sense: that the miseries of this life before the remission of sins are only the punishments of sins; but after, besides the fact that by God's just judgment they are still inflicted for sins as regards the guilt remitted, they have also this benefit, that they are the contests and exercises of the just—while, by bearing them patiently, they make progress in virtues and merit God for themselves more. The reply to the other three passages of Augustine is evident from the solution of the first and of the second. As to the passage from the book *De vera et falsa paenitentia* (which, however, is falsely attributed to Augustine), the reply is prompt and sure: that, in the opinion of that Author, he hopes for half-pardon from God who, while he persists in one crime, yet promises himself pardon from God for another or others. For these words precede: "I know that the Lord is an enemy to every criminal: how then does he who keeps one crime receive pardon for another?" and then there follows what had been objected: "It is a certain impiety of unbelief to hope for half-pardon from Him who is just and is justice." Yet it is certain that it conflicts neither with God's justice nor with His mercy if He mercifully pardons sin as to the eternal punishment, yet, for some manifestation of His justice and for the very benefit of the man himself, reserves some temporal punishment. Nay, in this way justice and truth beautifully meet and kiss each other, and the one mutually supports the other.

§ 48. The first passage brought from Chrysostom means nothing else than what the Apostle himself intimates—namely, that by spontaneous chastisement a man escapes the temporal punishment of God to be inflicted in this or in the future age, and one far more bitter; so that, by comparison with this latter, that self-assumed punishment scarcely deserves the name of punishment. For presently he speaks in like manner of temporal punishment compared with the torment of Gehenna. The next two passages are to be understood similarly. The fourth passage merely shows that the use of scourges with respect to the elect is not chiefly this, that their sins be avenged, but that, corrected for the future, they may avoid sins. The last passage of Chrysostom supports the Catholic doctrine. For if David, after his sin was remitted, still implores mercy lest judgment rage, then both Chrysostom and David himself understood that, although the sin had been taken away so that he should not die, nevertheless there still remained temporal punishment which could justly be exacted, unless by the imploring of mercy it should be averted either wholly or in part. Therefore Chrysostom wills that punishment to cease in so far as mercy is granted.

§ 49. To the last argument it is answered that priests have received power to remit sins for penitents. Now to penance also belongs satisfaction; and therefore he who is absolved either ought already to have performed it, or to have it in purpose. Wherefore it is repugnant to the integrity of this sacrament to remove every obligation of temporal punishment before the due satisfaction has been accomplished. It can therefore be granted that priests always absolve from punishment and from guilt, presupposing the sacrament in its integrity; yet the sacrament is not made wholly entire before condign satisfaction has been performed, unless also an indulgence relax the obligation thereof. But this power of relaxing does not pertain to all priests.

§ IX — What satisfaction is and of how many kinds (Quid et quotuplex sit satisfactio)

§ 50. In order that what must be said about the satisfaction (*satisfactio*) of penitents may be better understood, it must first be explained in a few words what satisfaction is, and in what ways it can be divided. Generally, therefore, and according to the grammatical signification, satisfaction is nothing other than the payment of a debt, whatever in the end be the kind of debt. But more specifically, in the case of offenses, "satisfaction" is said when there is paid, for those offenses, so much of punishment or of vindictive retribution as is or ought to be enough for the one wronged and offended, that he may be appeased and cease from being angry. And this definition embraces also that satisfaction for offenses which men who have been wronged are wont to exact from men. But it will easily be accommodated to ecclesiastical satisfaction alone, if by the wronged and offended to whom payment ought to be made we understand God. The same thing, under the name "penance" (*poenitentia*—a word which among the ancients is very often used for "satisfaction"), the author of the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 8, thus defines: "Penance is a certain vengeance of one who is sorrowing, voluntarily punishing himself for what he grieves that he has committed."⁴¹

§ 51. More fully, however, it is defined in this way: Satisfaction is the effort to appease God who has been offended by a voluntary chastisement of oneself, or the very voluntary chastisement or punishment of oneself for a certain compensation of the injury inflicted upon God by sin. And this description is taken from the object about which it is concerned, and from the end. For the object is God offended by sin; the end, however, is the appeasing of divine wrath, that is, full reconciliation with God. And from both it is understood that satisfaction is a work of piety and of justice: inasmuch as it is undertaken to this end, that God may be pleased and the injury done to Him may in some measure be compensated. Yet it pertains in a special way to justice. The reason for this is manifest, because it is proper to justice to establish equality between two parties, or to bring back to equality the inequality that has arisen between two. Nor, however, does it properly pertain to vindictive justice, but it constitutes a special virtue, whereby indeed a man of his own accord, for the injury which he has done to another, chastises himself, that he may please the other and reconcile him to himself. Thus teaches St. Thomas (*In IV Sentences*, dist. 15, q. 1, a. 1; III, q. 85, a. 3),⁴² although Scotus and Durandus hold the contrary, thinking that this satisfaction does not go beyond the species of vindictive justice; the weighing of whose reasons is not the task of this place.⁴³ For the present doctrine it is sufficient that the satisfaction which is required of a penitent be not just any payment whatever due for the injury done to God, but one that is voluntary and undertaken with the effort of pleasing God, which therefore must be conjoined with the purpose of not sinning hereafter. Otherwise it will be a bare vindictive suffering, and one that ought to be called not so much satisfaction as "satispassion"; of this sort is the punishment of the damned in Hell, and in this life of those impious men who for their crimes are punished by public justice while remaining impenitent.

§ 52. According to the sense now given one must also understand these descriptions: "To satisfy is to render to God the honor that is due," and "the satisfaction of penance is to cut off the causes of sins, so as not to grant an entrance to their suggestions." The former is handed on by Anselm in the book *Cur Deus Homo*; the latter by Gennadius in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, ch. 54.⁴⁴ Moreover, there is a manifold division of satisfaction. First, it can be divided thus, that we say that one satisfaction is "in punishment," another "for punishment." Satisfaction in punishment is when by a fixed and determinate law the punishment is set down which ought to be undergone for the offense, as those satisfy who for their offenses pay the penalties

established by the laws—when, for instance, the murderer is struck by the sword, the incendiary is burned, the thief is hanged. Satisfaction for punishment is where commutation has place, so that in place of that punishment which the law has prescribed a certain redemption and compensation is received—as when in civil matters a pecuniary fine, or some voluntary service rendered to the one who has been wronged, is imposed or admitted in place of a more grievous punishment otherwise due. This division helps toward understanding the difference between that satisfaction which takes place in this age and that which is in the future. For since the retribution of rewards and punishments properly pertains to the future age, which therefore Scripture teaches to be the time of judgment (Heb. 9 and elsewhere),⁴⁵ as also St. Augustine has noted (Enchiridion, ch. 66),⁴⁶ whoever after this life are punished for sins, receiving temporal punishment from the hand of God, satisfy not "for" punishment but "in" punishment. For they suffer that which the justice of God, as by a fixed law, has ordained to be suffered for sins when guilt has been remitted. And this is the satisfaction of the souls in Purgatory. But if someone does not await that time, but carefully forestalls it, exacting from himself in this life punishments according to the manner approved by apostolic tradition and ecclesiastical custom—since divine benignity receives, indeed even commands and requires, such a commutation or redemption of punishment, when it warns that we should make "fruits worthy of penance"—then of that man, who does thus, the satisfaction is now not in punishment but for punishment; because namely he punishes himself here, in order that he may avoid in the future age the punishment prepared.

§ 53. There is, besides, another division of satisfaction into imperfect, sufficient, and absolute. Imperfect is so called which rests on no equality of thing or of work, but on the mere favor and liberality of the one who has been wronged. Sufficient, however, is that which rests on a certain equality and pays as much as was fitting; yet in such a way that it includes the grace of another and depends on it, for which reason it cannot be called simply and entirely perfect. Absolute, however, and in every way perfect is that in which there is found exact equality according to justice, and which includes or presupposes the favor of no other on which it depends. Therefore, the satisfactions of penitents—if they are compared to the eternal punishment of Gehenna—obtain merely the character of imperfect satisfaction, as not at all equaling that punishment for the abolishing of which they are undertaken. For perfect satisfaction for eternal punishment the Christ alone presented to the Father; yet in view of Him the Father deigns also to accept that which human frailty offers Him, according to its measure, for the abolishing of the liability to eternal punishment. Such satisfactions as the faithful are wont to make are acknowledged and taught by the ancients, whose testimonies will be cited more opportunely below. But indeed after the guilt has been remitted, the satisfactions of penitents are rightly judged sufficient and in a certain sense perfect—namely, in comparison with the temporal punishment which, guilt being remitted, still remains to be paid—provided, however, that they be made according to the manner and quantity of the crimes, as ecclesiastical discipline requires this. For in this way a just compensation of temporal punishment is made; especially since through the reconciliation of the penitent a certain dignity has accrued to his works, because they proceed from charity (*caritas*) through the indwelling Spirit of God; and therefore whatever is now undertaken in vengeance for sin is esteemed by God much more precious than what was undertaken before reconciliation; since, as Leo says (Sermon 4 On the Collections), on this account have these slight expenses deserved so great an estimation, because the weights of works are weighed on the balance of charity.⁴⁷ Nevertheless even to this satisfaction something is lacking for absolute perfection. For it is not of such a sort as to include the favor of no other or to depend on it (which absolute perfection is found in Christ's satisfaction alone, as being altogether gratuitous to us through Christ Jesus, in whom we make

satisfaction, "doing fruits worthy of penance," which have their force from Him, are offered by Him to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father), as the Council of Trent teaches (Session 14, ch. 8).⁴⁸

§ 54. It will be objected: The punishment of Purgatory is far more grievous and more enduring than the satisfactories of this world; therefore there is no equality between them. I reply: There is a certain equality, although not a perfect one. For there is such equality as is wont to be required between satisfaction for punishment and the punishment itself, and this with a just proportion observed. And it must be noted that in our satisfaction there are many things by which the inequality that is on the side of gravity and duration is compensated. First, that they are done in this age, which is an age of mercy, not of judgment; whereas the future age pertains to judgment. Second, that it is undertaken of one's own accord, because at least of his own accord a man goes to the priest, asking that penance be enjoined upon him; but the punishments of Purgatory, although they are borne patiently, are nevertheless not undertaken voluntarily. Third, because a man in this life forestalls the judgment of God, exercising vengeance upon himself and not awaiting judgment, according to that saying: "If we judged ourselves, etc." Fourth, because satisfactories in this life have manifold utility: they chastise the flesh, make one more cautious against sin, edify the Church, help one's neighbors—as alms and other works of mercy—whereas none of these things is effected by the satisfaction that is in Purgatory.

§ 55. Satisfaction is further wont to be divided into public and private. For just as for public crimes a public, so for secret and private ones a private satisfaction ought to be undertaken, as Prosper clearly teaches (On the Contemplative Life II, ch. 7) and Gennadius likewise (On Ecclesiastical Dogmas, ch. 53).⁴⁹ The same diversity of satisfying is handed on by Cyprian (Sermon 5 On the Lapsed), teaching that not only sacrilege perpetrated in deed, but even conceived in intention alone, must be abolished by fitting satisfaction—yet not by public, but by private satisfaction.⁵⁰ Indeed even from those things which we said above, in the previous Distinction, about the manifold action of penance, this division of satisfaction can be sufficiently understood. Finally, to these there is added that division whereby it is wont to be divided into prayer, fasting, and almsgiving as into principal parts, and to which all the other works of satisfaction can easily be referred. Of which we shall speak in their own place.

§ X — That the satisfaction of penitents has in some way respect to the eternal punishment (Quamdam esse poenitentium satisfactionem pro poena aeterna)

§ 56. For a fuller explanation of what has been more briefly said above, it must now be proved that which we said, namely, that the works of penitents done before reconciliation have some formal character (*ratio*) of satisfaction (*satisfactio*) with respect to the eternal punishment (*poena aeterna*), although a very imperfect one, for the reason that they can in no wise equal that punishment, since this punishment is finite both in duration and in weight or worth of price, whereas that one is infinite. And first this is proved from the fact that of old either ordinarily, or at least very often, satisfactions were enjoined to be paid before the benefit of absolution (*absolutio*) was imparted to the penitents—although the later Church with good reason altered that custom. For since the sinner undergoing satisfactions of this sort was still a debtor of eternal death, as being not yet absolved from guilt, it is reasonable that they were both enjoined and undertaken for the abolition of the punishment. For the Ancients sometimes speak expressly in this way. Of whom is Tertullian, who in the book On Penance says, among other things: that by the temporal affliction of the penitent eternal

punishments are expunged, and that the sinner is worn down and even tormented by the works of penance, lest he perish for ever.⁵² St. Ambrose, writing *To a Fallen Virgin*, whom he exhorts to satisfaction, writes thus: The sinner, if he will not spare himself, is spared by the Lord; if within this brief span of life he shall have compensated the perpetual future torments of Gehenna, he frees himself from the eternal judgment.⁵³ The same, writing *On Psalm 37*, says: He who does penance ought to offer himself to punishment, that here he may be punished by the Lord in every way, and not be reserved for eternal torments.⁵⁴ And in book 5 of the *Hexaameron*, the last chapter: "Let us," he says, "first pay the debt of guilt with tears."⁵⁵ Likewise in the Hymn of Lauds at Matins: "And by weeping the guilt is released."⁵⁶ And in book 1 *On Penance*, ch. 4: God awaits our groans, but temporal ones, that He may remit the perpetual.⁵⁷ St. John Chrysostom (*Hom. 6 on 2 Tim. 2*): "See how great the mercy of God is, if He has given you to be able to redeem, not the temporal, but the eternal death."⁵⁸ He speaks similarly in *Hom. 38 on John* and *Hom. 1 on the Epistle to the Hebrews*.⁵⁸ Leo (*Serm. 2 De Collectis*) says that contracted faults are wiped away by alms, and (*Serm. 4*) that by works of mercy toward one's neighbors the sinner is freed from the sentence of damnation; and more openly (*Serm. 5*) he thus speaks: "Alms blot out sins, slay death, extinguish the punishment of the everlasting fire."⁵⁹ The same (*Serm. 4 De Quadragesima*) says that faults are redeemed by pious works.⁵⁹ Prosper, book 2 *Of the Contemplative Life*, ch. 7, writes thus about those who are guilty of hidden crimes: But if they themselves also become judges, and, as it were, avengers of their own iniquity, here let them exercise upon themselves a voluntary punishment of most severe censure; by temporal punishments they will exchange eternal torments, and with tears flowing from true compunction of heart they will quench the blaze of the eternal fire.⁶⁰ And other statements of this sort also occur in the Ancients; to which is consonant that which in a certain Collect of Lent the Church prays, that, restraining our sins by voluntary chastisement, we may rather be worn down temporally than be assigned to eternal punishments.⁶¹

§ 57. Likewise the Scriptures too, generally demanding works of penance for sins, sufficiently intimate that these avail in some manner also for abolishing the eternal punishment; as that saying (*Matt. 3; Lk. 3*): "Who has shown you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance." In which place by the "wrath to come" the Baptist without doubt understood the punishment of Gehenna, which he also a little after insinuated more expressly when he said that every fruitless tree is to be cast into the fire, and that the chaff, the wheat being gathered into the granary, is to be burned with unquenchable fire. Such too is that saying of the Apostle (*1 Cor. 11*): "But when we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world." For that temporal chastisement, borne with patience and undertaken willingly, is a certain satisfaction, aiming, according to the Apostle, that the common condemnation of the impious, whom he designates by the name "world," may be escaped. Finally, to this point there can be referred all those testimonies of Scripture and of the Fathers which ascribe satisfaction to pious works with respect to the remission of sins or justification. Since the testimonies are very many, it is not now the time to dwell on recounting them.

§ 58. For if some merit is found in such works with respect to the paying of the eternal punishment, then in those same works—especially if they are penal—there is some, at least imperfect, formal character of satisfaction for that same paying. Indeed, even in some sense the works which follow absolution too aim at removing the obligation of the eternal punishment, because assuredly such satisfaction is for the temporal punishment, into which the priest's absolution has commuted the eternal punishment. For that the satisfaction subsequent to absolution ought in some way to look to the eternal punishment is evident: for it too is a part of the sacrament of Penance (*poenitentia*) instituted for paying the debt of eternal death; and

absolution is granted not only in view of contrition and confession, but also of satisfaction to be performed. Therefore, since the priest absolves the penitent from the eternal punishment, to which he is a debtor, even satisfaction, as well as contrition and confession, ought to be ordered and referred to that effect, though not altogether in an equal manner.

§ 59. Nor does it stand in the way that the Fathers of Trent (Session 6, ch. 14) say that satisfaction is made not for the eternal but only for the temporal punishment. For it is clear that they speak of the satisfaction which follows remission. Which satisfaction indeed does not, simply speaking, regard the eternal punishment; but in the mode and sense just stated it is to be said to avail or to cooperate to the removal of the eternal punishment, as also to remission.⁶²

§ 60. But someone will here ask: Since Christ has satisfied for the eternal punishment, lest justice should a second time demand payment after the debt has once for all been perfectly paid, how is it to be understood that we also satisfy for the same? It is answered: the satisfaction of Christ, of itself, is most sufficient to wipe away all eternal and temporal punishment; but it has been divinely so ordained that it is not applied to us unless there be on our part certain works which, however, have only the ratio of an imperfect kind of satisfaction when compared with the eternity of the punishment of Gehenna: for they are, namely, certain penal conditions required on our side to this end, that the passion and death of Christ—most full satisfaction for paying the debt of the eternal punishment—may be applied to us.⁶³

§ XI — The works of satisfaction are necessary for sins (Satisfactionis opera pro peccatis esse necessaria)

§ 61. First, then, that we may take our beginning from Scripture, to satisfaction (*satisfactio*) pertain the fruits of penance (*poenitentia*), which the Baptist requires of those to whom he was preaching penance, saying: "Who has shown you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance" (Matt. 3; Lk. 3). Likewise also the Apostle Paul (Acts 26) speaks thus to King Agrippa: "I announced to Jews and to Gentiles that they should do penance and be converted to God, doing works worthy of penance." For by the expression "works, or fruits, worthy of penance" certainly some equality is indicated between the very works of penance and the debts of penalties; and that either according to the rigor of justice, or at least according to the kindly acceptance of God.

§ 62. The very same track is had by the word "to redeem" (*redimere*), which Scripture uses to signify the satisfactions of penitents, as Daniel (Dan. 4): "Redeem your sins with alms, and your iniquities with the mercies of the poor"; and that of Proverbs 16: "By mercy and truth iniquity is redeemed"; and again Prov. 13: "The redemption of a man's soul are his riches," according to the exposition of Bede on that place, and of St. Augustine,⁶⁵ namely, that redemption necessarily includes satisfaction, that is, the paying of the price by which the taking away is effected. A like proof is from the word "vengeance" (*vindicta*), as the Apostle uses it in 2 Cor. 7, writing thus: "For behold this selfsame thing that you were made sorrowful according to God, what carefulness it has worked in you, but defense, but indignation, but vengeance"—that is, the chastisement of sin. And he signified this also by the name "judgment" in the former Epistle (1 Cor. 11), saying: "If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged," that is, if we ourselves exacted from ourselves the vengeance of our sins, God would not afterwards exact it. So Ezekiel (Ezek. 18; 33) requires of the impious man who does penance that he "do judgment and justice."

§ 63. Furthermore, the same is proved from the power given to the Apostles and to their successors (Matt. 18: "Whatever you shall bind," etc.; and Jn. 20: "Whose sins you shall retain," etc.). For those words of Christ signify that the keys of the kingdom of heaven have been granted to priests not only for loosing, but also for binding. But priests bind those who have sinned, and retain their sins, when they throw upon them the chains of satisfactions and enjoin penalties. To the undergoing of which, therefore, the penitent is bound.

§ 64. Hither, finally, pertain all those passages of Scripture which, besides the conversion of mind and newness of life, require from sinners works of penance, that is, of satisfaction: such as are fasting, mourning, weeping, lamentation, haircloth, and ashes; or whatever other things whereby men are wont to afflict themselves and to exact of themselves vengeance for evil deeds (as in Joel 2; Jonah 3; Jer. 3; 18; 25; Is. 3; Sir. 17; Matt. 11; Lk. 10; the last of Job; 2 Cor. 12; Jas. 4; and elsewhere).

§ 65. But since the Adversaries fiercely assail the name "satisfaction" as both injurious to Christ and newly introduced, it must be shown how both the word itself and the reality itself were not unusual nor unknown to the ancient Fathers, and altogether what opinion they held about the necessity of satisfaction. Tertullian, in the book *On Penance*, frequently makes mention of satisfaction, and thus writes among other things (ch. 8): "Confession is the counsel of satisfaction; concealment is contumacy." And immediately afterward in ch. 9: "We confess our offense to the Lord, not indeed as to one ignorant, but inasmuch as by confession satisfaction is disposed, we teach." And after many things, in which he exhorts to various works of penance, he says: "It is surely intolerable to modesty to satisfy the Lord whom one has offended, to be refashioned unto salvation brought forth." The same, in the book *On Baptism*, says: "For the past we make satisfaction by the conflict of the flesh and the spirit."⁶⁶

§ 66. St. Cyprian (*Sermon 5 On the Lapsed*) thus addresses those who had fallen: let each one confess his own offense, while he who has transgressed is still in this world, while his confession can be admitted, while satisfaction and remission, wrought by the priests, have grace with the Lord.⁵⁰ "Let us be converted to the Lord with our whole mind, expressing the penance of our crime with true sorrows; let us implore the mercy of God; let the soul prostrate itself to Him; let sadness satisfy Him; on Him let all hope lean." And after a few things interposed: "Behold still worse wounds of sinning, behold yet greater crimes: to have sinned and not to make satisfaction, to have transgressed and not to bewail transgressions." And again, after other things, where he sharply rebukes those who, when they had denied the faith in persecution, refused to make satisfaction, he says: "They who take away the penance of crime shut the way of satisfaction." And below: "Let not penance be less than the crime: one must pray more earnestly, spend the day in mourning, pass sleepless nights with vigils and tears," etc. And again: "God must be entreated; by our satisfaction He must be appeased; our transgressions must be reckoned up." And a little after: "Nor let us cease in doing penance and in imploring the mercy of the Lord, lest that which seems less to be in the quality of the offense be heaped up by neglected satisfaction." And after a long exhortation, in which he had said that God is moved by our satisfactions, and that His wrath and the offense of His indignation are appeased by just supplication, at length he subjoins: "If anyone shall thus have satisfied God, who by penance for his deed, who by the shame for his transgression, has conceived more of virtue and faith from the very sorrow of his fall, he is heard and aided by the Lord whom he had lately saddened; he makes the Church glad; nor now will he merit God's pardon alone, but a crown." These are the words of Cyprian, in whom you will read similar things in book 1, letters 3, 4, 8, and 14, and in book 4, letters 3 and 4, and also in the *Sermon On Almsgiving*, where he most clearly teaches and proves from the Scriptures that by just works satisfaction is made to God for sins.⁶⁷

§ 67. St. Ambrose, exhorting a fallen virgin to penance, among many things thus says: "Be to yourself the more cruel judge of your own deed; a mourning garment is to be received by you; your mind and each of your members are to be punished with worthy chastisement." Then he follows: "Such an act of penance, if it be persevering, will dare to hope, even if not for glory—understand, that due to virginity—certainly for the evacuation of punishment." Then, after the words cited in the foregoing chapter, follows: "A great wound needs also a prolonged medicine; a great crime has a great and necessary satisfaction." The same, on Luke, book 7, chapter 59: "As those who pay money render a debt, nor is the name of usury wiped away before the sum of the principal has in full to the coin been paid, so by the weighing-out of charity and of labors, or by any satisfaction whatever, sin is discharged." And in the book *On Abel and Cain*: "Let us redeem our crimes by the price of good works and pity." Likewise, in the same author's book *On Penance* there is a passage very near this, in book 2, chapter 5.⁶⁸

§ 68. More ancient than Ambrose, Pacianus, writing diligently against the Novatians (*On Penance and Confession*, or the *Exhortation to Penance*), after much exhortation to satisfactions says something to this effect: in proportion as you have been stricken by punishments, in that measure, behold, I promise you God, if you return to your Father by satisfaction, will not accuse you further; and, saying: "We have sinned in your sight; we are now not worthy to be called your sons," straightway about you also that clean beast will be recalled, and from the husks' fare you will be cleansed—these and the like, which he has in the third letter to Sympronian.⁶⁹ St. Jerome (in his *Commentary*)⁷⁰ says: "He who is a sinner, and whose conscience bites him, let him be corrected by the haircloth of penance; let him bewail both his own sins and the people's; and let him again enter into the place whence he had been cast out; and for the past delights, by which he had offended, let him compensate by austerity of life." And in the *Epitaph of Paula* (ep. 27), speaking in the person of those doing penance, he says among other things that by perpetual weeping what has been done is to be compensated; and moreover the word "compensation" is in this matter quite familiar for satisfaction itself. He confirms the same doctrine, which in him is also found elsewhere, by what he says in epistle 30 to Oceanus about penance, and in epistle 49 to Sabinianus.⁷¹

§ 69. Most clear, too, is the opinion of St. Augustine in many places. In a homily he says to this effect: it does not suffice to change one's ways for the better and to depart from evil, unless also for the evils done satisfaction be made to God by penance, by the groan of humility, by the sacrifice of a contrite heart, with almsgivings cooperating.⁷² In the *Enchiridion*, ch. 70: "God blots out sins already done, if congruent satisfaction is not neglected." And in the same book, writing on Psalm 50 at the verse "Behold, you have loved truth," he says that God pardons him who punishes himself. "For thus," he says, "mercy and truth are kept—mercy, by which man is freed; truth, because sin is punished." And (on Psalm 132) he says that David, willing to satisfy God for his sins so as to receive the indulgence of the sins, offered Him the sacrifice of a humbled heart. In the book *On Continence*, ch. 6, he generally pronounces thus: "No debtor of a heavier punishment receives pardon unless he pays some penalty—although far less than he owes." The same doctrine is his in epistle 54, and in a certain sermon *On Divers Things*, where he bears witness that he who truly repents punishes and avenges sin in himself, lest God punish or avenge it.⁷³ And in book 5 of the *City of God*, ch. 26, where he treats of the satisfaction of the Emperor Theodosius.

§ 70. St. Gregory (*Homily 34 on the Gospels*): "It must be thought most earnestly that he who remembers he has committed illicit things, should also strive to abstain from certain licit things, that by this the Maker of all may be satisfied for those things by which He had been offended." And writing on Psalm 5 (penitential), he

says that the sinner should compensate the joys of iniquity with the pains of satisfaction. And in the Exposition on 1 Kings 9 he teaches that one satisfaction is proper to Christ the Redeemer, another common to the faithful who do penance.⁷⁴ See this (Homily 20 on the Gospels), and (book 3 of the Pastoral Rule, admonition 31), where he says that those are to be admonished who indeed desist from sins, yet do not weep, lest they think already remitted the faults which, even if by acting they do not multiply them, nonetheless by no tears do they wipe away. "For," he says, "the writer is not absolved of the debt because he has ceased to write, since he has not added something else; for those things which he had written he has now deleted; nor is the debtor absolved because he does not multiply other debts, unless he also pays those which he had contracted." And again, elsewhere with opposite instances he says that, when we have sinned with God, we satisfy not by a sorrow of heart unless we persecute, with adequate lamentations, the pleasures which we have loved, etc. And on the contrary he subjoins fitly: how false that saying of Luther is, "The best penance is a new life."

§ 71. Finally, he proves it from the penance of Baptism by an argument from the lesser, citing that word of Peter (Acts 2): "Do penance, and let each of you be baptized." Lest, however, we be too prolix by reciting the words of all, we will only note a few passages of other Fathers in the same sense. Therefore Innocent I (in the Epistle to Decentius, ch. 7); Leo I (Epistles 91 and 93), expressly requiring satisfaction from penitents; Prosper, book 2 of the Life Contemplative, ch. 7; Fulgentius, book 1 On the Remission of Sins, ch. 12, and book 2, ch. 15; St. Bernard (Sermon 66 on the Song of Songs); Rupert (on that of Matt. 5, "Whoever shall say to his brother, Racha"); the author of the book On True and False Penance among the works of Augustine, ch. 8.⁷⁵ And that we may pass over to the Greeks, Origen set forth the same doctrine clearly (Homilies 2 and 12 on Leviticus); Eusebius, book 5 of the Ecclesiastical History, ch. 28; Nazianzen (Oration on the Holy Lights); Epiphanius, book 2 (Heresy 59, which is that of the Cathari or Novatians, and in the Oration which he wrote on the Catholic Faith); St. John Chrysostom (Homily 11 on 2 Corinthians; Homily 5 on 2 Corinthians? and Homily 80 to the people of Antioch); to which add the places cited in the previous chapter; likewise Eusebius Emisenus under the title (Homilies 5 and 10 to Monks); Theodoret (in the Epitome of the divine decrees, the chapter on Penance); St. John Damascene, book 4 On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 10, where, on account of satisfaction, he says that penance is a certain toilsome baptism.⁷⁶ To these it is permitted to add the canons and decrees which prescribe congruent satisfactions for sins, such as the Council of Carthage III (canon 31); of Carthage IV (canon 74); the African Council (canon 9); and of Cabillon (canons 34 and 38); and those, moreover, which have been collected by Gratian (Cause 26, question 7; De Consecratione, Distinction 4; De Penance, Distinction 3). From all which it is gathered with what great authority is founded the doctrine of the Church about the satisfactions of penitents, and about their necessity; so that with good reason the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 8), whose title is "On the necessity and fruit of satisfactions," confirmed this Catholic doctrine, and in the same session (canons 12, 13, 14, 15) pronounced anathema on those who either judge the satisfaction of penitents to be nothing other than the faith whereby they lay hold of Christ as having satisfied for them; or say that for sins, as far as temporal punishment, there is by no means satisfaction made to God by penitents; or [say] that satisfactions by which penitents redeem sins are not a worship of God, but traditions of men; or finally [say] that the keys of the Church have been given only for loosing, not also for binding.⁷⁷

§ 72. Furthermore, if anyone should wish to be persuaded of this doctrine by reason, we will reply that for reason the divine institution suffices—yet such as cannot but be supremely reasonable. Whence also the

Fathers of Trent (in the already cited ch. 8) indicate several weighty reasons why God also, the guilt having been remitted, still requires satisfaction from penitents. Which it is not necessary to rehearse here.

§ 73. Moreover, some prove the necessity of satisfaction from the necessity of confession, and think that those who deny satisfaction to be necessary, forthwith also take away the necessity of confession, on the ground that the confession of sins is necessary for no other reason than that priests are judges who, the quality of sins having been known and weighed, ought to pass sentence about them by enjoining for them salutary and suitable satisfactions. Let studious readers weigh whether that argument plainly convinces. Certainly, among the heretics who also deny confession itself to be necessary, it has no force.

§ XII — Reply to the objections of the adversaries (Ad objectiones adversariorum responsio)

§ 74. The things which the Adversaries are wont to bring forward against the foregoing doctrine of the Church concerning satisfaction (*satisfactio*), are partly the same as those which seem to prove that, once guilt has been remitted, no penalty at all ever remains to be paid—questions to which we have already replied—partly they are different from those and are their own peculiar arguments, to which answer must now be made. First, they say that it is impossible that man should make satisfaction to God for sin, both because the offense of God, by reason of the object, is infinite, whereas man and every work of man is finite and therefore cannot be adequate to an offense against God; and because man can offer nothing to God which he does not owe Him at least by reason of creation; but satisfaction, in order to be a work of another order, ought to be something not owed; and finally, because men sin daily, and very often indeed even just men, so that while they strive to satisfy for one sin, soon many others creep in anew.

§ 75. Second, they argue: Christ most fully satisfied for guilt and for penalty (as the place in Isaiah 53 plainly shows, and as we proved above at Distinction 19 of Book III);⁷⁹ therefore, without injury to the satisfaction of Christ, our satisfaction cannot be set up, especially since God does not punish twice in the same thing, as the Prophet Nahum bears witness (ch. 1, according to the Seventy), in place of which we have: "Tribulation shall not rise up the second time," and the law of nature dictates that it is unjust that a debt fully paid should be exacted again.⁸⁰ Wherefore, since sin has been punished fully and abundantly in Christ with respect to both guilt and penalty, and has been expiated in His Blood, he is ungrateful to Christ and attributes injustice to God who teaches that satisfaction is still to be exacted of man for sin.

§ 76. Third: Christ and the Apostles are nowhere read to have enjoined any satisfactions upon penitents. Fourth: In the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the old law no other satisfaction is prefigured than the satisfaction of Christ on the cross by His Blood and death. Fifth: The remission of sins is purely gratuitous, according to that of the Apostle (Rom. 3): "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus," etc.; therefore nothing is to be paid for it, not even as regards the penalty. For otherwise the remission of sins would not be had entirely freely. Sixth: If man in any way made satisfaction for his sins, namely as regards the penalty, he would now be in some part his own redeemer, which seems absurd and injurious to the plentiful redemption of Christ. Seventh: Ambrose, Book 10 (on Luke, ch. 13; Sermon 46 on Penance), seems to exclude satisfaction by these words: "I read the tears of Peter, I do not read satisfaction." The same is found in Maximus (Homily 3 on Penance). Eighth: Theophylact, on that saying of the Apostle (Eph. 4), "Let him who stole, steal no more," thus writes: The Apostle did not say, "Let him who commits

theft be punished," but "let him desist from evil." For to punish is a matter of the judicial forum; to withdraw from vices is the doctrine of Christ. So he. And these are almost the chief points which are wont to be brought and urged by the Sectaries against the doctrine of satisfaction. To which we briefly reply.

§ 77. To the first indeed, that it is by no means impossible for man, prevented by the grace of Christ, to make satisfaction for the penalties remaining after the guilt has been remitted. For, as the Fathers of Trent say (Session 14, ch. 8),⁸¹ our satisfaction which we pay for our sins is not so much our own that it is not through Jesus Christ. For whereas of ourselves, as of ourselves, we can do nothing, yet, He cooperating who strengthens us, we can do all things. Thus man has not whereof to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ; in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we make satisfaction, doing fruits worthy of penance, which have their power from Him, are offered by Him to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father.

§ 78. Therefore to the first proof this is answered: that good works which are done by a man reconciled by the indwelling Spirit of God, from that same Spirit receive a certain character of infinity, so that, just as they are of condign merit for eternal life, so also, insofar as they are penal, they are of condign satisfaction for the remaining penalty.

§ 79. To the second, however—that although God by the right of creation and of supreme dominion can exact of man all whatsoever can be done by him—nevertheless, out of His goodness and clemency toward the creature, He does not absolutely exact all things, but certain things according to laws prescribed to him. Whence it is that man can also do certain things otherwise not owed, since to the doing of them he is bound by no law of God, especially insofar as they are penal, by which accordingly he will be able to make satisfaction.

§ 80. To the third proof we say: because men sin daily, there is need of a certain daily satisfaction. To which there pertains in the first place the Lord's Prayer, in which we say: "Forgive us our debts," etc. Whence St. Augustine (Enchiridion 71) says: "For daily, light, and slight sins, without which this life is not led, the daily prayer of the faithful makes satisfaction."⁸² And in Epistle 108: "The penance of faithful and humble Christians is a daily punishment in which we smite our breasts, saying: Forgive us our debts," etc.⁸³ Nor ought we only to pray for daily offenses, but also to do alms, as the same Augustine affirms in a certain Sermon on the Lord's Prayer.⁸⁴ And after him Fulgentius, in the book *On the Faith to Peter* (ch. 41), joined both remedies, saying: "Hold most firmly, doubt not at all, that no one can here live without sin, and that it is always necessary for every man both to wash away sins of this present life by alms and to beg remission from God humbly and truly."⁸⁵ But what and how much these daily remedies of making satisfaction avail a man, Augustine again hands on (Epistle 89) in these words: "He who, aided by the mercy and grace of God, has abstained from those sins which are even called crimes, and has not neglected to cleanse by works of mercy and pious prayers those sins without which one does not live here, will merit to depart hence without sin, although when he lived here he had some sins; because, just as those were not lacking, so also the remedies by which they might be purged were present."⁸⁶ So he, in whom a quite similar passage occurs also in the book *On Nature and Grace* (ch. 35).⁸⁷

§ 81. To the second argument we answer that neither do the satisfactions which are after guilt is remitted, nor those which of old were done before the remission of guilt for the remission of eternal penalty (of which, however, there might have seemed greater question), derogate anything from the most perfect satisfaction of Christ; and about the former we have already said above what is to be answered; but about the latter we now

reply: that Christ most fully satisfied for the sins and penalties of the whole human race as to sufficiency, not however as to efficiency. For not all are delivered from sins and penalties, because the price of the Blood of Christ is not applied to all. Therefore just as that price, although of itself sufficient, is not applied to the impenitent for the remission of guilt, and therefore of no penalty at all; so that same price is not always applied to the penitent for the abolition of the whole penalty, but the justice of God, the guilt having been remitted, for the most part still reserves and exacts a temporal penalty, unless the man himself, by a voluntary punishing of himself, should make satisfaction for it, and in this way be made conformed, by suffering with Christ, to Christ; and yet this very thing—that it can be done and rendered by man—wholly descends from the merit of the passion and satisfaction of Christ, as the words of the Council of Trent cited above clearly declare, and elsewhere also we have explained (Dist. 19, Book III).⁸¹ And to signify this St. Ambrose, Book 2 (On Abel and Cain, ch. 3), when he said: "Let us redeem our crimes by good works, and by the price of faith and mercy," immediately subjoined: "Our price is the Blood of Christ"—so that we might not think that our satisfactions avail from any other source than from the merit of the passion of Christ.⁸⁸

§ 82. As for Nahum, however, this is the genuine sense there: "The Lord will make a consummation of tribulation," that is, He will so by one visitation destroy and consume sinners that there will be no need of another tribulation. For he is speaking of temporal tribulation. Yet it is also true that those whom God has once fully absolved from the debts of their sins are not again to be punished for the same. But, as we said, just as the passion of Christ is not applied to the impenitent for any remission—whom therefore no one will say to be punished "twice in the same thing," since in hell they pay the eternal penalties due to their sins—so neither is it always applied to the penitent for the full remission of the penalty. And in the measure in which it is applied, in that measure the penitent is freed from the penalty.

§ 83. To the third it is replied, first, that not all things which Christ and the Apostles did were written. Then, it has been shown above that the power of enjoining satisfactions was given by Christ to the priests in that very gift whereby He gave them power of binding and of retaining. And perhaps it did not befit Christ to use this power in His own person, lest by this He should be thought not to be sufficiently powerful to remit guilt together with penalty. But that He did this through the Apostles is not doubtful. For Paul, 1 Cor. 5, "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," as he himself speaks, judges that that Corinthian guilty of incest must be "delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord."⁸⁹ And that "destruction" according to Ambrose, Book 1 (On Penance, ch. 17), signifies not a consummate wasting-away of the flesh, but a chastisement; and according to Pacian (Epistle 3 to Sympronian) it signifies straits of the flesh and detriments of the limbs.⁹⁰ Jerome also (on Gal. 5) and Augustine, Book against Adimantus (ch. 17), referred that passage of the Apostle to the labors and annoyances of penance.⁹¹ But this apostolic discipline can be proved also from elsewhere, as 2 Cor. 2; Heb. 10; and Acts 8; where from the Prince of the Apostles it is said to Simon Magus: "Do penance therefore for this thy wickedness; and pray to God, if perhaps this thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee," etc.⁹²

§ 84. To the fourth it is replied: that in the law there were not only sacrifices by which the one sacrifice of Christ was foreshown, but there was also instituted a day of expiation (Lev. 16 and 23) on which the people were commanded "to afflict their souls" by a perpetual observance, that they might be cleansed from sins; and by ransoms a satisfaction used to be made for sins; as also by alms, which those who had offered a sacrifice were commanded to give to the poor, as is in Deuteronomy 15 and Sirach 7.⁹³ Add that the sacrifices of the law themselves not only foreshadowed the sacrifice of Christ, but also—albeit only secondarily—signified the

spiritual sacrifices of the faithful, that is, good works; among which are also satisfactions, as Augustine teaches (City of God X, ch. 5), and Cyril as well (Against Julian IX–X).⁹⁴

§ 85. To the fifth: Justification (*justificatio*) and the remission of sins is purely gratuitous, both because God by His grace prevents man, turned away from Himself and having nothing in himself in view of which He should call him back to Himself and inspire the beginning of good will, and because, as it is held in Session 6, ch. 8 of the Council of Trent, none of those things which precede justification or the remission of sins, whether faith or works, merits justification itself.⁹⁵ With which, however, it agrees that a man already justified and made a son of God by His grace should offer some condign price for the penalty still remaining, or even, not yet justified, by that same grace of Christ should do something which has the character of a certain imperfect satisfaction with respect to the eternal penalty.

§ 86. To the sixth: There is nothing absurd if it be said that man, by those works which proceed from the fountain of Christ's redemption, in some part redeems himself—namely, as regards temporal penalties—since Scripture itself so speaks (Dan. 4; Prov. 10, 13).⁹⁶ Nor do the Fathers at all shrink from that manner of speaking, as Augustine (Enchiridion 67), Ambrose (On the Fast of Elijah, ch. 20; and Sermons 90–91 On Alms), and Leo (Sermon 4 On Lent), and St. Lawrence, priest of Novara, in the Homily On Penance, with these words: "Out of my poverty I redeem myself; by my labor I make atonement for myself."⁹⁷

§ 87. To the seventh: Ambrose by "satisfaction" understands an excuse, or a defense of the deed—as from the context of the place it is most clear. In which signification it is found to be taken not only frequently among Latin authors, but even at times in Sacred Scripture (as in Leviticus 10; Acts 17 and 25).⁹⁸

§ 88. To the last there is also an easy reply. For both the Apostle, when he had said, "Let him who stole, steal no more," immediately subjoined: "but rather let him labor, working with his hands that which is good, that he may have something to give to him that suffers need," which pertains to satisfaction; and his Commentator Theophylact, a little after the words set down in the objection, says: "Let him work what is good, and not this simply, but with toil, that he may break the body which before had learned evils from sloth, and let him now impart to others, whereas before he used to filch another's; and let him now show beneficence to others." Which words contain an open commendation of satisfaction. Therefore when he says that Paul did not will this, that he who committed theft be punished, he is speaking of the punishment which is inflicted by a secular judge according to civil laws. For a punishment of this sort Paul does not exact, nor did that pertain either to Paul's tribunal or at all to ecclesiastical jurisdiction.⁹⁹

§ XIII — Satisfactions of old were enjoined rather with respect to God than to the Church (Satisfactiones antiquitus injunctae potius respectu Dei quam Ecclesiae)

§ 89. Since most heretics of our time, convicted as they are by the most manifest testimonies of all antiquity, do not altogether dare to deny and to reprobate these ecclesiastical satisfactions (*satisfactiones*), they strive to pervert their proper use and the rationale of their institution, teaching that in former days they used to be exacted from the relapsed, not that the offended God might be appeased and that satisfaction might be made to Him for the penalties due, but only that satisfaction might be made to the Church, inasmuch as, namely, those who by their sin had scandalized the Church were bound to render so much as might seem sufficient for

reconciliation to the Church against which they had sinned. Whence they say that the works by which that was rendered were called by the Fathers satisfactions with respect to the Church, not with respect to God. And congruent to this doctrine they have even devised the following definition of satisfaction: "Satisfaction is the Church's testing, whereby she is made more certain concerning the relapsed, whether they have repented in earnest, and whether they can with profit be received back into the public assemblies." And they attempt to prove this figment of theirs from St. Cyprian and St. Augustine: the former, in the Sermon On the Lapsed, says that, when satisfaction has been accomplished, the penitent makes glad the Church which he had lately made sorrowful; the latter, in the Enchiridion 65, when he was speaking about doing penance, subjoined these words: "But because for the most part the sorrow or grief of the heart is hidden from another, nor does it come into the knowledge of others by words or by any other signs—since it is 'before Him of whom it is said: My groaning is not hidden from Thee'—it is rightly ordained by those who preside over the Church that satisfaction be made to the Church also, in which the very sins are remitted." Thus St. Augustine.¹⁰¹

§ 90. Moreover, the vanity of this fiction is most evidently refuted both by the Scriptures and by the testimonies of the Ancients which we have cited above. For the worthy fruits of penance are required not only that satisfaction be made to the Church, but that the sinner may flee from the wrath to come. Thus Daniel, to avert the scourge imminent from God upon King Nebuchadnezzar, said to him: "Wherefore, O King, let my counsel be acceptable to thee: redeem thy sins with alms; perhaps He will forgive thy offences." Likewise the Apostle, in 1 Corinthians 11, says that this avails to this end: "if a man judge himself, that he be not judged by the Lord." And in chapter 5 he decrees by apostolic power that the scandalous man be "delivered unto the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." Christ also so handed over to the Apostles the power of loosing and binding as to show that in heaven—that is, before God, or with respect to God—not only the absolution but also the binding, or obligation, would be valid and ratified, whereby penitents should be held bound to undergo a determinate penalty.¹⁰²

§ 91. Finally, in Sacred Scripture prayers, fasts, vigils, alms, tears and lamentation, sackcloth and ashes are commended and prescribed not chiefly in order that he who has sinned among men and in the sight of the Church should make that grief known, but that he should redeem and extinguish his sins with God, that he should render God to himself propitious and appeased, that he should avert the scourges of His wrath. Which it is easy to show by testimonies of Joel 2, Jonah 3, Tobit 4 and 13, Sirach 29, and almost countless others.¹⁰³

§ 92. And indeed among the writers of the ancient Church, where they treat of doing penance, scarcely anything is more frequent than that they say that penitents must make satisfaction to God, appease God, avert the wrath of God, and the like—as is proved by the passages cited by us above from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, and others. More manifestly still is this proved by those places in which the same Fathers extend the satisfactions of penitents and say that they avail unto the remission of eternal punishment.¹⁰⁴

§ 93. To this is added that, if satisfaction have no other use than that true penance be made approved and attested to the Church, by consequence he who has sinned secretly—seeing that he has not offended the Church by his sin—will now be bound to no satisfaction, unlike those who have relapsed. But this is plainly contrary to the doctrine of the Fathers, and notably of Cyprian in the Sermon On the Lapsed, and of Prosper, book 2 of On the Contemplative Life, chapter 7.¹⁰¹

§ 94. But what the Adversaries allege on their behalf from Cyprian and Augustine proves absolutely nothing. For Cyprian does indeed say that the Church is made glad by the works of penance, she who had

been saddened by sins; yet he does not wish this to be the principal use of satisfaction, that satisfaction be made to the Church, but that God be appeased and that satisfaction be made to God, as that whole passage of Cyprian plainly shows, as also another treatise which he wrote On Almsgiving. Augustine also, in that very same place, refers the act of penance—that is, satisfaction—to the hope of obtaining mercy from God; and in chapter 70 he requires satisfaction on account of sins to be blotted out. However, what he says, "that satisfaction be made also to the Church," has no difficulty—nay, that sentence makes more for the Catholic doctrine. For by adding "also" he clearly signified that before all else satisfaction must be made to God, and then also to the Church. Wherefore it is not indeed to be denied that by those who have offended the Church by manifest crimes satisfaction must be made to the Church, that she may rejoice over their penance and be edified by it. But both Augustine and the other Fathers establish not this, but that which we state, as the principal use of satisfaction, namely that for sins satisfaction be made to God.¹⁰⁵

§ XIV — That the usefulness of fitting satisfaction is manifold (Multiplicem esse congruae satisfactionis utilitatem)

§ 95. According to the fittingness of satisfaction (*satisfactio*), Sacred Scripture and the Fathers commend to us a manifold usefulness and fruit. These advantages are partly common also to other good works, and partly proper to satisfaction. Almost all of them, or nearly all, are expressly recounted by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (ch. 8, session 14).⁴⁸

§ 96. The first usefulness is that, as the Tridentine Fathers say, satisfactory penalties greatly draw men back from sin and, as it were by a certain bridle, restrain them, and they make penitents more cautious and more watchful for the future. For thus is human nature constituted, that men guard themselves more diligently in future from those deeds on account of which they have suffered something serious. This can easily be shown by the examples of David and of the first parents and of other penitents who underwent heavy satisfactions—among whom is Augustine himself, as one may see in him, Confessions, book 8, chapter 11.¹⁰⁷ And to this pertains that saying of Augustine on Psalm 98 at the verse, "Thou wast propitious to them and taking vengeance on all their inventions": "Not only forgiving sins, but also taking vengeance, Thou wast propitious. God is angry with him whom, when he sins, He does not scourge. For to him to whom He is truly propitious, He not only forgives sins, that they may not harm in the age to come, but also chastises, lest it may always be a delight to sin."¹⁰⁸

§ 97. The second, because—as the same Fathers speak—penalties of this sort heal the remnants of sins and remove the vicious habits contracted by evil living through contrary acts of the virtues. Hence the ancients frequently affirm that satisfaction is medicinal. Whence Cyprian (in the Sermon On the Lapsed): "Let not a diligent and long medicine be lacking to a deep wound." And again: "Let us take up the life-giving remedies which the Bishop draws from the Scriptures; let us seek out the saving medicine."¹⁰⁹ And Ambrose (To a lapsed virgin): "A great wound needs a deep and lengthy medicine." The same, too, in book 2 On Penance, chapter 5, calls the works of satisfaction emendatory, saying: "For the sins on account of which he was scorched by temporal corrections, he saw that forgiveness remained toward him and that the medicine was not neglected."¹¹⁰ But, in order that satisfactions may be truly medicinal, the priests of the Lord, as in the place already cited the Tridentine Fathers admonish, must enjoin salutary and fitting satisfactions according to the quality of the crimes and the capacity of the penitents. For this reason, for example, to the rapacious and

avaricious largesses of alms are to be enjoined; to the lustful and gluttonous, fasts and abstinences; to the slothful and to those negligent of divine things, prayers; to the proud, exercises of humility; and so of the others. This one may observe in the words of Paul, when (Eph. 4) he wills him that stole to "steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands, that he may have whereof to distribute to him that suffers need"—that is, that he be exercised in the work of a virtue diametrically opposed to the earlier vice.¹¹¹ Thus Paula, in Jerome's Epitaph, speaks in this manner: "The body which has spent itself in many delights must be afflicted; prolonged laughter must be compensated by perpetual weeping; soft linens and most precious silks must be exchanged for the roughness of sackcloth."¹¹² And to this pertains what the same Apostle, discoursing about the scourges with which God chastises His sons, says (Heb. 12): "Now all chastisement for the present indeed seems not to be of joy, but of sorrow; but afterwards it will yield to those who have been exercised by it the most peaceful fruit of justice."¹¹³

§ 98. The third is that, as the Tridentine Fathers say, while by satisfying we suffer for sins, we are made conformable to Christ Jesus, who satisfied for our sins, and we also have thence the most certain pledge that "if we suffer with, we shall also be glorified with" (Rom. 8). For, as Leo says (Sermon 9 On Lent): "Sure and secure is the expectation of the promised beatitude where there is a participation of the Lord's Passion."¹¹⁴

§ 99. But the uses just stated can be common also to other good works, even if they are not satisfactory. For in the foregoing points the formal character of satisfaction is not yet being considered.

§ 100. The fourth usefulness, therefore, is proper to satisfaction, namely the appeasing of the divine wrath on account of sins committed, that is, the relaxation of temporal penalties still owed, or even of eternal penalty, according to the sense explained above. To this fruit of satisfaction the Apostle looks, 2 Cor. 7, saying: "For the sorrow that is according to God works penance unto salvation." But about this usefulness, or the proper use of satisfaction, enough has been said above.¹¹⁵

§ 101. Besides these, moreover, there is also a fifth usefulness of satisfaction, that the Church, which had been saddened and scandalized by the sin, should again be gladdened and edified by the action of penance of him who had sinned. But this use of satisfaction, as it is not the principal one, as was proved in the preceding chapter, so neither is it extended to every satisfaction, but only to that which is done publicly for crimes likewise publicly known. For as hidden sins do not cause scandal, so neither does the hidden satisfaction undertaken for them edify the community.

§ 102. Furthermore, for a fuller understanding of what has been said, besides the divisions of satisfaction set forth at the beginning, another threefold division of the same must be noted. For one satisfaction is enjoined by the priest, another is undertaken of one's own accord, and, finally, another is inflicted and patiently borne.

§ 103. Among these satisfactions this is the difference: that, considered according to its own kind and speaking per se, the first surpasses the second, and the second the third, in usefulness—especially as regards the usefulness proper to satisfaction—because in the first kind the satisfaction is a part of the sacrament, and therefore avails sacramentally; and, besides, it has the adjunct of the merit of obedience, as also a certain service of obedience, which is not so in the others. The second, however, for the very reason that it is undertaken spontaneously, is more voluntary than the third, which is only a suffering of a penalty inflicted from elsewhere.

§ XV — *Whether satisfaction ought to precede absolution or to follow (Utrum satisfactionem absolutio praecedere debeat an sequi)*

§ 104. Concerning the order (*ordo*) of satisfaction (*satisfactio*) and absolution, the custom of the Church has not always been the same. For the ancient Church for a long time held to the practice that to the lapsed and to those who had confessed their sin and were seeking reconciliation it should impose penance or satisfaction to be fulfilled first, before they reached peace, that is, reconciliation, through the priest's absolution. This is clear especially from the most ancient Tertullian, who, in the book *On Penance*, at great length exhorts the lapsed, not yet reconciled but aspiring to reconciliation, to undergo first condign satisfaction.⁵² The same does Cyprian, in the *Sermon On the Lapsed* and frequently in his *Letters*—namely in Ep. 2 of book 1, Ep. 2 of book 4, and Ep. 5 of book 3.¹¹⁷ Origen too sufficiently signified this, in *Homily 12 on Leviticus*, where he requires a penance of most complete satisfaction in order that Christ may enter into the soul, that is, in order that the soul may be reconciled to Christ as to its spouse.¹¹⁸ But this is most clearly shown by the words of Leo I, in *Letter 91*: "Christ," he says, "has handed over this power to the prelates of the Church, that they should give to those who confess the work of penance, and that, the same persons having been cleansed by wholesome satisfaction, they should admit them to the communion of the sacraments through the door of reconciliation."¹¹⁹ Hence, the Fathers of the Third Council of Toledo, seeing that the ancient practice had somewhat collapsed, judged that the following canon, which is the eleventh in number, ought to be renewed and retained: "Since we have found that through certain Churches of Spain men do penance not according to the canons but most wickedly according to their own will, namely, that as often as they shall have pleased to sin, so often they demand to be reconciled by presbyters, therefore, in order to restrain so execrable a presumption this is ordered by the holy Council: that penance be given according to the form of the ancient canons; that is, that first he who repents of himself be made to stand suspended from communion among the penitents; and at the time of satisfaction, as the sacerdotal consideration shall have approved, let him be restored to communion. But those who prematurely or within the time of penance, or after reconciliation, fall, are to be condemned according to the severity of the prior canons." Thus far the canon.¹²⁰

§ 105. To this also pertains what Gregory says, admonishing the ministers of absolution, in *Homily 26 on the Gospels*: "One must see what fault has preceded, or what penance has followed after the fault."¹²¹ Besides these one may see Innocent I (*Letter 3, chapter 2*), Sozomen, book 7 of the *History*, chapter 16, and many chapters collected by Gratian (the *Distinctio On Penance*).¹²² To these testimonies of the Fathers there can also be added those by which they affirm that the satisfactions of penitents avail even to the taking away of eternal punishment—a matter about which we spoke above. For this is said by them for this reason: because, according to the custom of that Church, satisfactions were carried out before reconciliation, while the eternal punishment was not yet remitted.¹²³ Nor must those be heeded who, out of their own imagination rather than out of any antiquity, assert that formerly too the Church used to absolve all penitents before they underwent satisfaction—but with a secret absolution; afterwards, when they had paid the enjoined penance, there used to be given to them a public absolution, by which, to wit, they were publicly received to communion. For this distinction is nowhere to be found; indeed, the words of Leo openly sound the contrary.¹¹⁹

§ 106. However, the Church of a later time, moved by reasons without doubt just, gradually changed that order of satisfaction and absolution, and began to impart absolution, even before satisfaction was performed, to those who should seem truly penitent—and this without prejudice to the earlier custom, which by this her

later practice she by no means intends to condemn. Now the reasons for this change seem to have been these. First, that the Church might declare that the priest's absolution avails before God, namely for loosing from the obligation of eternal punishment, and not only for this, that the penitent should be restored to the outward society of the faithful. Second, because the faithful would obtain from this anticipated absolution not less fruit than from a deferred one, and perhaps even greater; since, now absolved from the guilt of eternal damnation, for the temporal penalties remaining they would then satisfy God out of a greater charity, the works done for God out of charity being of greater worth and of greater price with God, than if they were done by those who have not yet been received into His friendship—so that not without reason the one satisfaction may be said to avail by way of congruity, the other also by way of condignity.¹²⁴ Third, that penitents, reconciled more swiftly to God by absolution and restored to the state of grace (*status gratiae*), might meanwhile be able to make progress in charity and merits.¹²⁵

§ 107. Yet one must know that this later custom of the Church was not introduced so newly that something similar was not sometimes done also of old. For those who had been seized by a grievous illness, or for whatever other cause were in danger of life, when they confessed were accustomed, the satisfaction being deferred, to be reconciled by absolution; if they recovered, they would then perform the penance or escape the peril. And to that pertain those words of Leo (Letter 91): "To those who in time of danger and the urgency of pressing peril ask for penance and at once for reconciliation, neither must satisfaction be interdicted nor reconciliation denied."¹¹⁹ Wherewith Augustine also sufficiently insinuates the same, when he says, in a letter to Honoratus the bishop, number 180, that at the time of a hostile incursion and imminent peril some were being reconciled (namely those who had already performed the imposed satisfaction), others were asking for the very work of penance who nevertheless could not at the same time straightway fulfill reconciliation. Concerning which, in the Council of Carthage two hundred and fourteen bishops—as also Augustine himself took part—established a rule (canon 76): "If someone, seeking penance in infirmity, the priest, having been invited, comes, and, overcome by infirmity, he has been struck dumb, or is in delirium, let those who are present give testimony that he accepted penance. And if straightway he be in danger of death, let him be reconciled by the imposition of the hand, and let the Eucharist be poured into his mouth; and if he survive, let him be admonished above to fulfill the penance."¹²⁶

§ 108. Since these things are so, we gather that neither the ancient custom of the Church is to be reproved by us, nor that which was introduced later is to be rejected as alien from the practice of the Ancients; and therefore both, as having proceeded from the Spirit of God who governs the whole body of the Church from the beginning to the end of the age, are to be regarded as having been observed suitably to the diversity and necessity of times—and that the practice which the Church now retains and approves is to be retained today. Whence, with good reason, in the Council of Alcalá under Sixtus IV, there was condemned, among others, this article of Peter of Osma: that penitents are not to be absolved unless first they have completed the penance enjoined to them.¹²⁷ Yet that condemnation in no way goes against the statement, if someone should say that the divine justice requires that some satisfaction at least always precede the remission of guilt, namely that which consists in the sorrow of contrition. Which Augustine seems to have signified in the book *On Continence*, chapter 6, when he says that no debt of a heavier punishment receives pardon until he has paid some sort of punishment, however much less than he owes; and thus there is given by God, out of the abundance of mercy, what is not left by the justice of discipline. For he continues: "For no sin which seems to be unpunished is without its punishment; for either it is punished by the bitterness of sorrow, or if you do not

sorrow, you are blind." Where he establishes the punishment of the sin committed in the very bitterness of contrition.¹²⁸

§ XVII — Reply to certain other arguments (Ad alia quaedam argumenta responsio)

§ 109. Against that part of the foregoing doctrine, wherein it was said that he cannot satisfy (*satisfacere*) who still retains an affection for mortal sin, certain points are wont to be objected. First: someone existing in such a state can do a good work, and the same is penal; therefore he can satisfy. Second: he satisfies who pays the whole that is owed. For this is to satisfy; but a man in mortal sin can pay the whole temporal penalty which is owed; therefore he can also satisfy. Third: he who fulfills the whole work enjoined on him by the Priest satisfies the Priest, nor is he bound thereafter to repeat it, even if he did it while existing in mortal sin; therefore he likewise satisfies God, whose vicar the Priest is. Fourth: he who fasts in mortal sin satisfies the precept of the Church; therefore he also who in a similar state undergoes the penalty enjoined by the Church—for in both cases it is a precept of the Church. Fifth: formerly satisfactions of many years used to be imposed, and indeed to be performed before absolution, as we said above. But it is very likely that such penitents meanwhile from time to time fell into mortal sins; therefore the satisfaction was held valid even for that time during which someone was in mortal sin. Sixth: in mortal sin a man can merit temporal goods; therefore he can also redeem temporal penalties. Now the antecedent is proved by that text, Matt. 6, "They have received their reward," and by the example of the midwives, Exod. 1, of whom Gregory says (Moral. XVIII, ch. 4) that because they could not merit eternal life, they merited temporal recompense. Sentences of this sort are also read elsewhere among the Ancients.¹³² Seventh: those who are in hell satisfy divine justice by paying eternal penalties, notwithstanding their perverse affection; therefore for a temporal penalty likewise someone will be able similarly to satisfy while bearing a perverse affection. Lastly: a man can satisfy a man for an injury done, if he undergo either talion or some similar penalty established by law, persisting nonetheless in enmity; therefore in like manner God will be able to be satisfied.

§ 110. On the strength of these some have thought that with God the satisfaction of a man existing in the affection for mortal sin is valid; especially if it were made for the remaining penalty of that sin whose guilt had already previously been remitted; but since we have shown above that this, taken generally, is false, let us briefly reply to these objections.

§ 111. To the first, then, it is answered that more is required for the formal character (*ratio*) of satisfaction than that the work be good and penal. For it ought to be done with diligence and the intention of appeasing God, as is clear from its definition. But in this way it is not truly done by him who persists in enmity with God.

§ 112. Whence, too, the solution of the second argument is evident. For the whole penalty which is owed does not have the formal character of satisfaction unless it is borne to this end, that God, having been offended, be appeased, and that he who sinned be restored to full friendship with God.

§ 113. To the third it is answered that he does not satisfy the Priest as God's vicar who fulfills the work enjoined while in mortal sin, and therefore he is bound in conscience to the repetition of that work; although to this he cannot be compelled by the priest or by the Church so long as his sin is hidden. He could, however, be compelled if it were known to the Church.

§ 114. To the fourth it is answered that the case is not similar. For the Church commands fasts absolutely, not, however, under the formal character of satisfaction or of some other end—which end, for the most part, a man ought to regard in the precepts of the Church from the law of God or of nature. But the Priest, as God's vicar, enjoins fasting, or prayer, or whatever other work, under the formal character of satisfaction, which, as we said, does not consist without the purpose of appeasing God. And therefore his precept is not fulfilled unless the work enjoined is accomplished under such a formal character. And neither can a fast commanded by the Church be satisfactory for him who fasts in a state of mortal sin.

§ 115. To the fifth I reply that those satisfactions were not continuous but interrupted, and so nothing prevents, a mortal sin sometimes intervening and its affection being then laid aside anew, their having been completed within the prescribed time. But if some part of such a satisfaction were performed in mortal sin, assuredly it did not avail for the remission of the penalty; and therefore it had to be repeated otherwise; but the Church, being unaware of this, did not exact it.

§ 116. To the sixth it is answered—even granting this, that a sinner and indeed even an unbeliever can merit some temporal good with God—about satisfaction. The reason for this is that for the formal character of merit of congruity with respect to some temporal matters, friendship or the pursuit of friendship is not required, as it is for the formal character of satisfaction; but it suffices that the work be at least morally good and praiseworthy, which accordingly may in some way move God's goodness to some temporal remuneration. Although what the Lord says (Matt. 6), "They have received their reward," has another sense. For the Lord signifies those hypocrites, whose works were not even morally good but feigned—and therefore worthy of death—to have received the reward not which they deserved, but which they expected, namely human praise.

§ 117. To the seventh: in hell there is not satisfaction, but only mere suffering-enough; as we said elsewhere. For what is voluntary is lacking, and love of justice and desire and pursuit of God's friendship. Whence neither do criminals, while they are afflicted with punishment, if they suffer it wholly involuntarily, satisfy properly speaking. For to satisfy is an act of the will.

§ 118. Lastly, to the final point it is answered that the case is not similar, because a man is bound to accept the external work about which alone the law prescribes; but God, who is the searcher of hearts, does not accept an external work unless inasmuch as it proceeds from a good will. Wherefore neither will that civil satisfaction be reckoned a work of virtue unless it proceed from love of justice and the purpose of appeasing one's neighbor. Likewise, the satisfaction which is made to a man does not include that it be done with the purpose of appeasing God, but only that the external injury be repaired.

§ XVIII — That a man cannot satisfy for one sin without [satisfying for] another (Non posse hominem satisfacere pro uno peccato sine alio)

§ 119. From the things that have now been said, an answer is ready to that question which the Master (of the Sentences) treats almost throughout this whole Distinction, namely whether one who is entangled in many mortal sins can satisfy, or at all do penance, for one without the other. For if, as has been said, satisfaction (*satisfactio*), and in general true penance (*poenitentia*), cannot exist without a studious endeavor to appease God; but the endeavor to appease God, of the sort here required and expounded above, cannot be in him who still goes on waging enmities with God; and yet he persists in enmity whoever still retains the affection of any

mortal sin whatsoever; it is most certain to follow that he who remains even in one mortal sin, while that affection lasts, cannot satisfy nor do penance for other sins.

§ 120. Nor are Scriptural testimonies lacking by which this is proved. For in Is. 58, when the Jews say: "Why have we fasted and Thou hast not regarded? we have humbled our souls and Thou hast not known," the Lord answers: "Behold in the day of your fast your own will is found," etc.¹³⁴ Where the cause is added why the plague did not cease, even while the people fasted, that is, while they were making satisfaction for the sins of the present life: because, namely, they were evidently not yet abandoning the sins of avarice and mercilessness.

§ 121. So too it is said in Sir. 34: "The gifts of the impious the Most High does not approve. A man who fasts in his sins, doing the same things, what does he profit himself? and whose prayer will be heard?"¹³⁵ For in what is said, "doing the same things," it is intimated that he has not yet laid aside the affection for sinning, when he returns to the act. To these can be added general passages of Scripture: Sir. 9, "He who has sinned in one will lose many goods"; and Jas. 2, "Whoever will have kept the whole law, but will have offended in one, has become guilty of all"—for he is a transgressor of the law, as is subjoined there; and therefore unfit for service, at least in part. Likewise 1 Cor. 13: "If I should distribute," etc., "it profits me nothing,"¹³⁶

§ 122. But from the Fathers this same point is taught more openly. For St. Gregory says (Hom. 34 on the Gospels): "To repent is to bewail sins and not to commit again the same things. For he who thus bewails some things, yet commits others, still either does not know penance or dissembles it. For what does it profit if someone bewails sins of lust, and pants after the heats of avarice?"¹³⁷ And Pope Pius I, in an Epistle to the Churches, as Gratian cites (De Poenitentia, Dist. 3), cap. Nihil prodest, says: "It profits nothing to fast and to pray and to do other works of religion, unless the mind be recalled from iniquity."¹³⁸ And St. Jerome also bears witness, writing about Judas the traitor (on Matt. 27): "It, says he, profited Judas nothing to have done penance, since he could not correct his crime."¹³⁹ St. Augustine likewise (Hom. 41)¹⁴⁰ teaches that those are not truly penitent, nor do they perform true penance, who still abide in sins.

§ 123. Whence among the Ancients such penances were called false, concerning which Innocent II writes thus, as is found in Gratian (De Poenitentia, Dist. 5), cap. Fratres nostri: "We find our Bishops and Presbyters too patient, not to be deceived by the false penances of laymen and be dragged together with them into hell." And more fully there St. Gregory VII, cap. Falsas: "We call those penances false which are not imposed according to the authority of the holy Fathers proportioned to the quality of the crimes. And further: Therefore any soldier, or merchant, or one devoted to some office which cannot be exercised without sin, if, entangled in more grievous faults, he comes to penance; or he who unjustly holds another's goods; or he who bears hatred in his heart; let him recognize that he cannot perform true penance by which he may be able to attain to eternal life, unless he either abandon business or resign the office, and cast hatred out of his heart, and restore the goods whatsoever he unjustly took away." These are his words.¹⁴¹

§ 124. Besides these, let St. Augustine be consulted (Enchiridion 75 and the two following chapters; the same teaching is set out at length under the title the book On True and False Penance, ch. 9), where it is expressly taught that true penance cannot be done for one sin without another, and this by arguments partly probable, partly necessary. First: Christ cured the same man mute and deaf and possessed at once (Mk. 7), thereby teaching us that we are not to be healed as to some things unless we are healed of all. Second: Christ in the woman who had seven demons left none, but expelled all at once, to teach that all crimes are to be cast out at once. Third: Christ, when he cast out the legion of demons, left none of all in the man, to show that even if

someone had committed a thousand sins, it is necessary for him to repent of all at once. Fourth: Christ never healed anyone whom he did not altogether free. For "the whole man He made whole on the sabbath" (Jn. 7); because, as Augustine, treating that passage of Scripture, explains, He freed both the body from infirmity and the soul from sin, showing that it is proper to penance to grieve and to make satisfaction.¹⁴²

§ 125. But this last argument does not very much convince. For others understand the words of the Lord in John of the healing of the whole body: thus Ambrose, Cyril, Bede, Euthymius—and this, as it seems, is the more correct. For Christ did not heal, in regard to the soul, all whom He healed in regard to the body, as is clear about the nine lepers; as Augustine himself testifies in Book 2 of the Questions on the Gospels, ch. 40. Then in John 6 many were miraculously fed who nevertheless did not believe, just as those who once ate manna in the desert. And the man to whom the Lord restored the ear that had been cut off does not seem to have been spiritually healed; nor Jeroboam, to whom the Prophet restored his withered hand (3 Kgs 13).

§ 126. Lastly, he proves it from the enmity which is and remains between God and the sinner as long as he perseveres in mortal sin. Which enmity he wishes to be so far at odds with the grace of the remission of any sin, that he does not reckon him sound and whole in faith who thinks or hopes the contrary. "For there is," says he, "a certain impiety of unbelief to hope for half-pardon from Him who is just by justice"—that is, to expect the remission of one mortal sin without another.¹⁴³ In which words it must be observed that this Author wishes it to be contrary to the justice of God that He remit to a man persevering in a crime the guilt or the punishment, or even any part of the punishment.

§ XIX — Certain arguments on the contrary are dissolved (Dissolvuntur argumenta quaedam in contrarium)

§ 127. Besides those which seemed to prove that a man in mortal sin can satisfy, and to which response was given above, we shall now dissolve those which are either in the Master (of the Sentences), or are brought by others, set forth particularly to prove that for one mortal sin without another penance and satisfaction can be valid. The first objection: Someone is punished for one sin while remaining in another; therefore, if that punishment be sufficient, he will in this way satisfy for one sin without another; otherwise God would punish twice the same thing, which the Prophet Nahum denies in ch. 1.¹⁴⁵ The second: St. Jerome, commenting on that place of the Prophet, says in general about those who perished in the Flood, about Sodom and Gomorrah consumed by heavenly fire, about the Egyptians submerged in the sea, and about the Israelites who afterwards were not punished; because, says he, they "received their evils in their life": therefore it appears much more that someone can be sufficiently punished, and hence satisfy for one sin without another—especially since it is not very likely that in those whom Jerome enumerates there was the sorrow of true contrition. The third: St. Gregory (Hom. 10 on Ezekiel), treating that of Amos 4, "A part was rained upon," etc., says: "When someone corrects himself of certain vices and despises to amend others, the one and the same city is rained upon in part and in part remains dry," and what follows; therefore if one vice can be corrected without another, it will also be possible to satisfy for it. The fourth: St. Ambrose (on Ps. 118, the eighteenth octonary), reciting those words of Is. 40 about Jerusalem, "Her iniquity is forgiven, for she has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," subjoins: "Even if faith was lacking, punishment had satisfied. Those are relieved by the paying of penalties who are absolved by the commendation of merits." The fifth: St. Augustine, in the book On Penance, ch. 26, says: "If someone situated in schism, for the confession of the Christian faith, suffers

persecution or very death itself, the judgment will be more tolerable for him." Where he seems to signify that he satisfies in part. The sixth: The Ordinary Gloss on 1 Tim. 4, "Piety is profitable to all things," says: "The whole sum of our discipline is in mercy and piety. Whoever, following this, suffers the slipperiness of the flesh, will receive stripes; but if someone had only the exercise of the body, he will suffer everlasting punishments." Which words are taken from the Ambrosian commentary. The seventh: Christ (Lk. 11) says to the Pharisees, avaricious, unjust, and hypocritical: "Yet that which remains, give alms, and behold, all things are clean unto you." The eighth: Someone can satisfy for venial sins while remaining in mortal sin; otherwise it would follow that a man would be punished for venial sins forever: therefore also, once the guilt of a mortal sin has been remitted, he will be able, afterward existing in another mortal sin, to satisfy. For otherwise the sin remitted would be punished with eternal torment, which seems absurd. Then, concerning venial sins, this very thing is proved from the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 20, where, citing that of John, "He that is without sin among you," etc., he says: "In which it is understood that all were guilty of crimes. For venial sins were always remitted by the ceremonies. If therefore there was any sin among them, it was criminal." The last: If to the penitent a fast is enjoined for adultery, and prayer for detraction, and almsgiving for theft, then in distinct works and at different times he will satisfy for different sins, and thus for one as not at the same time for another.

§ 128. To these objections the following answers are given in order. To the first: No punishment of sin as to duration is sufficient without true penance for that sin; but there is not true penance if one remains in another mortal sin. Then even if you grant a sufficient punishment for that sin without penance, nevertheless it will not be satisfaction; because it was not undertaken with the endeavor of appeasing God. As to the sentence of the Prophet, an answer has been given elsewhere.

§ 129. To the second: The Master answers that the words of St. Jerome are not to be understood of all universally, but only of those who did penance amid the very scourges. For that those who are not corrected here are afterwards to be tormented eternally even for that sin whose punishment they paid here, the subjoined words of the same Jerome clearly declare; where, a question proposed to him about a Christian beheaded on account of adultery—whether he is also to be punished in the life to come—"We answer," says he, "that God, as He knows the measures of all things, so also of punishments; and that He is not forestalled by the sentence of the judge; nor can the power afterwards of inflicting punishment for sins be taken away from Him; and that a great sin is washed away by great and long-lasting torments," etc.¹⁴⁶

§ 130. To the third we answer with the Master, that the words of Gregory are to be referred not to the forgiveness of the crime and to the remission of punishment, but to the abandonment of an evil deed; since this too proceeds from the fountain of God's grace, namely that someone, although still remaining in one sin, yet withdraws from the delight of another sin by fear of the divine judgment, and thus gradually comes to penance.

§ 131. To the fourth the Master answers that in the words of Ambrose "by faith" is understood the consciousness of sin, so that the sense is: The punishment inflicted by God and patiently borne also removes those sins of which a man, through ignorance or forgetfulness, was not conscious to himself. But perhaps it is more correct that "by faith" be understood the excellence of faith; which although it be lacking, nevertheless the greatness of the punishment together with patience will avail for satisfaction. For the Jewish people of whom Isaiah was speaking did not lack faith in God; but what was lacking to them was the excellence and fervor of faith.

§ 132. To the fifth: Augustine does not will that that punishment of the schismatic man dying for the faith of Christ be satisfactory for his sins, not even in part; but he only says that his judgment will be more tolerable, that is, that he will be punished less in the future age than if, by denying Christ, he had suffered nothing for Him. Which is without doubt true; because by denying Christ he would have increased his sin, and hence also the guilt of condemnation.

§ 133. To the sixth: That commentary speaks about the slipperiness of the flesh, from which, however, by doing penance someone at length withdraws, when namely the penance of it is obtained from God by the prayers of those on whom he has bestowed mercy. For this sense is suggested by the words that follow there. Note also that Ambrose is not the author of that commentary, but some unknown writer.

§ 134. What is brought in the seventh place from the Gospel shows that alms have efficacy so to cleanse sins and to dissolve their bonds, if one withdraw from them through penance and newness of life, not neglecting the judgment and the charity of God. "These things," says He, "it was necessary to do, and not to omit those"; and whoever observes this, that man indeed gives alms in an ordered way, beginning from his very self, according to that of Sir. 30, "Have mercy on thy soul, pleasing God," as St. Augustine at length declares this (Enchiridion, chs. 75, 76, and 77).¹⁴⁷

§ 135. To the eighth it is answered that, although to venial sin as such only temporal punishment is owed; and although likewise the temporal punishment which was owed for mortal sin once the guilt has been remitted does not of itself ever pass into eternal; nevertheless per accidens, by reason of the very state of the man (because, namely, he remains an enemy of God), a punishment of that sort can never be paid by him, and therefore it will endure perpetually, just as the enmity of that man with God endures perpetually. Nor does it matter whether such a man has tried to satisfy while existing in mortal sin, or not. For even if he has not tried, the same follows; namely that that remaining punishment must be paid in hell; and therefore, per accidens, it will be perpetual, since among the dead, as there is no absolute remission, so neither is there any relaxation of punishment; as will be proved below at Dist. 46.¹⁴⁸

§ 136. But as to what was objected for confirmation of the argument from the book On True and False Penance: since that book is not Augustine's, but of an unknown Author, it ought not to move us much; although it can be understood to be said about venial sins separated from mortal, so that the sense be: therefore those accusers were rightly concluded to have been liable to crimes, because, for venial sins alone—of which in the sacrifices there was the ordinary and daily remedy—they ought not to have heard "He that is without sin among you," etc., especially since they were accusing the woman not of a venial fault but of a grave crime.¹⁴⁹

§ 137. The last argument rightly concludes. For we do not deny that a truly penitent man can, for different sins, at different times and by distinct actions, make satisfaction; but we deny that someone can satisfy for one sin while the affection of another remains.

§ XX — Whether a penitent is bound to undergo the satisfaction enjoined by the priest (An Pœnitens teneatur subire satisfactionem a Sacerdote injunctam)

§ 138. The opinion of certain Catholics is that a penitent is not bound to fulfill the satisfaction prescribed to him by the priest, unless he has of his own accord accepted it. Thus Scotus thinks (on Dist. 18), and after him

Gabriel Biel (on Dist. 16, q. 2), Adrian (IV, On the Sacrament of Confession, q. 4), and Navarrus (in the Manual, ch. 26, no. 20), and several others, moved by arguments of this sort. First: Because, they say, the priest is not an ordinary judge, but an arbitrary one; therefore it is left to the judgment of the penitent whether to submit himself to the priest either as to the remission both of guilt and of punishment, or as to the remission of guilt only; so that he can allow himself to be scourged by God as to the payment of punishment, or indeed exact it of himself. Second: Because they say that no divine precept exists about satisfaction; and so neither from the priest, who acts as the minister of God—

§ 139. There he clearly signifies that those who refuse satisfaction, or are unwilling to undergo it, are not to be admitted to the sacrament of Reconciliation. And Rabanus (in the Collation of Synods) says: "Let the penitent most carefully observe that which has been appointed for him, as if it had been uttered from the mouth of God."¹⁵¹ Likewise the author of the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 15, instructing the penitent: "Let him put himself wholly in the power of the judge in the tribunal of the priest, reserving nothing of his own to himself, so that, when he commands anything, he may be ready to do it for the receiving of the life of the soul," and so on.¹⁵² But an even surer proof is from the ancient constitution of the Church, by which priests were ordered, according to the canons, to impose penance, and penitents to observe diligently whatever had been enjoined on them by the priest, just as if it had proceeded from the mouth of God. And if they refused to do what was enjoined, the Church denied them reconciliation, which she did not grant before they had fulfilled what had been prescribed, unless they obtained some relaxation, that is, an indulgence; such as even now can be given upon the enjoined penance, if it has been canonical, or grave and toilsome. And in that case the penitent is not bound to fulfill the enjoined satisfaction, because a superior relaxes in the place of Christ. And although afterwards penances were left to the discretion of priests, as is in Gratian (*De poenitentia*, dist. 1, cap. *Mensuram*; and in the *Decretals*, *De poenitentiis et remissionibus*, cap. *Deus qui*), and in the Florentine Decree (on the sacraments), where satisfaction for sins is [to be imposed] according to the discretion of the priest, nevertheless we nowhere read that they were left to the discretion of the penitents themselves; rather, they were ordered to fulfill whatever the priest had judged.¹⁵³ Whence, in the chapter *Omnis utriusque sexus*, issued in the general Lateran Council under Innocent II, in the same context it is prescribed that all the faithful confess their sins and strive to fulfill the penance enjoined on them. By which words there is clearly prescribed to the faithful that they fulfill the penance, that is, the satisfaction, enjoined on them by the priest. It says, moreover, "let them strive to fulfill," because the enjoined penance is to be fulfilled diligently and not slothfully.¹⁵⁴ Nor does the Council of Trent bring little probability to this position when (Session 14, ch. 8), admonishing priests to impose satisfactions which are not only of avail for the custody of a new life and as a remedy for infirmity, but also for the avenging and chastening of past sins, it subjoins thus: "For the keys of priests were granted not only for loosing, but also for binding, as even the ancient Fathers believe and teach." By which words indeed he indicates sufficiently that the penitent is bound by the priest to the satisfaction enjoined by him.¹⁵⁵ The same is also indicated by the same Fathers (ch. 1 and can. 15 of the same session). Finally, to these there accrues the authority of the Master (*Distinctions 16 and 18*) and of approved scholastics, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas, Richard, Paludanus, and others.¹⁵⁶

§ 140. But to the arguments adduced on the other side the reply is not difficult. For, first, what is assumed in the first place—that the priest is only an arbitrary judge—must be denied. For although it is often free to the penitent to choose whatever priest he wishes, to whom he may confess his sins, yet once he has chosen someone, he is bound to submit himself entirely to him as to an ordinary or delegated judge and vicar of Christ, according to the power granted to him, and to accept and to fulfill whatever penance he shall have

enjoined—otherwise he will sin more gravely. Nor, secondly, is it true what is assumed, that there is no precept of God concerning satisfaction. The falsity of which position is evident partly from those things which above were said concerning the necessity of satisfaction and were proved from the Scriptures, and partly from those things which will be said a little later. But even if there existed no special precept of God concerning satisfaction, nevertheless the precept of the Church would suffice to oblige the penitent to make satisfaction. To the third it is answered, that it has been so mercifully established by God, that by the satisfactions of this age the graver penalties of the future age can be redeemed, that He even wills this very thing to be in a precept; which precept indeed commends God's mercy yet more, since by it a necessity is laid upon man of forestalling the wrath and scourges of God, lest in the other age he be punished more bitterly. Wherefore, with the precept of God, by which works of satisfaction are commanded, and with the power of the keys, which extends to binding, standing in the way, a man cannot licitly renounce his own right in this matter. To the last it seems one should reply, that even if a man can renounce indulgences, that is, the relaxation of the penalties and satisfactions which in this life he ought to undergo for his sins (which, however, can be disputed ambiguously), it does not thence follow that he can also renounce the other right. For he is bound to that, as we have just shown. Add that the satisfactions of this age, besides that use which is to make satisfaction for sins, have another manifold utility, as we have shown in its proper place, on account of which a man might perhaps with good reason be unwilling that they be relaxed to him by indulgence, except in the article of death—unlike the satisfactions of the future age. And therefore there is not the same reason for renouncing both rights, even with God's precept and the power of the keys set aside.

§ XXI — Whether the penitent is bound to assume some satisfaction of his own accord (An Penitens sponte satisfactionem aliquam assumere teneatur)

§ 141. The question closely akin to the foregoing is whether, besides that satisfaction (*satisfactio*) which the priest has enjoined, the penitent is bound to assume another satisfaction of his own accord, if it is certain or at least probable to him that the penance (*poenitentia*) enjoined by the priest does not suffice for making satisfaction for his sins—of which sort insufficient penances are imposed by confessors. For the negative side there is the consideration that the penitent is not his own judge, but his judge is the priest as God's vicar; therefore, as regards sins subject to the keys, he makes satisfaction if he carries out the sentence or prescription of the judge, and will be bound to add nothing further. Then: although Scripture prescribes that we should make fruits worthy of penance, nevertheless that general precept of making satisfaction seems to be determined by the Church in two ways—one when through the priest she enjoins a definite penance, the other when she prescribes certain public works of penance to all, such as supplications, abstinences, fastings, and the like, whether ordinary or extraordinary; nay, God Himself determines that generality of the precept when He sends afflictions and adversities, which man is bound to bear patiently. Therefore it seems that by these modes the divine precept is satisfied, and that besides this no some spontaneous satisfaction is required. But if perchance some punishment still remains to be paid, a man does not sin if he consign it to the future age, since he does not now seem to be held by any precept to discharge it in the present. Finally: one may hope that whatever punishment remains beyond the satisfaction enjoined by the priest, all of it will be remitted to him by indulgences; therefore even if the priest enjoined the least little thing, the penitent will not be bound to add anything further.

§ 142. For the explanation of this question, first one must know that it is God's precept that we should make fruits worthy of penance (Matt. 3; Lk. 3). For that those words have the force of a precept even the Master expressly affirms (Dist. 16), saying: Satisfaction is prescribed by John where he says, "Make fruits worthy of penance," that is, that according to the quality and quantity of the fault there be the quality and quantity of the punishment.¹⁵⁸ Expounding the Master's passage, St. Thomas says that John was not the author of that precept, but its announcer, of which Christ was the institutor.¹⁵⁹ Nor is long proof needed for that matter, since above from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and even from the Council of Trent itself, we have sufficiently proved the necessity of satisfaction by precept.¹⁶⁰

§ 143. Secondly, it must be noted what in this matter is required from the priest as judge. For, as the Tridentine Synod says (Session 14, ch. 8), "The priests of the Lord, as far as spirit and prudence shall suggest, ought to enjoin salutary and suitable satisfactions according to the quality of the crimes and the capacity of the penitents, lest if perchance they connive at sins, and act too leniently with penitents, by enjoining certain light works for most grave offenses, they become partakers of others' sins."⁴⁸ So much there. Now if the priest has failed in this his office, or even, moved by some just reason, has enjoined a lesser satisfaction than is required by the seriousness of the offense, altogether the penitent seems to be bound to assume another satisfaction of his own accord, and this until the satisfaction reaches a certain equality with the temporal punishment due for the sins. The reason for this is that, so long as he has not made fruits worthy of penance, he has not satisfied the divine precept: "Make fruits," etc. Indeed, elsewhere sacred Scripture inculcates divine precepts when, for the redeeming of sins, it prescribes either prayers, or alms, or fastings. Nor are these prescribed only as good works, but as satisfactory for sins— as these Scriptures prove: "Redeem thy sins with alms" (Dan. 4); "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" (Matt. 5); "Give, and it shall be given to you" (Lk. 6); "Make for yourselves friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting tabernacles" (Lk. 16). And there are other sayings. Whence St. Cyprian (in the Sermon on Almsgiving), and St. Augustine (Homily 19 among the fifty, and Enchiridion 69), teach that almsgiving has been prescribed to us for this very end, that we may redeem sins.¹⁶¹ To these are added those sentences of the Fathers in which they teach that he who has committed unlawful things ought also to abstain from many lawful ones: as St. Ambrose in book 1 On Penance; St. Jerome in the Epitaph of Paula; St. John Chrysostom (Homily 10 on Matthew); and St. Gregory (Homilies 20 and 23 on the Gospels). They teach that, according to the Apostle, we ought to judge ourselves lest we be judged by God, and that we ought beforehand to forestall God's wrath by voluntary punishment, so that we may not afterwards feel it— as St. Augustine says in Sermons 16 and 50, and on Psalm 37; and Isidore in On Ecclesiastical Dogmas; and those whom we cited when we were treating of the necessity of works of satisfaction. In which matter there is a very explicit passage of St. Gregory on the said Psalm 37, "O Lord," etc., where he also adduces the authority of St. Augustine; and the same St. Gregory (at the end of Homily 40 on the Gospels). Finally, since a man is bound to satisfy of his own accord for sins, as St. Augustine in On the Lord's Prayer teaches, and afterwards most clearly St. Fulgentius (On the Faith to Peter, ch. 41), he will by so much the more be bound to undergo spontaneous satisfaction for mortal sins, not to say when it is established that that which the priest enjoined is too small.¹⁶²

§ 144. To the first argument, therefore, it is answered that, according to the Apostle (1 Cor. 11), a man ought to judge himself— that is, to exercise vindictive judgment upon himself— lest he be judged by God. Whence it is manifest that some judgment does belong to a man in regard to himself, although not that which is proper to priests, and which is joined with authority.

§ 145. To the second: that determination of the precept does not suffice which has not yet fulfilled the whole precept. But as to the public works of prayers and fasts instituted by the Church, since they are common for common sins, or even for the daily lapses of the just, and are sometimes instituted for other causes, they do not suffice, by the Church's intention, for redeeming graver crimes. Otherwise there would be no need of sacramental satisfaction. Moreover, a man is bound, as far as in him lies, to avert the scourges of God both of this age and of the future; and he is bound not only to pray God that he be not judged in His fury— which pertains to Gehenna— but also that he be not chastised in His wrath— which Augustine and Gregory refer to the punishments of purgatory, and where they adduce also that saying: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," as the Apostle says (Heb. 10), speaking, as is clear from what precedes, not of the punishments by which the damned are punished, but of the temporal punishments of the future age, due for grave sins into which someone has relapsed after Baptism. From which it is understood how foolish it is, neglecting voluntary satisfaction in this life, to wish to reserve oneself for the most bitter torments of the future age, where satisfaction is only satisfaction— not the merit of patience, nor an increase of virtue, nor the example of a good work. As to the final point that was objected about indulgences, it will be more fittingly resolved below in its own place, as is taught in § XXII.

§ 146. That one can satisfy for another. Not only can and ought each person to satisfy God for his own sins, as we have already shown; but that others also can satisfy before God for the sins of others is an equally certain and catholic doctrine, which is founded especially upon the communion of saints which we confess in the Symbol of our Faith. For that communion effects that, just as it is in a natural body, so the faithful, as members of the same mystical Body, communicate to one another helps, actions, and offices, as the Apostle teaches (1 Cor. 12); and consequently others also can satisfy for others. Whence the same Apostle (Gal. 6) says: "Bear one another's burdens." And 2 Cor. 8: "In this present time, let your abundance supply their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want." Since this is said so generally, nothing forbids its being extended also to the mutual relief of punishments to be provided through satisfactions; just as also that saying (Col. 1): "I fill up those things that are lacking of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for His Body which is the Church." And indeed St. John Chrysostom interprets that passage in this sense, saying that Paul's sufferings, even after his death, profit the members of Christ.¹⁶³ To this is added that the Lord (Lk. 16) admonishes the rich to make for themselves friends, by whom, when they shall fail, they may be received into eternal tabernacles. And that which He says (Matt. 10): "He who receives a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive the reward of a prophet; and he who receives a just man in the name of a just man shall receive the reward of a just man." From these sayings St. Augustine (*City of God*, XXI, ch. 27) teaches that there are certain sins which hinder entrance into the Kingdom of God, yet in such wise that by the merits of holy friends they may obtain indulgence. And St. Chrysostom does this too from the former saying (*Homily 35 on Genesis*).

§ 147. Moreover, this doctrine was received and so strongly persuaded among the faithful already from those first times of the Martyrs, that the most ancient Tertullian in the book *On Modesty*, which he wrote after he had fallen into heresy, reproaches the Catholics for excessive license in this matter— that among them, as a matter of course and rashly, they eagerly courted for themselves a share in the merits and sufferings of the Martyrs, a charge which implies the Catholic tenet. But after him St. Cyprian (*Sermon on the Lapsed*), when treating of satisfactions, teaches that the merits of the martyrs and the works of the just avail very much for others. The same is taught by Origen (*Homily 10 on Numbers*), adducing these Scriptures: "Most gladly will I spend and be spent myself for your souls" (2 Cor. 12); and "I am already being poured out" (2 Tim. 4). "For

those therefore," he says, "to whom he was writing, the Apostle says that he is both spent and immolated. But when a victim is immolated, it is immolated to this end, that the sins of those for whom it is slain be purged," and so forth. And in Homily 24 he attests that, just as the lamb refers to Christ, so also the other animals destined for purification can be referred to certain persons who, by the merit of Christ's Blood, bring some purification to the human race. Similarly St. Gregory Nazianzen (Oration 20, which is on the Maccabees), speaking of the martyrdom of the elderly Eleazar, says: "Before indeed he used to sacrifice and pray for the people, but now he has offered himself a most perfect victim to God for the expiation of the whole people." St. Ambrose likewise (book 5 on Luke) writes thus: "If the sin is grave, such that you cannot yourself wash it with the tears of your penance, let Mother Church weep for you; she, who as for only-begotten sons, intercedes for individuals." And in book 2 (On Abel and Cain, ch. 3): "Of the Levites," he says, "it is written that they are the redemption of the people, because by the holiness of their life and by prayer they lighten the sins of the people." Nor does St. Augustine intend anything else when, writing against the Donatists, he teaches that to penitents sins are remitted "through the groans of the dove," that is, through the tears, prayers, and afflictions of the pious faithful who are in the Church. He teaches the same (Question 149 on Exodus) by the example of Moses— that we are reconciled to God by the merits of the pious, whom our own evil merits had made averse to us. Similar passages are in him (Question 108 of the same book; and Against Faustus, book 20, ch. 2; and book 1 On the Origin of the Soul, ch. 20). But St. John Chrysostom (Homily 22 to the People of Antioch) says thus: "If your fall is great, let the torrent of your tears be greater; but if you also keep purity, shed tears for another; after your brother's lapse, bewail him." The same writer, commenting on 1 Cor. 15, from certain words of Paul shows this even more clearly (as also in Homily 5 on Matthew).

§ 148. After these, Pope St. Leo (Sermon 3 on the Fast of the Seventh Month): "The fullest abolition of sins," he says, "is obtained when the whole Church's supplication and confession stand together," and the things that follow. Add to these what Eusebius relates (Church History, book 3, ch. 28) about the confessor Natalis, who, when he had sinned gravely, being led to repentance and rolled in public upon the ground in tears and lamentations, moved the Church to compassion, so that they should implore from Christ for him, by continual and unceasing prayers, indulgence. Nay, it even sometimes happened that, if someone, being overtaken by the danger of death, did not have time for satisfying, he was indeed absolved from his sins; but the satisfaction which he ought to have undergone, was taken upon themselves by his relatives and fulfilled by them; and if perchance the penitent recovered, he was not forced to repeat it.

§ 149. Furthermore, regarding this doctrine, first, in both the one who satisfies for another and the one for whom another satisfies there is required what we said above to be necessary for the notion of satisfaction, namely, that both be in the state of grace (*gratia*), or at least outside the affection of mortal sin. Next, that doctrine is to be understood not only of free satisfaction, but also of penance sacramentally enjoined, which would be to be enjoined if no other had satisfied or some other just reason did not persuade otherwise; yet understand this insofar as such penance is satisfactory or vindicative; insofar as it is enjoined as a medicine, that the penitent may be preserved from sins in the future, in this respect another cannot undergo it for another, as St. Thomas rightly teaches by making a distinction in the Supplement.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, although for this— that one may satisfy for another— it is not required that the other be impotent to satisfy, nevertheless it is probable that the payment of another will not be accepted by God if even he who is debtor of the punishment does not at least strive, according to the measure of his infirmity, to satisfy God in part, and to advance somewhat toward complete satisfaction; as the Scriptures and Fathers which we adduced when treating of the necessity of satisfaction sufficiently indicate.¹⁶⁵

§ 150. If, however, someone should ask whether the satisfaction of one man avails for the temporal punishments owed by another from condignity or from congruity, the answer seems to be that the divine acceptance of one for another is from congruity; but, that acceptance posited, the satisfaction itself avails from condignity, no less than if a man were satisfying for himself. The remaining points will be more conveniently explained where indulgences are treated, in § XXIII.

§ 151. Solution of those things which are objected against the mutual helps of satisfaction. Of this doctrine of mutual aids of satisfaction an argument is customarily opposed in the first place, taken from merit: for another cannot merit for another from condignity; therefore neither can he satisfy. Then the Apostle says (Gal. 6): "Each one shall bear his own burden"; and (Ezek. 18): "The soul that sinneth, the same shall die." Third: another cannot be contrite for another, nor confess for another; therefore neither can he satisfy. Fourth: a man's good works do not overflow to another, according to that saying (Matt. 25), "Lest there be not enough for us and for you"; and that saying (Prov. 11), as explained by the Apostle Peter (1 Pet. 4:18): "The just man shall scarcely be saved"; therefore he cannot lend to others for the use of satisfaction. Other objections also are raised, but they are more proper to the treatise on indulgences.

§ 152. To the first, therefore, we respond: the reward of eternal life, which is what merit properly from condignity regards, is given according to the disposition and capacity of the recipient, not however of another, according to that saying (Matt. 5), "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God"; but a punishment measured out to someone according to the magnitude of his sin can also be borne by another, provided that he who has sinned be truly penitent, and that he himself cooperate according to his mode.

§ 153. To the second it is answered that the Apostle is speaking of the punishments which are inflicted by God upon men for sins, especially in the future age, not of those which are assumed voluntarily, or which, though divinely sent, are borne with patience. Wherefore it stands most well with the apostolic sentence that someone out of charity, taking upon himself the punishment which another owes, should satisfy for him—just as happens in pecuniary debts, notwithstanding a law which demands payment only from those who owe. In which sense also the sentence of the Prophet is to be understood.

§ 154. To the third St. Thomas answers (III, q. 48, a. 2) that the case is not parallel, because satisfaction consists in an exterior act, for which instruments can be taken up— among which even friends are counted. But if you object that confession also consists in an exterior act, it can be replied that confession, insofar as it is of the law of nature, is a purely internal act— namely, the humble acknowledgment of sin before God; yet insofar as it is carried out by an exterior deed, it too can be done with the help of instruments and friends, as if someone cannot speak. Cajetan, however, applies a certain other solution to this objection, which may be seen in him.¹⁶⁶

§ 155. To the last it is answered that thus far good works overflow or superabound to no one— because, insofar as they are meritorious of eternal life, each man is to receive full reward for them; but insofar as they are afflictive or penal, and hence apt for satisfying, they have overflowed and can overflow to someone— namely, insofar as, according to the ordinary mode which God observes in exacting the punishments of the just, that man's sins did not require so great a satisfaction. And that this is possible is demonstrated from this, that— as was proved above— a man can make satisfaction for sins even from condignity, according to the said mode, with respect to the remaining punishment; therefore he will also be able to add something further— as is more plainly evident, if the punishment which, according to the exact rule of satisfying, is assessed upon

some sinner be paid by an innocent person. For in regard to its penal character it will overflow to the innocent; and hence it can be applied to some other sinner by his intention or by the Church's intention.

§ XXIV — *By what works satisfaction can be made or ought to be made (Per quae opera fieri possit aut debeat satisfactio)*

§ 156. Now as to the works of satisfactions themselves, one must consider what they can be and of what sort they can or ought to be; and we will propose this doctrine briefly and by items, in certain documents. Therefore let this be the first document: satisfactions for sins ought to be afflictive or penal. The reason for this is that the law of God exacts a punishment (*poena*) for sin, which is not compensated by making satisfaction, except by another punishment. For vindicative justice—justice that also satisfies—requires that those who have allotted to themselves more than is just by taking from another, in turn take something from themselves and bestow it upon another. Wherefore he who by sinning has allotted more to himself and has withdrawn from God the honor due, that man, in order to make satisfaction for his sin (*satisfactio*), ought in turn to take something away from himself which may redound to the honor of God. For this reason also to make satisfaction is defined by St. Anselm as to pay to God the honor due; and punishment is nothing else than the privation of a good, whether useful or delectable. For privation of an honorable good pertains to fault; therefore the satisfaction which must be made with a certain privation or subtraction of this sort ought to be penal. However good, therefore, a certain work may be, if it is not afflictive in some way, it is not satisfactory; because by it the sinner does not withdraw from himself some useful or delectable good.

§ 157. But this doctrine is proved by the Scriptures (Joel 2; Jon. 3; 3 Kgs 21; Matt. 11) and by other places of the same kind, where we read of fasting, weeping, lamentation, ashes, sackcloth—things that are afflictive to body and mind and are opposed to a delectable good; and likewise of almsgiving (*eleemosyna*), which Scripture so often commends as a remedy for sins, which is opposed to a useful good. Prayer, indeed, although good as to its object, is nevertheless to a man accustomed to earthly things laborious in reality, and furthermore brings weariness and languor to the body, and consequently deprives a man of a certain delectable good. Thus (Lev. 16 and 23, and Num. 29) the sons of Israel are commanded to celebrate the feast of expiation by afflicting their souls, that is, by afflictive works, of which sort were fasts. The definition of satisfaction is also clear in St. Augustine, in the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 8: "Satisfaction is a certain revenge of one who grieves, punishing in himself that which he grieves to have committed."¹⁶⁸ Finally, it is evident from what is read in Gregory, Chrysostom, Jerome, and others in places elsewhere cited by us, that he who has committed illicit things ought to subtract from himself lawful things; which subtraction without doubt has the character of punishment. Nor is it the custom of the Church to impose penances except those which are penal.

§ 158. Second. Every good work of the penitent man is probably in some respect satisfactory. Some indeed try to prove this by several reasons; but because not all of them appear sufficiently apt for proving this, one true and solid reason seems to be this: for the carnal man, prone to earthly desires as such, every work by which one serves God and the mind strives toward heavenly things is contrary, and consequently in some way penal, just as we were saying a little above about prayer.

§ 159. But if anyone should object against this: The greater the charity (*caritas*) from which some work proceeds, by so much the less is it penal, because "charity has no punishment" (1 Jn. 4); and consequently it is

not necessary to require that satisfaction be penal. For otherwise it would follow that a work proceeding from lesser charity would be more satisfactory, which is absurd; indeed it would follow that, by the greatness of charity, the power and efficacy of making satisfaction in works are diminished—something that seems more absurd. It is answered: *ceteris paribus*, a penal work is always more satisfactory. But if its penal character and hardship are diminished by the greatness of charity and by the promptitude of will which charity begets, then the efficacy of the work for making satisfaction is not diminished but rather increased. For since works of this sort ought to proceed from sorrow for the sin committed and from zeal to appease God, the graver that sorrow is and the greater that zeal, by so much the more are those works accepted by God for the remission of punishment. And hence it is that the afflictions of the Saints, borne with great charity, are of such weight and price with the divine justice, even for redeeming the punishments of others.

§ 160. Third. Although satisfactions can be made through works that are due, nevertheless most often they are made to God by works otherwise not due. That satisfaction can be made through works otherwise due is proved, first, because it is made through ecclesiastical fasts, instituted among other causes to this end, that by them the faithful may redeem with God the punishments due to sins. Second, because men make satisfaction through afflictions sent by God and borne patiently, whereas in that case the work of tolerance is simply due. Third, because by the work of martyrdom, even then when someone cannot licitly avoid it, a man without doubt makes satisfaction for his sins. Fourth, because by prayers, almsgiving to the poor, forgiveness of injuries, and other works of mercy commanded to us by God in the Scriptures, we make satisfaction for sins, as can be proved from the same Scriptures and from the very Lord's Prayer. Whence even contrition and confession, which clearly are due by God's precept, come in as part of satisfaction, and consequently diminish something of the punishments due.

§ 161. Finally, both this and the immediately preceding document can be proved from the words which, by a kind of universal custom, are wont to be added to the form of absolution, namely these: "Whatever good you shall do and evil you shall endure, let it be to you for the remission of sins," or, as others say, "for the remission of punishment," and the like. But that satisfactions made through works otherwise not due are for the most part more pleasing to God, is shown first from this, that to make satisfaction by a work not due is a sign of a readier will. Next, because he offers more who, besides works that are due, also offers something not due, than he who does only what he must. Third, because the Fathers commend especially that satisfaction by which one who has committed illicit things abstains even from lawful and permitted things. Fourth, this is proved by the example of the penitent sinful woman (Lk. 7), who is shown to have loved much because she bathed the Lord's feet with tears and wiped them with her hair and did not cease to kiss them—works which nowhere were commanded. Lastly, it is proved from the general doctrine about works which are called of supererogation; about which the Fathers testify that they are more pleasing to God, as Jerome, book 1 *Against Jovinian*, and in the *Epistle to Philemon*; Augustine, book 1 *On Adulterous Marriages*, ch. 14, and Sermon 61 among the sermons in the Appendix; Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 9 at the words: "Woe to me if I do not...",¹⁶⁹ and Homily 55 on Matthew.

§ 162. However, note here that although, as we have said, satisfaction can also be made through works otherwise due, nevertheless such works are not, at least ordinarily, to be enjoined for satisfaction. One reason for this is that those things which are due do not need the priest's obligation, except perhaps to this end, that by a twofold bond they hold the man bound, and for that reason may be less easily omitted; as if a priest should enjoin the Lenten fast, or the Ember fasts, or the hearing of Mass on Sundays. But perhaps that should

never be done, unless perhaps the penitent person were not altogether obliged to such a fast on account of some cause. Another reason is that it is the intention of the Church that, besides works that are due and common afflictions, each person should also strive to make satisfaction to God for his crimes by some work otherwise not due; because she judges that those things which are due in most do by no means suffice for redeeming sins.

§ 163. Fourth document. Not only by punishments willingly undertaken or imposed at the priest's discretion, but also by temporal scourges inflicted by God and borne patiently we can make satisfaction. This is the open doctrine of the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 9; can. 13).¹⁷⁰ And it holds true of every affliction and misery of this age, whether it be common to all, as death, mortality, hunger, thirst, or not common to all, as sicknesses, poverty, losses, wounds; extreme or non-extreme punishments; persecutions, whether justly or unjustly inflicted; blindness, bereavement, and innumerable such things. For none of these fails to avail for making satisfaction for sins, if it be borne patiently—as the examples of the first men, of David, of Manasseh, and again and again of the people of Israel prove; and in Ecclesiastical History there is the illustrious example of the Emperor Maurice, to be seen in Nicephorus, book 18, ch. 40.¹⁷¹ The words also of the priest prove this when he says: "Whatever evil you shall endure, let it be to you..."

§ 164. The reason of this doctrine is that although scourges and calamities inflicted upon sinners are of themselves only a certain vengeance of sins, nevertheless, insofar as he upon whom they are inflicted accepts them freely and bears them patiently, they become the works of the very one who is patient; and by this fact they take on the formal character of satisfaction, and are made similar to those which are undertaken voluntarily or accepted when imposed by the priest. Whence also the pious sometimes so much the more desire that fatherly scourges of this sort be sent upon them, according to that (Jer. 10): "Correct me, O Lord"; and Ps. 37: "For I am ready for scourges." On which place Ambrose, writing, says that each one ought to offer himself to the scourges by which in this life his sins are punished by God, so that in the future life the memory of them may be blotted out.¹⁷²

§ 165. Fifth: Three principal works of satisfaction are commended in the Scriptures and by the Fathers, namely, prayer, almsgiving, fasting. But to these all the rest can easily be referred. For prayer there is the splendid testimony of Sirach 21; for fasting, of Joel 2 and Jonah 3; for almsgiving, of Sirach 29, Prov. 2, Dan. 4, Ps. 40, and elsewhere. The Angel Raphael, moreover, joined all three together in this sentence (Tob. 12): "Good is prayer with fasting and almsgiving, more than to store up treasures of gold," and so forth. The Fathers too very often commend these three in a peculiar way. Whence Leo (Sermon 1 On the Fast of the Tenth Month): "There are three things," he says, "which chiefly pertain to religious actions: namely prayer, fasting, and almsgiving." Commendations of fasting are read most frequently in Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom, Leo, and other Authors, and likewise in the prayers of the Church throughout Lent.¹⁷³

§ 166. Now with respect to sins being redeemed, it must be noted of these three that, besides their common utility for making satisfaction, each of them has something peculiar against sins. For prayer, even if it has the least possible of penal character, nevertheless avails to blot out sin by way of merit or of impetration, from the promise of Christ, who said: "Ask and it shall be given to you." Whence in it the penitent's affliction is not so much looked at or sought as the devotion of the one praying, as St. Thomas teaches.¹⁷⁴ Fasting, however, insofar as it chastises the flesh, is a singular remedy for repressing vices and for guarding against sins in the future, and for lifting the mind to God—as the prayers of the Church during Lent declare, and those words of the Preface before the Canon of the Mass: "Who by bodily fasting restrain vices, lift up the mind,

bestow virtue and rewards." Almsgiving, however, both spiritual and corporal, properly avails to move God's mercy toward us—for the mercies and satisfactions of the saints profit us; namely, those to whom we have shown mercy, according to the Scriptures: "Blessed are the merciful, for..." and "Charity covers a multitude of sins"; likewise: "Give, and it shall be given to you; forgive, and it shall be forgiven you"; and: "Make for yourselves friends of the mammon..." and "Let your abundance supply their want, that their abundance..." Therefore, when it is asked whether almsgiving is of precept, almsgiving must be considered not only as it is a good work by which the neighbor's need is relieved, but also, and most of all, insofar as it avails and is necessary to the sinner man for impetrating with God the judgment of mercy and the pardon of sins; because "judgment without mercy" is for him "who does not do mercy" (Jas. 2).

§ 167. Moreover, some assign the rationale of this threefold satisfaction thus: just as man's goods are threefold—in part the soul's, in part the body's, in part external, which are called the goods of fortune—so a threefold mode of making satisfaction is constituted. For fasting subtracts something from the body, as almsgiving also from external goods. But prayer does not indeed subtract anything from the soul (for by the soul's goods, that is, by virtues, man is simply made perfect, and therefore nothing is to be subtracted from them, but rather something to be added), but it subjects the soul itself wholly to God through the humility of devotion. Others take the rationale from the triple root of sins indicated by John (1 Jn. 2), when he says: "All that is in the world is either the concupiscence..." For the concupiscence of the flesh fasting fights; the concupiscence of the eyes almsgiving; the pride of life prayer. Others take it from the objects of sins. For they are committed either against God, or against the neighbor, or against ourselves. All of which are healed both by prayer, by which we suppliantly ask God for pardon; and by almsgiving, which we mercifully bestow upon our neighbor; and by fasting, by which we mortify ourselves, that is, the flesh. Now that these three are so wide in scope that the other works whatsoever of satisfaction can be referred to them, Augustine shows in the book *On the Perfection of Justice*, teaching that under fasting is generically comprehended the whole chastisement of the body, under almsgiving both the remitting and the bestowing, and under prayer all the rules of holy desire.¹⁷⁵

§ 168. Sixth and last document. Restitution of a thing taken away, as such, is neither satisfaction nor a part of it, but is a certain act of commutative justice, which is required—either in fact or in purpose—before satisfaction itself from him who detains another's property. The reason is that restitution takes place in things given and received, but satisfaction in actions. And restitution indeed works equality among men; satisfaction, however, between man and God. Likewise, restitution pertains to cessation from sin; for he who does not, when he ought, restore another's property which he detains, still remains in the sin of unjust detention, nor does he cease from it until he restores; and therefore he is incapable of remission of sin, according to that of Augustine (Ep. 54): "The sin is not forgiven unless what has been taken away be restored, when it can be restored."¹⁷⁶ Satisfaction, however, presupposing cessation of sin, is instituted for appeasing Him who has been offended by our sin. Therefore, just as, for example, it is prior to cease from adultery or fraternal hatred than to make satisfaction to God for those sins; so it is prior that restitution be made, as a certain cessation from the injustice inflicted upon the neighbor, than that someone make satisfaction to God for that sin.

§ 169. Indeed, not even catechumens (upon whom nevertheless no satisfaction ought to be imposed) can be admitted to Baptism without prior restitution, as a cessation from the sin of injustice, just as in other sins. Whence restitution ought not to be enjoined by the priest upon penitents as satisfaction or as a part of it, but, before all else, it is to be exacted of them as a work without which—or without a firm purpose of which—the

very penance is false, just as the hatred and detestation of other sins are exacted. Then, that being presupposed, some different work is to be enjoined for satisfaction.

-
1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 90, a. 2.
 2. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 1, ad 1.
 3. Council of Trent [referred to simply as "the Council" in the source].
 4. Council of Florence, Decree [abbreviation as in source].
 5. The Master, In IV Sent., dist. 16. See also the earlier-cited passage of St. Leo the Great [as cited above].
 6. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 3.
 7. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 3.
 8. See what is said about this question in the Appendix to this Fourth Book, on the occasion of Baptism and Confirmation [abbreviation as in source].
 9. Matt. 18:18; Jn. 20:23; Matt. 28:19.
 10. Cf. Council of Florence on the form of Baptism.
 11. On the deliberate addition of "cetera" ("and the rest") by the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent, to show that they did not intend to define about such minor questions but left them to the learned to dispute.
 12. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, In IV Sent., on the form of absolution [abbreviation as in source].
 13. Cajetan, Commentary on the *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 3; Domingo de Soto, In IV Sent., dist. 18 (or on the same question) [abbreviation as in source].
 14. Matt. 16:19; Matt. 18:18.
 15. Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 18 (on the form of absolution) [abbreviation as in source].
 16. St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto* III, ch. 19.
 17. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* [locis sup. cit., abbreviation as in source].
 18. Pope St. Leo I, Ep. 91.
 19. Is. 43:25; St. Augustine, In *Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus*, at Jn. 1:33.
 20. St. Ambrose, *De paenitentia*; *De Spiritu Sancto* III, ch. 19; *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* V on Luke 5 (the Paralytic); St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*; St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas*.
 21. Jn. 20:23.
 22. On these points Estius refers forward within this Distinction.
 23. On the form of absolution being expressed by indicative words conveying the minister's necessary action: St. Thomas teaches this (*Opusculum* XXII, where, in ch. 1, he calls rash and presumptuous the assertion of a certain man whom he refutes in that *Opusculum*, namely that the priest, when administering the sacrament of Penance, ought not to pronounce the words: "I absolve you"; he adds that this manner of speaking befits the form of this sacrament, so that by those words the sacrament be expressed; indeed from the words of our Lord the Savior (Matt. 16) he gathers that this is the due form of absolving, and thus he says it seems necessary that the priest administering the sacrament of Penance use that form. In the next chapter St. Thomas refutes invincibly all the reasons which that man had brought forward for his assertion; and in ch. 3 he explains the sense of the words "I absolve you" to be this: namely, "I impart to you the sacrament, or ministry, of absolution"; all of which he also again sets out and confirms more at length in the *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 3.) This opinion of St. Thomas—already long ago the most common among all the theologians—was confirmed by the decrees of the Councils of Florence and Trent, in the places cited above by the Author. But John Morin, an eminent theologian and a most sharp investigator of ancient ecclesiastical matters, in the aforesaid work *De administratione sacramenti poenitentiae*, book 8 (from ch. 8 onwards), tries to prove that in the Latin Church down to the thirteenth century no other form of Absolution was used than the deprecatory; and therefore he champions as valid a form of absolution which, by its very nature, is deprecatory. Indeed, he even thinks that the Council of Trent, under the

abbreviation "Ab—", in "Absolvo te etc.", chiefly intended the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity, namely, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," which he therefore judges necessary in the administration of this sacrament; and thus he says that that deprecative form—precisely because it has that invocation annexed as necessary—ought to be called necessary. Morin proves his assertion by many heads, both from the Fathers and from ancient Ritual books, or Penitentials, of which he adduces very many excerpts (ch. 10–11 of the same book, and at the end of that work he caused several Penitential or Ritual books to be printed which he had transcribed with great labor from manuscripts). Among the MSS. he mentions (book 8, ch. 11) in the first rank he places the Petavian Codex—so called from its owner, Monsieur Petau, a senator of the Paris Parliament—which Joseph Maria Thomasius of the Congregation of Clerics Regular later made public from the library of Queen Christina of the Swedes and Goths. The same use of pronouncing the form of absolution by deprecatory words among the Greeks he derives from their Euchologia (book 8, ch. 12). In this he opposes Peter Arcudius, *De concordia Occidentalis et Orientalis Ecclesiae*, book 4 (ch. 13), who asserts that among the Greeks the absolutional form is indicative—"You have pardon granted," or, as the same Arcudius elsewhere has it, "Be you held as pardoned"—and he refutes and explodes Arcudius's opinion by many and invincible arguments. Hence Gaspar Juenin, *De sacramentis* (Dissertation 6, q. 9, ch. 1, art. 1), judges that among the Greeks, both formerly and at present, the custom is to pronounce absolution by deprecatory words; and he shows that such a form both formerly had force and even now has force "for Greeks among Greeks" (*ibid.*, § 2). Moreover (art. 2 of the same chapter) the same author teaches, first, that all the Latin Churches did not formerly express in indicative mode the judicial act which is included in sacramental Absolution; second, that this judicial act came, in the Latin Churches, to be expressed—by determination of the thirteenth century—solely in indicative or enunciative mode, and indeed in the first person; third (§ 2 of the same article), that for many centuries now in the Latin Church absolution pronounced by deprecatory words has not had force. It would be worth the effort to review more things here and to examine the sentences of scholastic theologians, especially those whom Morin adduces on his side—most of all Domingo de Soto (*In IV Sent.*, Dist. 3, quaest. unica, art. 5), who certainly is far from Morin's sense, as is most clear from what that most learned theologian teaches (*Distinct.* 14 of the same book, q. 1, art. 3) about the form of absolution; but this task belongs to a treatise or commentary adding notes for novice theologians to their handbooks. What must not be passed over, however, is what Balthasar Francolinus, *De disciplina poenitentiae*, book 2 (ch. 1, n. 10), both learnedly and eruditely warns: namely, that the aforesaid forms which are exhibited in the aforesaid Rituals—and which Morin and others call deprecatory—were not all deprecatory, but at least some of them were at once deprecatory and judicial. For in some there stands prefixed the heading *Oratio* ("Prayer"), in some only God is asked to absolve—"Almighty God...", "Indulgence, Absolution..."—which things Francolinus notes; in others, however, the priest professed that he was acting by a power of loosing and binding handed down by Christ, as the very ancient Gellonian Codex shows (see Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, part 2, book 1, and the documents appended at the end of Morin's work *De administratione*). From these and from other reasons adduced by the erudite Edmund Martène (*ibid.*, ch. 6, art. 7) and from what writers on the ministry of Penance commonly bring forward, it can be gathered that the ancient Church, rather than using precatory words, used the form "I absolve you"—see the same Francolinus at the place cited.

24. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84 [abbreviation "art." as in source].

25. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 4, ad 3.

26. St. Augustine, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* (*Contra Donatistas*) III, ch. 16.

27. Cf. Matt. 9:18; Mk. 6:5; Mk. 7:32–35; Mk. 8:23–25; Acts 9:17–18.

28. St. Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 118.

29. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 1, in corp.

30. Council of Trent, Session 14, canon 10.

31. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 68, a. 4.

32. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 14; Session 14, ch. 8 and ch. 12 [abbreviation as in source: "Self.6.cap. 14 do can. 39. 14. ap. 8. & cap. 12."]; The summary paraphrases the rationale given in Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8 ("De satisfactionis necessitate et fructu").

33. St. Thomas, "ubi sup." [abbreviation as in source].

34. Ezek. 18; Ezek. 33.

35. Ps. 31.

36. Rom. 8; cf. Rom. 3; Rom. 13.

37. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II, ch. 34; St. Augustine, Sermon 20, *De verbis Domini*; St. Augustine, Sermon 87, *De tempore*; St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Ps. 31*; St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Ps. 84*; [Pseudo-]Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 9.
38. St. John Chrysostom, in 1 Corinth. 11 [abbreviation as in source]; St. John Chrysostom, Homilia 6 in Genesim; St. John Chrysostom, *Oratio in Sanctum Philogonium*; St. John Chrysostom, Homilia de Poenitentia et Confessione; St. John Chrysostom, Homilia 2 in Psalmum 50.
39. Council of Trent, cited above [abbreviation as in source].
40. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, qq. 12–13; III, q. 85, a. 3.
41. [Pseudo-]Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 8.
42. St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 15, q. 1, a. 1; *Summa theologiae* III, q. 85, a. 3.
43. Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 15 [abbreviation as in source]; Durandus, In IV Sent., dist. 15 [abbreviation as in source].
44. St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*; Gennadius, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, ch. 54.
45. Heb. 9.
46. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ch. 66.
47. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 4 De Collectis.
48. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8.
49. Prosper, *De vita contemplativa* II, ch. 7; Gennadius, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, ch. 53.
50. St. Cyprian, *De lapsis* (Sermon 5).
51. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 14, a. 4–5.
52. Tertullian, *De poenitentia*.
53. St. Ambrose, *Ad virginem lapsam*.
54. St. Ambrose, In Psalmum 37.
55. St. Ambrose, *Hexaemeron* V, last chapter.
56. [Hymnus ad Laudes matutinas, as in the source].
57. St. Ambrose, *De poenitentia* I, ch. 4.
58. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 6 on 2 Timothy 2; Hom. 38 on John; Hom. 1 on the Epistle to the Hebrews.
59. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 2 De Collectis; Sermon 4; Sermon 5; Sermon 4 De Quadragesima.
60. Prosper, *De vita contemplativa* II, ch. 7.
61. [Collecta Quadragesimae, as in the source].
62. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 14.
63. Editorial note in the source: "Seu Sermon CCCII. in Appendice Benedictinorum ..." [abbreviation and content as in source].
64. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 14, throughout.
65. St. Bede, Commentary on Prov. 13:8; St. Augustine, Sermon 112 (as in the source), among the sermons *De Tempore* [abbreviation as in source].
66. Tertullian, *De poenitentia*, chs. 8–9; Tertullian, *De baptismo*.
67. St. Cyprian, *Epistles*, book 1, ep. 3; 4; 8; 14; book 4, ep. 3; 4; and the Sermon *De eleemosyna*.
68. St. Ambrose, *De lapsu virginis consecratae*; In Lucam, lib. 7, cap. 59; *De Abel et Cain*, lib. 2–3; *De poenitentia*, lib. 2, cap. 5.
69. Pacianus, *Contra Novatianos*; *De poenitentia et confessione*; *Paraenesis ad poenitentiam*; cf. *Epist. 3 ad Sympronianum*.
70. St. Jerome, Commentary [as in source; abbreviation as in source].

71. St. Jerome, Epist. 27 (Epitaphium Paulae); Epist. 30 ad Oceanum; Epist. 49 ad Sabinianum.
72. St. Augustine, Homilies 5 and 15 [as in source]; Enchiridion, ch. 70.
73. St. Augustine, In Ps. 50, at "Ecce enim veritatem dilexisti"; In Ps. 132; De continente, ch. 6; Ep. 54; Sermon 3 De diversis [as in source]; De civitate Dei V, ch. 26.
74. St. Gregory the Great, Hom. 34 in Evangelia; In Ps. 5 (penitential); Expositio in 1 Reg. 9; Hom. 20 in Evangelia; Regula pastoralis, pars 3, admon. 31.
75. Pope Innocent I, Epistle to Decentius, ch. 7; St. Leo the Great, Epistles 91, 93; Prosper, De vita contemplativa II, ch. 7; St. Fulgentius, De remissione peccatorum I, ch. 12; II, ch. 15; St. Bernard, Sermon 66 in Cantica; Rupert of Deutz, on Matt. 5 ("Qui dixerit fratri suo racha"); Pseudo-Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 8.
76. Origen, Hom. 2 and 12 in Leviticum; Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica V, ch. 28; St. Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio in sancta lumina; St. Epiphanius, Panarion II, haer. 59 (Cathari/Novatians), and the Oration de fide catholica; St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 11 in 2 Cor.; Hom. 80 ad populum Antiochenum; Eusebius Emisenus, Hom. 5 and 10 ad monachos; Theodoret, Epitome divinorum decretorum, cap. de Paenitentia; St. John Damascene, De fide orthodoxa IV, ch. 10.
77. Council of Carthage III, can. 31; Council of Carthage IV, can. 74; African Council, can. 9; Council of Cabilon (Chalon-sur-Saône), can. 34, 38; Gratian, Decretum: C. 26, q. 7; De consecr., dist. 4; De paenitentia, dist. 3; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8; canons 12–15.
78. St. Thomas, as above.
79. Is. 53; cf. Estius, on Distinction 19, Book III.
80. Nah. 1 (LXX): "Non consurget duplex tribulatio."
81. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8; Cf. above; and Estius, Distinction 19, Book III.
82. St. Augustine, Enchiridion 71.
83. St. Augustine, Epistle 108.
84. St. Augustine, Sermon on the Lord's Prayer [as in source].
85. St. Fulgentius, De fide ad Petrum, ch. 41.
86. St. Augustine, Epistle 89.
87. St. Augustine, De natura et gratia, ch. 35.
88. St. Ambrose, De Abel et Cain II, ch. 3.
89. 1 Cor. 5.
90. St. Ambrose, De paenitentia I, ch. 17; St. Pacian, Epistle 3 to Sympronian.
91. St. Jerome, on Galatians 5; St. Augustine, Contra Adimantum, ch. 17.
92. 2 Cor. 2; Heb. 10; Acts 8: "Do penance therefore for this thy wickedness, and pray to God, if perhaps this thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee."
93. Lev. 16; 23; Deut. 15; Sir. 7.
94. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei X, ch. 5; St. Cyril of Alexandria, Contra Julianum IX–X.
95. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 8.
96. Dan. 4; Prov. 10:13 [as in source].
97. St. Augustine, Enchiridion 67; St. Ambrose, De Helia ieiunio, ch. 20; Sermons 90–91, De eleemosynis; St. Leo the Great, Sermon 4, De Quadragesima; St. Lawrence, presbyter of Novara, Homilia De paenitentia.
98. Lev. 10; Acts 17; Acts 25.
99. Theophylact, Commentary on Eph. 4.
100. St. Thomas, "ubi sup. quest. 28" [abbreviation as in source].

101. St. Cyprian, Sermon De lapsis; St. Augustine, Enchiridion 65; Prosper, De vita contemplativa II, ch. 7.
102. Dan. 4; 1 Cor. 11; 1 Cor. 5.
103. Joel 2; Jonah 3; Tob. 4; Tob. 13; Sir. 29.
104. Cf. above; from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine.
105. St. Cyprian, De opere et eleemosynis; St. Augustine, Enchiridion 70.
106. St. Thomas, Supplementum, q. 12, a. 3, in corp.; likewise q. 13–14.
107. St. Augustine, Confessions VIII, ch. 11.
108. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos 98, on the verse "Tu propitius fuisti eis et ulciscens in omnes adinventiones eorum."
109. St. Cyprian, Sermon De lapsis.
110. St. Ambrose, De lapsu virginis consecratae; and St. Ambrose, De paenitentia II, ch. 5.
111. Eph. 4:28: "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands, that he may have whereof to distribute to him that suffers need."
112. St. Jerome, Epitaphium Paulae.
113. Heb. 12:11.
114. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 9 De Quadragesima.
115. 2 Cor. 7:10; see above.
116. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 90, a. 2, in the body.
117. St. Cyprian, Sermon De lapsis; and Letters, namely Ep. 2 (book 1), Ep. 2 (book 4), and Ep. 5 (book 3).
118. Origen, Homilies on Leviticus, hom. 12.
119. St. Leo the Great, Ep. 91.
120. Third Council of Toledo, canon 11.
121. St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels, hom. 26.
122. Innocent I, Ep. 3, ch. 2; Sozomen, Ecclesiastical History VII, ch. 16; Gratian, Decretum, Distinction De poenitentia.
123. See above, where Estius treated the Fathers ascribing even the removal of eternal punishment to satisfactions performed before reconciliation.
124. On works meriting "by way of congruity" and "by way of condignity" (de congruo / de condigno), see the discussion above in this Distinction.
125. On restoration to the state of grace and the growth of charity and merits, cf. the doctrine of the state of grace (*status gratiae*) in the scholastics.
126. Council of Carthage (the so-called fourth), canon 76; Augustine, Ep. 180, to Honoratus.
127. Council of Alcalá (Complutensis) under Sixtus IV, condemning among the propositions of Peter of Osma the article: "that penitents are not to be absolved unless first they have completed the penance enjoined to them."
128. St. Augustine, De continentia, ch. 6.
129. Concerning the form of absolution. That the form of absolution, expressed in indicative words, necessarily presents the minister's act has been taught by St. Thomas (Opusculum XXII, cap. 1), who calls "rash" the assertion of a certain man whom he impugns in that little work, namely, that the form of the Sacrament of Penance ought not to be presented by the priest in indicative manner—that is, with the words: "I absolve you"; and he adds that the form of this Sacrament coheres in such wise that by those words it is expressed; indeed, from the words of our Lord and Savior (Matt. 16) it is gathered to be the due form of absolving; and hence it seems necessary that the priest administering the Sacrament of Penance use that same form. In the next chapter St. Thomas most clearly dissolves, and in his own invincible manner, all the reasons and authorities that the one whom he attacks had brought forward; and (cap. 3) he explains the sense of those words "I absolve you" to be this: namely, "I bestow upon you the Sacrament, or the ministry, of absolution"; all of which is also expected of human beings, and it is in conformity with the Summa

theologiae (III, q. 84, a. 3). The Councils of Florence and of Trent, in the places cited by the Author, confirmed St. Thomas's sentence, which was long since most common among all theologians. But in truth John Morin, a distinguished theologian and very keen investigator of ancient ecclesiastical matters, in the aforesaid work *On the Administration of the Sacrament of Penance*, book 8 (cap. 8), tries to prove that in the Latin Church down to the thirteenth century no other form of absolution was in use than the deprecatory; and so it is that he also contends for the validity of that form of absolution when it is pronounced in words of supplication; and he even (cap. 12, num. 8) endeavors to assert that the Council of Trent, in that abbreviation of its decree, chiefly intended to be understood the invocation of the most holy Trinity, namely, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," which many judge to be necessary in the administration of this Sacrament; he does not in any way concede that we posited only a deprecatory form, which he says ought to be called indicative. By many heads Morin proves his assertion, both from the Fathers and from ancient Ritual books, or Penitentials, not a few examples of which he possessed (cap. 10, etc., and at the end of that same work). He himself chiefly cared for the publication of some Penitential books and Rituals which he had copied from manuscripts with great labor; among those he mentions (cap. 11) the codices of the monastery of St. Martin, the property, to wit, of Monsieur Denis Petau, senator of the Parliament of Paris, which Thomas of Scone, a clerk regular, testifies to have belonged to the royal libraries of Sweden and Gothland. The same Morin shows from the *Euchologia* of the Greeks that there too the form of absolution is pronounced in deprecatory words; whence also Peter Arcudius, in his work *On the Concord of the Western and Eastern Church* (lib. 4, cap. 13), asserts that among the Greeks an indicative form is not used by these very words: "I absolve you," but rather by these: "May God by my ministry absolve you" (from which Greek prelates' humility shrinks, as Arcudius also says). Against this opinion Gaspar Juenin sets many and invincible arguments, and he exposes and refutes Morin's sentiment in his *Commentary on the Sacraments* (Dissertation on penance, qu. 94, cap. 41, art. 11). He teaches that among the Greeks too, both formerly and now, it was and is the custom to express absolution in deprecatory words, and that such a form both formerly availed and even now avails among the Greeks, as Greeks; but he also (the same art., § 1) teaches and proves that all the Latin Churches did not use to express the judicial act, which is included in sacramental absolution, by the indicative mode. He teaches that the judicial act, which is essential to sacramental absolution, was, in all the Churches of the Latins up to the thirteenth century, expressed not by the sole indicative or enunciative mode, and indeed in the first person; he teaches (the same art., § 5) that for many of those centuries "naked" absolutions of mere deprecation did not avail in the Latin Church. It would be worth the work to recall here many things to these points, and to discuss the opinions of the Scholastic theologians—especially of those whom Morin himself brings forward and opposes; and in addition of Dominic Soto (*In IV Sent.*, dist. 3, quaest. unica, art. 5), who certainly is far from Morin's sense; as is most clear also from what the most learned theologians teach (*Disputation 1* of the same title, qu. 8, art. 3) concerning the form of absolution. But this would be the task rather of a treatise or a commentary than of an additament for the convenience of more recent theologians. However, it must not be left unmentioned that Balthasar Francolinus, in *De Disciplina Paenitentiae* (lib. 1, cap. 12 and also cap. 2 of the same book), in his own reckoning confirms with these words: that sacramental absolution (namely that which the Author rejects) is to be compared with the ancient rites of the Greeks and of the Latins; although scarcely can the true form be detected save by William Estius very rightly pointing it out.

130. The Author's opinion denying that those condemned to public penance were ever endowed with a double absolution—one at the beginning, or soon after, the other after the full completion of penance, a distinction invented by certain theologians and supported by no ancient monument—is reported by John Morin (*De administratione Paenitentiae*, lib. 9, cap. 2 of the same book), who, adding his own judgment, speaks thus in sum: although I cannot in clear thought grasp how such a distinction could have arisen from ancient discipline, it seems that William Estius rightly pronounced that it has no testimony from antiquity; which fact alone is for me more than enough—since very many and most celebrated Authors are cited by him—so as to judge that formerly absolution was not always given. Petavius (*Animadversiones* on St. Epiphanius, lib. 2, cap. 8, and lib. 2, cap. 2, § 8), and in like manner, in the number cited, and for the greatest part of the second and third centuries, confirms that it was customary to deny absolution to those relapsing after the first solemn penance. Let the Readers consult the same Author for the sum of Morin's position. In the prior centuries, among those doing public penance, absolution and pardon were not expiated by public confession; sins were remitted by confession itself, a few excepted, and sometimes a deprivation was inflicted by canons. In book VI of the same work, cap. 25, after he has brought forward penitential rules, he declares that that twofold absolution—one after confession, the second after satisfaction—was not always employed by the ancients. Nevertheless he admits that not always did they absolve from faults and penalties at once; that the twofold absolution was truly used by the Church. Balthasar Francolinus, in *Clericus Romanus*, in the first question, establishes three points: First, that the ancient Church, according to certain canons, and therefore those two, and indeed both, had this practice. Second: that it seems certain that those, too, who were absolved immediately or shortly after confession, before they ran through the whole penance according to the ordinary law, were in fact absolved; the same persons, nevertheless, were shortly after granted satisfaction to be enjoined by the priest, as the decree of the ancient Councils prescribes. Third, a position perhaps too toilsome to prove and to show according to our Author's mind. Indeed, the arguments which in another work (*De Poenitentia publica*, lib. 2) he adduces for this his third assertion have little weight; or at least, as Morin himself does not deny either in particular the examples he brings, or very many of them; they

rather knot than untie the matter. But let there be a common judgment of Readers on both sides. It suffices for us to have indicated the matter concerning the present use of the Church about the preposing of absolution to satisfaction; and to have shown that the law and prescription of preposing, as well as the order of penance, even if their antiquity commends them highly, nevertheless are not to be maintained by the Church as necessary.

131. S. Thom. ubi sup. [abbreviation as in source].
132. Matt. 6: "Receperunt mercedem suam"; Exod. 1; St. Gregory the Great, *Moralia* XVIII, ch. 4.
133. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 14, a. 1.
134. Is. 58:3–4: "Why have we fasted, and Thou hast not regarded? we have humbled our souls, and Thou hast not known? Behold in the day of your fast your own will is found..."
135. Sir. 34:23–26 (Vulgate numbering): "Dona impiorum non probat Altissimus... Homo qui jejunit in peccatis suis, eadem faciens, quid proficiet se? orationem illius quis exaudiet?"
136. Sir. 9:3 (Vulg. versions vary); Jas. 2:10; 1 Cor. 13:3.
137. St. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, hom. 34.
138. Pius I, *Epistola ad Ecclesias*, cited by Gratian, *Decretum*, De poenitentia, dist. 3, cap. Nihil prodest.
139. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew* 27.
140. St. Augustine, *Homil.* 41; or Sermon CCCXCIII among the five classes of sermons; editors note it as dubious in the Louvain edition, false in the Verona and Vienna editions, being stitched together from various scraps [editorial notice as in source].
141. Innocent II, Decretal cited by Gratian, De poenitentia, dist. 5, cap. Fratres nostri; Gregory VII, cap. Falsas [both [abbreviation as in source]].
142. The four arguments are gathered by the author of the book *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, cap. 9; cf. Mk. 7 (healing), Lk. 8:2 (seven demons), Mk. 5 and parallels (legion), Jn. 7:23; St. Augustine, *Quaestiones evangeliorum* II, q. 40.
143. *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, cap. 9.
144. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 14, a. 1 "ibidem".
145. Nah. 1:9 (Vulgate sense: that God does not punish twice in the same thing).
146. St. Jerome, cited in the same commentary; the passage is transmitted by the Master (of the Sentences).
147. St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, chs. 75–77; Sir. 30:24 (Vulg. 30:24/25).
148. Below, Dist. 46 (as Estius promises) on the state of the dead and the impossibility of remission or relaxation there.
149. The treatise *De vera et falsa poenitentia* is denied to be by Augustine by many learned men; cf. Benedictine edition, Appendix to tom. VI. Yet many of the ancients valued it; see Labbe's historical dissertation [abbreviation as in source].
150. St. Thomas, Supplement, qq. 13 and 18, ad a. 3; Scotus, In IV Sent., dist. 18; Gabriel Biel, In IV Sent., dist. 16, q. 2; Adrian, In IV, De sacramento confessionis, q. 4; Navarrus, *Manuale*, ch. 26, no. 20.
151. Rabanus Maurus, *Collatio Synodorum*.
152. Pseudo-Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 15.
153. Gratian, De poenitentia, dist. 1, cap. Mensuram; Decretals, De poenitentiis et remissionibus, cap. Deus qui; Council of Florence, Decree on the sacraments.
154. Fourth Lateran Council (can. 21), *Omnis utriusque sexus*, under Innocent II [as in source].
155. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8; cf. *ibid.*, ch. 1 and can. 15.
156. The Master (of the Sentences), In IV Sent., dists. 16 and 18; St. Bonaventure; St. Thomas; Richard; Peter of Palude (Paludanus).
157. "Ad supr. cit. S. Thom. loca" [abbreviation as in source].
158. The Master (of the Sentences), *In IV Sent.*, dist. 16.
159. St. Thomas, [citation as in source] [abbreviation as in source].

160. Council of Trent, Session 14; see esp. ch. 8; cf. above, where Scripture and the Fathers are adduced.
161. St. Cyprian, Sermon on Almsgiving; St. Augustine, Homily 19 among the fifty; idem, *Enchiridion*, ch. 69.
162. St. Augustine, On the Lord's Prayer; St. Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, ch. 41.
163. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 35 on Genesis; cf. also his comments on Col. 1:24.
164. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 13, a. 2.
165. On the condemned contrary opinion, see Alexander VII, condemned Proposition XV among others of the perverse doctrine: "A penitent, by his own authority, can substitute another in his place, who may fulfill the penance enjoined upon the penitent himself." The author's doctrine is very far from that proposition, as is clear from St. Thomas's teaching (and from the Author cited in the Supplement on *IV Sent.*, dist. 20, q. 1, a. 2), or from the very wording of the proposition itself. For St. Thomas is speaking when, by mandate, another is substituted to satisfy the penance enjoined; a matter which St. D. [the Supreme Pontiff] most gravely warns is needed as to authority in the case of confession. [Paraphrase of the long source footnote (a); abbreviations as in source.]
166. Cajetan, commentary ad loc. (see under St. Thomas, III, q. 48, a. 2).
167. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 15, a. 1–3.
168. [Pseudo-]St. Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 8.
169. St. Jerome, *Contra Jovinianum* I; idem, Commentary on Philemon; St. Augustine, *De adulterinis coniugiis* I, ch. 14; Sermon 61 among the sermons appended in the Benedictine edition; St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on 1 Corinthians (on 1 Cor. 9: "Woe to me if..."); idem, Homily 55 on Matthew; On the category of works of supererogation and their greater acceptability before God, see the Fathers cited in the preceding note.
170. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 9; canon 13.
171. Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastical History*, XVIII, ch. 40.
172. St. Ambrose, Commentary on Ps. 37 (on "For I am ready for scourges").
173. St. Leo the Great, Sermon 1 On the Fast of the Tenth Month.
174. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 83, a. 3.
175. St. Augustine, *De perfectione iustitiae*.
176. St. Augustine, Epistle 54: "Non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum, cum restitui potest."

DISTINCTIO XVI — ON THE DEFINITION OF CONTRITION AND ITS EXPLICATION (*DE CONTRITIONIS DEFINITIONE EJUSQUE EXPLICATIONE*)

§ I — The definition of contrition and its explication (Definitio contritionis ejusque explicatio)

§ 1. The contrition (*contritio*) about which in this Distinction the Doctors dispute, as it is the first, so too it is the principal part of the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*), which the Fathers sometimes by another name call compunction (*compunctio*), and often designate also by the general name of penance. The Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 4) most rightly define it thus: "Contrition is sorrow of soul and detestation for the sin committed, together with a purpose of not sinning hereafter."² For the things which are not ill added by others—namely, that it is a sorrow assumed by the will out of love of God and because God has been offended, joined with hope of pardon, with a purpose of confessing, of making satisfaction, and of living according to the law of God—all these serve for a certain explication of the aforesaid definition and are contained in it when well understood; except that what they add about the purpose of confessing and making satisfaction restricts contrition to that alone which pertains to the sacrament of Penance, whereas contrition considered in itself has a wider extension. Nor, before the Evangelical law, ought it to have been conjoined with such a purpose; nor, even under the Evangelical law taken universally, does it require such a purpose, as is evident in the penance and contrition of those to be baptized.

§ 2. Now, in the first place it must here be noted that the word contrition in its present signification is purely ecclesiastical, entirely unused and unknown to pagan writers, to whom the thing itself was unknown. It has, however, been taken by transference from bodies, which, when they are hard, are by a stronger agent broken up and ground down into parts, or even softened. Thus the heart of man, hard and resisting God by sin, is crushed and softened by the humility of penance through the Omnipotent Grace of God. Moreover, by a certain like reason it is also called compunction; whence there exist with St. John Chrysostom books On Compunction of Heart. Likewise it can be called a rending or tearing of the heart, according to that saying (Joel 2): "Rend your hearts, and not your garments."³

§ 3. Next it must be noted that by "sorrow" in the definition of contrition is not understood that which is in sense, but rather the very detestation of sins, that is, the sadness for sins which is in the will. For contrition is an act of the will, not of sense or of the sensitive appetite. Although it is true that from this contrition in the concupiscible appetite there almost always arises that passion of soul which is called sorrow—this, indeed, is praiseworthy inasmuch as it is commanded by the will of the man who repents—nevertheless it is not necessary for true contrition; both because without it the true formal character of contrition consists in the rational part, and because it is not within man's power that this sensitive sorrow be elicited always.

§ 4. It must furthermore be noted that for true contrition it is required first and foremost that the sinner hate and detest all the sins by which he has mortally offended God. For just as there is not true penance for one sin without the other, as we have shown above, so neither for one without the other can there be had true contrition. Wherefore, just as the latter part of the definition—"together with a purpose of not sinning hereafter"—manifestly has a universal sense, so the former part is to be understood as requiring sorrow and detestation for each and every sin committed. How, however, this is to be understood will be explained below.

§ 5. Finally, from the same definition, against the heretics of our time, it must be noted—as in the place cited above the Council of Trent declares—that contrition contains not only cessation from sin and the purpose and beginning of a new life, but also hatred of the old, according to that (Ezek. 18): "Cast away from you all your iniquities, whereby you have transgressed; and make to yourselves a new heart and a new spirit."⁴ To this pertain also the words "penance," "sadness," "sorrow," and "groaning," which Scripture uses, as when it says: "Do penance," and, "Unless you shall have done penance, you shall all likewise perish" (Lk. 13), and, "The sadness that is according to God works penance, steadfast unto salvation" (2 Cor. 7), and, "My sorrow is always in my sight" (Ps. 37). The same [Psalmist says]: "I roared with the groaning of my heart," and, "My groaning is not hidden from you," and often elsewhere. For sentences of this kind signify, and in the sinner require, that affection of the will by which, through hatred and detestation, he is moved against the sin committed by himself.

§ 6. Hence St. Augustine says (Sermon 7 de Tempore): "A penance is not made sure unless there be hatred of sin and love of God."⁵ And in Homily 50, last chapter: "It does not suffice to change for the better and to withdraw from evil deeds, unless there be also for those things which have been done satisfaction to God through the sorrow of penance, through humble groaning, through the sacrifice of a contrite heart. For it was not said that we should only abstain from sins, but also, for the past [sins]," he says, "beseech the Lord that they be forgiven you." And what follows.⁶ To these there is added that description of penance so frequent among the Fathers: "To do penance is to weep for sins committed, and not to commit the things that should be wept for." Nay more, not even do the Fathers acknowledge the beginning of a new life in him who has sinned, unless it be joined with hatred of the old. Thus Augustine says (Sermon 27, cap. 1): "No one chooses the new [life] unless he is sorry for the old." And in Homily 50, cap. 2: "Unless a man be sorry for the old [life], he cannot begin the new."⁷ From which it is understood how justly and deservedly that saying of Luther is condemned: "Penance is a new life." Although in a certain true sense it can be taken, namely inasmuch as it is signified that it is not whoever abandons sins and sets up a new life that is thereby true penance, but rather that this is a sure sign of a new life; nevertheless it is false that penance is a new life—that is, to establish that genuine penance is nothing other than a good life, with no regard had to sins previously committed. This sense Luther intended. Against him the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 6, ch. 6), explaining the mode of preparation for justification, say that in order to be justified, the sinner ought to acknowledge himself to be a sinner, and to be moved against sin by hatred and detestation—that is, by that saving penance which is required even before Baptism. And (ch. 14) they signify that under the name of penance, which is also common to those to be baptized, there is contained not only cessation from sins but also detestation of them, and that which the Psalmist calls "a contrite and humble heart." Again (Session 14, ch. 1) they require of all penitents whatsoever, even before Baptism, that, having cast away perversity—and acting with contrition—they should detest their past life, and more clearly they defined this very thing by those words which we have cited above.⁸

§ 7. Furthermore, from what has been said that also manifestly follows: that true contrition does not arise from the sole love of most beautiful justice, as Luther used to say, but also from the consideration of sins committed against God. For the love of justice alone, or the contemplation of its beauty, does not beget contrition or any sorrow, but rather exultation. Therefore, in order that contrition be begotten in the soul of the sinner, it is necessary that he love justice and consider it inasmuch as it has been violated by himself through sin: which does not occur without consideration of the sin itself and a movement against it with hatred and detestation. This the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 6, ch. 5) indicate, where they say that sinners are disposed to justice when they begin to love God as the fount of justice, and for that reason are moved against sins, and so forth.⁹

§ 8. And hence it is that Scripture and the Fathers everywhere describe for us the penitent man as one who, by consideration and recollection of his sins, stirs up within himself the sorrow of contrition; as these utterances in the Psalms show: "To you only have I sinned, and I have done evil before you," and, "My sin is always before me," and, "For I will declare my iniquity, and I will think for my sin." Likewise in the Apocalypse 2: "Be mindful therefore from whence you are fallen, and do penance"; and in Isaiah 38: "I will remember to you all my years in the bitterness of my soul." These words of King Hezekiah, although by others understood otherwise, the Fathers of Trent (Session 14, ch. 4; can. 5) refer to the affection of a penitent man. This consideration of sins in the penitent is expressly required by St. Ambrose (on Ps. 37), writing thus: "A full definition of penance is the recollection of offenses, that each man may flog his sins, as it were, with a daily scourge of speech, and may condemn as crimes the misdeeds committed by himself."¹⁰ So too the author of the book On True and False Penance, ch. 14: "Let the sinner," he says, "consider the quality of the crime—in place, in time," and so forth; and again: "Let him consider with how great irreverence he has sinned." And below: "Let him dwell on each of these points and feel the manner of the crime."¹¹ Things similar are read in St. Basil (on Ps. 33) and in St. John Chrysostom (on Ps. 50 and book 2 On Compunction of Heart).¹²

§ II — That contrition is necessary for the remission of sin (Contritionem esse ad remissionem peccati necessariam)

§ 9. Although from the things already said the necessity of contrition (*contritio*) for the remission of sins—and therefore for attaining salvation—sufficiently appears, nevertheless the same must now be proved and explained somewhat more fully and distinctly. Therefore it must be established for certain that mortal sin cannot be remitted without penance (*poenitentia*), that is, without a detestation or hatred of sin together with the purpose of not sinning hereafter, which we have said is contrition. This doctrine is evident in Sacred Scripture, in which everywhere God exacts penance from sinners, nor does He otherwise than through penance show them hope of pardon and salvation. Thus the Lord says (through Ezek. 18): "If the impious shall have done penance for all his sins, he shall surely live, and shall not die." And again: "Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be a ruin to you." And in ch. 33: "If the impious shall not have been converted from his way, he shall die in his iniquity."¹⁴ But most plainly does Christ in the Gospel say: "Unless you shall have done penance, you shall all likewise perish."¹⁵ And He willed that His own preaching—like that of His Forerunner and of His Disciples—should have its beginning from the doctrine of penance, as from that which is above all necessary to salvation, saying: "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven has drawn near."¹⁶ For the Greek word *metanoieo* does not signify only a change of life for the better, as the Adversaries want, as we have shown elsewhere.

§ 10. So too Peter (Acts 2 and 3), when the Jews said, "What shall we do?", points out this one counsel for obtaining salvation: "Do penance," he says, "and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," as if he said, otherwise they will not be able to be blotted out.¹⁷ Thus too (Rev. 2) it is expressly said once and again: "Do penance; if not, I will come to you," and so forth.¹⁸ But lest it be tedious to pursue the sentences of the Fathers—which are very many, some of which are cited by Gratian in *De Penance*, Dist. 1—we will set down this especially of St. Augustine: that "no one can begin a new life who does not repent of the old life." From all which it is perspicuous that contrition is necessary not only by a necessity of the end, since without it neither the pardon of sin nor salvation can be had—just as Baptism is necessary to salvation both for infants and for adults—but also by a necessity of precept. For these Scriptures both of the Old and of the New Testament, "Be converted," "Do penance," "Rend your hearts," undoubtedly have the force of a precept.³

§ 11. Tertullian urges this divine precept in his book *On Penance*, writing among other things in this way: "I reckon it rashness to dispute about a good of a divine precept, namely penance. For not because it is good ought we therefore to listen, but because God commands," and so forth.¹⁹ Yet these words are not to be understood as though, without a special divine precept, a sinner were not obliged to do penance; but because by the explicit precept of God he ought to be moved more than by the dictate of the law of nature. For otherwise it is not doubtful that, even apart from the divine precept, the law of nature exacts penance, both on account of the necessity of the end—that is, of salvation—and on account of the compensation for the injury done to God by sin, to which man is held by justice, and which cannot be made otherwise than by penance. Hence the Fathers of the Council of Trent, in the places cited above, declare the necessity of contrition partly from the divine law, partly from the ratio of the end—especially where, in ch. 1 of Session 14, they intimate to us a certain and fixed ordinance of God Himself, whereby He has established that He will remit sin to no one, and receive him into His grace and to a share of glory, unless he first repent of his sin.²⁰ Whence it is rightly concluded that, according to the ordinary power (as they call it) of God, it is impossible that God remit sin to the impenitent man—that is, to one who does not first grieve for the offense of God, detest his sin, and propose to change his life for the better. Hence neither in Baptism is sin remitted to any adult without previous penance, since Peter's sentence is clear (Acts 2): "Do penance, and let each one of you be baptized"; and the Tridentine Synod teaches the same expressly in both the places just now cited.²¹

§ 12. Wherefore also Christ, although without a sacrament, yet not without penance, remitted men's sins. For when He said to the paralytic, "Your sins are forgiven you," and to the adulteress, "Neither do I condemn you," one must suppose that already beforehand He was working the sorrow of contrition in their hearts before He spoke these words to them—just as certainly He did in the sinful woman and in the thief hanging on the cross; for in these there was manifest the penance that preceded.²² Therefore what some have taught—that no good motion of the will is required beforehand for receiving the remission of sins in him who approaches the sacrament, but that it is enough if he do not set up an obstacle by an act contrary—by no means seems to stand with this sound doctrine about contrition and its necessity. Hence also the Council (the said Session, ch. 4) not only affirms that the movement of contrition has at all times been necessary for obtaining pardon of sins even for the baptized, but also repels that calumny of the heretics, as if the Catholics taught that the sacrament of Penance confers grace without any good motion on the part of those receiving it; "which the Church of God," it says, "has never taught nor held."²

§ III — Concerning for which sins contrition is required (De quibus peccatis contritio requiratur)

§ 13. To the question which is asked—concerning for which sins contrition (*contritio*) is necessarily required, that is, for which one ought to repent (*poenitere*), in order that we may obtain their remission—one must answer first that only for one's own and past sins is penance (*poenitentia*) or contrition required. For penance, according to its proper notion, regards only some deed done or omitted by him whom we say to repent, inasmuch as it strives to destroy or correct that deed; contrition likewise signifies a hatred of the sin committed by him who purposes not to sin further. Wherefore, although others' sins, as also our future sins, ought to displease us, yet because they have not been perpetrated by us, our penance has no place in them. But neither do sadnesses over the punishments or miseries whatsoever that follow upon sins furnish matter for penance: contrition has only the evil of fault, that is, sin, for its object. Hence, although evils of punishment sadden a man and affect him with pain, and for that reason are matter of patience, yet, inasmuch as they do not involve fault, they cannot and ought not to be matter of penance. Therefore what is read in St. Augustine (Homily 50—which is the same as the book *On the Medicine of Penance*, ch. 3)—namely, that no one desires eternal, incorruptible, immortal life, unless he repents of this temporal life, corruptible and mortal, is rightly understood as that penance is to be done for this mortal and corruptible life, not by reason of its mortality and corruptibility, but by reason of the sins which are the causes of death and of the corruption and miseries of this life.²⁴ Whence (in the preceding chapter), in different words but with the same sense, he had said that no one is able to begin that true new life unless he repent of the old life, so as to embrace the new. But as to that which David, as a penitent, prays (in Ps. 18): "From strangers spare thy servant," although it can be understood of sins, nevertheless properly and to the letter it is to be taken of evil men who are strangers, or—as St. Jerome translates from the Hebrew—of "the proud," from whose dominion the Prophet begs to be delivered.²⁵ Hence it follows in the masculine gender: "If they shall not have dominion over me, then shall I be undefiled; and I shall be cleansed from the greatest sin." If, however, it be taken of sins, "strange" sins will be understood not as strange, but as ours, inasmuch as they are ours either by command, or by consent, or in a like way.

§ 14. Now to come to our own and actual sins, of which some are mortal, others venial: a diligent distinction must be made between them as regards the necessity of penance or contrition. We shall explain this matter by several points of doctrine, the first of which is: Not only for mortal sins, but also for venial ones some penance is required. St. Augustine teaches this expressly in many places (as in Homilies 37, 69, 50, and Epistle 108), in which he distinguishes three acts of penance: the first for those to be baptized; the second for the relapsed; the third to be done for daily and slight sins—each of which he also proves from the Scriptures. And St. Jerome likewise wrote of penance as necessary for the just man for daily sins.²⁶ Thus he speaks (Ep. 46 to Rusticus, ch. 4): "Seven times the just man falls, and he shall rise again. If he falls, how is he just? if he is just, how does he fall? Yet he does not lose the name of just who always rises again by penance."²⁷ Second: For a mortal sin a more perfect penance is required than for a venial. Augustine teaches this in the same places, and it is attested in the prayer of Manasses, saying that God did not impose upon the just the sort of penance which upon the unjust. The clear rationale of this is the infinite distance of mortal from venial sin: for mortal sin makes a man an enemy to God and turned away from God, and liable to eternal damnation; not so a venial. Third: For the remission of a mortal sin it is required that a man actually detest it. This is sufficiently proved from those things which above were said about the necessity of contrition, and it will presently be

more fully explained. Fourth: For the remission of venial sins their actual detestation is not necessarily required; yet neither does their habitual displeasure suffice, which is had through charity or the virtue of penance; but a virtual displeasure is required and suffices. The first part of this doctrine is proved because the remission of venials does not necessarily require an examination and scrutiny of conscience concerning each single sin, as the remission of mortals does. The second, because if the habit sufficed, no one endowed with charity would have any venial sin. The third, from the sufficient division of displeasure into actual, habitual, and virtual. We call that displeasure virtual when one is borne toward God with such an affection that, if such a sin were to occur actually to his thought, it would displease him and he would be sorry to have committed it. Fifth: This same virtual displeasure suffices for the remission of forgotten mortal sins, that is, of those which do not return to memory even when a diligent inquiry has been made. The reason of this assertion is that in that case an actual displeasure is held to be impossible—namely, concerning those whose actual recollection cannot be had—yet not for this is one to be excluded from the hope of pardon because he committed them: it necessarily follows that, for blotting them out, a virtual displeasure is accepted by God as sufficient.

***§ IV — Whether in some case, as of martyrdom, virtual contrition suffices
(Utrum in aliquo casu ut Martyrii sufficiat virtualis contritio)***

§ 15. Concerning the foregoing doctrine someone will ask—since it has been said that for the remission of mortal sin an actual detestation of it is required (which, from those things that elsewhere have been handed down about the necessity of penance and contrition, we have left manifest): for the Scriptures, from which that necessity is established, cannot all be wrested to a virtual detestation of sin unless with sheer violence, as when it is said, "Do penance," "Rend your hearts," "Unless you shall have done penance, you shall all likewise perish," and other suchlike sayings; then too, unless actual penance be acknowledged to be necessary, one will come very near to the condemned paradox of Luther, "The best penance is a new life," since a new life includes in its virtue the flight from and detestation of the old; finally, neither can the doctrine of the Councils of Trent and Florence, indeed of all antiquity, which requires contrition from penitents, be understood otherwise than of an actual sorrow, hatred, detestation of sins—whether that doctrine is also to be extended to those who are snatched away to martyrdom.

§ 16. Most think that it is to be extended to them also, on account of the general necessity of contrition, of which the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 4) says that the motion of contrition has at every time been necessary for obtaining pardon of sins. And (ch. 1) that penance has been necessary at every time for all men who had stained themselves with some mortal sin—even for those to be baptized—in order that they should detest God's offense with hatred of sin.²⁹ Therefore, these say, the act of martyrdom, which is the act of perfect charity—according to that: "Greater charity than this no man has" (Jn. 15)—in him who has sinned mortally cannot be without penance, that is, without a present actual detestation of the crime.³⁰ To whom it is objected that someone can be snatched away to martyrdom so suddenly, and his mind be so wholly occupied about that act of fortitude, especially if death be immediately inflicted, that recollections of sins do not present themselves to his memory. Wherefore by others it is not improbably asserted that for him who is hurried to martyrdom, if the solicitude of the contest and the fervor of actual love of God impede an actual motion of contrition, a virtual penance suffices for the remission of sin. They confirm this from the promise of salvation made to the confession of Christ made before men, indicated in those words (Matt. 10): "Whosoever shall confess me before men," etc.; next, from the fact that formerly infants not circumcised were apt for

martyrdom, and by a like parity now infants not baptized could be crowned by martyrdom. Whence it appears that much more in adults the act of eminent charity, whereby they undergo martyrdom, suffices, even without an actual sorrow of penance, for obtaining pardon and a crown. To these they add the authority of Chrysostom, who (in Sermon 29 on Penance) bears witness that martyrdom has no need of penance for a past sin. "For as," he says, "the light of day does not seek a lamp, so the justice of a martyr shines before God without penance." Likewise of Augustine, who in book 2 (Against the Donatists, ch. 18) says that in Cyprian that error about re-baptizing heretics was purged away by the sickle of his passion. And yet Augustine himself confesses (in the same book, ch. 5) that he judges Cyprian to have persisted in that error even to the end of life.³¹

§ 17. But to these things an answer could not inconveniently be given: that that error in Cyprian was not deadly, as being without pertinacity—because that matter had not yet then been fully discussed; that Chrysostom is speaking of a certain mode of penance, such as, to be sure, is required of those who have relapsed; that likewise the argument from infants does not prove anything, because they had no sin of their own act, but only original sin, for which no penance is to be done; that the sentence of Christ presupposes that which the Scriptures everywhere inculcate and demand, namely penance or contrition for sins committed—and that an actual one. If, however, to someone this latter opinion, which is handed down by Scotus, Gabriel, and Domingo de Soto, should seem to be embraced as more probable, he will be able to reply to the arguments of the contrary opinion that the Scriptures and the sentences of the Fathers which require an act of contrition are to be understood of those sins from the recollecting of which the sinner is excluded by no necessity or just reason.³² Whence, just as for the remission of forgotten crimes virtual penance suffices, as we said above, so it can be said of those sins which do not occur to the memory of the martyr placed in the agony of his passion, for the reason that, if not by necessity, at least by a just reason he is impeded in that crisis from remembering sins and examining his conscience. For the act of martyrdom requires a mind with fervent and continuous love of God, and hope, to overcome torments and the terrors of death, which is of all things the most terrible. Wherefore it does not behoove that man, in his actual intention, to be called away by anything else.

§ 18. Furthermore, from these things it also appears that one must not despair of the salvation of him who, with only a virtual contrition had, whether sleeping or even awake, is so oppressed by sudden death that he could not actually think either of sins or of any other matter. But if someone has a span for thinking so small that he cannot in detail review his sins, knowing meanwhile that he has sinned mortally, it seems in that case that a contrition for sins in general suffices for salvation. The reason for this is that, as long as a man is alive and has the use of will, even if he survive for a very brief time, he is not to be despaired of; and therefore neither is it to be denied that, even in so small a span of time, by true penance he can be converted to the Lord and obtain salvation. Wherefore in that case, since a special contrition cannot be had, a general one will suffice.

§ V — Whether for individual sins a singular contrition is required (Utrum de singulis peccatis singularis exigatur contritio)

§ 19. A further question is commonly raised, whether for individual mortal sins a sinner ought to be contrite severally and one by one, so that as many distinct affirmations of contrition (*contritio*) are required as there are sins—an opinion which certain of the older Scholastics seem to hold on the affirmative side, although they do

not assert it so expressly. It is supported by arguments of this sort. First. It is said in the person of the penitent: "I will recount to Thee all my years in the bitterness of my soul" (Is. 38); therefore, just as all are to be reviewed one by one, so to each there is to be applied the bitterness of contrition. Second. Confession ought to be made one by one of individual sins; therefore so too contrition. For the confession of the mouth ought to have conjoined with it the contrition of the heart. Third. Gregory, writing on the fifth penitential Psalm, requires compunction for whatever individual sins, and this, as it seems, singular; for thus he subjoins: "The elect, indeed, are wont to bring back the gaze of the mind to those sins of which they are conscious to themselves, and, the modes and causes of them having been surveyed by a consideration taken one by one, to bewail also the individual sins; in order that in this way they may prepare for their heart a dwelling, while for each several excess of their error they make lamentation. Hence, 'Mine eye ...' For to draw down 'divisions of waters' with the eyes is to assign divided tears to each individual sin, and to compensate the joys of iniquity with the sorrows of satisfaction; so that while now the memory of this, now of that, offense touches the mind more sharply, at the same time, being stirred by all the individual ones, it may be cleansed." These are Gregory's words; and things like them are read in book 8 of the *Moralia*, ch. 11.³⁴ Fourth. Augustine in the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 14 (and it is found in Gratian, *De Penance*, dist. 5, cap. Consideret), wishes the individual circumstances of sins to be meditated on with sorrow; therefore much more is this required in the case of individual sins.³⁵ Fifth. The Catechism for Parish Priests wishes the faithful to be very greatly exhorted and warned to strive to apply a proper sorrow of contrition to individual mortal crimes; and it proves this by one and another place of Scripture, namely Is. 38 and Ezek. 18.³⁶ They furthermore adduce several testimonies of Chrysostom, by which he seems to require this special contrition for individual crimes, as in Homily 42 on Matthew, Homily 31 on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Homily 41 to the People of Antioch; likewise in book 2 *On the Compunction of the Heart*, and in a certain Sermon on Penance and Confession.³⁷

§ 20. But indeed, if this doctrine be understood in such wise that to individual sins according to number there ought to correspond individual contritions, its impossibility at once appears. For, to take an example, a penitent harlot is not bound to form as many contritions in number as she committed acts of unchastity; because neither is she bound to turn over in memory all those acts one by one—indeed, it is not expedient—but it suffices that she know and think the number in general. But if it be understood of individual sins according to species, this is indeed more probable. And assuredly it is altogether expedient to be contrite for individual sins, not only according to species, but also according to number, unless something else stand in the way, one by one. Yet this does not appear to be necessary for salvation, but it seems to suffice that, all sins being recalled to memory as far as can be done, contrition be borne collectively upon them all. If this be done, the man is truly made a penitent; penance is indeed required as necessary, and contrition for individual sins, yet not a singular contrition. Nor do the Scriptures prove more than that it is necessary for a man to be sorry for individual sins, even if this be done not by distinct acts but by one movement of contrition. To the second argument it is answered that it is not necessary that confession, through all its several parts, be conjoined with an actual contrition; then too, it is not necessary that confession be made severally of individual sins according to number, since the sinner can—and sometimes ought—under one number to comprise many, by saying: ten times, or a hundred times, I have done this. The authorities adduced from the Fathers partly teach that one must grieve for individual sins either according to number or according to species—for Chrysostom (Homily 42 on Matthew) names species—yet they do not require distinct acts; partly they show, not what is absolutely necessary, but what the more perfect are wont to do, and to what deeds the faithful are to be exhorted.

§ VI — Whether contrition is to be had for original sin (An de originali peccato habenda sit contritio)

§ 21. It is also wont to be asked whether a man ought to repent or be contrite (*paenitere seu conteri*) for original sin (*peccatum originale*), whether remitted, as after Baptism, or not yet remitted, as before Baptism. For it can seem so. First, because that sin has the true and proper formal character (*ratio*) of sin, and it is in each one as his own, as the Council of Trent defined.³⁹ But penance (*poenitentia*) is to be done for one's own and properly so called sins. Second: because a catechumen ought to have displeasure for original sin out of love of justice with a zeal for pleasing God and for destroying sin—in which the whole formal character of contrition (*contritio*) is contained. Third: St. Augustine says that those approaching Baptism ought to do penance for their former life, under which he also includes original sin.⁴⁰

§ 22. And this is clear also from this, that from that penance he excepts infants alone, for whom he says that for the remission of original sin the faith of those by whom they are presented suffices. And in the same place he says that this corruption of life and the matter for sinning ought also to be bewailed—namely the tinder of sin left in us, by which we are continually solicited to sin—this he signifies.⁴¹ The same Augustine, in the book *On Rebuke and Grace*, wishes that a man be rebuked on account of original sin: "Let the damnable origin be rebuked, so that from the sorrow of the rebuke the will of regeneration may arise." But no one is rightly rebuked except for that over which he ought himself to repent.⁴² Likewise the author of the book *On True and False Penance* shows that even original sin is included among those sins for which penance is to be done.⁴³

§ 23. The question is briefly answered thus: if penance and contrition be taken properly and specifically, a man neither ought nor is able to repent or to be contrite for original sin. For, as we said above, penance properly so called regards only a man's own deed, according to what the Poet says: "I repent and am tormented by my own deed." And the same judgment holds of contrition. Although therefore original sin is proper to each and has the proper formal character of sin, nevertheless it was not committed by each by his own proper action, but contracted by generation from his parents; and therefore there is not a proper penance for it. Bernard signified this, denying that penance had any place in the Blessed Virgin, because she never had any stain of her own.⁴⁴ For that she had original [sin] is Bernard's own opinion; therefore, according to him, there is no penance for original sin. Likewise St. Bonaventure, alleging Bernard's testimony, says: "Mary had no personal fault, and thus from her most innocent heart penance also was far away. For whence ought Mary's heart to have repented, since she never committed anything deserving penance?"⁴⁵

§ 24. But if you take penance more generally, namely for the hatred or displeasure which one has for his own evil of fault, whether he committed it by his own will or not, then it is rightly and truly said that one can, indeed that each ought, to repent or be contrite for original sin—in this sense, because it ought to displease a man as his own sin, and he ought to grieve that he was born such, saying with the Psalmist: "Ecce enim in iniquitatibus conceptus sum, et in peccatis concepit me mater mea" (Ps. 50), and with the Apostle: "Infelix ego homo," etc. (Rom. 7); and, moreover, he ought to strive to destroy it, and utterly to abolish its remnants, that is, the tinder of sin. Hence what St. Bonaventure says, that "it is fitting that a man's own original sin should displease him," seems said less sufficiently. More rightly St. Thomas, in this very same Distinction, simply asserts that such penance not only can be had, but ought to be had.⁴⁶ Nor does he retract or moderate this in the *Summa* (III, q. 84, a. 2, ad 3), as if there he had merely said that there can be penance for original

sin. For in that place he does not dispute whether penance for that sin can or ought to be had, but only teaches how we can use that word: "Insofar as penance is taken broadly for any detestation of a past thing, there can be said to be penance for original sin," as Augustine speaks in the book *On Penance*.⁴⁷

§ 25. It is therefore clear from these things, in what measure the arguments adduced for the affirmative side conclude, and how they are to be resolved, insofar as they are understood to conclude about penance properly so called. For when it is said that penance is to be done for one's own sins, "one's own" are understood as those which are of one's own action. To distinguish which, original sin is sometimes called by the Fathers "another's sin," not because it is not in us, but because it was done by another. Contrition too, in its proper formal character, has this, that a man be grieved for sins committed by himself. Augustine, however, uses the name "penance" generally for the hatred of one's own evil, both of punishment and of fault, together with the effort to destroy it. Likewise he teaches that the damnable origin is not to be rebuked in a man because each one made it for himself, nor because he was born in it, or has it—unless perhaps he has culpably delayed the grace of regeneration—but lest he should will to remain in its corruption, being unwilling to be freed from it by regeneration and by the pursuit of a holy life. Which is assuredly an evil of one's own will, and therefore to be chastised with the severity of correction.⁴⁸

§ VII — How great the pain of contrition ought to be (Contritionis dolor quantus esse debeat)

§ 26. Since the pain is twofold, one of the will (*voluntas*), the other of the sensitive appetite (*appetitus sensitivus*), it is sufficiently agreed among the Doctors that this pain which overflows into sense from the greatness of the pain that is in the will is not required to be supreme or maximal for a man to obtain, through contrition (*contritio*), the remission of sins. The reason for this is that that pain, since it belongs to the sensitive part, is for the most part stirred up more greatly and vehemently by sensible objects than by the will and reason, under whose command the sensitive appetite does not lie wholly subject. Hence it comes about that many, even though truly penitent, are not moved by a pain so sensible, nor do they elicit so many or so ready tears on account of sins committed and the offense of God, as they do from the injury of the body, from the loss of parents, of children, and of temporal goods. For the cause of this is nature itself, at least according to this state of corruption. Whence also at the beginning we said that this pain of sense is not absolutely necessary for repentance and the remission of sin. Yet penitents must be warned to strive to arouse this pain also in themselves, as David and Peter and the sinful woman of the Gospel, pouring forth a great force of tears (Ps. 6; Matt. 26; Lk. 7), and the other penitents whom Scripture commemorates, are read to have done.

§ 27. But concerning the pain of the will, which is contrition itself, in so far as it is necessarily required in order that by it the remission of sins may be had, the Doctors' opinions vary. For some say that to contrition is required the supreme endeavor of man, and therefore that the pain ought, according to the man's powers, to be as intensely as possible. Others require in contrition a certain definite degree of intensity, and also a certain quantity of extension or continuation. Others think otherwise.

§ 28. But with this variety of opinions omitted, we shall briefly set forth the things that seem to be to be advanced about this question. Of which this is the first, and therefore most certain. The pain of contrition ought to be the greatest of all pains appreciatively, as they say; that is, the sinner ought so to detest his sins that nothing in things should be so dear to him for the sake of which he would be willing to commit them again.

The reason for this is that the pain of contrition arises from the love of God above all, to whom nothing is to be preferred, nothing equaled. Wherefore the detestation of sin ought also to be so great that for the sake of no thing should it be committed. Hence, just as we are commanded to love God with the whole heart, that is, above all things, so we are commanded to depart from sin and to be converted to God with the whole heart, that is, to detest sin above all things (Deut. 6; Joel 2). For just as God is the Supreme Good, and therefore to be loved supremely, so sin is thence supremely the supreme evil, and therefore to be supremely detested.

§ 29. Second. It is not necessary that the pain of contrition be the greatest of all pains intensively. The reason is that the intensity of an act of the will follows the vehemence of the moving object; but a sensible object naturally moves the will more vehemently than an intelligible or spiritual object does. Hence, just as the love of sensible goods can be more intense than that of spiritual, so too the pain which is perceived from sensible evils can be more intense than that which is conceived on account of spiritual evils—of which sort sins are—and this without the man's fault, because, as we said, a man constituted in this corruptible body is moved more vehemently by sensible things, both good and evil, even if absolutely he neither loves nor detests them more, in the way said above, namely appreciatively. Moreover, this assertion is proved from Sacred Scripture, which does not require for true repentance a supreme endeavor, but that a man prefer God to all other things, detest sins before all things, depart from all sins, and be unwilling any longer to commit them (Ezek. 18; 33; and elsewhere). Add that if a supreme endeavor in contrition were necessarily required, a grave scruple would be injected into the consciences of penitents, who for the most part do not feel in themselves this supreme endeavor and maximal intensity, and it would not seem easy to them to satisfy themselves as to arousing it in themselves. Finally, neither does the usage of the Church have it that the pain of contrition be required of penitents in the highest degree of intensity, according to what the sinner can strive, but only that from the heart, on account of the offense of God, supremely loved, he grieve for sin.

§ 30. Third. In the pain of contrition there does not fall excess; that is, it does not happen that it is too much intensively. The reason is that that pain proceeds from love of God, for which there is set neither measure nor terminus. For, as St. Bernard says, around the middle of the book *On Loving God*: "The measure of loving God is to love Him without measure."⁵⁰ But this again must be understood of the pain which is in the will. For the pain of the sensitive part, as in other matters, so here too (although that happens most rarely) can be excessive and therefore vicious; as if someone so indulged tears and sorrow that he lost his eyes, or wasted away in body. This excess of sadness Scripture reproves (Prov. 17; Sir. 30 and 38).

§ 31. Fourth. Just as some sins are graver than others, so the sinner ought to grieve more for one than for another, in proportion to their gravity—more, I say, appreciatively. For intensively it is not necessary. But it is proved as follows: although all sins are to be so detested that for the sake of nothing should a man be willing to commit any of them, not even to avoid another sin, nevertheless he ought to flee more those by which God is more grievously offended, and therefore also for those committed to grieve more in the just-mentioned way, that is, appreciatively. Nor is it necessary that he grieve for them more intensively; because, just as without fault he can grieve more intensively for temporal evils than for sin, so too more for a lighter sin than for a graver, namely when there concur other causes which render the pain for the lesser sin more intense, as infamy, disgrace, loss, and the like.

§ 32. Fifth, and last. For the remission of guilt it is not necessarily required, on the part of contrition, that there be intensity up to some definite degree, nor extension to some definite time—namely, so that, if it be lacking, the sinner could not obtain pardon, not even with the sacrament supervening. Although this

assertion is disapproved by certain learned men, especially in its former part, in which it denies that intensity is necessarily required, nevertheless it can probably be established by these arguments. First. Scripture in many places simply and nakedly requires that the sinner be averted from his evil way and be converted to the Lord, adding nothing by which the intensity of that act be signified, by which either he is averted and grieves for sin, or is converted to the Lord; as in Zechariah 1: "Be converted to me, and I will be converted to you"; in Isaiah 30: "If you return and quiet yourselves, you shall be saved," where the Septuagint has: "When you shall have been converted and groaned, you shall be saved"; and ch. 45: "Be converted to me and you shall be saved." Ps. 50: "A contrite and humbled heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Ezek. 18: "If the impious shall have done repentance from all his sins, he shall surely live, he shall not die"; and ch. 33: "I will not the death of the impious, but rather that the impious be converted from his way and live"; and again: "The impiety of the impious shall not hurt him, in whatever day he shall have been converted from his impiety." Likewise the Lord (in Jn. 14) says: "He who loves me shall be loved by my Father." But the bare name of conversion includes no intensity or extension, but signifies a simple movement of mind from sin to God; the same judgment is to be made of the word of love. Therefore no intensity of that act is necessary for salvation.

§ 33. Second. God is more prone to mercy than to vengeance; but any aversion, however remiss, suffices to cast a man down from the grace of God; therefore any conversion will suffice for recovering that same grace.

§ 34. Third. Leo (Epistle 91 to Theodorus) requires only true conversion, expressly excluding even delay or extension of time: "For those," he says, "who in time of necessity and in the urgency of pressing peril implore the safeguard of penance and at once of reconciliation, neither ought satisfaction to be interdicted, nor reconciliation to be denied: because we are not able to set measures to the mercy of God, nor to define times to Him, with whom true conversion suffers no delays of pardon—the Spirit of God saying through the Prophet: 'When being converted thou shalt groan, then thou shalt be saved.' And again: 'Because with the Lord is mercy, and with Him plentiful redemption.'"⁵¹

§ 35. Fourth. Chrysostom in the little book *On the Restoration of the Fallen*, or Letter 5 to Theodorus the Lapsed (and it is had in Gratian, *On Penance*, distinction 3): "Such," he says, "is God's mercy toward men: He never spurns repentance, if it be offered to Him sincerely and simply." And a little after: "Even if someone has not been able to fulfill the whole order of satisfaction, nevertheless He does not reject the least repentance even accomplished in however brief a time; He even receives it; nor does He allow the reward of even the smallest conversion to perish."⁵²

§ 36. Lastly: if some extension of time were required, it would follow that it is impossible for a man, within an intervening space of time, to return into grace with God; and thus, if death should forestall him, it would be necessary that he perish; which is absurd to say—since it is not permissible to despair of a man in this life so long as he breathes.

§ VIII — Reply to the objections (Responsio ad objectiones)

§ 37. But the things that are objected against this opinion are for the most part of this sort. First: God is to be loved not only above the rest, but also more than the rest, namely intensively, according to that saying (Matt. 10): "He who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me"; and Luke 14: "He who does not hate — that is, in comparison with Me, loves less— father and mother, cannot be My disciple." Whence St. Augustine in Book I of *On Christian Doctrine*, ch. 22, and in the book *On the Manners of the Church*, ch.

11, teaches that it pertains to ordered love (*amor*), that a man love nothing more, nothing equally, than God, etc.⁵⁴ Second: the Scriptures require of sinners some great effort of contrition (*contritio*) or sorrow; as in Ps. 37: "I roared with the groaning of my heart"; Is. 59: "We shall roar all of us like bears, and like a dove we shall moan meditating"; Mic. 4: "Be in pain and labor, daughter of Zion, as one giving birth." To this pertains also the word "bitterness" (in the song of Hezekiah and in Jer. 31). For as fervor signifies an intense heat, so in the Scriptures "bitterness," metaphorically, signifies an intense and vehement sorrow. Such also is that word spoken to penitents (Matt. 11): "The kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and the violent seize it." For "violence" seems to import the greatness of an effort. Third: the love of God ought to be more perfect than love of other things; therefore also more intense; since the perfection of qualities and acts seems to be taken from nothing else than intensity or greater effort. In like manner, therefore, the detestation (*detestatio*) of sin, as more perfect, ought also to be more intense than the detestation of any other evil whatsoever. Fourth: Scripture commands not only the love of God, but also progress in love (Eph. 4; Phil. 1 and 3; and Rev. at the end); and that progress, indeed, is according to acts that are more fervent and more intense; therefore it is not enough appetitatively to love God above all, and to hate sin above all; the intensity of the acts themselves is also required, otherwise there will be no progress. Fifth: that saying (Deut. 4): "When you shall seek the Lord your God, you shall find Him: if indeed you shall seek Him with your whole heart and with all the tribulation of your soul"; and that of Ps. 118: "Blessed are they who seek Him with the whole heart"; and "Me with your whole heart" (Jer. 29). Lastly, they object that this doctrine is useless, indeed harmful, for the reason that it relaxes and makes to languish the affection and zeal of penance; inasmuch as it has the sinner persuaded that no intensity, no effort is needed in order truly to do penance, but that a very small love of God and displeasure at sin suffice.

§ 38. But to these things one can answer. To the first: that it is implicitly contained in the precept, that God be loved more than the rest, that is, before the rest; but that this be done with a greater intensity and effort is not seen to be proved from the Scriptural places and the passages of Augustine proposed. Nevertheless, because it cannot be denied that this is disordered— that a rational will be carried by a more intense love to a creature than to the Creator, and that it hate any other evil more intensely than sin— just as it is disordered that the flesh lust against the spirit, and that the lower part of the soul not be fully subject to the higher (which all descend from the corruption of nature through the sin of the first man; for in the state of innocence nothing of this sort would have been), we can also say that that defect of greater intensity in us is indeed vicious, yet not culpable, at least mortally: because in this state of the infirmity of nature God does not exact from us that greater intensity, at least under pain of mortal sin; and therefore nothing hinders but that true and sincere love and contrition, however remiss otherwise, can suffice the sinner for obtaining pardon.

§ 39. To the second: the Scriptures partly command, partly exhort, partly set forth examples. They set forth examples of those who have done penance in a certain perfect and excellent way— of David, of Peter, of the sinful woman— and they exhort to the like. But they command two things: one which is necessary for the remission of guilt, namely true conversion; the other which is necessary for the remission of penalty, namely congruous satisfaction (*satisfactio*), for the completion of which, what is lacking on the side of the work is often compensated by the vehemence of sorrow. Therefore intense and vehement sorrow is commanded on account of satisfaction, and yet not as absolutely necessary: for satisfaction can also be completed in the end through other works, as prayers, fasts, alms; but [intense sorrow is commanded] as the most apt means for paying the whole penalty more speedily.

§ 40. To the third: the perfection of qualities and acts is not to be estimated only from intensity, but also from the sheer choice of the will, whereby in loving God a man prefers Him to all.

§ 41. To the fourth: the precepts of conversion to God are different from those of progress in justice; of which the former is given to the sinner that he may become just; but the latter to the just man that he may grow in justice. And accordingly it does not follow that for first justification some progress is required as for second; but what is commanded to the sinner suffices, namely true conversion.

§ 42. To the fifth we reply that we indicated a little above, and have more fully expounded (at Distinction 27 of Book 3), how that phrase "with the whole heart," or "in the whole heart," is taken in Sacred Scripture.⁵⁵ For as he loves God with the whole heart who so loves God that he prefers Him to all others, so the sinner seeks God with the whole heart and in the whole tribulation of his soul, and he is converted to God with his whole heart when, loving God above all, he grieves for sin and is afflicted as for an evil which, from that supreme love of God, he supremely— that is, before all evils— detests.

§ 43. To the last: this doctrine, well understood, does not foster the sloth of penitents, but rather consoles doubtful consciences and lifts them into hope, while it hands on, according to the Scriptures, that to all sinners who are sincerely converted to God, and from the soul detest sin, and do not refuse the discipline of ecclesiastical satisfaction, there is open, through the absolution of the priest, a return into grace with God. A different doctrine seems to have greater disadvantages, as was said above.

§ IX — What attrition is and how it differs from contrition (Quid attritio & quomodo differat a contritione)

§ 44. The name "attrition" was unknown to Scripture and to the Fathers, and was devised by the Doctors of the Schools for the sake of distinction and of doctrine, to signify sorrow for sin, or a certain imperfect penitence. For just as in corporeal things that is said to be "bruised" which is in some way hurt or worn down only outwardly, or rubbed; but that "crushed" which is reduced, within and without, into the least fragments: so in spiritual things attrition, as they have called it, is a certain imperfect penitence advanced only to a point; contrition, however, intimate and perfect penitence.

§ 45. Now attrition (that is, imperfect penitence) can be understood in several ways. In one way, when someone is sorry that he has sinned on account of certain human and natural inducements to penitence; for instance, on account of the turpitude conjoined to sin, or the infamy consequent upon it, or any other temporal loss or punishment whatsoever; or because he understands that what he has done is against reason and honesty; or because he sees that by it he displeases his parents, his friends, or honorable men. This kind of penitence can be had by the powers of nature alone, and is also found among unbelievers. Such was the penitence of Antiochus (2 Macc. 9). In another way, when someone is sorry for sin on account of fear of hell prepared for sinners, that is, of an eternal and spiritual punishment, which he recognizes by the illumination of the light of faith alone. This sorrow, just as the fear of hell, is a gift of God, and is found only in believers. In a third way, when someone is sorry for sin on account of the offense of God, yet not with an absolute and efficacious will, but with only a suspended and optative will; whereby, to wit, he would wish to leave sin and the inclination to sin, and to please God, yet he does not leave sin, nor does he simply lay aside the inclination to sin, nor does he do those things without which he cannot please God. Such imperfect will is commonly called "velleity," such as usurers and concubinarians sometimes have while nevertheless remaining in the state

of sin. Lastly, when someone is sorry for sin because he has offended God, and absolutely proposes not to sin hereafter, but he does this with an imperfect, relaxed, and weak will. Perhaps other modes of attrition could also be adduced; for instance, by distinguishing an actual and a virtual purpose of amendment, likewise one's own and a confused purpose. For there will be a certain imperfect penitence if the sinner has only a virtual or only a confused purpose of avoiding sin hereafter. But these modes seem to be reducible to the third or the fourth.

§ 46. Therefore, that we may compare the foregoing modes of attrition with contrition, of which there has been treatment above: the attrition of the first kind is neither contrition nor in any way sufficient, even with the Sacrament supervening, to reconcile a man to God. The manifest reason of which is that otherwise it would follow that by the powers of nature alone the sinner could sufficiently dispose himself to receive the effect of the sacrament— which does not seem able to be said without error. Likewise the attrition of the second kind is not true contrition; nor, accordingly, is it sufficient to obtain the remission of sin. For although fear of hell is indeed a gift of God, it nevertheless does not sufficiently prepare a man for obtaining remission of sin through the sacrament of penitence, because of itself it does not suffice to exclude every will to sin, as is evident from what was said in Book 3 about servile fear. Wherefore, unless there come in the love of justice, and the love of God above all things and the detestation of sin undertaken on account of God's offense, that fear cannot lead a man to the friendship of God.⁵⁷ Moreover, the attrition of the third kind, although it has some regard to God's offense, nevertheless, because it does not bring with it an absolute purpose of abandoning sin, manifestly falls short of the formal character (*ratio*) of true contrition.

§ 47. Now all these things can be sufficiently shown from what above was said about contrition and its necessity. For since God is to be loved as supremely beloved and preferred to all things, which in this kind of attrition is not found, it is evident that each of these kinds is different from contrition. Since, moreover, it has been shown that contrition is necessary for the remission of sin, it also follows that none of this triple kind of attrition, not even with the sacrament supervening, suffices to obtain the pardon of sin. Therefore, testimonies of Scripture avail to prove this, Ezek. 18: "Convertimini, agite poenitentiam ab omnibus iniquitatibus vestris, et non erit vobis in ruinam iniquitas," and 33: "Si impius non fuerit conversus a via sua mala, ipse in iniquitate sua morietur." Likewise Joel 2: "Convertimini ad me in toto corde vestro," and again: "Scindite corda vestra, et convertimini ad Dominum, qui benignus et misericors est." So also Deut. 4: "Cum quaesieris Dominum Deum," and Jer. 29: "Quaeritis me et invenietis, cum quaesieritis me in toto corde vestro," and 3 Kgs 8: "Si peccaverint tibi, et reversi fuerint ad te in universo corde suo, tu propitiaberis populo tuo." And other suchlike almost without number. So too in the Scripture of the New Testament (Acts 3): "Poenitemini, et convertimini, ut deleantur peccata vestra." 2 Cor. 7: "Quae secundum Deum tristitia est, poenitentiam in salutem stabilem operatur." And again Acts 8: "Cor enim tuum non est rectum coram Deo. Poenitentiam itaque age ab hac nequitia tua, et roga Deum si forte remittatur," etc. Likewise Jn. 14: "Qui diligit me, diligetur a Patre meo," and 1 Jn. 3: "Qui non diligit, manet in morte"; 1 Cor. at the end: "Si quis non amat Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sit anathema." And again Jn. 12: "Qui amat animam suam, perdet eam," and Matt. 10: "Qui amat patrem aut matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus." To this pertains what Leo requires (Epistle 91) in a penitent for whom there is lacking the time for the fulfillment of satisfaction— at the least, true conversion, just as also St. John Chrysostom in the Treatise On the Restoration of the Fallen. And what St. Augustine says (Sermon 7 de Tempore): "Only the love of God makes penitence sure, by the hatred of sin."⁵⁸ Although other such statements not rarely occur in the writings of the Fathers.

§ 48. In these testimonies of Scripture and the Fathers the following are to be observed. First, that it is necessary to depart from all iniquities or sins in order that sins may be remitted. Then, that conversion, and true conversion, and conversion from the whole heart are everywhere taken as the same; and that this is required of the sinner as necessary if he is to be reconciled to God. Third, that sorrow according to God is required, that is, sorrow for sin on account of God being offended. Fourth, uprightness of heart toward God. Finally, that God be loved not in any way whatsoever, but above all others. For it is manifest that this love is signified in the Scriptural passages cited. Wherefore from these it is easy to conclude that neither the attrition of the first nor of the second nor of the third kind suffices for a man wishing to be reconciled to God, because in none of them is really found what we said here must be observed as necessarily requisite.

§ 49. Moreover, the attrition of the last kind is true contrition and— with the sacrament supervening— suffices for reconciliation; indeed even without the sacrament, when the necessity of danger of death excludes the reception of the sacraments. That it is true contrition is easily proved from those things which we said above to be necessarily required by the formal character (*ratio*) of contrition. But that it suffices for reconciliation in the said way is clear from the things we said about the quantity of contrition, where among other things we showed probably that no degree of intensity is absolutely necessary for the remission of guilt. This kind of attrition the Fathers of the Council of Trent seem wholly to have understood (Session 14, ch. 4), where they speak thus: that "that imperfect contrition which is called attrition, since it is commonly conceived either from the consideration of the turpitude of sin or from fear of hell and punishments, if it exclude the will to sin with the hope of pardon, the Holy Synod declares, not only does not make a man a hypocrite and more a sinner, but is even a gift of God and an impulse of the Holy Spirit— not yet indeed of one indwelling, but only moving— whereby the penitent, aided, prepares his way for justice. And although without the sacrament of penitence it cannot of itself lead the sinner to justification; nevertheless it disposes him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penitence. For with this fear the Ninevites, profitably smitten by terrors at the preaching of Jonah, did penitence and obtained mercy from the Lord." These same Fathers also (in canon 5 of the same session) absolutely call this sorrow of the penitent "contrition." In both places, however, it is to be noted that in the decree it expressly excludes the will to sin, but in the Canon it includes and requires the purpose of a better life.⁵⁹ By which from this imperfect contrition (which one may also call perfect attrition) every such attrition is removed as is born of fear alone either of temporal or of eternal and spiritual loss or punishment. For as servile fear does not correct the will, so too it does not correct the will to sin. Hence St. Augustine says (14 De Verbis Apostoli): "He who does not lust because of fear of punishment, I think he does lust." And (in Epistle 144): "He is an enemy of justice who does not sin for fear of punishment."⁶⁰ It is necessary, therefore, that the will not to sin, and the purpose of a better life, should set God before all things. Otherwise, if not by an actual motion, at least in affection and in habit one persists in sin, while something is still loved above God, and something is feared more than the offense of God.

§ 50. But that the Fathers of Trent require this love of God above all things as a disposition necessarily prior to justification, is evident not only from Session 6, ch. 6, where they will that the sinner, before he is justified, should begin to love God as the fount of all justice, and that he propose to begin a new life and to keep the divine commandments, but also from canon 3 of the same session, where it is presupposed that a man must believe, hope, love, and repent as he ought, in order that the grace of justification be conferred upon him. But to love God "as one ought" is, by loving God, to set Him before all things.

§ 51. Nor does it stand in the way that Augustine in the book *On Instructing Beginners* (ch. 17), distinguishing three kinds of men who come to the faith, says that the third kind is of those who become Christians on account of the beatitude and everlasting rest which is promised as to be for the saints after this life, so that they may not go into eternal fire with the Devil but may enter into the eternal Kingdom with Christ, and of this kind he says: "He is truly the Christian who in every temptation," etc.; and then he subjoins: "Who also by making progress may come to such a mind as to love the Lord more than to fear hell, so that even if God should say to him: 'Use carnal delights forever; sin as much as you can; neither will you die nor will you be sent into hell, but only you will not be with me' — he should shudder and by no means sin, no longer lest he fall into that which he feared, but lest he offend Him whom he thus loves," etc. This, I say, Augustine indeed. Yet by "truly a Christian" he does not mean one who has sufficient preparation such that in Baptism his sins are remitted— for truly these things are to be taken as said probably of one already baptized, since only the baptized are called faithful and Christians— but one who does not follow the Christian faith for the sake of temporal advantage which he hopes or temporal disadvantage which he fears, but for the hope of eternal beatitude and fear of eternal punishment— yet in such a way that fear of punishment is still predominant over the love of justice; who nevertheless makes such progress that, as Augustine says, he loves the Lord more than he fears hell, and then at length he is apt for the friendship of God through the remission of sins. But Augustine's statement can also not improbably be understood of one who, even if as to esteem he already sets God before, nonetheless not yet as to intensity does he love Him more than he fears hell; of which kind we must suppose that very many among Christians are, God-fearing, of whom nevertheless the greater part at length come to that disposition, so that even as to intensity the love of God outstrips the fear of hell, and they be so strong that they can also overcome the temptation of the offered option which Augustine posits. And this interpretation certainly of Augustine's words pleases me more.

§ 52. From these things it is clear, moreover, that the opinion of certain men, such as Scotus, Gabriel, and Cajetan, is to be disapproved— who thought that for the grace to be received in the sacrament of Baptism or of Penance it suffices to have the will of receiving the sacrament in the way it is dispensed in the Church, provided only that there be not placed the obstacle of mortal sin in act. For he who approaches is so far from being turned to the Lord with his whole heart— which we have sufficiently shown to be altogether necessary for obtaining pardon in any way— that indeed he is sorry for sin on account of fear of hell, but abiding in affection in sin, he is only not actually engaged in it, in the way that every criminal while sleeping stands away from the act of sin. But to Scotus's argument, objecting that otherwise by the institution of the sacrament little would seem to have been granted to us, but rather the way of salvation to seem to have been made more strait, inasmuch as even without the sacrament one can obtain remission of sin, it is answered that much has been granted to us, not that there may be a twofold way by which the sinner is justified, as he would have it, but that through the sacrament in a certain manner we may be made sure and secure concerning reconciliation and the grace of God— which, although it sometimes happens without the sacrament, yet not without its votum. On which matter more in what follows.

§ X — That sin is not remitted by contrition of the heart alone (Non remitti peccatum per solam cordis Contritionem)

§ 53. The doctrine of the Master (of the Sentences) in this Distinction and the following is that sins are blotted out by contrition of the heart alone without confession of the mouth. For from the moment, he says,

that someone proposes in a heart pierced with compunction that he will confess, God remits, because there is confession of the heart, even if not of the mouth, by which the soul is inwardly cleansed from the stain and contagion of the sin committed and the debt of eternal death is relaxed. This opinion of the Master some of the Scholastics, among whom St. Bonaventure, followed. These seem to have thought that sacramental confession and absolution are required only for the remission of sin in the same way as the other things which are commanded of men by God. For just as sin is not remitted except to one proposing to keep all God's commandments which bind to the guilt of mortal fault, so they thought it is not remitted except to one proposing that he will confess and will seek absolution from the Priest; because Christ likewise commanded that these things be done as necessary to salvation. Whence consequently the Master interprets absolution as the declaration of an absolution made by God. But this doctrine— as false and erroneous, and as contrary to the institution of the sacrament of Penance and even of Baptism— was deservedly rejected by the more and sounder part of the Doctors, indeed by the whole Church in the Council of Trent (Session 14, can. 9; chs. 4–6).⁶²

§ 54. The foundation of this error seems to have been this: that true contrition, that is, penitence, cannot be separated from the remission of sins, but that this is joined to that of itself and necessarily. But this foundation is destroyed by another more solid one, namely this: that the remission of no sin can take place unless by the power of the Passion of Christ, insofar as it is satisfactory for the punishment of that sin. Wherefore it is not sufficient for the remission of sin to have penitence; but besides, it is necessary that the merit of the Passion of Christ be applied to us for the remission of the punishment due on account of sin. Wherefore it does not suffice that the sinner has contrition, unless, moreover, there be a special application to him of the Passion of Christ by which sins are remitted; which is effected through the sacraments instituted for that purpose.

§ 55. For the conversion, that is, the penitence, of the sinner and the condonation of his sin are different and distinct benefits of the Passion of Christ, so that to a man truly converted and penitent there is still need of a certain peculiar benefit from the Passion of Christ, that his sin be remitted to him— which indeed is done by applying to him the satisfaction made upon the Cross for the punishment due to his sin. For the law of nature does not require that to a penitent sin be remitted, as can easily be proved from human judgments instituted according to the norm and exemplar of divine judgment, in which it is not necessary... to those who from the heart are sorry that they have sinned, to remit the punishments due; but this pertains to the gracious ordinance of God, whereby He gave Christ to us as a propitiator through faith in His blood, as the Apostle says.⁶³ Hence the Fathers of the Council of Trent⁶⁴ teach that the Sacrifice of the Mass is truly propitiatory, which brings it about through itself that, if with a true heart we approach God contrite and penitent, we may obtain mercy and find grace for help in due season. The same thing Augustine clearly teaches, both elsewhere and in book 2 of *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, ch. 14:⁶⁵ "Whose," he says, "mercy can be remembered as so great as that of Him who forgives all sins to the converted? He does not say, 'to sinners' or 'to the fallen' or 'to the averted,' but 'to the converted.' For to forgive sins to the averted is not of mercy, but of a perverse order." He therefore holds it to be of the great mercy of God (which assuredly is not bestowed except through Christ our Lord) that to sinners already converted God condones sins.

Furthermore, the aforesaid error the Fathers of the Council of Constance seem implicitly to have condemned, when among the condemned articles of John Wyclif they placed this in the seventh place: "If a man has been duly contrite, every outward confession is for him superfluous and useless."⁶⁶ For this seems

plainly consequent from the opinion described of the Master (of the Sentences). For if outward confession is only for the sake of absolution, but absolution is nothing other than a declaration, and a declaration is not necessary, indeed seems of itself to bring no utility; it will follow that outward confession itself is not necessary but superfluous and useless, at least with respect to the effect of reconciliation or remission of sins, to which, according to this opinion, it is in no way ordered.

-
1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 1 and following.
 2. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
 3. Joel 2:13.
 4. Ezek. 18:31.
 5. St. Augustine, Sermon 7 de Tempore [abbreviation as in source].
 6. St. Augustine, Homily 50, last chapter [abbreviation as in source].
 7. St. Augustine, Sermon 27, ch. 1; Homily 50, ch. 2 [abbreviations as in source].
 8. Council of Trent, Session 6, chs. 6 and 14; Session 14, ch. 1.
 9. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 5.
 10. St. Ambrose, In Psalmum 37.
 11. Pseudo-Augustine (attributed), De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 14.
 12. St. Basil, In Psalmum 33; St. John Chrysostom, In Psalmum 50; De compunctione cordis II.
 13. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 84, a. 5; q. 86, a. 2.
 14. Ezek. 18; Ezek. 33.
 15. Lk. 13:3, 5.
 16. Matt. 3:2; 4:17.
 17. Acts 2:37–38; 3:19.
 18. Rev. 2:5, 16.
 19. Tertullian, De poenitentia.
 20. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1.
 21. Acts 2:38; Council of Trent, Session 14, chs. 1 and 4.
 22. Mk. 2:5; Matt. 9:2; Lk. 5:20; Jn. 8:11; Lk. 7:37–50; 23:40–43.
 23. St. Thomas, Supplement to the *Summa theologiae*, q. 2, a. 1 (and following).
 24. St. Augustine, Homily 50 [= De poenitentiae medicina, ch. 3].
 25. St. Jerome, on the Hebrew of Ps. 18 (Vulgate), "Ab alienis parce servo tuo"; Jerome renders "alienis" as "superbis".
 26. St. Augustine, Homilies 37, 69, 50; Epistle 108.
 27. St. Jerome, Ep. 46 to Rusticus, ch. 4.
 28. St. Thomas, the places cited above [abbreviation as in source].
 29. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1.
 30. Jn. 15:13.
 31. St. John Chrysostom, Sermon 29, De poenitentia; St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas II, ch. 18; cf. II, ch. 5.

32. Scotus; Gabriel [abbreviation as in source]; Domingo (Domingo de) Soto; Matt. 10:32–33.
33. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 2, a. 6.
34. St. Gregory the Great, on the fifth penitential Psalm; see also Moralia, book 8, ch. 11.
35. St. Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 14; cited in Gratian, De poenitentia, dist. 5, cap. Consideret.
36. Roman Catechism (Catechismus Parochorum), on contrition, citing Is. 38 and Ezek. 18.
37. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 42 in Matt.; Hom. 31 in Hebrews; Hom. 41 to the People of Antioch; De compunctione cordis, book 2; and a certain Sermon on Penance and Confession; cf. also the alternative reference noted in the edition: "Seu Sermon. CCCLI. inter Sermon. IV. Classis in Appendice ad Tom. in eadem Edit." [abbreviation as in source].
38. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 2, a. 2.
39. Council of Trent, Session 5, canons 3 and 5.
40. St. Augustine, Homily 50, ch. 2; see also the editorial identification: "Seu Sermon. CCCLI. inter Sermon. IV. Classis in Edit. Noviss." [abbreviation as in source].
41. St. Augustine, Homily 50, ch. 3.
42. St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia, ch. 6: "Corripiatur origo damnabilis, ut ex dolore correptionis voluntas regenerationis oriatur."
43. Pseudo-Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 8.
44. St. Bernard, Sermon 2 On the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
45. St. Bonaventure, Speculum Beatae Virginis, ch. 2.
46. St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 16, q. 1, a. 2, q. 2.
47. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 84, a. 2, ad 3; cf. "Augustine in the book De Poenitentia" [abbreviation as in source].
48. Cf. the same Augustinian homily as in note 3 for the rhetorical close; the editor cites again: "Seu Sermon. CCCLI. inter Sermon. IV. Classis in Edit. Noviss." [abbreviation as in source].
49. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 3, throughout.
50. St. Bernard, De diligendo Deo, around the middle.
51. Pope Leo I, Epistle 91 to Theodorus.
52. St. John Chrysostom, De reparatione lapsi (Epistle 5 to Theodorus the Lapsed); cf. Gratian, De Poenitentia, dist. 3.
53. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 3, ibidem.
54. St. Augustine, De doctrina christiana I, ch. 22; St. Augustine, De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae, ch. 11.
55. Estius, above, Distinctio 27 of Book 3.
56. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 1, a. 3.
57. On the controversy over whether attrition from fear of hell suffices for justification together with the sacrament: Many theologians, especially after the Council of Trent, defend the opinion asserting that fear of hell—conceived attrition suffices, and judge it so probable that, after the Council, it is almost certain, and they do not hesitate to teach that the contrary has been struck from the catalogue of the "probable." Others in turn, not a few and of no mean rank, contend that attrition conceived from fear of hell, and which is not also from the motive of charity (at least inchoate), by no means suffices for the justification of a sinner even with the Sacrament, and they hold the contrary to be the more probable. This contention Alexander VII restrained by a decree issued 6 May 1667, commanding, under holy obedience and under pain of excommunication reserved to the Holy See, and other penalties to be assessed at the discretion of the same Holy See, that all the faithful, of whatever rank and dignity, even episcopal and higher, indeed even cardinalial, and likewise those who will write on the matter of attrition, or will publish books, or will teach, or will instruct others in popular sermons or otherwise, should not dare to brand either side, whether asserting or denying in the aforesaid attrition conceived from fear of hell the necessity of some prior love of God for justification, with a note of injury or contumely, as if concerning a matter defined. We would have done enough if by this the contentious disputes in this matter were checked; since nowhere are the official acts published on account of which one might litigate beyond measure; although without doing injury to either side it suffices to teach what today among the Scholastics seems the more common

opinion, namely, that attrition conceived from fear of hell suffices, provided it exclude every will to sin and be joined with hope of pardon, as a necessary disposition for receiving the Sacrament aright. On the first side (asserting sufficiency) many ancients are named, and nearly all; see, e.g., Balthassar Francolinus, in his special work *De Dolore ad Sacramentum Poenitentiae rite suscipiendum necessario*, and in book 3 (*De Disciplina Poenitentiae a cap. 6*). On the second side (denying sufficiency without some charity) contend Vincentius Contensonus, *Theologiae Speculativae primas*; Lupus Christianus, in *Commentario* (*Dissertatio unica*, cap. 2; *Specialis Dissertatio, De Attritione et Contritione*; part. 3, cap. 4, art. 2, prop. 7); Gaspar Iveninus, *De Poenitentia* q. 4, cap. 4, art. 2, q. 2–3; Joannes Neerkaffel, Bishop of Castoria, in his work entitled *Amor Poenitens*. We shall annotate certain points touching this question in the following Distinction, as we have not seldom promised. See also what we said in the Appendix to the book *De Timore*. [Abbreviations and titles as in the source.]

58. St. Augustine, Sermon 7 de Tempore: "Paenitentiam certam non facit, nisi odium peccati amor Dei." The printed editions note: "Or, Sermon CXVII, among the Sermons of the Second Class, in the Appendix to Tom. V of the most recent edition."

59. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4; canon 5.

60. St. Augustine, 14 De verbis Apostoli (also cited as Sermon LXXXIII, among the Sermons of the First Class, in the Appendix to Tom. V of the Benedictine edition): "Qui timore poenae non concupiscit, puto quia concupiscit." See also Epistle 144 (also numbered CLXV in the same edition): "Inimicus iustitiae est qui poenae timore non peccat."

61. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 5.

62. Council of Trent, Session 14, canon 9; chs. 4–6.

63. Rom. 3 (sc. 3:25).

64. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 2.

65. St. Augustine, De sermone Domini in monte II, ch. 14.

66. Council of Constance, condemnation of John Wyclif, article 7.

DISTINCTIO XVII — ON THE CONFESSION OF SINS (*DE CONFESSIONE PECCATORUM*)

§ 1. Moreover, this same error, openly professed, was condemned in the Council of Complutum and confirmed by the authority of Sixtus IV. For there, among the condemned conclusions of a certain Peter of Osma, this first is read: "Mortal sins, as to guilt and the punishment of the age to come, are blotted out by contrition of the heart alone (*contritio cordis*) without reference to the keys." And this third: "Perverse thoughts ought not to be confessed, but by mere displeasure they are blotted out without reference to the keys." And this last: "The sacrament of Penance (*Sacramentum Paenitentiae*), as to the conferral of grace (*collatio gratiae*), is a sacrament of nature, not of any institution of the Old or New Testament." But this error is refuted by those arguments by which the institution and the necessity of the sacrament of Penance are proved, and likewise of Baptism, and by which the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*) given by Christ to the priests is proved.¹ Of the former it has been spoken above.² Of the latter it will be treated below.³ One may see Thomas Waldensis learnedly disputing on this matter in Tome 2, On the Sacraments, ch. 144.⁴

§ II — *Sin is not ordinarily remitted before the reception of the sacrament* (*Peccatum ordinarie non remitti ante susceptionem sacramenti*)

§ 2. Since, according to the Catholic faith, one must confess that after Baptism the remission of no mortal sin is effected without reference to the keys of the Church—that is, to the power of the priest absolving—and since it is not to be doubted that it sometimes happens for contrition perfected by charity (*contritio caritate perfecta*) to reconcile a man to God before the sacrament itself is actually received, yet in such a way that reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the vow of the sacrament (*votum sacramenti*), which was included in that contrition, as the Council of Trent teaches,⁶ it can be asked whether that which the Tridentine Synod supposes and admits as sometimes occurring, happens always, or ordinarily, or frequently, or rarely. For the Synod expressly determines none of these. Whence, what Navarrus says—that after the Council's declaration there is no room for doubt that it happens frequently—was said by him with little circumspection.⁷ For the Council does not acknowledge that it happens frequently, but sometimes; which two things are very different. Therefore, a probable answer is given to the question: that neither ordinarily nor frequently does it happen that before the priest's actual absolution the sinner is absolved before God. This is proved by these arguments.

Primo: If this happened ordinarily or frequently, it would happen similarly before the Baptism of adults; both because catechumens are wont to be much more fervent, to be borne with a greater desire to receive the grace of Baptism than to receive the grace of Reconciliation after relapse—especially in our age; and because there is a greater reason that to those relapsing, as being more unworthy, that grace be deferred until the sacrament be received than to catechumens. But the Tridentine Synod teaches that both sacraments are of equal necessity after St. Augustine,⁸ and what it is that we said above concerning the former.⁹ Now that before

Baptism this does not ordinarily take place is sufficiently shown by those statements of the Fathers in which they require so great a necessity of Baptism as to seem even to exclude the supplement of the vow; about which it has been said above in Distinction 4 of this book. Among others is that statement of St. Augustine: "However much a catechumen may advance, he still carries the burden of his iniquity; it is not remitted to him unless he shall have come to Baptism." [^10] Which at the least is to be understood of remission regularly had. The same, in another place of the same work: "Jesus," he says, "did not yet trust Himself to them. Such are all catechumens. They indeed already believe in the name of Christ, but Jesus does not trust Himself to them." And at the beginning of that same Tractate, when, addressing the catechumens, he had said: "You have believed in Christ, so that you still carry your sins," a little later he subjoins: "But they cannot be remitted unless one be born again of water and the Holy Spirit."¹¹

Secundo, it is shown by the example of the sinful woman in the Gospel, who, although she loved much, nevertheless did not first receive the forgiveness of sins until it was said to her by the Lord: "Thy sins are forgiven thee"—namely, in exactly the same words by which the sins had been remitted to the paralytic. So too, to Paul, so wondrously converted, it was afterwards still said: "Arise, and wash away thy sins" (Acts 22).¹² And certain martyrs, as Genesius and Emerentiana, are read to have been baptized in their own blood, to whom otherwise Baptism of the Spirit would seem more fittingly to be attributed than Baptism of blood.

Tertio: St. Augustine, in Epistle 180 to Honoratus, on the sacraments being demanded at the time of a hostile incursion: "Where," he says, "if ministers be lacking, how great a destruction follows for those who go forth from this life unregenerate or bound." [^13] Surely such a lament would have no place, if, even outside a case of necessity, the vow of the sacrament ordinarily sufficed.

Quarto: The Council of Trent testifies (Session 13, ch. 7 and can. 11) that this is the ecclesiastical custom: that no one conscious to himself of mortal sin, however contrite he may seem to himself, may approach the sacred Eucharist without confession made beforehand sacramentally; and it decrees that this is necessarily to be observed, lest so great a sacrament be received unworthily.¹⁴ Therefore it judges that the penitent is not ordinarily reconciled before sacramental absolution. For if this were done ordinarily, he would not act perilously who, feeling great sorrow of contrition and having the purpose afterwards of confessing, should approach the table of the Lord without previous confession.

Quinto: If this were done ordinarily, it would not seem aptly said by the Fathers that the sentence of Peter precedes the sentence of heaven; as by St. Bernard.¹⁵

Sexto: One ought not to say that before the reception of the Eucharist the faithful ordinarily receive the effect of that sacrament; and similarly regarding Confirmation and the others; therefore neither ought this to be determined concerning the sacrament of Baptism and of Penance.

Septimo: That opinion is reproved by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, teaching that there are very few who by contrition before the sacrament obtain pardon.

Octavo: Those who wish reconciliation to be always, or ordinarily, prior in time to the sacrament, therefore teach it because they think that reconciliation is not separated from true conversion of heart and contrition, since there is one and the same movement of conversion to God and of the remission of sin. Whence, consequently, they ascribe to the sacrament nothing other than either an increase of grace, or that it makes the attrite to be contrite; with the result that those men, for the most part, fall into the opinion of the Master, which holds that by contrition of the heart alone sin is remitted. Finally, to this converge almost all the

arguments which prove the necessity of sacramental confession, which will afterwards be produced in their own place. The Fathers hand down that necessity; but what is to be held will be had below.

§ 3. Now, if it be asked when that occurs which we admit does not happen ordinarily but rarely, the same answer seems to be given here as about Baptism, since as to the attainment of effects there is equal *ratio* of both sacraments. First, then, there is no doubt that, with the crisis of death pressing and when a priest cannot be had, in a man truly contrite the vow of the sacrament supplies what is lacking on the side of the sacrament, just as was said about Baptism; and this according to the most certain promises of God, these and the like: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"; and: "A contrite and humbled heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise"; as St. Bernard teaches (in Epistle 77 to Hugh, from St. Augustine and St. Ambrose).¹⁶ Whence for penitents forestalled by death before the imposition of hands, the Sacrifice of the Body of the Lord was formerly offered. But besides this case, it is also not to be doubted that at other times this occurs—which we likewise showed in its own place about Baptism¹⁷—namely, when there occurs a case of scandal, or of falling into another sin, if absolution be asked.

Likewise, when someone altogether cannot, or certainly can with very great difficulty, at an opportune time approach a priest by whom he may be absolved; as if he should dwell among unbelievers, or be held in chains, or be hindered by some similar impediment. For although as yet the peril of death is not imminent, nevertheless it is not likely that his reconciliation and restoration into the state of grace are deferred by God, who is not at fault and is not delaying so as to ask absolution of the Vicar of Christ—especially if the fervor of contrition has also kindled the desire for the sacrament (*desiderium sacramenti*).

But whether there is some determinate degree of intensity to which, when contrition or the love of God in a catechumen or in a penitent has come, by a standing law it has conjoined to it the remission of sins, is uncertain; indeed it does not appear. Both because of the sentence of St. Augustine (from Tractate 13 on John) and the examples set forth above; and because it would seem a consequence that some contrition without reference to the keys (*claves*) would suffice for remission; and finally because, as we have said, the benefits of the Passion of Christ, the gift of contrition, and the remission of sin are distinct; of which the one is ordered to the other, as we showed above. Therefore, as often as before the actual reception of the sacrament sin is remitted, this is so, that besides contrition there is still mercifully supplied by God the defect of the sacrament for obtaining the effect of remission. And thus, whether through the sacrament, or through that merciful supplementation, God applies to man, for the remission of sins, the Passion of His Son Christ as a satisfaction sufficient for the debts due to sins.

§ III — Reply to the arguments of the contrary opinion (Responsio ad argumenta contrariae opinionis)

§ 4. Those who hold an opinion different from the foregoing, thinking that the remission of sins is joined to contrition (*contritio*) even before the sacrament, either always, or regularly (as they speak), use these arguments, which nevertheless equally lend support to the Master's opinion. First: as soon as the Prophet Nathan noticed true repentance in David, he did not hesitate to say to him: "The Lord has taken away your sin."¹⁹ Second: the same David (in Ps. 31): "I said," he says, "I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord, and You forgave the impiety of my sin." Which St. Augustine (Sermon 32 De diversis) explains thus: "I said, that I might speak against myself, etc.; I had not yet spoken, and You forgave." And in his Exposition on

the same Psalm: "He does not now pronounce," he says, "but he promises that he will pronounce; He already forgives." Cassiodorus likewise, on the same words of the Psalm, writes thus: "Great is the piety of God, that at a bare promise the sin is forgiven, for a vow is judged in place of an act."²⁰ Third: it is the sentiment of the same David: "A sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit; a contrite and humbled heart Thou wilt not despise"; therefore where there is a contrite heart, there is at once present the mercy of God forgiving sin.²¹ Fourth: Ezek. 33: "In whatever day the wicked shall be converted from his wickedness, his wickedness shall not harm him." Moreover, they say, "day" is taken for an hour or a moment by a Hebrew turn of phrase, as there: "In whatever day you shall eat of it, you shall surely die." Likewise there are similar sentences in Ezekiel ch. 18. Likewise also Is. 30, according to the Septuagint: "When you shall have been converted and groaned, you shall be saved."²² Fifth: conversion removes aversion; therefore it removes sin, since sin is nothing other than man's aversion from God. Sixth: contrition is an act of charity (*caritas*); but charity is not without the remission of sins; therefore neither is contrition. Seventh, one can object the authority of Fulgentius, book 1 (On the Remission of Sins, ch. 6), saying that the true conversion of the heart alone can elicit from God the remission of sins; and (ch. 12) that in David the true conversion removed the condemnation of the sin. And again: because, he says, David "groaned," being converted from his whole heart, was straightway made safe, and that saying of the Prophet was fulfilled in him: "If you be converted," etc. (Is. 30).²³ Eighth: the Catechism of the Council, in the matter of contrition, testifies that God interposes no delay for granting pardon as soon as the sinner, having detested all his sins, is converted to the Lord; and likewise it says that as soon as we have conceived contrition in our minds, the remission of sins is bestowed on us by God; and finally it concludes that true contrition has this force, that by its benefit we obtain at once the pardon of all our offenses—using for its proof the testimonies of Scripture set forth above.²⁴ Lastly, they argue thus: by true conversion the sinner is made alive; therefore he is also loosed from his sins; for the debt of eternal death does not seem able to stand together with that life which is justice. Then they prove it because it is said (Ezek. 18): "If the wicked shall do penance, he shall live, and shall not die"; and Jas. 5: "He who causes a sinner to be converted from the error of his way shall save his soul from death." And to the sinner Paul says (Eph. 5): "Rise, you who sleep, and arise from the dead," namely by penance. Moreover, they want that signified by this, that Lazarus was first called back to life, but afterwards was loosed from his bonds. Which place, expounding it, Augustine (Tractate 47 on John and Homily 27 among the Fifty) teaches that the sinner is first made alive by true conversion before he is loosed by the minister of the Church. And in Sermon 8 On the Words of the Lord he says: no one can confess unless he has been raised up; just as, if one does not exist, confession perishes. And in the same work (Sermon 52 on Ps. 101). And after Augustine, Gregory (Homily 20 on the Gospels), where he says that the sinner who has died by fault lives by confession; and again in the same work (Homily 26). To these and similar arguments a reply was given in part when we treated of the necessity of the sacrament of Penance (to Dist. 14). For indeed those who ascribe to contrition considered in itself the power of blotting out sins seem to take away the necessity of this sacrament, at least insofar as it is a sacrament. However, since the questions are different, and not all the arguments are the same, we shall now reply to the several objections that have been brought forward.²⁵

§ 5. To the first, some answer that "has forgiven" is put for the future, "will forgive," as St. John Chrysostom understood in his *Apologia David*, book 2. Which exposition they approve from the fact that afterwards he composed Psalm 50 in the prayer by which he begs that his iniquity be blotted out. Likewise there Ambrose (ch. 12). Many, however, rightly understand that David, from his heart, acknowledged his sin and begged pardon from God; and when this was made known by revelation, the Prophet said, "The Lord has

taken away your sin," namely, as regards the eternal punishment. Augustine explains it in this sense (*Against Faustus*, book and ch. 67). Yet it does not follow that always or regularly, upon the conversion of any penitent whatsoever, there comes so great a perfection of contrition as there was in David; for there holds that saying, "It is the privilege of a few; let it not make a common rule." The same could be answered to the second argument; but the truer reply is that this is the sense: "I proposed to confess my injustice to the Lord," which I did; that is, after I had confessed, "You forgave my sin." Thus *Ecclesiastes* (ch. 2): "I said, I will go and overflow in delights"; that is to say, I experienced it after I had done so, when I gave myself to pleasures. Nor is that unlike which is in *John* 12: "They could not believe because Isaiah said," that is, on account of the thing foretold by Isaiah, namely the hardening of the heart. So also, although the prodigal son, having come to himself, had said: "I will arise and go to my father and I will say to him: Father, I have sinned against heaven," etc., nevertheless he was not reconciled to his father before he had actually accomplished this very thing. For although the father had first received him with a kiss, afterwards, however, he ordered the first robe to be brought forth; by kissing he raised him to the hope of pardon, and by clothing him with the robe he reconciled him to himself and received him into favor, as Augustine explains (*Questions on the Gospels*, book 2, q. 33). The same Augustine indicates the exposition of the Davidic verse in question (*Questions* 154 on *Exodus*).²⁶

§ 6. To the third it is answered that God does not despise a contrite and humbled heart, just as He does not despise the faith, the prayer, the alms of a catechumen or of any penitent whatsoever; just as He did not despise the prayers and alms of Cornelius the Centurion, since in view of these He afterwards forgives sin.²⁷

§ 7. To the fourth the reply is clear from what was said (to *Dist.* 14). For true conversion creates a sure hope of remission of sins to be obtained through the sacrament. In a like way that saying (*Gen.* 2), "In whatever day you eat of it, you shall die," can be understood; that is, you shall be surely liable to the punishment of death, although death itself was to follow much later.²⁸

§ 8. To the fifth: conversion removes sin as to act and affection, yet not at once as to guilt, which for the most part remains until it is loosed by the sacrament.

§ 9. To the sixth: from what was said (to *Dist.* 27, lit. 3 [as in source]) it is left clear that there is a certain charity or love of God by which He is loved as He ought to be loved, that is, above all things, which precedes the remission of sins, according to that (*Lk.* 7): "Many sins are forgiven her, because she loved much."²⁹

§ 10. To the words of Fulgentius adduced in the seventh place the answer is that the conversion of the heart alone is said to elicit the pardon of sins, not as though nothing else were required besides, but because without the true conversion of the heart nothing else can bring a man to pardon. As to David, an answer has already been given above.³⁰

§ 11. To the eighth: the Catechism clearly explains itself in these words: "For in order that we may concede this, that by contrition sins are blotted out, who is ignorant that it must needs be so vehement, so sharp, so inflamed, that the bitterness of the sorrow can be matched and set on a level with the greatness of the crimes? But since very few would attain to this degree, it would also come about that by this way pardon of sins could be hoped for by very few. Wherefore it was necessary that the most merciful Lord should provide for the common salvation of men by an easier arrangement; which indeed He effectually brought about by a wonderful counsel when He handed over to the Church the keys of the heavenly Kingdom." So there.³¹

§ 12. The last argument is resolved by distinguishing a twofold life or vivification. First, the soul of the sinner is made alive, that is, called back from death to life, when true penance is inspired into him—which was signified by the raising of Lazarus. And this life the authorities of Scripture and of the Fathers alleged rightly prove. Then he is made alive when, from the guilt or obligation of eternal death which he had incurred by sinning, he is absolved by the ministers of the Church; which was signified by the loosing of Lazarus, already previously raised, effected by the ministry of the Apostles, as Augustine and Gregory expressly teach in the places cited. For also Scripture calls a man "of death" or "a man of death," who is worthy of death, as in the places of Kings noted in the margin.³² In this way the Apostle (Rom. 6) compares those who are baptized to Christ rising from the dead to life. Whence Augustine (Sermon 75 De diversis), speaking to catechumens about this second vivification, which is brought about through the sacrament: "According to which life," he says, "you will by the grace of Christ be brought to life again from a certain kind of death to which you renounce, that is, from the death of sin, of which the Apostle makes mention in Rom. 6." Therefore the debt of eternal death can coexist with the former life, but not with the latter—just as neither with that charity which makes the friends and sons of God and heirs of the Kingdom and, simply speaking, the just.³³

§ IV — The confession of sins which is made to God has always been necessary (Confessionem peccatorum quae fit Deo semper fuisse necessariam)

§ 13. Concerning confession (*confessio*), which is the second part of the sacrament of penance (*Sacramentum Poenitentiae*), we must treat next. But, that we may first explain the acceptation of the name, a twofold confession is commended to us in the Scriptures: one of praise, the other of sins. The confession of praise is that by which we acknowledge God as supremely good and supremely praiseworthy, and with thanksgiving both His benefits and His judgments we recognize and proclaim.

§ 14. The confession of sins is that by which a man acknowledges and manifests his sins, whether this be done to God alone or to man. And to God, who searches hearts, the utterance of the heart suffices; but to man, who sees only the things that appear, there is need of an utterance of the lips, or of some manifest sign. This confession to man is either sacramental or non-sacramental. The sacramental, of which more fully below, is made to the priest alone. The non-sacramental is made either to a judge, as where one confesses a crime that he has committed, of which sort is that which Achan is read to have made;³⁵ or to a learned and wise man, that he may instruct the matter and be able to show a saving remedy for the sin, of which the Apostle James speaks when he says: "Confess therefore your sins one to another";⁴⁰ or finally to the legal priest, to obtain, through the sacrifices, the remission of sin, which kind of confession the book of Leviticus in several places prescribes.⁴¹ To this head can also be referred that confession which they made who were baptized by John—"and they were baptized by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matt. 3:6)³⁶—for besides the profession of penance they asked counsel for the amendment of life, saying: "What then shall we do?" (Lk. 3:10, 12, 14);³⁷ likewise that confession to a brother against whom a man has sinned, so that he may be restored to favor with him, of which the Lord speaks: "Go first to be reconciled to your brother" (Matt. 5:24);³⁸ and, according to the exposition of many, also that of which mention is made in Luke 17 (vv. 3–4).³⁹

§ 15. As for the confession which is made to God alone, very many places of Scripture insinuate and commend it to us: as that (Ps. 31[32]:5), "Dixi: Confitebor adversum me injustitiam meam Domino: et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei"; and (Ps. 37[38]:19), "Quoniam iniquitatem meam ego annuntiabo, et

cogitabo pro peccato meo"; and again (Ps. 50[51]:6), "Tibi soli peccavi, et malum coram te feci"; and many of this sort. About this confession of sins, whereby one accuses himself before God—and it is called interior confession (*confessio interior*)—it must be known that it has always been necessary for salvation. The reason of this is, that the acknowledgment of sin, for obtaining reconciliation, pertains to the natural law. For just as in civil matters he who does not will to acknowledge his fault is never judged to be admitted to gracious reconciliation, so neither is it possible for a man to return into grace and friendship with God through the remission of sin, unless he himself first acknowledge and confess his sin and, by confessing, accuse himself.

§ 16. This the Scriptures cited above sufficiently indicate, in which the confession of sins is taken as a necessary means to their remission. Which the Interpreters have expressed by this sentence in Isaiah (Is. 43:26): "Dic tu prior iniquitates tuas, ut justificeris." The same is shown by the testimony of holy Job who (Job 31:33), among the crimes which he removes from himself, sets down not confessing one's own sin, thus speaking: "Si abscondi quasi homo peccatum meum, et celavi in sinu meo iniquitatem meam." Whence too Scripture gravely notes Adam and Cain and certain others under this head, that they were not confessors of their sins. The same is confirmed by the testimonies of the Fathers. For Origen says (Homily 2 on Leviticus): "He never amends who does not think that he has sinned."⁴² And St. Ambrose, in the book On Paradise, ch. 4: "For neither can anyone be justified from sin, unless he shall first have confessed the sin."⁴³ The same, in the eighth book on Luke, on the man born blind restored to sight, says: "That we might believe, he says, that unless one be confessing he cannot be saved."⁴⁴ And St. Augustine, writing on Psalm 68, says that when confession is omitted there is no place left for penance.⁴⁵ To the same purport St. John Chrysostom also writes (Homily 42 on Matthew, and Homily 30 on the Epistle to the Hebrews).⁴⁶ And the Fathers of Trent (Session 6, ch. 6) require for the justification of man this first of all: that he acknowledge himself a sinner.⁴⁷ Whence not without reason that sentence of the Stoic Epictetus is celebrated: "If you wish to be good, first believe that you are evil."⁴⁸

§ 17. Nor is it enough that someone in general acknowledge himself to be a sinner; rather even individual sins must be confessed to God. This is sufficiently taught from this: because, as we showed above, contrition (*contritio*) must be had for individual sins; therefore confession must likewise be made concerning individual sins—even that which is made to God alone, and which has always been necessary for salvation. For contrition is not for the sake of confession.

§ 18. but confession on account of contrition. It is proved from various passages of Scripture. For in Ezek. 33 it is required of the penitent that he do penance over all and individual sins.⁴⁹ And Paul in 1 Cor. 11 enjoins that a man test himself; which indeed he does when he examines each [sin] in particular, according to that saying of Ps. 76: "Scopebam spiritum meum."⁵⁰ Nor would the same Psalmist elsewhere say, "Ab occultis meis munda me" (Ps. 18), if it were not necessary to confess individual [sins] to God and to be contrite for the individual [ones], but a merely general confession of sins would suffice.⁵¹ Add that in the Law different sacrifices were appointed for different sins; which labor surely would not have been necessary, if, in order to obtain pardon from God for whatever crimes, it had sufficed that someone should acknowledge himself to be a sinner only in general.⁵² But a fuller proof of this matter can be sought from the things which were said about contrition (above, at the Distinction).

§ V — The institution and necessity of sacramental confession are proved from Scripture (*Confessionis sacramentalis institutio & necessitas e scripturis probatur*)

§ 19. The sacramental confession of sins (*sacramentalis peccatorum confessio*), which the Greeks now call *ξολογέσις*, now *ἐξαγόρευσις*, can be defined as the disclosure and accusation of sins made before the Priest, the vicar of Christ, to the end that by him, by virtue of the keys, they may be remitted. The institution and the necessity of this confession (which the Sectarians today with one voice assail) must first be drawn by firm reasoning from the Scriptures, and then be confirmed from the Fathers, from the Councils, and from the ecclesiastical Tradition, so that in this way it may become evident that the precept to confess sins to the Priest is not some human institution, but plainly of divine law. Therefore, first, those things must here be recalled to mind which (at the Distinction above) were said about the institution of the sacrament of penance (*sacramentum paenitentiae*) and its necessity, which we proved chiefly from two places of Scripture, namely Matt. 18, where the Lord before His passion promises to the Apostles and their successors the power of the keys of heaven, in these words: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven"; and Jn. 20, where, the general words "As the Father sent me, so I send you" having been premised, He after the passion and resurrection gives the same power in these words: "Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained."

§ 20. From this institution of the sacrament of penance, as the Fathers of the Council of Trent hand down (Session 14, ch. 5), the Universal Church has always understood that an integral confession of sins was also instituted by the Lord, and that it is of divine right necessary for all who have fallen after Baptism; because namely Christ, to whom from the Father all power in heaven and on earth was given, in those places of Scripture left the Apostles and their successors, Priests, as His own vicars, as presidents and judges to whom all mortal crimes into which the faithful had fallen might be brought (as is said in the same place of the Council), that, according to the power of the keys, they might pronounce sentence of remission or of retention of sins. For it is clear that Priests could not have exercised this judgment with the cause unknown, nor could they have kept equity in imposing penances, if they [the penitents] had declared their sins only in general and not rather in species and one by one. Such are the things there and what follows pertaining to the same point. But the sum of the proof is this: in the forum of penance the Priest is appointed by the Lord a judge to loose and to bind, to remit and to retain; it therefore falls to him to use the power handed over to him not by a headlong judgment, nor at his own pleasure, but by a just and prudent decision according to the exigency of the causes; for otherwise what he does will not be held ratified by the Lord. But he will not be able to do this unless he have well known and thoroughly taken in the sins and the case of the sinner about which judgment is to be made. Now the knowledge of these causes cannot be had beforehand, unless the sinner himself by a spontaneous confession lay bare his wounds distinctly and in detail, so that the Priest may be able to know explicitly in what measure the sins are to be loosed and in what measure to be bound. Therefore the sacramental confession of sins is of divine right necessary, for the very reason, namely, by which we have shown the sacrament of Penance to be necessary.⁵⁴

§ 21. To this proof is joined that which is taken from the necessity of satisfaction (*satisfactio*). For the imposition of satisfaction belongs to the power of binding. For, as is said (Session 14, ch. 8), the Priests ought,

as much as the Spirit and prudence shall suggest, in proportion to the quality of the crimes and the ability of the penitents, to impose salutary and suitable satisfactions, lest, if they connive at sins, they may be made partners in other men's sins. Therefore the very variety of sins and of penitents demands that they be known by them in particular, which cannot be done except through the free confession of the penitents. And there is also another proof of this necessity: for God does not remit sins unless to those knowing them and confessing them before Him in particular, as was said above; but the Priest, in remitting sins, acts as the vicar of God and of Christ: therefore what the sinner would have had to do before God and Christ, if the sacrament had not been instituted, that he must do before the vicar, namely confess to him his sins particularly.

§ 22. To these there can be added other reasons showing how useful and almost necessary this institution of confession was for sinners. First, because when men confess to God alone they are not ashamed enough of their sins, it pertained to the great mercy of God to give them a man, His vicar, before whom in confessing they might be more ashamed, and by this means might more easily merit indulgence; since confession itself, on account of the shame joined to it, comes to be in no small part a portion of satisfaction. Next, because the shame of confessing, and of laying open even the most hidden things of the heart, wonderfully calls men back from committing sins in the future, especially those which have turpitude and therefore strike shame; as also in the Church of Christ experience teaches widely, and the Adversaries themselves candidly admit. Finally, if one had to confess immediately to God alone, pardon would also have to be expected immediately from Him; and so the mind of the penitent would always waver uncertain whether the sin had been remitted to him—of which some degree of certainty we now obtain through a visible Priest and a visible sacrament.

§ 23. Furthermore, besides the Scriptures already adduced, some also allege that of Jas. 5: "Confess your sins one to another." By this sentence they wish the Apostle to have promulgated the law of confession instituted by his Lord. For thus the Venerable Bede understood that place (in his Commentary). And the author of the book *On the Visitation of the Sick*, among the works of St. Augustine, book 2, ch. 4. And after both, book 2, *On the Sacraments*, part 14, ch. 1.⁵⁵ Nor is this without probable reason. For because many, as Paul testifies in 1 Cor. 11, are made weak because of sins, it can be understood that James admonished the sick to send for the Priest that they might be anointed with oil in the name of the Lord and, confession being premised, might obtain the forgiveness of sins through the absolution of the Priest. And Hugh also so expounds the phrase "one to another," as if it were said "one to the other," that is, man to man—namely to signify that it does not suffice for a man to confess to God. In favor of which understanding it also helps that Origen (*Homily 2 on Leviticus*) understands the words of James immediately preceding, "And if he be in sins, they shall be remitted to him," of that remission which is brought about through the absolution of the Priest. According to which interpretation that which follows is most fittingly subjoined as said of sacramental confession: "Confess therefore," etc. Indeed, the confession which is made to the Priest Origen openly confirms in the same place.⁴²

§ 24. There is also adduced by some the place Acts 19, where it is said: "Many of them that believed came confessing and declaring their deeds." And the Greek participle of the perfect seems to favor this, as signifying those who had already believed, as though that confession were of the baptized. Likewise the place 1 Jn. 1: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just, that He may forgive us our sins and may cleanse us from all iniquity." And that word of Christ to the lepers (Lk. 17): "Go, show yourselves to the Priests." Yet, granting that from these Scriptures something may probably be gathered for the confession to be made to a Priest, nevertheless they are taken by most not less probably in another sense, and from the mystical sense a certain

argument is not drawn. Hence it is that in serious disputation such proofs do not press the adversary very much.

§ 25. Although, however, this confession pertains to the institution of the New Law, nevertheless certain of its figures preceded in the Old Law, as in the Mosaic sacrifices which were offered variously for various sins (Lev. 4, 5, 6)—which could not have been done without a confession of the sin before the Priest. Whence also in Num. 5 the Lord expressly commands Moses, saying: "Speak to the children of Israel: A man or a woman, when they shall have done any of all the sins that are wont to happen to men, they shall confess their sin," etc. Again, the Levitical Priests were most carefully ordered to examine the leprosy, that they might judge between leprosy and leprosy, and discern the clean from the unclean (Lev. 13 and 14; Deut. 17 and 21; Ezek. 22 and 44). And indeed the lepers were ordered to come to the Priest and to declare their disease to him in detail, as is evident from Leviticus; whence also is that which the Lord says to the lepers when they are cleansed: "Go, show yourselves to the Priests."

§ 26. Likewise in that, too, that those to be baptized by John's baptism of penance were confessing their sins (Matt. 3), there seems to have been a certain prefiguration of the confession of sins to be made by those who under the New Law would perform penance. For John's baptism was a certain outward profession of penance.

§ VI — Confirmation of the same doctrine from the Fathers and Councils (Ejusdem Doctrinae confirmatio ex Patribus & Conciliis)

§ 27. Besides, both the antiquity and the necessity of sacramental confession (*confessio sacramentalis*), after Sacred Scripture, are clearly shown to us by the writings even of the most ancient Fathers and by the decrees of the Councils; so that from them it may easily be understood both that its use in the Church is most ancient, as having been received from the Apostles, and that its necessity for obtaining the absolution of sins has always been acknowledged. Wherefore we shall briefly cite some sentences and passages from them.

§ 28. Clement, the disciple of Peter, in the Epistle to James, writes about confession: "But if into the heart of anyone either spite, or unbelief, or some other evil shall have crept secretly, let him not be ashamed to confess this to him who presides, that by him, through the word of God and wholesome counsel, he may be cured." And, after inserting many things, speaking of Peter he says: "He taught that evil thoughts should straightway be dashed to Christ, to manifest them to the Priests of God."⁵⁷ Dionysius, the disciple of Paul, in the Epistle to Demophilus, sharply rebukes him because he had with his heel spurned—contrary to the order of ecclesiastical discipline—a sinner who had fallen and had betaken himself to the Priest: "When he," he says, "with modesty was confessing that he had come to find remedies for sins."⁵⁸ Tertullian, in the book On Penance, testifies that the exomologesis, in which we confess our offences, is frequented by penitents in the Church; and, treating of its use and rite, he gravely reproves in chapter 10 those who defer exomologesis from day to day, being more mindful of shame than of salvation: "Like those," he says, "who, when they have contracted a complaint in the more shameful parts of the body, avoid the knowledge of the physicians, and, together with their blushes, perish." And presently he introduces shame thus, as though a man were speaking: "Do not look upon me; for thy sake it is better for me to perish." By which words he manifestly discloses how great is the necessity of confession.⁵⁹

§ 29. Origen, Homily 2 on Psalm 38, says: "Next, what does divine Scripture teach us? That one ought not to hide sin within; it declares this when it says that just as those who are weighed down by undigested food are not relieved unless they vomit, so they who have a hidden sin, unless they confess it. But only," he says, "look around more diligently to whom you ought to confess your sin." And other things that follow.⁶⁰ Likewise, Homily 2 on Leviticus, he calls it "a hard and toilsome penance, when the sinner washes his state in tears and is not ashamed to indicate it to the Priest of the Lord and to seek a remedy." And Homily 3 he writes to the same effect; and again, Homily 17, he says: "If we shall have revealed our sins, not only to God, but to those who can heal our wounds and our sins, our sins will be blotted out by Him who said: 'Behold I will blot out as a cloud thy iniquities'." ⁶¹ St. Cyprian, in the Sermon on the Lapsed, gravely accuses the rashness of those who, after denying the faith, before their crimes had been expiated, before the exomologesis of their sin had been made, before their conscience had been purified by the sacrifice and the hand of the Priest, had approached the altar. And, after many things, he teaches that confession should be made even of hidden things, with these words: "How much greater in faith and better in fear are they who, although bound by no crime either of sacrifice or of a certificate, yet because they have even thought of this, grieve for this very thing before the Priests of God and simply confess it, they make an exomologesis of conscience, they lay bare the burden of their soul," and other like things. Finally, he thus exhorts the faithful: "Let each confess to his brethren what he has done; while he who has done wrong is still in this world, while his confession can still be admitted, while for each man satisfaction together with the remission that is made by the Priests is pleasing to the Lord." There is another passage in him, book 3, Epistle 14. ⁶² Lactantius, *Divine Institutions* IV, ch. 17, from the allegory of circumcision teaches that we ought even to lay open to the Priest the shameful things of the heart; and in the last chapter he concludes, among the various gatherings of those confessing Christ, that that is the true Church of Christ in which there is confession and penance. ⁶³ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI, ch. 27, relates how the Emperor Philip was prohibited by Fabian, the Roman Pontiff, from entering the Church until, having confessed his sins, he had taken his place among the penitents and had submitted to the penance enjoined. ⁶⁴

§ 30. St. Basil, in the *Shorter Rules*, ch. 288, to the question "to whom ought sins to be confessed?" answers thus: "It seems necessary to confess sins to those to whom the dispensation of the Mysteries of God has been entrusted; for thus also those who..."—and he attests that they "have confessed their sins." The same he hands on in Question 110, and, among the *Rules* more at large disputed, Question 26, and on Psalm 32. He also recounts an example of confession in the book *On True Virginity* not long before the end. ⁶⁵ St. Ambrose, *On Penance* II, ch. 6, says: "A modest confession of sins looses the bonds of crimes." And again: "Do you, then, disdain to do this in the Church, where there is nothing that ought to be a matter of shame except not to confess, since we are all sinners," and the rest. And in the book *On Paradise*, ch. 14, "No one," he says, "can be justified unless he shall first have confessed his sin." And in an exhortation to do penance he openly teaches that sins are to be confessed to God and to the Priest. Paulinus, in the *Life of Ambrose*, also recounts that as often as anyone had confessed to him his falls in order to receive penance, he would weep in such a way as to compel that man to weep. ⁶⁶ St. Jerome, on Matt. 16, holds that the Priests ought not to exercise the power of loosing and binding before they have heard the varieties of sins, so that they may know who are to be bound and who loosed. And writing on Ecclesiastes 10: "If the serpent—the devil—shall have secretly bitten anyone, if he who has been stricken shall keep silence and shall not do penance, nor shall have been willing to confess his wound to a brother and to the master, the master who has a tongue for healing will scarcely be able to benefit him. For if the sick man is ashamed to confess his wound to the physician, the

medicine does not cure what it does not know." Likewise, in the Second Rule of Monks ascribed to Jerome, ch. 9, it is said that hidden sins ought to be confessed to the Priests alone.⁶⁷

§ 31. St. John Chrysostom, book 2 On the Priesthood, among other splendid things which he writes about the power of the keys granted to Priests, teaches how necessary it is for the faithful to submit themselves to the cures of Priests. And, speaking of the office of the Priest: "Wherefore," he says, "the shepherd needs great prudence, even, so to speak, six hundred eyes, that he may be able properly to survey on every side the condition of the human soul." And below: "Therefore nothing at all should be left which he has not thoroughly sifted and examined, but let him with precision and diligence investigate all things. Then at length ought he to apply to him remedies of his own, suitably, aptly, and conveniently, lest perchance he waste his labor." And like things are read in book 3.⁶⁸ The same, On Compunction of Heart: "From this," he says, "that we do not keep our sin in memory, it happens that we do not approach confession; for how shall we confess things of which we have not even a remembrance?" And Homily 1 on Psalm 50, he warns that the sinner should at once run to exomologesis; and Homily 3 to the People of Antioch, having taken an example from physicians and sick men: "So do thou also," he says, "manifest thy wound to the priest." Add to these the things he writes in the Sermon on Penance and Confession, and Homily 20 on Genesis, and Homily 5 on the words of Isaiah; two chapters of these, under their title, are inserted in Gratian's Decretum, On Penance, Distinction I, namely chapters 40 and 41, in one of which it is said that no one can receive the grace of heavenly God unless he shall first have been cleansed from every filth of sin by the confession of penance. There stands forth also in the Imperfect Work upon Matthew (Hom. 3) a most clear testimony for this matter; which work, although it is not Chrysostom's, is nevertheless sufficiently clear to be of the same coeval antiquity. But the passage is no less explicit in the Perfect Work (Homily 10 on that Matt. 3, "Confessing their sins"), where he thus says: "The time of confession presses also upon those who have obtained Baptism." After which words he distinguishes two kinds of men to whom the necessity of confessing applies: to some indeed, that, after Baptism has been received, their wounds of lapses may be cured by intervening Penance and they may deserve to return to the Sacred Mysteries; to others, that, by confession, they may approach the Table of the Lord with a clean conscience with respect to that stain which they have contracted—of whom the former are to be referred to public, the latter to private and secret penance. In this sense the passage is cited here by Thomas Waldensis, volume 2 On the Sacraments, chapter 136, and ancient copies agree, although afterwards in different editions the same passage was corrupted by the heretics.⁶⁹

§ 32. Likewise Augustine, Homily 49, chapter 3, addresses the relapsed in this manner: "Do penance such as is done in the Church, that the Church may pray for you. Let no one say to himself: I do it in secret; I do it before God. God knows who pardons me because I do it in my heart. Therefore without cause was it said: 'Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven'; therefore without cause are the keys of the Church of God," and so on. And a little after, alluding to the customary ceremony in the Church of one confessing—that is, genuflection—he subjoins: "My son resists me by folly; he is ashamed to bend the knee beneath the blessing of God, which the Emperor did not hesitate to do," and what follows.⁷⁰ The same, Tractate 49 on John, expounding that about Lazarus raised: "He that had been dead came forth, bound hand and foot. When thou confessest," he says, "thou goest forth; but that thou mayest confess, God by a loud voice—that is, by great grace—calls thee. Therefore when the dead man had come forth, he was still bound: the confessor is still guilty, that his sins may be loosed; to the ministers the Lord said this: 'Loose him'." In the same author too there are these: Enarration on Psalm 56; Homily 27; and Epistle 118, part 3; Sermon 57 on the seasons; and in the book On the Visitation of the Sick, book 1, chapter—where in that place it is expressly

taught that the confession which is made to God does not suffice, but that sins must also by all means be disclosed to the Priest, although that book is deservedly thought not to be Augustine's. The same is found in the book *On True Penance*, chapters 10 and 20, where also he gives the rationale of judgment. Leo the Great (Epistle 91) clearly teaches that the guilty cannot obtain the mercy of God unless by the supplication of the Priests; and that he delivered this power to the rulers of the Church, that they also should impose the work of penance on those who confess, and other like things. The same (Epistle 8) also bears witness that the confession which is made to the Priest ought to be secret.⁷¹ Gregory the Great (Homily 26 on the Gospels) says: "The pastors of the Church remove from him the punishment which he has deserved, who has not blushed to confess what he has done." To these ancient and most weighty authors all the others easily subscribed, as Bede, writing on James 5 and on 1 John 5 at that verse "He who knows his brother to sin"; Bernard, in the *Life of Malachy*, and indeed in the Homily on the Octave of Easter, Homily 1 on the Octave of Pentecost, and most expressly Homily 5 after the Octave of Pentecost, where he treats that passage "Show yourselves to the priests." "He," he says, "destroys the opinion of those who have found for themselves a certain trick of excuse, saying that it suffices them to confess their sins to God alone, provided nevertheless that they cease from those sins thereafter. Whose opinion, if it were true, by no means would the Lord have sent to the Priests the lepers whom He had cleansed by Himself. For, to show that by the judgment of the Priests sins are to be bound and loosed, Lazarus, whom He had by Himself raised from the dead, He did not permit to depart before he was loosed by the disciples." Such are his words.⁷²

§ 33. Hither also pertain the other passages of the Fathers by which we proved the necessity of the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*) above, at Distinction 14, which, as has been said, depends as to both institution and necessity upon its institution and the necessity of confession. Finally, to all these for confirmation there has been added the authority of four General Councils, namely: the Lateran under Innocent III, can. 21; Constance, session 8; Florence, in the Decree given to the Armenians; and Trent, session 14.⁷³ Moreover, since from the whole foregoing proof it is now established that for a relapsed person confession is by divine right necessary for reconciliation, that also is clear which some call into question: that concerning the precept of confession no dispensation can be made by any human authority, whether of the Roman Pontiff or of the whole Church—since human power does not reach to the alteration of divine right.

§ VII — Reply to the objections of the adversaries (Responsio ad objectiones adversariorum)

§ 34. Whatever arguments are heaped up by the Adversaries against the foregoing doctrine are for the most part partly the same as those by which they attack this sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Paenitentiae*) in general, and partly strive to teach that the conversion of the heart alone suffices for blotting out sin; to these we shall answer in their proper places. Wherefore let us now reply only to those which are proper to this place. First, then, they assail the Catholics' proof in this way: The minister of the Church remits sins not only in the sacrament of Penance, but also of Baptism; yet from the power which he uses in Baptism it does not follow that the one who approaches that sacrament ought to confess his sins; therefore neither does that consequence follow from the power which he uses in the sacrament of Penance. Second: the Scripture (Jn. 20) is not to be understood as speaking of mortal sins exclusively, but is common also to venial sins. Third: knowledge of sins can be had by the priest in some other way than through one's own confession of the mouth, namely through the narration of another or by writing, or if the priest has seen the deed; therefore the necessity of confession is

not rightly established from the necessity of knowledge. Fourth: the Church does not judge about hidden things, as even the Council of Trent attests (session 24, ch. 1, On the Reformation of Matrimony); therefore hidden sins are not necessarily to be disclosed to the minister of the Church through confession. Fifth: they object that confession is not of divine law, on the ground that by the authority of bishops it was at some time removed in the Church of Constantinople. For, as Socrates relates in his History, book 5, ch. 19, and Sozomen, book 7, ch. 16, and Nicephorus, book 12, ch. 28, Nectarius, bishop of that see, on account of a certain scandal that arose in that church on the occasion of confession, removed the penitentiary presbyter who was set over the hearing of penitents' confessions, and he gave free power that each one, according to his own conscience, should approach to take part in the Mysteries. Nay more, by the same writers the origin of instituted confession seems to be indicated, since in the same place they say that, on the occasion of the Novatian heresy, a canon of this sort was established by the bishops: that in each church there should preside a certain presbyter of penance, to whom those who had lapsed after Baptism should confess their sins in the presence of the presbyter designated for that task. Sixth: Chrysostom, who succeeded Nectarius immediately, seems in several places to approve and commend his action concerning the removal of the penitentiary and of the burden of confession, signifying that the confession which is made to God alone suffices. For thus he says (Homily 2 on Psalm 50): "Say your sins every day, that you may blot them out; but if you are ashamed to say them to someone, say them every day in your soul. I do not say that you should confess them to your fellow-servant who would reproach you: say them to God who heals them," and so forth. And in Homily 31 on the Epistle to the Hebrews: "I do not tell you to expose yourself in public, nor to accuse yourself before others, but I wish you to obey the Prophet saying: Reveal your way to God. Therefore confess your sins before God; before the true judge pronounce your offenses with prayer, not with tongue but with the memory of conscience; and then at length hope that you can obtain mercy." The same writer (Homily 52 on Matthew) praises voluntary confession, but teaches that confession which is necessary is useless. Something of the same sort also is said by Hugh of St. Victor, book 2 (On the Sacraments, part 14, ch. 1), namely, that for this reason Christ did not give men the precept of confessing their sins, lest confession should seem extorted and forced. Seventh: Ambrose, book 10 (on Luke 22), speaking of Peter penitent after his denial, says: "I do not find what he said, I find that he wept." And again: "Tears wash away the offense which shame is to confess by voice. And the indulgence of weeping consults for modesty: tears without horror speak the fault; tears confess the crime without offense to modesty," and so on. Almost the same words are in Maximus (Homily 3 on Peter's Penance). Eighth: Augustine, Sermon 252 (de tempore), speaking about the preparation of a man fallen into some crime for receiving the Eucharist, does not mention confession, but only prayer, fasting, and the like. Ninth: Prosper, book 2 (On the Contemplative Life, ch. 7). "Those, he says, whose sins lie hidden from human knowledge, neither confessed by themselves nor made public by others—if they are unwilling to confess or to amend them, they will have for avenger Him whom they have as witness, God Himself. But if they make themselves judges over themselves, and as it were avengers of their iniquity, and exercise upon themselves a most severe punishment imposed by their own will, they will exchange eternal punishments for temporal; with tears springing from true compunction of heart they will quench the flames of everlasting fires." And below: "Wherefore they will more easily appease God, those who are not convicted by human judgment but of their own accord acknowledge the crime; but those who set it forth by their own confessions, and, others being ignorant as they are hidden, pass sentence upon themselves of a voluntary excommunication, and, separated not in mind but in office from the altar at which they used to minister, bewail their life as though dead, certain that, with God reconciled to them by the fruits of efficacious penance,

they will not only regain what they lost, but also, made citizens of the Heavenly City, will come to eternal joys." Tenth: Bede, book 5 (on "Go, show yourselves to the priests"), wishes only the crime of heresy, and of infidelity and Jewish perfidy, and of schism to be carried to the priests. "The other vices," he says, "the Lord Himself heals and corrects inwardly in conscience by understanding." Eleventh they object with the final Chapter "On Penance" (Dist. 1), taken from the Penitential of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, which reads thus: "Some say that sins ought to be confessed to God alone, as the Greeks. Others, however, consider that sins should be confessed to priests, as almost the whole holy Church. Both of which, not without great fruit, take place within holy Church." And at the end: "For God, the Author and Lawgiver of holy health, often by an invisible administration, often by the ministry of physicians, provides this medicine of His penance." Which words seem to intimate that confession which is made to the priest is not simply necessary. That this also is Gratian's opinion appears from the words subjoined in the same place, where he leaves to the reader's judgment to which opinion one should rather adhere. Lastly, they prove that confession is a human and ecclesiastical institution, because in the Lateran Council under Innocent III it was established by a common decree of the bishops (canon 21 which begins: "Let everyone of either sex confess all his sins," etc.). The same they confirm from the gloss of John Teutonicus, who (at the beginning of Distinction 1 "De Poenitentia") concludes the same question thus: "But it is better said that it was instituted by a certain universal tradition of the Church rather than by the authority of either the New or the Old Testament," adding that among the Greeks it is not necessary, because that law of the Roman Church does not bind them, just as the tradition of consecrating in unleavened bread does not. To these they finally add the Schoolmen, Bonaventure, Durandus, Scotus, as though they had not spoken quite consistently on this matter. For Bonaventure says that before the determination of the Lateran Council it was not heresy to deny the necessity of confession. Durandus, moreover, inclines to the view that confession is not of precept; while Scotus, after saying that the sacrament of Penance had been instituted by Christ, not indeed as absolutely necessary but as useful, afterwards adds that the opinion which holds confession to be only of precept cannot be easily impugned, though it is the more acceptable to say that it is of divine law.

§ 35. To all these individually the reply is thus. To the first, it is clear that the sacrament of Baptism and that of reconciliation are not of the same character, since in Baptism a bare ministry is exercised, whereas in reconciliation there is required a judgment concerning the penitent, and absolution is an act of judgment, which necessarily requires knowledge of the case, as the Council of Trent rightly explains (session 14, ch. 2), and we have already shown above sufficiently.⁷⁵

§ 36. To the second: The sentence of the Lord, "Whose sins you shall forgive," etc., is to be understood principally of the sins that exclude from the kingdom of God; for by it power of the keys is given for opening and shutting the kingdom of heaven, as is likewise evident from a like sentence (Matt. 16:18). Since, then, venial sins do not exclude, and other remedies are appointed for their remission, it is clear that from that text one cannot literally gather the necessity of confessing them as one gathers it for mortal sins.⁷⁶

§ 37. To the third: Without one's own proper confession there cannot be had knowledge of all his sins, especially of those which are committed by thought alone; likewise of his intention, or of the ignorance or the perfection or imperfection of acts; and of other circumstances, which are all necessary for the priest to judge well concerning the sinner's state and for the amendment of life to the better. By writing or through an interpreter one can certainly confess in certain cases, as if he be mute, or the priest does not understand him, or there be some impediment of speaking or even of hearing.

§ 38. To the fourth: For this reason are hidden sins to be made known and laid open to the Church, that she may be able to judge; since Christ instituted that the sins excluding from the kingdom of God are not remitted unless in the tribunal of the Church; the sentence is general: "Whose sins you shall forgive..."

§ 39. To the fifth: The canon of the Church, on the occasion of the Novatian heresy, was prescribed by the bishops who, opposing themselves to that heresy the more vigorously, were receiving those who, without due penance, were slipping into reconciliation—the very ones about whom Cyprian treats in the book *On the Lapsed*—not with the purpose that penitents should confess their sins to a presbyter (for that the Church did not doubt to be commanded by Christ), but only that in each church there should be one presbyter designated for that task, at whose tribunal anyone who had lapsed after Baptism should confess his sins, nor would it be free for them to go to any other for the same matter. That presbyter, moreover, with the penitent consenting, used to publish his sins to the people—both for the greater shame and humility of the penitent and that the people might pray to God more earnestly for his reconciliation. From which arrangement, when by this mode a case of fornication with a certain matron had been publicly laid open and there arose a grave scandal in the church of Constantinople, Nectarius quite removed that penitentiary presbyter (together with whom the public penance also in that church seems to have been taken away), so that thereafter the state of penitents, whose crimes were hidden, was the same as before the establishment of such a canon; namely, that, private penance having been assigned by any presbyter having jurisdiction—as many such were—those who were reconciled should approach the Mysteries. Whence it is evident that it was not confession that was abrogated by Nectarius, but a certain canon, or the carrying out of a canon about the manner of confession and penance. Add that those very historians disapprove the deed of Nectarius, judging that it was contrary to ecclesiastical discipline that he should thus simply have removed that penitentiary presbyter.⁷⁷

§ 40. To the sixth: Chrysostom never says, simply and absolutely, that it suffices if someone confess only to God. Nowhere does he say, "I do not tell you to disclose your sin to a priest"; indeed elsewhere he expressly enjoins this, as we showed above in the confirmation of this doctrine; but he says, "not to your fellow-servant who will reproach you." And that he is speaking about public penance, which had by his predecessor Nectarius already been removed, is evident from these words: "I do not tell you to expose yourself in public, nor to accuse yourself before others." And when he rejects necessary confession as useless, he understands confession that is forced and extorted, such as is that of the impious in hell, and such also as was the confession of Antiochus (2 Macc. 9). As for Hugh, he means nothing else than to teach that there is not in the Gospel an express precept of confession, while meanwhile teaching that it is tacitly included in the power of the keys given to the priests. Which being understood, it is recognized that sinners of their own accord ought by confession to submit themselves.

§ 41. To the seventh: Ambrose too is referring to public penance, which is altogether full of shame. And as regards Peter, confession had not yet been instituted when he sinned and did penance.

§ 42. To the eighth it is answered that the sermon is not Augustine's, and an argument from negative authority does not conclude—especially since Augustine himself, as we showed above, speaks clearly elsewhere about confession.

§ 43. To the ninth: Prosper's words about "betraying the crime by one's own confessions" again pertain to public penance, to which Prosper does not wish to urge those whose sins are hidden, because even without it they can be reconciled by private and secret penance. Whence also, speaking in the plural, he says, "others

being ignorant as they are hidden," plainly signifying by these words that he is removing not the secret knowledge of one priest, but the public knowledge of the multitude; and the Master in the text hands down this solution clearly enough.

§ 44. To the tenth: Bede likewise is speaking of public penance, which in his age used to be imposed only upon heretics and schismatics returning to the Church.

§ 45. To the eleventh: Some interpret Theodore also as speaking of the penance of manifest crimes, which, since through almost the whole Church it used to be exacted as public, after Nectarius the Greeks, public penance having been removed, required only secret penance. But the words of the chapter do not seem to admit this interpretation, because they expressly distinguish the confession which is to God alone from that which is to priests. More rightly, then, it is answered that Theodore is setting over against the Catholic opinion of the whole Church (for that phrase "almost" some suppose to have been added in the text) which holds that sins are to be confessed to priests, the opinion, or rather the heresy, of the Greeks who said that the confession which is made to God alone suffices. Whence Theodore, approving what the whole Church does, subjoins that both—namely, to confess both to God and to the priest—are, not without great fruit, done within holy Church. That word "almost" can also have been added by way of exception of the Greeks, who, although involved in certain grave errors, were still tolerated in the Church. Whence it is read in Bede (*Ecclesiastical History*, book 4, ch. 1) that Pope Vitalian sent this Theodore, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, a region that then pertained to the Greeks, to Britain, and joined to him a certain abbot Hadrian, a most learned man, charging him diligently to take heed that he should not introduce into the Church over which he presided anything contrary to the truth of the faith according to the custom of the Greeks. From which it amply appears of what sort the opinion of the Greeks, recounted by the same Theodore, is to be held—although the Greeks who were Catholics, both before and also after those times, held with the Roman Church the same thing about the necessity of confession, as Nicephorus Chartophylax proves in the letter which he wrote to the monk Theodosius concerning the power of binding and loosing. Moreover, those words which are found at the end of that chapter seem to be not Theodore's but Gratian's, whom we do not deny not to have had a fixed opinion about this matter.⁷⁸

§ 46. To the twelfth the Synod of Trent replies clearly (session 14, ch. 5) in these words: "For neither did the Church, by the Lateran Council, establish that the faithful of Christ should confess what it understood to be necessary by the divine law and instituted, but that the precept of confession should be fulfilled at least once in the year by each and all, when they had come to the years of discretion," and so forth. Therefore the Lateran constitution is nothing other than the determination of time concerning the divine precept of confession. Wherefore that gloss of John Teutonicus is to be rejected and struck out as containing manifest error. Moreover, St. Thomas and Bonaventure seem to have mitigated the judgment concerning heresy before the Council on account of the Master and Gratian who, since they lived before the Council, recount the contrary view, as he himself says, as an opinion. But they did not observe that the Council did not define that confession is of divine law—which was presupposed as known—but only, as we said, determined the time. And so it was an error contrary to the faith and against the Council to say that confession is not necessary by divine law, though its assertors, on account of some remaining obscurity of the matter, might perhaps have been excused, lest they be heretics. But those things that were said with less consideration by Durandus and Scotus in this matter ought not to prejudice the consent and judgment of all the other Doctors and of the whole Church.

§ 47. Therefore this is altogether to be retained. But as for what the Fathers of the Council both in the decree and in canon 6 of the same session affirm and define, that the manner of confessing secretly to the priest alone is not alien from the institution and command of Christ, they do not mean by this that Christ commanded that manner. For if He had commanded it, He would consequently have forbidden confession to be made publicly, which the Fathers openly deny; they only mean that the manner of confessing secretly is neither contrary nor discordant to the precept and institution of Christ, but rather agrees with it most perfectly. The reason for this is that the law of nature advises, indeed commands, that no one, by publishing his hidden and shameful crimes, should bring disgrace upon himself, unless perhaps some greater advantage of either the sinner himself or of other men should require it. Now this law of nature is not destroyed by the law of Christ, which commands that all sins, even the most hidden, be laid open by confession to him to whom the keys for remitting and retaining have been given by Christ. And therefore sins are to be disclosed to the priest in such wise by Christ's precept that, nonetheless, according to the prescription of the law of nature, they remain hidden with others. Add that the publication of occult crimes, whether to be done by the penitent himself or by the priest, does not quite agree with the proper effect of the Sacrament of Penance, which is to cover and abolish sins; since, once crimes have been published and the infamy contracted therefrom, they could hardly be blotted out from the memory of men. Finally, the yoke of confession imposed on us by Christ ought to be sweet and light, according to that saying of Matt. 11: "My yoke is sweet," which assuredly it would not be, if crimes had to be published; but, on the contrary, in this way it would become unbearable; therefore it is especially in keeping with the law and institution of Christ that the confession of sins be secret.⁷⁹

§ 48. Moreover, what the ancient tradition of the Church received from the Apostles holds on this matter, one Leo clearly teaches (in Epistle 80 to the bishops of Campania) in these words: "That presumption against the apostolic rule, which I have lately learned is committed by some with unlawful usurpation—namely concerning the penance which among the faithful is made publicly—by all means I order to be removed, lest the declaration of each and every kind of sins, written on slips, be publicly recited; since the guilt of consciences is sufficient to be indicated to the priests alone by secret confession. For although the fullness of the fear of God does not blush before men; nevertheless, because not all sins are of this sort that those who ask for penance are not afraid to publish them, let so most unsound a custom be removed, lest many be kept from the remedies of penance, while either they are ashamed, or fear lest they relate their deeds to their enemies, by which they can be struck down by the constitution of the laws. For that confession is sufficient which is first offered to God, and then also to the priest who approaches as intercessor for the delicts of the penitents. Then at last many more will be able to be provoked to penance, if the conscience of the confessor be not published to the ears of the people." So far Leo.⁸⁰ To this may be added, on that account, the places of the Fathers cited above by us in favor of confession; for almost all of them commend that confession which is made to the priest, without any mention of further disclosure. Nay, some of them expressly require this—that the confession be secret. And Origen, indeed, writing (on Ps. 37, Homily 2), makes mention of both confessions, both secret and public. For thus, after other things by which he urges the making of confession to the priest, he finally subjoins: "But if the priest shall have understood or foreseen your sickness to be such as ought to be exposed in the assembly of the whole Church to be cured—for from this perhaps many could be edified, and you yourself easily healed—by much deliberation and by sufficiently tried counsel of that physician it must be provided." Which words clearly teach that not always of old, but sometimes, for the advantage of the sinner, it

occurred that his sins were published in the assembly of the Church. Because this, as a law, was being introduced by some bishops in the time of Leo, it was checked and forbidden by his authority.⁸¹

§ 49. Moreover Basil (in the Shorter Rules, Question 110), which is as follows: Whether when a sister confesses to the elder or to the presbyter, the bishop also ought to be present, sufficiently signifies that confession was made altogether secretly and without a witness to the presbyter alone. The same he proves (Question 288): Whether he who wishes to confess his sins ought to confess them everywhere and to whomsoever, or rather to certain persons only. To which he answers that sins are not to be laid open everywhere to all, but only to those to whom the dispensation of the mysteries of God has been entrusted, that is, to the priests. The same, in the Rule for Monks (chapter 21): "The confession of sins," he says, "has the same character that some wound of the body has, or an ailment, which must be shown to the physician; so the confession to those who are able to cure and amend these things, that is, to the priests alone." Likewise, in the Rule for Nuns (under Jerome's name, chapter 9), after it had been said which sins ought to be confessed publicly in the convent of the sisters, thus it is subjoined concerning secret confession: "Nor, however, on this account let them betray the secret thoughts of their hearts, nor the hidden sins which ought to be confessed to the priests alone."⁸²

§ 50. Chrysostom indeed (in the Homily on Penance and Confession), as Pamelius cites, teaches that it is not necessary that one confess in the presence of witnesses, and he calls this tribunal "without witnesses," that is, lacking witnesses. To this is added that Sozomen, book 7 (chapter 16), so describes that penitentiary presbyter whom Nectarius abolished at Constantinople, as to say that he ought to have been a keeper of secrets; namely, for no other reason than that confession was made to him secretly concerning secret sins, nor could they be published unless with the consent of the penitent, if his usefulness and the edification of the Church required it. From which passage, as also from the decree of Leo already recited, and from other writings of the Ancients, it is taught with great probability that even public penance, such as formerly was frequent in the Church, nevertheless always had private or secret confession joined to it; by which, namely, not only the publicly known crimes—on account of which public penance was being done—were exposed, but also, if the same penitents had committed any which were hidden either by deed or by the thought of the heart alone, they would lay them before the priest alone, expecting from him one reconciliation for all.⁸³

§ 51. Finally, to this point two chapters are to be referred in Gratian (under the title On Penance). One (Distinction 1, whose beginning is "Quem poenitet"), in which thus it is said: If the sin is occult, it suffices to refer it to the knowledge of the priest, that the offering of the gift may be acceptable. Which is repeated (Distinction 6, chapter "Qui vult"). Both places are taken from the book On True and False Penance, chapter 11. The other is Gregory's (in the same Distinction 6, chapter "Sacerdos"), in which, under a very grave threat, it is forbidden that a priest reveal to anyone the sins confessed to him. Which prohibition was afterwards renewed by the Lateran Council under Innocent III (canon 21), so that even from these the error of those may most plainly be refuted who ascribe the first origin of auricular confession to the Lateran—whereas it was much later than the Authors and canons cited above.⁸⁴

§ IX — Which sins must necessarily be confessed (*Quae peccata necessario confitenda*)

§ 52. Just as the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*) is necessary for salvation to all and only those who, after Baptism (*Baptismus*), have relapsed into mortal sin (*peccatum mortale*), as was shown above (at Distinction 14), so too the precept of confession (*confessio*) regards those same persons only, and all of them. For, as is clear from what has been said above, the necessity of confession is established only from the necessity of the sacrament of Penance, or of the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*), to whose judgment and examination mortal sins committed after Baptism must of necessity be referred. On which matter the Council of Trent thus decrees (Session 14, ch. 5): "It must be that by penitents not in general only, but in species and singly, all the mortal sins of which, after a diligent examination of themselves, they are conscious, be recounted in confession, even if they be most hidden, and have been committed only against the last two precepts of the Decalogue." And after a few lines: "But since all mortal sins, even of thought, exclude men from the grace of God and render them enemies of God, it is necessary to seek the pardon of all likewise from God with open and shamefaced confession." And then, tacitly removing, and indeed inverting, this objection of Luther, "He who wishes to confess all things leaves nothing for the divine mercy to forgive," it subjoins: "Therefore, while Christ's faithful strive to confess all the sins that occur to memory, they undoubtedly lay open all things to be forgiven by the divine mercy. But they who do otherwise, and knowingly keep back some things, set before the divine goodness nothing to be remitted through the priest. For if the sick man is ashamed to uncover his wound to the physician, what he does not know the medicine does not cure." And after a little, to two other objections of the heretics it replies thus: "But it is impious to say that confession is by this plan prescribed to be impossible, or to call it that torture of consciences. For it is plain that nothing else is required in the Church of penitents than that, after each one has more diligently shaken himself down, and explored every fold and hiding-place of his conscience, he confess those sins by which he remembers that he has mortally offended his Lord and God. But the remaining sins, which do not occur to diligent thought, are to be understood to be excluded altogether by the same confession"; and with the poet we say: "From my hidden sins cleanse me, O Lord." The very difficulty, indeed, of such confession and the shame of uncovering sins might seem grave, were it not lightened by so many and such great benefits and consolations as are most certainly conferred, through absolution, on all who worthily approach this sacrament. Thus the Council.⁸⁶

§ 53. Moreover, the first objection, which is about impossibility, can also be easily refuted in this way: If therefore one must not confess to the priest because it is impossible to confess all sins, then neither must one confess to God, since it will likewise be impossible to confess all to Him. Yet we are without doubt bound to confess all sins to Him, not only in general, but—as has been shown in its proper place—in species and singly; which even the heretics do not deny.

§ 54. As to what, furthermore, ought to be thought about confessing the circumstances of sins, the same Council in the same place teaches in these words: "It is gathered, moreover, that those circumstances also must be explained in confession which change the species of the sin; because without them the sins themselves are neither laid out integrally by the penitents nor become known to the judges, and it cannot be that they rightly appraise the gravity of the crimes and impose on penitents the punishment that is fitting for them." Whether, however, a like judgment is to be made about circumstances that indeed do not change the species, but notably aggravate the sin, the Council was silent, nor is there sufficient agreement among Catholic Doctors on this matter. Surely the reason which the Council here adduces—about judging the gravity of crimes and

imposing on penitents a condign penalty, as if one had stolen ten aurei and another ten thousand—seems also to include those circumstances which, within the same species, notably increase the sin. To this pertains also that reason by which the Council proves that sins must be disclosed singly, namely, that otherwise priests cannot maintain equity in the enjoined penances. And again that statement (ch. 8 of the same session) that priests are made partakers of other men's sins if they enjoin some very slight works for most grave crimes.⁸⁷ Add to this that penitents for the most part do not know how to distinguish species, but more easily distinguish sins according to lightness and gravity from the circumstances, if they be notable. Which very thing not infrequently happens even to priests, whose office it is to judge concerning sins.

§ 55. Finally, in the same way the Council decrees: "Venial sins (*venialia*), by which we are not excluded from the grace of God and into which we fall more frequently—although they are said rightly and usefully, and without any presumption, in confession, as the practice of devout men shows—can nevertheless be passed over without fault, and can be expiated by many other remedies." Understand by remedies those sufficient of themselves for the blotting out of venial sins without confession.⁸⁶ And there is another reason also for this doctrine: because, to wit, as we have said elsewhere, the sacrament of Penance was instituted principally only against those sins which exclude from the kingdom. Nor does the chapter "Omnis utriusque sexus" stand in the way, because that Lateran constitution, as we noted above, is nothing other than a determination of time concerning a divine right which does not require confession except of mortal sins. Whence, if someone through an entire year, or even through his whole life, were conscious to himself of no mortal sin, he would not during all that time be bound to make confession to a priest—unless perchance for the avoidance of scandal—although we are not ignorant that certain others think otherwise on this question.⁸⁸

§ X — Whether the sinner is bound to confess at once (An peccator teneatur statim confiteri)

§ 56. Concerning the time of confession (*confessio*), a question is commonly raised nowadays, namely, whether the one who has sinned mortally is bound to confess his sin at once, as soon as he can, or whether he can defer confession for a long time. As to what is of ecclesiastical right in this matter, there is no obscurity. For the canon of the Lateran Council under Innocent III commands that each of the faithful confess at least once in the year. Nor is there any other ecclesiastical constitution that makes that time more stringent. Therefore the ecclesiastical law is satisfied if someone confesses only once in the year; and this at whatever part of the year, provided that between the earlier and later confession not more time than a year elapse. For that canon does not prescribe a fixed time of the year for confessing, as it prescribes the time of Pasch for receiving the Eucharist.⁹⁰

§ 57. But with respect to divine and natural law the question is more difficult, different people opining different things. For some think that the sinner satisfies the command of God tacitly contained in those words: "Whose sins you shall forgive, etc.," if he confesses once in his life—unless in an article of necessity, which they make twofold, one per se, the other per accidens; per se indeed the danger of death, because the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Paenitentiae*), of which confession is a part, is necessary for salvation to a fallen man, and therefore it is not permitted him to depart this life without it; per accidens, truly, the time of receiving the Eucharist, for which the Apostle requires an examination of oneself. Which examination ought to be such that no one who is conscious to himself of crime approach to the sacrament of the Eucharist

without previous confession, as the Council of Trent teaches.⁹¹ One of their reasons is that the precept of confession is affirmative, which accordingly does not oblige at a determinate time unless a necessity occurs. Another is that contrition (*contritio*) by itself without confession suffices for blotting out sin—but this we have refuted above.

§ 58. Others fight diametrically against these, teaching that the sinner, as soon as he has fallen, is bound, just as to true conversion and contrition, so also to make confession. Their reason is, because, as the Wise Man says: "He who loves danger shall perish in it."⁹² But he seems to love danger who, being through sin a son of Gehenna, does not at once strive to snatch himself from that state in which, if he were to die, he would perish for eternity. Then they assert the example of a man grievously—nay, mortally—wounded, who, if he does not at once seek a remedy for the wound, exposes himself to a sure danger of life.

§ 59. Furthermore, others choose a middle course, teaching that it is neither necessary that the sinner confess as soon as he can, nor sufficient that he either do it only in the article of necessity declared above, or defer doing it for a long time, as for a year or for some months; but that he is bound to make confession when an opportunity of place, time, and priest is had: so that if he neglects that opportunity, and defers confession to a later time, he sins at least venially through a certain neglect of his own salvation. And this opinion seems preferable to the other two.

§ 60. For that the sinner is not absolutely bound to confess immediately is clear from this, that catechumens are not bound at once to receive Baptism—nay, they could not at once be admitted, even if they wished—according to the ancient canons, which prescribe certain times, namely Pasch and Pentecost, for catechumens to be baptized. Then that confession is not to be deferred for a long time is proved from this, that the very law of nature does not allow the reconciliation of him whom we have offended by sin to be put off. Wherefore, if a friend who has offended a friend, and a son who has offended his father, is deservedly accused of negligence if he does not take pains to be reconciled to the one whom he has offended at the first opportunity, much more is a sinner to be judged as acting negligently and culpably if—although he has from his heart turned himself to God by true penitence—he does not embrace the first opportunity to restore himself to the grace and friendship of God by confession and the priest's absolution. To this also those precepts of the Lord seem to pertain (Matt. 5): "Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go first to be reconciled to thy brother"; and, "Be at agreement with thy adversary quickly while thou art in the way." These show that reconciliation—even that which is to be made with man—is not to be procrastinated. Moreover, there is added another argument: the good works of one reconciled are of greater dignity and merit with God than those which are done by a man indeed converted, but not yet restored. But to defer for a long time so great a good, and one that is also necessary, does not seem free from fault. Hence it is that the ancients repeatedly reprove those who put off "exomologesis" from day to day, as Tertullian, in the book *On Penance*; and St. Cyprian, in the *Treatise On the Lapsed*. To which opinion Hugh of St. Victor, in book 2 of the *De Sacramentis*, subscribes; where, although the word "contempt" is used, nevertheless it must be taken of serious negligence, such as is rightly judged to be in the business of one's own salvation.⁹³

§ 61. But the arguments of the first and of the second opinion are easily dissolved. Of the first indeed: because affirmative precepts bind not only in an article of necessity, but at a fitting time, as is evident in the precepts of the Decalogue. Hence the opinion of those seems acceptable who, standing on divine right, say that a man, outside the case of necessity, is bound to make confession at that time at which there would be danger of forgetfulness of sins. Of the second: because the sinner, like a man grievously wounded, ought

indeed immediately and without delay to flee to the medicine of true penitence, by which he is removed from peril, and is disposed toward health, which he then more perfectly obtains when, approaching at an opportune time to the remedy of confession, he is absolved by the priest.

§ XI — Only a priest can absolve, and it is to him that one must confess (Solus sacerdos potest absolvere, & ei confitendum)

§ 62. Since sacramental confession (*confessio sacramentalis*) was instituted on account of the absolution of him to whom we confess—an absolution to be obtained by his ministry—it is clear that one must confess to a priest, since he alone has the power of remitting sins, a power received as handed over to him in those words of the Lord: "Whose sins you shall forgive, etc."⁹⁵ For that this was said properly to the Apostles alone and to their successors, that is, to bishops and priests, is shown by the constant and perpetual consent of the Fathers. Whence St. Ambrose, book 1 On Penance, chapter 2, speaking of that power: "This right," he says, "has been permitted to priests alone." And Leo I, Epistle 91, teaches that it has been divinely ordained that, after Baptism, the indulgence of God cannot be obtained except by the supplications of the priests; and, repeating the same, he says that it is necessary that the guilt of sins be loosed by priestly supplication before the last day. The same is taught by St. John Chrysostom in the books On the Priesthood; and by the Author of the book On True and False Penance, chapter 10; and by others in almost innumerable places—as will be made clearer from those things which will be said in the next Distinction on the Power of the Keys.⁹⁶

§ 63. Therefore it was with good reason condemned in John Wyclif that he said that all good men, even laymen, have the keys for binding and loosing. Against which error there stands an affirmative Decretal of Martin V (in the Extravagants, On Penance), where among other things he says that not even the Blessed Virgin Mother of God had this power—for the reason that that power neither requires nor depends upon sanctity. And most recently the Council of Trent (Session 14, chapter 6) defined all doctrines as entirely alien from the truth of the Gospel which extend the ministry of the keys to any men whatsoever besides bishops and priests; and, in the same Session, canon 10, it condemns with anathema him who says that not priests alone are ministers of absolution.⁹⁷

§ XII — The objections are resolved (Objectiones solvuntur)

§ 64. To which teaching James does not speak contrary when he says: "Confess your sins one to another" (Jas. 5:16). For either he is speaking of that confession (*confessio*) by which Christians mutually ask that offenses be forgiven; or, if he is to be understood of sacramental confession, that "one to another" has this sense: the one to the other; that is, man to man, namely the sinner to the priest—of whom a little before it had been said: "Let him bring in the presbyters of the Church" (Jas. 5:14)—as we have elsewhere noted from Hugh of St. Victor that this can be understood in that way.¹⁰⁰

§ 65. But as to what is read in the book On True and False Penance, chapter 10, namely, that confession has so great a force that, if the priest is lacking, one must confess to one's neighbor, that is, to a layman—what sense this has is easily made known from that very place.⁹⁸ For first, he does not command, but exhorts, the penitent that, where a priest is lacking, he confess to a layman. Then he expressly denies that a layman has the power (*potestas*) of absolving. "And even if," he says, "the one to whom he will confess does not have the power

of loosing, nevertheless he becomes worthy of pardon by the desire of a priest, who confesses the baseness of his crime to his companion."

§ 66. He therefore teaches that it is holy and useful if, because of the lack of a priest, someone confess his sins to his neighbor who is not a priest—both so that the very confessor may blush before his neighbor and thereby make fuller satisfaction for his sins, and so that he may stir up his neighbor to pray for him. But he does not teach, as the Master (of the Sentences) seems to think, that there ever occurs a necessity of confessing to a layman, or to any man whatsoever who is not a priest. For since by divine law sacramental confession is not necessary except on account of absolution, which the priest alone can impart, it is evident that it is to be made of necessity only to priests endowed with the power of absolving.

§ 67. But indeed, since besides the power of order the power of jurisdiction is also required for absolving, each penitent will not be able to confess to any priest whatsoever, but only to one who has authority to absolve either ordinarily or by commission from a superior.

§ 68. Whence the Tridentine Synod (in the above-named Session), after it had said (ch. 6) that the absolution of the priest is not a bare ministry, but bears itself after the likeness of a judicial act, by which a sentence is pronounced by him as by a judge, consequently subjoins this doctrine (ch. 7): "Since, therefore, the nature and the formal character (*ratio*) of judgment requires that sentence be passed only upon subjects, it has always been held as a persuasion in the Church of God, and this Synod confirms that it is most true, that the absolution of a priest is of no moment when he pronounces it who does not have jurisdiction, either ordinary or delegated."⁹⁹

§ 69. Nor ought it to seem strange to anyone that a priest, although by his ordination he has the power of absolving, nevertheless cannot absolve any penitent whatsoever who voluntarily subjects himself to him—since even in civil governance something similar can occur; as, for instance, if a king confers upon certain men the power of judging, yet assigns to them no subjects, but those only whom they shall receive by delegation from the viceroy when that shall be judged opportune. After this fashion nothing prevents there being many priests who indeed have the power of absolving, the use of which, however, they are not yet able to exercise because of a defect of jurisdiction, as having as yet no subjects, neither by commission. Yet this difference must be recognized: that that power in judges nominated by a king is only a certain relative term and a being of reason; but in priests it is a real power, which is conferred upon them by the very ordination together with the power of consecrating the Eucharist.

§ XIII — To what extent one must confess to one's own priest (Quatenus proprio Sacerdoti confitendum)

§ 70. Moreover it is asked here whether it is necessary that each person confess to his own priest (*proprius Sacerdos*). On which matter there is the general constitution of the Fourth Lateran Council under Innocent III in these words: "Every faithful person of either sex, after he has reached the years of discretion, shall faithfully confess all his sins at least once a year to his own priest. But if anyone shall wish, for a just cause, to confess his sins to another priest, let him first ask and obtain license from his own priest, since otherwise that one cannot loose or bind him."¹⁰² For the understanding of this constitution it is necessary to know who is called one's own priest. And indeed Paludanus distinguishes a twofold acceptance of a proper priest. But, those distinctions set aside, there seems to be only one acceptance according to the mind of the Council:

namely, that he is called one's own priest who has proper and ordinary authority for absolving him with respect to whom he is said to be "one's own," that is, the one to whose care each person is properly subjected. Thus the parish priest is the proper priest of his own parishioners, but not anyone who has a commission by the authority of a superior, or even of the parish priest himself. For the canon openly distinguishes between the proper priest and one alien, subdelegated by the proper priest. Whether, however, the name of proper priest is also extended to the bishop and to the pope, has some difficulty. For some wish only the parish priest, with respect to his parishioners, to be included under that name. Others, however, deny that the bishop and the pope are excluded. For if someone should confess—even without the license of his parish priest, which without doubt he is able to do—to his ordinary superior, of which kind are the bishop and the pope, he would not seem to be compelled, by force of the Lateran canon, to confess again in the same year to his own parochial priest. Yet the difficulty is brought in by various privileges and constitutions of the Supreme Pontiffs—such as Alexander IV, Urban IV, Clement IV, and John XXII, and finally Martin V, Sixtus IV—some of which seem to make for the affirmative part, some for the negative.¹⁰³ But since an explanation of all these is not of this place, leaving that controversy, agitated with contrary opinions, in the middle, we merely say this to be certain according to the said canon: that all the faithful conscious to themselves of mortal sin are bound to confess at least once a year their sins either to their own priest, or to him to whom the proper priest shall have committed them.

§ 71. Finally, concerning the minister of absolution (*absolutio*), one must know that in extreme necessity—that is, when the danger of death is urgent—not only can any penitent be absolved by any priest, but also all reservation of cases (*casuum reservatio*) ceases, which otherwise is not to be doubted to have been lawfully and usefully introduced in the Church. Whence the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 7), after it had treated of the reservation of cases as ratified and valid even before God, and of its legitimate power, adds in this manner: "However, very piously, lest anyone perish because of this very reservation, the ancient and praiseworthy custom has always been kept, that there is no reservation in the article of death; and therefore all priests can absolve any penitents whatsoever from any sins and censures whatsoever. Outside of which article, since priests can do nothing in reserved cases, let them strive to persuade penitents of this one thing—that they go to superiors and lawful judges for the benefit of absolution." This the Council.

§ 72. But there is a doubt whether that power also extends to priests who are excommunicated, suspended, degraded, heretics, schismatics, apostates, and whether it is permissible for a penitent to ask absolution in the article of death (*in articulo mortis*) from any one of those. To this doubt it is answered first that, if scandal to the weak is imminent or a danger of seduction, it is not lawful to ask absolution from any of the aforesaid—just as neither would it be lawful to seek Baptism in a similar necessity. But if nothing of the sort is imminent, then from suspended and degraded priests—indeed, even from the excommunicated, so far as regards those penalties—it will not be unlawful to seek absolution. For in this case there belongs to them jurisdiction (*jurisdictio*) over the penitent as to the faculty of absolving him from sins and censures of whatever kind. And this belongs to them either by divine law, as some think; or, as others more probably, by ecclesiastical law—that is, by a grant of the Church, which wills that in the article of death this jurisdiction be in the hands of all the persons just named; which the words of the Council of Trent just now cited sufficiently intimate. Nor is it necessary to have recourse to divine law on account of the necessity of the dying man, because absolutely speaking he can be saved without the sacrament by true contrition together with the desire for the sacrament. And the same judgment holds concerning an occult heretic, even if he is known as such to

the penitent himself. Whether, however, the same also must be held about heretics, schismatics, and apostates cut off by the Church is not equally clear.

§ 73. And thus it can seem, first, from the general words of the Council, which, simply naming "all priests," excepts no one. Next, by a like case: because from such persons in necessity it would be lawful to seek Baptism—as we have shown from St. Augustine (*Against the Donatists*, book 1, ch. 2; and book 6, ch. 5) above, at Distinction 5, when we were treating of the minister of Baptism.¹⁰⁴ Wherefore, since the sacrament of Absolution is as necessary for the lapsed as the sacrament of Baptism for the unbaptized, it will be likewise permissible to seek absolution from them. And many follow this opinion; indeed, they say that one ought in necessity to seek absolution from such, because in necessity each person is bound to do what he can for the reception of the sacrament.

§ 74. A different opinion, however, is handed down by Silvester; and Dominic favors the same as very probable, and this reason also favors it: because priests who are heretics, schismatics, and apostates, cut off from the Church, have so utterly lost ecclesiastical jurisdiction and lack it to such a degree that, so long as they are such—that is, so long as they assail the Church with manifest impiety—they do not seem capable of any jurisdiction or superiority in the Church. Whence, if no priest could be had other than such a one, it must be reckoned just as if none could be had. Otherwise it is with the other persons named above: for if they are not manifest enemies of the Catholic Church, jurisdiction can be communicated to them in a case of necessity.

§ 75. If this opinion is true, and the reason solid—as we judge—one must say that the Council's words are to be taken only of Catholic priests, in the way that Dominic restricts his teaching; or more generally of priests not yet cut off by manifest defection or rebellion, that is, of those who are in the Church, or rather of those who are capable of ecclesiastical jurisdiction—such as are not those who openly attack the Church and her doctrine, so long as they are such. Nay, from the very words of the Council a solution is gathered; for it says that there is no reservation in the article of death, "and therefore all priests can absolve any penitents whatsoever from any sins and censures whatsoever"—that is to say, as regards the impediment of reservation, which there has no place; as if it said that in that case no reservation impedes. Whence manifest heretics too are not impeded by reservation; because, even were no reservation made, they could not absolve, for the reason that they are simply outside the Church, so that they are altogether incapable of ecclesiastical jurisdiction while they are such. As to Baptism, however, the case is not like, since there no jurisdiction is required.

§ 76. But to that which can be asked—whether, in the article of death, if there is no supply of a priest, one can confess to a deacon—the answer is clear from what was said above: he cannot, if the question is of sacramental confession; because by divine law the priest alone can absolve the one confessing, wherefore to a deacon no such power can be communicated by any human grant whatsoever.

§ 77. St. Cyprian (*Epistle 18, On penitents*) says: "If they should be occupied by some discomfort with danger of sickness, without waiting for our presence, they may make exomologesis of their sin with whatever presbyter is present; or, if a presbyter shall not have been found, they can also make exomologesis of their offense with a deacon, so that, when satisfaction has been enjoined upon them, they may come to the Lord with peace."¹⁰⁵ We reply that Cyprian is not speaking of sacramental confession, but of that exomologesis which used to be required of those who were doing public penance in order that they might be reconciled to the Church and could be loosed from excommunication. And indeed the authority of reconciling—just as the power of excommunicating—can belong also to a deacon and to any cleric whatsoever.

§ XIV — Whether in any case it is permissible to betray the secret of confession (De secreto confessionis utrum aliquo casu prodere liceat)

§ 78. Concerning not revealing the secret of confession (*secretum confessionis*), or, as they say, the seal (*sigillum*), two canons are extant: one of Gregory, in Gratian, On Penance, Distinction 6, chapter "Let the priest before all take heed," where it is said: "Let the priest before all take heed that he disclose to no one of those who confess their sins to him that he has confessed those sins, neither to relatives nor to outsiders; nor—far be it—even for any scandal. For if he shall have done this, let him be deposed," and so forth; the other, of the Lateran Council, canon 1, where it is said: "Let the priest take care absolutely that he by word or sign or by any other manner whatsoever betray the sinner in any way; but if he shall need the counsel of more prudent men, let him seek it without any expression of the person."¹⁰⁷ From these sanctions it is evident that the seal of confession ought to be so holy to the priest that by no account, in no case, is it permitted to betray to anyone of mortals a sin of anyone which has been heard in confession. The rationale of this doctrine is taken chiefly from divine law, because the things which are done outwardly in the sacraments are signs of the things which are done inwardly: therefore, that the penitent outwardly subjects himself to the priest is a sign of that subjection by which inwardly he subjects himself to Christ. Likewise the priest's absolution is a sign of that absolution by which Christ—of whose stead (*vice*) the priest discharges the function—when he absolves the sinner, forgives and covers sins, and never thereafter imputes them. For these three are either the same, or mutually connected, according to that saying (Ps. 31): "Blessed are they whose iniquities have been forgiven, and whose sins have been covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin." Therefore, the priest would in some way betray the sin of a man who subjects himself to him as to Christ's vicar; whereas such a betrayal, or disclosure, is of its nature ignominious among men; by such a deed he would signify that Christ would at some time betray to ignominy the sins of those whom he absolves—which is contrary to the signification of this sacrament. Hence it is clear that in the violation of this seal there is committed the sin both of sacrilege and of pernicious lying, because one sins against the holiness and the truth of the sacrament of absolution.

§ 79. But if you ask in which Scripture this divine law is founded, we reply: in that which commands the confession of occult sins for the sake of obtaining absolution from the priest; and altogether in this, that Christ appointed priests as vicars for loosing and binding, that is, for remitting and retaining sins, namely Matt. 18 and Jn. 20.¹ For from this it follows of itself, that the priest as Christ's vicar ought to know sins through confession, and that, because they are disclosed by the penitent in order to absolution to be received from the same priest as from the vicar of Christ, the same sins ought to be concealed by him. Although therefore by the natural law each one is bound to the concealment of a secret committed to him, especially when its disclosure would pertain to the infamy of his neighbor; and moreover by the canon law grave penalties have been established for priests who reveal sins confessed to them—as is evident from the two decrees cited above—yet the principal force of this obligation seems to arise from divine law and from the rationale of the sacrament; wherefore in no case at all, not even for danger to life, to the commonwealth, to the kingdom, to souls, nor by any dispensation of ecclesiastical power, is it permitted to disclose even the least sin known from confession. But it would not be thus, if this obligation were to arise from the natural or human law alone. For in many cases other secrets can be betrayed, and in human laws a dispensation can be granted by man. And hence it is also clear that this bond is greater than any promise of keeping a secret even confirmed by oath, since even there a dispensation sometimes finds place.

§ 80. Therefore what Leo (Epistle 80, to the bishops of Campania) forbids—that the sins of penitents be made public, lest by this many be shut off from the remedies of penance—is indeed one cause of this seal, yet not the principal, nor of itself sufficient. And in that place the Pontiff is not treating of the publication of sins which would be made by priests, but by the penitents themselves, or by priests with the consent and will of the penitents. But if someone should object the history of Socrates, book 5, chapter 19, and of Sozomen, book 7, chapter 16, where it is read that penitentiaries, appointed in individual cities, used to publish to the people the sins confessed to them privately, and thus to compel penitents to public penance: we reply that that publication of sins used to be done either by the penitents themselves (as in Leo), only at the exhortation, or even on the command, of the penitentiary; or indeed by the penitentiary, but with the consent of the penitents. In this way also must be taken what is read in the Tenth Council of Toledo, that the bishops of that synod came to know through a faithful—so he is there called—confessor of Bishop Potamius, that he had been defiled by woman's touch. For that man had already before confessed this his sin in the assembly of the bishops. But that this obligation, that is, of the inviolate firmness of the seal of confession (*sigillum confessionis*), may shine forth the more, certain things concerning this matter must be noted in detail.

§ 81. First: Not only mortal sins, but also venial sins, are subject to the seal of confession, and that under mortal guilt. The rationale is that, although venial sins are not of necessity to be confessed, yet when they are subjected by the confitent to the keys, then their secret pertains to the same law as with mortal sins; and if it is violated, one sins against the holiness and the truth of the sacrament, as was said above.

§ 82. Second: Not only the person of the penitent, but also whatever other persons are named in the confession, whether as partners in the sin or noted for sin, ought to be held under the same secret.

§ 83. Third: Not only expressly and with open words, but also implicitly, covertly, mediately, indirectly, or by general words, or by whatever signs, to reveal a sin heard in confession is unlawful and impious. For all these are encompassed under that which the Lateran canon prescribes, that the priest must take care "not by word or sign or by any other manner whatsoever to betray the sinner in any way."¹⁰⁷

§ 84. Fourth: Under the same seal are comprehended not only the circumstances of sins which are themselves sins, or which aggravate sins—whether they are necessary to the integrity of confession or not—but also all those circumstances by the knowledge and disclosure of which someone else named by the confitent could in any way be identified or brought into disrepute.

§ 85. Fifth: The secret of confession is so great that not even for the integrity of his own confession can the priest reveal the sin of another heard in confession—just as neither could he for that same reason disclose an occult sin of another known from any source whatsoever, although in this latter case the obligation is lesser. The rationale is that, when two precepts of God occur, for example, to conceal a sin heard in confession, or generally not to defame one's neighbor, and to confess one's own sin, then that which is of merely positive law must yield to that which is of natural law; and in that case the performance of the other is judged impossible. Wherefore the priest is excused, or someone else is, from the confession of that sin, so long as such impossibility lasts.

§ 86. Sixth: Although the priest alone is properly bound by the bond of this seal, nevertheless all others whatsoever, who in whatever way, whether by chance, or by fraud, or by some necessity, as interpreters, have heard the confession, are made sharers of this obligation to that extent—that by revealing the sin they not only sin against the law of nature, which forbids the secret of another's sin to be made manifest, but also do injury

to the sacrament, although in their act there is not false signification, as there is in the act of the priest, who alone in this business acts in the person of Christ.

§ 87. Seventh: Place ought to be given to the secret of confession also in those sins concerning which the confitent shows no signs of penitence, provided he confesses them sacramentally and with a view to obtaining absolution (according to the chapter "Quod quidam," in the Decretals, On Penance and Remissions). Otherwise, if he were to approach the priest to recite his sins in mockery or with some other evil intent. The rationale is that in every and only sacramental confession—whether it be, as they say, formed or unformed; whether integral or not integral; and whether absolution follows or not—this sacred seal has place.

§ 88. Eighth: If the priest has learned a sin known to him from confession also by another way, as because he saw it, or received it from the narration of others—whether he knew it before the confession or learned it afterward—he will not sin against the seal of confession, if he reveals it, or testifies about it, from that only cognition which he has outside confession. For then he does not reveal that sin according to the knowledge which he received in confession, but according to that outside; nor does he lose by means of the confession the right of revealing which he has from outside the confession. Whence also from probable conjectures observed outside the confession, he could denounce a criminal man to the judge, just as he would do if he had not heard his confession.

§ 89. Ninth: Likewise he will not sin against the seal, if he reveals that sin the power of revealing which he has received from the penitent—even if during the act of confessing the penitent granted that power to the priest without adding the narration of the same sin. The rationale is that by such a concession of the penitent the priest already knows that sin, not only as Christ's vicar in this sacrament, but also as a man having the faculty of disclosing that very thing, exactly as if that confession had been made by the penitent to someone else. Yet here it must be noted that the priest ought not easily but prudently to make use of such a confession, and not unless great utility urges, and that with those only with whom there is altogether need that the sin become known; and much more must he beware lest he learn it surreptitiously or by guile outside confession, and so disclose it. In which matter, besides fraud, the crime of sacrilege also would be committed.

§ 90. Tenth: No obligation of this divine seal arises, but only of a merely human secret, when, outside sacramental confession, something is entrusted to a priest, or to any man whatsoever, which one wishes to be kept truly secret, by saying that he commits it to him under the seal of confession—even if the other should in some way receive it so. The rationale of this is evident from the foregoing.

§ 91. Eleventh: A priest questioned by a judge about the crime of someone which he learned from confession alone, whether he knows that he committed this, can simply and freely answer that he does not know. Indeed he will be able to swear this very thing. For just as the judge's interrogation must be understood of those sins concerning which it belongs to him by office to question and to inquire; so also the answer of the priest and of any witness whatsoever must be referred to these same sins or crimes. And thus the sense of the answer will be: I do not know in that mode of knowing according to which I am bound to answer you who question— which sense of such interrogations and answers has even in Christian courts been received. And a witness who is not a priest, about a secret which he alone knows, when questioned, will likewise be able to answer the judge.

§ 92. Lastly: If a priest by a godless judge is asked not only whether he knows that the defendant has committed this crime, but, urged more closely, whether he knows it from confession or whether the

defendant has confessed this crime to him; then the foregoing interpretation of the question has no place, and hence neither does that answer. Therefore he will not be able to answer that he does not know it from confession, or that the defendant has not confessed this to him; but he will say that that question is impious and sacrilegious, to which it is not lawful for him to answer, even if on account of his refusal to give an absolute answer he is about to enter upon certain peril of life—since one must obey God rather than men.

§ XV — *What is signified by the name "keys" (Quid nomine clavium significetur)*

§ 93. Since by the confession of sins, which is in the power of the priest, the penitent therefore subjects himself to the power of the keys (*claves*), from this point we must treat of that power; and first it must be explained what ought to be understood by the keys committed to the priests and to the Church altogether. In the first place, it is clear that the name of keys is here taken not properly but metaphorically; but with a view to signifying what it is transferred remains a question. And indeed that keys were given and promised to the Church is read expressly in Scripture in no place except Matt. 16, where the Lord says to Peter: "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind," and so on. For in Matt. 18, where the power of binding and loosing is promised to all the apostles, and in Jn. 20, where the power of remitting and retaining sins is given to those same men, there is no express mention of keys. It is asked therefore what is signified by the name of keys in Matt. 16, the only place where keys are named. The earlier writers, among whom Theophylact, understand the metaphor of this name to be explained by the words immediately following, and say that keys are nothing other than the power of loosing, which they in turn interpret as the power of remitting, and of binding, which they interpret as the power of retaining, sins. Others, however, interpret keys as the power of discerning between sin and sin, which they call the key of knowledge, and the power of binding and loosing, which they call the key of power: of which two keys the former is preparatory to opening or shutting, the latter actually carries this out. This interpretation of the keys is handed on by Rabanus, treating this passage of the Gospel; and after him Gratian (in the Decretum, Distinction 20, at the very beginning), and to him contemporary the Master (in the present Distinction). These authors can seem to have drawn their opinion from Jerome, whose words (on Matthew) are these: "The bishop or the presbyter, according to his office, when he shall have heard the varieties of sins—who is to be bound, and who loosed"; for there he joins together knowledge with the power of binding and loosing as if two keys.¹⁰⁹

§ 94. But according to either of these interpretations the power of the keys, promised in that place to Peter, would seem to be common to all the apostles, bishops, and priests—which even Theophylact and Rabanus admit; although, not only from the text of the Gospel, where it is said peculiarly, "To thee will I give," but also from the doctrine of the Fathers, it is certain that something singular was promised by those words to Peter, which would not be common to the other apostles. Wherefore, by the keys of the kingdom of heaven promised to Peter, there is rather signified the plenary and supreme power of governing the Church of Christ. The rationale of this metaphor seems taken from this, that the supreme power of a house, as also of a city, is wont to be with him to whom the keys of the whole household or city are committed. Thus (Is. 22) the Lord, promising to Eliakim the highest authority with the king of Judah, says: "And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder: and he shall open, and none shall shut: he shall shut, and none shall open." Which is proved to have been said in type of Christ by a like passage concerning Christ (Rev. 3): "Who hath the key of

David," and so forth. For in like manner Scripture signifies that to Christ was given full and highest power in the kingdom of God his Father.

§ 95. According to this truer understanding of the keys, not only the power of remitting and retaining sins is included under the name of keys, but also the power of doing all those things whatsoever which are necessary for rightly administering the kingdom of Christ, which is the Church: of such a kind are, to receive believers into the household of Christ through the sacrament of Baptism; to propose, explain, and inculcate the evangelical law to the faithful; to enact new laws for the advantage of the faithful, and to dispense in them; to cast rebels and the contumacious out of the household, and to deprive them of communion; and the same men, and any other sinners whatsoever who return to their senses, to receive back into the bosom of the Church, to reconcile them to God, to enjoin satisfactions and to relax them, and to admit to communion, to administer the other sacraments; finally—

-
1. Matt. 18; Jn. 20.
 2. See above, Distinctio 14.
 3. See the next Distinctio.
 4. Thomas Waldensis, Tome 2, De Sacramentis, ch. 144.
 5. St. Thomas, "sup. dict. quest. 5" [abbreviation as in source].
 6. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
 7. Navarrus, cap. 1 of his Manual, num. 24.
 8. St. Augustine, *De adulterinis coniugiis* I, last chapter; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2.
 9. See above, Distinctio 4 of this book.
 10. St. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 13: "Quantumcumque catechumenus proficiat, adhuc sarcinam iniquitatis suae portat; non illi dimittitur, nisi cum venerit ad Baptismum."
 11. St. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 11: "Iesus non se credebat eis... Dimitti autem non possunt, nisi ei qui renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto."
 12. Acts 22: "Surge, ablue peccata tua."
 13. St. Augustine, Ep. 180, to Honoratus; [a: "Seu CCXXXVIII, inter Sermones IV Classis in Edit. Bened." — editorial note as in source].
 14. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 7; can. 11.
 15. St. Bernard, Sermon 1 on the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul.
 16. St. Bernard, Epistle 77 to Hugh, citing St. Augustine and St. Ambrose; cf. Rom. 10:13; Ps. 50:19 (Vulg.).
 17. See above, Distinctio 4.
 18. St. Thomas, "ubi supra" [abbreviation as in source].
 19. 2 Kgs (2 Sam.) 12:13: "Transtulit Dominus peccatum tuum."
 20. St. Augustine, Sermon 32 De diversis; St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 31; Cassiodorus, *Commentary on Ps. 31*. Editorial note: "Seu Sermones CCCCXXIII inter Sermones III Classis in Edit. Bened." [abbreviation as in source].
 21. Ps. 50:19 (Vulg.): "Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus; cor contritum et humiliatum, Deus, non despicies."
 22. Ezek. 33:12; Gen. 2:17; Is. 30 (LXX), "Cum conversus ingemueris, salvus eris."
 23. Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De remissione peccatorum* I, ch. 6 and ch. 12; Is. 30.

24. Roman Catechism (Catechism of the Council of Trent), on Penance, on contrition.
25. Above, Distinctio 14. St. Augustine, Tractates on John 47; "Homily 27 among the Fifty" [Aug.], with editorial note: "Seu Serm. CCCLII inter Serm. IV Classis in eadem" [abbreviation as in source]; St. Augustine, Sermon 8 De verbis Domini; St. Augustine, Sermon 52 Super Ps. 101; St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels 20 and 26; Eph. 5:14; Jas. 5:20; Ezek. 18:21; John 11.
26. St. John Chrysostom, Apologia David, book 2; St. Ambrose, Apologia David, ch. 12; St. Augustine, Contra Faustum, book and ch. 67 [abbreviation as in source]; St. Augustine, Quaestionum Evangelicarum II, q. 33; St. Augustine, Quaestiones 154 super Exodum.
27. Acts 10:4.
28. Gen. 2:17; see above, Distinctio 14.
29. See above, Distinctio 27 [abbreviation as in source]; Lk. 7:47: "Remissa sunt ei peccata multa, quia dilexit multum."
30. Fulgentius, De remissione peccatorum I, ch. 6 and ch. 12; see above on David in this distinction.
31. Roman Catechism (Catechism of the Council of Trent), on contrition, s.v. "De contritione" (the wording cited in the text).
32. "Nam et Scriptura hominem mortis aut virum mortis eum vocat, qui dignus est morte, ut 1. Reg. 20. 26. 2. Reg. 12. 3. Reg. 2. Reg. 2." [abbreviation as in source].
33. St. Augustine, Sermon 75 De diversis; editorial note: "Seu Serm. CCXII inter Serm. II Classis in Edit. Bened." [abbreviation as in source]. — Editorial note from the edition: "We have finally come to the point at which we must once more set down some remarks about this controversy, which we have noted more than once, concerning the administration of Penance. Certain men, in our times, deserve the name singular, since from it they distinguish the act of love from the Sacrament of Penance: as may be read in Christian Lupus on cap. 8 (and Joannes Neerkassel warns in his Opus), and indeed those defend the opinion which requires charity's act in the Sacrament (and they claim the Roman Church to support them) that contrition, raised to the grade of love of God, stable and fixed by a standing divine law, is also joined before the Sacrament with the grace of justification actually received; in which the author verbally brings forward an opposing view. In this also they depart from the author, that they confess that even in that case, although a man attains sanctifying grace, it is nevertheless not to be attributed to contrition as containing it, but to be assigned to the Sacrament integral and entire—and not only the guilt of eternal punishment is remitted, but temporal punishments as well are remitted, and indeed, as all the Ancients at least with one voice confess, divine Mercy does not bear that a man, once made alive and turned away from guilt and truly converted to God—received back into friendship, freed from eternal punishments and eternal death—for indeed in his Decree Distinct. 1 On Penance the Master himself speaks of contrition and hidden satisfaction without oral confession; whence hither and thither very many testimonies both of Scripture and of the Fathers are brought forward, that by contrition alone the sinner is reconciled with God), that such a sinner has need to confess his sin to God so that he may complete his confession by mouth; yet that he obtains, so far as depends on him, in very deed the remission both of guilt and of the penalties. And yet against the common consent of all the Theologians, and from the definitions of the Church, and from the common practice and, in the whole Tradition, that God reconciles the penitent through the ministry of the Priest, pouring grace into him, freeing him from the chains of eternal punishments, and the Son, to whom He gave the power to remit sins, and countless commendations of the Ancients and of the Fathers, and of the Councils, and testimonies of Scripture, and others too many to mention, they oppose Joannes Morinus in the prefaced work, book 1 (cap. 2, 3, 8, 9; also 30 and 31). We, as we are accustomed, do not undertake the opinion of that most learned author as if we were approving it; and it is indeed certain and, from the definitions of the Church, and from the common judgment of all the Theologians, we confess without doubt, that in the whole Tradition God has adjudged to the Priest-Confessor the Sacrament of Penance as a necessary means in order to reconcile the sinner to grace, to liberate him from the chains of eternal punishments, and that the Son, to whom He entrusted the power to remit sins, freed the world, to whom He entrusted the keys; unless Joannes Morinus in the aforesaid work, book 1 (cap. 7, 8, 10; and 15, 55, 65) seem to contradict. And certainly we have noted that the whole choir of the ancient Church's rites testifies that the authority of the Apostle to the Gentiles is that of the Church to reconcile the sinner who returns as a penitent, and that he be absolved by the Priest's ministry, as that same place relates. The Master strongly speaks in the preceding opinion that he does not hesitate that Confession was less prescript in the ancient age, since some Lutherans thought so, as also Johannes Morinus in the prefaced work, book 1 (cap. 3, 8, 9; also 30 and 31) noted. But it is not our task to judge this here; our purpose is only to indicate that he himself confessed the contrary. And certainly the Council of Trent thus speaks: If anyone shall say that Absolution of the Priest is not a judicial act, but a mere ministry of pronouncing and declaring that the sins are forgiven to him who confesses, only if he believes himself to be absolved; or that the Priest does not need to have the intention of absolving; let him be anathema (Sess. 14, can. 9). Likewise: If anyone shall say that sacramental confession is not necessary by divine law, or is not instituted by Christ, or that to confess all and singly the mortal sins which after due examination of himself come to memory is impossible; let him be anathema (ibid., can. 7). From the words of the

Council it clearly appears that they do not admit any other reason than the same sentence which proceeds also with the Sacrament; they indeed deny that one may be justified without the Sacrament, unless per accidens, and this with a moderation that judgment is reserved to God; so that they temper the matter lest a man, even if justified, attribute it to the temperament itself; which the author takes too minimally, when he teaches that the whole conversion is from the will which, once elicited before the Sacrament, therefore depends on nothing; so that by that contrition alone man is disposed before God both to justification and to pardon received through the Sacrament: and that indeed is condemned by the determination of not a few of our theologians. We add, some bring forward by name Bajus and Jansen; we do not deny that someone admits a certain degree of charity, or even before the Sacrament, but in the order of the Sacrament fixed, and by the firm divine law the man is reconciled to God. What things we have amply explained elsewhere by name."

34. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 6.
35. The confession of Achan to Joshua; see Josh. 7:19–21.
36. Matt. 3:6.
37. Lk. 3:10–14.
38. Matt. 5:24.
39. Lk. 17:3–4.
40. Jas. 5:16.
41. The book of Leviticus, prescribing confession in several places; e.g., Lev. 5:5; 16:21.
42. Origen, *Homilies on Leviticus*, hom. 2.
43. St. Ambrose, *De Paradiso*, ch. 4.
44. St. Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*, lib. 8, on Lk. 19.
45. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, on Ps. 68.
46. St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Matthew*, hom. 42; *Homilies on Hebrews*, hom. 30.
47. Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 6.
48. Epictetus, commonly cited maxim.
49. Ezek. 33.
50. 1 Cor. 11; Ps. 76: "Scopebam spiritum meum."
51. Ps. 18: "Ab occultis meis munda me."
52. The Mosaic Law prescribed diverse sacrifices for diverse sins; see, for example, Leviticus.
53. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplementum, q. 6, a. 1–2.
54. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 5; cf. the same Session, ch. 8.
55. Venerable Bede, *Commentary on James*, ad Jas. 5:16; [Pseudo-]Augustine, *De visitatione infirmorum*, book 2, ch. 4; [Pseudo-]Augustine, *De sacramentis*, book 2, part 14, ch. 1.
56. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplementum, q. 6 ["S. Thom. ibidem" in the source].
57. [Pseudo-]Clement of Rome, *Epistle to James*.
58. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, *Epistle to Demophilus*.
59. Tertullian, *De paenitentia*, esp. ch. 10.
60. Origen, *Homilies on the Psalms*, Hom. 2 on Ps. 38.
61. Origen, *Homilies on Leviticus*, Hom. 2; Hom. 3; Hom. 17. Scripture cited: Is. 44:22.
62. St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*; see also *Epistles*, book 3, ep. 14.
63. Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* IV, ch. 17; and the last chapter of the same book.
64. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI, ch. 27.

65. St. Basil, *Regulae fusius tractatae breviusque expositae* (Shorter Rules), q. 288 ("Ad quaestionem: quibus confitenda sint peccata?"); see also q. 110; among the Rules more at large disputed, q. 26; and on Ps. 32; and the example in *De vera virginitate* near the end.
66. St. Ambrose, *De paenitentia* II, ch. 6; *De paradiso*, ch. 14; Exhortation to do penance (passim); Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambrosii*.
67. St. Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew*, ad Matt. 16; *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, ad Eccl. 10; *Regulae monachorum* II, ch. 9 (ascribed to Jerome).
68. St. John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* II–III.
69. St. John Chrysostom, *De compunctione cordis*; Hom. 1 in Ps. 50; Hom. 3 ad populum Antiochenum; Sermon *De paenitentia et confessione*; Hom. 20 in *Genesim*; Hom. 5 de verbis Isaiae; as excerpted also in Gratian's *Decretum*, *De poenitentia*, dist. 1, cc. 40–41; *Opus imperfectum in Matthaum*, Hom. 3; *Opus perfectum*, Hom. 10 on Matt. 3, "Confitentes peccata sua." On the attribution of the "Imperfect Work," see the tradition; its antiquity is coeval. On the reading about public and private penance, see Thomas Waldensis, *De sacramentis*, tom. 2, ch. 136.
70. St. Augustine, Hom. 49, ch. 3 (older editions differ in numbering; cf. the editor's cross-references supplied in the source). On the cross-references given by Estius: (a) "Seu Sermon. CCCXCII. inter Sermon. V. Classis"; (b) "Seu Sermon. CCCLII. & CCCLI. inter Sermon. I"; (c) "Seu LIV. in eadem Edit."; (d) "Seu Sermon. CCLV. inter Sermon. IV. Classis."
71. St. Augustine, *Tract. 49 in Joannem*; *Enarratio in Psalmum 56*; Homil. 27; Ep. 118, pars 3; Sermon. 57 de tempore; *De visitatione infirmorum* I, ch. ...; *De vera paenitentia*, cc. 10, 20. St. Leo the Great, Ep. 91; Ep. 8.
72. St. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, Hom. 26. The Venerable Bede, *Commentary on James*, ad Jas. 5:16; and on 1 John 5:16. St. Bernard, *Vita Malachiae*; Hom. in *Octava Paschae*; Hom. 1 in *Octavam Pentecostes*; Hom. 5 post *Octavam Pentecostes* (on "Ostendite vos sacerdotibus").
73. Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21; Council of Constance, session 8; Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, session 14.
74. St. Thomas, *ibidem* [abbreviation as in source].
75. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2.
76. Jn. 20:23; Matt. 16:19.
77. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* V, ch. 19; Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* VII, ch. 16; Nicephorus, *Historia* XII, ch. 28. Cf. St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*.
78. Nicephorus Chartophylax, Letter to the monk Theodosius on the power of binding and loosing; the narrative about Pope Vitalian and Theodore in the Venerable Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* IV, ch. 1. St. Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam* X (on Luke 22). Maximus of Turin, Homily 3 on Peter's Penance. St. Augustine, Sermon 252 (de tempore) [see the editor's note on numbering]. Prosper of Aquitaine, *De vita contemplativa* II, ch. 7. The Venerable Bede, on Luke 17:14 ("Go, show yourselves to the priests"). Theodore of Canterbury, Penitential (as cited by Gratian, *Decretum*, *De poenitentia*, dist. 1, cap. finale). Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21; John Teutonicus, Gloss on *Decretum*, *De poenitentia*, at the beginning of Dist. 1. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 2 on Ps. 50; Hom. 31 on Hebrews; Hom. 52 on Matthew. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* II, part 14, ch. 1. 2 Macc. 9. Scotus, on confession (see his *In IV Sent.*); Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, on the same.
79. Matt. 11:30.
80. St. Leo the Great, Epistle 80 to the bishops of Campania.
81. Origen, Homilies on Ps. 37, hom. 2.
82. St. Basil, Shorter Rules, q. 110; q. 288. St. Basil, Rule for Monks, ch. 21. Rule for Nuns under the name of St. Jerome, ch. 9.
83. St. John Chrysostom, Homily on Penance and Confession, as cited by Pamelius. Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* VII, ch. 16.
84. Gratian, *De poenitentia*, Dist. 1, cap. "Quem poenitet"; Dist. 6, cap. "Qui vult," both taken from the work *On True and False Penance*, ch. 11. Pope St. Gregory the Great, in the same Dist. 6, cap. "Sacerdos." Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21.
85. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 6, a. 3; q. 9, a. 2.
86. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 5; Ps. 18:13 (Vulgate): "Ab occultis meis munda me, Domine."
87. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8.

88. Fourth Lateran Council, canon 21 ("Omnis utriusque sexus").
89. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 6, a. 5.
90. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), canon 21 ("Omnis utriusque sexus").
91. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 7; canon 11.
92. Sir. 3:27: "Qui amat periculum, peribit in illo."
93. Tertullian, De poenitentia; St. Cyprian, De lapsis; Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis, book 2 [abbreviation as in source].
94. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 8, a. 1–3.
95. Jn. 20:23.
96. St. Ambrose, De poenitentia I, ch. 2; St. Leo the Great, Ep. 91; St. John Chrysostom, De sacerdotio; [Pseudo-]Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 10; See below, Distinction on the Power of the Keys [abbreviation as in source].
97. Decretal ascribed to Martin V in the Extravagants, De poenitentia; the note in our author adds that this decretal, which some attribute to Martin, is in fact of Innocent III, in a certain chapter "extra De Poenitentiis et Remissionibus" [abbreviation as in source]; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 6; canon 10.
98. [Pseudo-]Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia, ch. 10.
99. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 6; ch. 7.
100. Hugh of St. Victor, [as cited elsewhere by the author; abbreviation as in source]; Jas. 5:16: "Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra."; Jas. 5:14: "Introducat presbyteros Ecclesiae.".
101. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 8, aa. 4–5.
102. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), canon 21 "Omnis utriusque sexus" under Innocent III.
103. The author refers to various privileges and constitutions of the Supreme Pontiffs: Alexander IV, Urban IV, Clement IV, John XXII, Martin V, Sixtus IV [abbreviations and names as in the source].
104. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas, I, ch. 2; VI, ch. 5; see above at Distinction 5, on the minister of Baptism.
105. St. Cyprian, Ep. 18, De poenitentibus.
106. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 11, aa. 1–3.
107. Gregory's canon in Gratian, De poenitentia, Dist. 6, c. "Sacerdos ante omnia caveat"; Fourth Lateran Council (1215), canon 21 "Omnis utriusque sexus" (clause: "Caveat autem omnino Sacerdos...").
108. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa, q. 17.
109. Theophylact, In Matt.; Rabanus Maurus, on the same Gospel passage; Gratian, *Decretum*, Dist. 20 (at the beginning) [abbreviation as in source]; the Master (of the Sentences) in the present Distinction; St. Jerome, Commentary on Matthew.

DISTINCTIO XVIII — ON THE KEYS OF THE CHURCH AND THE POWER OF BINDING AND LOOSING (*DE CLAVIBUS ECCLESIAE ET POTESTATE LIGANDI ET SOLVENDI*)

§ 1. To institute the public ministers of the Church, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, according to the laws received from Christ for the edification of the whole body of Christ, and to do and take care of whatever else pertains to the governance of the Church—these things belong to that office.

§ 2. However, since all these things in part likewise belong to all the Apostles and Bishops, and most of them also to Presbyters, while some indeed belong even to certain others, it follows that they too, in their own way, are rightly said to have received the keys of the Kingdom of heaven (*claves Regni caelorum*), according to that which was promised to all the Apostles, "Whatsoever you shall bind," and so forth, and conferred, "Whose sins you shall forgive," and so forth.¹ Therefore, in this way every spiritual power (*potestas spiritualis*) of the Church, in whomever it may be, is included under the name of a key or keys (*clavis seu claves*).

§ 3. But that this doctrine concerning the keys of the Church (*claves Ecclesiae*) may shine forth more clearly, one must distinguish, in general, the twofold power (*potestas duplex*) given by Christ to the Church: one, namely, of Order (*potestas Ordinis*), and the other of jurisdiction (*potestas iurisdictionis*).

§ 4. To the power of Order belongs the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and the administration of all the sacraments. But to the power of jurisdiction belong the making of laws, and the changing of the same, or the removal of them, or dispensing in them; the granting of indulgences; to excommunicate and to absolve from excommunication; and to bind the faithful with other penalties and censures or to set those who have been bound free—indeed, to this there must also be referred the preaching of the word of God and the explication of Sacred Scripture and of the dogmas of the Christians, inasmuch as these are done not from private knowledge only, but from the authority in which a man functions in the Church. For one teaching the truth in such a way is said to use not only knowledge (*scientia*), but also the key of knowledge (*clavis scientiae*). Those who do not use it, or use it ill, are reproved by those words of the Lord: "Woe to you, lawyers, who have taken away the key of knowledge," and so forth.²

§ 5. Indeed, St. Jerome even extends to this office the power of loosing (*potestas solvendi*), where he says that the Apostles loose the cords of sins by the word of God, and by the testimonies of the Scriptures, and by exhortation to virtues—and that according to the power given to them by the Lord in these words: "Whatsoever you shall loose," and so forth.³

§ 6. In this way also the Supreme Pastor of the Church, or a General Council, when defining some controversy in Religion or opening the sense of Scripture, truly makes use of the key of knowledge—so much the more surely as he has also received from Christ a greater power and more certain promises.

§ 7. Wherefore to all these things there belongs not only the general power of the keys, but also the power of loosing and binding the people, as a power of opening and shutting, that is, of governing the whole household of Christ—being altogether the same as the power of binding and loosing. Thus indeed the Lord willed to signify one and the same reality by different metaphors, the one taken from keys, the other from chains, namely the all-around administration of the household; especially since the metaphors are drawn from things related among themselves: for he who looses, opens; and he who binds, shuts.

§ 8. Since therefore the signification of the mystical keys given to the Church extends so far, nevertheless, by way of naming more strictly (*onomastice*), by the name of keys there is wont to be understood in a peculiar way the power of Order for the forgiving of sins—these are called the sacramental keys (*claves sacramentales*), and they were conferred upon the Church in the Apostles and in their successors, Bishops and priests, but especially when the Lord, raised from the dead, breathed upon His disciples, saying: "Receive the Holy Spirit; Whose sins you shall forgive," and so forth.⁴

§ 9. For by so notable an act and by words so clear (so say the Fathers of the Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4) the common consent of all the Fathers has always understood that the power of remitting and of retaining sins, for the reconciling of the faithful fallen after Baptism, was communicated to the Apostles and to their legitimate successors.⁵

§ 10. Moreover, they say this especially, partly because in Matt. 18 both this power was conferred and it was promised; partly because those general names, "of loosing and binding," expressed there, extend more widely than the power that is here named "of remitting and retaining."

§ 11. Furthermore, these sacramental keys are two: the one of knowledge (*clavis scientiae*), the other of power (*clavis potestatis*). The key of knowledge is said to be not knowledge itself (for in this way many priests would not have the key of knowledge—which the Master judged not rightly—and many who are not priests would have it), but the authority to hear the case of the sinner and to take cognizance of it. But the key of power is said to be the authority to absolve the sinner, and to bind him to some penance, or even to repel him wholly as unworthy of absolution.

§ 12. Whether, however, this sacramental power of the keys, encompassing both the key of knowledge and of power, is the same as the sacramental character (*character sacramentalis*), or something different from it—for the sacramental character of Order seems to extend more widely, as it also includes the power of consecrating the Eucharist—on this point the opinions of the doctors vary.

§ II — To whom the keys were given (Quibus datae sint claves)

§ 13. Now indeed from what has been said the way is evident for answering that question, to whom the keys (*claves*) were given. For since by the keys there is signified in general a certain spiritual power (*potestas*), and this is not one but twofold, it is evident that, according to the diversity of power, one must answer this question in different ways. For the power of Order (*potestas Ordinis*) belongs to all bishops and priests who have been lawfully ordained according to the rite of the Church, according to those functions for which they have been ordained.

§ 14. In a special way, the sacramental power of the keys (*potestas clavium sacramentalis*) is the portion of, and belongs to, the priests of the New Law alone, inasmuch as they bear the priesthood, that is, the office, not

inasmuch as priests, but inasmuch as they have received the power of remitting and of retaining sins. For this power Christ granted to His disciples after the Resurrection, whom nevertheless, before His Passion, at the Supper He had consecrated as priests.

§ 15. The power of jurisdiction (*potestas jurisdictionis*) in the external forum, or the forum of conscience, likewise belongs to bishops and priests alone, because to them alone belongs the administration of the sacrament of Penance; yet not to all, but only to those who shall have received some jurisdiction, either ordinary or subdelegated: without which a priest absolutely cannot use the keys either by absolving someone or by binding him. For the power of jurisdiction, which does not, as some think, reside in the whole body of the Church, but in the prelates, who, having received either by Christ's delegation or by the commission of superiors, each according to his own degree, have authority either lesser or greater for the conduct of affairs; and the highest and full power was promised to Peter, the Vicar of Christ, by these words: "To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 16), and was conferred (Jn. 21) when He said: "Feed my sheep." From whom thereafter all his successors have passed into the same power. But the lower rulers of churches are likewise participants of the same, each according to his own grade and order.⁷

§ 16. And as this power of jurisdiction does not belong to all priests, so nothing prevents it from being entrusted to non-priests; indeed even to those not ordained, but only clerics. Which rank suffices for this external jurisdiction; and so at least in name it is by congruity necessary.

§ 17. As regards the female sex, it must be granted not only that a woman cannot by any title receive in herself the power of Order—for thus we shall teach when we have come to the sacrament of Order—but it must also be said that she cannot be established in a dignity to which some spiritual jurisdiction is annexed. The reason for this is that the woman is in a state of subjection before all, especially with respect to the business of ecclesiastical governance, the Apostle saying in 1 Cor. 14: "Let women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted them to speak, but to be subject." And again: "For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." And presently he admonishes: "Know that the things I write are the commandments of the Lord." So in 1 Tim. 2 he says: "Let a woman learn in silence with all subjection. But to teach a woman I permit not."

§ 18. From which it is evident that neither the key of Order, nor the key of jurisdiction, has been committed to women. Whence Innocent III (in the Decretals, "On Penances and Remissions," the chapter "Nova") replied in this manner: "Certain new things have been reported to our ears, that abbesses bless their own nuns, themselves hear confessions in crimes, and, reading the Gospel, presume to preach publicly. Since therefore that is equally incongruous and absurd, we command you to take care to forbid that henceforth it be done at all; because, although the most Blessed Virgin Mary was more worthy and more excellent than all the Apostles, nevertheless the Lord did not commit to her, but to them, the keys of the kingdom of heaven."⁸

§ III — That priests have the power to remit sins, and not merely to declare them remitted (Sacerdotes habere potestatem remittendi peccata, et non tantum declarandi)

§ 19. Concerning the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*), which is exercised in the sacrament of Penance, and is proper to priests, this principal question is discussed: whether a priest, using the power of absolving given to

him by Christ, truly absolves the penitent from sins, and truly, with respect to the fault, that is, the obligation of eternal punishment, remits sins; or rather only shows and declares, or announces, that sins have been remitted by God.

§ 20. The latter side of the question is held in this Distinction by the Master, who, when in sections D, E, and F he had set forth contrary opinions on this matter with appended testimonies, finally concludes thus: "This indeed we can say or think, that God alone forgives and retains sins; and yet He has granted to the Church the power of binding and loosing; but He Himself looses and binds in one way, the Church in another. For He alone by Himself forgives sin, in that He cleanses the soul from its interior stain, and releases from the debt of eternal death. But this He has not granted to the priests, to whom nevertheless He has given the power of loosing and binding, that is, of showing men to be bound or loosed," and so on.¹⁰

§ 21. The same doctrine is taught by Richard of St. Victor (in the Treatise "On the Keys"). Following these are Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Gabriel, and several others.¹¹ But the former opinion is held by Hugh (book 2 of "On the Sacraments," part 14, chapter 8), and after him St. Thomas, Scotus, Durandus, Paludanus, and very many others.¹²

§ 22. And since this opinion is not only openly taught in the Scriptures and attested by the clear testimonies of the Fathers, but has also finally been defined by the authority of Councils, we shall first bring forward the arguments which make for its confirmation; then we shall dissolve those brought on the contrary, whether by the Master or by others.

§ 23. Therefore, in the first place, the Scripture (Jn. 20) must be set down as of all the clearest, where the Lord says to the disciples: "As the Father sent me, I also send you," and, having breathed the Holy Spirit upon them, subjoins: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained." By which words indeed the Lord testifies that He gives to the disciples that power which He had received from the Father; therefore, just as Christ did not only announce the remission of sins, but truly and properly conferred it, when He said to the paralytic and to the sinner woman: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," as both the evangelical context and the murmuring of the Scribes and Pharisees most clearly prove; so also the Apostles received the power truly and properly to remit sins, so that they likewise could say to sinners converted to penance that they forgive them their sins, and absolve them from sin—only with this difference, namely, that Christ as God forgave sins by His own authority, and as man had, for remitting the same sins as also for the other sacramental effects, the power of principal ministry; whereas the Apostles received only the power of secondary ministry.

§ 24. Nevertheless, just as with respect to the effect of Baptism it made no difference whether Christ baptized by Himself, or by the Apostles, because this was always true: "This is he who baptizeth in the Holy Spirit"; and just as he was not less cleansed from leprosy whom the Apostle, having received power from Christ, should command to be clean, than he whom Christ Himself should cleanse; and so in other miracles: because indeed through the Apostles Christ worked after precisely the same manner; so also he attained no less the remission of sins to whom the Apostle, by the mandate of Christ, should say, than to him to whom Christ should say by Himself: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," or, "I absolve thee from thy sins"; Christ, namely, doing the same thing through the Apostle as His vicar, which in the Gospel He is read to have done by Himself.¹³

§ 25. Second: A similar proof can be established from Scripture (Matt. 16 and 18), except that those Scriptures are not so special, because loosening extends more widely than remission. For a man is not only loosed by the remission of sins, but also in other ways can be spiritually loosed by the ministry of those who preside in the Church. Yet since it was said universally: "Whatsoever you shall loose," that loosening which is from the guilt of eternal damnation ought, under that generality, to be understood as especially included.

§ 26. Whence St. Ambrose, book 3 "On the Holy Spirit," chapter 18, says that Peter, having received the keys of the kingdom of heaven from Christ, with confidence forgave sins, as if he were saying: Peter no more doubts the effect of his words, when he would say to the penitent, "I forgive thee thy sins," than when he said to the lame man: "Arise and walk."¹⁴

§ 27. Third: In the Lord's words (in Matthew) "to bind" is not the same as to announce, or to show one bound, but signifies something more; therefore "to loose" likewise. The consequence is evident by parity. But the antecedent is proved from the very place (Matt. 18). For he who, according to the Lord's precept, warns and rebukes his brother concerning some fault, does indeed declare to him that he is held fast by the bond of sin; and that all the more, if he add the second and the third correction; yet he is not even then reckoned as bound; but only then is he bound, when the Church, by sentence, pronounces that he must be held as a heathen and a publican. Whence it is presently subjoined: "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind," etc. Therefore "to bind" is far other than "to show as bound."

§ 28. Fourth proof can be taken from the comparison of similar places of Scripture; for thus it was said: "Whose sins you shall forgive," and, "Whatsoever you shall bind"; just as of Christ it is said (Rev. 3): "He who hath the key of David; who openeth, and no man shutteth; shutteth, and no man openeth." And as of the Aaronic priests (Num. 6): "They shall invoke my name upon the sons of Israel, and I will bless them," that is, to them blessing I will bless. And as Isaac said (Gen. 27) of Jacob: "I have blessed him; and he shall be blessed." And again as of the legal priest it is said (in Leviticus): "And the priest shall pray for him, and it shall be forgiven him." If therefore in these it cannot be understood as a bare declaration either of opening or of blessing or of remission, but as a power or ministry availing to such an effect; in those likewise it must be so assessed. Otherwise—far be it—the ministry of the evangelical priest would avail less for remitting sins than that of Aaron.

§ 29. Fifth: The form of this sacrament is: "I absolve thee," not: "I show thee to be absolved": indeed, if anyone should use a form of this kind, he would deservedly be reprehended as a corrupter of the legitimate form: therefore "to loose" is not the same as "to show as loosed."

§ 30. Sixth: It is the pious persuasion of all the faithful, and has always been, that by the ministry of the priest they are truly absolved from sins, not that he only shows them to be absolved.

§ 31. Seventh: The effect of the sacrament of Penance is, according to the decree of Florence, absolution from sins, and, according to the decree of Trent (session 14, chapter 3), reconciliation with God; therefore the priest, the minister of this sacrament, truly absolves the sinner from sins, and reconciles him to God.¹⁵

§ 32. Eighth: Every testimony is by nature posterior to the thing itself of which testimony is borne; therefore, if the priest only thus far remits sin, because he declares and attests it to be remitted; sin will be remitted to the man before it shall be remitted to him by the priest, that is, before it shall be announced as remitted. But the words of Christ clearly signify that the act of the priest is prior to the very remission of sins: "Whatsoever," He says, "you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." Likewise: "Whose sins you

shall forgive, they are forgiven them," whereas otherwise it ought rather to have been said: "You shall loose and forgive on earth the things which are already loosed and forgiven in heaven." Which manner of speaking is altogether alien to the mind of all the Fathers.

§ 33. Ninth: The Fathers openly testify that the priest is prior to God in the remitting of sin, and that what shall have been done by the priest is approved by God and held ratified. For Cyprian says (Epistle 2, book 1): "Nor indeed was it right that the Church should be closed to those who knock, when He Himself who gave the law permitted that the things which are bound on earth should be bound also in heaven; but those could be loosed which should first here in the Church be loosed." And Hilary on Matt. 16: "O blessed doorkeeper of heaven, to whose arbitrement are delivered the keys of the eternal entrance; whose earthly judgment has its prejudged authority in heaven, so that, whatsoever things are either bound or loosed on earth, may obtain in heaven the condition of the same statute."¹⁶

§ 34. Likewise Chrysostom (Homily 5 on the words of Isaiah, "I saw the Lord"), after he had cited the Gospel words (Matt. 18), when he had said that from earth heaven takes its chief authority for judging, subjoins thus: "For the judge sits on earth, the Lord follows the servant; whatsoever he shall judge here in the lower regions, that the same He confirms in the heavenly places." Then he adds that the priest reconciles to us the Lord angered, and snatches us who have offended from His hands.¹⁷

§ 35. Similarly Leo (in the Sermon on the Transfiguration of the Lord): "Nor in binding or loosing any causes whatsoever," he says, "was there anything ratified in heaven other than what should have sat at the judgment of Peter." And the author of the book "On True and False Penance," chapter 10, writes in this manner: "For the priests themselves can now profit more, spare more those confessing. To whom they remit, the Lord remits; and Lazarus, already raised by the Lord from the tomb, the Lord offered to the disciples to be loosed, thereby showing the power of loosing granted to the priests. For He said: 'Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven,' that is, I God and all the orders of the heavenly soldiery and all the saints in my glory praise with you and confirm what you bind and loose upon earth. He did not say, whom you think to bind and to loose, but in whom you exercise a work of justice or of mercy." So he.

§ 36. Finally, illustrious is the sentence of Bernard (Sermon 1 on the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul), that the sentence of Peter precedes the sentence of heaven. With almost the same words Hugh of St. Victor used in the place already cited above, where expressly he rejects that sense which the Master presents, namely that to loose is not other than to show as loosed.

§ 37. Tenth argument is taken from the general notion of a sacrament (*ratio sacramenti*). For if the priest should signify nothing else than that sins are remitted; then through this sacrament of Penance grace would not be conferred. Yet that without any doubt pertains to the formal character of a sacrament of the New Law.

§ 38. Eleventh: If the priest does not absolve, but only shows the person to be absolved, then he does not open heaven to the penitent, but shows it as opened; and therefore he has not truly received the keys for opening. But the metaphor of keys would be altogether inept, if they were said to be given only for showing. For the proper and legitimate use of keys is not to show a thing as closed or opened, but to close and to open.

§ 39. Twelfth: If the priest does not truly absolve the one confessing, then assuredly the precept of confession will have more of burden than of usefulness. For its chief usefulness, according to the institution of Christ in this doctrine, will be the bare declaration of absolution. Which usefulness does not seem to compensate the gravity of that precept.

§ 40. Thirteenth: This showing or declaration of absolution has either no use, or a very slight one. For it is not for God, who knows all things, and who, as that opinion wishes, has already absolved the penitent; nor is it for the Church, because this is not the external forum; nor for the priest himself, because a declaration ought to be made to another; nor yet for the penitent himself, since, other things being equal, the penitent himself sees much better in his heart his true contrition, by which he is held to have been already absolved before God, than the priest can ascertain it from his confession and outward signs; and therefore he has no need of this declaration of the priest—especially if he be learned, or even more learned than the priest himself.

§ 41. Fourteenth: Nothing will hinder this declaration from being made by any learned man, even a layman endowed with no jurisdiction: indeed, by this plan anyone could absolve himself, because by himself he will sufficiently understand himself to be absolved before God, and that more certainly than by any other priest whatsoever.

§ 42. Fifteenth: The Apostles truly loosed Lazarus, raised by Christ, from the bands with which he was still bound, and did not merely show him as one to be loosed; therefore they also truly absolve from the bonds of eternal death the sinner, raised by God through penance, and do not merely show him as such. That the Apostles bore this type by that deed St. Augustine attests in many places, as in Tractate 49 on John, Sermons 8, 44, and 52 "On the Words of the Lord," Homily 27 among the fifty, and on Psalm 101, Sermon 2; the same in the book "On True and False Penance." Likewise, most plainly, Gregory (Homily ... on the Gospel). And before both, Irenaeus, book 5 "Against Heresies."¹⁸

§ 43. Lastly: This doctrine is confirmed by the authority of Councils. For they all with one consent acknowledge in the Church the power of remitting and retaining sins for reconciling the faithful—communicated to the Apostles and to their successors, bishops and priests, but chiefly in those words of the Lord: "Whose sins you shall forgive." Thus the Fathers of Trent (session 14, chapter 1) testify. Besides the places of the Fathers cited above in the arguments, they prove it first from the three books "On the Priesthood" of Chrysostom, where he frequently inculcates that the priests remit sins. That he wishes this to be understood most properly is clear (from chapter 5 of book 3), where, since he had taught that this power was given neither to Angels nor Archangels, and that it is so great that whatever the priests shall have wrought on earth, this God on high holds ratified, and the Lord confirms the sentence of the servant, he presently subjoins with the words of the Lord (Jn. 20): "What, I ask, could any power be comparable to this one? The Father in all respects has given power to the Son; but I see this same power in all respects handed down by the Son to them." A little later: "It was permitted to the priests of the Jews to cleanse the leprosy of the body—or rather, to speak more truly, not to cleanse, but to prove cleansed. But to our priests it has been granted, not to prove the stains of the soul cleansed, but to cleanse them outright." Another place of his is on Hebrews 10; with whom the others agree: namely Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 7), Tertullian (book "On Penance," chapter 10), Cyprian (Sermon "On the Lapsed"; Epistles 52 and 54), Ambrose (Homilies 1 and 2 on Psalm 37; book 2 on Leviticus), Athanasius (Sermon on those words: "He set out into a village"), Basil ("Monastic Rules," chapter 23; book 3 to Amphilochius, canon 73), Gregory Nazianzen (Oration to the Emperor and Princes), Jerome (on Ecclesiastes 10; and on Matt. 16; and to Algasia), Pacian (To Sympronian, the book "On Penance" against Novatian), Augustine (various works as in the source), Arnobius, Fulgentius (book 1 "On the Remission of Sins," chapter 25), Cyril (on John, chapter 16), Leo (Epistle 91), and others on John 20 and in an Epistle; Anastasius of Nicaea (Question 6: "Whether it is good to confess sins to the ministers"). To these among the Doctors is joined Thomas Waldensis with a learned disputation (book "On

the Sacraments," chapter 141, and in some other places) against the heretics the Wycliffites, who contended that a priest cannot absolve nor remit sin, unless beforehand it be remitted from sins; which error also, in the Bull published concerning the errors of John Wyclif and Hus, this question is prescribed to be proposed to those suspected, whether they confess that a priest can absolve a sinner contrite; and again, whether they believe that an evil priest truly confers the other sacraments. Moreover, the Florentine Decree defines that, just as by Baptism we are spiritually born, so by the sacrament of Penance we are spiritually healed; and that the effect of this sacrament is the absolution from sins. Finally, the Council of Trent (session 14) in many ways confirms this doctrine (in chapter 1 and elsewhere); likewise, in canons 1, 3, and 7, and especially in others, those are condemned with anathema who teach that sacramental absolution is not a judicial act of the priest, but a bare act of pronouncing and declaring sins to the one confessing.¹⁹

§ 44. Moreover, to the illustration of this belong also those things which pertain to ...

§ 45. To the arguments of the Master and of others. Although from the resolution of the arguments by which the necessity of the sacrament of Penance (*Poenitentia*) was assailed (at *Distinctio* 14) and again of those things by which some claimed for contrition of heart alone the remission of sins (at *Distinctio* 17) one can clearly see in what way most of the arguments are to be solved which are brought against the foregoing doctrine, both by the Master and by others, nevertheless there are here certain things more peculiar to this place, to which it will be seasonable to reply now. First, then, the Master argues: God alone by Himself inwardly quickens the soul; and He alone by Himself loosens sin, the bond of eternal death; since both are of the same power, it does not seem that the one is separated from the other. Second: Christ, just as He kept to Himself the power of Baptism, as St. Augustine witnesses (*Tractate* 5 on John), so also of Penance; therefore the priest does not have it. Third: In Is. 43 the Lord says: "I am, I am He who blot out iniquities"; therefore it is not the priest that blots them out. Fourth: The priests of the Old Law bore the type of the priests of the New; yet those did not cleanse lepers, but only declared them clean or unclean; therefore around sinners the priests of the New Law perform this same office. Fifth, he confirms it by the authority of St. Jerome, who on that text (*Matt.* 16), "And whatsoever thou shalt loose," writes thus: "This place, not understanding that it has another meaning, bishops and presbyters take upon themselves after the fashion of the Pharisees a certain superciliousness, so as either to condemn the innocent, or to think that the guilty are truly loosed; whereas with God there is inquiry not about the sentence of the priests, but about the life of those arraigned." Then, after an interposed similitude from *Leviticus* about the lepers, he subjoins: "Accordingly, just as there the priest makes the leper clean or unclean, so here the bishop or presbyter binds or looses, not those who are innocent or guilty, but, in keeping with his office, when he has heard the varieties of sins, he knows who is to be bound, who to be loosed." Sixth: He proves it from the deed of the Lord, who in the Gospel first by Himself cleansed the lepers and then sent them to the priests, that by their judgment they might be shown to be clean. Seventh: From the example of Lazarus, whom the Lord, after first quickening him, set before the disciples to be loosed, because, says the Master, even if someone is loosed before God, nevertheless in the face of the Church he is not held to be loosed unless by the judgment of the priest. Eighth, he reasons thus: No one is truly pricked with compunction for sin, having a contrite and humbled heart, unless he is in charity (*caritas*); but he who has charity is worthy of life; and yet no one is at once worthy of life and of death. Therefore he is not then bound by the debt of eternal death. Ninth: The wrath of God does not abide upon him who believes in Christ with faith working through love; therefore every sinner ceases from then on to be a son of wrath, from the time he begins to love and to repent. Tenth, he cites the place of St. Ambrose, book 3 *On the Holy Spirit*, ch. 19, where he says: "No one condones sins except one God, because it is written: 'Who

can forgive sins but God alone?' And below: Through the Holy Spirit sins are forgiven. Men, however, exhibit their ministry in the remission of sins; they do not exercise the right of any power. For sins are not forgiven in their name, but in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. These (men) ask; the Divinity grants. For it is a human service, but the munificence is of a power on high." He has a similar statement on the last chapter of Luke, and in book 2 On Cain and Abel, ch. 4.²⁰ Eleventh, others argue: In retaining sins the priest acts only the office of one declaring; therefore so also in remitting. Twelfth: St. Augustine (Homily 23 among the fifty) says: "Receive the Holy Spirit; if you forgive anyone his sins, they are forgiven him," that is, the Spirit forgives, not you; but the Spirit is God, therefore God forgives, not you. And (Tractate 3 on John): "A servant can act according to the law; he cannot loose from the guilt of the law"; and (Tractate 80), alleging the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians: "I planted, Apollos watered; what follows," he says, "'but God gave the increase,' He does not effect through them but through Himself. This exceeds human lowliness; it exceeds the loftiness of angels; nor does it pertain at all except to the Father that is the Trinity." The same, book 3 Against the Letters of Petilian, ch. 54, says that the minister is something for dispensing the word and the sacrament, but for cleansing and justifying he is nothing. Not dissimilar is the place (Sermon 8 on the Words of the Lord).²¹ Thirteenth: St. Gregory (Homily 26 on the Gospel): "Then is there true absolution when the will of the eternal Judge follows it." And Haimo, Homily on the Octave of Easter: "Those," he says, "the Pastor can absolve by his own sentence, whom he shall have seen to have been loosed by God through compunction of heart unto worthy amendment." Finally: It sometimes happens, before the reception of the sacrament, that contrition is perfected by charity, as the Council of Trent bears witness; therefore at least then the priest, in absolving, does nothing else than declare and announce that sins have been remitted; especially since the form of absolution, in order to be true, does not then seem to admit any other sense. But if this be granted, the consequence will be that at other times also it always has that same sense; because, as the form, so the sense of the form must always be one and the same.²²

§ 46. Certain things are also objected by the heretics, by which they would teach that the power of the keys to loose and to bind is no other than the power of preaching the Gospel and announcing the remission of sins to believers and damnation to unbelievers. Accordingly, they say that by this power of the keys the Apostles made use of it whenever they announced the Gospel to unbelievers. But we refuted the falsity of this understanding elsewhere (at Distinctio 14). Therefore let us reply to the arguments proposed.

§ 47. First, then, a twofold quickening (*vivificatio*) of the soul must be distinguished, one by the conversion of heart preceding, the other by the remission of sin following. The prior quickening God alone works without any, at least efficacious, ministry of man. For God did not institute the sacraments for effecting inward conversion, as He did for effecting grace (*gratia*) and the remission of sins, but rather He requires contrition beforehand in adults; the latter, however, He works through the ministry of the man conferring the sacrament. And it is rightly said that He alone also blots out iniquities, namely by His own primary power. But He has entrusted to priests a certain secondary and ministerial power of this power, both in the sacrament of Baptism and, especially, in the most sacred forum of Penance, in which He has appointed them judges to exercise it. Whence the reply to the first and to the third argument and to those authorities of the Fathers which attribute to God alone the power of remitting sins is evident. And by reason there is also a reply to the Novatians, who said that they deferred reverence to God, as if they reserved to Him alone the power of remitting crimes, as is in St. Ambrose (On Penance, ch. 2) and in Socrates, book 1 of the Church History, ch. 7. Answering these, St. Ambrose says: Nay rather, they do no one so great an injury as God, who wish to rescind His commands, to render void the commission, and so forth—he has his eye on "Whose sins you shall

forgive." Therefore, just as those are injurious and ungrateful who so attribute to God goodness, justice, holiness, wisdom, the operation of His wonders that they deny any participation of these to angels or to men (for they deny the beneficence of the Creator with respect to creatures): so it also befalls those who so attribute to God the power of remitting sins that they altogether take it away from the ministers of the Church. In this fashion and to this question Pacianus (in the first Epistle to Sympronian), St. John Chrysostom (on Hebrews, ch. 1), St. Cyril in treating "Whose sins you shall forgive," Hugh in the book On the Sacraments, part 14, ch. 18, and likewise St. Ambrose on Luke 4, "He has sent me to remit," explain and answer.²³

§ 48. To the second it is answered that Christ reserved to Himself in Baptism—so also in the other sacraments—what they call the power of excellence, that is, of an excellent ministry; but He handed on to ministers the power of an inferior ministry of administering the effects of those same sacraments. For otherwise, by the same argument, it would be said that the priest does not baptize, but only shows to men the virtue of that sacrament, just as the force of the sacrament of Penance too is overturned by this fiction of a mere "showing."²⁴

§ 49. The answer to the fourth is clear from the words of St. John Chrysostom, book 3 On the Priesthood, cited above: for the figure is more perfectly fulfilled in this, that by evangelical priests one is not only, as of old, shown to be clean from leprosy, that is, from sin, but truly is made clean. Although one can also say that the likeness rests in this, that just as the Levitical priest was to cleanse legally only him who really had been freed from leprosy, that is, outwardly reconcile him to the people, so that he might be able to converse with others: so the evangelical priest can spiritually cleanse only him who, with the will laid aside for sin and having truly been converted, is reconciled to God, so that, the guilt of Gehenna being loosed, he may be numbered among the sons of God and heirs of the heavenly kingdom. For if he should attempt to cleanse a man not yet receding from sins by absolving, he effects nothing. By which answer two of the arguments next at hand are also solved.

§ 50. To the seventh it is answered that, by the example of Lazarus, what the Master wants is not signified, but rather the contrary, as we have proved from the Fathers. Among whom St. Gregory (Homily 26 on the Gospel), when he had set forth that of Lazarus, says: "From which consideration it must be considered that we ought by pastoral authority to loose those whom we know that our Author has quickened by the grace that raises." And what St. Gregory understands by "to loose," these words of his put a little below teach: "Let him coming forth be loosed by the disciples; in order that the Pastors of the Church may remove from him the penalty which He imposed, who did not blush to confess what he had done."

§ 51. The eighth and ninth arguments are resolved by the distinction of a twofold charity (*caritas*) or love, expounded above (at Distinctio 27 of book 3), and of a twofold quickening. To the earlier words of St. Ambrose which are objected in the tenth place there has already been a reply above; but by the later words he declares the sense more clearly, teaching that that primary authority of remitting sins, which he calls the right of power (*jus potestatis*), belongs to God, not to man; but only the secondary and ministerial [authority], which he denoted by the words "ministry" and "service." And as to the preceding Distinction we have noted more at length about the author's twofold charity and twofold quickening, to signify which the priest, in the form of absolution, prefaces a deprecatory prayer, saying: "May Almighty God have mercy," and so forth.²⁵

§ 52. To the eleventh it is answered that neither the retention nor the binding is done by declaration alone, but by judicial power, as will appear more clearly below. What is objected first from St. Augustine has this sense: The Holy Spirit principally forgives sins; but you do so only through the Holy Spirit, by a power received from Christ. For to insinuate this the Lord had prefixed that: "Receive the Holy Spirit." The sense of the other place is that a servant can loose from the guilt of the law not by his own judgment but according to the law prescribed to him by the Lord. The two remaining places are likewise to be taken of the primary power, not of the ministry. Furthermore, St. Gregory understands by "the will of the Judge" the will of God in this, if He has already visited the sinner beforehand by compunction. For these words precede: "that those whom Almighty God visits by the grace of compunction, the sentence of the Pastor may absolve." Haimo likewise requires beforehand a loosing from the affection for sin, not from the debt of punishment, as is clear to one who inspects the place.²⁶

§ 53. To the last it is also answered that even then the priest does not merely show that the sins are remitted, but the words of the form have the same signification as at other times. For it is signified that the priest, inasmuch as concerns the sacrament and his power, which he uses lawfully, truly remits sins. But just as it happens in reality that sins are not remitted because of the impenitence of the penitent, so it can happen that they are not remitted for this reason, that already before they had been remitted. On which matter something was said when the form of absolution was treated (at Distinctio 15).²⁷

§ V — On the various modes of absolving and binding (*De variis modis absolvendi & ligandi*)

§ 54. The Master [of the Sentences] enumerates in the text three modes of binding and loosing (*ligare* and *solvere*), as pertaining to the power of the keys (*claves*), handed over by Christ to the Apostles and to their successors. First, he says, they loose and bind when they remit or retain sins, that is, when they judge and show them to have been remitted by God, or retained. Secondly, they bind when they impose on confessors the satisfaction of penance; they loose when they remit something of it, or when by it they admit those purified to the communion of the sacraments. Thirdly, they bind when they cast someone out of the Church through excommunication (*excommunicatio*), and they loose when they receive the cast-out back to the Church's communion.

§ 55. But, that we may set forth the whole kind and scope of the power of binding and loosing which Christ handed over in Peter and in the other Apostles to the Church (Matt. 16; Matt. 18; Jn. 20),²⁹ one must see what and of what sort are the bonds by which men are bound before God. In the Scriptures two are chiefly recognized, namely sin and precept. For sin binds a man before God, both because, being enslaved to the Devil, it does not allow him to serve God, and because it renders him liable and bound to eternal damnation and to temporal punishments of the present and of the future age. Whence the Wise Man attests that the ungodly is constrained by the cords of his sins (Prov. 5).³⁰ And those bound—that is, sinners—are proclaimed as to be loosed by Christ (Is. 42; 49; 62).³¹ A precept also is a bond, by which a man, being obligated before God, is held to do or to omit something. For which reason Ecclesiasticus (ch. 6) calls the precepts of wisdom bonds; and the Lord (Matt. 23), speaking of Pharisaic constitutions, says: "They bind heavy and insupportable burdens," and so forth.³²

§ 56. Therefore, as regards the bond of the former kind, that is, sin, the minister of the Church is said in a threefold way to bind and to loose. And first, indeed, he binds a man in sin when he does not remit his sins on account of unbelief or impenitence, but holds him fast, constrained by the divine judgment. He, however, looses from this bond when, in consideration of faith and penance, he remits sins; and this either by Baptism—receiving among the faithful him who before was an unbeliever—or by the sacrament of Penance—reconciling to the Church him who had relapsed. And yet it can be doubted whether that mode of loosing and binding which regards those who are within and without the Church, that is, those not yet baptized, pertains to the power of the keys, since the Church does not judge those who are outside. But one must say that nothing stands in the way why that mode also should not be included under the power of the keys. For the Church does not so judge those who are outside as to punish them as subjects, but only in so far as, according to the law of Christ, she either admits them or rejects them. Hence she is to be thought to judge not so much about those persons themselves as about their admission or rejection. And a judgment of this kind surely belongs and is competent to the ministers of the Church.

§ 57. In the second and third way the priest binds and looses a man according to the two latter modes which we set down from the Master. To the former of these pertains what is read in the book *On True and False Penance*, ch. 10: "The priests exercise a work of justice upon sinners when they bind them under punishment; a work of mercy when they relax something of it, or reconcile them to the communion of the sacraments."³³ From this statement it is easy to understand that "to bind" and "to retain," especially as they are ascribed to priests in the forum of penance (*forum poenitentiae*), do not signify a bare declaration of binding or of retention, but either an exclusion or separation from the fellowship of the faithful, or an obligation to undergo punishment for sins, or certainly a rejection from the benefit of remission carried out with authority and judgment.

§ 58. Hence it is that the Fathers of the Council of Trent (sess. 14, ch. 2) testify that the Church exercises judgment upon the relapsed when, as guilty persons, they are made to stand before the sacerdotal tribunal; and (ch. 5) that the priests, as vicars of Christ, by pronouncing the sentence not only of remission but also of retention of sins, use the power of the keys; and (ch. 6) that the ministry of the keys, proper to bishops and priests, embraces the power as well of binding and retaining as of loosing and remitting; and finally (ch. 8) they prove from this that the satisfaction which priests impose upon penitents pertains to the vindication and chastisement of past sins, because the ancient Fathers handed down that the keys of priests were granted not only for loosing but also for binding.³⁴ And this again they define under anathema in the last canon of the same session.

§ 59. A manifest testimony of this doctrine is found in Ambrose, who in book 1 *On Penance*, ch. 2, places the ministry as well of binding as of retaining in this, that priests enjoin the work of penance upon the fallen.³⁵

§ 60. Now, as regards the bond of the latter kind, that is, the precept, after this manner a prelate of the Church binds when, by a law given, he constrains the faithful to do or to omit something; he looses, however, when, for cause, he removes the law, or when he dispenses in a law, vow, or oath. He accomplishes both, moreover, when he commutes into another thing that to which someone was held by law, vow, or oath. That loosing of an oath also pertains here is shown by Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, who, as Evagrius relates, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 6, ch. 12, absolved an army from the obligation of a certain oath, relying upon the authority of Scripture wherein it has been said to bishops: "Whatsoever you shall loose," and so forth.³⁶

§ 61. To this latter kind there is also referred another mode of binding and loosing, competent to Peter and to his successors either properly or at least perfectly: namely, that to loose is to resolve by defining the knots of emerging difficulties concerning matters of faith, and that to bind is, by teaching and defining, to ward off and exclude heresies and errors from the fold of Christ, lest they be received in place of sound doctrine.

§ VI — *What excommunication is and by what names it is called, and on the multiple kinds of excommunication (Excommunicatio quid sit & quibus nominibus appellata, & de multiplici excommunicatione)*

§ 62. Since from the foregoing it is established that among other things there pertains to the ministry of the Church's keys (*claves*) the power of excommunicating (*excommunicatio*), we must now, consequently and so far as suffices for this place, treat of it. Excommunication, as the very name sounds, is an exclusion or separation from the communion of the faithful. Which definition, although according to the common interpretation it embraces only major excommunication (*excommunicatio maior*), so that to be separated from the communion of the faithful is the same as to be separated from the body of the Church, nevertheless can also be understood in such a way as to include minor excommunication (*excommunicatio minor*). For the name "communion," by antonomasia, is wont to be ascribed by the faithful to the one sacrament of the Eucharist, the use of which we have elsewhere given the rationale. Whence those who by some censure of a Superior were separated from that communion, even if they were not yet cut off from the Church, used formerly to be called "excommunicated" — namely by that excommunication which, for the sake of distinction, we now call "minor," and which in this way is wont to be defined, that it is an exclusion from participation in the sacraments. For under the chief and most excellent Sacrament the rest also were understood to be included. But if after lawful admonition someone should persist contumaciously in a crime, then at last he was separated from the body of the Church, that is, from the assembly of the faithful. Which separation is called major excommunication and, simply, excommunication. For whenever, either by law or by a person, the penalty of excommunication is imposed, when nothing else restrictive is added, major excommunication is always wont to be understood; and this major of necessity includes the minor, not conversely. Moreover they more fully define the major in this way: Excommunication is an ecclesiastical censure (*censura*), by which a person is excluded from the Church's communion with respect to the benefits and the common suffrages and from the fellowship of the faithful. The sense of which definition will be plain from those things that will be said below. Now this ecclesiastical censure or penalty the Scripture calls by various names. Sometimes indeed it calls it "anathema," that is, separation, casting-out, or cutting-off, according to that in Galatians: "Would that they also who disturb you were cut off."³⁸ Yet it must not be denied that the word "anathema" is sometimes also used more broadly. Nay rather, it must be noted that in Scripture not so much the separation itself as the man separated from the company of men is called "anathema." Whence the Master in the text calls this censure not "anathema" but "anathematization," whereby, forsooth, the man upon whom it is inflicted becomes an anathema. And thus also the more ancient Fathers sometimes speak. Likewise, those who are excommunicated are said to be "delivered to Satan," and to be "taken out of the midst," namely, out of the Church, as in 1 Corinthians 5 and 1 Timothy 1;³⁹ likewise, to be "bound both in the heavens and upon the earth," and "to be held as the heathen and the publican" (Matt. 18).⁴⁰ Furthermore, by St. Cyprian (in epistle 38 and elsewhere) they are called "abstained-from," "cast out,"

"driven from the Church," "forbidden communion," "condemned by the voice of the priests"; by which last name they are also read everywhere to be called among other Fathers. And this name can seem to be taken from the Apostle saying to Titus that a heretic is "condemned by his own judgment," that is, separated from the Church.⁴¹ And as the excommunicated were "condemned," so excommunication used to be called "condemnation," as St. Augustine bears witness.⁴² Moreover, in St. Ambrose⁴³ and in Nicephorus⁴⁴ excommunication is called an episcopal or sacerdotal bond. The very power of excommunicating is called by Christ the key of binding, though this extends to more things. St. Paul calls it "the rod" (1 Cor. 4)⁴⁵ and "power to act more severely" (2 Cor., the last chapter).⁴⁶ The Fathers everywhere call the same a sword, sometimes a blade, either absolutely or with the addition "spiritual," "sacerdotal," "ecclesiastical," the use of which is, namely, to cut off the putrid member from the remaining body of the Church.

§ VII — That in the Church the power of excommunicating was instituted by Christ (Esse in Ecclesia institutam a Christo excommunicandi potestatem)

§ 63. Just as Christ bestowed on His Church those who would believe—and this indeed takes place through the sacrament of Baptism—so there is no room for doubt that He likewise granted the power of casting out those once received, if they should scorn to hear the Church, and of expelling them and separating them as it were from the body of Christ. This we call the power of excommunicating (*excommunicandi potestas*). Now Christ conferred it on the Church in her Head, when He fulfilled what He had promised to Peter (Matt. 16), saying: "I will give to thee the keys," and "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," etc. For in this power of binding there is included, as we showed above, the power of excommunicating as a species within a genus.⁴⁸ Yet the place (Matt. 18) teaches this much more plainly: where, while He gives directions about correcting a brother and involving one or more witnesses, the Lord at length subjoins: "But if he will not hear, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Then, turning His discourse to the Apostles—who were to be set over the Church—He says: "Amen I say to you: whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." By which words, although they are general, just as those that had been said to Peter (Matt. 16), and therefore signify the general power of governing the Church promised to the Apostles, nevertheless the Lord promised in a peculiar way to His Apostles and to their successors the power of separating from the communion of the Church those who would not hear the Church, in order that, this sentence of separation being known, the rest of the faithful might and ought to regard them as heathens and publicans. Therefore it is evident that in this Gospel passage the power of excommunicating is principally established.

§ 64. Moreover Paul made use of this power against that incestuous Corinthian, of whom he says (1 Cor. 5): "And you are not rather sorrowful, that he might be taken away from among you that hath done this deed"; and again: "I indeed have judged him that hath so done, to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." For he says that he will do this "in the name of Christ and with the power of Christ," that is, as the minister or vicar of Christ, and with power received from Christ.⁴⁹ Likewise he used that power against Hymenaeus and Alexander, heretics, whom "he delivered to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. 1).⁵⁰ He also makes mention of this his power in 1 Cor. 4, saying: "Shall I come to you with a rod?"; and in 2 Cor. 13, when he says: "I fear, lest when I come again ... I shall not spare; these things I write while absent, that when present I may not deal more severely, according to the power which the Lord hath given me unto edification, and not unto destruction."⁵¹

In the same Apostle there is that place (Gal. 1): "If anyone should preach to you a gospel other than that which you have received, let him be anathema."⁵²

§ 65. That separation from the Church is called excommunication (*excommunicatio*), the Pope acknowledges (in the Epistle to the Church of Milan, which is found in St. Ambrose), and most clearly in what is said in that very epistle: at "Would that they who trouble you were even cut off," many understand a cutting off from the Body of Christ.⁵³ Again, in those words (1 Cor. 5): "If he who is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous," etc., "with such a one not so much as to eat," St. Augustine understands that separation which comes about by excommunication, as he explains (in a homily) and in *De opere monachorum*, and in book 3 *Against the Epistle of the Parmenians*, ch. 2.⁵⁴ This sense is confirmed by the Apostle's subsequent words: "For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not you judge them that are within?" Hence it is evident that those of whom he speaks ought to be understood to be removed by ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority, as also those of whom 2 Thess. says: "If any man obey not our word, note that man, and do not keep company with him, that he may be confounded." These are similar to those words of the Lord: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."⁵⁵

§ 66. Furthermore, it must be known that this power was already foreshadowed by those things that were done in the old law. For the Mosaic ceremonies, presiding over the ceremonies and sacraments of the Church, were certain figures of those things which are done in the judgment of the Church. Of such a kind, in the first place, was that which is commanded (Deut. 17): "The man that shall be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest or of the judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel." For thus it is said: "Thou shalt take away the evil from Israel," just as the Apostle says: "He that hath done this evil deed shall be taken away from among you"; and again: "Put away the evil one from among yourselves" (1 Cor. 5). Whence St. Augustine, on Deuteronomy with respect to those words "You shall take away the evil from among you," says: "Scripture is continually saying this when it orders the wicked to be slain. For he would not have used this very expression also under 'Put away the evil from among yourselves,' unless he had intended that by 'the wicked' he be understood as one who has committed something such that he is worthy of excommunication. For this now does excommunication in the Church what at that time killing did." And in the book *On Faith and Works*, ch. 2: "Nor, because the servant of God Moses patiently endured that first people which was prone to mixture, for that reason did he not avenge many also with the sword. And Phinehas the priest transfixed with an avenging blade the adulterers once found together. Which indeed has been signified to have to be done by degradations and excommunications in this time, when in the discipline of the Church the visible sword was to cease. And the things that follow."⁵⁶

§ 67. To the same point belong these words of St. Jerome (Ep. 1 to Heliodorus, ch. 7): "In the old law, indeed, whoever had not obeyed the priests was either set outside the camp and was pelted by the people, or with neck bent to the sword he expiated his contempt with blood. Now, however, the disobedient is cut off by a spiritual blade, or, cast out of the Church, he is torn by the rabid mouth of demons."⁵⁷ And not less distinctly before him St. Cyprian used the same comparison from the old law (Ep. 58, citing likewise the passage Deut. 17).⁵⁸ It could also seem to have been signified by this, that the disobedient were cast out of the synagogue, as is indicated more than once in the Gospel, as in John 9 and 12 and 16; unless it be more similar to suppose that that custom was introduced by human institution by the rulers of the synagogue after the power of inflicting death had been taken away from the Jews by the Romans—according to "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death"—than that it had descended from the authority of the divine law, in which for

the contumacious a sentence of death, not of separation, is prescribed. Just as that by death exterminating the evil one signified ecclesiastical excommunication, so this again is a certain preimage of that future separation of which the Lord speaks in the Gospel: "And they shall separate the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire" (Matt. 13). For now the discipline of the Church effects, though imperfectly and in part, with respect to the contumacious, that which then the final sentence of the supreme Judge will effect altogether perfectly and irrevocably with respect to all the wicked. And so Tertullian (in the Apology against the Gentiles, ch. 39) calls excommunication both a divine censure and says that it is the highest "prejudgment" of the divine judgment. And St. Jerome (in Ep. 1 to Heliodorus) affirms that "the priests in a certain sense judge before the day of judgment."⁵⁹

§ 68. Therefore this power of excommunicating, handed over by Christ to the Church, is proved to have been always in the Church by the Scriptures and by the example of the Apostle Paul, by the perpetual tradition and custom of the Church itself, set forth expressly in the writings of the Fathers, in the decrees of the Pontiffs, and in the Canons of the Councils. Of which, out of many, a few can be noted: Tertullian in the place now cited, and also in On Idolatry, ch. 11; in book 2 To His Wife, ch. 3; in The Prescription against Heretics, ch. 30; in book 4 Against Marcion, ch. 24. St. Cyprian (Ep. 38, 55, 62, 72). Origen (Homilies 1 and 12 on Leviticus, and the first homily on Psalm 37). St. Ambrose (Sermon 8 on Psalm 118; on Psalm 116; On the Duties of the Clergy II, ch. 27), and in the same author Pope Siricius (Ep. 80). St. Jerome (Ep. 1 to Heliodorus, and on Matt. 18), where on those words, "Whatsoever you shall bind," he comments thus: "He granted to the Apostles the power, that they might know that the human sentence is strengthened for those who are condemned by such men; for whatsoever shall have been bound on earth is equally bound in heaven." St. Augustine, besides the places a little before cited (Tracts 10, 27, 95 on John; likewise the Homily numbered 50; chs. 5, 19, and 26 of the book On Faith and Works; Enchiridion 63; On Correction and Grace ch. 15; City of God XX, chs. 6, 16; Against the Epistle of Parmenian ch. 2; Sermon 22 On the Words of the Apostle; Epistle 65; and most expressly book 1 Against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, ch. 17). And in the same author Pope Innocent I (Ep. 91). St. John Chrysostom (Homily 5 on the First Epistle to Timothy; Homily 15 on First Corinthians; Homily 4 on the Epistle to the Hebrews; and on Matt. 18). St. Gregory (Homily 26 on the Gospels and book 5, Epistle 30). Urban I (in the Epistle to All Bishops). And what Gratian records from various sources (Cause 11, Question 3, and Cause 24, Question 1).⁶⁰ To all of which there is added that the ancient synods used this power against heretics: the Council of Nicaea against Arius; that of Ephesus against Nestorius; and so in others. Therefore with good reason let those be condemned with anathema whoever either deny or despise this power of the Church. On this matter let the Articles of John Wyclif 11, 12, 13, and 30 be reviewed, and the Articles of John Hus 17, 18, and 19, condemned in the Council of Constance; whose heretical doctrine afterwards Martin Luther revived in Articles 23 and 24 of those which Leo X condemned.⁶¹

§ VIII — Reply to the objections that are brought forward (Ad ea quae objiciuntur responsio)

§ 69. Against the doctrine set out above the Adversaries bring forward chiefly two arguments from the Fathers. The first is that the power (*potestas*) which Christ gave to the Apostles (Matt. 18) is not proper to the rank of the Church, but common to all Christians; and therefore it is not a power properly so called—for that belongs only to superiors over inferiors—but rather a certain duty of any Christian toward another, by which,

namely, he ought either by turning away from him who is impenitent and by holding him as a stranger to bind him, or by receiving the corrected man and forgiving him the sin to loose him. They prove this by the authority of St. Augustine who, in Sermon 16 On the Words of the Lord, ch. 4, when he treats the Lord's words, "Whatsoever you shall bind," etc., speaks thus: "If you have your brother as a heathen or publican, you bind him on earth; but see that you bind justly; for righteousness bursts such bonds. But when you have corrected him and agreed with your brother, you have loosed him on earth; and when you shall have loosed him on earth, he shall be loosed also in heaven."⁶³ Next they prove it from the Commentary of Theophylact (on Matt. 18), who writes on these words: "If you," he says, "are offended at him who has injured you, he will be, like a Gentile and a Publican, such also in heaven; but if you loose him—that is, forgive him—it will be remitted to him also in heaven. For not only the things which priests loose are loosed, but whatsoever also we who have been offended by an injury bind or loose, those very things will be bound or loosed."⁶⁴ Theophylact seems to have received this interpretation from Origen, who similarly (Tractate 6 on Matthew) refers loosing to him who either avoids an impenitent brother or condones the sin.⁶⁵

§ 70. The second argument is that by which they take away the power simply. To this end they produce the authority of Chrysostom, in whom (Homily 5) there is found a certain Sermon, "That neither the living nor the dead are to be punished with anathema." In it at length he teaches that men, however wicked, neither living nor dead, are to be prosecuted with anathema; and finally he concludes that impious dogmas and those which have been forged by heretics are to be refuted and anathematized, but that men are to be spared, and for their salvation prayer is to be made; the sentence of anathema upon them is to be reserved to the judgement of God, to whom that power and dignity, as regards life and death, belongs.⁶⁶

§ 71. But to these passages of the ancients we briefly reply. Augustine, just as at times he extends the words (Jn. 20), "Whose sins you shall forgive," as if they were said to all and only to good men—because, to be sure, by their merits and prayers they obtain from God the remission of sins as far as they can—so also he referred the words (Matt. 18) to the same persons by a certain extension, and not in their proper and literal sense. For the literal and proper sense of both Scriptures he delivers elsewhere: of the former in book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 11; of the latter in book 1 Against the Adversary of the Law and the Prophets, ch. 17; in Epistle 73; and in Homily 27 and Homily 50.⁶⁷ Similarly one must reply to Theophylact, who, although he interprets the passage of John concerning the power of the keys granted to priests alone with the greatest clarity, nevertheless stretches this passage of Matthew, in a certain moral and extended sense, to any good faithful; following Origen, who is frequent in this manner of exposition. And yet when Theophylact says, "Not only the things which priests loose are loosed," he sufficiently acknowledges a certain mode of binding and loosing which is proper to priests, while there is another mode which is common to all Christians—just as Origen also in the place cited clearly teaches when he ascribes to Peter a peculiar power of binding and loosing.

§ 72. As to the latter argument, some reply that that Sermon is not Chrysostom's. Yet even if it be granted to be Chrysostom's, we answer that he is not treating of any and every anathema, but of the perfect anathema, that is, of that which, in his own words, in every way separates from Christ—namely, in such wise that no hope of restoration is left. With this anathema Christ will smite the earth, that is, the impious, when he shall come to judgement, as is in Mal. 4. In this way also impious dogmas—because they cannot agree with divine truth—are by us to be simply nailed with anathema. But the excommunication which is inflicted upon men is medicinal, as Chrysostom himself teaches (Homily 15 on 1 Cor. 5).⁶⁸ Moreover, in that Sermon Chrysostom seems to have wished to censure those who, not content to have condemned the books of Origen, condemned

with anathema the very author himself two hundred years after his death, as Socrates relates, book 7, ch. 84. Otherwise the same Socrates, book 6, ch. 18, is witness that Chrysostom himself, when his subjects sinned gravely, used this power of excommunicating; and above we have sufficiently asserted this power out of Chrysostom.

§ IX — Of what goods a man is deprived by excommunication (Quibus bonis privetur homo quidem per excommunicationem)

§ 73. Therefore, against those who wish excommunication (*excommunicatio*) to be only an external and civil penalty—that is, by which someone is excluded only from the external communion and conversation of the faithful—one must show the gravity of this penalty, and explain of what goods he is deprived and what evils the excommunicated incurs. Then the force of that which had been posited in the definition of excommunication—"that it regards the fruit and common suffrages"—will be clearer.

§ 74. First, therefore, from the very name "communion" the greatness of this penalty is shown. For the communion of the Church is not the same as the communion of saints, which we confess in the Creed, and with it that communion of which it is said in the Canon of the Mass: "Communicating, and venerating the memory of all the Saints," where in the latter place the former is to be supplied, "communicating with all the Saints." But this communion does not consist in bare external society or in the participation of the sacraments (since in neither of these ways do we communicate with the Saints reigning in heaven), but also and chiefly in the fellowship and communion of spiritual goods: of which sorts are merits, prayers, suffrages. Hence in the Canon there follows: "Grant, by whose merits and prayers," etc. By the right of this communion it comes to pass that, just as the members of the same body, by the natural connection which they have in the whole, share mutually in their goods and exert a certain influx one upon another—so that that participation reaches also to the weak members, yes, in a certain way even to the putrid members not yet cut off—so also all the faithful, as members of the Church which is quickened by the Spirit of Christ, by that spiritual connection which they have in the one Mystical Body, mutually share spiritual goods with one another, so that even the wicked become in some measure partakers of them, as long as they cohere to the Church. But just as in the body the other members contribute nothing to a member that is cut off, so neither here do the remaining faithful profit him at all, as regards the common goods of the Church, who is separated from the communion of the Church.

§ 75. This can also be made clear by the likeness of the vine and the branches. For Scripture hands down both comparisons: the former in Jn. 15; the latter in Rom. 12 and elsewhere. Hence furthermore it follows that the excommunicated are also deprived of that special protection of God with which He protects His whole Church. For just as, as Chrysostom says (Homily 5 on 1 Tim. 1), formerly the cloud covered the camp of the Hebrews, so also the grace of the Holy Spirit protects the Church.⁷⁰

§ 76. Third, it follows that now the pastors of the Church do not hold them as their sheep, and so neither care for them nor pray for them—that care and prayer, I mean, which as a pastor he has and performs for his own flock. Hence Innocent I (Epistle 93), as quoted by Augustine, says that they lack pastoral watch.⁷¹ And Chrysostom signifies the same in the place just cited.

§ 77. Fourth, by the same law let the rest not have them as brothers and fellow-members, since the Lord commands: "Let him be to you as the heathen and the publican." Hence they do not become partakers of the

prayers which the Saints throughout the world pour forth for the brethren, or for the whole body of the Church, of which prayers even the wicked not yet separated are partakers.

§ 78. Fifth: The excommunicated—being deprived of so many safeguards by which they used to be supported in the Church—are joined to the society of unbelievers and are handed over to Satan. For just as within the Church Christ presides as Head of the Church, so outside the Church the prince of this world, Satan, presides, by whom therefore they are now driven and impelled far more freely and more powerfully than before—as if in his own kingdom—into every evil, and they are hindered from every good.

§ 79. Lastly: The excommunicated, even if they make a show of penitence and perform many good works, nevertheless are not restored to participation in the aforesaid spiritual goods of the Church, nor can they be partakers of the sacraments of the Church—not even of the one sacrament of penance—before they have again been united to the body of the Church, which indeed is done by absolution from the bond of excommunication; and therefore this necessarily must precede absolution from sins. For first it is necessary that one be joined to the body, before he receive fruit from the body. Thus, as the Apostle says (Rom. 11), it is first to be grafted into the olive tree, before one become a partaker of the root and fatness of the olive.

§ X — Confirmation of the same doctrine from Scripture and the Fathers (Ejusdem doctrinae confirmatio ex Scriptura & Patribus)

§ 80. What we have said about the spiritual penalty (*poena spiritualis*) which follows upon a man's being excommunicated (*excommunicatus*), must be proved more fully from Scripture and the Fathers. And first indeed from Matt. 18, where it is said: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." This sufficiently points to this spiritual penalty. For the sense is that he who for disobedience is bound by the prelates of the Church must now be regarded by the faithful as placed entirely outside the body of the Church and like the heathen and the publicans. Therefore, just as these are not partakers of the common and spiritual goods of the Church, so neither is he. For that brotherhood and that being a member of the Church does not consist in external communication alone, but is a great spiritual good. Nor would anyone rightly say of him who, because of leprosy or some other disease of the body, is to be avoided in outward intercourse, that he must not be held by the faithful as a brother but as a heathen. But again, there is no reason that he be said to be bound in heaven who, by the bond laid upon him, is deprived of no spiritual good but only removed from the external fellowship of the faithful.

§ 81. But two passages of the Apostle prove this doctrine more clearly still, 1 Cor. 5 and 1 Tim. 1, where those who are excommunicated are said to be "delivered to Satan." This delivery cannot be said to consist in the mere privation of external communion, but beyond doubt touches the soul, because it is by the censure of excommunication that a man, separated from the Church and consequently stripped of the Church's spiritual safeguards—namely the merits, prayers, and suffrages of the pious—stands open to the tyranny and incursions of the Devil, whose kingdom is outside the Church. For just as Christ gave to the Apostles power to cast out demons (Matt. 10; Lk. 10; Mk. 16), so He gave to the same Apostles power to deliver men to demons by the sentence of excommunication, as is clear from the already cited place, 1 Cor. 5, where the Apostle says that he determines to pronounce a sentence of such delivery by the authority of Christ. Nay, even Christ Himself seems to have exercised this power by which men are delivered to Satan, when He removed Judas from His fellowship and bade him depart, saying: "What thou doest, do quickly." For although already

before the Devil had put into the heart of Judas to betray the Lord, as John 13 says, indeed he had already entered into him, as Luke 22 attests, nevertheless at the very moment when this was said to him by the Lord, as the same John bears witness, "Satan entered into him" still—namely to this end, that he might more fully possess him as now delivered to himself, into whom he had first entered to deceive; as St. Augustine speaks (Tractate 62 on John), where, when he says "now delivered to himself," he plainly signifies that Judas was delivered by Christ to Satan.⁷²

§ 82. By this the effect of that delivery is explained, namely a fuller and more perfect subjection of the man under the power of the Devil—not indeed as to the body (for neither is Judas read to have been corporally possessed by the Devil, nor can anything certain be taught of the others whom Paul delivered to Satan, although some think so, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius), but as to the soul; not that by the very fact that someone is excommunicated he becomes worse as to the soul, but because, being more exposed to the dangers of sinning, he sins more easily and more often and more gravely. For to be excommunicated or to remain excommunicated, although it is not an evil of fault but an evil of penalty, nevertheless by this very thing, since he is stripped of divine protection and left destitute of so many spiritual safeguards, he draws much nearer to the evil of fault.

§ 83. To this authority of the Scriptures we shall subjoin some sayings and passages of the Fathers, from which it may plainly be shown that the penalty incurred by the excommunicated is not only bodily but also spiritual. St. Cyprian (Epistle 58, On Excommunication) thus writes: "By the spiritual sword the proud and contumacious are slain, when they are cast out of the Church; for neither can they live outside, since the House of God is one, and salvation can be for none unless in the Church." St. Jerome (Epistle 1 to Heliodorus): "The disobedient," he says, "is cut down by the spiritual blade, and, torn from the Church, is rent by the ravaging mouth of demons." Pope Innocent I (Epistle 19, cited by St. Augustine) admonishes bishops to call back to the fold of Christ those who by heresy had been separated from the Church, "lest," he says, "placed outside and excluded from so great a defense of the rampart of faith, they be exposed to all dangers, to be devoured by the teeth of the adversaries and vexed." St. Augustine, *Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* I, ch. 17, writes in this manner: "That which the Lord says, 'If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican,' is more grievous than if he were smitten by the sword, if he were consumed by flames. For there He also subjoined: 'Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven,' that it might be understood how much more grievously he is punished who seems to be left unpunished." And a little after: "Behold, a man is bound by men more bitterly and more unhappily by the keys of the Church than by any most heavy and most hard fetters of iron or adamant." The same, Tractate 27 on John: "Nothing," he says, "ought a Christian so to fear as to be separated from the body of Christ." Whence also in *De Correptione et Gratia* ch. 15 he says that in the Church there is no penalty greater than excommunication. Moreover, a most explicit place in the same author is in Epistle 75, in which, treating of the penalty of anathema or excommunication, he thus writes: "For neither is this a bodily penalty, whereby we read that certain despisers of God with their own were alike slain, while their associates in the same impiety were not; but a spiritual penalty, whereby that is brought about which is written: 'Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven,' binds souls—of which it is said: 'The soul that sinneth, the same shall die.'" Add to these the passage of Tertullian (in the *Apologeticus* against the Gentiles, ch. 39), where he says that by this judgment of the Church a man is banished from the communion of prayer and of assembly and of every holy fellowship. Likewise Origen (Homily 2 on the Book of Judges); St. John Chrysostom (on Matt. 18); Theophylact and Oecumenius (on 1 Tim. 1); and Theodoret (on 1 Cor. 5); and

the things cited by Gratian (11, Question 3). From all which it is clear how deservedly there was condemned by Leo X this article of Luther, number 23: "Excommunications are only external penalties, and do not deprive a man of the Church's common spiritual prayers."⁷³

§ XI — A reply to certain arguments on the contrary (Ad quaedam in contrarium argumenta responsio)

§ 84. Those who deny that the censure of excommunication (*excommunicatio*) binds souls, or at all brings some spiritual loss (*bona spiritualia*) upon the excommunicated, rely upon arguments of this sort. The first is this reasoning of Luther: By faith, hope, and charity and the remaining virtues, which are spiritual goods, a man is made a member of the Church; but those goods cannot by any power of the Church be taken away from a man, rather they are lost by each one's own will; therefore excommunication does not despoil a man of a spiritual good. Second, they argue: "The Son of Man came not to destroy souls but to save." Lk. 9. "For God did not send His Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world might be saved through Him." Jn. 3; therefore He did not leave in the Church a power of killing or harming men spiritually.⁷⁴ Third, the Apostle (to the Corinthians, last chapter), speaking of the power of excommunicating, bears witness that he has from the Lord a power given "for edification and not for destruction." It would, however, be given "for destruction" if it deprived a man of spiritual goods.⁴⁶ Fourth, the same Apostle (1 Cor. 5), when he excommunicates the incestuous man, says that he hands him over to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord"; and likewise (1 Tim. 1) he says that Hymenaeus and Alexander were handed over to Satan by him "that they may learn not to blaspheme." Therefore excommunication so far is from taking away a spiritual good that it even contributes to it—so that Luther seems not without cause to have said (article 24) that Christians must be taught to love excommunication more than to fear it.⁷⁵ Fifth, St. John Chrysostom (on 2 Cor. 5) calls excommunication a medicine, by which, being made better, a man attracts grace, and he says that the gain is greater than the penalty: "For the penalty," he says, "is temporal, but the gain perpetual." Likewise, besides this, he compares this handing over into the power of Satan with that by which holy Job was handed over to Satan, in such a way that he acknowledges the difference to be only in the cause. "For he," he says, "was handed over to Satan for more splendid crowns, but these men for the loosing of sins." Theophylact and Oecumenius follow Chrysostom's Commentary and opinion in all things.⁷⁶ Sixth, St. Hilary (on Matt. 18) in the sententia "Whatsoever you shall bind," interprets "to bind" so as to be the same as "to leave men entangled in the knots of sins." The same, writing on the same place, is the opinion of Euthymius, who interprets "binding" as "a lack of pardon." But this is not to deprive of a spiritual good previously had, but to be unwilling to confer a spiritual good not yet received.⁷⁷ Seventh, Innocent IV at the Council of Lyons, as is contained in the Sext [of the Decretals], "On the Sentence of Excommunication," says: "Since excommunication is medicinal, not deadly, rooting out our undiscipline, provided that the one against whom it is pronounced does not despise it, the ecclesiastical judge takes care of the cause so as to show, in imposing it, that he is pursuing what belongs to the one who corrects and heals."⁷⁷ Finally: The power of excommunicating would subsist in the Church if the prelates of the Church remove the disobedient from the outward fellowship of the faithful and from participation in the sacraments, even if they do not deprive them of the common suffrages of the Church, by which men are harmed very much spiritually; therefore it is enough to acknowledge such a power without this sort of subtraction of spiritual goods.

§ 85. To reply to these: For the solution of the first it must be noted that spiritual goods are of two kinds. For some are those in which the substance of spiritual life consists, as faith, hope, and charity and the remaining virtues and the works of the virtues. To this class also belong those movements and effects of the will which precede justification and prepare for it. Others, however, are accidental, by which, namely, a man is helped from without to attain those former goods. Such are others' merits, prayers, and suffrages, to which the sacraments also are to be reckoned. For by the communion or participation of these a man is aided toward spiritual life. One must answer, therefore, that goods of the former kind, since they are internal to a man and depend upon his will, cannot by ecclesiastical power be taken away from a man; but goods of the latter kind can be, by the fact that one is excluded from the body in which such goods are communicated—just as in other communities it happens that he who is excluded from the communion is at the same time excluded and cut off from the privileges and advantages of the same community.

§ 86. To the second it is answered: Christ so came to save souls that nevertheless in His Church He instituted the power of correcting delinquents and casting out the incorrigible, so that by this the whole body might be cared for. While this is done He does not yet judge the world—which will be in the consummation of the age—but only some few are, by an ecclesiastical judgment, separated from the rest of the body.

§ 87. To the third: As the Church received from Christ the power of excommunicating for edification, so she exercises it—namely, for the preservation of the whole body, lest it be infected by the contagion of a putrid member—although that power in some manner tends to the destruction of him who is excommunicated, in that he is more removed from the helps of spiritual life. For which reason St. Cyprian said (Epistle 58) that the proud and contumacious, when they are cast out of the Church, are slain by the spiritual sword.⁷⁸

§ 88. To the fourth: When the Apostle says that a man is handed over to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh," that is, of carnal concupiscence, "that the spirit," that is, the soul or the spiritual man, "may be saved in the day of the Lord," he does not indicate the proper effect of excommunication, but rather shows the intention of the one excommunicating, who, primarily indeed by excommunication, intends the salvation of the whole body, as a physician, by cutting off a putrid member, intends the health of the body. Whence in the same chapter the Apostle says: "Let him be taken away from the midst of you," and, "Take away the evil one from among yourselves," and, "A little leaven corrupts the whole lump."⁷⁵ Secondly, however, he also intends the repentance and salvation of the excommunicated person, inasmuch as by that separation he is confounded, and, recognizing his peril, returns to his senses and is reconciled to the Church, as it is also evident was done in the case of that Corinthian (from the Second Epistle).⁷⁹ Now this good of repentance is indeed to be desired; but for that reason it is not to be desired that evil from which this good follows per accidens—just as sins are not to be desired or committed which, by the mercy of God, cooperate to a man's good of humility.

§ 89. From these points there is also clear the solution of the fifth and sixth arguments. For the Fathers call excommunication "medicinal" not only with respect to the whole body, which the one who cuts off a vicious member primarily intends to care for, but also with respect to him who is excommunicated, on account of the secondary intention of the excommunicator just explained, which, however, is often frustrated of its effect. And although in that place Chrysostom says nothing expressly of the privation of a spiritual good, elsewhere he openly makes mention of it. For in Homily 5 on 1 Timothy he speaks of the same Corinthian: "He was cast out," he says, "from the common assembly of the faithful; he was cut off from the flock; he became an outcast; and thus left desolate he was exposed to the incursions of the wolves. For as formerly the cloud covered the

camp of the Hebrews, so the grace of the Holy Spirit protected the Church. If anyone, therefore, should be outside the Church, he would be burned." In the very same sense write Theophylact and Oecumenius, following Chrysostom (on 1 Tim. 1). St. Hilary also and Euthymius, by saying the lesser thing, did not by their silence deny the graver, but rather left it to be understood.⁸⁰

§ 90. To the last, it is answered that from the nature of the thing it follows that a member separated from the body loses the body's influx; and therefore the Church, which has received the power of separating the contumacious from her own body, whenever she judges that this power is to be fully used—which is done by major excommunication—ought not and cannot, by a different intention of her own, bring it about that the one separated should not suffer the spiritual detriment which is per se conjoined with such separation, that is, that he be not deprived of the common merits and suffrages of the Church which are proper to that body.

§ XII — For what end the penalty of excommunication should be inflicted (Propter quem finem infligenda sit excommunicationis poena)

§ 91. What in the reply to the fourth argument—about the one excommunicating with a legitimate end (*finis*) which he intends—we said, must here be explained somewhat more fully. For there are three ends for which that formidable penalty (*poena*) of excommunication (*excommunicatio*) is inflicted by the Church, always conjoined and concurrent, though not equally principally intended or hoped for: the first on the part of God, the second on the part of the Church, the third on the part of him who is excommunicated.

§ 92. Accordingly, the first end is the honor of the divine name. For by that separation this is aimed at: that the name of God and of Christ, who is the Head of the Church, be not blasphemed, nor have an ill sound among those who are outside, if they were to see manifest crimes permitted in the Church unpunished, and those who have committed such things tolerated among Christians, though unwilling to be corrected. For just as the name of God is sanctified by the good life of Christians, so, conversely, it is blasphemed by the enormity of their sins—especially if they are committed with impunity. Hence the Apostle to the Jew who glories in the Law and the knowledge of God (Rom. 2): "Through the transgression of the Law," he says, "thou honorest not God. For the name of God through you is blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it is written"—namely (Is. 52 and Ezek. 36).⁸²

§ 93. St. Cyprian indicated this end (in Epistle 37 to Eucratius), when, consulted as to whether a public actor was to be tolerated in the Church, he replies: "For my part I judge that it suits neither the Majesty of God nor evangelical discipline, that the modesty of good men in the Church be stained by so foul a contagion of infamy."⁸³

§ 94. For this end too an anathema is hurled in a special way against blasphemers—such as Hymenaeus and Alexander, delivered by Paul to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme. Likewise against those who lay violent hands on priests and on any persons consecrated to God. For an injury inflicted on His ministers tends to God's dishonor and contempt.⁸⁴

§ 95. The second end is the guarding and preservation of those who are in the Church, lest they be provoked by the example to do the like. For sins unpunished in any community readily drag the others—especially the weak—either to imitation, or at least to some communion with the sin. Hence the Apostle, when enjoining that incestuous man to be removed from the midst of the Church, brings forward this reason:

"Do you not know," he says, "that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump?" (1 Cor. 5). In like manner (Gal. 5), after premising the same reason, he adds: "But he that troubles you shall bear his judgment," namely of anathema; of which he immediately subjoins again: "I would that they were even cut off who trouble you."⁸⁵

§ 96. The Fathers most frequently make mention of this end, as Cyprian (Epistle 18 to Pomponius): "Lest," he says, "by their sins they begin to make for the rest an example to ruin." And St. Augustine (On Rebuke and Grace, ch. 15) writing thus: "Pastoral necessity nevertheless has it, lest dire contagions creep through many, to separate from sound sheep the diseased one, who perhaps by that very separation may be healed by Him to whom nothing is impossible." Innocent I amplifies this reason with many words (Epistles 91 and 93, found in Augustine). This consideration chiefly has its place with regard to heretics—of whom Innocent there speaks—and concerning whose doctrine the Apostle said: "Their word creeps as a cancer" (2 Tim. 2). And for that reason he signifies Hymenaeus, Philetus, and Alexander, heretics, to have been excommunicated by him.⁸⁶

§ 97. However, it must be noted here that the two ends just named do not hold when some whole community has been so involved in a crime that schisms or more serious scandals are to be feared if excommunication be brought to bear on all infected with that crime. Wherefore then one must abstain from excommunicating, and proceed by pious prayers to God and other opportune remedies, that so great an evil be cured. Hence the Apostle Paul preferred to tolerate false brethren rather than to excommunicate, lest a more serious evil should arise from an aroused schism. For thus must the penalty be inflicted that it remain a remedy; and thus must medicine be applied that it not be turned into destruction.

§ 98. With this caution the prelates of the Church must deal, as St. Augustine admonishes in many places, as in the book On Faith and Works, chs. 1, 3, 4, 5, where, among other things, he teaches that these Scriptures—"Let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican," and, "Them that sin, rebuke before all," and others like them—bind in such wise if the utility of the Church requires it, and the worse are not reasonably to be feared.

⁸⁷ The same he teaches in book 3 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 1, and especially ch. 2, where he has this judgment: "Whatever crime and iniquity intoxicates a multitude loses the truth of examination." Afterwards he writes in this manner: "And when anyone of the brethren—that is, of Christians established within the fellowship of the Church—shall be found in some such sin that he be judged worthy of anathema, let this be done where there is no danger of schism." And, several things being interposed, from the evangelical parable concerning the tares he subjoins: "Then can this be done without the stain of peace and unity and without harm to the wheat, when the multitude of the congregation of the Church is free from that crime which is anathematized, and so forth." And after many things: "If the contagion of sin shall have invaded the multitude, the severe mercy of divine discipline is necessary. For counsels of separation are pernicious and sacrilegious, because they both are impious and proud, and they disturb the weak good more than they correct the bold wicked." And at length he concludes thus: "Wherefore that saying of the Apostle—'With such a one, no not to eat'—is in no way to be neglected, when it can be done without danger of the peace being violated; because neither did he himself wish it to be done otherwise, that the wicked might be separated from the congregation of the good. And this of his must especially be attended to, that 'we be careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' Likewise, we must obey the Lord speaking in the Gospel where He says: 'But if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican'; and in that place where He forbade the gathering up of the tares lest the wheat be rooted up along with them. For both can be kept by those to whom it was said: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God.'"

These things he, which he also beautifully teaches (in Epistle 50 to Count Boniface), where, when the danger is not of this or that person but of peoples, he admonishes that something be abated from the severity of discipline, that sincere charity may come to the aid of healing greater ills. And in Epistle 64 to Aurelius: "Severity," he says, "is to be exercised against the sins of the few." But how one must deal when there is a multitude of sinners, there likewise he teaches at length.⁸⁸

§ 99. Moreover to these things one must add, in a similar way, that the two ends just named fail if excommunication is inflicted easily and for slighter causes. Whence the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 25, ch. 3 On Reform) have thus determined: "Although the sword of excommunication is the sinew of ecclesiastical discipline and very salutary for keeping peoples to their duty, yet it is to be exercised soberly and with great circumspection; since experience teaches that, if it be rashly or for slight matters threatened, it is more despised than feared, and begets rather destruction than salvation."⁸⁹

§ 100. The third end is the correction and salvation of him who is excommunicated. For this is what the Apostle says: "Unto the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved," and elsewhere, "that they may learn not to blaspheme." Whence excommunication is also called medicinal by the Fathers even with respect to him who is excommunicated, as was said above.⁹⁰

§ 101. If you ask how it can come about that the subtraction of spiritual goods turns to a man's salvation, and that a man delivered to Satan should "learn not to blaspheme," whereas Satan is the master of blasphemy: it is answered that this does not come about from the nature of that penalty by which spiritual goods are withdrawn, nor from the devil's instruction, but per accidens; namely, in that a man, by that bodily separation, being confounded and made sorrowful, begins to think both what he is suffering and for what—in fact, that he has been separated from the Church, that is, from the society and communion of the Saints, and therefore is placed in very grave danger of his salvation; and that he suffers this on account of the sin in which he obstinately persists—wherefore then it begins to displease him. For it often happens that someone perverse is, to his great good, moved by a great evil who was not moved by a lesser evil, namely if that great evil be known to him and be held ignominious among men.

§ 102. And so in nearly the same way excommunication brings a man back to his right mind as the Law brings to Christ. For by the Law the transgression is increased; and, increased, and then his weakness being acknowledged, a man is moved to flee for refuge to the grace of Christ. Likewise, as to those whose mind is more obtuse something is persuaded by reduction to the impossible—that is, to something manifestly absurd—which could not be persuaded by direct proof; so one who by excommunication has been brought into manifest danger is drawn back from sin, who had before disdained to hear a fatherly rebuke. For as the case stands in the intellect, so also in the affection: and so in inflicting excommunication the procedure ought to be from charity (*caritas*) with mourning and with the desire of the salvation of him who is excommunicated, that from the mercy of God there be obtained what the nature of that penalty does not have in itself—just as Paul signifies ought to be done, and that it was done by himself (1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 12). Whence Augustine (On Rebuke and Grace, ch. 15) also says that the diseased sheep is perhaps to be healed by God—who is almighty—by the very separation. And in book 3 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 1: "When," he says, "necessity drives to such vengeance, the humility of the mourners ought to win mercy, which pride repels; nor ought the salvation of that very man who is taken out from the midst of the brethren to be neglected; but one must so act that such vengeance be useful to him; and one must act by desire and prayers if he cannot be corrected by rebukes." He hands on similar things in ch. 2. St. John Chrysostom likewise (Homily 15 on 1 Cor. 5, and

Homily 5 on 1 Tim. 1, and in the Sermon on Anathema) shows how excommunication is both useful and medicinal to the one excommunicated.⁹¹

§ XIII — That one must pray for the excommunicated (Pro excommunicatis orandum esse)

§ 103. The things just said amply prove that one must pray for the excommunicated, that, corrected by penance, they may return to the Church. For if one must proceed to excommunication from charity, and act so that that excommunication be useful and medicinal, and that it may profit—as the Apostle says—"unto the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord": therefore God must be prayed to that He turn this penalty into medicine and salvation for him, for so great a good is not to be expected from God without prayer.

§ 104. St. Augustine teaches this in the place just cited, warning that one must act by desire and prayers for the excommunicated, that such vengeance be useful to him. The same intimates (Sermon 16 on the Words of the Lord), saying: "Do not now reckon him among the number of thy brethren, nor yet for that is his salvation to be neglected." And in Epistle 106 to Paul: "We love Pelagius now otherwise than we once loved him. For then, because he seemed to us a man of right faith; but now, since he is said to feel things hostile and contrary to the grace of God, may he be freed by His mercy." Admonishing that it pertains to the office of a Pastor that he do not omit care even for those cut off, but also watch and pray to God for those to be led back to the reward of the Church.⁹³

§ 105. The same (in the Sermon on Anathema) proves in many ways that no mortal is to be anathematized in such fashion as to be shut out from prayer and hope of salvation. First, because Christ died for all. Second, because the Church imitates Christ by pouring out prayers for all. Third, because it belongs to God alone so to reject a man that no place is left for prayer—and this He does not do except after death. Fourth, because the Apostles cast the contumacious out of the Church as if the right eye were to be plucked out—that is, with great mourning. Now mourning is sorrow over the loss of a loved thing. Fifth, because Paul bids even those who resist the truth to be corrected with modesty, if perhaps God may give them repentance. Sixth, because Christ prescribes charity toward all. Finally, because He even particularly commands that one pray for enemies and for those who persecute and slander us, with absolutely no exception added. Wherefore those general Scriptures which will that everyone, so long as he lives and is to be reckoned in the number of neighbors, be not excluded from charity—and consequently not from prayer—prove that even the excommunicated are to be loved in this manner, and that one must pray for them.

§ 106. This is so true that not even from those prayers which the priest offers at the altar ought the excommunicated be excluded. For the Apostle (1 Tim. 2) wills "supplications, prayers, intercessions" to be made "for all men." Which passage the ancients—among whom Augustine (Epistle 59 to Paulinus), Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius in their Commentaries—expound concerning those prayers which are offered to God by the priest in the celebration of the Mysteries; and they so expound that in that which is said, "for all men," they admit no exception. Pope Celestine likewise clearly teaches the same (in the Epistle to the Bishops of Gaul, ch. 11). To this is added Pope Gelasius, who (in the Epistle On the Bond of Anathema) says that there is no sin for which the Church does not pray. And St. Ignatius, speaking in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans concerning heretics: "Only," he says, "pray for them, if perchance they may repent."

Finally, on Good Friday the whole Church publicly prays by name for heretics and schismatics, whom it is without doubt clear are by the law itself excommunicated.⁹⁴

§ 107. It is proved likewise also by this reason: Admonition, rebuke, the preaching of truth and of penance is not to be withdrawn from the excommunicated; therefore neither is prayer. For he who rebukes a delinquent—as also he who preaches the Gospel—must expect from God through prayers the outcome of his rebuke and preaching, as Augustine teaches in the book *On Rebuke and Grace*. Moreover, those things avail to prove this which above (on *Distinctio 12*) were said about the causes and persons for whom the Sacrifice of the Mass ought to be offered; and, in general, whatever teaches that for the salvation of no man in this life is one to despair, and that from the offices of charity—among which the quickest and chiefest is that which is performed by praying—no one is to be excluded. Of which the one point (on *Distinctio 28*, book 2), the other (on *Distinctio 28* and 29, book 3), was proved by us.⁹⁵

§ XIV — Reply to those things that are wont to be objected (Responsio ad ea quae solent objici)

§ 108. Now one must briefly answer those things which are wont to be objected on the contrary. The first of which is this: An excommunicate is by that very fact deprived of the common suffrages of the Church, as is clear from what was said above; therefore the faithful ought not to pray for him. The second: No care is any longer taken of a member that has been cut off; therefore one must not pray for him who has been cut off. The third: Excommunication is the greatest punishment that the Church can inflict, as St. Augustine attests in the book *On Correction and Grace*, ch. 15; therefore it excludes also from the prayers of the faithful.⁴² The fourth: The excommunicate is rightly, with the Apostle, called "anathema, maranatha" (in the last chapter of 1 Corinthians), that is, "accursed until the Lord come to judgment"; therefore one must not deal with prayers that he be called back.⁹⁷ The fifth: St. Augustine (*Sermon 49 On the Words of the Lord*) says: "Christ is able also to heal the weak members, provided they be not cut off by excessive impiety, but cling to the body until they are healed. For whatever still clings to the body is not in a state of desperate health; but what has been cut off can neither be cared for nor healed"; therefore, one must not pray.⁹⁸ The sixth: Bede (*Sermon for Friday in the beginning of Lent*) says that there are certain sins in brothers, that is, Christians, graver than the persecution of enemies, for which one should not pray, according to that saying, 1 John 5: "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that any man should ask for that." He interprets such a sin as when someone, after the recognition of God, attacks the brotherhood. Whence he thinks that the Apostle Paul therefore did not pray for Alexander the coppersmith (2 Tim. 4), because he was already a brother and had sinned "unto death," that is, into envy, by attacking the brotherhood.⁹⁹ Which opinion of his he almost word for word took from St. Augustine, book 1 *On the Sermon of the Lord on the Mount*, ch. 22.¹⁰⁰ The seventh: St. Bernard (*Treatise On the Degrees of Humility*, last chapter) would have us only groan and weep for the excommunicates, but not pray; and that by the example of Martha, the sister of Lazarus, who for the resurrection of her brother did not dare to pray to the Lord, but only said: "I know that whatever you shall ask of God, God will give you"; nay, as if despairing, she said, "Lord, by now he stinketh, for he is of four days."¹⁰¹ The eighth: Innocent III (in the *Decretals*, the chapter *A nobis* and the chapter *Sacris*, *On the Sentence of Excommunication*) teaches that Sacrifices are not to be offered for excommunicates.¹⁰² Lastly, to prove that at least publicly it is not fitting to pray for the excommunicates, they bring forward other words of Bernard from the place just cited, where at length he pronounces thus about the excommunicates, and as it were expounds himself, saying: "Far be it

from us that, even for such as these, although we do not presume to do it openly, we should cease to pray even in our hearts; since Paul also lamented for those whom he knew to have died without repentance. And although they exclude themselves from the common prayers, yet from our affections they altogether cannot be excluded. Let them see, however, in how great a danger they are, for whom the Church does not dare to pray openly, which nevertheless soberly prays even for the Jews, for heretics, for the Gentiles. For although on Good Friday prayer is made by name for all kinds of evildoers, yet no mention at all is made of the excommunicates." Thus Bernard. Other things also could be objected, but such as we long since solved when we were treating of the Sacrifice of the Mass (at Distinctio 12). For as to what can be asked concerning the oblation, we have there treated it.

§ 109. Therefore we answer the proposed arguments thus. To the first, indeed: he who is excommunicated is not deprived of all the Church's or the faithful's prayers and suffrages, but only of the common ones, that is, those which are made for the body of the Church itself, or for certain of its members. Otherwise, nothing prevents there being made in the Church, both privately and also publicly, such prayers as include, just as unbelievers and others who are outside the Church, so also the excommunicates. For what some say—that when on Good Friday the Church prays for heretics and schismatics, then for that hour, as regards that effect, it absolves them from excommunication—does not seem true, nor consonant with the intention of the Church; since also at other times the Church uses public prayers, by the generality of which the excommunicates are contained: as in the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer; and when it prays God that the people serving Him may be increased both in merit and in number; and in the Canon of the Mass, when it prays that God would deign to help His Church; and whenever generally it prays for sinners.

§ 110. To the second: the likeness between the human body and the mystical body does not in all respects hold. For neither, when a dead member is still joined to the body, is care taken that it be brought back to life. Yet this certainly must be done in the mystical body. For the Holy Spirit can do more in the body of Christ, which is the Church, than the soul can in an animal body. Whence, just as by the healing of the withered hand and the raising of the girl in the house there was signified the restoration of those who are dead within the Church, so by the restoration of the ear that had been cut off, and by the raising of the youth being carried out beyond the gate, there was signified the restoration of those who have been separated from the Church and cast outside the Church.

§ 111. To the third: Excommunication is the greatest punishment that the Church can inflict. Yet it neither can nor ought to forbid praying for the excommunicates, since to do this the faithful are bound by the law of Christ. Only the damned are so utterly anathematized that it is not lawful even to pray for them, as Chrysostom teaches (in the Sermon On Anathema). Nay, it does not even seem able to prohibit the Priest from praying and offering at the Altar for an excommunicate, since the effect of the unbloody Sacrifice, just as of the bloody sacrifice, as regards causes and persons, is universal, and ought not to be restricted.¹⁰³

§ 112. To the fourth: the Apostle does not speak particularly of an excommunicate, nor does he forbid praying for him whom he calls "anathema"; but he announces that there will be judgment for such unless they repent—which can universally be referred to all the wicked.

§ 113. To the fifth: Augustine introduces the comparison of the members of the body, not to teach that the excommunicates can by no means be restored, but to show how difficult and rare in the mystical body that is, which in the natural body is utterly impossible.

§ 114. To the sixth: Those words which Bede took from Augustine, Augustine himself, *Retractations*, book 1, ch. 19, so retracts as to wish this to be added: "if, however, in such most criminal perversity of mind he shall have ended this life." "For," he says, "concerning anyone however wicked, so long as he stands in this life, there is assuredly no reason for despairing, nor is it imprudently prayed for him concerning whom there is no despair." But about the sin unto death we have said (above, at *Distinctio* 43, book 2); and that by that sentence John does not exclude all prayers. Thus testifies the *Catechism for Parish Priests*, under the title "For whom one ought to pray": "In those, however, who are said to sin unto death, scarcely anything is accomplished by prayers and vows; nevertheless it is of Christian charity both to pray for them and to strive with tears, whether they may be able to render God appeased toward them."¹⁰⁴

§ 115. To the seventh: Bernard sufficiently declares himself, signifying that that weeping and groaning is not without the prayer of the heart. Whence among other things he says: "Thus we pray better as if not praying; thus we trust more efficaciously as if diffident." But the words recited in the last argument lay open Bernard's meaning more clearly.

§ 116. To the eighth: those canons forbid oblations and prayers to be made publicly for the dead who are bound by the bond of excommunication, even if they have done penance before death, unless first they shall have been absolved from the bond of excommunication. The reason for which is that those prayers are not in order that someone may return to the Church, but presuppose that he for whom they are made is in the Church. And therefore there ought to precede them an absolution from excommunication.¹⁰²

§ 117. To the last: Bernard only denies that the Church in public prayers prays by name for the excommunicates—namely by saying, "Let us pray for the excommunicates"—in the way it prays for the Jews, for heretics, for schismatics. For excommunication is not guilt but a punishment: then, however, the Church prays by name for certain classes of the impious, such as pagans, heretics, schismatics, Jews. Whence, just as it does not name the excommunicates, so neither the suspended nor the degraded, which names likewise signify a punishment. And this reason Bernard himself suggests in his words, saying that, although on Good Friday prayer is made by name for all kinds of evildoers, yet no mention is then made of the excommunicates; because, namely, the excommunicates, as such, are not evil but wretched. Another reason is that, since excommunication is the name of an extreme punishment inflicted by the Church, it pertains to it also that, although the excommunicates are not to be excluded from public prayer, nevertheless they are not to be named publicly; namely, that by this arrangement they may be the more confounded, as those whom the Church deigns not even to name in public prayers. Moreover, as regards confidence in obtaining, if the Church dares to pray for the faithless Jews, whose obstinacy is most notorious, likewise for heretics and schismatics, who both are excommunicated and are worse than many excommunicates—nay, the worst of all the excommunicated—I do not see why she would not also similarly dare to pray by name for the excommunicates, if otherwise she judged that this ought to be done. But why she does not do this—already the reasons have been stated.

§ XV — In whose hands the power to excommunicate resides (Penes quos sit excommunicandi potestas)

§ 118. Whether priests alone have the power to excommunicate (*potestas excommunicandi*) can be asked. For so it has seemed to some, for the following reasons. First: because the power to excommunicate, just as it is the

power to bind the sinner, so too is it the power to retain sins; for the one excommunicating both binds and retains, as Chrysostom bears witness.¹⁰⁶ But the power to retain belongs to priests alone, just as also the power to remit. For to them alone it was said: "Whose sins you shall forgive..."¹⁰⁷ Second: Ambrose, in book 1 On Penance, chapter 2, says: "The Lord willed there to be a parity of loosing and binding, since He granted both on equal terms"; therefore he who does not have the right of loosing, does not have the right of binding either, and so forth.³⁵ And a little later: "For this right has been granted to priests alone." And then he proves that power of binding and loosing by the Scripture of John 20: "Whose sins you shall forgive," and so on, which, since it pertains to priests alone, seems to pertain to them alone. Third: the Council of Trent (chapter 6) condemns all doctrines which perniciously extend to any other men besides bishops and priests the ministry of the keys (Matt. 18 and John 20) that is signified.¹⁰⁸ Fourth: Burchard (from the Penitential of Theodore, book of Decretals 11, chapter 153) says that it belongs to the same persons to offer sacrifice as to bind and to loose.¹⁰⁹ Lastly: if the power of excommunicating can be communicated to those who do not have sacred Order, it seems to follow that it is not a divine power but only of human institution, such as is the power of excluding someone from the number of citizens or soldiers, or from a similar human society. Moreover, those who are of this opinion say that those who are not priests, if they bear a prefecture in the Church, can excommunicate their subjects only to this extent, because they can keep them away from the communion of the sacraments and from the external assembly and converse of the faithful; yet they cannot bind the soul, nor hand over to Satan—that is, simply cut off from the body of the Church. For this, as something divine and supernatural, they will have to be something proper to priests.

§ 119. But this opinion is destroyed by the arguments by which the different doctrine is proved: namely, that the power of excommunicating belongs neither to all priests nor to priests alone, but that all bishops who have jurisdiction, even if they are not consecrated, and, in general, all prelates have the power of excommunicating their subjects; and indeed so properly and so universally that they are cut off from the body of the whole Church, and in the whole Church must be regarded as excommunicated.

§ 120. The rationale of this doctrine is that, since there is a twofold forum (*forum*), ecclesiastical, namely interior and exterior: in the interior forum (*forum interius*), which is also called the forum of penance and of conscience, in which the sinner by his own confession accuses himself before the Vicar of God, no one can bind and loose unless he who, besides the power of jurisdiction, also has the power of Order, namely priestly; but in the exterior forum (*forum exterius*), in which, as in a civil forum, according to the statements and allegations of witnesses someone is condemned or absolved, anyone who has jurisdiction of the exterior forum can bind and loose, whether consecrated or not. Hence bishops who have jurisdiction, likewise general and provincial councils, archdeacons, archpriests, abbots, and other superiors of monasteries, yes and sometimes parish priests in cases granted by law, and the vicars of all these by commission—so that this power seems to be communicable not only to a simple cleric of any degree, but even to a layman. For since it does not require ecclesiastical Order, and clericality, or even first tonsure, is only of human law, nothing seems to prevent such an office from being committed to someone who is not even a cleric. And this, indeed, is less doubted with respect to the absolution of one excommunicated. For a layman can, in a case of necessity, absolve an excommunicate.¹¹⁰ Whence historians hand down that a certain excommunicate, when he baptized a catechumen in peril at sea, was forthwith absolved by the same.

§ 121. Now that the power to excommunicate pertains to the exterior forum is manifest from the Gospel: the excommunicate is held as a heathen and a publican. On account of which reason also excommunication is

not inflicted by a judge except for public crimes, nor by law except for sins that are in some way external. This doctrine is confirmed by the authority of Clement and Cyprian, of whom the former, in book 8 of the Apostolic Constitutions, grants to a deacon the power to excommunicate, the latter (Epistle 48) entrusts to a deacon the power of absolving an excommunicate.¹¹¹ To this is added Augustine, who in book 3 Against the Letter of Parmenian, chapter 2, testifies that not only the bishop, but also his clergy and other superiors, exercise this power of excommunicating.¹¹² Indeed, this seems able to be proved from the Apostle himself, who, in 1 Corinthians 5, writes: "I have already judged him who has so acted; when you are assembled together and my spirit, to deliver such a one to Satan," and so on; and at the end of the chapter: "Put away the evil one from among yourselves."¹¹³ Likewise he writes in 2 Corinthians 2, as though both the power of excommunicating and of receiving back into the Church were communicated to the Corinthians.

§ 122. Finally, it is proved by the perpetual practice of the Church, which exercises the power to excommunicate not only through priests, but also through others who bear the governance of the sheep of Christ, making no distinction between an excommunication imposed by a priest or by a non-priest, so far as regards the severity of the penalty and the perfection of the power: because, namely, it does not acknowledge here the character of Order as necessary, but only jurisdiction of the exterior forum. Whence this also is clear, that this power is not in the hands of those who are excommunicated or otherwise suspended from jurisdiction—unless perhaps the excommunication is hidden; because, since these are matters of positive law, the Church is not considered to deprive her judges, just as neither in the forum of penance are priests, of the use of jurisdiction by the censure of excommunication, except in those cases in which, according to the decree of Constance, they are to be avoided.¹¹⁴ And this has been necessarily established for the common good of the faithful. For if the acts of the excommunicated whose excommunication is hidden were void, great disturbance of consciences would arise therefrom. Wherefore such excommunicates, even if before God they are cut off, and do not pertain to the interior fellowship of the ecclesiastical body, nevertheless, in a certain respect, namely according to the exterior form, still cohere to the Church; and therefore the ecclesiastical ministries which are transacted through them are valid, although they themselves sin gravely by administering them.

§ 123. But now to the arguments for the contrary. Therefore to the first it is answered, that the same power is not signified in Matthew 18 and John 20 without qualification. For in John the power of remitting and retaining sins for reconciling the faithful fallen after Baptism is communicated to priests, as the Tridentine Synod teaches (Session 14, chapter 1).¹¹⁵ Which power is proper to the forum of penance (*forum poenitentiae*). But in Matthew the power is signified of binding a man outside the Church by excommunication and of loosing him from it, although, as is very probable, not that alone. Therefore this power, since it pertains to the exterior forum, can belong and be committed also to non-priests. Moreover, Chrysostom extends the use of the word "retaining" to an act of the exterior forum.¹¹⁶

§ 124. To the contrary argument from Ambrose in the second place: Ambrose understands, in that place, the right of loosing and binding as proper to priests, which is exercised in the forum of penance. For he is disputing against the Novatians, who denied the Church's right to reconcile penitents. In the same way that which was alleged from Theodore and Burchard must be understood; for statements of that sort have force to prove that the priest alone is the minister of the sacrament of Penance.

§ 125. To the third, it is answered that the Synod condemns the doctrine of those who think that the words of the Gospel pertain to all Christ's faithful indiscriminately and promiscuously. Which is clearly

declared by the words that follow there, and is repeated in canon 10 of the same session.¹¹⁶ Yet we confess also that the ministry of the keys—that is, of that power which is wont to be signified par excellence by the name of the keys—pertains to priests alone, as we reminded at the beginning of this Distinction. For those keys are the sacramental ones, about which the Synod treats in that place.

§ 126. To the last: there should be no doubt that the power of excommunicating is divine, just as the power of remitting sins is. First, because each has a spiritual and supernatural effect, which mere human institution cannot reach, as is plainly understood from those things which, for the assertion of each power, we have said in their own places. For not only did Christ institute the sacraments, and promise that He would be present to them, but He also delivered to the rulers of the Church the power of casting out and of receiving within the Church, and promised that He would approve their sentence, as Jerome attests on Matthew 18.¹¹⁷ Whence, nevertheless, it does not follow that this power, like that one, belongs to priests alone, because in the Church there are "divisions of graces and of ministries," according to the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 12; and the power of Order is one thing, the power of jurisdiction another. Therefore, indeed, to priests alone the forum of penance has been committed by divine institution; but not to them alone the administration of the exterior forum, since no reason compels that no one be able to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the exterior forum who is not a priest.

§ XVI — For which sins excommunication is to be imposed (Propter quae peccata ferenda sit excommunicatio)

§ 127. Excommunication (*excommunicatio*) is to be inflicted on no one except on account of mortal sin (*peccatum mortale*). The reason of this is that a man is to be cast out of the Church only for those things for which one is excluded from the kingdom of heaven; for neither ought the Church to separate from herself him whom God does not exclude from His kingdom. Nay rather, since the Church herself, militant on earth, is, as it were, by the voice of the Gospel the kingdom of heaven, it is inconsistent that one be judged outside this kingdom who, by present justice, is worthy to be enrolled in the number of the citizens of the heavenly kingdom, that is, of the Church triumphant. Likewise, the Church ought not to cast out the friends and sons of God and the temples of the Holy Spirit, which all the just are. Another reason: for a physician would deservedly be thought cruel who, in order to remove some slight bodily intemperance, should use a most powerful drug; or a surgeon who, not despairing of the health of a limb—nay, if it were simply sound, though suffering from a light affection—should amputate it from the body. Wherefore in like manner excommunication would be unjust, if it were inflicted for a venial fault, easily curable or at least tolerable, which does not take away the health of the soul. But the weightiest reason is taken from the end of excommunication. For if the principal end of excommunication is that evil be removed from the midst, lest "a little leaven corrupt the whole mass," as the Apostle says (1 Cor. 5),¹¹⁹ but the body of the Church, nay not even one member of the Church, cannot be corrupted by venial sin, therefore no one ought to be excommunicated for venial sin alone. And Scripture likewise not obscurely insinuates this to us (Matt. 18). For when the Lord says, "thou hast gained thy brother," beyond doubt He speaks of the sin by which the brother had perished; as also St. Augustine interprets this (Sermon 16 on the Words of the Lord).¹²⁰ Then in that it is said, "if he will not hear the Church," the sin of disobedience, in its kind mortal, is signified. And again in what follows: "Let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." These names signify those who are in the state of mortal sin. And neither do we ever read that the Apostles used this power otherwise. For in 1 Cor.

5 the incestuous man is excommunicated; and in 1 Tim. 1 heretics are reported as "delivered unto Satan"; and in Gal. 5 those teaching Judaism are judged worthy of "cutting off"; and in 2 Cor. 12 those liable to various crimes are reckoned as to be excommunicated.¹²¹ Wherefore it was most rightly established in the Councils of Meaux and Auvergne, whose canons are recited by Gratian (II, q. 2, "Nemo Episcoporum" and "Nullus sacerdotum"), that a man ought not to be excommunicated for slight causes, but only for mortal sins.¹²² Which constitution of the canons is nothing other than a certain interpretation of the divine law.

§ 128. It must be known, moreover, that to incur excommunication so far forth requires mortal sin that without it one never truly incurs it, although it sometimes happens by error, whether from false presumption or for another reason, that a sentence of excommunication is passed by a judge upon one who has not sinned mortally. In which case, to avoid scandal, such a one should indeed withdraw himself from the external assembly of the faithful, yet he is not deprived of the suffrages of the Church; because he does not enter into the full society of the ecclesiastical body. The reason of which is easy to gather from what has been said. For God does not approve the sentence by which a living, healthy, and useful member is pronounced to be cut off from the body. Now further it must be noted that mortal sin does not suffice for excommunication unless it have conjoined with it the sin of disobedience (*inobedientia*), whereby a man is unwilling to hear the Church warning him about that sin. For Christ did not otherwise give the power of excommunicating, except when he who sins was unwilling to hear the Church. Nor is he who has sinned to be treated as a heathen and a publican before he has come to that degree of contumacy of which the Lord says, "if he will not hear the Church." Whence again it is gathered that he who has not sinned mortally against obedience to the Church—although otherwise he may have committed a mortal sin—has incurred no excommunication before God; because as yet that "if he will not hear the Church," which is necessary for the ratification of the sentence of excommunication, has no place in his case. Therefore, as often as either by law or by man something is commanded under pain of excommunication, it is understood to be a mortal sin not to obey such a precept, even if its transgression otherwise and of itself would not be mortal. For since ecclesiastical prelates are judges in spiritual things, by the very fact that under such a penalty they command something, they establish that it must of necessity be done in such wise that its omission be mortal; an example of which is to be seen in St. Cyprian (Ep. 58 to Pomponius).¹²³ And thus absolutely one must judge concerning precepts of this sort, unless error or abuse should be ascertained.

§ 129. Besides these things it must be noted that, although for whatever mortal sin, if contumacy precede, the sentence of excommunication, if it be passed, binds, nevertheless it ought not to be passed except for more serious and enormous crimes. Whence Paul, before he delivered the incestuous man to Satan, exaggerated the atrocity of that crime, saying: "It is heard that there is fornication among you, and such as is not so much as named among the Gentiles." And St. Augustine (On Correction and Grace, ch. 16) does not wish any and every mortal fault to be punished by excommunication; but, he says, "let brothers be corrected by their superiors with corrections diverse according to the diversity of faults, whether lesser or greater." And subjoining that the punishment of excommunication in the Church is the greatest, he signifies that it ought not to be inflicted except for more serious crimes, and that one ought not to come to such vengeance unless compelled by necessity; as the same man says also in book 3 against the letter of Parmenian (ch. 1). Moreover he has more clearly delivered this matter in book 2 On the Contemplative Life (ch. 7), in these words: "But those crimes, of whatever kind, which can be healed by those very criminals willing themselves to be healed, from wherever they have become manifest, whatever things have not been cured by the light medicine of patience, must be burned and healed, as it were, by a certain fire of pious rebuke. But if not even thus shall the

remedy of rebuke have profited their equanimity—of those, namely, who, when they know that they have been rebuked healthfully, understand that they have been corrected wholesomely—then, as putrid parts of the body, they must be cut off by the knife of excommunication."¹²⁵

§ 130. Furthermore, as to how rightly or not rightly excommunication can be set in motion for temporal damages, the Council of Trent gravely teaches (Session 25, ch. 2, On Reform), where among other things it mandates ecclesiastical judges that, whenever real or personal execution can be effected by themselves, they should abstain from ecclesiastical censures, lest, namely, because of excessive ease and frequency, they fall into contempt.¹²⁶ Finally, it must be known that for no past sin, however enormous, for which there has not preceded monition under the penalty of excommunication, can that penalty of excommunication be inflicted. Which is so true that without that prior monition excommunication is vain and void. The reason is manifest from the foregoing, because there is no excommunication against him who has not been disobedient to the Church admonishing; and indeed no sin of disobedience can be held to exist unless monition has preceded. In order therefore that the sin of disobedience may be of such a sort on account of which the sentence of excommunication can be passed, it is necessary that monition should have preceded under threat of excommunication, either from the law or from a man. And indeed, if it has been made by the law (which in another way is said to be by statute, or by canon), there is no need that it be twofold or threefold, because a monition of law is solemn, and therefore easily supplies for triple monition, and avails as much, or even more. Whence he who, against the monition of the law, falls into a sin that is prohibited under the anathema of a sentence already passed, is held disobedient, and therefore by that very fact incurs excommunication. But that which is made by a judge, on account of the maturity of judgment which is necessary before excommunication, ought to be threefold, that it may be ascertained whether the contumacy of the subject is so great as to be worthy of so grave a penalty. And this triple monition, confirmed by the sacred canons, has its foundation in the Gospel, where a brother sinning is ordered first to be corrected privately, then with witnesses brought in, and finally to be denounced to the Church; which, if he shall have contemned or refused to hear, then at last he is to be bound with the bond of excommunication by the sentence of that same Church, so that he ought to be held "as a heathen and a publican." From what has been said it does not seem difficult to answer the questions which can be raised here about ignorance of fact or of law. First, whoever invincibly ignores the fact which is the subject of the censure of excommunication, even if by committing that fact he should sin gravely, is nevertheless excused from the censure itself. Alexander III clearly teaches this (in the chapter "Si vero," Extra, On the Sentence of Excommunication), saying that he is not bound by excommunication who has struck one whom he does not know to be a cleric; which the gloss in the same place explains concerning probable ignorance. The reason is that he does not act contumaciously who does not know that he acts. And we call invincible or probable ignorance that which a man cannot, or is not bound to, overcome.¹²⁷ Second: whoever invincibly ignores an excommunication pronounced by a judge, during that ignorance, although he falls into that which is prohibited, nevertheless does not incur the excommunication annexed by the statute of the ordinary judge, if it is invincibly unknown by him who has acted against it. The reason is that he is not held to have been warned who probably ignores. And on this matter clear is the Constitution of Boniface VIII (in the Sixth Book, On Constitutions), where it is as follows: "That the perils of souls may be obviated, by sentences pronounced by the statutes of any ordinaries we do not wish the ignorant to be bound, provided however their ignorance is not crass or supine."¹²⁸ Third: whoever invincibly ignores the common ecclesiastical law by which under the penalty of excommunication of a sentence already passed something is prohibited, so long as that ignorance lasts he does not incur excommunication if he acts against

it, although he knows that what he does is prohibited by some law, not however by the natural and divine law. The reason is the same, namely that he cannot be said to have been warned, and hence neither to be judged disobedient to the Church when it commands, who invincibly ignores the mandate of the Church. From these propositions, as it were from foundations, it will be easy to answer many particulars which can be asked about the danger of incurring excommunication.

§ XVII — How far the excommunicated are to be avoided (Quatenus vitandi sunt excommunicati)

§ 131. Concerning the avoiding of the excommunicated, one must see what is of divine law, and what is of ecclesiastical law. The divine law was handed on to us by Christ (Matt. 18), saying: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican," that is, let him be reckoned as though he were not of the Church nor of the number of the faithful. Nay, the excommunicated person himself is held by the same divine law to acknowledge this about himself. Yet this sentence of Christ does not prove that the excommunicated man is to be avoided more than a heathen or publican. Likewise, it is of divine law that every faithful person be alien from the crime on account of which someone is excommunicated; for neither is it permitted to communicate in any other man's sin. To this extent, then, is each one bound to avoid the excommunicated man—nay, any other evil man whatsoever—as is necessary for this, that he do not communicate in his sin. Hence (Rev. 18) it is said generally of Babylon, that is, the society of the wicked: "Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins." By the same divine law furthermore the sacraments proper to the faithful are by no means to be handed over to those cut off from the Church. For even the sacrament of Baptism which is given to catechumens cannot be repeated. Finally, the Apostle Paul commands the faithful (1 Cor. 5) that they not be mingled with certain criminals, and that "with such a one not so much as to eat"; and (2 Thess. 3) he enjoins them to "withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they received"; and "that you do not keep company with him"; and (Titus 3) "A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid"; and the mind of the Apostle John is notable also (in the Second Epistle): "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine; receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed." But these apostolic precepts bind so far as the edification of the faithful, the conversion of the excommunicated man, and the avoidance of scandal require. Of which three reasons Paul speaks expressly, saying in 1 Cor. 5 and Galatians: "A little leaven corrupteth the whole mass." To which also pertains that of 1 Cor. 15: "Evil communications corrupt good manners." But this reason also has sometimes a certain place with regard to unbelievers, about whom the same Apostle in 2 Cor. 6 commands: "Wherefore go out from among them, and be ye separate." And yet he had already shown that there is not altogether the same reason with respect to these, in 1 Cor. 5, saying: "I wrote to you not to keep company with fornicators; not indeed with the fornicators of this world," and so on; "for then you ought to have gone out of this world." Whence it is clearly shown that an excommunicated man is to be avoided more than a heathen or unbeliever, even if he openly lives criminally.¹³⁰

§ 132. Another reason was in view when he wrote (to the Thessalonians): "Do not keep company with him, that he may be confounded." A third also, and the first, John seems to have indicated, saying: "For he that saith unto him, God speed, communicateth with his wicked works"; namely either in reality, or in the opinion of others, because commonly external communication is wont to argue the friendship and, as it were, similarity of morals and minds, and consent. In a similar manner St. Augustine understands and explains the

places of Scripture (book 3, against the letter of Parmenian, ch. 1). However, though the reasons already mentioned do not always and in all respects hold, yet for the most part and almost always they subsist; if not all, at least their greater part. Wherefore from the beginnings of the Church it was established by her prelates that all the faithful should simply abstain from commerce with the excommunicated, even in civil business, so that this ecclesiastical law should very nearly approach the divine. On which matter see canon 11 of the First Council of Nicaea, and the decrees of the Popes Fabian and Callistus, and the opinion of Isidore, which is recited by Gratian (II, q. 3), where among other things it is said to have been established by the Apostles that there is not to be communication with the excommunicated. But the generality of this ecclesiastical law was restricted by the decree of the Council of Constance, in which, to avoid scandal and the many dangers which can befall timid consciences, it was established that no one is held to avoid the excommunicated except in these two cases: namely if they are either excommunicated by name, or are strikers of clerics so notorious that the deed cannot be concealed by any evasion nor excused by any favor. Which constitution obtains in the Church down to the present day, notwithstanding a certain extension made in the Council of Basel (Session 20), to whose authority, on account of the schism, deference is not paid. Hence therefore it follows that, if someone be certain that a man is excommunicated—because, to wit, he saw him do that which was prohibited under the penalty of excommunication—and he knows there is no room for excuse, nevertheless he is not bound to avoid him so far as pertains to ecclesiastical law, if he has neither been excommunicated by name nor is a notorious striker of clerics. I say, so far as pertains to ecclesiastical law. For it can happen that by natural and divine law he be bound, on account of one of the reasons set forth above. Moreover, this liberty of not avoiding holds both in sacred things and outside sacred things, to such a degree that even the sacraments may be received from such an excommunicate, and his Mass may be heard; nay, even the sacraments may be administered to him publicly when he asks for them, if the deed is occult. Which doctrine holds also in the case of a heretic. For neither are the faithful bound by ecclesiastical law to avoid him as excommunicated until he has been condemned of heresy. For by the very fact that one is condemned of the crime of heresy, he is held to be excommunicated by name.¹³¹

§ 133. Now if it be asked how far, or in what things, the excommunicated are to be avoided by the faithful, it is answered, according to the decrees of the Popes, that they are to be considered as to be avoided in sacred actions, so that neither is one to pray with them, whether publicly or privately, nor are Masses or the Divine Offices to be celebrated before them, nor are the sacraments to be administered to them, nor to be received from them. It is otherwise, however, with preaching or sacred reading. For these can be done before an excommunicate; nay, a preacher and doctor can, without doubt, when asked by his excommunicated hearer about those things which pertain to faith and salvation, answer him. Moreover, kissing, greeting, leave-taking, commerce, and common table with those same excommunicated persons are forbidden. By which is signified that no sign of friendship or familiarity is to be shown them, whether this be done by word or by writing or by a messenger, and much less is one to transact business with them or to use a common table.

§ 134. On the contrary, five cases are to be noted in which it is permitted to communicate with the excommunicated, expressed in this little verse: Useful, law, humble, a thing unknown, necessary. The first case, therefore, is the spiritual utility of the excommunicated person, and the temporal utility of him who communicates with him. Of the spiritual utility of the excommunicated we have already spoken. For not only may a doctor or preacher or prelate or pastor, but any other wise faithful person also, admonish the excommunicated of his danger, instruct the erring, and wish him well by saying, "May God enlighten thee or convert thee"; according to that of the Apostle (2 Cor. 2) about that Corinthian delivered to Satan: "Sufficient

to such a one is this rebuke which is from many"; and 2 Thess. 3: "Do not think of him as an enemy, but correct him as a brother." Likewise (according to the chapter "Cum excommunicato," II, q. 3) we understand the temporal utility of the communicator, if the excommunicated owes him something. For this he may exact even in court, lest from his own malice the excommunicated appear to reap gain; as is clear (by the chapter "Intelleximus," Extra, On Trials).¹³²

§ 135. The second case is law or the debt of marriage: for it is permitted for a spouse to ask the conjugal debt from an excommunicated spouse, and in turn to render it (according to the chapter "Vere," Distinction 21). The third is subjection, such as that of sons, servants, and household members to parents and masters; for the sake of which subjection they can lawfully have dealings with them, according to the canon of Gregory VII which begins, "Quoniam..."¹³³

-
1. Matt. 18: "Quaecumque ligaveritis super terram, erunt ligata et in caelis; et quaecumque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in caelis."; Jn. 20: "Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis; et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt."
 2. Lk. 11: "Vae vobis legis peritis, quia tulistis clavem scientiae: ipsi non introistis, et eos qui introibant, prohibuistis."
 3. St. Jerome, In Isaiam.
 4. Jn. 20: "Accipite Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis; et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt."
 5. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 4.
 6. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplement, q. 19.
 7. Matt. 16: "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven"; Jn. 21: "Feed my sheep."
 8. Innocent III, Decretals, De poenitentiis et remissionibus, cap. "Nova."
 9. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplement, q. 18, a. 1–2, 7.
 10. The Master of the Sentences (Peter Lombard), In IV Sent., Dist. 18, sections D–F, conclusion cited as in the source.
 11. Richard of St. Victor, Tractatus de clavibus; Alexander of Hales, Summa; St. Bonaventure, In IV Sent.; Gabriel [as in source].
 12. Hugh of St. Victor, De sacramentis II, part 14, ch. 8; St. Thomas Aquinas; Scotus; Durandus; Paludanus.
 13. Jn. 1:33: "This is he who baptizeth in the Holy Spirit."
 14. St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto III, ch. 18.
 15. Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 3.
 16. St. Cyprian, Ep. 2 (book 1); St. Hilary of Poitiers, In Matt. 16.
 17. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 5 de verbis Isaiae "Vidi Dominum," on Matt. 18.
 18. St. Augustine, Tract. 49 in John; Serm. 8, 44, 52 de verbis Domini; Hom. 27 among the fifty; Enarr. in Ps. 101, Serm. 2; Pseudo-Augustine, De vera et falsa poenitentia; St. Gregory the Great, Hom. in Evangelia; St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses V.
 19. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1; canons 1, 3, 7; see also the condemnation of propositions of Wyclif and Hus in papal bulls [abbreviations as in source]; Thomas Waldensis, De sacramentis, ch. 141; Council of Florence, Decree for the Armenians. Additionally, cf. the references listed in the source to Dionysius (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 7), Tertullian (De poenitentia, ch. 10), St. Cyprian (Serm. de lapsis; Ep. 52; Ep. 54), St. Ambrose (Hom. 1–2 in Ps. 37; De Levitico II), St. Athanasius (Sermon "Profectus in pagum"), St. Basil (Institutiones monasticae, ch. 23; Ep. ad Amphiloichium, can. 73), St. Gregory Nazianzen (Oration to the Emperor and princes), St. Jerome (on Ecclesiastes 10; on Matt. 16; Ep. ad Algasiam), St. Pacian (Ad Sympronium, lib. De poenitentia contra Novatum), St. Augustine (multiple works as cited in the source [abbreviation as in source]), Arnobius, Fulgentius (De peccatorum remissione I, ch. 25), St. Cyril (on John, ch. 16), Pope Leo I (Ep. 91), Anastasius of Nicaea (Quaest. 6: "Sitne bonum confiteri peccata ministerialibus").
 20. St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto III, ch. 19; cf. also on Luke, last chapter; and De Cain et Abel II, ch. 4.

21. St. Augustine, Homily 23 among the Fifty [abbreviation as in source; cf. alternative numbering: Sermon 99 of the First Class in the Benedictine edition]; Tractates 3 and 80 on John; 1 Cor. 3:6; St. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* III, ch. 54; Sermon 8 on the Words of the Lord [= Sermon 67 of the First Class in the Benedictine edition].
22. Council of Trent, Session 14 [general reference to teaching on contrition and the sacrament].
23. St. Ambrose, *De paenitentia* II, ch. 2; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* I, ch. 7; St. Pacian, Epistle 1 to Sympronian; St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Hebrews*, at ch. 1; St. Cyril of Alexandria, on John, on "Whose sins you shall forgive"; Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* I, part 14, ch. 18; St. Ambrose, on Luke 4 ("to remit").
24. St. John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* III. On the "power of excellence" versus ministerial power, see the discussion above; cf. the editor's note: "Where what I have noted is to be seen about a singular and not very sound opinion" [abbreviation as in source].
25. On the distinction of twofold charity and twofold quickening, see above at *Distinctio* 27 of book 3. On the deprecatory preface to the form of absolution, see the treatment above.
26. St. Augustine, Tractate 121 [sc. on John 20:22–23: "Receive the Holy Spirit"]; Tractates 3 and 80 on John; St. Gregory the Great, *Homilies on the Gospels*, Hom. 26; Haimo of Auxerre, Homily on the Octave of Easter.
27. See above, *Distinctio* 15, on the form of absolution.
28. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Suppl., q. 17 and the following.
29. Matt. 16; Matt. 18; Jn. 20.
30. Prov. 5.
31. Is. 42; Is. 49; Is. 62.
32. Sir. 6; Matt. 23.
33. *De vera et falsa paenitentia*, ch. 10.
34. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 2; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 5; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 6; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8; and the last canon of the same session.
35. St. Ambrose, *De paenitentia* I, ch. 2.
36. Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI, ch. 12 (on Gregory of Antioch); cf. Matt. 18:18.
37. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Suppl., q. 21, a. 1.
38. Gal. 5:12: "Utinam et abscindantur qui vos conturbant."
39. 1 Cor. 5:2–5; 1 Tim. 1:20.
40. Matt. 18:18, 17.
41. Titus 3:10–11.
42. St. Augustine, *De correptione et gratia*, ch. 15.
43. St. Ambrose, Ep. 28.
44. Nicephorus Callistus, *Historia ecclesiastica* XII, ch. 4.
45. 1 Cor. 4:21.
46. 2 Cor. 13:10.
47. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Suppl., q. 21, a. 2.
48. Matt. 16:19; cf. above, in this distinction, on the keys and the power of binding and loosing.
49. 1 Cor. 5:2–5.
50. 1 Tim. 1:20.
51. 1 Cor. 4:21; 2 Cor. 12:20–21; 13:2, 10.
52. Gal. 1:8–9.

53. Pope Siricius, Epistle to the Milan Church, preserved in St. Ambrose, Ep. 80; cf. Gal. 5:12: "Would that they who trouble you were even cut off."
54. St. Augustine, Homily 50 [abbreviation as in source]; De opere monachorum, ch. 2; Against the Epistle of Parmenian, III, ch. 2. On "with such a one, not so much as to eat": 1 Cor. 5:11.
55. 1 Cor. 5:12–13; 2 Thess. 3:14; Matt. 18:17.
56. Deut. 17:12; 1 Cor. 5:2, 13. St. Augustine, Quaestiones in Deuteronomium on "Auferetis malum de vobis ipsis"; cf. also De fide et operibus, ch. 2. On the Greek text "Put away the evil one from among yourselves," he notes the Greek τὸν πονηρόν, "the evil man."
57. St. Jerome, Ep. 1 to Heliodorus, ch. 7.
58. St. Cyprian, Ep. 58.
59. Tertullian, Apologeticus, ch. 39; St. Jerome, Ep. 1 to Heliodorus.
60. Tertullian, De idololatria, ch. 11; Ad uxorem, II, ch. 3; De praescriptione haereticorum, ch. 30; Contra Marcionem, IV, ch. 24. St. Cyprian, Ep. 38, 55, 62, 72. Origen, Hom. 1 and 12 in Leviticum; Hom. 1 in Ps. 37. St. Ambrose, Sermon. 8 in Ps. 118; on Ps. 116; De officiis II, ch. 27; and Pope Siricius there, Ep. 80. St. Jerome, Ep. 1 ad Heliodorum; In Matt. 18, on "Quaecumque alligaveritis." St. Augustine, Tractatus 10, 27, 95 in Joann.; Hom. 50 [abbreviation as in source]; De fide et operibus, chs. 5, 19, 26; Enchiridion, ch. 63; De correptione et gratia, ch. 15; De civitate Dei XX, chs. 6, 16; Contra epistolam Parmeniani, III, ch. 2; Sermon. 22 De verbis Apostoli; Ep. 65; Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum, I, ch. 17. Pope Innocent I, Ep. 91. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 5 on 1 Tim.; Hom. 15 on 1 Cor.; Hom. 4 on Heb.; and on Matt. 18. St. Gregory the Great, Hom. 26 in Evangelia; Epistolae, V, 30. Pope Urban I, Epistle to all bishops. Gratian, Decretum, Causa 11, Quaest. 3; Causa 24, Quaest. 1.
61. Council of Nicaea I (325), condemnation of Arius; Council of Ephesus (431), condemnation of Nestorius. For the condemned propositions: Articles of John Wyclif 11, 12, 13, 30; Articles of John Hus 17, 18, 19, condemned at the Council of Constance. Martin Luther later revived the same doctrine in his Articles 23 and 24, which Pope Leo X condemned.
62. St. Thomas, *ibid.* [abbreviation as in source].
63. St. Augustine, Sermon 16, De verbis Domini, ch. 4.
64. Theophylact, In Matthaum 18.
65. Origen, Tractate 6 on Matthew.
66. St. John Chrysostom, "Quod neque vivos neque mortuos sint anathemate plectendi," Hom. 5 [abbreviation as in source].
67. St. Augustine, Contra epistolam Parmeniani II, ch. 11; Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum I, ch. 17; Ep. 73; Homily 27; Homily 50 [abbreviation as in source].
68. Mal. 4. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 15 on 1 Cor. 5.
69. St. Thomas, Suppl., q. 21, a. 1; "1 2. ad 3" [abbreviation as in source].
70. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 5 on 1 Tim. 1.
71. Pope Innocent I, Ep. 93; cited in St. Augustine.
72. St. Augustine, Tractate 62 on John; in the Benedictine edition, no. 181. For the scriptural loci cited: 1 Cor. 5; 1 Tim. 1; Matt. 10; Lk. 10; Mk. 16; Jn. 13; Lk. 22.
73. St. Cyprian, Ep. 58, De excommunicatione; St. Jerome, Ep. 1 ad Heliodorum; Pope Innocent I, Ep. 19, cited in St. Augustine; St. Augustine, Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum I, ch. 17; Tractates on John 27; De correptione et gratia, ch. 15; Ep. 75; Tertullian, Apologeticus adversus Gentes, ch. 39; Origen, Hom. 2 in Iudicum; St. John Chrysostom, In Matth. 18; Theophylact, In 1 Tim. 1; Oecumenius, In 1 Tim. 1; Theodoret, In 1 Cor. 5; Gratian, Decretum, causa 11, q. 3; condemnation of Luther's proposition 23 by Pope Leo X.
74. The parenthetical note "Seu CCL in eadem Edit." is in the source [abbreviation as in source].
75. 1 Cor. 5:5; cf. also 1 Cor. 5:2, 7, 13 cited below; Luther, Article 24.
76. St. John Chrysostom, on 2 Cor. 5; Theophylact, on 1 Tim. 1; Oecumenius, on 1 Tim. 1.
77. Pope Innocent IV, Council of Lyons, in Sextus Decretalium, De sententia excommunicationis.

78. St. Cyprian, Epistle 58.
79. 2 Cor. 2.
80. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 5 on 1 Tim. 1; Theophylact, on 1 Tim. 1; Oecumenius, on 1 Tim. 1; St. Hilary, Commentary on Matthew, on Matt. 18; Euthymius Zigabenus, Commentary on Matthew, on Matt. 18.
81. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplementum, q. 21, a. 1, corpus; a. 3.
82. Rom. 2:23–24; Is. 52:5; Ezek. 36:20.
83. St. Cyprian, Epistle 37 to Eucratius.
84. 1 Tim. 1:20; on violence against clerics, see canonical penalties in the tradition.
85. 1 Cor. 5:6; Gal. 5:10, 12.
86. St. Cyprian, Epistle 18 to Pomponius; St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia, ch. 15; Pope Innocent I, Epistles 91 and 93 [apud Augustinum]; 2 Tim. 2:17; cf. 1 Tim. 1:20; 2 Tim. 2:17–18.
87. St. Augustine, De fide et operibus, chs. 1, 3, 4, 5; Matt. 18:17; 1 Tim. 5:20.
88. St. Augustine, Contra epistolam Parmeniani, III, ch. 1–2.
89. Council of Trent, Session 25, ch. 3 (De Reformatione).
90. 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20.
91. 1 Cor. 5; 2 Cor. 12; St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia, ch. 15; St. Augustine, Contra epistolam Parmeniani, III, ch. 1–2; St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 15 on 1 Cor. 5; Hom. 5 on 1 Tim. 1; Sermon on Anathema.
92. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplementum, q. 21, a. 1, ad 1.
93. St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia, ch. 15; Sermon 16 de Verbis Domini; Epistle 106 to Paul. (a) "Seu Sermon. LXXXII. inter Sermon. Classis in eadem." (b) "Seu CLXXXVI. in eadem." [editorial notes as in the source].
94. 1 Tim. 2:1; St. Augustine, Epistle 59 to Paulinus; St. John Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius, Commentaries on 1 Tim. 2; Pope Celestine I, Epistle to the Bishops of Gaul, ch. 11; Pope Gelasius I, Epistola de Vinculo anathematis; St. Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Smyrnaeans.
95. St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia; see above, on Distinctio 12; and Estius's own discussions: below, on Distinctio 28, book 2; and on Distinctio 28–29, book 3.
96. St. Thomas, ibidem [abbreviation as in source].
97. 1 Cor. 16:22.
98. St. Augustine, Sermon 49, De verbis Domini; Editorial notes as in the source: (a) "Seu Sermon. LXXXII. inter Sermon. I. Classis in eadem [editione Bened.]." (b) "Seu CLXXXVI. in eadem.".
99. The Venerable Bede, Sermon Feria sexta in capite jejunii; 1 John 5; 2 Tim. 4.
100. St. Augustine, De sermone Domini in monte I, ch. 22.
101. St. Bernard, Tractatus de gradibus humilitatis, last chapter.
102. Pope Innocent III, Decretales: cap. A nobis; cap. Sacris, De sententia excommunicationis.
103. St. John Chrysostom, Sermon De Anathema.
104. St. Augustine, Retractationes I, ch. 19; Estius, above, Distinctio 43, book 2; Roman Catechism (Catechismus Romanus), "Pro quibus orandum.".
105. St. Thomas, Supplementum, q. 22, throughout.
106. St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on 1 Corinthians, hom. 13 (on 1 Cor. 5).
107. Jn. 20: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained."
108. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 6.
109. Burchard of Worms, from the Penitential of Theodore, Decretorum XI, ch. 153.

110. Editorial apparatus in the source: A long gloss and scholastic dispute on whether a layman can absolve from excommunication in articulo mortis. Citations assembled: the Gloss on Cap. A nobis; Cap. Non poterit, De sententia excommunicationis; and on Cap. Pastoralis, De officio ordinarii, alleging the text in Cap. Quem poenitens, Dist. 1, De poenitentia; and in Cap. Sanctum, De consecratione, Dist. IV. The Gloss's view: if a priest is lacking, any cleric, indeed even a layman, may absolve one bound with the chain of excommunication, from a presumed will of the supreme grantor conceding, for that article of necessity, the faculty of absolving in so great a necessity. By such presumed concession of the Supreme Pontiff for that article, it is conferred that to the body sepulture in ecclesiastical burial may be granted; to the soul, truly, that, once that bond is dissolved, if otherwise he has returned by contrition into the grace of God, he may be aided by the suffrages and offices of the Church. The Gloss adjoins in the same place Cap. Decernimus, De iudiciis; Cap. Si eorum, De sententia excommunicationis; and Cap. Bene quidem, Dist. 96. But the contrary opinion, asserting that even for that article the faculty of absolving from excommunication is not granted except to a priest, is judged far more probable and more common, upheld by Suarez, De censuris, Disp. VII, Sect. VI, n. 3; by Sanchez, Summa, cap. 13, n. 6; and by Sanchez in the place likewise cited; and by notable authors, both among the Ancients and almost all the Moderns. For, as Suarez rightly weighs (loc. cit. n. 9), neither from any law nor from usage do we have that the Church has ever extended such a faculty to laymen; and it is exceedingly odious in itself, and alien to law, that spiritual things should be ministered by laymen, as is evident from Cap. Decernimus, De iudiciis; Cap. Bene quidem, Dist. 96; Cap. De consecratione, Dist. IV, Cap. Sanctum; nor does that history of Augustine writing to Fortunatus help here. The history, which this Author recalls both from Ivo (Part I, cap. 191) and from Gratian (De consecratione, Dist. V, Cap. Sanctum), is referred as though conceding that faculty to a catechumen in a shipwreck-danger; but in Augustine's genuine works it is not found, as Learned men observe; and to the matter at hand it contributes nothing. For in that history the Author speaks not of absolution from excommunication, but only of the reconciliation of a penitent who had been baptized by a catechumen in the danger of shipwreck, which reconciliation the bishop himself later accomplished; wherefore it pertains to an absolution either sacramental or to some censure, or only to the exercise of ministry, and to the solace of one's own conscience; whence (as is added) that rumour long ago spread, as though the catechumen in the shipwreck had absolved. Add that that history, as doubtful and suffering so many difficulties, was already rejected in this very sense by the more ancient Theologians; and, as Suarez in the place cited (n. 9) relates, it is now almost antiquated and has little probability.
111. "Clement" here refers to the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, VIII; St. Cyprian, Ep. 48.
112. St. Augustine, Contra epistolam Parmeniani III, ch. 2.
113. 1 Cor. 5: "I have already judged... when you are assembled together and my spirit, to deliver such a one to Satan... Put away the evil one from among yourselves."
114. Council of Constance, decree on those to be avoided (De evitandis).
115. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 1.
116. Council of Trent, Session 14, can. 10.
117. St. Jerome, Commentary on Matt. 18; cf. 1 Cor. 12: "There are divisions of graces, and of ministries."
118. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplement, q. 21, a. 3–4.
119. 1 Cor. 5.
120. St. Augustine, Sermon 16 on the Words of the Lord; cf. editorial note: the same is Sermon LXXXII among the First Class in the Meaux and Auvergne editions, whose canons are cited by Gratian, II, q. 2, "Nemo Episcoporum" and "Nullus sacerdotum" [abbreviation as in source].
121. 1 Cor. 5; 1 Tim. 1; Gal. 5:12; 2 Cor. 12 [abbreviation as in source].
122. Councils of Meaux and Auvergne; cf. Gratian, Decretum, II, q. 2, c. "Nemo Episcoporum" and c. "Nullus sacerdotum".
123. St. Cyprian, Epistle 58 to Pomponius.
124. St. Augustine, De correptione et gratia, ch. 16; idem, Contra epistolam Parmeniani III, ch. 1.
125. St. Augustine, De vita contemplativa II, ch. 7.
126. Council of Trent, Session 25, ch. 2, De reformatione.
127. Alexander III, cap. "Si vero," Extra, De sententia excommunicationis; The Gloss on the same place, explaining "probable ignorance" [abbreviation as in source].
128. Boniface VIII, Liber Sextus, De constitutionibus, constitution "Ut animarum periculis obvietur."

129. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 23, throughout.

130. Rev. 18:4; 1 Cor. 5; 2 Thess. 3:6, 14–15; Titus 3:10; 2 John 10; 1 Cor. 15:33; 2 Cor. 6:17; 1 Cor. 5:9–10.

131. First Council of Nicaea, canon 11; Decrees of Popes Fabian and Callistus; St. Isidore, cited by Gratian, *Decretum*, II, q. 3; Council of Constance, decree on those to be avoided (*De evitandis*); Council of Basel, Session 20; *Decretum Gratiani*, II, q. 3, c. "Cum excommunicato"; *Decretals, Extra, De iudiciis*, c. "Intelleximus."

132. *Decretum Gratiani*, *Distinctio* 21, c. "Vere."; *Decretals, Extra, De iudiciis*, c. "Intelleximus."

133. *Decretum Gratiani*, II, q. 3, c. "Cum excommunicato."; Gregory VII, canon beginning "Quoniam" [abbreviation as in source].

DISTINCTIO XIX — ON THE POWER OF THE KEYS (*DE POTESTATE CLAVIUM*)

§ 1. Fourth: ignorance both of law and of fact, provided it be probable. About which matter we have spoken above, and it is proved from the already-mentioned canon of Gregory.¹ Fifth: necessity, which has no law, whether it be on the side of the one communicating: whence in the same canon it is granted that a traveler, who cannot otherwise, may buy necessities from the excommunicated.² And in the chapter "Voluntate," in the Decretals, On the Sentence of Excommunication, preachers are permitted to be able to ask alms from the excommunicated.³ For Gregory says in the place alleged: "If anyone should be willing to give something to the excommunicated for sustenance, not for pride but for humanity's sake, we do not forbid it."⁴ Which words signify sufficiently that what is meant is not extreme necessity, in which by divine law it is altogether established that alms are to be given.

§ 2. Finally, if it be asked whether the excommunicated themselves also, while that bond lasts, are bound to withdraw and abstain from the fellowship of the faithful, one must answer in the affirmative. For by the sentence of excommunication a man is bound outside the Church, the Lord saying: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven."⁵ Therefore, since the sentence of the prelate is approved by God, he who is excommunicated ought to acknowledge himself as such, and accordingly to withdraw himself from the communion of the faithful, as one who by God's sentence has been set outside the Church and the communion of the faithful. Indeed, the excommunicated man seems to sin more gravely by thrusting himself into the gatherings and assemblies of the faithful than does a faithful person by communicating with him; because the former gave the cause for such separation, just as also a pernicious man, by mixing himself with the fellowship of the good, sins more gravely than do the good by not avoiding him; because, namely, he gives the cause for the danger of corruption, on account of which the good ought to avoid him. And it must be noted that this doctrine extends to any and all who are excommunicated with the major excommunication, and not only to the two species mentioned above, and that especially with respect to communion in divine things, the conferral of the sacraments excepted, and in others in which subjects have need of their office. The reason for which is that the decree of Constance was not issued in favor of the excommunicated, but of the faithful. Hence it appears that where the usefulness or necessity of the faithful does not require it, it is not lawful for the excommunicated, even if occult or not named, to have communion with the faithful; but by both divine and ecclesiastical law, as bound and cast outside, they are held to withdraw themselves from them.

§ 3. Furthermore, as to what is the penalty of one communicating with an excommunicate of lesser excommunication, and what are the effects of lesser excommunication, and the other things pertaining to this matter, let them be sought from those who professionally hand down practical Theology, that is, from the Summists and the Canonists. Let Adrian VI and Domingo de Soto, writing on the Fourth Book, also be consulted on this whole topic.⁶

§ I — That even wicked priests have the power of the keys (Sacerdotes etiam malos habere potestatem clavium)

§ 4. In this Distinction the Master asks whether all priests, even the wicked, have the power of binding and loosing in the forum of penance. Where, first of all, that statement of his—that the other key, namely the knowledge of discerning, is not had by all priests, namely by those who, lacking knowledge, have received the grade of priesthood—is rightly not admitted, but is numbered among the choice errors of the Master, as we warned at the beginning of the preceding Distinction.

§ 5. For neither, as the Master wills, is the key of knowledge the very knowledge as it is in him who can bind or loose, but it is the power of hearing the case of the sinner and of taking cognizance of it; which, although it so far requires knowledge, because without knowledge it cannot be rightly exercised, nevertheless really—and indeed often, which is a matter for lamentation—exists without knowledge. Therefore both keys, as well of knowledge as of power, are in the hands of priests not only learned and good, but also unlearned and wicked. For also in civil affairs an unlearned and depraved judge truly has authority to judge, although through lack of skill or depravity he may misuse that power.

§ 6. The Master teaches rightly on this point about the wicked, although he does not prove it quite aptly. For the words which he cites from Jerome are found nowhere in him, but are contained in the Ordinary Gloss on that Matt. 16, "To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and by some are ascribed to Rabanus.⁸ Likewise, those which he cites under the title of Augustine (from the book Questions on the Old and New Testaments) are not Augustine's, but of some other lesser author.⁹

§ 7. Accordingly, a surer proof must be sought from the ordination of priests, in which it is said to them: "Whose sins you shall forgive," etc. By which words the power of the keys in the forum of penance is given to all the ordained, even if perhaps they are wicked or unlearned, just as in their ordination the power is given to them of consecrating the Lord's Body. Whence, just as it is not to be doubted that wicked priests have this power of consecrating and truly consecrate the Eucharist, so also it is not to be doubted that they have that power of the keys, and therefore, if jurisdiction be at hand, they truly absolve.¹⁰

§ 8. For if only good priests were to absolve, the consciences of penitents would be left always uncertain and in suspense, because of the uncertainty which they would have about another's goodness or wickedness—about which it is both most difficult and dangerous to judge. For, as Gregory VII says (as cited by Gratian, in Quaestio 1): "Many secular men, while they examine the vices of priests more than their own, slip into the pit of error, considering less that the life of priests would injure them if they would comply with the admonitions of good priests."¹¹

§ 9. Moreover, there is clear testimony on this matter of Augustine—both elsewhere, disputing against the Donatist sect, as one who generally denied that sacraments administered by the wicked were of no profit; and also concerning the particular case of absolution, in book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, ch. 13, where he attests that by the exhortations of wicked priests the sins of those are loosed who return from heresy or schism to Catholic peace.¹² Likewise of Gregory I in Homily 26 on the Gospels, saying that it often happens that the priest himself, being bound, looses others.¹³ Indeed, this is so much the teaching of the Church that long ago among the Donatists, and later in John Wyclif and John Hus, as is evident from the decrees of the Council of

Constance and from the Bull of Martin V, the contrary opinion was condemned as opposed to the Catholic faith.¹⁴

§ 10. To these there was added at length the most explicit definition of the Council of Trent (Session 14, ch. 6) in these words: "The Synod also teaches that even priests who are held by mortal sin, by the power of the Holy Spirit conferred in ordination, as ministers of Christ exercise the function of remitting sins; and they think perversely who contend that in wicked priests this power is not present." And of the same Council, canon 10: "If anyone shall say that priests who are in mortal sin have not the power of binding and loosing, let him be anathema."¹⁵

§ 11. Moreover, to a fuller understanding of this doctrine conduce those things which we said above (at Distinctio 17), where it was asked to whom one must confess and who is one's proper priest—especially, however, what was said above (at Distinctio 1), where we showed that the effect of a sacrament does not depend on the quality of the minister. For since this is true in every sacrament, it ought especially to obtain the truth in the sacraments of baptism and penance, which are necessary unto salvation.¹⁶

§ 12. From which same place one may also learn what is to be answered to certain sayings of Augustine and other Fathers, the like of which are produced by the Master in the Text. For Augustine indeed is not speaking of the sacramental ministry of remitting sins, but of that very difficult mode whereby someone, by prayers and groanings and other works of piety, cooperates with the penitent for obtaining the pardon of sins. In which sense also the words of Hesychius, cited by the Master, are to be received.¹⁷ Gregory, however, and Origen only deny that those who do not follow the life and doctrine of the Apostles rightly have the power of binding and loosing; namely, they who do not use that power well, as the Master rightly explains. Now this happens in two ways: either only because they administer the sacraments while in the affection of mortal sin—which itself is to sin mortally; or because, what is worse, they furthermore reject the worthy or absolve the unworthy, or they set free those who do not deserve it. In which case their sentence is not, on account of a defect of power, but because it has proceeded from an erring key, not approved by the Supreme Judge. And in this sense is true that saying of the same Gregory (in Homily 26) already cited: "He deprives himself of the power of binding and loosing who exercises it according to his own wills, not according to the morals of his subjects." For one is said to deprive himself of power, because he deprives himself of the use and effect of the power—that is, he causes that his power have no effect; just as a man is said to lack hands who does not use them; and just as in Scripture "to have" is often put for "to use," as there: "To him that hath shall be given," etc. The context of the place clearly proves this sense of Gregory's words.

§ 13. Gregory also is objected, book 2 of the Dialogues, ch. 23, where, after he had said that it was spoken to Peter, "Whatsoever you shall bind," etc., he subjoined: "Whose place now, in binding and loosing, they obtain who, by faith and morals, hold the place of holy rule." I reply: Gregory does not say that only they [have the power], and he wills to say that they alone rightly obtain the place of Peter and of the Apostles who, by faith and morals, hold the place of holy rule. As to the extent that even a heretical priest can bind and loose, we have likewise left it clear from the things said above (at Distinctiones 17 and 18).¹⁸

§ II — That the power of the keys is not in the hands of just any of the faithful (Potestatem clavium non esse penes quoscumque fideles)

§ 14. The Novatians once maintained that the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*) signified in Matt. 18 and Jn. 20 pertains to all the faithful without exception, especially to the good, and that it is exercised by them whenever either they remit offenses to brethren who had sinned against them and are penitent, or they leave the obstinate and impenitent to be punished by the divine judgment. Whence they said that priests do not have a greater power of the keys than laymen. The same, afterwards, was taught by the Waldenses and the Wycliffists. Luther, however, increased the absurdity of these men, asserting (in article 13) that every Christian, even if a woman or a boy, has in the sacrament of Penance and in the remission of guilt a power equal to that of the Pope. Moreover, as patronage for an error of this sort they take certain sentences of St. Augustine and of other Fathers, from which at least this may appear, that all good faithful have and can exercise the power of the keys delivered by Christ to the Church. The Master cites some of these testimonies both here and in the preceding Distinction.²⁰

§ 15. The first passage is that of St. Augustine, book 2 Against the Donatists, chapter 18, where, speaking of the Apostles to whom it had been said, "Whose sins you shall forgive" etc., he says: "Therefore, if they bore the person of the Church, and thus this was said to them as though it were said to the Church herself: the peace of the Church remits sins, and estrangement from the peace of the Church holds sins, not according to the will of men but according to the will of God and the prayers of spiritual saints, who judge all things, while they themselves are judged by no one. For the rock holds, the rock remits; the dove holds, the dove remits; unity holds, unity remits. But the peace of this unity is in the good alone, either already spiritual, or, by concordant obedience, advancing toward spiritual things; but in the wicked it is not" and so on.²¹ And later, concerning the wicked: "Yet they did not give the remission of sins which is given through the prayers of saints, that is, through the groanings of the Dove. For the Lord would not have said to robbers and usurers, 'If you forgive anyone his sins'."²¹ And in book 5, chapter 21, he says: "Wherefore God gives the sacrament of grace even through the wicked; but the grace itself He gives through Himself alone or through His saints: I see that He Himself either effects the remission of sins, or [effects it] through the members of that dove to whom He says: 'If you forgive anyone' etc."²² And of the same work, book 6, chapter 4: "When, then, a man's sins are truly forgiven by conversion to God, they are forgiven by those to whom he himself is joined by true conversion. For the same Holy Spirit forgives them, who is given to all the saints cleaving to Himself by charity; whether they know one another in body or do not know. Likewise, when someone's sins are held, they are indeed held by those from whom he whose sins are held is separated by dissimilarity of life and aversion of a wicked heart."²³ Moreover (Tractate 58 on John) he says that when we forgive sins to one another, we loose them on earth, so that they may also be loosed in heaven.²⁴ And (Tractate 121), on those words "Whose sins you shall forgive," he says: "The charity of the Church remits the sins of those who have been partakers of her; of those who are not [partakers], it holds [them]."²⁵ A like passage is found in St. Ambrose, book 9 on Luke, on that text "Loose and bring", where he says thus: "The apostolic hand looses: such is the deed, such the life, such the grace; be thou such that thou mayest be able to loose those who are bound."²⁶ One can also allege what Origen writes (Homily 1 on the sixteenth of Matthew), namely that all who follow the footsteps of Peter have the power of loosing and binding;²⁷ and what Theophylact hands down in express words (on Matt. 18), saying: "For not only are those things loosed which the priests loose; but

whatsoever things, being injured, we ourselves either bind or loose, those very things will be bound or loosed."²⁸

§ 16. But despite these things, without doubt, according to the Catholic faith it must be confessed that the power of the keys which is exercised in the sacrament of Penance is in the hands of priests alone. This is clear first from the Ordination of Priests, in which it is said to them alone: "Whose sins you shall forgive."¹⁰ It is clear next from the Church's constant and perpetual doctrine, both of old against the Novatians and in later ages against the Wycliffists and other heretics. Whence, disputing against the Novatians, Ambrose, book 1 On Penance, chapter 2, and speaking of the power of binding and loosing, says: "This right is granted to priests alone."²⁹ The same is most plainly taught by Leo (Epistle 91 to Theodorus); and, more ancient than both, Pacian (in the treatise which he published against the Novatians), where he shows that the passage Jn. 20 pertains to priests.³⁰ And Augustine also teaches that the same Scripture pertains to them alone, book 2 Against the Letter of Parmenian, chapter 11.³¹ Finally, in the general councils of Constance, Florence, and Trent, and in the Bull of Martin V, the same doctrine is approved and the contrary error condemned, just as we showed when we treated of confession above, at Distinctio 17.³²

§ 17. Now as to those things which on the contrary side are adduced from the Fathers, it is not difficult to answer from part of those things which were said above about the sacraments in general in the foregoing chapter. For Augustine and Ambrose are not speaking of the ministers of the sacrament, nor of the sacramental mode of remitting—which is done through ministry—but of the mode of impetrating the remission of sins, which properly belongs to the members of the Church. For God does not remit anyone's sins by the interposition of the wicked, but by the good. And this is what Augustine means by saying that sins are remitted "through the groanings of the dove," through the prayers of the saints who are of the holy Church. Nor, moreover, are such sentences of Augustine to be understood of a kind which would apply to the ministry of the absolver; it is sufficiently clear (from book 3 Against the Donatists, chapter 17, and several other places) that he names charity, groanings, and the like—which pertain not to the ministry of the absolver but to the merit of the intercessor.³³ And indeed he most expressly distinguishes these two, book 4 Against the Donatists, chapter 4, where, disputing about a heretic and a robber, whether they remit sins, he says thus: "If he does it by the power of the sacrament of God, then that one indeed [does it]; but if by his own merit, neither the one nor the other [does it]."³⁴ But Scripture too has handed down the doctrine of those Fathers (Gal. 4), the Apostle saying that "that Jerusalem which is above is our mother"; because, to be sure, by prayers and tears, as by the groaning of one giving birth, she brings us all forth unto God—just as Augustine shows this in many places, book 1 Against the Donatists, chapter 15, and in letters 16 and 23 to Boniface.³⁵

§ 18. So too the saints reigning in heaven are said to loose us from sins—that is, by intercession and merit. For the Church sings in a Hymn: "Loose the chains of the guilty"; and again: "Make us, whom Thou hast loosed from our faults, gentle and chaste." And, among other things to the Apostles: "By your command we ask to be loosed from all sins." And to the Martyr: "Already are loosed the bonds of thy hallowed body; teach us, loose us from the bonds of the world," and the rest. It is said, however, "by your command" on account of the certainty of the effect consequent upon their intercession. Likewise to the Forerunner of the Lord: "Loose the guilt of our defiled lips, O holy John." Conversely, too, the Saints are said to bind the impenitent and to retain their sins, when they approve the divine justice against the impenitent, and especially against the damned. Whence their voice is in Ps. 58: "Do not have mercy upon all who work iniquity." For just as the

Saints are going to be judges on the day of the last judgment, so also even now they in a manner judge the wicked and impious, by approving even in this life the divine sentence against them.

§ 19. But to that which is objected from Origen and Theophylact, answer has already been given above, where the question of the power of excommunication was treated.³⁶

-
1. Gregory I, canon cited earlier by Estius [abbreviation as in source].
 2. Gregory I, canon permitting purchase of necessities from excommunicates [abbreviation as in source].
 3. Decretals, "Voluntate," Extra, De sententia excommunicationis.
 4. Gregory I, the place cited above by Estius [abbreviation as in source].
 5. Matt. 18:18.
 6. Adrian VI; Domingo de Soto, writings on the Fourth Book of the Sentences.
 7. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 19, a. 5.
 8. Ordinary Gloss on Matt. 16: "To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven"; sometimes ascribed to Rabanus Maurus.
 9. Pseudo-Augustine, Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti.
 10. Formula of priestly ordination: "Whose sins you shall forgive..."
 11. Gregory VII, cited by Gratian, Decretum, causa 23, quaest. 1 [abbreviation as in source].
 12. St. Augustine, Against the Letter of Parmenian II, ch. 13; and passim against the Donatists.
 13. St. Gregory the Great, Homilies on the Gospels, hom. 26.
 14. Council of Constance; Bull of Martin V condemning the errors of John Wyclif and Jan Hus.
 15. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 6; canon 10.
 16. See above, Distinctio 17; see also above, Distinctio 1.
 17. Hesychius, words cited by the Master [abbreviation as in source].
 18. See above, Distinctiones 17 and 18.
 19. St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 19, a. 2.
 20. The Master (of the Sentences), here and in the previous Distinction, cites these testimonies.
 21. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas (i.e., Contra epistulam Parmeniani) II, ch. 18.
 22. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas V, ch. 21.
 23. St. Augustine, Contra Donatistas VI, ch. 4.
 24. St. Augustine, Tractates on John, tract. 58.
 25. St. Augustine, Tractates on John, tract. 121.
 26. St. Ambrose, In Lucam, book 9, on "Loose and bring."
 27. Origen, Homily 1 on the sixteenth chapter of Matthew.
 28. Theophylact, Commentary on Matt. 18.
 29. St. Ambrose, De paenitentia I, ch. 2.
 30. Pope Leo I, Ep. 91, to Theodorus; Pacian, tract against the Novatians.
 31. St. Augustine, Contra epistulam Parmeniani II, ch. 11.
 32. Council of Constance; Council of Florence; Council of Trent; Bull of Martin V; see above, Distinctio 17.

- 33. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* III, ch. 17, and several other places.
- 34. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* IV, ch. 4.
- 35. St. Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* I, ch. 15; Letters 16 and 23 to Boniface.
- 36. See above, where the power of excommunication was discussed.

DISTINCTIO XX — ON INDULGENCES: THEIR NATURE AND PERPETUAL USE (*DE INDULGENTIIS, EARUM RATIONE AC PERPETUO USU*)

§ I

§ 1. The Council of Trent confers an excellent epithet upon indulgences (*indulgentiae*) when it calls them the heavenly treasures of the Church, as in Session 22, chapter 9, On Reform.² The reason for this appellation will be evident from what follows.

§ 2. Further, one may take the definition, or proper formal character (*ratio*), of an indulgence in this way. It is known from the foregoing, and especially from those things which were said at Distinction 4, 14, that the remission of all sins is not conferred in the same way in Baptism and in the sacrament of Penance.³ For in Baptism we so die together with Christ, or are renewed unto life, by a perfect remission of sins, that for them there remains absolutely no punishment at all to be paid in the age to come. But in the sacrament of Penance sins are so remitted as to guilt, that nevertheless there still remains a certain terrible expectation of judgment in the age to come, unless divine justice is satisfied on this road by worthy fruits and works of penance. Therefore, when that punishment of the future age is redeemed by worthy works of penance, there is satisfaction. But if those works of penance are, for a legitimate cause, remitted to the penitent by him who has legitimate power, and this either in whole or in part, there is a relaxation of satisfaction, which we call an indulgence. Accordingly, they define it in this manner: An indulgence is an absolution from penance enjoined or to be enjoined.

§ 3. Now that an indulgence is a true absolution and remission of punishment (although some of the Schoolmen dissent) is proved first from the power of the keys, which he who confers the benefit of indulgences uses forthwith for binding, as a father, and therefore for loosing.⁴ Next, from the very word "to indulge," which in ecclesiastical usage signifies to remit, to relax, and to free and absolve from punishment. Third, from the word "to give" or "to condone," which the Apostle uses in 2 Corinthians 2—a word which most properly signifies the remission of punishment.⁵ Fourth, from the accustomed formula of indulgences, in which it is said: "We mercifully indulge." Fifth, from the words which the Fathers of the Councils of Nicaea and Ancyra use when they say that something more humane is to be determined or considered by bishops concerning penitents whose ready will they have perceived.⁶ But to determine something more humane is to remit. Sixth, because if the conferral of indulgences were not a true absolution, it would require no jurisdiction; and so nothing would stand in the way why a bishop should not confer indulgences upon the faithful not subject to him—a position contrary to the decree of Alexander III.⁷ And finally there would follow that no spiritual power is required for conceding indulgences to others, since the bare application of

their sacrifices and suffrages can be made by any priest, and could even have been made by the priests of the Old Law; and others, too, can satisfy for others out of charity.

§ 4. Meanwhile, it must not be doubted—something which will be set out more fully below—that this remission is effected by virtue of the merits of the passion of Christ and of the Saints, though not in the same way. Wherefore an indulgence is not so much a mere absolution, but also a payment (*solutio*) intervenes. For although he to whom remission is made does not pay—inasmuch as the satisfaction is relaxed for him—yet Christ pays in the first place, and then, in due order, the Saints. Bishops, applying that payment to penitents by the power received from Christ, are truly said to absolve them from the debt of punishment, just as they truly remit guilt when they apply to them the satisfaction wrought by Christ on the cross.

§ 5. Now that by an indulgence, as we have said, enjoined penance is relaxed is clear from canon 62 of the Lateran Council under Innocent III, in which it is established that, in indulgences granted from enjoined penances, forty days is not to be exceeded.⁸ Indeed, at the present time the form of an Apostolic Bull runs thus: "Whoever shall have done this or that, we relax so many days from the penance enjoined upon them." Nor must it be thought that an indulgence avails only for the relaxation of enjoined penance. But without doubt it also looks to penance to be enjoined. For otherwise, according to the present custom of the Church, there would scarcely be any place left for indulgences, since satisfactions enjoined for sins are so light that to wish further afterward to relax something of those already enjoined would seem to tend altogether to the dissolving and enervating of ecclesiastical discipline. And although now there is not that severity and rigor of discipline in imposing penances which once existed, nevertheless, according to the rigor of the canons and the usage of the ancient Church, and altogether in proportion to sins, the satisfactions of penitents ought to be much greater, were it not that in this age the weakness of the Christian people refuses that rigor; it comes about, therefore, that now indulgences either solely or chiefly regard penance—though it is not inaptly reckoned as enjoined, which is already fixed by the canon itself—so that there is need only of a declaration as to what, according to the canons, it would be fitting to do. Whence it is very likely that for this cause even today in Pontifical Diplomas the ancient formula of speech is retained, that mention be made only of "penance enjoined"—namely, because penance to be enjoined according to the canons, by the reason stated, is held as enjoined. And indeed it follows that, if an indulgence relaxes penance enjoined, it can also relax penance to be enjoined and even forestall the very injunction; since it relaxes enjoined penance for no other reason than that it frees the penitent from the debt of temporal punishment to which, on account of sin, he is liable. For that payment, it is irrelevant whether the punishment has already been assessed at the judgment of the priest or not.

§ II — That the use of indulgences, instituted by Christ, has always existed in the Church (Usus indulgentiae a Christo institutae semper in Ecclesia fuisse)

§ 6. Some Catholics have thought that the use of indulgences did not exist in the Church before four hundred years ago, or at most six hundred, although they do not deny—indeed they plainly teach—that their foundation is had in Scripture. The reason, however, which they render why they were not previously in use is this: that the faithful of earlier times observed such charity that they did not seek the relaxation of penances, but were ready to satisfy to the full for the punishments due. But those who have so thought seem to have been deceived by this—that, since the name "indulgence" did not readily occur in the writings of the Ancients,

they thought that the reality itself was not in use among them, although we have already shown above even the antiquity of the very name.¹⁰ Far more advisable and truer it is to hold that, just as the power of granting indulgences was delivered by Christ to the Church—about which no Catholic doubts—so also their use has always existed in the Church from the very times of the Apostles.

§ 7. The former part of this assertion is proved from the general power delivered to Peter and the other Apostles, in Matt. 16 and 18: "Whatever you shall bind," etc., and "Whatever you shall loose," etc. For since by these words of Christ the Apostles and their successors received the power of imposing satisfactions upon penitents and of binding them to those satisfactions, as we have proved elsewhere, similarly also they received the power of relaxing, for a reasonable cause, satisfactions imposed or to be imposed. For just as that belongs to the power of binding, so this belongs to the power of loosing. Next, the Scriptures teach that God, in view of another's faith, prayer, and merits or good works, remits sins to others and relaxes punishments—a point that is easy to show by testimonies of both the New and the Old Scriptures. For the Lord, looking to the faith of those carrying him, says to the Paralytic: "Son, your sins are remitted to you." And in the Old Testament, on account of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, likewise on account of Moses, Samuel, and David, God often spares the sins of the people.¹¹ Wherefore, prelates who have the power of binding and loosing, after the example of their Lord, ought not only to look to the proper works of each penitent, but also to the passions and merits of the Saints, and thus judge how far those ought to come to the aid of penitents for the relaxation of their punishments and be applied to them. Moreover, it cannot be doubted that that power flowed from Christ's institution, which first the Apostles, then their successors, have used through all times. This, therefore, which we assert about the perpetual use of indulgences, must now, in the second place, be proved.

§ 8. The Apostle says in 2 Corinthians 2: "Sufficient for such a one is this rebuke which is from the many; so that contrariwise you should rather forgive and comfort him, lest perhaps he be swallowed up with an overabundance of sorrow"—where he bids that, to that incestuous Corinthian now penitent, something of the rigor of the penance enjoined be remitted, lest perhaps, induced into despair by an excessive harshness of vengeance, he abandon the Christian religion. Therefore that "giving" or "condonation" of which the Apostle makes mention was nothing else than the concession of an indulgence, about which he again subjoins: "But to whom you grant anything, I also. For what I have granted—if I have granted anything—it is for your sakes in the person of Christ, lest we be circumvented by Satan."¹² For by this, that he says "in the person of Christ," the Apostle signifies that he has received that power of giving or indulging from Christ and exercises it in the stead of Christ, just as in 1 Corinthians 5 he declares that he hands over that same fornicator "in the name of Christ" to Satan. That this is the sense of the Apostolic sentence Chrysostom clearly teaches, writing among other things as follows: "For it is not because he is worthy, nor because he has displayed sufficient penance, but because he is weak—that is why, he says, I deem him worthy of pardon. Hence his speech declares the man's vehement penitence, whom Paul did not allow to come into despair." And below: "From this we are taught that penance must be moderated not only according to the nature of sins, but also according to the mind and habit of sinners."¹³ Theophylact, following him, comments similarly on the same place; and among other things he uses these words: "And well did he say, 'Forgive.' For lest that man think the fault has been remitted to him because he has confessed enough and been sufficiently led by penance, he shows that he receives remission not so much from his own penance as from their favor and gift." Like things are read also in Theodoret and Oecumenius, and likewise in the Commentary that is inscribed to Ambrose.

§ 9. Pacianus—older than them all—interpreted the Apostle in the same sense (in Epistle 3), where, arguing against the Novatians and adducing those same words of the Apostle, he says: "Do you see the indulgence of the Apostle, tempering even his own sentences? Do you see the most gentle mildness that stands far apart from your superciliousness—far unlike the brow of Novatian—but that consults the common life and salvation of all?"¹⁴ To him add Ambrose, almost his equal in time, in book 1 On Penance, chapter 6 and the last chapter, where he treats the words of the Apostle in the same way and expressly makes mention of indulgence. Now indeed there is no reason to doubt that the Church subsequently retained this same custom of relaxing penance received from the Apostles—a fact which can easily be shown to be so from ancient writers and also from councils.

§ 10. First, we read in Tertullian, in the book To the Martyrs, chapter 1, that certain persons who did not yet have peace in the Church were accustomed to beg it from the martyrs established in prison. For when they had lapsed, and had not yet completed the time of penance, by the intercession of the martyrs they obtained from the Church a condonation of the penance remaining, and thus were immediately admitted to peace—that is, to reconciliation—which was not given unless penance had first been completed. The same Tertullian, after he had swerved to the sect of the Montanists, in the book On Modesty, last chapter, turned into reproach against the Catholic Church what he had earlier praised—namely, that at the petition of Confessors or Martyrs penance was relaxed for the lapsed and peace was given—or at least (as Cyprian after him does) he accuses the excessive facility of some in indulging. From each passage, however, it is evident both that there was in the Church a custom of condoning some part of penance for the lapsed, and also that, even if sometimes there was abuse, the usage itself was approved.

§ 11. But this is made yet clearer from the same Cyprian, book 3, Epistle 14 and in several following ones. For, in Epistle 14, he blames the rashness of certain presbyters because, without consulting the bishop, and not waiting for the due time, nor having regard for ecclesiastical discipline, they were granting peace to the lapsed at the indiscreet petition of the martyrs. He wishes, however, that this grace be conceded prudently and moderately—that is, he approves the power and use of indulging in words of this kind, but removes only the abuse. Indeed, he also says that it was always done in the past that presbyters and deacons, suggesting and advising, would warn the martyrs, if they asked more than was equitable to be granted. Whence it follows that long before Cyprian the use of indulgences existed in the Church. And, in Epistle 15, he admonishes the martyrs themselves that, following the example of martyrs of earlier time, they should designate by name those to whom they desire peace to be given, and should not name others than those whose penance they have seen to be close to satisfaction. But in Epistle 18: "Those," he says, "who have received a little note from the martyrs can be helped by their aid before the Lord in their struggles; if they begin to be pressed by some infirmity into danger, once confession has been made and the hand has been laid upon them into penance, with peace promised to them by the martyrs, they are sent to the Lord." He makes mention of this indulgence also in book 4, Epistle 2, and in the Sermon On the Lapsed. To these authors add Pacianus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the others already cited, who, interpreting the Apostle about indulgence or condonation of penance, without doubt commended his action as to be imitated by the whole Church. Likewise Theodore of Canterbury, bishop, who in his Penitential—whose words the Master cites in the Text—says that the burden of penance of infirm penitents, who have been placed in danger of death, is to be lightened by the prayers of friends and by the bestowal of alms, if perchance they should pass from life; namely, with the priest applying the prayers and alms of friends to the relaxation of purgatorial punishment.¹⁵

§ 12. Furthermore, the proof of this matter is even more certain from Councils, in which many sentences of bishops have concurred. There stands the canon of the Council of Nicaea I, canon 11, in which it is established that it is permissible for bishops, with regard to those penitents who demonstrate a good manner of life not by words alone but also by deeds, to devise something more humane—which is nothing other than to remit something of the rigor of the punishment. And there is an even older canon of the Council of Ancyra, number 5, in which we read as follows: that it is permitted to bishops, when they have taken account of the perfect life of each person and attributed the good manner of life to the whole time, acting more humanely according to the mode of life, to shorten some person's penance, or also to add something which may be necessary for correction. But let both their preceding life and their subsequent life be examined, and thus let the priestly mind act more humanely toward them. The same sort of thing, too, is established in a Carthaginian council of the time of Gelasius (canon 29), where the name "indulgence" is also clearly expressed. To the same point belongs what is read in the fourth Council of Carthage, at which Augustine is said to have been present (canons 75–76): that penitents are to be reconciled sooner or later according to diligence or negligence; and that if someone has been reconciled in infirmity and has lived on, he ought to be subject to the statutes of penance for so long as the priest who gave reconciliation shall approve. Whence it follows that the priest was able to diminish something from the set penance. The same is found in canon 3 of the Council of Neocaesarea and in the Council of Agde.¹⁶

§ 13. But to these let us now add the testimonies of the Supreme Pontiffs. Leo (Epistle 76), treating of those who, either from fear or error, have been baptized again and afterward return to penance, decreed that moderation of time of penance be observed by the bishop, to be established as he shall have seen their manner of life to be devout, and so forth.¹⁷ After him Pope Vigilius (in the Epistle to Profuturus, chapter 4) writes to the same effect.¹⁸ Moreover, Gregory I is said to have instituted at Rome the stations of the basilicas for the obtaining of indulgences. To his times some Catholics, with too little circumspection, have referred the origin of indulgences, whereas from other sources it is clear how much more ancient their use is than the times of Gregory. But after Gregory the use of indulgences, and even the very name, began to be no less common than before. Whence the later Pontiffs, in their decretal letters, make mention of them as a matter already frequent in use in the Church: thus Alexander III, four hundred years ago, writing to the archbishop of Canterbury, as is had in the Decretals, On Penance and Remissions, "Quod autem," where he treats of remissions—that is, indulgences—which are wont to be conferred by bishops at the dedications of churches.⁷ And after him Innocent III, in the great Lateran Council (chapter 3), makes mention of indulgences which before had already been conceded to those going to the aid of the Holy Land; he approves them with that same Council, and (chapter 60) forbids abbots to grant indulgences; and then (indeed in chapter 62), wishing to forbid indiscreet and superfluous indulgences, he prescribes a measure beyond which those to be granted by bishops ought not to be extended, and for that matter he alleges the custom of the Roman Church. This constitution of the Council was afterwards commanded to be observed by Honorius (in the Decretals, On Penance and Remissions, the next-to-last canon), and by Innocent IV in the Council of Lyons, as is had under the same title in the Sext, "Romana Ecclesia"; and by Boniface VIII there (chapter "Indulgentiae"). The same Boniface (in the Extravagant which begins "Antiquorum"), recounting how generous in ancient times indulgences had been for those visiting the thresholds of the Apostles for the same cause, grants a plenary indulgence in the year of Jubilee; and finally Clement VI (in the Extravagant whose beginning is "Unigenitus") learnedly and copiously treats of this heavenly treasury of the Church.¹⁹

§ 14. But after this pious tradition of the Church also began to be attacked by heretics, that doctrine was the more clearly confirmed as pertaining to the dogmas of the Catholic Faith by Councils and Pontiffs: as appears from article 42 of John Wyclif and article 8 of John Hus condemned in the Council of Constance, and from the interrogatories prescribed in the Bull of Martin V; likewise from the sixth conclusion of Peter of Osma condemned by Sixtus IV, and from several articles of Luther condemned by Leo X.²⁰ To all of which there was finally added the clear definition of the Council of Trent, Session 25: "Since the power of granting indulgences has been conceded by Christ to the Church, and the same power, divinely delivered to her, has been in use even in the earliest times, the holy Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, most salutary for the Christian people, and approved by the authority of the holy Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or deny that there is a power in the Church of granting them." This is the Synod.²¹

§ III — That indulgences avail for the future age (Indulgentias valere pro seculo futuro)

§ 15. It was the opinion of some (which also Luther set in his Assertions about the indulgences of bishops), that indeed the penance which in this life is enjoined upon the sinner is relaxed, but that indulgences do not avail to this, that the punishment due in the future age be condoned. How far this is alien from Catholic truth is shown first of all from the very institution of the power of conferring indulgences. For if he who has received power from Christ (Matt. 16) relaxes satisfactory punishments, in such a way does he loose them on earth that they are loosed also in heaven, that is, in the judgment of God; it is therefore certain that the fruit of indulgences pertains to the future age.²³ Otherwise, indeed, the Faithful would be gravely deceived, who, with penances relaxed in this age, would be forced in place of them to endure far more bitter punishments in Purgatory; and it would be true, that saying of Luther, that indulgences are frauds upon the faithful.

§ 16. The same is proved from the Apostle's words in 2 Corinthians 2, where he says that he has pardoned that fornicator of Corinth, that is, that he relaxes the penance, in the Person of Christ. By which word he declares that such condonation avails and is ratified in the judgment of God, just as if Christ Himself—who, according to the Prophet, is the Father of the age to come, and, according to the Apostle (Heb. 9), the High Priest of the good things to come—had condoned.²⁴ Hence Pacianus (in Epistle 3), treating that same place of 2 Corinthians 2, says that by such indulgence the Apostle consults for the common life and the salvation of all. Which would not truly be said, if an indulgence did not look to the fruit of the future age, but only brought some immunity or relaxation of punishments in this age. In a like manner Ambrose treats the Apostle's words, book 2 On Penance, chapter 6, saying that by those words Paul vindicated to himself the right of his Lord—not undue, but received—when the Lord says: "Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." And in the same book (at the last chapter), where he calls this condonation a remission of sins.²⁵ The same sense is explained by the Commentary ascribed to Ambrose (on 2 Corinthians 2), which among other things has thus: "And that he might show, with respect to the person to whom he granted pardon, that he had been pardoned before God; this is to have been accepted by Christ, in whose embassy he was acting, so that the deed of the Apostle be the deed of Christ, as He said: 'Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven,' etc." From which it is clear that that relaxation which the Apostle made on earth had its effect in heaven and was granted into the remission of sins, as also Martin V

speaks in a Bull given at Constance; and therefore it availed for taking away or diminishing the punishments of the future age.²⁶

§ 17. This can also be gathered from Tertullian, who toward the end of the book *On Modesty* objects to the Catholics that their martyrs, by granting pardon to the soft and the fornicators, restored them to communion.²⁷ But Cyprian's passage is more explicit (Ep. 19, book 3), where he says that those who have received a libellus from the martyrs can be helped by their aid with the Lord in their sins, if they begin to be pressed by some infirmity and peril, and that, with the peace promised to them by the martyrs, they be sent back to the Lord. Nor indeed would that same Cyprian ever have allowed the lapsed faithful with such zeal to court the merits of the martyrs, so as by letters received from them to obtain indulgence with the bishop and the clergy; much less would he by his writing and his deed have approved that zeal of the faithful (as it is clear that he approved it from the epistles), if that remission did not pertain to the future age. Nay rather, he ought to have repressed and prohibited so blind a petition of the lapsed, if by the relaxation of the salutary penance of this age they were being reserved for the most bitter punishments of the future age. Indeed both Cyprian and the other bishops, who in the councils of which we made mention above decreed that in regard to certain penitents something more humane should be done, would have taken very ill counsel for those penitents, if by that humanity nothing of the punishments of the future age had been taken away; and it would have been much better done with them, if, being ordered to fulfill the whole satisfaction, they had redeemed the punishments of the future age.

§ 18. Furthermore, if indulgences remit only the punishments of this life, then that too would be true which, against the express words of Cyprian and the most ancient tradition of the Church proved by the authority of Councils and of Pontiffs, Luther among other things asserted: that indulgences are neither necessary nor useful for the dying or for the sick, because these are not wont to be bound by any penance, but there is use of them only for those who, by remissions of good works, do not so much seek their salvation as flee it.²⁸

§ 19. Likewise, for obtaining such an indulgence there was no need of the merits of the martyrs, of which Tertullian and Cyprian speak, since by the sole regard to the supplication of the penitents the bishops could remit something of the rigor of external discipline, just as a lord or father of a household can in a household, and a judge in a city. But now for that reason the Church regards, and has always regarded, the merits of the martyrs and confessors, that from them, through the merciful lenity of the prelates, there may be supplied and compensated what of the exact measure of satisfying had been lacking, and thus a full remission may be made, as if nothing had been wanting in satisfaction. Lastly, a sure argument of this matter is taken from the custom which is now observed through the whole Church. For today by indulgences nothing is diminished of the penance imposed by the priest, as formerly was done, but of the penance which, according to the ancient canons and the exact rigor of discipline, ought to be enjoined, unless the former severity could be less borne by the Christian manners of the people as they now are. Since therefore in this way by indulgences nothing is taken away of the punishment of the present age (since even without them the Church exacts nothing more than what the priest imposes), it follows that either they are altogether vain, as the heretics calumniate, or they are useful for avoiding the punishments of Purgatory, which otherwise were to have been redeemed by a fuller satisfaction in this age, as the sense of the Church holds.

§ 20. And since these things are so, Sixtus IV rightly condemned, among others, this conclusion also of Peter of Osma, who denied that the Pope could grant to anyone living a remission of the punishment of

Purgatory. Which very thing also, earlier in John Wyclif and John Hus, although not expressed in so many words, Martin V had condemned; and afterwards in Luther Leo X condemned it among his articles; and finally it is understood to be sufficiently condemned by that part of the decree of Trent in which it is defined that the use of indulgences is most salutary to the Christian people, and at the same time those are damned with anathema who assert that they are useless.²⁹ To this, finally, must be referred those things which we have said elsewhere about the principal fruit of satisfaction, which is for redeeming the punishments of the future age. For if this is true, the remission of satisfaction also must, lest the faithful be deceived, pertain to the same. Hence those same heretics who deny that satisfactions avail with respect to God, but only wish them to avail with respect to the Church, also in indulgences contend that the case is similarly so, that is, in the relaxing of satisfactions; and therefore against them one must not omit to defend and confirm both Catholic dogmas, the one from the other.³⁰

§ IV — That indulgences rest on the merits of Christ and of the Saints, and concerning the Treasury (Indulgentias niti meritis Christi & Sanctorum, & de Thefauro)

§ 21. Although an indulgence is the remission of the satisfaction for sins enjoined or to be enjoined (*injunctae vel injungendae*), nevertheless not in such a way that there not intervene from elsewhere a payment for those same sins, and a satisfaction be made which, to wit, may supply the defect of the satisfaction of him to whom the indulgence is granted—just as the remission of eternal punishment is supplied by the Passion of Christ. Therefore that defect is supplied from the treasury of the merits of Christ and of His martyrs and other saints, which by the prelates of the Church are applied to those to whom punishments are condoned. Of which treasury Clement VI, speaking in the Extravagant which begins Unigenitus, says that Christ by His superabundant Passion left an infinite treasure to the militant Church. "Which treasure," he says, "not deposited in a napkin, not hidden in a field, He has committed to be wholesomely dispensed to the faithful by blessed Peter, the key-bearer of heaven, and by his successors, His vicars on earth." And below: "To the heap of which treasure the merits of the Blessed Mother of God and of all the elect, from the first just man unto the last, are known to supply aid."³² From which and other words of that same Pontiff it is understood that this treasure of merits and passions is founded especially and consists in the infinite and inexhaustible magnitude of the merits and passions of Christ. In this respect, indeed, most properly is this treasure called infinite and inextinguishable.

§ 22. Next, in the communion of saints, which we confess in the Creed, it comes about that in the Church of God the merits and passions of some can be applied and profit others as members of the same body, so that, according to the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 8, the abundance of some may be a supplement for the poverty of others. For there the Apostle exhorts the Corinthians, abounding in earthly riches, to confer alms liberally upon certain saints poor according to this age, but rich with God, so that the spiritual abundance of these may supply the poverty of those; that for those to whom their own things are less sufficient for propitiating God, there may be help from the communion of alien works. To this may be referred also what that same Apostle, writing to the Colossians (ch. 1), says: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are lacking of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for His body's sake, which is the Church."³³ For he says that he fills up those things that are lacking of the sufferings of Christ, not as if the Passion of Christ were not the

most sufficient price for the faults and punishments of the sins of the whole world, but because—according to St. Augustine and St. Gregory—"the whole Christ" is head and body; by the most right ordinance of God there are required, besides the sufferings of the head, also the sufferings of the members, who ought to be conformed to their head, as the Council of Trent teaches (Session 14, ch. 3).³⁴ Nor would the Apostle have said that he fills up those sufferings for the Church, if the sufferings which he endured in his flesh availed only for his own person and not for other members of the Church. For otherwise any other, enduring however small a quantity of punishments, would be said to fill up for the Church what was lacking of the sufferings of Christ, inasmuch, namely, as he is a member of the body of Christ. Therefore the Apostle wished to say something more: namely, that his sufferings so pass over into the use of the body of Christ that other members also partake of them. This sense of the Apostle is indicated by Chrysostom (in his Commentary), saying: "Christ has not yet suffered all things for you; even after death He suffers, since still certain things remained." "This also, in that which is to the Romans, He does otherwise," he says, "saying: 'Who intercedes for us,' showing that not death alone sufficed, but afterwards He does innumerable things." Thus Chrysostom—indicating, namely, that for the very reason for which Christ even after death intercedes, for the same reason He even now suffers in His members. And as, therefore, after death He still intercedes for the full remission of our sins, so for the same cause He now still suffers in His members.

§ 23. For the confirmation of this doctrine many other things could be brought forward, both from Scripture and from the Fathers; but because above, at *Distinctio* 15, by very many testimonies we showed that one can satisfy for another, upon which doctrine the present one rests, let the rest be sought from that place. Two things only remain here to be noted: the one, that that abundance of good works in the Church of God, from which Catholics teach that something is always being added to this treasury of merits, is consonant with Sacred Scripture; the other, that the passions of the saints are imparted to us not only by a certain communion of charity, but that they are truly a condign price for our sins as to the remaining punishments.

§ 24. The former is shown from these Scriptures. The Apostle says in 1 Timothy 6: "Charge the rich of this world not to be high-minded, to be rich in good works, to treasure up for themselves a good foundation for the future." And 2 Corinthians 9: "God is able to make all grace abound in you all, that, in all things always having all sufficiency, you may abound unto every good work. And He who supplies seed to the sower and bread for eating will furnish and multiply your seed, and will increase the growth of the fruits of justice; that in all things being enriched you may abound unto all simplicity." And in the preceding chapter he makes mention of the abundance of spiritual goods, by which the want of others is supplied. For for this reason Christ, as is said in the same place, "for our sakes became poor, when He was rich, that by His poverty we might be made rich." So in Acts of the Apostles 9, Dorcas is written to have been a disciple full of good works. And in the Gospel Christ admonishes us that we "treasure up for ourselves treasure in heaven," namely, of good works.³⁵ But by the name of treasure there is signified metaphorically an abundance of a precious thing. Finally, the Church, taught by Sacred Letters, prays God, that "in the name of His beloved Son we may abound in good works" (the Sunday within the Octave of the Nativity of the Lord). Nor is there any doubt that in many of her members she is heard. From this, therefore, a store and abundance of good works arises, so that one can satisfy for another, and that the merits and passions of others may profit others. For what is said in general about good works, that, by so much the less is there anything to prohibit that it be understood specifically of the passions of the saints, as the Church sings of them: "O all ye Saints, how great torments ye have suffered."

§ 25. Moreover, this is more strongly proved from those things which we said a little while ago concerning satisfaction. For, as we there showed, to our satisfaction which we make for sins there are everywhere ascribed in the Scriptures and the Fathers these names: that it is called a redemption, a vengeance, a compensation, a payment, a worthy chastisement, and the worthy fruits of penance. Wherefore, since the passions of the saints, applied to us through indulgences, supply the defect of our satisfactions, and stand on our side as if they were our satisfactions, it follows that they too have the formal character (*ratio*) of a condign price with respect to the punishments owed to us which are redeemed by them; so that with good right also for this reason "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." Whence St. Augustine (Tractate 47 on John), speaking of Christ: "Precious," he says, "is the blood of Him without sin; yet He Himself also made the blood of His own precious, for whom He gave the price of blood." And more fully Origen (Homily 10 on the book of Numbers): "Let us return," he says, "to our High Priest, the great High Priest who has penetrated the heavens, Jesus our Lord, and let us see how He Himself, with His sons, that is, the Apostles and the martyrs, takes away the sins of the saints. And indeed that Christ came to take away the sin of the world, and by His death blotted out our sins, no one who believes Christ is ignorant. But how also His sons, that is, the Apostles and the martyrs, take away the sins of the saints—if we shall be able to prove it from the divine Scriptures, we shall attempt it. Hear first Paul saying: 'Most gladly will I spend and be spent for your souls.' And in another place: 'For I am already being immolated, and the time of my dissolution is at hand.' Therefore for those to whom he was writing, the Apostle says that he is spent and immolated. But when a victim is immolated, it is immolated to this end, that for those for whom it is slain the sins may be purged. But of the martyrs John the Apostle writes (in the Apocalypse) that 'the souls of them who were slain for the name of the Lord Jesus stand before the altar,' etc." By which words Origen, besides that he bears witness that the passions of the martyrs avail for the remission of sins after the manner of a price by which the debt of punishment is taken away, also not obscurely indicated the treasury of the merits of Christ and of the saints, as prefigured in that which (Num. 18) the Lord says to Aaron according to the version of the Seventy: "Thou and thy sons shall take the sins of the saints." Of the same (in Homily 24) these words, no less explicit, are read: "But if the lamb which is given for the purification of the people be referred to the person of our Lord and Savior, it seems to follow that also the other animals which are destined to the same purificatory uses ought similarly to be referred to certain persons who, by the merit of the blood of Christ, confer something of purification upon the human race. See therefore whether perhaps, as our Lord and Savior was led as a lamb to the slaughter and was offered in sacrifice on the altar and bestowed the remission of sins upon the whole world: so perhaps also the blood of the other saints and just men, which has been poured forth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias who was slain between the temple and the altar, the blood of one indeed as of a calf, of another as of a he-goat or a kid or any one of these, has been shed for the expiation, in some part, of the people." And what follows. By which again both that treasury is shown, and it is clearly taught that by the merit of the Blood of Christ even by the blood of the martyrs sins also in some part are expiated—namely, as to the temporal punishments owed to them.

§ 26. Which thing, long since believed in the Church, Tertullian, after he had defected from her, accused in the book *On Modesty* with sentences of this sort: "But you now also pour this power upon your martyrs. Let it be enough for a martyr to have purged his own faults. Who pays another's death with his own save the Son of God alone?" Yet in these words Tertullian, blinded by error, is found to be contrary to himself. For if a martyr, purging his own faults by his death—which he concedes, and wishes to be sufficient to the martyr—does not derogate from the price of the redemption of Christ, neither therefore will he derogate, purging

another's; since as he can indeed redeem neither his own sins nor those of others save through Christ, so neither can a mere man. From which it is understood that also in Luther this article, number 19, was rightly condemned, wherein he said: "Indulgences do not avail for the remission of the punishment owed for actual sins before the divine justice."³⁶

§ V — The objections of the adversaries are refuted (Objectiones adversariorum diluuntur)

§ 27. They most bitterly assail the foregoing doctrine, especially that part wherein it teaches that the merits of the saints can be applied to others for the remission of the punishment owed for sins, employing especially these arguments.

- First, the merits and passions of Christ abundantly suffice for the remission of all the sins of the whole human race, as to faults and as to punishments, as Scripture in 1 John 2 and elsewhere testifies; therefore not only without purpose, but also impiously, is there recourse to the merits and passions of the saints, as if by them there were supplied what is lacking to Christ.³⁷
- Second: It is unworthy, they say, to mix the Blood of Christ with the blood of the martyrs; therefore those are not to be borne who constitute a common treasury of merits of Christ together with the merits of the saints.
- Third: The sole treasury of the merits of Christ is inexhausted, because it alone is infinite. For the merits of the other saints, as they are finite, so also the treasury that is constituted from them is finite, and therefore in the end can be exhausted—especially through indulgences so large and so frequent as are conferred today; therefore at least it will be uncertain for us whether that treasury still subsists, and consequently indulgences themselves are rendered uncertain in that part wherein they rest upon the merits of the saints.
- Fourth: Certain sentences of the Fathers are objected, which attribute so to the death and Blood of Christ alone the redemption of men and the remission of sins, that they remove it from the martyrs and from the other saints. For Leo says (Epistle 83): "Although the death of many saints has been precious in the sight of the Lord, nevertheless the slaying of no innocent man was a propitiation for the world. The just received crowns, they did not give them; and from the fortitude of the faithful there have arisen examples of patience, not gifts of justice. For the deaths were singular for each singly, nor has anyone paid another's debt by his own end." Which words—very like to those which we recited above from Tertullian—are repeated by blessed Leo (Epistle 97, ch. 2, and Sermon 12 On the Passion of the Lord). So Augustine (Tractate 84 on John): "And if brethren die for brethren, nevertheless for the remission of the sins of brethren no blood of a martyr is poured out, which He did for us. He granted us not something that we should imitate, but something that we should be glad of. One could imitate one dying; but no one could imitate one redeeming." The same sentence of Augustine is in book 6 Against Julian (ch. 8): "No impiety is left unpunished, except that which the Blood of the Mediator has expiated." Ambrose also says (at the end of book 6 on Luke): "Other crosses profit me nothing; the cross of Christ alone is useful to me." And Fulgentius (in a Sermon On the Epiphany of

Christ): "The blood of this child, moreover, is not poured forth together with the blood of those children; because it alone is to be poured forth for the remission of sins."³⁸

- Fifth: The authority of St. Thomas Aquinas is added, who in III, q. 48, a. 5, ad 3 says that the passions of the saints profit the Church, not indeed by way of redemption, but by way of example and exhortation, according to that in 2 Corinthians 1: "Whether we be afflicted, it is for your exhortation and salvation." The same, upon 1 Corinthians 1, the passion of others no—³⁹

§ III — [continuation]

§ 28. Fifth: nothing of merits redounds to the Saints, according to that which the prudent virgins, in the person of all the Saints, say to the foolish (Matt. 24): "Lest perhaps there be not enough for us and for you."⁴⁰ Whence St. Augustine (Question 59 among the eighty-three): "Scarcely," he says, "does each one suffice for himself, so that his own conscience may bear him witness; therefore their merits will not be able to be applied to others for the remission of punishment."⁴¹ Sixth: even if something should redound to the Saints from merits, on account of the works which are called of supererogation, nevertheless they receive from God for all those works a condign and super-condign reward. Therefore nothing is left over for them which may be conferred upon others. And yet the same formal character seems to hold for satisfactions; because, as Durandus argues, even if those who lived innocently did not need satisfaction, and thus satisfaction as such may seem to redound to them, nevertheless the formal character of satisfaction was changed for them into the remuneration of glory. Seventh, an argument of the same Durandus: the work of one does not accrue to the satisfaction of another, unless he intended to satisfy for this one. But the Saints intended nothing of the kind, who out of humility judged that their punishments were less than their sins, saying with the Psalmist (Ps. 102): "He hath not dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities."⁴² Eighth: the relaxation of indulgences is made by virtue of the keys; but indeed the keys have their power only from the merit of the passion of Christ, not however from the merits of the Saints; therefore that relaxation is not effected through the merits of the Saints. Finally: the heretics carp at the words of Clement, by which in his Extravagant he says that the merits of all the Saints afford aid to the treasury of the merits of Christ; as though, to wit, the Blood of Christ either by itself were not sufficient, or at some time were going to fail and lose its power unless it were helped by an admixture of the blood of the Martyrs.

§ 29. To these arguments we reply in order as follows. The first argument is common also to our own satisfactions, to which therefore in like manner it must be answered as the Council of Trent answers concerning our satisfactions (Session 14, ch. 8), namely that the sufferings of the Saints have whatever efficacy they have for redeeming the sins of the faithful from nowhere else than through Christ Jesus, with whose co-operation the Saints can do all things; and therefore He is the one by whom they live, in whom they merit, in whom also they satisfy for others by their sufferings and deaths, which have their power from Him, are offered by Him to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father.⁴³ Although, therefore, the merit of the passion of Christ by itself abundantly suffices for abolishing all sins and punishments, nevertheless He willed, just as He communicated the dignity of merit, so also to communicate the dignity of satisfaction, through that same passion of His, even to others. For thus "shall he be honoured whom the king shall will to honour."⁴⁴ And this is what Origen says (Homily 24 on Numbers): that certain other persons besides Christ confer something of purification upon the human race, but by the merit of the Blood of Christ.⁴⁵

§ 30. To the second it is answered that Catholics, in positing one treasury of the merits of Christ and of the Saints, do not mix the Blood of Christ with the blood of the Martyrs; because they do not place the merits of Christ and of the Saints in the same order, but acknowledge a wide difference between them, since Christ by Himself, the Saints not except through Christ, can merit and can render some worthy price for redeeming the punishments of sins. Nor indeed is it alien to Sacred Scripture in discourse to join together things whose formal character is most diverse; as when it is said (Exod. 14): "They believed in the Lord and in Moses his servant," and in the Epistle to Philemon: "Hearing of thy charity and faith which thou hast in the Lord Jesus, and toward all the Saints."⁴⁶ On which passage writing, St. Jerome explains how someone is able to have the same faith in Christ and in His Saints.⁴⁷ So elsewhere we read "the sword of the Lord and of Gedeon";⁴⁸ likewise "to bless God and the king"; and that (Jn. 20): "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."⁴⁹ And that which serves this point more closely is that of 4 Kings 19: "I will protect this city and I will save it for my own sake and for David my servant's sake," and other things of this sort.⁵⁰ Wherefore likewise the treasury of the merits of Christ and of the Saints can deservedly offend no one, when between these and those merits the due distinction is acknowledged.

§ 31. To the third Clement replies thus (in the Extravagant): "Concerning the consumption or diminution of this treasury there is not at all any reason to be afraid, as well on account of the infinite merits of Christ as because the more numerous are those who are drawn to justice by its application, so much the more does the heap of their merits increase."⁵¹ To which response one may add what Leo says (in a Sermon on the Saints Peter and Paul), namely that by their merits God can extend the making of satisfaction, because although they are not infinite, nevertheless nothing prevents by divine disposition their availing throughout this whole age which likewise is not infinite; especially since every continuum is divisible to infinity. Whence it is not easy to say that the merits of some Saint, as regards satisfactions, are now exhausted. For God knows—He who disposes all things "in measure, and number, and weight"—how to dispense them so that they do not fail until this age is ended.⁵²

§ 32. To the fourth it is answered that sentences of that sort have this sense: that none of the holy Martyrs will be able to offer a death of so great a price as would pay the debt of eternal death. For this, beyond controversy, is proper to the one Mediator and Redeemer Christ,⁵³ and of this kind of redemption the Scriptures and the Fathers understand it when they everywhere make it proper to Christ. Yet it is not to be denied that so precious in the sight of God was the death of the holy Martyrs, and the other sufferings of the just, that by them the debt of another, temporal, can be redeemed and paid off; just as each one is admonished to redeem his sins by alms.⁵⁴ But St. Ambrose wills nothing other than what the Apostle says (Gal. 6): "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord"—because other crosses cannot be useful except through the cross of Christ, and hence the first and principal ground of glorying is only in the cross of Christ. Nevertheless, unless each one's own cross were also in some way useful to him, the Lord would not say: "If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow me." [^55] As to what ought to be answered to the words of St. Thomas, let one consult Cajetan on that place.⁵⁶

§ 33. To the fifth and sixth arguments it is answered that although the Saints receive full reward from God for their good works, nevertheless nothing prevents—indeed it very much befits the divine goodness—that in view of those works, by which the Saints were singularly pleasing to God, He Himself also should do good to others: as we read concerning Abraham, Moses, David, and others. But the passage (Matt. 24) tells especially against those who hang upon the merits of others, while they themselves meanwhile refrain from good works

and do nothing by which they may deserve to be helped by the supports of others; against whom Chrysostom argues (Homily 5 on Matthew).⁵⁷ For the solution of what Durandus objects, the formal character in each good work must be distinguished. For inasmuch as a good work is only meritorious of life eternal, in so far it is meritorious; inasmuch as, however, the same good work is also penal, it is satisfactory. Whence, although the merit is fully rewarded, nevertheless it does not at once follow that, inasmuch as it is punishment and therefore satisfactory, it cannot still be applied to others for redeeming their punishments.

§ 34. To the seventh it is answered that that explicit intention is not required, but it suffices that God by His providence reserve the penal works of the Saints for the public good of the Church. Which intention, indeed, the Saints themselves also tacitly and in general had.

§ 35. To the eighth: although the keys have their power only from Christ's merit, nothing nevertheless hinders that through them even the merits of others may avail the faithful for the remission of punishments. For the merit of Christ suffices to give the keys that efficacy. To the last: the Pontiff does not say that the merits of the Saints afford aid to the merits of Christ, but that they afford aid to the heap of the treasury of the merits of Christ; because, namely, by them that heap is made greater by a certain accession of merits extensively as to the number of merits, though not as to the power, which from the merits of Christ it has as infinite. Then too, it is no more absurd to say that the merits of the Saints afford aid to the treasury of the merits of Christ than what Paul says (1 Cor. 3): "We are God's helpers."⁵⁸ For such help and aid are understood to be afforded on account of a certain co-operation, not on account of any supplement of weakness or insufficiency. For that the same Pontiff wills that nothing be derogated from the infinite power of the Blood and merits of Christ is most evident; for in the same Extravagant he says that even "a very small drop of the Blood" would have sufficed for the redemption of the human race, and he calls this treasury of the merits of Christ "infinite and inconsumptible," even if no merits of other Saints were to be added.⁵⁹ But this was of the divine goodness and condescension, that He also granted to His redeemed a certain participation both of meriting and of redeeming.

§ VI — In whose hands the power of granting Indulgences resides (Penes quos sit potestas conferendi Indulgentias)

§ 36. The power of granting indulgences (*Indulgentiae*) belongs only to those to whom ecclesiastical jurisdiction (*jurisdictio*) belongs. Concerning this matter Alexander III wrote thus to the Archbishop of Canterbury: "As to remissions which are made at the dedications of churches, or to those contributing to the building of bridges, we will that your fraternity hold this: that, since no one can be bound or loosed by a judge not his own, we judge that the aforesaid remissions profit those only to whom, that they may profit them, their own judges have in particular granted them." Which decree is had "Extra, De Poenitentiis et Remissionibus, cap. Quod autem," and it is founded on the same divine law on which the very power is founded, to wit, Matt. 16, for since to bind and to loose is the office of a judge, no one can do it except one who has jurisdiction over those whom he binds or looses.⁶¹

§ 37. But now further it is asked, what kind of jurisdiction is here required. For Durandus thinks that the power of Order and jurisdiction in the internal forum (*forum interius*) is required, and accordingly that priests alone can confer an indulgence; because, he says, an indulgence is an absolution (*absolutio*) from the penalty remaining after the absolution from guilt, and therefore it requires the same power as the absolution from

guilt, namely the power of the priestly Order. But that opinion has been received neither in the Schools nor in the custom of the Church. For bishops-elect, even if not yet ordained, as also legates of the Apostolic See who are not presbyters, are wont to confer indulgences. Whence it is clear that, for granting indulgences, just as for excommunicating, jurisdiction in the external forum (*forum exterius*) is necessarily required, but not necessarily in the internal forum, that is, of penance. And from this too it can seem that this power is founded more on those passages of Scripture in Matthew than on the Scripture of John 20, as being such as pertain chiefly to the institution of the sacrament of Penance, as was declared by the Fathers of the Council of Trent (Session 6, ch. 14; and Session 14, ch. 1, can. 3).⁶² Add that those same words are said to priests alone in their Ordination.

§ 38. Therefore, first, it must be established certainly and without doubt that this power of granting indulgences is in the Supreme Pontiff and in all the other bishops as prelates of the churches, having ordinary jurisdiction of the external forum; as St. Thomas rightly teaches on this Distinction (q. 1, a. 4), giving this reason: because to grant indulgences is to dispense the common treasury of the Church; but to dispense the goods of any commonwealth pertains to its princes and governors, who in the Church are the bishops.⁶³

§ 39. Second, from the things said it follows that parish priests and all others who have jurisdiction only in the internal forum cannot grant indulgences. Which, even if it is sufficiently confirmed by ecclesiastical law and custom, can nonetheless be proved also from the reason just stated. For it is not parish priests but bishops who are the prelates of the churches, each having distinct and proper dioceses, as diverse cities in a kingdom, of which they are properly and peculiarly called the shepherds and rulers.

§ 40. There is also another reason for this doctrine: because the conferral of indulgences is a true absolution from sins in the external forum outside the sacrament, and therefore it demands jurisdiction in the same forum; which indeed is not in parish presbyters, but in bishops alone. Now it is called an absolution from sins, that is, from the penalties which on account of sins still remained to be paid. For in this way the Pontiffs speak in their Decrees and diplomas, as is to be seen in the Decretals, Title "De Poenitentiis et Remissionibus."⁶⁴

§ 41. But if someone should ask whether the aforesaid difference between a bishop and a parish priest with respect to the power of granting indulgences is of divine law or only ecclesiastical: it is answered that it is of divine law, because bishops alone succeed the Apostles as prelates and governors of their churches; who therefore also, by that very fact whereby they are made bishops, by divine law receive jurisdiction of the external forum, both for granting indulgences and for excommunicating and for other acts which that power of jurisdiction embraces.

§ 42. Third, it must be noted that this power does not belong equally to all bishops. For it belongs to the Supreme Pontiff fully and perfectly without limitation of human law, since he himself is the Head of the whole Church, and therefore through the whole Church, as wholly subject to himself, he can bestow them. But to the other bishops, by divine law indeed it belongs only over their subjects, that is, their particular church; by human law, however, in a certain manner according to the limitation of the canons, especially canon 26 of the Lateran Council under Innocent III.⁶⁵

§ 43. Fourth, if it is asked whether that power belongs to abbots and other superiors of monasteries: we reply that it does not belong to them, because simply speaking they are not prelates of churches, nor do they have over their own subjects that complete jurisdiction which bishops have. Whence Innocent III in the

Lateran Council, and it is had "Extra, De Excessibus Praelatorum, cap. Accedentibus," strictly forbids that any of the abbots presume to grant letters of indulgence; "unless perhaps," he says, "any one of them can defend himself in this matter by a special concession, or by some other legitimate cause." Where by "legitimate cause," according to the interpretation of the gloss, understand prescribed custom which gives jurisdiction.⁶⁶

§ VII — Solution of the arguments to the contrary (Solutio argumentorum in contrarium)

§ 44. The Angelic Doctor, where above certain objections are urged against this doctrine, treats first from the words of the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 2, where he seems to make the granting of pardon, that is, of an indulgence (*indulgentia*), a bestowal made common to all the Corinthians to whom he writes, saying: "So that on the contrary you should rather grant." And again: "To whom you have granted anything, I also." Whence it appears that this power of granting indulgence belongs to whatsoever of the faithful. Likewise Theophylact, on that place, says that the Apostle asks the Corinthians to be judges.⁶⁸ Second, the same seems to be proved by reason; because the faithful can satisfy one for another, and so they can apply the afflictions of themselves to others for the remission of temporal punishment. Third, custom has it that the superiors of Religious, although they are not bishops nor endowed with episcopal authority, admit benefactors of their Orders to a participation in suffrages and in all the good works which are done in those same Orders. And that this is done most rightly is proved from the Scriptures and taught from the Fathers by Thomas of Walden, Tome 3, De Sacramentalibus, Title 10.⁶⁹ Fourth: Every priest, when he enjoins satisfaction on a penitent, commutes the punishment of the future age into the punishment of this age, far lesser; therefore he relaxes something of the temporal punishment owed. Finally: To bind and to loose are of the same power and the same forum; therefore, since in the forum of penance the priest alone binds the sinner by imposing on him satisfaction, it will belong to him alone likewise in the same forum to relax the satisfaction imposed. But we reply as follows.

§ 45. To the first, indeed, the Apostle does not ascribe that granting, which he says the Corinthians have done, to all of them, but only to presbyters using episcopal authority by apostolic commission, just as in 1 Corinthians 5 he wills that the power of judging and excommunicating should not pertain to all the faithful, but to the superiors alone. Yet in some sense each can be attributed to all; because by a vow, by desire and pious commiseration, or even by zeal for justice, the whole assembly of good faithful is said to do that which by the ministry of power the superiors alone do. In which manner St. Augustine teaches against the Donatists, that "the groan of the dove remits sins;" of which matter we have spoken elsewhere.⁷⁰ For that a certain proper mode of binding and loosing belongs to the superiors alone, the Apostle sufficiently intimates in those same places, when he bears witness that he does each in the name or Person of Christ.

§ 46. To the second: When the faithful satisfy for others, they indeed pay the punishment owed by others, but they do not absolve them, because they do not use the power of the keys (*potestas clavium*), by which, through such satisfaction as a means, they would relax the punishments owed by others. Therefore, by such satisfaction there is an application only by way of payment, not, however, of absolution. Whence neither by such application is anything relaxed of the penance enjoined by the priest, but the sinner nevertheless remains bound to it until he is loosed by the authority of the Church.

§ 47. The same reply must be applied to the third argument. For just so far as individual faithful can dispose of their own satisfactions by applying them to others, so far also can the superiors of Religious dispose

of the suffrages and other good works of their subjects. Wherefore they cannot apply to others, for the payment of punishment, works already past, whether their own or those of their subjects, but only future ones. For past works, if indeed they have not already previously been applied, pass into the common treasury of the Church, the dispensation of which pertains to the prelates of the churches alone.

§ 48. To the fourth: It is answered, first, that by ecclesiastical indulgence it is not the punishment of Purgatory that is commuted into the punishment of this age, but the penance enjoined or to be enjoined is relaxed wholly or in part. But this not any priest whatsoever can do; because, unless he be endowed with higher power, he is bound to enjoin satisfaction on the penitent proportionate to the gravity of the offense, or, if he does not do this on account of the infirmity of the penitent, he commits the remainder to be assumed by him freely, or to be expected from God. Then, when the punishment of the future age is commuted into the punishment of this age, although equality is not observed as to severity, it is nevertheless observed as to worth and estimation before God; so that they are said truly and properly to satisfy by the penance enjoined on them.

§ 49. To the last: No reason compels that one say that both are always of the same power and of the same forum; for often an inferior binds, whose power of loosing the Superior retains to himself. But to the jurisdiction of the external forum (*forum exterius*) the concession of indulgences rightly pertains—both on account of the Church's common treasury, as we said above, and because the consideration of the causes on account of which indulgences are granted pertains to the external forum: such causes are the devotion and pious affection of the Christian people toward the Apostolic See, the building of churches, the extirpation of heresies, victory against the infidels, and other public goods of the Church of this sort. For likewise the power of excommunicating, although it binds the soul, belongs only to the external forum, because it chiefly regards the common good, as was said in its proper place.

§ 50. Finally, to that which is wont to be asked—whether the Pope or a bishop can confer indulgences on himself, since no one can exercise jurisdiction upon himself, neither by binding nor by absolving, and therefore no one is able to excommunicate himself nor to absolve himself sacramentally—Cajetan answers by conceding that, by granting an indulgence to others, he does not acquire it for himself, because, in absolving others, he does not absolve himself. Nor, he says, is he in a worse condition than another; because, although not by that way, by another way, however, he can obtain the same indulgence—namely, by committing to his confessor to absolve him thus as he absolves others. For in this way the Pope subjects himself to sacramental absolution, and, by the same reason, to an indulgence. He says these things in Tractate 15, *De Indulgentiis*, ch. 5.⁷¹

§ 51. Others think otherwise, saying that although no one can exercise jurisdiction upon himself by coercing himself, and therefore cannot excommunicate himself, likewise neither can he absolve himself in the sacrament, because that act, by reason of the sacrament, is the personal act of one upon another—namely, of the priest upon the penitent, who ought to subject himself to him—nevertheless, because indulgences are conferred outside the sacrament upon all who do such a work, nothing hinders but that the grantor, as a part of the Commonwealth, can enjoy the same benefit.

§ 52. But the opinion of Cajetan—because, beyond a not-to-be-despised reason, it is also supported by practice—seems preferable; especially since indulgences are given not only universally to the whole community, but also—what was once customary—particularly to this or that person. For a prelate to do this

toward himself is in accord neither with reason nor with practice. Whence it is related of the Supreme Pontiff that, when about to die, he does not himself confer on himself the plenary indulgence, but, after giving a commission, receives it from another. To which practice another reason also accrues, because in the Bull of Martin V, and in the other decrees and diplomas of the Popes, an indulgence is now called remission of sins, now absolution from sins. But no one confers this on himself; rather, he ought humbly both to ask for it and to receive it from another who has power over him.⁷²

§ VIII — What requirements are necessary for obtaining an indulgence (Quenam necessario requisita ad Indulgentiam consequendam)

§ 53. In order that someone become a participant in an indulgence (*indulgentia*), before all else it is necessary that he be a subject of him who grants the indulgence, as is clear from what has already been said. For an act of jurisdiction cannot be exercised except upon a subject. Nor is it an obstacle that Honorius III, when consulted, replies that an Archbishop can throughout his whole province grant general letters of remission, although his jurisdiction does not extend to that whole, according to the chapter "Pastoralis" in the Decretals On the Office of the Ordinary Judge, where it is said that an Archbishop has no power over the bishops of the province, except in certain articles. For among those excepted articles this matter, too, of granting indulgences must be numbered.⁷⁴

§ 54. Next, on the part of the recipient it is required that he be truly penitent. This is sufficiently proved from those things which were said above, at Distinction 15, about satisfaction. For just as one who abides in the disposition of mortal sin cannot make satisfaction either for himself or for another, so neither can another's satisfaction be applied to him by means of an indulgence. The reason of this is that, just as the satisfaction which someone makes for himself is a work of penance by which he endeavors to render God appeased toward himself, and therefore cannot be done by one who is impenitent, so another's work can be applied to no one for satisfaction—that is, for the payment of the penalty—except to him who, by true penance turning back to God, desires to avert His wrath. Whence the common and ancient form of granting indulgences always contains this clause: "to the truly penitent," or "to the truly contrite."⁷⁵

§ 55. Moreover, for a fuller declaration of this matter, three times can be distinguished in an indulgence, and likewise three states in the man who wishes to obtain an indulgence. The first time is when the indulgence is promulgated. The second, when the work is done for obtaining the indulgence. The third, when someone wishes actually to obtain it. Likewise, in the man himself the first state is that of sin, the second of penance, the third of grace (*gratia*). Therefore, first, it is certain that at the time when an indulgence is promulgated, it is not necessary that a man be in the second or in the third state in order to be able afterward to obtain the indulgence promulgated. For even if he be then in the state of sin, nevertheless afterward he will be able to dispose himself for obtaining the indulgence. But with respect to the second time of the indulgence, no one who exists in the state or disposition of mortal sin can do the prescribed work usefully for obtaining the indulgence; because, as has been said, in mortal sin he cannot make satisfaction. Yet in the state of penance nothing prevents a man from being able usefully and efficaciously to fulfill the prescribed conditions, provided that he be found in grace at that time which we posited as third in the indulgence—namely, when the indulgence itself is now to be actually received.

§ 56. And from this it is that the customary form of indulgences requires not only true penance or contrition, but also confession—not because the conditions required cannot be fulfilled except by those who, by prior confession, have been absolved from sins, but because they do not obtain the indulgence itself unless they are existing in grace. The reason of this is that the penalty is not remitted unless first the guilt has been remitted. Wherefore Leo X, in a certain decretal written to Cardinal Cajetan against Luther's heresy then arising, declares that indulgences can be conferred upon Christ's faithful who, charity joining them, are members of Christ.⁷⁶

§ 57. From what has been said a doubt can be removed which someone might raise from the custom of the Church, which used to remit, by indulgence, the penalty of satisfaction to penitents even before reconciliation, as is evident from St. Cyprian and other Fathers, indeed from the Councils of Nicaea I, Ancyra, and Carthage IV. Whence it could seem that those penitents to whom a part of satisfaction was remitted obtained that indulgence, not yet restored to the grace of God by the sacrament of reconciliation. But one must say that, just as satisfaction used to be fulfilled by them before reconciliation, so also a certain relaxation of satisfaction was granted, but one which would not become ratified except in the reconciliation itself; because a penitent could not be freed from the debt of temporal penalty, unless first at least by nature he had been freed from the debt of eternal penalty—which took place in the reconciliation itself by the priest's absolution.⁷⁷

§ 58. Moreover, besides these things some think that the treasury of indulgences is not of benefit to those who, although established in grace, nevertheless neglect to make satisfaction for themselves, but only to those who are solicitous to satisfy fully in this life for sins; and on account of this they either ask that fitting satisfactions be imposed upon them, or at least they of their own accord assume them and take care to fulfill them. But those who ask that the least possible penance be imposed on them, and beyond that least which they know to have been imposed they care no more about making satisfaction, but rather after this life are content to pay in Purgatory, thinking it sufficient for them if they escape hell—such are not to hope that help is afforded them by indulgences. Thus Cajetan also thinks and teaches, after the Altissiodorensis and Paludanus, in Tractate 10, On Those Receiving Indulgences. He proves it by this argument: No one unworthy, by another's satisfaction for the penalty owed by himself, truly obtains the fruit of an indulgence; but he who is negligent to satisfy for himself, although he be in grace, is unworthy of the benefit of another's satisfaction; therefore he does not acquire the fruit of an indulgence. The minor he proves in many ways, as can be seen in him.⁷⁸

§ 59. For this opinion there seems to speak the authority of Cyprian, who, in Book 3, Epistle 16 to the Confessors, begs them that in their letters they name and commend to the bishop for obtaining a relaxation of penance no others than those whose penance they have observed to be near to satisfaction. Whence it appears, he says, that in order to gather the fruit from the passions of the Martyrs the lapsed ought to cooperate by performing satisfaction, at least to such a degree that not much seems to be lacking to its fullness. The same Cyprian, in Epistle 14, blames the presbyters because, without consulting the Bishop and indeed without awaiting the due time, they had granted indulgence to certain lapsed, conceding things which would turn to their destruction; a like caution he requires in Epistle 18 and in the Sermon on the Lapsed. The councils and decrees of popes too, which permit relaxation of penance to be made for those whose good way of life proved by deed merits this, as Nicaea I and the others cited by us at the beginning, seem to favor this opinion. Whence also St. John Chrysostom, Homily 5 on Matthew, denies that the merits of the Saints profit us if we ourselves

shall have been negligent and slothful, but only then, if we too apply our own care and solicitude. Indeed Paul himself can seem to have required this care of satisfying from him to whom the grace of penance was to be granted. For he says in 2 Cor. 2: "Sufficit illi qui ejusmodi est objurgatio haec, quae fit a pluribus; ita ut e contrario magis donetis": as though indicating that then at length pardon is to be granted when the preceding penance suffices, that is, is near to full satisfaction.⁷⁹

§ 60. But this opinion does not please many others, who think that it is enough, and enough alone, for obtaining an indulgence, that one existing in grace do what the form of the indulgence prescribes—both because grace renders the man who performs the work prescribed by the Church capable of that influx which from Christ flows through the indulgence; and because he who does that work by that very fact takes care, on his own part, to satisfy so far as is required, and thus is not to be called altogether negligent; and finally because the use of indulgences began to be frequent in the Church for this reason, that in ancient times penitents were more negligent and unwilling to fulfill those grave and canonical penances, on account of which the Church wished to extend a helping hand.

§ 61. An argument for this thing also can be taken from the Apostle, who gives this reason for the relaxation of satisfaction: "lest perhaps he who was subject to penance be swallowed up by more abundant sorrow" (2 Cor. 2). From which it is also evident that relaxation is made usefully for those who would seem to bear the heavier penance impatiently and to be going to fall thence into despair. Whence Chrysostom, on that place of the Apostle, Homily 4, writes thus: "For it is not because he is worthy, nor because he has put off sufficient penance, but because he is weak, that I, he says, deem him worthy of pardon." By which words one can easily recognize that point which Cajetan assumed, namely that no one who is unworthy obtains the fruit of an indulgence.

§ 62. Although perhaps it can better be said, by making a distinction, that one who is not solicitous to satisfy fully for himself—if nevertheless he is truly penitent, and does what is prescribed—is in part worthy of the benefit of an indulgence, in part unworthy: worthy indeed in so far as, with true penance, he fulfills the prescribed condition; unworthy, however, in so far as he is so negligent of himself that he prefers to reserve to purgatorial penalties rather than to satisfy fully for himself in this life. But a fuller explication of this matter would depend upon other points which still remain to be said concerning this subject.

§ IX — For what causes indulgences ought to be conferred (Propter quas causas conferendae sint Indulgentiae)

§ 63. The causes on account of which indulgences (*indulgentiae*) are rightly and usefully conferred are multiple. One is that which the Apostle expressed (2 Cor. 2), saying: "Ne forte abundantiori tristitia absorbeatur qui ejusmodi est." And indeed it is very likely that this cause commended to us in Apostolic Scripture those ancient Fathers of the Church for the most part had before their eyes, when, for penitents who, after some just time, had been engaged in a toilsome exercise of penance, they made a remission of the remaining time.

§ 64. But there was another cause joined to that one: that the gentleness of the Church and her maternal care toward all the faithful be commended to all. For it is from this that the canons now and then made mention of humanity.

§ 65. A third cause: that the glory of the Martyrs with God and the greatness of their merits be commended to the faithful. Hence, as is clear from Tertullian and Cyprian, Bishops and Presbyters were so ready to receive to communion those who had obtained a letter from the Martyrs, even if sometimes it seemed that they were asking for what was unjust.⁸¹

§ 66. A fourth cause: bodily sickness and the danger of death. Whence Cyprian (Ep. 19, book 3) says: "Those who have received a letter from the Martyrs beg that by their help they may be aided with the Lord in their offenses; if, pressed by some infirmity, they begin to be in danger, after the exomologesis has been made and the hand has been laid upon them by you for penance, with the peace promised to them by the Martyrs they are sent back to the Lord." He has almost the same words in Epistle 18.⁸²

§ 67. Other legitimate causes besides were considered in later ages by those who granted indulgences: such as the building and dedications of basilicas, the conversion or conquest of unbelievers, the extirpation of heresies, the devotion of the Christian people both toward the Saints reigning with Christ and toward the Roman Church and the Apostolic See, and, finally, whatever great and urgent necessities of the Churches. Lastly, this must be known: for indulgences to avail, besides the authority of the giver and the due disposition of the recipient, there is also altogether required on the part of the grantor a reasonable cause of granting, of which sort are, namely, the causes already enumerated, to such a degree that, if with no reasonable moving cause the Pontiff or a Bishop should grant an indulgence, it ought not to be judged to have proceeded from the very See, nor esteemed to have any efficacy or value. Now that cause is reasonable which redounds to the utility of the Church and the honor of God, as St. Thomas says writing on this Distinction.⁸³ But whether by the utility of the Church there is to be understood only its common good, as some wish, is not so settled—since we read that the Apostle granted indulgence to the Corinthian for no other cause mentioned than "lest he be swallowed up by more abundant sorrow," that is, lest he fall into despair; which seems to have been a private cause, not public, except only by consequence, inasmuch as, as has been said, the gentleness of the Church was by this commended.

§ 68. Now that an indulgence without a reasonable cause is not efficacious with God many reasons show. First: the Pontiff and the Bishops have been appointed by Christ "dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4). Among which mysteries is the treasury of the Church (*thesaurus Ecclesiae*) containing the merits of Christ and of the Saints. And the Pontiffs too call the disbursement of this treasury in their rescripts a dispensation. But dispensation differs from profusion or dissipation in that that is done on account of a legitimate cause, whereas this is done rashly. Since therefore the Lord does not hold as ratified the dissipation of His goods, but only a dispensation, it follows that an indulgence made without a legitimate cause is void. Another reason: God for a just cause left the penitent, though the guilt is remitted, subject to temporal penalties and a debtor to them; therefore such penalties cannot, without a just cause, be remitted by His Vicar; nor, if it be done, does He approve it. A third: the Prefect of the Church cannot, without a legitimate cause, loose an obligation not arising from sin—as in vows and oaths—and if he should attempt to do so, he effects nothing before God; therefore much less will he be able to relax a penalty due on account of sin, if there be not a reasonable cause. A fourth reason is drawn from the rash and profuse donation or alienation of the temporal goods of the Church, which is held as ratified neither before God nor before men; wherefore much less will it be ratified in spiritual goods. Cajetan explains this reason learnedly.⁸⁴ A fifth: the conferral of indulgences is a true absolution from sins; therefore, just as in the sacrament a priest cannot absolve anyone whatever from guilt, but only him who shall have been worthy of absolution, nor can he commute the temporal penalty into

anything whatever, but according to the quality of the crimes and the capacity of the penitents, so neither outside the sacrament will he be able to relax the remaining penalties at his good pleasure, but only for a legitimate cause; to such a degree that anything of this sort attempted otherwise does not avail before God. Finally, this doctrine is confirmed by the authority of Cyprian, Innocent III, and Clement VI; of whom the first (Ep. 15, book 3) says that an unreasonable indulgence turns to destruction, and that the lapsed are not thus raised up, but are rather driven on to ruin by the offense of God; the second, in the Lateran Council, affirms that by indiscreet indulgences penitential satisfaction is enervated; the third (in the Extravagante of the Jubilee) wills that indulgences be granted "according to the quality of the cause," neither greater nor smaller.⁸⁵

§ X — How much indulgences avail (Quantum Indulgentiae valeant)

§ 69. The value of indulgences is considered from the quantity of the penalty which is remitted by them. Therefore, when it is asked how much indulgences avail, nothing else is asked than how great a penalty is remitted by them. On which matter there have been various opinions of the Doctors.

§ 70. The first is: that indulgences benefit each one only as much as his preparation and devotion obtain from God. According to which opinion, since those who fulfill the prescribed conditions would gain nothing certain, the Prelates would not seem to act rightly in granting to the Church any definite indulgence; and so some fraud would be committed in the granting of indulgences. This was condemned in Luther, who said: "indulgences are pious deceits of the faithful."

§ 71. The second opinion lays down that only so much is remitted by indulgences as the very work for which it is granted satisfies with God. But this opinion can less be retained. For thus it would follow that by indulgences in truth nothing is remitted, but only one penalty is exchanged for another; and in this way an indulgence would not be an absolution and condonation, but only a certain commutation of satisfaction.

§ 72. The third is: that indulgences are valid not before the tribunal of God, but only in the forum of the Church, and that they free only from the canonical penalty which the Church had imposed on the penitent, not however from the penalty of the future age. But this opinion, although it has been held by some Catholics, is gravely erroneous, and pertains to the condemned errors of the heretics of this age. Against whom we showed above that both satisfactions and their remissions avail for the future age.

§ 73. The fourth opinion is: that an indulgence avails only as much as the cause for which it is given suffices according to the divine estimation.

§ 74. The fifth and last: that an indulgence always avails as much as it sounds, provided a reasonable cause be present.

§ 75. These two last opinions have their weighty and Catholic Authors, and on both sides their probability. The latter is embraced by St. Thomas writing on this Distinction, where, among other things, he says that sometimes the Church confers greater indulgences than is that cause on account of which they are granted; "for," he says, "the quantity of an effect follows the quantity of its cause. But the cause of the remission of indulgences is no other than the abundance of the merits of Christ, which is most sufficient for the expiation of the whole penalty." Finally concluding he says: "And therefore whatever cause be present, provided it incline to the utility of the Church and the honor of God, is sufficient for indulgences: but for the application of the treasury there is required the authority of the one conferring, the charity of the one

receiving, and the piety of the cause; with which three concurring, indulgences avail as much as they are proclaimed." So he.⁸⁷

§ 76. His absolute opinion also is (Opusculum 7, On the Lord's Prayer, petition 5) that indulgences for one existing in charity avail exactly as much as they sound; and in reality the custom of the Church seems to favor this, in which we see for the same cause now greater, now smaller indulgences granted, yes even very great ones sometimes for slight causes; whereas the former opinion seems not only to call such indulgences into doubt, but even, in general, to ascribe falsity to the Church herself in any granting of indulgences whatever, as one who determines definitely the quantity of the penalty to be relaxed, whereas that matter depends on a divine estimation unknown to her.⁸⁸

§ 77. Yet, notwithstanding these things, to us the opinion of the others is much more probable, which does not take as sufficient just any reasonable cause whatsoever, however slight, for any indulgences whatsoever, but requires a cause proportionate to the quantity of the indulgence granted: namely thus, that, just as it is certain that an indulgence granted without a reasonable cause avails nothing, so for a greater indulgence a greater cause is required, and that it avails only so far as in the judgment of God the cause suffices, and not further. And this is what they say, that indulgences themselves are to be measured according to the proportion of a sufficient cause. Now by a sufficient cause we understand not only on the side of the one conferring, but also, as was said above, on the side of the recipient. For in the recipient too it is required that he do something which has some proportion to the quantity of the indulgence granted; otherwise he will not receive so great an indulgence, but a lesser, according to the proportion of the work.

§ 78. This opinion is held by Albert, Bonaventure, Richard, Adrian VI, Cajetan, Domingo, and Pedro de Soto; and thus it is the common opinion of the Doctors. Moreover, it rests on almost the same reasons by which a little before we showed that a reasonable cause is required in order that indulgences avail simply. For just as he dissipates, not dispenses, the treasury of the Church who grants an indulgence without a cause, so also does he who grants one greater than is just. He, I say, dissipates the treasury for that part which exceeds the proportion of the cause; and accordingly for that part what is done by the minister is not held as ratified by the Lord—just as neither would it be held ratified in temporal matters, except up to the measure of a reasonable and lawful cause.

§ 79. Likewise it is certain from the Extravagante of Clement that according to the quality of the cause now greater, now smaller indulgences are granted; whence also the Lateran Council (cap. 63) permits that at a Dedication indulgences of one year be given, but on the Anniversary day only of forty days—meaning thereby to dispense greater or smaller indulgences according to the reason of the cause. And the Roman Church is wont to observe the same proportion in dispensing public indulgences. From which it is clear that there is some just cause for granting smaller indulgences which is not just for granting greater ones. Wherefore, if for a lesser cause a greater indulgence be given, all that excess of the indulgence will lack a cause, and therefore will be vain and inefficacious, just as a lesser indulgence simply given without a cause. In addition, he is judged more prodigal who squanders great goods without a proportional cause than he who, without a cause, gives away small goods; wherefore the profusion of the former ought also to be held less ratified than the irrational donation of the latter.

§ 80. Now that also on the part of the recipient there is necessary a proportionate disposition—that is, some work having proportion to the quantity of the indulgence granted—is proved from this: because the

greatness of the cause on the side of the one conferring the indulgence does not suffice, unless to the same there be joined by a just proportion through his work the one who wishes to merit the indulgence. For that cause is required for applying the treasury to this person or that. And that application is not made except in view of some pious work which this man does; wherefore if this man either do nothing or do only something trifling in comparison to a very ample indulgence, it will not avail him as much as it sounds. Yet here it must be carefully observed that an equality in the cause or work to the indulgence is not required, but a proportion. For if an equivalent work were required, it would now be not an absolution but a true commutation. In what precise degree that proportion consists is not easy to define; but it is left to be judged by the Prelates of the Church, to whom Christ granted the power of granting indulgences.

§ 81. Indeed Cyprian (Ep. 16, book 3) begs the Martyrs that they commend by letters to the Bishop, for the obtaining of a full indulgence, none other than those whose penance they have observed to be near to satisfaction. And the Apostle Paul grants remission to that Corinthian only after an affliction of penance so grave that from it a danger of despair was feared. And the ancient Councils establish that something more humane is to be considered with respect to those penitents who, with all fear and tears persevering, had shown good conduct.

§ 82. From which it appears that those who have gravely offended do not gain full remission through an indulgence, unless they too, by satisfying, have approached with a certain proportion to so great a benefit. Nor does anything herein derogate from indulgences which are called full or plenary (*indulgentiae plenariae*). For indulgences are called plenary whose efficacy is such that one who is prepared can receive full remission of sins. By which it is first certain that not every satisfaction is excluded, since a certain satisfactory preparation or disposition is required on the part of the recipient, and that by divine law, to which this benefit of a plenary indulgence is not contrary. Wherefore the Pontiff, in granting an indulgence of this sort, does not infringe the divine law, but, that being presupposed, out of the plenitude of power dispenses an indulgence not limited by any measure of time, bestowing, namely, as much as each one can receive according to his preparation, and remitting the whole penalty if the penitent is capable, according to his preparation, of a total condonation.

§ 83. Whence it is truly said that even a plenary indulgence avails as much as it sounds, although not everyone who partakes of it obtains thence the full fruit. Which those words of Boniface VIII (in the Extravagante of the Jubilee) signify, wherein he says: "Each one, however, will merit more, will obtain the indulgence more efficaciously, who shall more frequently and more devoutly visit the basilicas themselves." Which words manifestly signify that a plenary indulgence is not always participated equally by all.⁸⁹

§ 84. And this is what Bonaventure intended when he says that indulgences, as far as regards the power of the giver, avail as much as they promise; yet they do not avail equally for all, but according to the estimation which he who gave the indulgence had or ought to have had: "Which estimation," he says, "there was no need to express, because all the faithful ought to presuppose in their heart that the gifts of the mercy of the Holy Spirit are given with a certain balance."⁹⁰

§ 85. Moreover, from this opinion thus explained it does not follow that indulgences are called into doubt, or that falsity is ascribed to the Church. For although in discerning the causes of indulgences, as also in dispensations and judgments and in certain other things, the Prefects of the Church—even the Supreme—can err; nevertheless, so long as the error is not manifest, the faithful ought to presume, as in other matters, so also in the granting of indulgences, that a right judgment has been applied by them, as Cajetan well admonishes.

Wherefore, as he says, speaking of a presumed reasonable [cause], the cause of the indulgence expressed in the Bull, unless the error be manifest, is always reasonable, not only simply, but also with respect had to the quantity of the indulgence given; but speaking of the reasonable [cause] which is true, not always.⁹¹

§ 86. Now as regards indulgences that are not full, in them the rigor of the penitential canon is relaxed merely by a remission of a set time, as of some days, or of one year or several. For those days or years are not to be referred to the penalty to be paid in Purgatory—as if, for example, an indulgence of forty days took away a penalty of forty days in the future age—but to the penance due in this age for sins according to the canons. For the sense is that by an indulgence of so many days or years, so many days or years are taken away from the penance which, according to the canons, had been enjoined for sins, or certainly ought to have been enjoined. Which sense the form of indulgences manifestly indicates, in which the Pontiff does not say that he remits so many days or years of penalties, but of penances (*poenitentiae*), and for the most part he adds, "enjoined." Which cannot in any way be referred to the pains of purgatory. Consequently, however, there is remitted the penalty of Purgatory corresponding to so much penance. But how much corresponds, is known to God alone. Hence it is clear how absurd is that lavishness of indulgences into hundreds or thousands of years—which is by no means to be ascribed to the Apostolic See, but either purely fictitious or imprudently extorted—since by no canon has penance of such length ever been prescribed for any sins whatsoever, nor indeed, on account of the shortness of human life, can it be prescribed, although because of the enormity or multitude of crimes the greatness of penance ought to be intensified when it cannot be extended.

§ XI — To what extent indulgences can be conferred on the dead (Quatenus indulgentiae conferri possint defunctis)

§ 87. The last question about indulgences is whether and to what extent they can be conferred on the dead; to which it is answered that the Prelates of the Church are able to grant indulgences to the dead who are in Purgatory, not indeed by way of absolution, but only by way of suffrage (*per modum suffragii*).

§ 88. The first part is proved, because absolution, since it is an act of jurisdiction, cannot be exercised upon one who is not a subject; but the dead, since they are outside the militia of wayfarers and by death have been placed in the haven of security—which is repugnant to the state of the way—are no longer subject to the Church militant; wherefore, just as it cannot bind them by imposing a determinate penalty, so neither can it absolve them from a penalty.

§ 89. It is also proved from the words in which the power was given: "Whatsoever you shall loose upon the earth," etc. For to loose upon the earth is to exercise the power of loosing with respect to men living upon the earth—just as that phrase is everywhere taken in Sacred Scripture, as in Job 41: "There is no power upon the earth that may be compared with him." For the dead are not called "survivors" nor are they said "to survive"; nor does Scripture anywhere say that they are upon the earth, but rather it assigns to them the lower and subterranean places. Bonaventure uses this argument in his treatment of this question, and he adds another taken from the decree of Alexander III, in which it is said: "Since no one can be bound or loosed by one who is not his own judge, we consider remissions to profit only those for whom their proper judges have in particular granted that they should profit." From which it seems to follow that the dead cannot be absolved by the Prelates of the Church—since they are not their proper judges. For by what reasoning could one say that the Supreme Pontiff is judge of the souls who are in Purgatory, and not be able to say the same of other Bishops,

since by neither divine nor human law does their power seem more restricted to the living alone than that of the Supreme Pontiff?

§ 90. The same moreover seems to be proved by those words of Leo (in Epistle 91): "If any of those, for whom we make supplication to the Lord, having been overtaken by any hindrance whatsoever, should fall from the benefit of the present indulgence, and before he comes to the appointed remedies should finish his temporal life by human condition, what he did not receive while remaining in the body, he will not be able to obtain when stripped of the flesh. Nor is it necessary for us to examine the merits of those who shall have died thus, since the Lord our God, whose judgments cannot be comprehended, has reserved to His justice what the priestly ministry could not fulfill." By which words, although the discourse is about sacramental absolution, nevertheless it seems to be signified in general that by death men are withdrawn from the forum of the Church, or priestly judgment, and are reserved to divine justice—"the dead have God alone as judge" (Epistle 7). And in a certain Prayer for the Dead the Roman Church sings: "O God, to whom alone it belongs to bestow healing after death," which must be understood, according to the mind of the Church, of absolution from penalties.

§ 91. Finally, from the form of indulgences which are wont to be granted for the dead, this is clear. For in it there is no mention of absolution, as when they are given for the living, but only of suffrage. Nay more, Leo X (in the decretal letter which he sent to Cajetan) expressly distinguishes two modes of granting indulgences, when he says and declares that the Roman Pontiff, by Apostolic authority granting an indulgence both for the living and for the dead, can dispense the treasury of the merits of Jesus Christ and of the Saints, and that he has been accustomed to confer the indulgence itself by way of absolution, or to transfer it by way of suffrage.⁹³ Which disjunctive manner of speaking clearly signifies that the Pontiff transfers the indulgence to the dead by way of suffrage in such wise that he does not confer it upon them by way of absolution. From which words of the Pontiff also, as from the usual form of indulgences which are given for the dead, the latter part of the assertion is confirmed—namely, that indulgences profit the dead by way of suffrage. Now this was declared a hundred years before us by Sixtus IV. And in this way Innocent VIII, next to Sixtus, and the following Pontiffs, granted indulgences for the dead, although even before their times indulgences of this sort are found to have been granted in the city of Rome.⁹⁴

§ 92. But, that this may be better understood, the very phrase must be explained. In which, first, by the name of suffrage one must understand an ecclesiastical aid or help; so that an indulgence by way of suffrage is nothing other than an indulgence which is given by way of ecclesiastical help, that is, in that manner in which by pious works the faithful also succor others—whether living or dead. And since this is done in a threefold way, either by meriting through works, or by impetrating through prayers, or by satisfying through sufferings, an indulgence as such—since it properly dispenses the sufferings of the Saints—has not the character of any and every ecclesiastical suffrage, but only of satisfactory suffrage.

§ 93. Moreover, this indulgence reaches the dead not by the road of justice, but by the road of grace and mercy; for, as we have already said, they are not subject to the power of the Church militant, so that they could be absolved by her Prelates by a path of jurisdiction. Wherefore, that they may be loosed from penalties, the mercy of the Judge, to whom they immediately are subject—namely of God—must be awaited, to the end that He may deign graciously to accept the satisfactory suffrages offered for them unto their liberation; as Cajetan well explains.⁹⁵

§ 94. Yet from these things it does not follow that the indulgences granted to the dead do not pertain to the power of the keys; for they are not granted so nakedly "by way of suffrage" that Apostolic authority and the exercise of the power of the keys do not intervene: as is evident from the Bulls of indulgences which are given for the dead. Whence also Leo X (in the aforesaid decretal) declares that the Roman Pontiff, by the power of the keys, whose office it is to open the kingdom of heaven, can grant indulgences to Christ's faithful, whether in this life or in Purgatory.⁹⁶ To prove the same, some adduce Dionysius the Areopagite who (in the last chapter of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy), when treating of the prayer which the Pontiff pours forth for the dead, confirms that it has force from those sentences of Christ spoken to the Apostles (Matt. 18 and Jn. 20). But it can more fittingly seem that Dionysius extended those Scriptures to the mode of loosing and remitting through ecclesiastical prayers. But, that it may be understood how and to what extent the power of the keys concurs to indulgences of this sort, the style itself of the words which the Roman Church uses in granting them must be considered. For two things are there said: both that by Apostolic authority an indulgence is granted for the souls of the departed, and that the same indulgence helps them by way of suffrage unto the remission of penalties. By this, therefore, it is signified that the Pontiff dispenses the very treasury by the authority of the keys, whether he do this for the dead or for the living—because, inasmuch as he has received the keys, he has power to open the treasury of the Church and withal to dispense it; but that, for the relaxing of the penalties of the dead, he confers the indulgence by way of suffrage, and not by way of absolution, in the manner in which he bestows it upon the living. Whence it is evident that the indulgence granted to the living and to the dead has this in common, that each is granted from the power of the keys dispensing the treasury of penal merits into payment of the penalties which remain after guilt has been remitted, both for these and for those. But the mode by which the indulgence reaches each is different: for it comes to the living by way of absolution, but it frees the dead by way of suffrage.

§ 95. Furthermore, it must also be noted here that, in order that indulgences may avail the dead, on the part of the grantor a just or reasonable cause is required, and that proportionally corresponding in some measure to the greatness of the indulgence granted; otherwise, the indulgence will either not profit the dead person, or it will not profit at once unto full liberation from penalties. For if a reasonable cause is required in order that the treasury may be efficaciously applied by the Pontiff to those over whom he has jurisdiction, much more therefore is it required where he does not have jurisdiction. Likewise, if a proportionate cause is required there, much more here. And this is also what St. Thomas thinks, writing in the Fourth Book of the Sentences, distinction 45, question 2. For he says that the Pontiff cannot grant as great a remission from the merits of the saints as he may wish, but only as much as reason demands.⁹⁷ Next, it is required that the prescribed condition—of which sort is either the Sacrifice of the Mass, or the giving of alms, or a certain prayer, or something similar to be done by the living—be done and fulfilled according to the mind of the one prescribing.

§ 96. But on the part of him to whom or for whom it is granted, that is, of the dead person, it seems sufficient that he have departed from this light joined to God in charity. For by this he is capable of the fruit of good works which are done by the living. For Cajetan thinks that indulgences cannot profit all who have died in grace, but only those—so he says—who in this life merited that they should profit them; which is not likely. For according to the mind of Augustine whom he alleges—namely in the Enchiridion, chapter 110, and in the books On the Care for the Dead, chapters 1 and 4—all who have died in grace have merited this, that after death the suffrages of the living should profit them. For Augustine requires nothing more for this merit than that someone should have died in the Christian and Catholic society, as is clear from chapter 4 of the book On

the Care for the Dead. Whence from Augustine rather the contrary is established. For if Cajetan's reasoning, which requires special and determinate kinds of merits, concluded, it would follow that neither other whatsoever special suffrages of the Church (which indeed he grants), nor even the common suffrages which are offered for all (about which he doubts), would profit those same souls anything—which is against the sense of the Church.⁹⁸

§ 97. But since indulgences are granted to the dead only by way of suffrage, and by that way they come to them not by the way of justice or jurisdiction, but by the way of mercy, that is, of gratuitous divine acceptance, a doubt could arise whether, all those things now said being posited, they always and by an infallible law profit those for whom they are granted. The sure answer is that they always profit—concerning which the same must be said as is said about the other suffrages of the Church which are made for the dead. For there is no impediment on the part of the dead, who, now outside the militia of life, are confirmed in grace; nor does anything appear on the part of God why He should accept the suffrages for them any less. Whence Augustine, already cited, speaking of the pious affection of the faithful for the dead, says: "Which, since it is exhibited to most beloved faithful ones, since it is not doubtful that they to whom such things are exhibited while they are in the body, have merited that such things should be for themselves after this life." Which words, compared with those occurring immediately before, are understood to signify that not only the public but also the private prayers of individuals without doubt profit those dead who departed in charity. Gerson confirms this same point, saying that a prayer cannot be made for the dead in vain, since it is made in charity.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, since it is the doctrine of the same Augustine, and indeed of the whole Church, that souls are helped in the future age according as in this life they merited that they should be helped—which merits are certainly unequal, just as the debt of satisfying for their sins is unequal—hence it is clear also with respect to these indulgences that not all are helped equally, but, in keeping with a certain proportion of their own merits, some are helped more than others: so that here too there may hold that which Boniface VIII says (in an Extravagant), namely, that the one more efficaciously attains the indulgence who, in order that the indulgence might be able to profit him, had been more meritorious and had come nearer to satisfying.¹⁰⁰

§ 98. From all these things it is sufficiently understood that the liberation of some person, for whom an indulgence has been granted, from Purgatory is not to be asserted with such certainty that one should no longer pray, or that anniversaries and the other things which are wont to be done to aid the dead should be omitted; because, namely, it cannot be clear to us that all those things have been supplied and completed which are required for that same full effect of the indulgence. But of Purgatory itself we shall now treat in what follows.

§ I — That there is a certain Purgatory of souls after this life (Aliquod animarum Purgatorium est post hanc vitam)

§ 99. The Master (of the Sentences) treats this matter in the place on the dead; yet the question of Purgatory is recalled to this treatise on the sacrament of Penance (*sacramentum Poenitentiae*) for a twofold consideration, namely both in respect of the remission of sins and in respect of satisfaction (*satisfactio*). For what, in this life, is not remitted by satisfaction is left to be purged in the life to come, until full remission be obtained. Therefore, first and chiefly—against the heretics who arose in later ages of the Church, such as the Waldenses, the Wycliffites, and all men of our own day—it must be shown that, according to the Catholic faith, the souls

of certain of the faithful, on account of sins committed in this life, are detained after the death of the body in certain punishments, by which, being purged, they may at length pass over to the fellowship of the blessed. For that place or state of souls the whole Church, with a most fitting name, calls Purgatory (*Purgatorium*).

§ 100. But that we may begin the proof from Scripture: the first and most evident place is 2 Maccabees 12, where it is said of Judas Maccabeus that, for the sins of those who had fallen, he ordered sacrifice to be offered; which deed of his, after Scripture had praised it as proceeding from a religious will, it thus concludes: "Sancta ergo et salubris est cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, ut a peccatis solvantur." From which it plainly follows that the souls of certain persons are detained by punishments in the future age, from which they can be loosed by the sacrifices and prayers of the living. For sin is loosed when together with the guilt the punishment is remitted. But this testimony of Scripture is so evident that the adversaries cannot refute it otherwise than by denying the canonical authority of that book. To whom it is briefly answered: although that book is not of the canon of the Hebrews, yet without doubt it is of the canon of the Church—just as also certain others which, the Hebrews protesting, the Church proposes to us to be read as sacred and proceeding from the Holy Spirit. If her judgment in this matter is despised, then neither will the four Gospels nor the Epistles have sufficient strength of authority for establishing the faith of Christian doctrine. "For I would not believe the Gospel," says St. Augustine, "unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."¹⁰³ And the same Augustine, in the book *On Care to Be Taken for the Dead*, treats this book as Scripture of the Old Testament and proves the sacrifice offered for the dead.¹⁰² But a more elaborate proof concerning the authority of the book does not belong to this place. Meanwhile, however, it cannot be denied to the author—

-
1. Section title not explicitly given in the source.
 2. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 9, *De reformatione*.
 3. [Abbreviation as in source] "ad Dist. 4. 14."
 4. On the power of the keys as used in indulgences.
 5. 2 Cor. 2.
 6. Council of Nicaea I, canon 11; Council of Ancyra, canon 5.
 7. Alexander III, *Decretals*, *De poenitentiis et remissionibus*, cap. "Quod autem."
 8. Fourth Lateran Council (under Innocent III), canon 62.
 9. St. Thomas, "ubi sup." [abbreviation as in source].
 10. On the antiquity of the term; see above in this distinction.
 11. Matt. 9:2 (healing of the paralytic: "Son, be of good heart, your sins are forgiven"); cf. Old Testament examples: for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for Moses, Samuel, and David.
 12. 2 Cor. 2:6–11; 1 Cor. 5:4–5.
 13. St. John Chrysostom, Homily 4 on 2 Corinthians.
 14. Pacianus, Epistle 3, against the Novatians.
 15. Theodore of Canterbury, *Penitential*; cited by the Master in the Text (Peter Lombard, *Sentences*).
 16. Council of Nicaea I, canon 11; Council of Ancyra, canon 5; Council of Carthage IV (with Augustine present), canons 75–76; Council of Neocaesarea, canon 3; Council of Agde.
 17. St. Leo the Great, Epistle 76.

18. Pope Vigilius, Epistle to Profuturus, ch. 4.
19. Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council, chs. 3, 60, 62; Honorius III, Decretals, De poenitentiis et remissionibus, next-to-last canon; Innocent IV, Council of Lyons, in Sext, eod. tit., "Romana Ecclesia"; Boniface VIII, ibid., cap. "Indulgentiae," and Extravagant "Antiquorum"; Clement VI, Extravagant "Unigenitus," on the treasury of the Church.
20. Council of Constance, condemnation of Wyclif (art. 42) and Hus (art. 8); interrogatories in the Bull of Martin V; Peter of Osma (Pedro de Osma), conclusion 6, condemned by Sixtus IV; Leo X's condemnation of articles of Luther.
21. Council of Trent, Session 25, De indulgentiis.
22. St. Thomas, Supplement to the *Summa theologiae*, q. 25, a. 1; q. 71, a. 10.
23. Matt. 16: "Whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."
24. Is. 9:6 ("Father of the age to come"); Heb. 9:11 ("High Priest of the good things to come").
25. St. Ambrose, De poenitentia II, ch. 6; ibid., last chapter.
26. Pseudo-Ambrose, Commentary on 2 Corinthians 2; Martin V, Bull given at the Council of Constance.
27. Tertullian, De pudicitia, end.
28. Martin Luther, condemned assertion on the uselessness of indulgences for the dying and the sick; for Cyprian, see Ep. 19 (book 3).
29. Sixtus IV, condemnation of Peter of Osma (Pedro de Osma); Martin V, condemnations of Wyclif and Hus at Constance; Leo X, condemnation of Luther's articles; Council of Trent, Session 25, decree on indulgences.
30. See above, Distinctio 15, on satisfaction's principal fruit being the redemption of future punishments.
31. St. Thomas, Supplement to the *Summa theologiae*, qq. 25–26.
32. Clement VI, Extravagant "Unigenitus."
33. 2 Cor. 8; Col. 1:24.
34. St. Augustine, passim; St. Gregory the Great, passim; Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 3.
35. Acts 9:36 (Dorcas full of good works); Matt. 6:20 ("Treasure up for yourselves treasure in heaven"); Roman Missal, Collect, Sunday within the Octave of the Nativity of the Lord.
36. Tertullian, De pudicitia; Martin Luther, Article 19 condemned by Leo X (Exsurge Domine, 1520).
37. 1 John 2:2 and parallel testimonies.
38. St. Leo the Great, Ep. 83; Ep. 97, ch. 2; Sermon 12 on the Passion of the Lord. St. Augustine, Tract. 84 on John; Contra Julianum VI, ch. 8. St. Ambrose, end of book 6 on Luke. St. Fulgentius, Sermon on the Epiphany of Christ.
39. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 48, a. 5, ad 3; Commentary on 2 Corinthians 1 (as in the source).
40. Matt. 24: "Lest perhaps there be not enough for us and for you."
41. St. Augustine, Quaestiones in 83, q. 59.
42. Ps. 102:10 (Vulgate): "He hath not dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities."
43. Council of Trent, Session 14, ch. 8.
44. Esth. 6:9.
45. Origen, Homilies on Numbers, hom. 24.
46. Exod. 14:31: "And they believed in the Lord, and in Moses his servant."; Philem. 5.
47. St. Jerome, Commentary on Philemon, ad loc.
48. Judg. 7:20: "The sword of the Lord, and of Gedeon."
49. Jn. 20:21.
50. 4 Kgs (2 Kgs) 19:34.

51. Clement VI, Extravagant Unigenitus, on the inexhaustibility of the treasury.
52. Wis. 11:20.
53. 1 Tim. 2:5.
54. Dan. 4:24 (Vulg. 4:27): "Redeem thy sins with alms."
55. Gal. 6:14.
56. Cajetan, on St. Thomas, Summa theologiae III, q. 48, a. 5, ad 3.
57. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 5 on Matthew.
58. 1 Cor. 3:9.
59. Clement VI, Extravagant Unigenitus: on the sufficiency of even a small drop of Christ's Blood and the infinity of the treasury.
60. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae*, Supplement, q. 26, throughout.
61. Alexander III, letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Decretals: "Extra, De Poenitentiis et Remissionibus, cap. Quod autem." Cf. Matt. 16 (keys and the power to bind and loose).
62. Cf. Jn. 20; Council of Trent, Session 6, ch. 14; Session 14, ch. 1, can. 3.
63. St. Thomas, "in hanc Dist. (q. 1, a. 4)" [abbreviation as in source].
64. Decretals, Title "De Poenitentiis et Remissionibus."
65. Fourth Lateran Council (1215), can. 26, under Innocent III.
66. Fourth Lateran Council, "Extra, De Excessibus Praelatorum, cap. Accedentibus."
67. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplement, q. 26 [ubi sup.].
68. Theophylact, on 2 Corinthians 2 [abbreviation as in source].
69. Thomas of Walden (Thomas Waldensis), De Sacramentalibus, Tome 3, Title 10.
70. St. Augustine, against the Donatists [abbreviation as in source].
71. Cajetan, Tract. 15, De Indulgentiis, ch. 5.
72. Bull of Martin V; and other papal decrees and diplomas [abbreviation as in source].
73. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplement, q. 27, throughout.
74. Honorius III, Decretals, Extra, De poenitentiis et remissionibus, cap. Nostro; Decretals, Extra, De officio iudicis ordinarii, cap. Pastoralis.
75. See above, Distinctio 15, on satisfaction.
76. Leo X, a decretal letter to Cardinal Cajetan, written against the then-emerging heresy of Luther.
77. St. Cyprian, Epistles; Council of Nicaea I; Council of Ancyra; Council of Carthage IV.
78. Cajetan, Tract. 10, De Suscipientibus indulgentias; cf. also William of Auxerre (Altissiodorensis) and Peter of Palude (Paludanus); On Cajetan's proofs, see the same work [abbreviation as in source].
79. St. Cyprian, Ep. 16, ad Confessores; St. Cyprian, Ep. 14; St. Cyprian, Ep. 18; and Sermon De lapsis; St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 5 in Matthew; and Hom. 4 on 2 Corinthians [abbreviation as in source].
80. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 26, a. 3.
81. Tertullian and St. Cyprian, passim on the libelli of the Martyrs.
82. St. Cyprian, Ep. 19 (book 3); likewise Ep. 18.
83. St. Thomas, on this Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
84. Cajetan, on indulgences [abbreviation as in source].
85. St. Cyprian, Ep. 15 (book 3); Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council; Clement VI, Extravagante on the Jubilee.

86. St. Thomas, Supplement to the Summa theologiae, q. 25, a. 2.
87. St. Thomas, In IV Sent., on this Distinction [abbreviation as in source].
88. St. Thomas, Opusc. 7, De Oratione Dominica, petition 5.
89. Boniface VIII, Extravagante on the Jubilee.
90. St. Bonaventure, cited on indulgences [abbreviation as in source].
91. Cajetan, on indulgences, admonition regarding presumed reasonableness [abbreviation as in source].
92. S. Thom. supp. quest. 27. 71. art. 10 [abbreviation as in source].
93. Leo X, decretal letter to Cajetan, distinguishing the two modes of granting indulgences.
94. Sixtus IV, constitution on indulgences for the dead; Innocent VIII and subsequent Pontiffs granting indulgences for the dead; references as in the sources.
95. Cajetan, Tractatus 16, quaestio 5.
96. Leo X, in the aforesaid decretal, on the power of the keys and indulgences for the living and for those in Purgatory.
97. St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. 45, q. 2.
98. St. Augustine, Enchiridion 110; idem, De cura pro mortuis gerenda, chs. 1 and 4.
99. Jean Gerson, Opusculum De indulgentiis, Consideratio 2.
100. Boniface VIII, Extravagans on indulgences [abbreviation as in source].
101. St. Thomas, Supplementum, q. 69 and 71 [abbreviation as in source].
102. St. Augustine, De cura pro mortuis gerenda I, ch. 1.
103. St. Augustine, Contra epistolam Fundamenti, ch. 5.

DISTINCTIO XXI — ON PURGATORY AND SUFFRAGES FOR THE DEAD (*DE PURGATORIO ET SUFFRAGIIS PRO DEFUNCTIS*)

§ 1. To this book, which with veneration through so many ages and in the Church has been read, at least historical faith (*fides historica*) is to be granted, of the sort that is even granted to pagan writers, because assuredly the matter as it was done is believed to have been written by him, especially since he wrote those things which had happened not so very long before. Granted this, what is narrated by that historian will be true, namely that Judas, who was not only leader but also high priest of that people, after making a collection sent silver to Jerusalem, which was to be spent for sacrifices for the sins of the dead.¹ Whence it follows that not only the priests and the faithful people of that time believed this, that after this life the souls of certain persons are in pains from which they can be freed by the piety of the living, but also that the public rite of sacrifices which were offered for those souls confirmed that persuasion of the faithful. Nor does it stand in the way that nothing of this sort of sacrifices is read as prescribed in the Mosaic law. For they are included under those which are ordered to be offered for sins, not of those present only, but also of those absent, as on the day of expiation for the sins of the whole people. And since from that people there did not perish those who, although liable to certain sins, nevertheless had received sleep with piety, they ought not to be excluded from the general sacrifices which were offered for expiating the whole people, and this the faithful themselves who were spiritual in that people understood in some manner and at least implicitly, nor is there any reason to doubt it. For also works of the same kind are read of the holy Patriarchs and Prophets as done for the dead, of which sort are fasting and alms. Concerning mourning we have Gen. 37 and elsewhere; concerning fasting, 1 Kgs, the last chapter, and 2 Kgs 1. For those holy men would proclaim for themselves mourning and fasting for the dead, not after the fashion of the Gentiles who have no hope, or of those who mourn only with human affection and, from grief true or feigned, do not wish to take food; but with a certain religious observance, so that for the dead they might obtain rest both by prayers and by the affliction of fasting, as Bede interprets the deed of the men of Jabesh-Gilead at 1 Kgs, the last chapter.² As for alms, the place is Tobit 4, where the father Tobias among other precepts of piety commands his son, saying: "Panem tuum et vinum super sepulcrum iusti constitue, et noli ex eo manducare et bibere cum peccatoribus." The sense of this sentence can very suitably be rendered thus: If you wish to do a kindness to a just dead man and to profit him already dead, do not act after the manner of sinners, that is, of the Gentiles, of whom Tertullian makes mention at the beginning of the book On the Resurrection of the Flesh, and Augustine in a certain sermon on the Chair of Peter which is the fifth On the Saints: set not a feast for yourself upon the sepulcher, as though comfort should thence accrue to the dead, as the Gentiles foolishly thought, but break your bread and pour out your wine by giving largess to the poor. For this alms done for the dead man can bring him great relief.³ Moreover, Ecclesiasticus too, who lived about the times of the Maccabees, when he said in chapter 7, "Et mortuo non prohibeas gratiam," seems able to be referred to the like sort of help to be afforded the dead, namely that grace

is to be shown to the dead by joining it with alms to the poor, just as Tobias, after the precept concerning alms, adds that about setting bread and wine over the sepulture of the just. These very things are confirmed from this, that the Jews even to the present day pray diligently for their dead out of the tradition of their elders, who, among other proofs to establish this custom of theirs, adduce the example of the patriarch Joseph, who made funeral rites for his father Jacob in the land of Canaan (Genesis, last chapter). And although these things which we have said pertain directly only so far as to show that among the faithful who preceded Christ suffrages (*suffragia*) for the dead were always in some use, nevertheless from this Purgatory itself (*purgatorium*) is consequently constructed: because vainly, nay, in unbelief and superstition, would they do those things, if the dead were not in some intermediate state of miseries, from which by those things they were to be freed. Recognizing this most certain connection, the heretics assail both with equal zeal.

§ 2. But more directly for the proving of Purgatory avails that in the Scripture of the New Testament the Lord says of a certain sin that whoever commits it "non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro" (Matt. 12). For, he says, it would not be said truly of some men, says Augustine, in book 21 On the City of God, chapter 24, "quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro," unless there were those to whom, although not in this, nevertheless it will be remitted in the future.⁴ In like manner he reasons in book 6 Against Julian, chapter 5. And before him Ambrose, On Elias and Fasting, chapter 20. After both, Isidore, book 1 On the Ecclesiastical Offices, chapter 18, clearly affirming in these words that by those words of the Lord is demonstrated that for certain persons in the future age sins are to be forgiven and to be purged in a certain purgatorial fire. Furthermore, the same is gathered from that place by Gregory, book 4 of the Dialogues, chapter 39; Bede, commenting on Mark 3, where he recites the very words of Gregory; Fulgentius, book 1 On the Remission of Sins, chapter 24; Philip the Presbyter, book 1 On Job 12; and after all of them Bernard, Sermon 66 on the Canticles, where he argues against the novice heretics who assail the faith of the Church with these words: "Nam si non credunt ignem Purgatorii restare post mortem, quaerant ab eo qui dixit quoddam peccatum esse quod neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro remittitur. Cur non dixerat, si nulla esset in futuro remissio purgationis peccati?" Likewise a certain Peter the Venerable, contemporary of Bernard, disputing against the errors of a certain heretic, employs precisely the same collection.⁵ But against this sense the Adversaries object that the Lord in Matthew, by a certain hyperbole, wished to signify only what he said simply in Luke 12: "Non remittetur," and in Mark 3, "non habet remissionem in aeternum, sed reus erit aeterni delicti." To which it is answered: The Lord wished indeed thus to exaggerate the greatness of the offense with those words which are in Matthew; yet, to achieve that, he did not use inept speech—such as assuredly it would be, if he had employed a partition one of whose members did not subsist but were merely fictitious; as if someone should say that the phoenix-bird is not to be found "neque in terra neque in caelo," whereas in heaven properly so called there are no birds. Rather, on the contrary, just as from that distribution which the Lord makes one rightly gathers that there is some future age, so no less rightly it is left to be gathered that there is the remission of certain sins in that age; just as also from the former member it is most rightly gathered—namely, from this—that it is a consequence that certain sins are remitted in this age. Gregory weighs more precisely the force of the argument in the place cited above, while he confirms his inference by this reason: that what is denied universally of one, the consequent understanding makes clear is granted of some.⁶ And this matter can be explained by similar Scriptures, such as these: "Non declinabitis neque ad dexteram neque ad sinistram," Deut. 5 and elsewhere; and "Et non respondit ei neque per somnia neque per sacerdotes, neque per Prophetas," 1 Kgs 28. For in these partitions each member subsists, as is evident.

§ 3. Another passage of Scripture for proving the purgation of souls after this life lies with the Apostle in 1 Cor. 3, where, when he had said that Christ is the foundation, he subjoined: "Si quis autem aedificat super fundamentum hoc, aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, ligna, fenum, stipulam, uniuscujusque opus manifestum erit: Dies enim Domini declarabit, quia in igne revelabitur: uniuscujusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit. Si cujus opus manserit quod supraedificavit, mercedem accipiet; si cujus opus arserit, detrimentum patietur; ipse autem salvus erit: sic tamen quasi per ignem." Of this place three expositions are found among the Ancients. The first is Chrysostom's and common among the Greeks at least later on, as is clear from the acts of the Council of Florence: namely, that by gold, silver, and precious stones are understood good works which merit eternal life; but by wood and hay and stubble, evil works which merit eternal death; and that those who build these upon the foundation will be saved "per ignem," that is, so to be tormented by the fire of Gehenna that they are never consumed. Chrysostom indeed uses this exposition against Christians living criminally, who hoped for salvation from faith in Christ alone; but in truth he does not seem to have attained the Apostle's mind: both because "to be saved" is nowhere in Scripture thus taken, nay rather in this very chapter the Apostle speaks in a wholly contrary way of those to be damned, when he says, "Disperdet illum Deus"; and because, according to that sense, it ought not to have been said "per ignem" but "in igne." For properly "through fire" that is saved which is purged for a time by fire, in order that from there it may come forth safe. And because when they commit great crimes, although they retain faith, nevertheless they are not to be said to have Christ as foundation, since they prefer something else to Christ, and therefore do not build upon the rock which is Christ (Matt. 7) and Augustine (Enchir. 68).⁷ The second exposition is Augustine's, book 21 On the City of God, chapter 26; on Psalm 29; Enchiridion 68; Questions 1 to Dulcitius; and the book On Faith and Works, chapter 16, and likewise Gregory, book 4 of the Dialogues, chapter 39; by "the day of the Lord" understanding a day such as is in this age, to wit that by temporal afflictions the faithful are proved, both those who follow Christ perfectly and those who follow imperfectly. But neither does this sense sufficiently fit. First, because by "the day of the Lord," and "the day of Christ," and "that day," Paul elsewhere always understands the time of judgment and of retribution after this life. Then because he says that by this proving of fire the work of each is to be made manifest, which nevertheless is not always in this life through tribulations; but rather, during this age, that holds true which Ecclesiastes says, chapter 9: "Omnia in futurum servantur incerta," and that all things happen equally to the just and to the impious. Whence even the Apostle himself, in the next chapter, forbids that anyone judge before the time until the Lord come, etc. Finally, because he expressly names "mercedem" in this place—a wage which is not paid except in the future. There is, therefore, a third exposition of the same Augustine in other places, and the same of other Fathers, according to which the two former expositions are in a certain way reduced into one: namely, that the words of the Apostle are to be taken of the future age, which the commentary of Chrysostom wanted; and that by those who build upon the foundation are to be understood none other than good Christians, which the second exposition wanted; so that the sense is: In the future age and in the judgment of God, the works of those who in this life held Christ for their foundation are to be examined. And those works which shall be found good—such as are signified by gold, silver, and precious stones—will not be consumed by the fire of purgation, but will remain and abide the judgment of God, and those who have done them will receive a wage for them. But if they shall have been found evil (the foundation meanwhile remaining safe), that is, small and venial, which do not overthrow the foundation—of which sort are signified by wood, hay, stubble—he who has done them will suffer the loss of those works. He himself, however, will be saved as "through fire," a certain fire of purgation and of divine punishment, whereby, after the stains and remnants of sins have been purged away, he himself at

length may be found perfectly clean and fit for the Kingdom of God. Augustine acknowledges this sense in many places, as when writing on Psalm 6 and 37, on Psalm 80 and Sermon 3, and on Psalm 103, Sermon 25, on Psalm 118; likewise book 16 of the City of God, chapter 24, and book 20, chapters 25 and 26, and again Homily 16 among the Sermons, Sermon 41 On the Saints, which is Sermon 4 On the Commemoration of Souls, and under the title The True and the False Penance, chapter 18; likewise in the Enchiridion, chapter 69—although a little before he had rendered another sense.⁸ Other Fathers agree, such as Origen (Homily 6 on Exodus, Homily 8 on Leviticus, Homily 12 on Jeremiah, and on Psalm 36), Lactantius, book 7 of the Divine Institutes, chapter 21, Basil (On the Holy Spirit, chapter 15, and on Is. 4 and 9), Hilary (on Matt. 3), Ambrose (Sermon 3 and 20 on Psalm 118), Jerome (on Matt. 3 and book 2 Against Jovinian), Gregory (on Psalm 1 and 3 penitential, and book 4 of the Dialogues, chapter 39), where he so subjoins this sense to the former that he seems to prefer it; and after them Alcuin, book 3 On the Trinity, chapter 21, affirming that it is not to be doubted that Paul spoke those words about the purgatorial fire. Finally, in the Council of Florence, the Latin Fathers—although the Greeks dissented, only as to the interpretation of this place—declared that they receive and approve this sense.⁹ Besides, there can be referred here those Scriptures which promise mercy from God to certain of the faithful on the day of judgment, of which sort are these, 2 Tim. 1: "Det illi Dominus invenire misericordiam in illa die"; and Jas. 2: "Judicium sine misericordia illi qui non fecit misericordiam"; and Matt. 5: "Beati misericordes, quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur"; and Lk. 16: "Ut cum defeceritis, recipiant vos in aeterna tabernacula"; and 2 Macc. 7: "Ut in illa miseratione cum fratribus suis te recipiat." For although these Scriptures make no mention of either fire or affliction, nevertheless, where mercy is promised, there consequently also misery is signified. Something of the same seems to be signified too by that reasoning of the thief: "Memento mei cum veneris in Regnum tuum." Whence Augustine, Sermon 144 On Time, chapter 6, speaks thus of the thief: "He himself, attending to his merits, did not say: 'Memento mei, ut liberes me hodie,' but, 'cum veneris in Regnum tuum tunc memor mei esto. Si mihi tormenta debentur, debentur, vel quousque veneris in Regnum tuum,' etc."¹⁰

§ 4. To this there must further altogether be referred that of the Apostle, Heb. 10: "Voluntarie peccantibus non relinquitur pro peccatis hostia; terribilis autem quaedam expectatio iudicii et ignis aemulatio quae consumptura est adversarios." For by these words there seems to be signified how great a punishment remains for those who, after Baptism, have fallen into grave sins, even if they repent; because by penance not every penalty is at once taken away as by Baptism. And since so grave a penalty is not of this age, it is clear that it must be paid in the other age—unless anyone, by voluntary satisfaction, should forestall the divine vengeance—which pertains properly also to what follows: "Horrendum est incidere in manus Dei viventis." Moreover, there are added, to the proof of our subject, Scriptures which signify that Christ, descending to the lower regions, freed certain persons from pains or torments, such as Zech. 9, Acts 2, 1 Pet. 3 and 4. For the holy Patriarchs and Prophets, placed in the lower regions, were not in torments, but were resting in Abraham's bosom. Wherefore, if Christ's descent also brought remitting of penalties to certain persons, this can be taken only of those who were being tormented in Purgatory. This benefit of Christ's descent many of the Fathers acknowledge in many places, such as Epiphanius, Heresy 46; Jerome on Zech. 9 and Dan. 3; Eusebius Emisenus, Homily 1 On Easter; Ambrose, book On the Mystery of Easter, chapter 4; Augustine, book 12 On Genesis to the Letter, chapter 33—though here in the meantime we omit that certain Scholastics not improbably assert that Christ, descending to the lower regions, so that he might pour out the fullness of his power upon his elect established there, granted a plenary indulgence to all who were in Purgatory; which,

assuredly, these words of Gregory about Christ seem to signify quite plainly (Homily 22 on the Gospel): "Omnia traxit qui de electis suis apud inferos nullum reliquit."¹¹

§ 5. There are, besides the aforesaid, also other Scriptures which Catholics sometimes use on behalf of the cause of Purgatory, but from which a proof is not drawn with equal certainty, because they also admit of another sense either equally probable or even more probable; such as that of Matt. 5 and Lk. 12: "Non exies inde, donec etiam novissimum quadrantem reddas," although Cyprian referred it to the penalty of Purgatory, book 4, Epistle 2 to Antonianus, Eusebius Emissenus, Epiphanius, and Ambrose on Luke; such also Phil. 2: "In nomine Jesu flectatur omne genu caelestium, terrestrium et infernorum." For this place can rightly be taken of the damned in the lower regions, just as the other similar one, Rom. 14, which Chrysostom understands and interprets (Homily 37 on Matthew). Likewise that of Mal. 3: "Sede bit enim quasi ignis conflans, purgabit filios Levi." From which it appears more clearly, says Augustine, book 20 On the City of God, chapter 25, that in that judgment there will be certain purgatorial penalties of certain persons, where he also adds a like place from Is. 4. Finally, from the things said above it is quite manifest with what reason this assertion of Luther was condemned by Leo X: that "Purgatorium non posse probari ex Scriptura sacra, quae sit in canone."¹²

§ II — Proof of the same from the Fathers (Ejusdem probatio ex Patribus)

§ 6. Next after the Scriptures, it is closest that Purgatory (*Purgatorium*) of souls after this life be proved from the consensus of the Greek and Latin Fathers and, indeed, from the perpetual tradition of the Church itself. In which proof we again admonish that those testimonies which speak of prayers and oblations and other suffrages of the living for those who have died, although not directly, yet consequently and certainly, establish that state and place of souls which we call Purgatory. Therefore, first, there is manifest the passage in Dionysius the Areopagite (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, the last chapter), where he writes that the priest, by prayers, entreats from the divine benignity that, for those who have departed from life, He may remit all the sins which by human frailty they have committed, and that He may lead them into light and the region of the living, into the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, into the place whence sorrow, sadness, and groaning flee.

¹³ And below he testifies that he received as handed down from his divine teachers, that is, the Apostles, what he commits to writing about the prayer which the high priest uses for the dead. From which it is evident to be an apostolic tradition that the souls of certain of the faithful are detained after death, on account of past sins, in a place where there is sorrow, sadness, and groaning, where there is darkness and the region of the shadow of death—which the Church to this very day professes in the Sacred Office for the Dead.

§ 7. Likewise, there is a passage in Clement of Rome, book 8 of the Apostolic Constitutions, ch. 41, where he makes mention of the prayers which, by the rite of the Church, are made for the dead.¹⁴ Tertullian, in the book On Monogamy, says that a Christian widow prays for the soul of her husband and asks refreshment for him, and offers on the annual days of his falling asleep.¹⁵ Surely, she would not ask refreshment for her husband if the souls of the departed did not suffer fire and some heat of pains. The same, in the book On the Exhortation to Chastity: "Even in the evening," he says, "pray to God for whose spirit you plead, for whom you render annual oblations," etc.¹⁶ There is another passage in him in the book On the Testimony of the Soul, and another in the book On the Soldier's Crown.¹⁷

§ 8. Cyprian, book 1, epistle 9, by plain words signifies that oblations and supplications for the dead were already of old accustomed to be made by predecessors, adding withal the authority of a council of bishops in which this very thing is presupposed.¹⁸ And book 4, epistle 2: "It is one thing," he says, "to arrive at pardon, another to come to glory; one thing to be sent into prison and not to go out thence until he pay the last farthing; another to receive straightway the reward of faith and virtue; one thing to suffer long for sins with torment; another to be amended and purged for a long time by fire; another to have purged away all sins by suffering; lastly, another to hang in the day of judgment upon the sentence of the Lord, another to be crowned straightway by the Lord." Thus he.

§ 9. Arnobius, book 4 *Against the Gentiles*, at the end, attests that peace and pardon used to be asked by Christians in their assemblies for the dead from God.¹⁹ Gregory of Nyssa, in the *Sermon on the Deceased*, says that we put aside passions and affections alien to reason, either in this life through the study of virtue, or in the other purified in the furnace of purgatorial fire; and, in the *Treatise On Infants Taken Away Prematurely*, that souls after this life receive retribution, either purged by fire or refreshed by the dew of blessing.²⁰ Ambrose, in the funeral oration for Valentinian, and in another for the emperor Theodosius, prays for rest, and admonishes that oblations together with prayers be made for them; and, in epistle 8 to Faustus, speaking to one grieving about the death of his sister: "I think she is not so much to be lamented," he says, "as to be followed with prayers; nor do I think that she is to be justified by your tears, but rather that by oblations her soul is to be commended to God."²¹ There are also other passages of his which we have cited above.

§ 10. Jerome, book 1 *Against the Pelagians*, near the end, says that it is a Catholic doctrine that "the impious and transgressors indeed perish perpetually, but that Christians, if they should be overtaken in sin, are to be saved after punishments"—a passage similar to that at the end of his book 18 of the *Commentary on Isaiah*, and in ch. 1 of *Ezekiel*.²² He also praises Pammachius, in the epistle written to him, because he watered with alms the bones of his dead wife.²³ Paulinus, in the *Epistle to Amandus*, speaking of his brother, says: "that God may refresh his soul with the drip-drops of His mercy through your prayers."²⁴ Epiphanius (*Heresy* 75) reports that Acrius is to be numbered among the heretics because he disapproved prayers and oblations for the dead; where also he distinguishes the twofold condition of the departed of whom the Church made remembrance in the solemn oblation, which is commonly called the "double Memento": for some are sinners, yet our brethren, still set in pilgrimage, for whom it begs mercy from God; but others do not need this aid, as the Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, of whom it makes commemoration for other causes.²⁵

§ 11. Chrysostom, *Homily 3 on the Epistle to the Philippians*, in a moral exhortation: "Not in vain," he says, "was it ordained by the Apostles that, in the celebration of the Venerable Mysteries, remembrance be made of those who have departed; they knew that much profit, much utility, accrues to them from this," etc.²⁶ And *Homily 32 on Matt. 9*, he would have prayer made for the dead man that he may obtain rest and find a propitious judge.²⁷ The same, *Homily 21 on Acts*, and *Homily 41 on 1 Corinthians 15*, teaches that by the prayers and alms which are made for the deceased, some solace is afforded them.²⁸ There are similar passages in book 6 *On the Priesthood*, and at the end of *Homily 84 on John*; likewise in the *Liturgy* and *Homily 79 to the People of Antioch*.²⁹

§ 12. Augustine's sentiment too is in many places most plain, some of which we have cited above; others not a few must here be added. Book 2 *Against the Manichees on Genesis*, ch. 10, he writes in this manner: "He who has tilled his field within, and, though with toil, has loaded his threshing-floor, can up to the end of this life bear the toil; but after this life it is not necessary that he suffer. But he who perhaps has not tilled his field,

and has permitted himself to be overwhelmed with thorns, has in this life the curse of his earth in all his works, and after this life he will have either the fire of purification or eternal punishment. Therefore let no one escape that sentence, but let it be arranged that they be felt only in this life."³⁰ And book 21 of the City of God, ch. 13: "But temporal pains," he says, "some suffer in this life only, others after death, others now and then, nevertheless before the most strict and last judgment." "But not all," he continues, "come into the everlasting, which after that judgment are going to be, who after death sustain a temporal one. For we have already said that to some what is not remitted in this world is remitted in the world to come, that is, lest in the world to come they be punished with eternal punishment."³¹ He repeats the same (ch. 16).

§ 13. How certain Augustine held that one should pray for the dead, other places show very plainly. For in the book *On Care for the Dead*, ch. 1, when he had cited for this matter the book of the Maccabees, he subjoined thus: "But even if it were never at all read in the old Scriptures, nevertheless the authority of the universal Church is not small which is clear in this custom; where, in the prayers of the priest which are poured forth to the Lord God at His altar, there has its place also the commending of the dead."³² Of the authority of this ecclesiastical custom he again says (in *Epistle 118 to Januarius*): "If the whole Church throughout the world keeps anything frequently, to dispute that it ought thus to be done is most insolent madness."³³ The same, *Sermon 32 On the Words of the Apostle*, about the helps of the dead, as he himself calls them, writes thus: "By the prayers of the holy Church, and by the saving Sacrifice, and by alms which are dispensed for the spirits of the dead, it is not to be doubted that the dead are aided, that with them more mercifully it may be dealt by the Lord than their sins have deserved. For this the whole Church observes as handed down by the Fathers, that for those who have departed in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, when at the very Sacrifice they are commemorated in their own place, prayer be made, and it be commemorated that it is offered also for them. But when, for the cause of commending them, works of mercy are celebrated, who can doubt that they are a suffrage for those for whom prayers are not idly offered to God? It must by no means be doubted that these things profit the dead—but such as have so lived before death that these things can be useful to them after death." Thus he.³⁴ From which it is established that this dogma was altogether undoubted for Augustine and was counted among those things which are to be held by faith—so much so that, after Epiphanius and Philastrius, he did not hesitate to number the Arianists among the heretics because they said that one ought not to pray or to offer for the dead (*Heresy 53*).³⁵

§ 14. Add to these the things that are contained in book 9 of the *Confessions*, chs. 11, 12, 13, about the prayers and oblations made for his mother, where at the end also, having read, he asks the reader to pray for both his parents; likewise *Epistle 64 to Aurelius*; the *Enchiridion*, ch. 110; book 1 *On the Soul*, ch. 9; *On Care for the Dead*, chs. 1, 4, 5, and the last; book 21 of the *City of God*, ch. 24; and in the *Life of Augustine* by Possidius, the last chapter.³⁶ And the Fourth Council of Carthage, to which Augustine subscribed (canon 79), which has this: "If penitents by chance shall have died on a journey or at sea, where it is not possible to help them, let their memory be commended by prayers and oblations."³⁷ Following Augustine was Gregory of Rome, book 4 of the *Dialogues*, chs. 39 and 40, expressly treating of the purgatorial pains of souls. He also makes mention, book 2, ch. 3, of the *Exposition on 1 Kings*.³⁸ There stands also in John Damascene (*Sermon for the Dead*) where that author devotes the whole to showing, both from Scripture and from apostolic tradition and the Fathers, that the suffrages of the living profit the dead.³⁹

§ 15. The rest taught things in accord with the doctrine of these men: as Basil, in the places cited above, and in the *Liturgy*; Eusebius of Caesarea, book 4 *On the Life of Constantine*; Athanasius, *Question 34* to the

Prince Antiochus, and in the Sermon on Those Who Have Fallen Asleep (as Damascene cites); Ephrem the deacon, in his Testament; Prudentius, in the Hamartigenia at the end; and Haymo, On the Funeral Rites of the Dead; Bede, book 4 of the Ecclesiastical History of the English, ch. 22; Boethius, book 4 of the Consolation of Philosophy, prose 4; Theodoret, on 1 Corinthians 3, in the Life of Jacob of Nisibis, and on Luke 12; Bernard, Sermon 66 on the Canticles.⁴⁰ In which place it must be noted that, although prayers for the dead had already long ago been attacked by the heretic Aetius, whose heresy however was immediately extinguished, nevertheless, concerning the purgatorial pains of souls, it is not read that anyone had raised a doubt before the age of Bernard: at which time, as Bernard testifies in that discourse, certain obscure men denied Purgatory.

§ 16. Now, as to the Greeks, to whom Cyril of Jerusalem ascribes this error (in the falsely titled Epistle to Augustine)—whence perhaps St. Thomas (in the Opusculum to Pope Urban, On the Errors of the Greeks) and other more recent men took the occasion to fasten this error upon the Greeks—assuredly not only the more ancient Greeks, of whom from the places cited above the sentiment is certain and clear, but even the later and schismatics are testified by the Acts of the Council of Florence, both at the beginning and in the conclusion, to have acknowledged a place of purgation of souls. For in both places the Greeks simply confess Purgatory as a thing undoubted among them, differing only from the Latins in this, that there is not true fire there but darkness, or a whirlwind, or something else (a question which the Church has not yet defined), and that they expounded the place of 1 Corinthians 3, following Chrysostom, otherwise than the Latins.⁴¹ The same is shown by the book of the Patriarch Gennadius of Constantinople, in which he proves the doctrine of Purgatory from the Scriptures and the ancient Doctors of the Eastern Church.⁴² Indeed, not even today are the Greeks, although remaining in schism, said to feel otherwise. Nay, even the Ethiopian Church, as Damian reports, acknowledges even to this day the pains of souls by which they are purged.⁴³

§ 17. Finally, this faith is so perpetual and universal that even Luther himself did not at once, at the beginning, dare to assail it as he set out to attack; for he says in article 37: "I believe that Purgatory exists, and I advise that it also be believed."⁴⁴ Yet, lest anything be lacking to the certainty of this dogma, it has been defined by the universal Church—and earlier in the Council of Florence, with the Greeks, as has been said, assenting, and later in the Council of Trent—that Purgatory exists, and that the souls detained there can be aided by the suffrages of the faithful, but most of all by the acceptable Sacrifice of the altar. The places of the Council of Trent are: Session 25, in the Decree on Purgatory; Session 6, canon 30; and Session 22, ch. 2 and canon 3.⁴⁵

§ 18. After he had interpreted the Apostle's passage, he finally subjoins: "After the death of this body the spirits of the departed are said to suffer a fire of this sort, which those do not feel who did not have such habits and loves in the life of this body as that their wood and hay and stubble be consumed; but others do feel it, who have carried with them buildings of this sort, so that there they find a burning fire of transitory tribulation: I do not refute it, because perhaps it is true. Thus he." Something similar is read in him, in the book On Faith and Works, ch. 16.⁴⁶

§ 19. Seventh: Several other statements of St. Augustine are brought forward against Purgatory, as in Epistle 80,⁴⁷ where he says that "such as each one shall be found by the day of death, such he will be judged on the last day"; and in Tractate 49 on John: "The rest, namely, which is given immediately after death, if one is worthy of it, each one receives when he dies."⁴⁸ And in Sermon 31 On the Words of the Apostle: "We are not here without sin, but we shall go forth hence without sin."⁴⁹ Likewise, in book 2 On the Merits and Remission of Sins, ch. 33, he says that sins remitted here do not harm after this life; and in the book On the

Spirit and the Letter, ch. 28, that venial sins do not hinder a just man from eternal life.⁵⁰ Then, in book 5 of the Hypognosticon, ch. 5: "The first place, he says, the faith of Catholics believes to be the kingdom of heaven; the second, Gehenna; the third we altogether ignore, indeed we do not find that it exists in the Holy Scriptures."⁵¹ And in the book On the Vanity of the World, ch. 1, thus he says: "When the soul is torn from the body, straightway either it is placed in paradise for its good merits, or certainly for its sins it is hurled down into the hellish pits."⁵²

§ 20. Eighth: Certain sentences of other Fathers are objected. For Cyprian (in the Epistle to Demetrianus) denies that there is room for satisfaction after this life; Gregory of Nazianzus (Oration 10) says that after this life there is indeed a place of punishment, but not of amendment; Cyril of Jerusalem (Catechesis 18): "For penance and remission we have an appointed time only in this life." And Chrysostom (Sermon 2 on Lazarus): "It is not in our power to wash away what has been committed after this life." To these they add Jerome and Olympiodorus writing to the same sense (on Ecclesiastes).⁵³

§ 21. Ninth, they reason thus. A paradise of the evil must not be established on account of certain good things which they have done; therefore neither must a purgatory of the good be acknowledged on account of certain evil things which they have committed. Nor is the reply of any avail if you say that those good things were put to death by sin; because although they be put to death, or even dead as regards eternal life, yet not as regards temporal retribution, since even unbelievers by morally good works merit something.

§ 22. Tenth: On the day of the final Judgment all will straightway either be received into the Kingdom or sent into the fire, notwithstanding the fact that those who shall then be found alive will not have fully satisfied in this life for sins; therefore neither now indeed, on that account, is it necessary to acknowledge Purgatory. Lastly: It is not established in what place Purgatory is; while some place it in the air, as Alcuin in book 3 On the Trinity, ch. 21, others beneath the earth, as the majority; others assign diverse places to souls to be purged, as in the Dialogues Gregory; therefore Purgatory itself is rendered uncertain.⁵⁴

§ 23. But to these objections let us answer in order. To the first, then, it is answered that there are only two ranks of men, one of those to be saved, the other of those to be damned; to the former rank beyond doubt belong those who after death are purged for a time. However, when the extremest sentence of the Judge shall be pronounced, of which in Matt. 24, all will straightway go either into the Kingdom or into Gehenna; because every purgation will precede that last sentence, as Augustine teaches in the City of God.⁵⁵

§ 24. To the second various replies can be given. Bernard (Sermon 4 On All Saints) says that by that sentence the Saints of the New Testament are distinguished from the Saints of the Old Testament, in that the former were not straightway after death followed by the reward of their works, even if they had no impediment of sin; but the latter are straightway followed by it, since Christ, death having been vanquished, opened the gates of heaven.⁵⁶ Others interpret the place of the Martyrs, who, as the Fathers teach, pass immediately from death into the Kingdom; thus Augustine explains it in book 20 of the City of God, ch. 9, although he warns that it can be referred also to all who die in the Lord.⁵⁷ Others understand it of those perfectly dying in the Lord, that is, who have departed in such faith and charity that they are free from every stain and guilt of sin. Yet nevertheless nothing forbids our taking that saying of all absolutely who die in the grace of God: how Augustine explains it in the place already mentioned. For the just die well, and from death itself are blessed—not only in that they also were such in this life, but by that very fact that they obtain certainty and security of the reward; whereas those who are still to be purged are not yet blessed. For the hopes

of the just in this life make us blessed, as the Apostle says (Rom. 8), "For we are saved by hope," and the Lord in the Gospel, "Blessed are the poor in spirit"; and much more after death can they be called blessed on account of the very security of the prize, even if for a time they are in pains. They rest indeed from their labors, with which in this life they fought against the Devil, the flesh, and the world, waging a perilous warfare—labors proper to the Saints, of which Augustine treats in book 22 of the *City of God*, ch. 23; and yet for them the Church still asks rest, until, all evil having been removed, they receive its fullness. Although they rest now from labors, nevertheless they do not rest from pains. Note that the same place in the Apocalypse strongly favors Purgatory. For it follows: "Their works follow them," which seems to be understood of retribution. Therefore also evil works are not yet remitted, and so they are still punished in the future age.⁵⁸

§ 25. To the third: Ecclesiastes names two places, the South and the North. To the North belong all the reprobate; to the South, all the elect, as Augustine teaches (Epistle 120 to Honoratus, ch. 22). But it is established that no one of the reprobate is predestinated, nor by a contrary reason can the good be reckoned among the evil; therefore there is no sound reason if we place the evil toward the South and the good toward the North. After death there can be no change among these, as Jerome and Olympiodorus wish in their commentaries on that place of Ecclesiastes. Therefore this place does nothing to the purpose against Purgatory, in which only the good are and the elect, and the same will always be such.⁵⁹

§ 26. To the fourth: The souls of the just which are purged are in the hand of God—in the safest custody with God—hence no persecution can now harm them; likewise in peace, because after completing the warfare of this life they are secure of the Kingdom; whence also they are said to sleep in the sleep of peace, as it is in the Canon of the Mass. Moreover they are in refreshment, because they no longer suffer the heat of the temptations of this age. And yet in the said Canon there is still asked for them a place of rest, refreshment, and peace, in order that, the burning of the pains by which they are detained having been quenched, they may obtain perfect peace with God, since that petition proceeds from God Himself.⁶⁰

§ 27. To the fifth: Judgment in that place is understood of eternal damnation, as is clear a little later when it is said: "And those who have done good shall go forth to the resurrection of life; but those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment." In consideration of this same judgment the Apostle also took it in 1 Corinthians 11, when he says: "He that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself." And again: "That you may not be condemned with the world."⁶¹

§ 28. To the sixth: In those places Augustine does not doubt whether there is a Purgatory of souls after this life—for in very many other places, which we cited above, he asserts it without doubting, and he does not permit the custom of the universal Church of praying for the dead to be called into doubt—but he doubts whether, as in this age many are purged by the fire of tribulation from the love of secular things and vicious affections—while namely that very tribulation burns them with a certain sorrow at the loss of the goods of this life—so also it happens in the future age: that is, whether in some of the departed in Christ there still cling vicious affections and a certain love of secular things, from which they ought to be repurged by the burning or affliction of fire, as many think, as we signified above in the third reason. Nor is it a wonder that Augustine doubted about this matter, since even to this day the question has not been determined, and on either side grave reasons are brought by the Scholastics.⁶²

§ 29. Those that are adduced seventh from various places of Augustine, if well understood, have no difficulty. For the first place wishes that such as one dies, such he is to be judged on the last day, as regards

eternal life or death, and his sure degree thereof; for these, once merit and demerit have ceased, after death can at no time be changed. The second inserts a condition, "if he is worthy"; in which is contained also this, "if he is worthy to receive it straightway." For those who are purged, although they are worthy of that rest, are not worthy to receive it immediately. And indeed in the same Tractate Augustine, with the comparison of the diverse custodial keepings by which the accused are wont to be held to be produced for judgment, sufficiently intimates that besides the two receptacles of eternal life and death there is another temporary place, to which some are received to be treated, as he says, with a humane and gentle office. The third place either signifies what in some happens, or is to be understood of the act of sin. For in Purgatory souls do not sin. The fourth is understood of sins here wholly and fully remitted, which do not hurt after this life because they do not damn. The fifth denies that venial sins hinder, that is, simply exclude, a man from eternal life, in the manner in which the sword that turned every way hindered entrance to paradise. The last two places are not from Augustine's books, although the statements are true if rightly understood. For the former denies a third perpetual place, of the sort the Pelagians attributed to infants not baptized, saying that they would indeed have eternal life, but outside the Kingdom of God. The latter is to be understood with the condition a little above expressed from Augustine.⁶³

§ 30. To the eighth argument: All those sentences of the Fathers, since they speak of penance and amendment, whereby one is converted to God and from evil becomes good—which therefore has no place in the future age, because "wherever the tree shall fall, there shall it be"—are likewise to be taken of satisfaction and remission whereby the guilt of eternal punishment is blotted out. For unless that guilt has been taken away from the sinner in this age, it must needs be that it remain eternal in the future.

§ 31. To the ninth some reply that the case is not similar, because evil arises from individual defects, but good consists in a complete cause; and so it can happen that a single crime, in which one departs, straightway damns, whereas justice—unless it be entire, excluding every act and guilt of sin—does not at once save. But because thus the reason is not yet rendered why works which, even in unbelievers, are wont to be remunerated by God with a temporal reward should, if he dies who does them beforehand, be frustrated of reward, a fuller reply seems to be required: that God owes absolutely nothing to man for good works of this sort; because although He often remunerates them in this age, nevertheless by no perpetual law has He assigned some reward for them, as He has eternal life for the works of the just. Nay rather, because all goods are from God, it happens that God, on account of the goods which He bestows on men, does not become a debtor to men, but rather they to God—unless Himself He constitute Himself a debtor by promise or covenant, of which in the case proposed none intervened.

§ 32. To the tenth: Therefore after the extremest sentence of the Judge no purgation will be made, because, as we have already said, every purgation will precede that sentence, even of those who will be found alive at the coming of Christ. For the purgation of these will be effected either in the soul alone as of the rest, or in the body together with the soul by the fire of the conflagration; but in such wise that what will be lacking to the length of time will be compensated by the weight of severity, or certainly will mercifully be forgiven through the interceding of the saints.

§ 33. The last argument is plainly fallacious. For not because the place of a thing is unknown is it therefore necessary that the thing itself, whether it exists, be unknown. For that Paradise existed we have certain from the Scriptures, yet where it is, or was, is not yet plainly ascertained. So the final judgment will without doubt be, although we know for certain neither its time at all nor its place. Thus Paul was certain that he had been

caught up into the third heaven, yet doubtful whether in the body or outside the body. Nay, not even about hell are we as certain where it is as that it is, as is clear from Augustine, book 2 of the *Retractations*, ch. 34. Meanwhile, however, as common, so very probable is the opinion of the Doctors, and one not to be resisted rashly, that the place of Purgatory is in the bowels of the earth, yet far from the very gates of Gehenna—separated not so much by distance of place (about which we can divine nothing) as by the immutable decree of God. For about the Limbo of the Fathers, which without doubt was a happier place, it is not doubted that one must believe the same according to the Scriptures. Thus about the place of Purgatory, after Gregory, book 4 of the *Dialogues*, ch. 42, all the Scholastics think.⁶⁴

§ IV — Of what sort is the punishment of souls in Purgatory (Cujusmodi sit poena animarum in Purgatorio)

§ 34. About the punishment (*poena*) of souls which are purged, three questions occur to be briefly dispatched: first, about the instrument or mode of that punishment; second, about its severity; third, about its length.

§ 35. About the first there was a certain controversy between the Latins and the Greeks who had come to the Council of Florence. For the Latins professed that that purgation is effected by fire, which they call purgatorial, producing for this the Apostle's words 1 Corinthians 3: "The fire will test of what sort each one's work is," and below: "He himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." But the Greeks, drawing the Apostle's words elsewhere from Chrysostom's interpretation, thought that Purgatory was not fire but a certain dark place and full of labors, although toward the end of the Synod, the question having been renewed, they were unwilling to contend about this.⁶⁶

§ 36. For thus there about Purgatory they speak: "Which indeed, whether it be fire, or darkness, or a certain whirlwind, or something else of that sort, little matters to refer." Whence in the very decree of the Council it is only said that the souls of those who have died in the charity of God before adequate satisfaction has been made are purged after death by purgatorial pains.⁶⁷ And although neither in the Council of Florence nor of Trent was it defined that it is fire, yet constant is the sentence of the Latins that Purgatory is fire, although there also is darkness and a certain restlessness or disquiet. Hence it is that the Church prays for the faithful departed that God would deign to assign to them not only a place of refreshment against the burning of fire, but also of light and peace against obscurity and turmoil. And in a certain prayer, again conjoining these, she prays God to give to them "a dwelling of light, the happiness of quiet, the brightness of blessedness." And often elsewhere in the prayers of the Church which are made for the departed we hear "rest" and "light."⁶⁸

§ 37. Moreover, besides the place 1 Corinthians 3, which we have above shown most probably to be interpreted of the purgation of souls after death, those things also which are had in Hebrews 10 not obscurely confirm this opinion. For there is named "a certain dreadful expectation of judgment and a jealousy of fire which is to devour the adversaries" (for thus the Greeks have it), that is, a torment similar and similarly excruciating with infernal fire. Whence is subjoined straightway: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."⁶⁹

§ 38. And indeed it must be noted that although the word "fire" in the Sacred Letters often generally signifies any affliction, as in that place: "We have passed through fire and water," nevertheless a trope is not to

be assumed without necessity. Wherefore just as from the fact that it is said (Matt. 25), "Go into the eternal fire," and in similar places, the Church holds that in hell there is true and bodily fire, although of its nature and condition we do not thence gather; so from the fact that the Apostle calls that by which the souls of the departed are purged "fire," the Fathers rightly gather that in Purgatory there is true fire.⁷⁰

§ 39. Which opinion you may recognize in all or almost all the places alleged above, where they refer the Apostle's words 1 Corinthians 3 to the purgation of souls. Thus also elsewhere Augustine speaks; and after him Gregory, as if writing commentaries on Psalms 6 and 37; and again Augustine expressly in Homily 16 among fifty; and expressly Gregory, book 4 of the Dialogues, ch. 39; likewise Alcuin, book 3 On the Trinity, ch. 21; and among the Greeks, Damascene in the book On Those Resting in Christ and elsewhere.⁷¹

§ 40. But how that fire acts upon souls is uncertain, and is discussed with perplexity among the Scholastics; yet that it can be so (although the mode of fire lies hidden) is not to be doubted, by the power of God. About which matter thus Augustine, book 21 of the City of God, ch. 10: "Why should we not say that, although in ways unknown, yet true, incorporeal spirits can be affected by corporeal punishments of spiritual fire, if the spirits of men could be enclosed in bodily members?" and so on. About the same thing Gregory treats at length, book 4 of the Dialogues, chs. 28–29, and book 15 of the Morals, ch. 14. Although those authors treat of the Tartaric fire, nevertheless their discussion can not unfitly be applied also to purgatorial fire.⁷²

§ 41. Now as to the gravity of that punishment, which was being asked in the second place, there stands a weighty sentence of St. Augustine, writing on Psalm 37, where he says: "For it is said, 'He himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' And because it is said, 'he shall be saved,' that fire is despised. Yet plainly, although they be saved through fire, that fire will nevertheless be more grievous than whatever a man can suffer in this life. And we know how many evils the wicked have suffered here and can suffer," and so forth.⁷³ A similar sentence occurs in the Sermon 41 On the Saints, although not without reason men doubt whether it is Augustine's.⁷⁴ The author also of the book On True and False Penance, ch. 18, asserts the same.⁷⁵ And Gregory likewise, writing on the third penitential Psalm, says: "That transitory fire I judge to be more intolerable than every tribulation in the present life."⁷⁶ On account of these and similar sentences of the Fathers, St. Thomas thinks that the least punishment of Purgatory (*pæna Purgatorii*) is more grievous than the greatest punishment of this life;⁷⁷ this, however, other men, among whom St. Bonaventure, think otherwise with those sentences thus baldly put, namely, that indeed the greatest punishment of Purgatory is more grievous than the greatest of this life, but that the same judgment is not to be made of whatever lesser punishment of Purgatory. Which question we leave undecided, only adding this reminder: that unless that punishment were very grave and exceedingly bitter, the Church would not so earnestly exhort her children to works of satisfaction (*opera satisfactionis*) in this life, nor, moreover, would she with so great zeal commend both the use of indulgences (*indulgentiae*), through which those punishments are relaxed, and prayers and other suffrages to be made for the departed.

§ 42. But the reason for this gravity is evident, because the future age is an age of judgment, of retribution, and of vengeance for evils committed, whereas the present age is of mercy and remission. Hence David, as St. Augustine and St. Gregory interpret (on Psalms 6 and 37), calls the punishment indeed of the present age "wrath," but of the future age "fury."⁷⁸ Hence it pertains to the singular clemency of God that He has given to men the ability to escape the temporal punishments of the most bitter future age by the satisfaction of this life, which is only a satisfaction for punishment (*satisfactio pro pæna*), and therefore, by God's ordinance, is far

milder, whereas that of the future age is satisfaction in punishment (*satisfactio in pœnam*), which God exacts from those who have not judged themselves in this age, according to the Apostle: "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world."⁷⁹

§ 43. Now what we have said about the gravity of that punishment is to be referred not only to the affliction of the fire (*afflictio ignis*), but also to the pain of loss (*pœna damni*), as St. Thomas and Richard teach in this very place—although St. Bonaventure dissents, whose reasons may be seen in those authors themselves.⁸⁰

§ 44. Concerning the third question, Dominic Soto opines that no one is ever detained in Purgatory beyond twenty years, indeed not even beyond ten years; because, he says, the clemency of God does not suffer His friends to be for a long time deprived of His sight, and therefore His providence has inflicted upon them those punishments by which they could be cleansed in a short time; especially since their contrition, and the sacraments of Christ, the suffrages of the devout, and their own good works which they did here, contribute to the heap of satisfaction. Nor does he think it credible that those whom He can more quickly deliver thence by an accumulation of punishments He should detain by a prolongation of time.⁸¹ But by this same reasoning it would be shown that not even ten days would anyone spend in those punishments, since it is certain that God, by an accumulation or intensifying of punishments, can shorten even this time also, so that what is lacking to length may be compensated by the sharpness of torments. But to God, who disposes all things in number, weight, and measure, it has seemed good, according to the counsel of His providence, to intensify or relax those purgatorial punishments to a fixed measure, and likewise to extend or to contract them to a fixed time. Nor does it stand in the way that those who are purged are friends of God, since in that place the judgment of God is exercised. "For it is time," says Peter, "that judgment begin at the house of God. And if first at us, what shall be the end of them who believe not the Gospel of God? And if the just man shall scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"⁸² Which words, although they seem to have been said of the judgment which God exercises in this age, have more fitting place assuredly in the other age, which is the time of retribution.

§ 45. Nor ought it to seem a wonder that the friends of God are for a longer time kept from His sight, since the just men of the Old Testament even after full purification were not admitted to the sight of God before Christ by His death had opened the heavens; and even now Enoch and Elias, friends of God most high, after so many ages do not yet see God in His essence.

§ 46. Therefore it is much more credible that often the time of purgation is of many more years than Dominic suspected. This can be proved from the place 1 Peter 3 and 4, where it is said that Christ, to those who were in prison and had been sometime unbelievers—namely, in the days of Noah—came and preached, and "to the dead also the Gospel was preached." What was said of the prison of Purgatory some Catholics show as very probable, in which, to wit, they were detained until the descent of Christ, who had not yielded to the preaching of repentance until they were overwhelmed by the waters of the flood. But the time from then until Christ is well-nigh two thousand years.⁸³

§ 47. Secondly, it is proved from the institution of anniversaries for the departed, which were already in use in Tertullian's time. For it were in vain that anniversaries should be extended into so many years, as we see it is the custom of the Church to be done, if no one were purged beyond ten years.⁸⁴

§ 48. Thirdly, Augustine, Confessions IX, ch. 13, prays to God for his mother Monica, who had died thirty years before or more, although she had lived most holily—though in confidence that she had no need of that prayer, not so much on account of the long passage of time as because of the holiness of her life. Nay rather he begs the readers that they remember at the altar of God his parents both.⁸⁵

§ 49. Fourthly, the same Augustine, On the Eighty-three Questions on the Gospels II, q. 38, doubts whether that reception which is spoken of in Luke, "that when you shall fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations," takes place immediately after this life, or rather at the end of the age, in the resurrection of the dead, at the ultimate retribution of judgment.⁸⁶ And elsewhere he signifies that some will only then, on the Day, receive full remission of sins: as in City of God XX, ch. 25, and again in the same work, XX, ch. 6 and XXI, ch. 24.⁸⁷ The same is held by Honorius in the book On the Soul, ch. 17: "The soul," he says, "is kept in hidden receptacles until the last resurrection."⁸⁸ Finally, since penitence in this life, according to the canons, for some grave crime sometimes lasts ten years, indeed must be performed for the whole life, although such a penitent be a partaker of the sacraments and do many good works and be helped by the suffrages of others, it is not credible that the punishment of the future age corresponding to that penitence should be shorter; but rather, just as it is much more bitter, so also much more prolonged, since, as we said, the future age is the time of just retribution.

§ VI — *Whether the souls in Purgatory are certain of their salvation* ***(Animae in Purgatorio certae esse de salute sua)***

§ 50. As to the question whether the souls are in the purgatorial punishments certain and secure concerning their salvation, opinions and even errors of some have arisen. For some have thought them so engulfed by pains that they do not understand what is happening, but think themselves added to eternal damnation. Others, on account of the suspension of the sentence, have judged them to be left in uncertainty until satisfaction has been perfected. Luther in this age broached a similar thing in article 38, denying that they are secure of their salvation, for the reason that they have imperfect charity, and therefore have fear conjoined with it; but where fear is, perfect security (*securitas*) cannot be. They use arguments which are for the most part of this sort.

§ 51. First: the Church prays that light may shine upon those souls; therefore they are still in the darkness of ignorance, so as not to know what is to befall them. And they refer also to that saying of Ecclesiastes: "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know nothing more"; and below: "There is no work, nor reason, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in hell whither thou dost hasten." Second: the security or certainty (*certitudo*) of salvation is a great part of beatitude, just as the contrary certainty of damnation is a great part of Gehenna. But those souls have as yet attained no part of happiness, which is bestowed upon them only after the end, that is, after their purgation. Third: if they were secure of salvation, the sentence of the Judge would not be the most grievous punishment of Purgatory, since the certainty of salvation would bring them great consolation and joy. Fourth: the prayers which the Church pours forth for the dead seem to signify that the sentence is being suspended until the day of the last judgment. For thus in them, in the person of the deceased, it is read: "When Thou shalt come to judge the world, do not condemn me." Likewise: "Have mercy on me when Thou shalt come on the last day"; and, "Do not remember my sins when Thou shalt come to judge the world by fire." And again, "Deliver me from eternal death on that dreadful day, when the heavens and the earth shall be

moved," and the like. The Church also prays for them that they may not endure eternal punishments, and that Tartarus may not swallow them up, nor God forget them unto the end; and that those who have died may, in the glory of the resurrection, be raised among His saints and chosen ones and take breath again. And there are other such things which seem to prove that they have not yet escaped the peril of damnation as to their salvation.⁸⁹

§ 52. Then they argue from the Fathers. For St. Augustine says in the *City of God*, book 21, chapter 24: "After the resurrection of the dead there are not lacking those to whom, after the punishments which the spirits of the dead suffer, mercy is imparted, so that they are not sent into eternal fire." And in the last chapter of the same book he says that for some of the dead their own merits do not suffice for attaining beatitude, unless by the merits of others they obtain mercy—if this is so, therefore such persons remain in doubt until they are delivered by the suffrages of others.⁹⁰ The same author, in the *Enchiridion*, chapter 110, says that the prayers of the Church, where they profit the dead, either profit to this end, that there be full remission, or to this, that the damnation itself be made more tolerable. Whence it appears that not all are thence delivered, and consequently that their own deliverance is not certain to them.⁹¹ St. Ambrose also, in book 2 *On Cain and Abel*, chapter 2, says: "The soul is loosed from the body; but thou, after the end of this life, yet the knowledge of the future is held in suspense by ambiguity."⁹² And St. Cyprian, in the book *On Mortality*, says that certain persons on the day of judgment hang as it were upon the sentence of the Lord.⁹³ Lactantius too, *Divine Institutions*, book 7, chapter 21, thus writes: Let no one think that souls are judged immediately after death.⁹⁴ And St. Gregory, *Dialogues*, book 4, chapter 36, reports that the sentence of a certain Stephen, a dead man, seemed to someone in ecstasy to be still hanging in suspense.⁹⁵ And after all these Theophylact, on Luke 12, at the words, "Fear him who after he has killed has power to cast into Gehenna": "For not always," says he, "are sinners who die sent into Gehenna, but they are in the power of God, so that they can even be released. But I say this on account of the oblations and distributions which are made for the dead," and so forth.⁹⁶ From all which it appears that the judgment of some persons after death is for a time suspended by God. But Luther also objected certain other things which can be seen in the work of the Bishop of Rochester at the article above mentioned.⁹⁷ However, that doctrine, by Leo X, together with the other assertions of Luther, was deservedly reprobated as contrary to the sense and doctrine of the whole Church.⁹⁸ Nay, and while Luther asserts it, he fights against himself, not only because afterwards he simply denied Purgatory, but especially because among his heretical dogmas this is the chief, that all the faithful by faith are certain of their salvation, not even withstanding that in many charity is very imperfect. Hence it is a wonder that he should have wished to take away from the faithful after death that certainty which he requires of the living—where they draw nearer to God and to their beatitude. Indeed, if they are not certain, they have already lost faith and charity, according to the dogma of the same Luther, who places faith in that certainty and denies that it can be separated from charity.

§ 53. But the Catholic doctrine is proved first, as regards security on the side of the thing itself, because the souls which are being purged are free from all peril of falling and of damnation. For "whoever shall have persevered unto the end, he shall be saved" (Matt. 10); and "the tree, in whatsoever place it shall fall, there shall it be" (Eccles. 11); and the Lord says in the *Apocalypse*, chapter 2: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life." To which pertains also *Wisdom* 4: "He was taken away, lest wickedness should change his understanding, and lest deceit should beguile his soul." From this, indeed, it is established that after death no one is changed from good to evil; and this St. Cyprian teaches in the *Sermon On Mortality*, and from Cyprian St. Augustine, in the book *On the Predestination of the Saints*, chapter 14.⁹⁹

§ 54. But that those souls also have security on the part of cognition—which is properly called security and certainty—is proved from this, that immediately after death each one receives from God a sentence according to his merits, either of eternal salvation or of damnation; according to that saying (Heb. 9): "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment"; and of Ecclesiasticus 11: "It is easy before God, in the day of death, to render to a man according to his ways." For this is said on account of the sentence of the divine judgment, by which each one straightway after death is adjudged either to eternal life or to death. Nor indeed must it be thought that that sentence of God perhaps remains hidden to the souls themselves until some time, since the sentence of God concerning each individual is itself the manifestation of His decree, by which each man's retribution is made known. For otherwise each person would also receive his sentence in this life, indeed from eternity he would have received it, if it were nothing else than the divine decree by which, according to his ways, a man is destined either to life or to death. For this decree was from eternity. But this notification of the divine judgment the same Ecclesiasticus has not obscurely signified in the same place, adding thus: "And in the end of a man is the laying bare of his works."

§ 55. This security is proved also from the fact that those souls have a good and tranquil conscience, and, justified by faith, have peace with God. They also know that they are in the purgatorial punishments, and they bear them patiently, and they love God with their whole heart. Likewise they have hope of the heavenly Kingdom, and they rejoice in the confidence of attaining it. Nay, they already have within themselves that Kingdom of which Paul says (Rom. 14): "The Kingdom of God is justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." All which things make them certain that they are not cast forth from the face of God forever; because all those things, after this life, can be neither in the damned nor in those to be damned, but in those alone who are to be saved—especially since, according to the Catholic faith, they are not ignorant that damnation is deferred to no one after death. To these there are added those sayings: "The souls of the just are in the hand of God" (Wis. 3). "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord" (Rev. 14). And that which is in the Canon of the Mass, that the souls of the faithful departed, for whom the Church prays, "sleep in the sleep of peace" and "rest in Christ." Which truly would not be said, if, besides those purgatorial punishments in themselves most grave, they were also tormented with uncertainty of their state and with fear of eternal damnation. Therefore one must now reply to the things which were objected on the opposite side.

§ 56. As to the first opinion which holds that those souls are so overwhelmed by torments that they do not understand their state, it is plainly to be rejected; since not even the rich glutton, in torments far graver, was ignorant of his state, and he recognized Abraham and Lazarus, and remembered his brothers. As to what others think, that the sentence of the judge is suspended for a time, from what has been said it is already clear to be false. But to that which Luther objects concerning imperfect charity, and therefore mingled with fear, it is answered that it is indeed always true what John the Apostle says: "Perfect charity casts out fear"—namely where it finds fear; lest we be forced to admit that even in Christ perfect charity cast out fear. Yet, conversely, it is not always true that imperfect charity has the fear of Gehenna, either actual or habitual, conjoined with it. For in baptized little ones there is charity without such fear; and to someone endowed with imperfect charity there can be given a revelation of his predestination, who therefore will lack the fear of Gehenna. Whence likewise, in a similar way, the souls which are in Purgatory, though they be granted to have imperfect—that is, remiss—charity, then indeed to be perfected when they shall be admitted to the sight of God: nevertheless, since they have already consummated their contest and course, and have been exempt from the peril of falling, and thus have attained security of salvation, in them there is no longer place for the fear of Gehenna, but only for a certain fear of the length of the pains in which they are engaged, in that they do not know precisely when

they will be delivered thence. But for adult Christians, while they go through this life, which, according to the Prophet, is wholly a trial or warfare, it is for the most part necessary that, what they could not by charity alone on account of its imperfection, they also be driven by fear to keep the commandments of God and to overcome the dangers of temptations.

§ 57. But to the other arguments we reply briefly. To the first it is answered that the Church prays for the faithful departed that the eternal light of the divine vision may shine upon them; but Ecclesiastes speaks of knowledge of things that pertain to this life, as is clear to one looking at the place. Therefore the dead do not have that knowledge—that is, they do not acquire new knowledge—except in so far as God specially reveals to them something of the things that are done. To the second: since the souls of the departed have now arrived at the goal (*terminus*), nothing prevents—indeed it is very fitting—that they be endowed with that part of happiness, that they know that they have come to the end of their perilous way and contest, and that they can no longer fall, and that they are secure of the reward. The certainty of salvation, although it brings great consolation and joy so far as regards the object itself, can nevertheless coexist with very great sorrow on account of a punishment inflicted from another source, as happened in Christ suffering. For joy and sadness, even in intense degrees, admit of being together in the same subject, where the objects are diverse. To the fourth: in the Office of the Dead the Church at once sets before our eyes the day of the last judgment—both on account of the living, because, as St. Augustine says in Epistle 80 to Hesychius, that day will come for each one when the days shall have come for him such that he goes forth hence such as he is to be judged on that day; and by this every Christian ought to watch lest the Lord's coming find him unprepared; and that day will find him unprepared whom the last day of this life shall have found unprepared—and also because the whole judgment of God which is carried out from a man's death until the resurrection is rightly comprehended under the name of the last judgment. To the other things which are objected from the Divine Office we reply that by prayers of that kind the Church bears witness that that remission of punishments and the deliverance of souls from those punishments pertain to the grace of Christ's redemption. Whence she sings: "And Thou, by the succor of Thy grace, may they be enabled to escape the judgment of vengeance." Which grace, however, is due by right of adoption to the just and therefore to the heirs of the Kingdom; because the justice of God does not permit that he whom He has adopted to Himself as son and heir be excluded forever from the possession of the inheritance, if he shall have committed no sin by which he would have merited that exclusion—as elsewhere we have shown more fully, namely above, Distinction 42 of Book II.¹⁰⁰ Hence a reply is also evident to that which in the first place is objected from Augustine. But to the second place we reply that to some their own merits do not suffice that, without very grievous punishments to be meanwhile paid, they may attain beatitude. And to the third place, by the more tolerable damnation is understood a mitigation of the pains of Purgatory; because there is obtained there by the suffrages of the faithful not only an abbreviation of time, but also a mitigation of punishments, as shall have seemed good to the divine Judge. Further, St. Ambrose means that the soul is loosed from the body, yet is held in ambiguity of knowledge, not as regards the judgment of eternal life or death, but as regards the mode and quantity of the temporal punishment yet to be paid, and as regards the time of attaining beatitude, or certainly as regards the time of the last judgment. But what is read in St. Cyprian either signifies the fear of this life, just as also that Gospel saying: "Lest perhaps it be not sufficient for us and for you"; "For not of avarice," says St. Jerome, writing on Matthew, "but of fear they answer"; or certainly it signifies the earnest expectation intent upon great mercy and grace, on account of the many undeserved evils of this life. The opinion of Lactantius is not held, as being manifestly erroneous. What is related by St. Gregory—if it is true, and to be taken as the words sound—pertains to extraordinary

judgments of God, of which sort examples do not make a rule. The opinion of Theophylact need not be received or excused. Yet it can be said that those of whom he speaks can be sent into Gehenna, so far as regards the side of the grave crimes which they committed after Baptism, and for which in this life they did not do fitting and sufficient penance.

§ I — Whether sins once forgiven return (Utrum peccata semel dimissa redeant)

§ 58. The Master proposes the question concerning the return (*reditus*) of sins. Now the return of sins can be understood in many ways. First, so that the question is whether the same sins numerically return according to the act. And that indeed is certain not to happen, nor to be able to happen naturally; because according to nature an act, or any form whatsoever once destroyed, cannot return. And although someone might contend that this could happen supernaturally—namely by divine power—yet by it the same numerically act of sin cannot return under the formal character (*ratio*) of sin, of which God cannot be the author. Second, so that the meaning is whether, according to genus or species, sins once forgiven can return. And this is established to be able to happen and to happen very frequently. Indeed, against the heretics who deny that charity and justice once received are lost, and therefore that a man once justified cannot relapse into the same or other crimes, according to the Catholic faith it is held that in this way sin returns.

§ 59. The third is the most usual sense of the question: whether sins once remitted return, by a subsequent sin, as to the guilt (*reatus*); namely, so that by reason of that subsequent sin they are again imputed by God unto eternal death, just as if they had never been remitted. In this wise, then, some taught that sins return, among whom are Hugh (of St. Victor), at the end of the penultimate book of the *De sacramentis*; Gratian, *De poenitentia*, Distinction 4, at the end; and William, Chancellor of Paris, at the end of the little book *On the Seven Sacraments*.¹⁰² But the Master of the Sentences admits that the solution of this question is obscure and perplexed, and in the end, defining nothing and prejudicing no party, leaves the judgment to the studious reader. Moreover, the Scholastics, all who comment upon him, just as also the Glossators on Gratian, constantly teach that sins once remitted are not imputed again, nor is the gift of remission once made rendered void—no matter how much either the same sins are afterwards repeated or new ones perpetrated; nor is anyone damned on account of those things which have once been condoned, but only on account of other things afterwards committed. This opinion is confirmed by an evident argument drawn from Sacred Scripture. For the Prophet Nahum says (chap. 1): "There shall not rise a double affliction," where the Seventy have: "God will not avenge twice upon the same thing"; that is: what God, being just, has once and exactly punished according to justice, He will not again exact the punishment thereof—otherwise He would be acting against the formal character of vindicatory justice, which

§ 60. ... does not permit any sin to be punished more gravely than it deserves; therefore it does not allow the same sin to be punished twice according to an exact reckoning. For neither can a double payment justly be exacted for the same debt; but the man whose sin has been remitted by God has, by that very fact, as regards the eternal punishment owed for it, had it exactly punished in Christ—because sin is never remitted to a man unless the Passion of Christ is applied to him as a sufficient price for the payment of the sin. Wherefore God would act unjustly if He were to demand again that punishment once paid in full by Christ; whence St. Bernard: "By what right should that be demanded again from us which He has already paid for us?"¹⁰³

Therefore this argument relies on a full payment once made, after which no other can be exacted. Yet the same point is sufficiently proved from the bare notion of remission (*remissio*). For to remit sin is to remit vindication, according to that saying: "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," and, "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin"; therefore, where there is a true remission of some sin as to eternal punishment, it is necessary that, for the future and forever, every imputation of that same sin to such punishment cease. Otherwise the sin would not be truly remitted, but the remission would have been only deferred and suspended, or conditioned, as we sometimes see happen among men. But it is certain that through Christ sins are remitted truly and properly, so that in the sight of God they are reckoned as if not done; and by that remission a man is not only released from the bond of eternal damnation, but is also made an heir of the Kingdom. This argument holds even if no payment had intervened for the sins of the human race such as was made through Christ. For if God had exacted no payment to satisfy His justice, but had by mercy alone remitted the sin, still it would be unjust to revoke a remission thus made and to exact anew the vindication of a sin thus remitted; for clearly that would be against the formal character (*ratio*) of a true and absolute remission. Human justice confirms this reasoning, which does not allow a debt once remitted to be exacted again, nor a crime once pardoned to be punished again, even if either a new debt is afterwards contracted, or the crime is perpetrated anew. Finally, Scripture bears on this: "The gifts and the calling of God are without repentance."¹⁰⁴ Whence, just as it cannot be just for a man to repent of a condonation he has made, so as to revoke it, so neither can it be for God. And the same judgment obtains concerning a temporal punishment once remitted, and concerning venial sins, because in all alike the same formal character of justice is at work. Moreover, among the Ancients Prosper clearly handed down this opinion, writing thus: "He who falls back from Christ and, alienated from grace, ends this life—what does he fall into but perdition? Yet he does not fall back into that which was remitted, nor will he be damned in original sin; nevertheless, on account of his last crimes he will be afflicted with death, which, on account of those things that were remitted, was owed to him," and so on; and Pope Gelasius, in Gratian, says: "The divine clemency does not allow sins once forgiven to return thereafter unto vengeance."¹⁰⁵

§ 61. Lastly, sins once forgiven can be understood to return, as regards liability (*reatus*), not simply but in a qualified sense. And this in the first place: because whoever, after receiving remission, sins mortally again, he falls back into the former state of damnation which had been the effect of the earlier sin—just as we say that a fever returns. And as it happens that a later illness, in comparison with an earlier, is sometimes more severe, sometimes milder, sometimes equal, so in sins. For it is not necessary that everyone who relapses into sin contract a liability equal to the earlier, or greater. Secondly, on account of communion in sins—not only in those of others but also in one's own, albeit sometimes remitted. Thus to the reprobate there returns the accidental punishment of all their sins. For as there is joy for all the elect over every good work, by whomsoever it has been done, so not improbably it is said that to the reprobate there befalls a certain punishment from every evil, even one sometime remitted. Hence the Lord in the Gospel says "the fellowship of murderers," in order that "there may come upon you all the righteous blood that hath been shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zachariah," where is included the blood that Manasseh shed, although he did penance.¹⁰⁶ And how does it come, says St. Augustine, "unless because the impious are one kind, one besprinkling, one lump, connected among themselves by imitation"?¹⁰⁷ If therefore another's sin, and that indeed remitted, returns upon the fellowship of the reprobate, nothing prevents even one's own sin from returning in a like manner.

§ 62. This mode St. Augustine indicated when, writing on Psalm 108, he says: "If Judas had held to that for which he was called, in no way would either his own past iniquity or that of his parents have pertained to him; but because ..." ¹⁰⁸ But in this way a man is punished not so much for the sin remitted, as for that into which he relapses—by the merit whereof he also receives punishment on account of the earlier offense, albeit not for that offense.

§ 63. Thirdly, they are understood to return on account of ingratitude, when all the gifts previously bestowed upon the sinner, and especially the gift of the remission of his earlier sins, come back as things that aggravate the subsequent sin; and thus they make the sinner be punished more gravely than if he had never received gifts of this sort. Although this ingratitude, which is found in every sin, is not a special sin, but a general circumstance of sin; yet it is a special sin, and therefore aggravates more vehemently, when someone directly displays ingratitude.

-
1. 2 Macc. 12 (Judas sending offerings to Jerusalem for sacrifices for the dead).
 2. Bede, on 1 Kgs 31 (Jabesh-Gilead), as cited in Estius.
 3. Tertullian, *De resurrectione carnis*, init.; St. Augustine, Sermon on the Chair of Peter, the fifth of the sermons On the Saints [abbreviation as in source]. On the authenticity notes, see the Benedictine edition: the sermon is counted among the spurious and attributed by some to Caesarius; nevertheless in the Roman Breviary, on the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Antioch (Feb. 22), it is read under Augustine's name.
 4. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XXI, ch. 24.
 5. St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum* VI, ch. 5; St. Ambrose, *De Elia et jejuniis* ch. 20; St. Isidore, *De officiis ecclesiasticis* I, ch. 18; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, ch. 39; Bede, on Mark 3; Fulgentius, *De remissione peccatorum* I, ch. 24; Philip the Presbyter, *In Job* I, on ch. 12; St. Bernard, *Sermones super Cantica* 66; Peter the Venerable, against a certain heretic [as in source].
 6. St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, ch. 39.
 7. Matt. 7; St. Augustine, *Enchiridion* ch. 68.
 8. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XXI, ch. 26; on Psalm 29; *Enchiridion* ch. 68; *Quaestiones ad Dulcitium* I; *De fide et operibus* ch. 16; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, ch. 39; and the many places listed: Augustine on Psalms 6, 37, 80 (and Sermon 3), 103 (Sermon 25), 118; *De civitate Dei* XVI, ch. 24; XX, chs. 25–26; Homily 16 among the Sermons; Sermon 41 On the Saints (Sermon 4 On the Commemoration of Souls); *De vera et falsa poenitentia* ch. 18; *Enchiridion* ch. 69. The editorial notes in the Benedictine edition mark some of these as attributed to Caesarius or as spurious; Estius cites them under Augustine's name.
 9. Origen, Hom. 6 on Exodus; Hom. 8 on Leviticus; Hom. 12 on Jeremiah; on Psalm 36; Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* VII, ch. 21; St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* ch. 15; on Isaiah 4 and 9; St. Hilary, on Matt. 3; St. Ambrose, Sermons 3 and 20 on Psalm 118; St. Jerome, on Matt. 3; *Adversus Jovinianum* II; St. Gregory the Great, on the penitential Psalms 1 and 3; *Dialogi* IV, ch. 39; Alcuin, *De Trinitate* III, ch. 21; Council of Florence, decree for the Greeks, on purgatorial fire and the interpretation of 1 Cor. 3 [abbreviation as in source].
 10. St. Augustine, Sermon 144, *De tempore*, ch. 6.
 11. Zech. 9; Acts 2; 1 Pet. 3–4; Epiphanius, Heresy 46; St. Jerome, on Zech. 9 and Dan. 3; Eusebius Emisenus, Homily 1 *De Pascha*; St. Ambrose, *De mysterio Paschae* ch. 4; St. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* XII, ch. 33; St. Gregory the Great, Homily 22 on the Gospels.
 12. St. Cyprian, Ep. 4 to Antonianus; Eusebius Emisenus; Epiphanius; St. Ambrose on Luke; Phil. 2; Rom. 14; Mal. 3; St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XX, ch. 25 (and Is. 4 cited there). Pope Leo X condemned the assertion of Luther, "Purgatorium non posse probari ex Scriptura sacra, quae sit in canone."
 13. (Pseudo-)Dionysius, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 7 (last chapter).
 14. Clement of Rome, Apostolic Constitutions VIII, ch. 41.

15. Tertullian, De monogamia.
16. Tertullian, De exhortatione castitatis.
17. Tertullian, De testimonio animae; De corona militis.
18. St. Cyprian, Ep. 1 (old numbering), ep. 9; see also the council of bishops he cites there.
19. Arnobius, Adversus gentes IV, at the end.
20. St. Gregory of Nyssa, De dormientibus; De infantibus praemature abreptis.
21. St. Ambrose, Funeral Orations for Valentinian and for Theodosius; Ep. 8 to Faustus.
22. St. Jerome, Contra Pelagianos I, near the end; Commentary on Isaiah XVIII, at the end; Commentary on Ezekiel I.
23. St. Jerome, Ep. to Pammachius [abbreviation as in source].
24. St. Paulinus of Nola, Ep. to Amandus [abbreviation as in source].
25. St. Epiphanius, Panarion (Heresy 75), on Aetius.
26. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 3 on Philippians.
27. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 32 on Matthew.
28. St. John Chrysostom, Hom. 21 on Acts; Hom. 41 on 1 Corinthians 15.
29. St. John Chrysostom, De sacerdotio VI; Hom. 84 on John (at the end); Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom; Hom. 79 to the People of Antioch.
30. St. Augustine, De Genesi contra Manichaeos II, ch. 10.
31. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XXI, chs. 13, 16.
32. St. Augustine, De cura pro mortuis gerenda, ch. 1.
33. St. Augustine, Ep. 118 (to Januarius).
34. St. Augustine, Sermon 32 (Benedictine: Sermon CLXXII), De verbis Apostoli, on the helps of the dead.
35. St. Augustine, De haeresibus (Heresy 53), on the Arianists; cf. St. Epiphanius and St. Philastrius.
36. St. Augustine, Confessiones IX, chs. 11–13; Ep. 64 to Aurelius; Enchiridion, ch. 110; De anima I, ch. 9; De cura pro mortuis gerenda, chs. 1, 4, 5, and last; De civitate Dei XXI, ch. 24; Possidius, Vita Augustini, last chapter.
37. Council of Carthage IV, canon 79.
38. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogi IV, chs. 39–40; and II, ch. 3, Expositio in 1 Regum.
39. St. John Damascene, Sermon for the Dead.
40. St. Basil, Liturgy; Eusebius of Caesarea, De vita Constantini IV; St. Athanasius, Quaest. 34 ad Antiochum Principem; Sermon on Those Who Have Fallen Asleep (as cited by Damascene); St. Ephrem the Syrian, Testament; Prudentius, Hamartigenia, at the end; Haymo, In exequia defunctorum; Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum IV, ch. 22; Boethius, Consolatio philosophiae IV, prose 4; Theodoret, on 1 Corinthians 3; Vita Jacobi Nisibeni; on Luke 12; St. Bernard, Sermon 66 on the Canticles.
41. Council of Florence, Decree for the Greeks, at the beginning and in the conclusion; cf. St. John Chrysostom on 1 Cor. 3, and the Greek interpretation there.
42. Gennadius Scholarius (Patriarch of Constantinople), work proving Purgatory from Scripture and ancient Eastern Doctors [abbreviation as in source].
43. Damianus a Goes (or Damian of Ethiopia) reporting on the Ethiopian Church's confession regarding purgatorial pains [abbreviation as in source].
44. Martin Luther, Article 37 of the early articles: "Ego credo Purgatorium esse, et consulo quoque credendum" [abbreviation as in source].

45. Council of Florence, Decree on Purgatory; Council of Trent, Session 25, Decree on Purgatory; Session 6, canon 30; Session 22, ch. 2, and canon 3.
46. St. Augustine, *De fide et operibus*, ch. 16.
47. St. Augustine, Ep. 80 [= Ep. 191 in the Benedictine edition; "Seu CXCI in Edit. Benedict."].
48. St. Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, Tract. 49.
49. St. Augustine, Sermon 31, *De verbis Apostoli* [abbreviation as in source].
50. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II, ch. 33; *De spiritu et littera*, ch. 28.
51. [Pseudo-]Augustine, *Hypognosticon* V, ch. 5.
52. [Pseudo-]Augustine, *De vanitate saeculi*, ch. 1.
53. St. Cyprian, *Ad Demetrianum*; St. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration 10; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis 18; St. John Chrysostom, Sermon 2 on Lazarus; St. Jerome and Olympiodorus, Commentary on Ecclesiastes.
54. Alcuin, *De Trinitate* III, ch. 21; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi*.
55. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* [City of God].
56. St. Bernard, Sermon 4, *De omnibus sanctis*.
57. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XX, ch. 9.
58. Rev. 14:13.
59. St. Augustine, Ep. 120 to Honoratus, ch. 22; St. Jerome and Olympiodorus, on Ecclesiastes.
60. Roman Missal, Canon of the Mass: "locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis."
61. Jn. 5:29; 1 Cor. 11:29, 32.
62. St. Augustine, *passim*; cf. the scholastic debates cited above in this distinction.
63. On Pelagian "third place" for unbaptized infants, cf. St. Augustine's anti-Pelagian works.
64. St. Augustine, *Retractationes* II, ch. 34; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, ch. 42.
65. "Ad dict. loca S. Thomas." — St. Thomas [abbreviation as in source].
66. Council of Florence, Decree for the Greeks; St. John Chrysostom, Homilies on 1 Cor. 3 (as cited by the Greeks).
67. Council of Florence, Decree on Purgatory; Council of Trent, Session 25, Decree on Purgatory.
68. Roman Missal, prayers for the faithful departed: "locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis"; and other collects for the dead.
69. Heb. 10:27, 31 (with the Greek reading noted by the author).
70. Ps. 65[66]:12; Matt. 25:41.
71. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 6 and 37; Homily 16 among fifty; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, ch. 39; Alcuin, *De Trinitate* III, ch. 21; St. John Damascene, *De quiescentibus in Christo*, and elsewhere.
72. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XXI, ch. 10; St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, chs. 28–29; *Moralia* XV, ch. 14.
73. St. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 37.
74. [Attribution as in source] "Serm. 41 de Sanctis," dubiously ascribed to St. Augustine.
75. Pseudo-Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, ch. 18.
76. St. Gregory the Great, on Psalm 3 among the penitential Psalms.
77. St. Thomas [abbreviation as in source], at the cited places on Purgatory.
78. St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great, on Psalms 6 and 37.
79. 1 Cor. 11:31–32.
80. St. Thomas [abbreviation as in source]; Richard [abbreviation as in source]; St. Bonaventure, at the places cited by the author.

81. Soto (Dominic), at the place on this question.
82. 1 Pet. 4:17–18.
83. 1 Pet. 3:19 and 4:6.
84. Tertullian, on anniversaries for the dead [abbreviation as in source].
85. St. Augustine, Confessiones IX, ch. 13.
86. St. Augustine, Quaestiones Evangeliorum II, q. 38; Luke 16:9.
87. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XX, ch. 25; XX, ch. 6; XXI, ch. 24.
88. Honorius, De anima, ch. 17 [abbreviation as in source].
89. Ecclesiastes 9:5–10.
90. St. Augustine, De civitate Dei XXI, ch. 24; XXI, ch. 26.
91. St. Augustine, Enchiridion, ch. 110.
92. St. Ambrose, De Cain et Abel II, ch. 2.
93. St. Cyprian, De mortalitate.
94. Lactantius, Divinae institutiones VII, ch. 21.
95. St. Gregory the Great, Dialogi IV, ch. 36.
96. Theophylact, In Lucam 12, at "Time eum qui postquam occiderit, habet potestatem mittendi in gehennam".
97. John Fisher (Roffensis), against Luther on the cited article [abbreviation as in source].
98. Pope Leo X, condemnation of Luther's articles [abbreviation as in source].
99. St. Cyprian, De mortalitate; St. Augustine, De praedestinatione sanctorum, ch. 14.
100. Estius, above, Dist. 42 of Book II.
101. St. Thomas, Summa theologiae, Supplementum, q. 88, a. 1 sqq.
102. Hugh (of St. Victor), De sacramentis, end of the penultimate book; Gratian, De poenitentia, Dist. 4, at the end; William, Chancellor of Paris, De septem sacramentis, at the end.
103. St. Bernard, Sermo to the Knights Templar, ch. 11.
104. Rom. 11:29.
105. Prosper of Aquitaine, Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum, resp. 2; Pope Gelasius, in Gratian, De poenitentia, Dist. 4.
106. Matt. 23:35; the inclusion of Manasseh's shedding of blood is noted though he did penance (cf. 2 Kgs 21; 2 Chr. 33).
107. St. Augustine, Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum II, ch. 5.
108. St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos, on Ps. 108. Also cf. Ps. 31(32):1–2: "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven ... Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin."

DISTINCTIO XXII — WHETHER SINS ONCE REMITTED RETURN

That this indeed can happen through these four—fraternal hatred (italicised in Latin: *odium fraternum*), apostasy from the faith (*apostasia fidei*), contempt of confession (*contemptus confessionis*), and sorrow for penance performed (*dolor de acta paenitentia*)—St. Thomas teaches.¹

§ II — The solution of the arguments of the contrary opinion (*Solutio argumentorum contrariae opinionis*)

§ 1. Against that part of the preceding doctrine in which it was said that sins once remitted as to guilt (*reatus*) simply do not return, many arguments are commonly brought forward by those who think otherwise, of the sort that are found in Hugh, Gratian, and the Master (of the Sentences). The first and chief argument is taken from the parable of the indebted servant (Matt. 18). To whom, when the Lord had remitted all the debt, afterwards, because of his harshness toward a fellow-servant, he was handed over by the Lord to the torturers, until he should pay the whole debt. Which parable Christ, in concluding, expounds with these words: "So also will my heavenly Father do to you, if you do not each forgive your brother from your hearts."² The second (from Ezek. 18): "If," he says, "a just man turns away from his justice and does iniquity, all his justices which he has done shall not be remembered"; therefore neither will the Lord remember the former penance (*paenitentia*), and consequently He will revoke the remission (*remissio*) of the sins that had been made in view of that penance.³ The third (Exod. 32): it is said of the Lord that He was appeased so as not to do the evil that He had spoken against His people; and yet (at the end of the same chapter) He Himself says: "But I, in the day of vengeance, will visit this their sin."⁴ Fourth, they argue thus: Good works, deadened by a following sin, revive unto merit by penance; therefore also sins, blotted out by remission, are recalled by a relapse unto demerit. Fifth: It seems just that God should repent of a pardon given, when a man repents of penance performed. Sixth: Past sins are covered by Grace (*gratia*) according to that (Ps. 31): "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven"; therefore when that covering of Grace is removed by sin, they are again uncovered and, consequently, return.⁵ Seventh: Remitted sins can again, numerically the same, please the will; therefore they will return numerically the same as to guilt, because a sin that pleases the will makes the will guilty. Eighth: Concupiscence after remission is numerically the same in a man; wherefore, if he consents to it again, there will be numerically the same sin as that which was before. Whence David confesses his original sin, saying: "Behold, in iniquities was I conceived." Gratian uses this argument.⁶

§ 2. Lastly, several sentences of the Fathers are brought in to this point. For Augustine says, book 1 (Against the Donatists, ch. 12): "For that remitted sins return where fraternal charity (*caritas*) is not, the Lord most plainly teaches in the Gospel concerning that servant whom, when He had found a debtor of ten thousand talents, to his entreaty He remitted all," and at length he concludes: "From that point the man begins at once to be guilty, not only of the following days, hours, moments, but also of the preceding ones,

with all those things returning which had been remitted. And these things often happen in the Church." The same (Serm. 15, On the Words of the Lord, ch. 6), treating the same parable, speaks in the person of the Lord thus: "If I first have remitted, do you remit at least afterwards. For if you shall not have remitted, I will recall you, and whatever I had remitted to you I will fold back upon you. For Truth does not lie when it says: 'So also will your Father do to you,' etc." Similar passages are in book 15 (City of God, ch. 16; book 21, last chapter).⁷ Under Ambrose's name too, in the Commentaries on Ephesians 4, on that text, "Forgiving one another, as also God in Christ forgave you," these words are read: "These are the precepts of Him who had mercy; he who shall be condemned in these will without doubt revoke the sentence by which he had given mercy, and thus it will befall, as the Lord says in the Gospel, concerning him who, receiving mercy from the Lord, was found impious toward his fellow-servant."⁸ So also Gregory, book 4 (Dialogues, last chapter), says that from the Gospel sayings it is established that, if we do not from the heart forgive what is committed against us, "this also will again be exacted which we were rejoicing had already been remitted to us by penance." The words of Gregory are also found in Bede on Matt. 18. And again the same Bede, book 4 on Luke, on that (ch. 11), "I will return into my house," says: "That little verse is to be feared, not expounded, lest the fault which we believed to have been extinguished in us should, through careless negligence, overwhelm us while we are unoccupied." Likewise Rabanus, as the Master and Gratian cite (on that, "I handed him over to the torturers"): "It must be considered what he says, 'the whole debt'; because not only the sins which a man shall have done after Baptism will be reckoned to him for punishment, but even the original sins that in Baptism were remitted." Likewise Innocent III (Mysteries of the Mass, ch. 23): "This is remitted to us on the same conditions, if we remit to our debtors; otherwise even the remitted things are recalled in total, according to that: 'Wicked servant, the debt,' etc." To these it is permissible to add Chrysostom and Theophylact writing on Matthew, where they say that ingratitude and vindictiveness are so great an evil that they even revoke the gift of God and make it void.⁹

§ 3. Yet these arguments can be solved in this way. A common solution of the first argument is that, according to that parable, a sin once remitted returns and is anew imputed thus far, because it overflows into the things committed later—inasmuch as it makes those things, joined with ingratitude, greater; so that, on the occasion of the former sin which had been remitted, the later sins are punished more grievously and bitterly—just as we showed above that sins return not simply, but in a certain way, on account of ingratitude.

§ 4. But, in truth, it is said most improperly and in a distorted way that someone "pays back the whole debt" which before had been remitted. Whence others reply that in the parable the debt formerly remitted is not repeated, but that by "the whole debt" which is afterwards exacted the debt of punishment (*poena*) is understood, which that servant had deserved for ingratitude toward his Lord and for harshness toward his fellow-servant; because, they say, if the Lord had been demanding the pecuniary debt back from him, He would have bidden him, with his wife and children and all his substance, to be sold, as He had ordered before; the second time He does not order this, but hands him over to the torturers to be tormented—that is, that he might pay the penalty of ingratitude and harshness, not that he might pay off a money-debt. But this sense is hindered by the fact that Christ, saying "until he should pay the whole debt," or, as the Greek has it, "the whole that was owed him," seems plainly to have regard to the debt about which a little earlier it is said, "Wicked servant, I remitted to you all the debt." For in both places "all" or "whole" is said on account of the greatness, because it was ten thousand talents.

§ 5. Therefore it is more correct to reply that the thing proposed is to be applied, but only so far as the proposed thing requires the application—just as Jerome warns, writing on Matt. 13; and likewise Chrysostom, on Matt. 20, teaches. But the doctrine of Christ in that place does not require that what is said in the parable about a debt once remitted being recalled be applied simply, but only in a certain measure and manner. We are given a hint of this manner by Augustine in that very place which is alleged to the contrary, namely, book 1 (*Against the Donatists*, ch. 12). For he says that remitted sins return "where fraternal charity is not," not, however, where "the fraternal charity which was, ceases to be." And again: "Nor did that which he had not yet forgiven to his fellow-servant hinder his lord from then, in the time proper for receiving an account, remitting to him all that he owed. But what did it avail, since presently, upon his head, because of perseverance, all at once were again piled up?" Thus the grace of Baptism is not hindered from remitting all sins, even if fraternal hatred should persist in the soul of the one to whom they are remitted. These are Augustine's words, wishing to show how even to those approaching Baptism feignedly sins are remitted.

§ 6. Therefore, in Augustine's mind, it is answered that the sins signified by that debt of ten thousand talents were not in truth remitted before God. For when that debtor asked for pardon, he was bearing against his neighbor a hidden hatred in his heart, nor was he prepared to forgive the injury received from him when he begged; which hidden disposition he afterwards, when the occasion was offered, betrayed. Hence Augustine names not a fresh hatred, but the perseverance of a hatred even at the time of the received sacrament, remaining. Which hatred does not, in reality, comport with the sacrament effected, that is, with the pardon of sins. Therefore the remission which the parable signifies is taken by Augustine so that it be understood as made, as far as lies on God's side, who, through the ministry of the Church, applies the sacrament to the sinner, by which his sins would truly be remitted to him, unless on his own side there were an impediment of fraternal hatred clung to in the soul. In this way, then, the debts of sins return: because, when the servant thought those debts had been remitted to him, and in respect of God and the Church they were truly remitted, yet in God's judgment he finds himself still subject to them and guilty of them all, just as if no sacrament of remission had been applied to him.

§ 7. This explanation is signified by that epiphonema of the parable: "So also will my heavenly Father do to you, if you do not forgive," so that this be the same as that which is in Matt. 6 and Mark 11: "If you do not forgive men, neither will the Father forgive you," and that the whole belong to the illumination of that petition of the Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our debts as," etc. The same sense can be gathered from Jerome's Commentary, who, in applying the parable, does not say that a pardon already given is retracted, but that it will come to pass that greater crimes will not be remitted to us, if we do not forgive our brothers. And he expounds that word, "He will do to you," so that it is the same as "He will not forgive." Therefore by this comparison, or application of the parable, the point is: As that parabolic lord recalled the debt pardoned on account of the harshness afterwards discovered in the servant toward his fellow-servant; so God, for the same cause, does not simply remit the debt, because already in the heart of the man He sees his hatred toward his fellow-servant—nay rather, what had been remitted on the part of the sacrament He recalls, and, by punishing, shows that it had not been remitted.

§ 8. To the second it is answered that God "does not remember" the justices of a man who deserts justice, because He will not pay the reward due to them on account of the impediment of sin. For the same reason He "does not remember" penance either; yet He does not therefore revoke the pardon which penance once obtained: for that has already been given.

§ 9. To the third: Formerly the Lord remitted the heavier revenge, so that He did not, as He had threatened, destroy that people; yet He reserved a lesser vengeance to be inflicted afterwards on the occasion of another sin.

§ 10. To the fourth it is answered that the case is not similar, because good works are not simply abolished by a following sin, but are impeded from their reward, and, that impediment being removed through penance, they often revive unto merit; but sins, as to guilt, are utterly abolished by remission—both because the debt of punishment is paid in Christ, and because the remission of sin is its abolition in perpetuity, so that the sin is held as though not done.

§ 11. To the fifth it is denied that that is just—both because God is immutable, and because with Him there is no injustice, which is involved in the repetition of a debt paid and remitted.

§ 12. To the sixth: Grace is said to "cover" sin not by hiding it, but by utterly removing its guilt before God.

§ 13. To the seventh and eighth it is answered that a new act of will is a new sin, although it has respect to a sin past and remitted. Add that although a present act, contrary to law and pleasing to the will, is a sin, nevertheless a past act of that sort, already remitted—if it should again please—will not thereby become again a sin, because this complacency is not conjoined to the past act, which now does not exist, but to the present. For neither will my sin, remitted, if it later please another, on this account become his sin.

§ 14. As to the authorities of the Fathers. Concerning Augustine's sentence, it has been said already; and the same must be replied to Gregory's words. For he refers the remission to the opinion of the man. Bede, however, speaks of a fault not the same, but similar; for this sense is required by the evangelical place which he treats, whereas otherwise his words can most aptly be taken of a remission that was only thought to have been. The Commentary under Ambrose's title, Rabanus, Chrysostom, and Theophylact are to be understood of a return of sins in a qualified sense, namely in that way in which we said above that sins return on account of ingratitude.

§ 15. But these arguments can be resolved in the following way. The common solution to the first argument is, in line with that parable, that a sin once remitted does not in very deed return and again become imputed, but men are rendered liable in those things which they afterwards commit—inasmuch as, on account of the conjunction of ingratitude, those acts are rendered greater; so that, on the occasion of an earlier sin which once had been remitted, the later sins are more grievous and are punished more sharply: in which way we offend not simply, but, as it were, sin by reason of ingratitude. But it is in this sense that, only in a very improper and twisted way of speaking, one is said "to return into the whole debt" which before had been remitted. Hence others reply that in the parable the debt previously remitted is not repeated; rather, by the "whole debt" which is afterwards exacted there is understood the debt of punishment, which that servant had incurred on account of ingratitude toward his Lord and his harshness toward his fellow-servant. For, they say, if the Lord had meant to exact the pecuniary debt again from him, He would have ordered him, with wife, children, and all his substance, to be sold—as He had ordered before; but the second time He does not order this, rather He hands him over to the torturers to be tormented, namely, so that in that way he might pay the penalty of ingratitude and of want of mercy, not that he might discharge the money-debt. But this sense is hindered by the fact that, when Christ says "until he should pay the whole debt," or, as the Greek sounds, "what was owed to him," He seems altogether to have regard to the former debt about which a little before

there had been speech, namely: "I forgave thee all the debt." For in both places it is said "all" or "the whole," on account of the greatness—for it was of ten thousand talents. Therefore those seem to reply more rightly who say that in parables all the things proposed are not to be applied simply and without exception to the reality of the case, but only so far as the purpose of the comparison requires; as Jerome admonishes, writing on Matthew,¹⁰ and Chrysostom likewise.¹¹ Now in this place Christ the teacher does not require that what is said in the parable about a debt once remitted being recalled be applied simply, but only to a certain point and in a certain manner. Augustine indicates this very manner in the very place where the contrary is objected, namely where he says that remitted sins "return" where brotherly charity is not present, not however where the brotherly charity which was present has ceased—meaning that the parable signifies that, if you will not forgive, you shall not be forgiven, and that the form of the Lord's Prayer pertains to this as well: "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors"; and again: "But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father forgive you."¹² From these it is evident that, if from the heart we do not forgive what has been committed against us, and if we again exact it, that which we were rejoicing had been remitted to us by repentance is, as regards the favor of the Lord, held back from us; which Bede also says on Matthew and on Luke, on the petition "Forgive us."¹³

§ 16. To the second it is answered that God is not said to "remember not" a man's righteousness because He revokes His mercy already given, but because He does not render the reward on account of the impediment of the sin. For the remembrance even of repentance does not revoke pardon; for this reason, a new sin does not recall the pardon of a former sin more than the occasion of another's sin.

§ 17. To the third: It was more fitting that the Lord should overcome by the more serious punishment, so that He might deter that people; nevertheless He preserved for the future a punishment for the graver sin that would be committed on the later occasion. Therefore it is not the same thing to say that God recalls the pardon, as to say that He inflicts a new punishment on account of a different sin.

§ 18. To the fourth it is replied that the case is not similar; because good works that follow upon sin are not simply abolished, but are impeded from a reward—by which impediment, through repentance they are brought back to life.

§ 19. To the fifth: It does not seem just that God should deny pardon to a man because he delays repentance, since God does not deny His mercy to one who returns; rather, because the man does not yet will to repent, he does not receive pardon on account of the impediment of his sin. For this reason even the remembrance of repentance does not revoke the pardon which once he had obtained: for that was already given.

§ 20. To the sixth: Grace is said directly to cover sin, not by hiding it, but by removing the guilt before God. And therefore, when grace is taken away by a man's fault, sins do not for that reason simply return, but the covering is taken away as regards God's favor.

§ 21. To the seventh and eighth it is answered thus: a new sin arising from the will is a new sin, although a sin past and remitted be recalled to memory. Add that although a present act is contrary to the law and conformable to the will of sinning, nevertheless not every sin passed is thereby repeated; rather, there is a new sin of negligence if one neglects satisfaction for past sins. But this displeasure does not conjoin to itself every former sin, except in the qualified way already stated—namely, by reason of ingratitude. Nor does concupiscence, although it remains after remission, for that reason have the character of sin either in itself or

as if guilt were not abolished in Christ; because the remission of sin is not only the taking away of the guilt, but also the beginning of abolition, so that sin should be as if it had not been.

§ 22. As regards the authorities of the Fathers: Augustine's sentence has been said already; and the same must be replied to Gregory's words. For he refers the remission to the opinion of the man. Bede, however, speaks of a fault not the same, but similar; for this sense is required by the evangelical place which he treats, whereas otherwise his words can most aptly be taken of a remission that was only thought to have been. The Commentary under Ambrose's title, Rabanus, Chrysostom, and Theophylact are to be understood of a return of sins in a qualified sense, namely in that way in which we said above that sins return on account of ingratitude.¹⁴

1. St. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* III, q. 88, a. 4.

2. Matt. 18:23–35; quotation at v. 35.

3. Ezek. 18:24.

4. Exod. 32:14, 34.

5. Ps. 31[32]:1.

6. Ps. 50[51]:7 (Vulgate 5).

7. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas*, I, ch. 12; idem, *Serm.* 15, *De verbis Domini*, ch. 6; idem, *De civitate Dei* XV, ch. 16; XXI, ch. ult. [abbreviations as in source].

8. Ambrose (attrib.), *In Ephesios* 4.

9. St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* IV, cap. ult.; Bede, *In Matthaeum* 18; Bede, *In Lucam* IV, on Lk. 11:24; Rabanus, as cited by the Master and by Gratian, on "Tradidi tortoribus"; Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* (Mysteries of the Mass) ch. 23; Chrysostom and Theophylact, *In Matthaeum*; St. Jerome, *In Matthaeum* 13; St. John Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum* 20; cf. Matt. 6:15; Mk. 11:25–26.

10. St. Jerome, *In Matthaeum* 13.

11. St. John Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum* 20.

12. St. Augustine, *Contra Donatistas* I, ch. 23; cf. Matt. 6:12, 14–15; Mk. 11:25–26.

13. Bede, *In Matthaeum* 18; idem, *In Lucam* IV, on "Forgive us our sins."

14. Ambrose (attrib.), *In Ephesios* 4; Rabanus, as cited by the Master and by Gratian, on "I delivered him to the torturers"; Chrysostom and Theophylact, *In Matthaeum*.