The FORGED CATHOLICISM



WILLIAM PERKINS

WILLIAM PERKINS

HIS PROBLEM

OF

The Forged Catholicism,

or the Universality of the Romish Religion.

And it is a counter-poison against Jodocus Coccius's Thesaurus Catholicus.

AND

An Introduction to young Students in the reading of the Fathers.

London
Printed by John Legat.

1631

Published by by Monergism Books P.O. Box 491 West Linn Oregon 97068

www.monergism.com

This edition has been carefully prepared for publication by Monergism Books.

Textual revisions were made to correct typographical errors and modernize spelling while preserving the integrity and meaning of the original. Artificial Intelligence (AI) was employed under human supervision to assist in these editorial tasks. Final review and editing were conducted by editor to ensure fidelity to the original content.

This edition is offered to the Church and the broader public as a faithful and accessible rendering of a historic theological work.

Copyright © 2025 Monergism Books

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publisher or author, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law.

Table of Contents

The Problem or Position. 4

The Explanation of the Problem.. 4

Preparations for the Demonstration of the Problem.. 5

I. The authority of the Fathers and their manner of writing. 5

II. The Causes of the Corruption of the Apostolic Religion. 8

The Demonstration of the Problem or Position. 9

Holy Scripture. 11

Tradition. 16

The Mediator 18

The Truth of the Humanity. 19

The Descension into Hell (to Deliver the Fathers) 20

Free Will 24

Of the Remainders of Concupiscence. 28

Venial Sin. 29

Images and Relics. 31

The Sign of the Cross. 35

Churches for Prayer 37

Canonical Hours. 38

Intercession, Invocation, and Worship of Saints. 39

Prayers for the Dead. 47

Justification. 51

Merit 55

Faith. 58

Fulfilling of the Law, Supererogation. 64

Pilgrimage. 66

Fastings, Stations, Procession. 67

Sacraments. 71

The Work Wrought 73

The Minister's Intention. 75

The Character 75

Baptism.. 76

The Sacrifice of the Mass. 80

Communion Under One Kind. 87

Private Mass. 89

Mixture of Wine and Water 91

Keeping of the Sacrament 91

Use of the Latin Tongue in the Service. 92

Transubstantiation or Real Presence. 93

Adoration and Elevation of the Sacrament 103

The Appurtenances of the Mass, at This Day. 104

Penance Sacramental, and Satisfaction. 106

Purgatory. 110

Sacramental Confession. 114

Confirmation; Chrism.. 117

Marriage. 120

Priest’s Marriage and Single Life. 121

Extreme Unction. 131

The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. 131

Of Bulls, or Indulgences. 145

Of the Power of Kings. 147

Cardinals. 152

Monks. 152

Mary. 156

Feast Days. 157

The Church, Succession, Antiquity. 159

Councils. 161

Benedictions, Hallowings. 163

The Clergy, and Laity. 164

Additions. 165

The Consequent 166

The Problem or Position

It is impossible for any popish divine in the world to show out of the true monuments of the councils and fathers, and out of their natural sense and meaning, that the faith of the present Church of Rome is truly catholic in those points wherein it dissents from the reformed churches of the gospel.

The Explanation of the Problem

By the faith of the Roman Church, I mean the doctrine concerning the way and means of salvation, propounded in the Council of Trent, in the Roman Catechism to the parish priests, and in the Missal and Breviary, which are reformed and printed by the command and authority of Pope Pius IV.

Catholic, I take in that sense which Vincent of Lérins does in his book against heresies, chap. 3: “There must be a special care,” says he, “in the Catholic Church, that that only be believed and taught, which has been held in all places, at all times, and by all professors, for that is truly and properly called catholic, as the very force and derivation of the word itself declares, comprehending all things truly universal.” And again, chap. 25: “He is rightly and truly a catholic, who has resolved with himself to believe and profess that only which he knows the Catholic Church in ancient times did universally hold. And what novelty or unknown doctrine he shall perceive anyone afterward to bring in, either varying from, or contrary to all the saints and fathers, let him know that that doctrine has no reference to religion any way, but rather wholly belongs to temptation.” So Saint Augustine, writing of baptism against the Donatists, in his 4th book, chap. 24: “Whatsoever the Church has universally, and continually professed (having not the institution thereof from some of the councils), that we must assuredly believe to have had its original from no other means but the ordination of the apostles.”

Now let us consider Saint Augustine and what Vincent of Lérins held to be ancient. It is twelve hundred years since either of them lived, wherefore what could seem ancient unto them, but such things as

were received in the apostles' times, and the age next succeeding? They doubtless thought not those ancient things which had their first entrance into the church in their time, or about a hundred or two hundred years before. Much less did they hold that of antiquity, which was neither found out, nor received into the church, till after their days. Therefore not all antiquity of doctrine is to be approved, but that only which Vincent of Lérins, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyprian, etc., held to be of and from antiquity, and which they commended unto their posterity, as also that universality is to be accounted true, and only that, which took place in all churches in the apostles' times, and in the ages next going before Vincent of Lérins and Augustine.

Preparations for the Demonstration of the Problem

Before I come to the confirmation of my position, I must necessarily give notice of three things, the better to clear the way for the defense ensuing. The first shall concern the authority of the fathers and their diverse manners of writing. The second shall discover their counterfeit works, and such as are doubted. The third shall explain the reasons why the apostles' religion is now so depraved.

I. The authority of the Fathers and their manner of writing

The ancient writers do teach and defend that the canonical Scripture is of itself the perfect rule and standard in all controversies of faith. Tertullian against Hermogenes: "I adore the fullness and perfection of the Scripture." Athanasius also in his Synopsis affirms that "those doctrines which are contained in the Scriptures are sufficient for faith." Basil in his treatise on faith: "It is a manifest offense of arrogance and infidelity, either to reject any part of that which is written, or to add any other thing which is not written." Augustine against Petilian's letters, book 3, chap. 46: "Whether it concerns Christ, or His church, or any other thing belonging to our faith, or life, I will not say if we do preach, that even as the apostle himself says afterwards, if an angel comes from heaven with any other doctrine than that you have heard out of the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be accursed." The same Augustine in his 49th tract on John: "Whereas our Savior Christ did many things, and yet all of them are not written: those things were chosen to be written

which were sufficient for the salvation of believers." Vincent of Lérins, chap. 41: "The Canon of Holy Scripture suffices for all things even abundantly." Salvian in his third book on providence says, "that the books of the gospel contain doctrine replete with all manner of perfection." Scotus likewise, in his prologue before the 1st book of Sentences, question 2, says, "It is evident that the Scripture sufficiently contains all things necessary for the pilgrimage" to heaven. Cameracensis on the Sentences: "We must have recourse only to the Scriptures, that we may obtain salvation." Bellarmine, on the unwritten word of God, book 4, chap. 11: "I say that all those things were written by the apostles which are necessary for all men, and which they publicly preached to all men."

The ancient writers will have their sayings and testimonies well examined, and so far only to be received as they agree with the rule of our faith, and the writings of the prophets and apostles. So speaks Dionysius of Alexandria of Nepos: "In many other things I do embrace and love Nepos, but surely the truth is to be preferred and respected before all. If any man speaks well, we ought to give him his due praise and approbation without all envy, but if he speaks anything that is not sound, we must both examine it and try it thoroughly." So Saint Augustine also: "I will not bind you to my authority, that you should therefore think anything necessary to be believed because I affirm it." And again: "I have learned to give this honor and reverence to those books alone which are now called canonical, that I do infallibly believe that no author of them all, or any of them, ever erred in any of his writings. For others, I so read them that (however holy or learned they may be) I do not think this or that to be true because they so held it, but so far as they are able to persuade me, either by those canonical authors, or by probable reason, that it is not opposing the truth." Besides, "I am not tied to the authority of this epistle, because I do not hold Cyprian's letters

for canonical, but I examine them by canonical Scriptures: and whatever I find therein consenting to them, I approve with his praise; and whatever is opposite to them, by his leave I must reject." And in another place: "In those parts of Scripture which are most plain, we found all those things that contain the rules of our faith and manner, namely, hope and charity." Chrysostom also says "that if a man affirms anything without authority of Scripture, his auditors do but slenderly respect it." Basil also teaches, "that it is not sufficient for us to believe the fathers and writers of the Church in matters of faith, unless they confirm their sayings by Scripture."

The fathers in many points of divinity have spoken very unsuitably. First, when they were moved to do so in the heat of disputation. As Basil, speaking of Gregory of Neocaesarea: "They could not understand," he says, "that this (namely, that the Father and the Son are one in person) was spoken in the contention and controversy of disputation with Aelian, not positively, nor dogmatically." Second, because in their exhortation they often were too rhetorical, either to favor others or to affect their audience more. Saint Jerome confesses this of himself, excusing something that he had spoken unsuitably: "We did play the rhetorician," he says, "and gave somewhat to our declamations." So Theodoret: "I do not account those things a rule of doctrines and decrees, which are flauntingly and rhetorically spoken in the church." This may far more truly be affirmed of the rabble of the canonists and schoolmen. Let one of them describe all the rest. "One cries that all actions of inferiors shall be judged by the pope, but the popes only by God. Another says, that none can judge the chief chair. A third says, that God only can depose popes. A fourth is not ashamed to aver, that though the pope should carry heaps of souls to hell with him, yet no man ought to reprehend him. Thus these wretches never consider that these allegations that they clap so fast together are either of the popes' own coining, enlarging the

borders of their garments, or of some of those that made it their trade to flatter them."

Third, because they speak more carelessly while controversies were not raised. As Augustine acknowledges, that while the Pelagians did not stir, the ancient fathers spoke more negligently about original sin and free will. His words are these: "He (meaning Chrysostom) disputing in the Catholic Church, did think his words would be no otherwise conceived: there was then no such question made concerning this thing, you had not as yet raised your contention, and therefore he spoke more carelessly." Bellarmine himself confesses that "the writers speak sometimes properly and warily, and sometimes unsuitably and heedlessly."

Fourth, because they often borrowed their forms of speech from the vulgar, and therefore have written in many places accordingly. Melchior Cano shall be a witness. "We cannot deny," says he, "that even the gravest authors, especially in describing the miracles of the saints, have both heeded flying reports and also delivered them in writing unto posterity. Wherein truly (if I might judge) they either indulged themselves or the rude and vulgar sort of the faithful too greatly; because they knew that the common sort did not only easily believe all those miracles but also desired most earnestly to hear of them. And they thought it the more tolerable because they knew that the most famous authors hold that it is the true law of a history to write such things as common report confirms to be true, which things I may perhaps both rightly and truly affirm of Gregory and Bede." After this manner in the books of antiquity, that is often termed by the names of catholic and apostolic which was so esteemed by the vulgar sort of the faithful.

Fifth, because the fathers, being overcome by the multitude, were now and then carried into superstitions, as the force of the tide violently carries away boats. And hereupon it ensued that they concealed some things for fear. “There are many such faults as this,” says one, “which I dare not so freely reprove, for fear of offending some other holy, or perhaps, turbulent persons.”

Sixth, because sometimes they speak of things historically and in the form of rehearsal, not positively, and by way of assertion. Witness Saint Jerome: “The ancient fathers are sometimes forced to speak against their own thoughts, only because they must be feigned to affirm so against the positions of the brethren.” Again, it is one thing to speak scholastically or disputatively, and another thing to speak dogmatically or doctrinally. So also a later writer: “We must mark how authors do speak, whether out of opinion, or out of assertion, or out of the vehemency of sorrow, comforting themselves.” And so he proceeds expounding the saying of Saint Ambrose, spoken of Valentinian dying without baptism: “the grace which he entreated for, he did not lose.” So Abbot Joachim: “A man may speak what he thinks out of conjectures, but not as though he understood certainly anything thereby.” And those testimonies of antiquity which say that Enoch and Elijah are the two witnesses, he calls them “opinions fallible, no knowledge or understanding.” So Bartolus the civilian is said to defend Pope Clement I, his institution concerning the pope’s power over kings, “rather triflingly and for fashion’s sake, than truly and out of his own conscience, because he is wholly uncertain, and never affirms one flat position one way or other; and also because his place of abode was under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome.” Hear another: “We must not hold all the pope’s opinative allegations (being not decretally spoken) to be of the same value with their express determinations, as they themselves do testify. For Innocent himself upon the Chap. Literas, etc. (when there was a question

made, concerning which the final sentence of Pope Clement was alleged) held not Clement's judgment for a determination, neither would he himself determine thereof. For it were too hard a matter, and not to be borne, that the judgment of the learned should be tied to every answer and opinative allegation of the popes, for they have not always the assistance of the Spirit." Bellarmine speaking of Celestine and Innocent teaching express contraries, says, "that neither of them decreed any certainty in that controversy, but both spoke out of their judgment to the greatest probability. And that there are many things in the decretal epistles, which imply not any matter of faith, but only discover the pope's opinions concerning these things." Why therefore may not we avouch the same of the fathers?

Therefore, the fathers of later ages oftentimes expounded the sayings of their predecessors out of the Holy Scriptures or else did flatly reject them. Witness hereof Saint Augustine in the controversies with the Pelagians: "Julian did cite Basil: Sin is not a substance, but an accident, therefore easily removed out of the will, so that no scar or token thereof remain." Saint Augustine expounds this place according to the analogy of faith: "It is easy not to man's will, but unto God's mercy." And this sufficed against the Manichees, who held that it was impossible, and whereas some fathers, viz., "Irenaeus, Justin, Clement, and Tertullian held, the law of nature had power to save the Gentiles without Christ," Saint Augustine expressly confutes them all. Nay, which is more, the fathers themselves would either plainly retract and call in again such things as they had unfitly committed to others' ears, or else they would correct them by writing the contrary in another place.

The fathers have errors, yea, and that sometimes very gross ones; they themselves acknowledge it very plainly. "In the doctors' books,"

says one, “which the church authentically uses, there are sometimes found errors, sometimes heresies, yet this is no sufficient cause to condemn either book or author. Let a reader of judgment peruse them, and he shall prove me no liar.” Another: “The fathers while they labor with all their industry to subvert one error, have oftentimes either fallen, or at least seemed in some sort to fall into another, not unlike to husbandmen who, striving to make straight the crooked trunk of a younger tree, often do exceed the mean so far, that they make it bend as much the other way.” Hear also a third of approved judgment: “The writings of great authors are not altogether perfect, for sometimes they slip and shrink, as one says, under their load, and other times they dally with the affluence of their own invention and affect popularity.”

II. The Causes of the Corruption of the Apostolic Religion[1]

The doctrine of religion is by many wrung and wrested unto the opinions of the heathen.

So Cassander testifies in the appendix of the defense of his book, De Officio pii viri. “We cannot,” quotes he, “deny, but that the ancient Christians (with a wonderful consent) have affirmed that of the laws of their religion, which both the Romans and other nations in elder times have affirmed of their laws, viz., that they were partly written and partly unwritten, ἔγγραφον καὶ ἄγραφον.” The Greeks themselves do use these words, even Clem. Alexand., Basil, Epiphan., and Dionysius. And the Fathers (lest the doctrine of the Church should seem too harsh) do twine it towards natural reason and physical arguments, and in the questions of sin, free will, and faith, they argue more like philosophers than divines. As for example,

Athanasius in his book against idols and Clement in the 2nd of his Stromata.

The counsels of supererogation are nothing else but the philosophers' κατὸρθωμα, or decorum. The doctrine of purgatory came into the Church out of the heathen writers, for the philosophers and the poets were the first that ever wrote of the pains of purgatory after death, as Plato, in his 10th book De Republica, Virgil, in his 6th of the Aeneid, and Ovid, in his Metamorphoses, lib. 15. "The Platonists," says Augustine, De civitate Dei, lib. 21, cap. 13, "although they will have no sin unpunished, yet all those punishments, they will have to tend unto reformation, whether they be inflicted by law divine, or human; in this life, or after death."

The rites and customs of the heathen (with some little change) have been brought into the form of God's worship, and that by Christians. It was a custom with many to banquet upon martyrs' solemnities, and this was fetched from an old ethnic custom. Augustine's Confessions, lib. 6, c. 2. Gregory Thaumaturgus changed the Gentiles' solemnities into the martyrs' feasts, as Gregory Nyssenus, in his life, says thus: "He permitted the celebrations of the martyrs' memories, lest the unskillful multitude should (through desire of vain delight) persist in the adoration of their gorgeous idolatry." Theodoret, De Evangelicae veritatis cognitione, lib. 8, says, for the Pandia, Diasia, & Dionysia, that is, the feasts of Jupiter and Bacchus, "the people do now make their banquets to solemnize the memories of Peter, Paul, Thomas, Sergius, Marcellus, Leontius, Antoninus, Maurice, and other such holy martyrs."

Painting and imagery was a heathenish custom (Euseb., lib. 7, c. 17, Hist. Eccl.), as also to burn incense and light tapers unto the images (Cicero, De Officiis, lib. 3). Yearly vigils were used by the Gentiles

before they came into the Church, as appears by Suetonius in Vespasian's life, c. 7, as also sprinkling of holy water (Juvenal, Satire 6), which Sozomen expressly calls a heathenish custom, lib. 6, c. 6. Also lighting of candles by daylight (Seneca, lib. 4, epist. 15), and shaving of crowns: Apuleius, De asino aureo, lib. 11. "The priests of Isis," quotes he, "had their hairs shaven, and their crown very smooth." Rufinus, Hist., lib. 2, c. 29, says that, for Serapis, "his breastplate, everyone painted the cross upon the posts, entries, windows, walls, and pillars, and that Constantine used this sign of the cross in his ensign," Sozomen testifies, lib. 1, c. 5.

The Church has resumed the abolished customs and ceremonies of the Jews, as the making of their holy vestments according unto the priests of Moses's law. Alcuinus, De officiis divinis. Also Amalarius, De officiis Ecclesiasticis, lib. 2, c. 22. Gratian, De consecratione, dist. 1, says, that "The consecrations and holy unctions are to be made and performed according unto the prescript of Moses, and the imitation of the Levites." The license and too free lib.ty which the Church used in these three things has been the cause of all these corrupted festers now predominant therein, and rankling the chief and choice parts thereof.

The Demonstration of the Problem or Position

The demonstration of the problem shall be shown in the following positions, which I have composed from the chiefest places of divinity now in controversy. And the scope of them all is this: to show and prove that the religion now professed at Rome is falsely called Catholic. The sum of my demonstration tends to show that the chief and proper heads thereof either:

§ were not received from the times of Christ or His apostles, or

§ if they were received thence, yet not as articles of faith but only as opinions and probable conjectures, or

§ that in all places the purest churches never held them in the same sense that the papists held them in the Council of Trent.

Holy Scripture

1. The ancient and Christian church has acknowledged the Jews' canon of the Old Testament to be true and perfect, excluding wholly from it the Books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees. Testimonies: "Besides these," says Athanasius, in Synopsi, "there are other books of the Old Testament which are not canonical, but only read by the catechumens, as the book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, etc." "Of these," says Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 4, "read the 22 books, but meddle not with the Apocrypha. Meditate

diligently upon those Scriptures which the Church confidently reads and use no other. The apostles and bishops, at the first sowing of the Word, who left us these books, were far wiser, far holier than you are; therefore since you are a son of the church, do not break the bounds they have set you." "And as I said before, study the 22 books of the Old Testament. These are they," says Cyprian, or Ruffinus, in exp. Symb. of the Jews' canon, "which the fathers have put into the canon, by which we must lay the foundation of our faith. Yet note this, that there are other books also called by the fathers ecclesiastical, not canonical, and such is the Wisdom of Solomon, and another of Jesus Sirach, as also the books of Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees. In the New Testament, the book called Pastor. All which books they would have read in the church, but not used for confirming any point of faith." Epiphanius, lib. de pond. & mens., after he has reckoned up the canon, thus censures the books of the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus: "They are fit and profitable, but not reckoned among those which are approved by the church, and therefore they were neither laid up in Aaron, nor in the ark of the testament." The same words are in Damascene. And Nazianzen certainly determines the canon in his verses of the true books of Holy Scripture. In English thus: "In our Old Testament two and twenty books are set, according to the number of the Hebrew alphabet."

Look also in the same Nazianzen, his iambic poetry to Seleucus, on good education. Jerome says, in prolog Galeato, in lib. Reg., that the Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, Judith, and Tobit, are not in the canon. And in another place, Praef. in lib. Salo., "As the church reads the books of Judith, Tobit, and Maccabees, and yet does not allow them as canonical, so also we read these two (the books of Wisdom and Sirach) for the edifying of the people, but not for the confirmation of any ecclesiastical opinion." And in the third place, Praef. in Esdram & Nehemiam, ad Dominionem & Rogatianum:

“What books soever are not from the Hebrews, and among the 24 old ones, are wholly to be rejected.” This opinion of Jerome is followed by Lyra, in Prolog. in Apocryph., Dionysius Carthusianus, and Hugo Cardinalis, Prol. in Josuam. “Let us take a testimony,” says Gregory, in Job, lib. 19, c. 17, “out of the Maccabees, which although they are not canonical, yet were set forth to edify the church.” “Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees,” says Radulphus, in Levit. lib. 14, c. 1, “are not of any authority though they be read for the instruction of the Church.” “After the authentic books,” says Petrus Cluniacensis, epist. 2, lib. 1, “there remain other six to be spoken of, viz., Wisdom, Sirach, Tobit, Judith, and the two of the Maccabees; and these, though they could not attain to the credit and authority of the former, yet for their usefulness and good worth, they have deserved admittance by the church.” Cajetan at the end of Esther says that seven chap.s of Esther, the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees are all apocryphal. Charles Sigonius, Com. in Severum Sulpitium, denies the Maccabees to be canonical because of the dissonance of their style from the rest and seems to prefer the history of Justin before it.

Jerome says in Praefat. in Judith that the Nicene Council reckoned Judith among the Holy Scriptures; therefore that synod held all the rest of the

Apocrypha as unworthy of allowance in the church. Yet it is not certain which Jerome affirms of this book, for his words are, we read the council to have reckoned it: “But Athanasius, present at that council, utterly refuses it.” Also the Council of Laodicea, in canon 59, decreed that no part of the Old Testament should be read in the church, but only the Hebrews’ canonical Scriptures. Indeed the Third Council of Carthage, in the 47th canon, numbers all the aforenamed books among the Holy Scriptures. But I say that the catalogue of the

books of that council is either counterfeit or justly doubted, for: 1. This canon which is reckoned for the 47th of this council, is in some books the 24th canon of another council under Boniface, as Surius will testify. 2. In this canon are allowed five books of Solomon, whereas there are not so many. 3. The canons in Trullo approve both the Laodicean Council and this one, which should not have been done if they had determined just contraries, the one making that apocryphal which the other makes canonical. 4. I think the Council of Carthage held all books canonical which the ancient fathers admitted to be read in the church.

2. The book of Baruch has been held apocryphal, both by the fathers and councils, even to the year 1439, at which time the Florentine Council canonized it. And yet did Driedo deny it to be canonical after this, D. dogm. Eccl., lib. 1, cap. 4.

3. Esther's last seven chap.s, Daniel's hymn of the children, the history of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, are all rejected as counterfeits by the fathers. Jerome, preface in Daniel, calls the history of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon fables, and says they bear not the authority of Holy Scripture. And so, he says, Eusebius, Apollinaris, and Methodius do all judge.

The author of the book de mirabilibus scripturae, in Saint Augustine, lib. 2, c. 32, says that concerning the other den of lions and the transportation of Habakkuk, in the tale of Bel and the Dragon, nothing is put in this rank, because they are not contained in the divine Scriptures. And Sixtus Senensis, Biblioth. lib. 1, cap. 8, rejects the seven chap.s of Esther and the history of Susanna as additions.

4. The word canonical is used by the fathers in two senses, namely, absolutely and respectively, ἁπλῶς and κατὰ τι. That which is absolutely canonical is the perfect rule both of faith and discipline.

Respectively canonical is that work wherein are contained some sentences taken out of the writings absolutely canonical, and some histories concerning the church of God, and are therefore allowed to be read in the church at public meetings. And in this sense, it is opposite only to profane and heathenish works. In this sense are these apocryphal books called canonical and divine, or of divine authority by Augustine, De Civitate Dei, book 18, chap. 36, with chap. 23, book 2, Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum, and Jerome, preface to Maccabees. And in this sense the Council of Carthage in the afore cited canon acknowledges all those for canonical Scriptures, which, says it, "we have received from the fathers to be read in the church." And indeed, when the fathers cite these apocrypha, they do not allege them as properly canonical, but only as historical. Ambrose, book De Bono Mortis and book 2 on Luke, cites the 4 books of Ezra, yet who is he that holds this book for canonical? So is the third of Ezra, and Hermes's book called Pastor, oftentimes alleged by the ancient writers, and yet are apocrypha. By the canons of the apostles, Canon 84, the 3rd book of the Maccabees is canonical, but not by the Council of Trent. Bellarmine says that the decrees of the popes are by Gratian called Holy Scriptures, but κατεγράφησαν, that is, absolutely to distinguish them from profane writings, and canonical to distinguish them from the fathers' holy works, which are neither rules for our faith, nor have power to bind us to believe them. "For although," quotes he, "the canons of popes and councils are distinguished from, and set after the Holy Scriptures, yet in their kind, they both are and may be called holy and canonical writings", as Innocentius, chap. Cum Martha, extra de Celebratione Missarum calls that sentence of Augustine's Holy Scripture: "he injures a martyr, that prays for a martyr." And in this sense Damasus calls the canons of the apostles canonical.

5. The ancient fathers, and the most learned of their successors, do hold the Hebrew and Greek text of the Holy Scriptures to be uncorrupted and pure. This not one denies. Jerome, in chap. 6, Isaiah, derides them that say that the Hebrew books are corrupted. The same father will have more credit given to the original than to the translator, Epistle to Lucinus de Optimo Genere Interpretandi, in chap. 3, Malachi, epistle to Augustine 89, preface to the Four Gospels. Augustine also, De Civitate Dei, book 15, chap. 13, says, "that when a diversity is found in the books, trust that language from whence it is known to have been first translated." So says Ludovicus Vives upon this place of Augustine. And Augustine himself in divers other places, namely, Epistle 108, Tractate 3 on John, De Doctrina Christiana, book 2, chap. 11. Arias Montanus says plainly that the Jews never corrupted the Hebrew book which we now have, and if there were any change, yet was there not one word, one letter, one tittle, which was not kept in the treasury called Masorah, and therefore he calls that Masorah a faithful custody.

6. The fathers before Gregory I never used the vulgar translation, which is now said to be of Jerome's correction, by Damasus's command.

Tertullian against Marcion used it not (lib. 5, cap. 4, cap. 5, cap. 13); Cyprian used it not (Ad Quirinum, lib. 1, num. 12; lib. 2, num. 6, 7; lib. 3, num. 35); the Roman clergy contemporary with Cyprian used it not (Ep. 31); Arnobius used it not (Comment. in Psal., 67, 106.); Hilary used it not (In Matth.); Ambrose used it not (Comment. in Luc., lib. 8.); Augustine used it not (Tract. in Joann., 44, 61; Tract. 10 in 1. Epist. John, Tract. 6 in 1. Epist. John, Tract. 7 in 1. Epist. John); Optatus used it not (In Matth. 16); Fulgentius used it not (Ad Thrasimundum, lib. 1, cap. 5; lib. 2, cap. 18.); Primasius used it not;

Prosper used it not (De promiss., part. 3.); Leo the Great used it not (Fest. om sanct.).

7. Gregory often follows that translation, even the errors of those who copied it out, as Luke 15, overturned the house, for overturned (hom. 34, in Evangel.). Therefore the Latin translation attributed to Jerome had not then gained footing, neither was it preferred in the Roman Church before others, until about the time of Gregory the Great, who in that respect, in the 20 books of his morals, cap. 23, terms that translation new. Neither does he in all things follow it, for in his 1st book of morals, c. 19, he reads not She shall bruise, but, She shall watch. And after Gregory's time, that alone was not received, for Bede, Gildas, and others followed other translations now and then. And Bernard, Serm. in Cant. 24, reads in Genesis 4, If you offer rightly, and do not divide rightly, according to the Septuagint. It was not therefore only and wholly approved of, for the space of one thousand years after Christ, neither can it be shown by any decree of the church that the Latin edition should be held for authentic before the late Council of Trent.

8. It is probable that the vulgar translation which is made authentic among the Catholics is not that which Jerome at Damasus's appointment did correct, for there are many errors in this which Jerome did correct. The name of Isaiah, in chap. 1, verse 2 of Mark's Gospel, in the vulgar edition, Jerome thinks was added by some copier's negligence, in his Commentary on Matthew chap. 3. And upon the 6th chap. of Matthew, he corrected the word (exterminant) which the vulgar translation keeps. And whereas the vulgar edition has Matthew 16:23, vade post me, Jerome says, vade retro me. Again, in the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. 1, they say, Expugnabam illam, but he says, in his Commentary there, Devastabam illam. And in the same chap. they say acquievi, he says, contuli. And upon the 3rd

chap., “It is written,” quotes he, “in certain books, Quis vos fascinavit non credere veritati? but because this is not in Origen’s copy, we let it pass.” In the 5th chap., the vulgar says, Evacuati estis à Christo, he says, à Christo opere cessastis, justly reprehending the former interpretation. Yea, Augustine himself, though he so greatly commends the translation of Jerome in his 10th epistle, yet in more than 500 places he does not follow this edition.

9. What the fathers have spoken concerning the church’s allowance of the Scriptures does not belong to the church that now is. That place of Augustine, Contra epistolam fundamenti, chap. 5: “I would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me,” Gerson of Paris, in his book on the spiritual life, lecture 2, Corollary, holds not to be meant of “any church, but only of the primitive church which saw Christ’s person, or His apostles, and could bear record of their doctrine and writing.” “That which is spoken of the church’s approbation of the Scriptures,” says Durandus, book 3, dist.n 24, question 1, “is meant of that church only which was in the apostles’ time, who were full of the Holy Ghost, and besides saw Christ’s miracles and heard His doctrine, and therefore were convenient witnesses of all things that He either did or said, so that the Gospels which that church then received cannot be by us now refused, because of the diversity of the cause. Whosoever thinks otherwise is a heretic, of what state or condition soever he be.”

What ground had Cusanus then for his assertion to the Bohemians, Epistle 2, namely, that “the authority of the Scriptures depends upon the approbation of the present church, and they have no more power to loose and bind than the church will give them.” And that speech of Bellarmine is a foundation of atheism: “If,” quotes he, De effectu sacramentorum, book 2, chap. 25, “we should take away the authority and credit of this present church and Council of Trent, the

decrees of all other councils, nay even Christian faith itself might be called in question." Again, "The credit and certainty of all opinions and doctrines depends upon the authority of the present church."

10. The canonical Scripture is a principle of divinity deserving credit of itself, and therefore not demonstrable by any other exterior principle. "The principles of divinity," says Petrus de Alliaco, in book 1 of Sentences, question 1, article 3, "are the very truths of the sacred canon. Moreover, the final resolution of theological discourse appertains unto them, and from them the conclusions of all divinity are drawn." "God's will," says Joachim Abbas, in his Apocalypse commentary, "is that we, acknowledging the letter of both the Testaments, presume not upon any other relation or opinion further than the written Word."

11. The Holy Scriptures, in all such things as are necessary for our salvation, do manifestly, truly, and infallibly explain and open themselves, serving for both gloss and text. "The regular and diligent interpretation according to Scripture," says Irenaeus, lib. 4, cap. 63, "is without danger of error or blasphemy." "Our meanings and allegations," says Origen, in Jeremiah, hom. 1, "without these witnesses, the Scriptures, have not any credit. And whereas it is said, 'In the mouths of two or three witnesses shall every word stand,' this rather belongs to the proof of the interpreter, than to any certain number of men whosoever, that I may confirm the word of my understanding, taking the two witnesses to be meant of the Old and New Testament, and the three to be spoken of the gospel, the prophet, and the apostle; for so shall every word be confirmed." "The Scripture expounds itself," says Chrysostom, Homily 13, in Genesis, "and suffers not the hearer thereof to err." So says Augustine, De doctrina Christiana, lib. 2, cap. 6 and 26, 27, 28. And so Clement also, "For you ought not," says he, Epist. 5, and he is cited dist. 27, c.

Relatum, “to seek out any strange and impertinent sense, nor confirm it by confused allegations of the Scriptures, but fetch the truest sense indeed out of the Scriptures themselves.”

12. The infallible and determining judgment of all controversies of faith is in Christ’s own person, or in the Holy Ghost, so far as He speaks unto us in the canonical Scriptures. “He,” says Tertullian, De praescriptione, “sits at God’s right hand, but He has sent His deputy, namely, the power of the Holy Spirit to work upon the hearts of the faithful.”

“We must have judges sought out,” says Optatus contra Parmenianum, “but since earth affords no judgment of this matter, we must seek a judge in heaven. But what need we knock at heaven, since we have here a testament in the gospel? An earthly father, feeling himself near death, and fearing the contention of his sons after his death, calling some witnesses, he transposes his will out of his dying breast into lasting parchment. If so be now contention do arise among the brethren, do they run to their father’s grave? No, but seek out his will and testament, and he who sleeps in his tomb speaks lively out of the silent parchment. He whose this testament is, is in heaven; therefore His will is to be searched out in the gospel as His testament.” “This controversy,” says Saint Augustine, De nuptiis et concupiscentia, lib. 2, cap. 33, “requires a judge. Then let Christ be the judge, let Himself speak who it was that His death did profit, and with Him let the apostle also judge, because in the apostle Christ speaks.” And, De gratia et lib.o arbitrio, cap. 18, “Let the apostle John sit as a judge between us.”

Tradition

1. The fathers, by the name of tradition, do sometimes understand the doctrine received in the primitive church, taught by the apostles, and recorded in their writings. “If it be taught in the gospel,” says Cyprian (Epist. 74, ad Pompeium), “or contained in the epistles or Acts of the Apostles, that converts from heresies should not be baptized, but only have imposition of hands in sign of repentance, let this holy and divine tradition be observed.”

2. They do sometimes call that an unwritten tradition which is contained only in the sense of the Scriptures, and not in the words. And to this manner of speaking are referred all things gathered by analogy or proportion. Augustine says (De Genesi ad liter., lib. 10, cap. 23) that “Baptism of children is an apostolic tradition.” Yet (De bapt., Contra Donatist, cap. 24) he proves it out of the Scriptures. So holds he that denial of rebaptization unto heretics is “a tradition unwritten according to the words, but written in sense and foundation.” Wherefore one and the same tradition may be both written and unwritten; written in sense, unwritten in words.

Tradition is by Vincent of Lérins used for the whole sum of catholic doctrine, founded and grounded upon and in the Scriptures; not containing any doctrine of faith without or besides the Scriptures, because he holds the Scriptures the perfect and all sufficient rule for us that can be. Yes, moreover, he adds that the tradition of the church is to be followed only in the chief questions that are the foundations of the whole Christian faith and doctrine.

3. By the name of tradition are very often meant customs in things of lib.ty, or ecclesiastic rites, that is, rules concerning things and actions of comeliness and government only, not pertinent any way to divine worship, or the articles of faith. And these for the more esteem of order in the church are called apostolic, as the Grecian idols for their

more reverence were said to come down from Jupiter (Acts 19). And Epicurus's book, de organo judicandi, was called Διοπετής, that is, à Jove lapsus, or fallen from Jupiter. And the porch in Jerusalem called Solomon's after the common opinion (John 10:23), whereas indeed, Herod built it. "Every province," says Jerome (epist. Ad Lucinium), "thinks their fathers' precepts to be apostolic doctrines." And in Aggae, c. 1: "But the sword of God strikes them for other things also, which they have invented, and feigned of themselves as apostolic traditions, being without all allowance and testimony of Scriptures." And in Tertullian, tradition is taken for any custom of what original soever. "Do you not think," says he (De corona milit., ca. 34), "that it is lawful for any Christian to invent and institute what agrees with God, assists discipline, and helps unto salvation?" The fast of Wednesday and Friday is called an apostolic tradition (Canon. Apost. 68 and Epiphan. Haeres. 75), and yet we find it seldom or never observed in the catholic church, which shows that it was apostolic only in name, and not in deed.

4. Some of the fathers inclining unto some heresies did make much of unwritten traditions. So Justin (Dial. cum Triphone) defends the heresy of the Chiliasts by apostolic tradition. So was Irenaeus deluded with traditions, for he held that Christ did live 50 years, which he says he received by tradition from the apostles. So Clement of Alexandria (Stromat., lib. 1) says that "God's workmen have a double husbandry, written and unwritten. And no marvel, for this man will have the Gentiles saved by philosophy." Irenaeus (lib. 3, cap. 2) and Tertullian (De praescriptione) do both testify that the old heretics held the same opinion of traditions, which nevertheless they both do confute. So Eusebius (de praeparat. Evang., lib. 1, cap. 8) dreamed that the apostles taught something in words, and other some in writings; and some things more excellent they reserved for

the perfect only. Tertullian, himself being fallen into Montanism, gave himself over unto new prophecies and traditions.

5. The ancient fathers, speaking of these traditions, do oftentimes contradict themselves. So does Basil: “We preach,” says he (li. de Spir. san., cap. 27), “and observe some things out of the written word, and other some which we have received by mystical tradition from the apostles.” And says that “Both these have like force and efficacy unto godliness.” But (Regul. morall. 8 and 26, epist. 80) he does not stick to say that “The Scriptures contain all things needful to salvation.”

So Chrysostom (in 2 Thess., homil. 1): “It is a tradition, inquire no further.” But (in Psal. 95, hom. 1): “If we preach anything without Scripture, our auditory will be most uncertain what to think, now assenting, now doubting, and sometimes plainly rejecting as frivolous the words they hear.” Thus he contraries himself. And again (Serm. de sancto & adorando Spir.): “If you hear any say, I have the Holy Spirit, and yet he speaks not out of the gospel, but of his own fantasy, he speaks of himself, and the Holy Ghost is not in him.” And a little after: “If any of those that are said to have the Holy Ghost, do speak ought besides the gospel of themselves, believe them not, but follow my doctrine.”

6). The Roman Church does not acknowledge the traditions which the ancient fathers called apostolic; and if it does acknowledge them, yet it is not certain that they are the apostles’. Thrice dipping in baptism is now out of use, talked of in Tertullian, de coron. mil., cap. 3, and Basil, which also the 4th Council of Toledo did disallow. Standing at prayers upon the Sundays between Easter and Whitsuntide now is quite forgotten, yet it was an old tradition. In Epiphanius, by tradition, no man may marry after a vow of

singleness, and yet he allows those which burn to marry, thinking it less evil to have one vice than many, though papists now do control him, making a nullity of such marriages. Neither use they nowadays to cause the newly baptized to taste milk and honey, nor to cause the baptized of discretion to fast the week after their baptism, nor to fast Wednesday and Friday, yet were all these traditions. But let us hear Cassander's mind herein: "There are three kinds of rites," says he (106), "whereof the first is of such as were not of such moment as to bind unto the strict keeping of them, as those were in Tertullian and Jerome, of tasting milk and honey after baptism, as also not kneeling on the Lord's Day, nor upon all the 50 days between Easter and Whitsuntide, but praying standing, which old custom both held apostolic, and instituted in the Council of Nicea, c. 20, as also confirmed by the divine custom of the churches. For all this has no sign or token of the use thereof remaining among us. For we make no difference now between Sunday and weekday, only upon some solemn fasts the deacon exhorts us to kneel. Also, the fast of Wednesday and Friday was once most religiously observed, which days Epiphanius says were 'By the apostles, appointed for holy assemblies.' But this Wednesday fast is now almost forgotten among the Romans, unless it be that some provinces and some private men do upon this day abstain from flesh. And the Friday fast is changed into only abstinence from flesh, as also almost the whole Lent, which abstinence yields a vain show of the true and ancient fasting, since it brings unto many rather change of dainties, and greater excess of luxury, than any restraint of bodily wantonness." Thus much Cassander.

Therefore, the present Church of Rome can show no consent of the catholic doctors for those unwritten traditions, which it has set down as necessary to salvation.

The Mediator

1. The ancient fathers do teach Christ to be the Mediator (as He is God and man) by a different act and operation, but in one and the same perfection, proceeding from both the natures of Christ. For in His human nature He wrought our salvation by suffering, dying, satisfying, and in His divine nature, by giving strength unto His humanity to endure the death of the cross, and perfect His satisfaction. "The divine humanity," says Augustine (hom. de onibus, c. 12), "and the human divinity is our Mediator." And in another place (de consensus Evang., lib. 1, c. 35), "Therefore is Christ called the Mediator of God and man, between immortal God and mortal man; God and man reconciling man unto God, remaining that which He was, and made that which He was not."

"Christ's death," says Cyril (l. 1, de fide, ad Reginas), "is confessed to be profitable unto us, but if He were not God, how could He, and He alone suffice for the price of all our redemption? But He only in His death satisfied for all, because He is above all." "Neither could we be freed," says Augustine again (Enchirid., cap. 108), "by that one Mediator of God and man, the man Christ, unless He were God."

2. Whereas the ancient fathers sometimes affirm that Christ is Mediator only as He is man, and Mediator by that by which He is man, and Mediator in His human nature, and Mediator according to His manhood, they do not speak of the manhood only and exclusively, but of the whole person, so considered as He has assumed man's nature and flesh upon Him.

3. Whereas they deny Christ to be Mediator as God, they speak of the godhead or of the Son of God absolutely considered, not of God as incarnate. That is, they speak of the bare deity, or of Christ as He is

verbum Patris, the Word of the Father. And there is not one of all the fathers that says that Christ, according to both His natures, is the Mediator so, as His only humanity is the formal cause of His mediatorship and the actions thereof. For the whole person compounded of God and man, according to both natures, is the beginning of all the operations of the God-man. Therefore, it is a fiction of the schoolmen to say that Christ is the Mediator only according to His humanity.

The Truth of the Humanity

1. The ancient fathers, when they call Christ's humanity deified, and partaker of the deity, and supreme glory, in these and like phrases they express the personal union. And they are to be understood with this caution, as far as these things agree with the nature of the humanity, and do not infringe the properties thereof. Or, they speak thus in respect that the flesh is as the instrument of the Divinity, by which and in which it exercises the power and actions thereof. "The Lord's flesh," says Damascene (lib. 3, cap. 17), "is enriched with divine efficacy because of the personal union, neither yet does it fall or depart from His own proper nature, nor from the natural properties thereof." And Nazianzene says (Orat. 42), that the humanity is endowed with divinity, and is God together with it. But this is in respect of the personal union, not essentially nor formally.

2. When the fathers sometime say that God's omnipotency is communicated unto the manhood of Christ, or to Christ as man, they must be expounded two ways: First, in respect that the man Christ is called omnipotent, because of the communication of the properties. Second, in respect that the proper works of God are ascribed unto the flesh, as the organ or instrument of the Divinity. So do Damascene

(lib. 3, cap. 18) and Nicetas (Thesaur., lib. 3, cap. 38) use these sayings.

3. Some of the fathers say that Christ's nativity was without miracle, as other men's ordinarily are. So affirms Ambrose upon the text Omne masculum aperiens vulvam (Comm. in Luc., lib. 2); and also Origen (Homil. 14, in Luc.); Tertullian (in fine lib. De carne Christi). Cyprian or Ruffinus (in Symbol. Apost.), and Leo (Epist. 83 and 97), is not far from this opinion also. "It is possible," says Durandus (lib. 4, dist. 44, q. 6), "that by the operation of the Deity, there was made a dilatation or enlarging of the natural parts and passages in the virgin Mary, without any breach or interruption." And to confirm this, he cites Gregory upon the second of Luke: "Again Jesus came in when the doors were shut, but it is not said that He came through the doors being shut;, they might be opened and shut again in a moment, so as the disciples might not perceive it."

4. The fathers, affirming the fullness of grace in Christ, do mean of Christ as God, or of the whole person, not of His soul. So means Athanasius in his 4th sermon against the Arians, and Nazianzene in his oration upon Basil.

5. The fathers do not with one consent affirm that Christ had the fullness of knowledge from His conception, so as He could never have more. "He received a soul," says Origen (Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, lib. 4), "in nature and essence like unto one of ours." "Therefore did Luke notify his age," says Ambrose (de Incarnat. Dom., cap. 7), "because you should know that he spoke of His manhood. For it is the body, not the deity, that is the object of age. Wherefore, if He increased in the years of man, He also increased in the wisdom of man." Augustine is variable in this point, and yet that place of Luke, Puerulus crescebat, he held to be meant of Christ's humanity (De Genes. ad liter., lib. 10,

c. 18). “Growing up in age and wisdom,” says Bruno Herbipolensis (in Symb. Apost.), “after His holy nativity, He came to the age of thirty years.”

6. That which the fathers do attribute unto the name of Jesus, or of Christ, is not properly ascribed to the bare name, but as it is invoked by men or to the invocation of the name. “Often times I have scarce pronounced that name,” says Nazianzene (ad Nemesium), “when the devil presently hasted away.” “The devils gave place,” says Origen (contra Cels., lib. 1), “at the very calling upon the name of Jesus.” And lib. 3: “The sick were cured by calling upon the Almighty God, and the name of Jesus over them.” “Hilarion,” says Jerome (in vita Hilari.), “cast out devils by invoking the name of Jesus.”

The Descension into Hell (to Deliver the Fathers)

1. The fathers do sometimes defend a virtual descension of Christ into hell and a virtual deliverance from hell, that is, by the merit and virtue of His passion and death, not a local. This Augustine (in Psalm 85) acknowledges. And Durandus (l. 3, Sent. dist. 22, quest. 3) denies any other descension of Christ into the place of the damned, than one virtual, or in the effect. Thomas also (par. 3, quest. 52, artit. 2) denies that Christ was really in any other place save limbo, but in the place of the damned only virtually, or in effect. In this sense many testimonies of the fathers must be taken figuratively. In like manner they say that Adam and others were in hell, not locally, but according to their desert, yea, and that before they died.

2. Those of the fathers that defend a local descension and deliverance do not defend it as an article of the creed, but as a probable opinion.

This may be proved because they seldom or never put this article into their creeds and confessions of the faith. “You must know,” says Ruffinus (in exposit. Symbol.), “that in the Church of Rome, this article, ‘He descended into hell,’ is not put in the creed, nor in the creed of the eastern church, though it seems to be included in these words, ‘dead and buried.’” Nay, this article is not in any creed or confession almost of all the fathers. It is not in Marcellus’s confession in Epiphanius; not in Ignatius’s confession (in ep. ad Magnetianos, vel ad Ephesios); not in that of Polycarp (Epist. ad Philippenses); not in Justin’s (in Apolog. 2); not in Irenaeus’s (lib. 1, cap. 2); not in Tertullian’s (lib. de Praescript. vel contra Praxeam), though he explains the Apostles’ Creed; not in Origen’s (in Proemio perì arkṑn), where he entreats of faith; not in Gregory’s of Neocaesaria; not in the Councils of Nicaea (Socrat., lib. 1, cap. 5); not in Eusebius’s creed of Caesaria (Theodoret, lib. 1, cap. 12); not in the third creed rehearsed in the Nicene Council (Socrat., lib. 1, cap. 5); not in Athanasius’s creed (Epist. ad Epictetum); not in that creed which is in Athanasius’s epistle touching the Councils of Arimin and Seleucia; not in the Synod of Syrmia’s creed (Socrat., lib. 2, cap. 25; Hilar., lib. de Synod. contr. Arian); not in the Council of Sardica’s creed (Theodoret, lib. 2, cap. 8); not in Hilary’s exposition thereof; not in the creed of the Synod of Antioch, set down by Hilary, lib. de Synod, contra Arian; not in the creed of Seleucia, a city of Isauria, in Socrates, lib. 2, cap. 32; Epiph., haeres. 73; not in the Synod of Illyria (Theodoret, lib. 4, cap. 8); not in Damasus’s creed, set down by Jerome, Tom. 2, operum. Theodoret, lib. 5, cap. 10; not in Eusebius Pamphilus’s creed (Socrat., lib. 1, cap. 5); not in Hilary’s de Synodis cont. Arianos; not in Basil’s creed, in his Ascetica; not in Nazianzene’s; not in that of Victorine, lib. 1, contr. Arian; not in Epiphanius’s Aneoratum, where the catholic faith is rehearsed; not in Theodoret, in Dialog. Impatibilis, where the Nicene creed is expounded; not in Maximus Taurinensis, where he expounds the

creed; not in that which Chrysologus repeats four times (Homil. 56, 57, 58); not in that of the first Council of Toledo; not in the Ephesine creed (anno 435); not in that of the first Council of Constant.; not in that of the Sixth Council of Constant., Act. 10; not in that of the Synod of Chalcedon, in Zonaras; not in the creed of the fathers in Cyril, ad Reginus, lib. 1; not in that of the third Council of Toledo; not in that of Gregory I; not in Spiridion's (Niceph., lib. 8, cap. 15); not in that which the bishops of the east offered Constans (Niceph., lib. 9, cap. 11); not in that which the legates of the west offered the same emperor (Niceph., lib. 9, cap. 10); not in the book of faith upon Petrus Diaconus; not in Augustine, wheresoever he expounds the creed; although in his works, lib. de fide & Symb., In libris 4, de fid. ad Catechumenos, Serm. de tempore 123, 125, he explains it five several times; nor in the first exposition of the creed in Chrysostom's 5th tome.

3. The fathers, by Christ's descension into hell, do sometimes understand His descending into these lower parts of the world. "Christ, not only in His death, but also in His birth," says Bede, Psalm 85, "did descend into hell." And in the 6th general Council, Act 10, "He descended into hell," is left out and there is put in, "He descended out of heaven." And so it is also in the Nicene Council, ibid., Act 17. And in the Ephesine Creed, "He descended from the heavens." In the 6th and 11th of Toledo, it is, "Being sent from His Father He came into the world."

4. The descension into hell sometimes is put for burial, as in Athanasius's creed, and the latter exposition of the creed in Chrysostom. And in the creed of Toledo 4, there are these words, "He descended into hell to free the saints there captive, and having overcome the dominion of death, He rose again." And in Jerome, in Praem. comment. in Isay, "Being buried, and rising again, He is

preached." "He descended not only into hell," says Radulphus Ardens, in vigil. ascen., Homily 2, "but also into the lower parts of the earth, that is, into the place of torment, breaking it up and leading away captivity captive."

5. The fathers either knew not at all, or (if they knew) yet speak doubtfully of the several places of hell, and therefore sometimes oppugn Limbus Patrum, which is called a part of hell, and sometimes (but uncertainly),

Make for it. "Abraham's bosom," says Augustine (epist. 99), "that is, the habitation of secret rest, is not to be held any part of hell." And De remiss. peccat., lib. 1, cap. 28: "There is no middle place for any man to be," says he, "but with the devil, that is, not with Christ." "Although," says he, De Genes. ad liter., lib. 12, ca. 33, "I confess I have not yet found that the place where the righteous rested (as Abraham and Lazarus) is called hell, neither where they are said to be in hell have I yet found, but I still do seek and know not. Nor do I find in all the Scriptures (which are canonical) that hell is taken in good part or sense; and, therefore, I cannot see how Abraham can be said or believed to be in hell." Again, "Perhaps," says he, in Psalm 85, "there is a lower part of hell where the sinners are shut, which were very wicked, for whether Abraham were in any of these places, we cannot certainly determine." And again, "Perhaps between those two hells, etc."

Tertullian will have Abraham's bosom (wherein he thinks the just souls are kept until the last judgment) distinct from hell. "Hell is one place, as I think," says he, Contra Marcion, lib. 4, cap. 51, "and Abraham's bosom another. And I call that region Abraham's bosom which, if it be not heavenly, yet is higher than hell, giving rest unto the souls of the righteous until the consummation of all things

terminates their resurrection, with fullness of reward." Here also he ascribes this opinion of limbus unto Marcion: "Marcion," says he, "thinks otherwise, namely, he determines both the rewards of the Creator, whether it be of torment or rest, in hell, unto those that keep or break the law and the prophets, but he ascribes heaven unto Christ, and to His God." And in lib. De anima, cap. 7: "What is that which is transported unto hell after the separation from the body, and unto what did Christ descend in His death? I think unto the souls of the patriarchs."

"Concerning the first man," says Augustine (epist. 99), "and our first parent, the whole church almost agrees in this, that Christ freed him from thence, which we must think was not believed upon no ground, whencesoever it first came up, although we have no authority of canonical Scripture to authorize it at all." "These perhaps," says Julian to Toledo, Prognost., lib. 2, cap. 4, "were the two hells, in one whereof the souls of the just were at rest, and in the other the wicked punished." Bede, in Psalm 85, says that the earth is the upper hell and that the place of punishment after this life is the lower hell.

6. Of the intent of Christ in His descension the fathers speak variably. Most hold that He went to free the souls of the saints out of the bonds and captivity of death. "I think it no absurdity," says Augustine (De Civit. Dei, lib. 20, cap. 15), "to believe that the saints of old that expected Christ in faith were in habitacles far distant from the torments of the wicked, but yet that they were in hell until that Christ's blood and descending thither set them free." But in epist. 99, more plainly, "I do not find," says he, "what good Christ did unto those just ones that were in Abraham's bosom by His descending into hell, from whom according to the blessed presence of His divinity, He was never absent."

“Christ descended into hell,” says Clement Alexandrinus most plainly (Stromat. 6), “for no other cause but to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, that they might learn the true faith and be saved, or justly be condemned for ever.” And thus also Damascene (in Oratione de fidelibus defunctis) holds. But this opinion is condemned by Philaster (cap. 74. “There are heretics,” quotes he, “that say that Christ descended into hell, and therefore after His death told them all that whoso there confessed Him should be saved.” Look at Augustine, De haeres., cap. 79, concerning this, and Gregory, lib. 6, indict. 15, epist. 15. “Christ descended into hell for us sinners,” says Fulgentius ad Thrasimund, lib. 3, cap. 31. “Christ descended,” says Epiph., Haeres. 46, contra Tasianos, “to give pardon unto those that erred, not from acknowledging His deity, but were kept in hell for other errors.” Yea, Bellarmine himself, De anima Christi, lib. 4, cap. 15, confesses that this in the belief of Christ’s descension is not of necessity, but of decency or conformity. “Although,” quotes he, “it be not necessary that Christ’s soul should be present in the illumination of the fathers with divine vision, yet it seems fit that it should be present while that was doing.” But the articles of our faith (good M. Bellarmine) be founded upon somewhat besides congruity; they stand upon necessity.

7. Those that will have the fathers in hell until Christ’s ascension do contradict themselves or one another. 1. Some, as Ruffinus for one, will have them in pains. “The King,” says he in expos. Symbol., “was said to be in prison also, but not as the rest were. They were there to suffer pains, but He to release them.” Athanasius, De salutar. Christ. advent., says, “Adam’s soul and the rest that served God in the law of nature were in sorrow and cried out.” “By Christ,” says Anastasius Sinaites, in Hexamer., “was Adam freed from his sorrows.” And De recta fidei dogmat., lib. 5: “The souls were freed out of the cloisters of hell where they were held in most miserable tyranny. Perhaps not

tyranny, yet guilty of the debt of a multitude of sins." "Presently upon Christ's descension," says Cosarius, Homil. 3, de Paschate, "that eternal night of hell had morning, the noise of the mourners was silent, the huge weights of the chains were laid off, and the bands of the damned fell away all broken."

8. Other some will have them in a quiet repose without all molestation. So will Jerome have them, Ad Paulam, epist. 25, cap. 3, and Augustine, De genes. ad lit., lib. 12, cap. 33. So that Abraham, although he was in that place of repose, yet is said to have been in hell with Lazarus.

Free Will

1. Some of the fathers, speaking of free will, in some places do mean of the freedom which was in our nature before our fall, or of the freedom of glory. So means August., Hypognost. 3 (or whosoever was the author of that book), when he says, "Unto Adam was that spoken, Eccles. 15, if thou wilt keep my commandments they shall keep thee."

2. Other some things are spoken of the natural freedom of our will from necessity, from which it cannot but be free. And in this sense, they say that we have a will absolutely free in all things, that is, an understanding mind and a will whereby we assent unto or dissent from our judgment, by which that which we do, we do it wittingly and willingly, not compelled. Gregory Arim., lib. 2, dist. 29, in fine, says, "It is sufficient to make a thing voluntary if it be done by him that knows and is willing." "The soul has free will," says Cyril, Catechis. 4., "The devil may stir it up unto sin but he cannot constrain it against the will." "God made us of a free consent," says Jerome, in Iovinian, lib. 4, "neither are we forced by necessity either to virtue or vice." And these speak of the lib.ty we have in reasonable

and sensible things. So does Augustine, de perfect. justit. contra Caelestium, and Caelestius, objecting that of Saint Paul, faciat quod vult, “As though,” says he, “it was a great matter to desire to wed, where the disputation is earnest concerning the assistance of God’s mercy.” “Neither let a man think,” says the author in Ambrose’s words, De vocat. Gent., lib. 1, cap. 3, “because he is drawn on by the Spirit of God, that he has not free will, for he lost not that when he yielded himself in will unto the devil, by whom indeed the judgment of his will was depraved, but not utterly taken away.” So says Euthymius, in Luc., 15, cap., of the prodigal son: “He asked that part of the goods which fell unto him, that is, free will; as if he should say, urge me not necessarily to serve, for I have free will.” So Bernard, De grat. et lib. arbit, says, “Seeing then that consummation or perfection in glory must be wrought upon us, or even in us, but not of ourselves, and that our creation was wrought, and that without us, there is only reformation, which after a sort is wrought with us by reason of our voluntary consent, that shall be reckoned to our desert.”

3. Some things also are spoken of free will as of a good belonging to natural life, or an external moral good, or of outward discipline. And this manner of speaking the author of the book in Augustine called Hypognostic uses, lib. 3: “He is rightly said to be but half alive,” says he, “for he had his vital motion, that is, his free will wounded.” And so Gregory of Arimin., 2 dist. 26, and after him, Cassalius, de quadripartita Justitia, lib. 1, do speak of goodness considered in the kind, object, and office, not of good from all circumstances.

4. Some of their sayings hereof are legal, in that they show not what we can do but what we cannot do through sin, and what we ought to do in duty. “The Pelagians,” says Augustine, De grat. & lib. arbit, cap. 16, “think themselves great scholars when they object that God would not command what He knows impossible to be kept; who knows not

that? But therefore, He commands us some things which we cannot do because we should know what we ought to beg of Him."

5. Others are meant of the will being freed, and therefore show what our will may do in a work, truly good not of itself and its own natural power, but what it can do by grace.

6. Most of the fathers correct their own unfit speeches of free will (but chiefly Augustine). For indeed almost all of them speak contraries, so that none can tell their positive doctrines. 1. Sometimes they extol human power too much, and that first because if they should directly have affirmed the weakness of the will, the philosophers might have scorned them. 2. Because they would not give the reins unto negligence. And sometimes they beat down the lib.ty of will on the other side. Chrysostom often gives too much to the power of the will after the fall, and yet sometimes corrects himself. "A man before he sins," says he, Sermon 1, de Adventu., "has free will to choose whether he will yield to the devil or no; but when he has once taken that subjection upon him by sin, then he is no more at his own command." "You have nothing," says Basil, Sermon de humilit., "left you, oh man, to be proud of, whose glory and hope should be to mortify all your own affections, and seek the life to come in Christ, whose first fruits we having reaped, do owe our life and all we are unto the gift and grace of God. For it is He that gives us both to will and to do according to His good pleasure."

7. The fathers before Pelagius, while the controversies of free will were not stirred up, spoke thereof very securely, like as Pelagius did chiefly; they that opposed the Marcionites, Valentinians, or the Manichees, with whom, while they contend about the heresy of the necessity of all things and of all events; they miss the way a little in giving too much to free will and too little unto grace, at least in show.

“There were naught of any worth in man,” says Justin (Apolog. 1), “unless he had an equal power to turn unto what part he lists.” “God does not force any,” says Irenaeus (lib. 4, cap. 71), “but is always well meaning, and therefore He counsels all men unto good. But He has given man a free election, even as well as the angels.” “We are all of one nature,” says the same father (cap. 72), “able to keep good, and so to work, and able to lose good, and not to work in it.” “There should no law have been given,” says Tertullian (contra Marcion, lib. 2), “unto him that has not the due keeping of the law in his own power. And the same freedom of will (which was in Adam) makes us victors of the same devil.”

“It is our part to begin,” says Jerome (contra Pelagium, lib. 2, cap. 1), “and God’s to perfect; we must do what we can, he will fulfill what we cannot.” “Unless the patriarch,” says Chrysostom (in Genes., homily 42), “had first done his part, he had not obtained so great things of God. And therefore, mark not only this, but in all things else, how first he shows the greatness of his virtue, and so thereby deserves God’s assistance.” “And again” (homil. 17, in Joan.), “let us here observe that God in His blessings to us does not prevent our wills, but it must begin in ourselves. And when He sees our minds prompt and ready to receive grace, then He gives us many occasions of salvation.” “I said,” says Augustine (de predest. Sanct., lib. primo, cap. tertio), “that it lives in us to believe and to will, and in God to give the power of working well unto the believing and willing.” “To propound or begin a good work,” says Hesichius (in Levit., lib. 2, cap. 7), “is in our power, but to perfect and finish it according to the precept is only in God’s grace.” After Pelagius was risen up, Cassianus held with him concerning free will (as Prosper says of him, contra Collatorem), for in one of his collations (Collatio 13, cap. 11), he affirms that the grace of God sometimes prevents us, and sometimes is prevented by us. So held Faustus Rhegiensis.

8. Augustine, after Pelagius was risen, in all his last writings, never acknowledges either the exercise or the active power of free will in working true good, or in the first conversion of a sinner. “Why do we presume so much,” says he (De natura & grat., cap. 36), “of the power of nature? It is wounded, maimed, vexed, and lost. Let us confess it freely, and not defend it falsely. Wherefore let us seek the grace of God, not to inform, but to reform it thereby.” And in the Hypognost. 3, cap. primo, “It is said, that by sin man did lose both the ability of goodness and the goodness of possibility.” “The will,” says Augustine in another place, De perfect. justit., “being overcome by sin, nature has lost her lib.ty.” And again, de spirit. & lit., cap. tertio, “Free will has not any power but unto sin, if the way of truth be unknown; and when that which is to be done begins to appear, unless also it delight, and be beloved, there is no doing, no undertaking, no well living.” “We are therefore willing, but God is He that works this willingness in us. And we work, but God gives us this ability to work according unto His good pleasure,” Augustine, De bono perseverantia, cap. 11. “It is certain that we are willing when we are so, but it is He that makes us so, of whom it is said, it is God that works this will in us. It is certain that we work when we do so, but it is He that gives us this working power, by giving our will most efficient power, as if He said, I will cause you work” (Augustine, De grat. & lib. arbit., cap. 16). “Unless He first work us to be willing, and then work with us being willing, we shall never bring to pass any good work. We must confess that we have free will both to good and evil, but in doing evil every man just and unjust is free (in choice); but in doing good, none can be free (in will and act) unless he be freed by Him that said, ‘If the Son free you, you are truly freed’” (Augustine, De corrept. & grat., cap. primo). “Holy thoughts, good purposes, godly counsels, and all motions of a good will are from God: because by Him we are able to do some good, without whom we can do nothing at all,” author de Dog. Eccles., cap. 17. “We lost our

free election to love God by the greatness of the first sin" (Epist. 107). "Lib.ty without grace is no lib.ty, but contumacy" (idem, Epistol. 89, ad Hilar). "Man, in his creation, had great power of free-will given him, but in his fall he lost it" (idem de verb. Apost., Sermon 2). And you shall very often find these words in Augustine, our bound will, captived, destroyed, lost, etc.

Of this opinion of Augustine was Prosper also. "Infidelity," says he, contra Collatorem, cap. 21, "took away our faith, bondage took away our lib.ty, neither can any part of virtue remain there, where such a crew of vices have broke in." "Adam," says Fulgentius, de Incar. & gra., cap. 13, "being created without necessity of sinning, when he lost his soul's health in offending God, lost utterly even the power of thinking of all divine things." Again, in another place, cap. 12, "The power of thinking good thoughts, being lost in the first man, was recovered in the second." "We believe," says Maxentius, de Fide, cap. 32, "that our free natural will has power in nothing but in discerning and desiring the worldly and carnal things only, which seem not glorious before God, though before men perhaps they do. But in things belonging to salvation, it can neither think of them, choose, desire, nor finish them without the infusion and operation of the Spirit of God." And he adds: "To will and to perform is God's gift." Bernard teaches that it is one thing to choose, and another to choose good. "To will," quotes he, de grat. & lib.o arbit., "is in us by free will, but not to perform our will. I say not to will either good or evil, but only to will, for to will good is increase (of grace he means), and to will evil is defect., Free will makes us willing, but grace makes us well willing. From free will we have power to will, and to will well comes from grace."

9) Augustine in divers places plainly affirms all the works of the unfaithful to be sins (de nupt. & concup., lib. primo, cap. tertio; in

Juli., lib. 4, cap. 3; de Civit. Dei, lib. 5, cap. 19 and lib. 19, cap. 25; in Psal. 31, in praefat.). "Our free will," says he (contr. 2 Epist. Pelag., lib. 3, cap. 8), "being now captivated, can do nothing but sin." So Jerome (in Galat. c. 3): "Without Christ all virtue is sin." And Gregory, very rightly (Moral., lib. 2, cap. 33): "The sons do feast in the eldest brother's house, when all other virtues are entertained in faith, which, if it be not the first begotten in our heart, all the rest can never be good, though they seem never so well." "It is through the gift of God, whensoever we decline from sin," says the Council of Arausic. But Stapleton (De Justific., lib. 2, cap. vitimo) scourges this doctrine, and sticks not to surmise that Augustine went a little beyond his bounds in this controversy with Pelagius. But other modern writers holding with Augustine do flatly deny that a man by the power of nature can discern or distinguish of a moral good. So holds Gregory of Arimin. (in 2 distinct. 26, quest. 1, art. 2, and 2 distinct. 29, quest. 1, artic. 2); Capreolus (in 2 distinct. 28, quest. 1, art. 3); Cassalius (de quadrip. justit., lib.. 1, cap. 15 and 32, etc.). Also, these deny that a man without faith, and the especial help thereof, by nature's power, can do a good moral work, so as there be no sin in the action or work. Both Gregory of Ariminium and Caprelius (in 2 dist. 28) hold this. But Cassalius (de quadrip. justit., lib. 1, cap. 36) both teaches and defends that the fathers were of this mind. This also is Marsilius's opinion (in 1 quest. 20). Bellarmine indeed confesses that Scotus, Durandus, and Biel (upon the 28th Distinction of Lombard's second book) have perhaps written more freely than is behooveful. Sixtus Senensis says (Praefat. in lib. 5, Biblioth.) that Augustine sometimes gives but too little unto man's free will, and Chrysostom, on the contrary, seems to extol it as much beyond the mean. Bradwardine (in his book De causa Dei, against Pelagius, lib. 3, cap. 4) teaches that free will, being tempted, cannot overcome any temptation by itself, without the assistance and grace of God. And this also in another place (cap. 5, ibid.): "With what

grace of the creation soever it be upheld, yet without some special grace of God, it cannot conquer any temptation at all." And again (c. 6, ibid.), that "That special help of God is God's invincible will."

10. The fathers say that our will is assisted by God according as we sometimes say, such a man helped me to do this, when as he did all, and I nothing.

11. The fathers hold a possibility of turning, whereby man's mind and will may by God's ordinary dispensation be turned to receive grace, when they are prevented and helped by the Holy Spirit. "To be able to have faith and charity," says Augustine (de praedest. Sanct. c. 5), "is in man's nature." And again (contra Julian, lib. 2), "Man's nature is capable of justification by the grace of the Holy Spirit." Gregory of Arimin unto that of Augustine: "There is nothing so much in man's power as to will," he says in lib. 2, dist. 28. "We may say that it is in our power not only to will or choose bad things, but also good things, but with this difference: we may use our election unto evil without God's especial help, but unto good, if He do not chiefly assist us, we cannot." "It is in man's power," says Augustine, Retract., lib. 1, cap. 22, "to change his bad will into better, but this power is none at all until God give it." And ibid., cap. 23: "We may will to believe, it is true, but with the same condition. They are both from Him (viz. to will and to believe) because He prepares our will. And both from us, because they be not done against our wills." And in this sense are many sayings of Saint Augustine to be understood. For he speaks of the passive possibility, which belongs to the matter, not of the active, belonging to the form, which is absent before the conversion, both according to the first and second act.

12. The fathers acknowledge a cooperation with the grace of God, even natural, in respect of the faculties of the understanding and will,

and also from the grace of God, in respect of willing that which is good. “He that made you without yourself,” says Augustine, De verb. Apost., serm. 15, “does not justify you without yourself. And He that made you not witting, justifies you being willing, and without your will there shall no righteousness be in you.” Therefore, the papists’ doctrine of free will, that it is but half dead, that is, bound from use or exercise, but not dead in respect of the active power of willing well, is not catholic.

Of the Remainders of Concupiscence

1. Whereas sometimes in the fathers we find it written that concupiscence is no sin after regeneration, it must be thus understood, because God of His mercy does not impute it. So that the fathers do only deny that concupiscence is sin unto the person in whom it is, but that it is sin in itself and of itself, and so remains after baptism, they never deny, but do aver it so to be. Augustine himself, Contr. Jul. Pelag., lib. 5, cap. 3, very plainly calls that concupiscence sin, against which the good spirit strives, because, says he, “There is in it a disobedience against the rule of the mind.” And again, De nupt. & concup., lib. 1, cap. 26: “This is to be free from sin,” says he, “not to be guilty of sin.” Besides, Tractat. in Joan., 41: “Let not sin rule. He says not, let it not be in you, for as long as you live you are sure to have sin in your members, but yet let it not rule in them.” So Ambrose, apud Aug. contra Jul. 2, c. 5, calls the remains of concupiscence in the regenerate, iniquity, and Hilary calls it malitiam, illness, apud eundem, lib. 2, cap. 8. Caietane, in Romans chapter 7, verse 8, sticks not to say that concupiscence (whereof Saint Paul speaks) is even formally sin, in respect that it is part of original sin.

2. The first motions of concupiscence, before consent, the fathers hold to be sin. So holds Bede: “Carnal concupiscences,” says he in Psalm 9, “are the first death, and death’s entry.” And in Psalm 114: “Whosoever falls but in thought offends God.” And again, in Psalm 1: “The soul is killed three ways: with delectation alone, with delight joined with consent, and with action.” “Sin,” says Radulphus, in Levitic., lib. 8, cap. 4, “breeds in a man’s soul before consent, and now begins to be brought forth, but is not consummate or perfected.” And Cassiodorus, in Psal. 119, calls those desires unlawful, to which we do not consent. And Augustine also before him, in Psal. 118, conc. 3, does the like.

3. When the fathers say that the first motions in concupiscence are not sins unless we consent, we must not so understand them as though they were not sins in the truth of appellation, but because the guilt of these first motions, together with the guilt of concupiscence itself, is taken away in our regeneration. So says Augustine, De peccat. origin., lib. 2, cap. 40: “The vicious desires also (unto which if we do not consent, there is not guilt contracted) are all purged away in the same fountain of regeneration.” And again, Contra Jul., lib. 2, cap. 10: “As for us, we should be always without sin, if this evil were once cured, and if we should never consent with it unto evil.” But he had said before, cap. 9, in fine: “How then do we say that this sin is dead in baptism, and yet confess that it dwells still in our members, and causes many desires in us against our wills, unto which we resist by not consenting, unless because it is dead touching that guilt wherewith it held us, and yet until it be cured in the consummation of burial, will rebel though it be dead? Although now it is not called sin after the same manner, whereby it makes a man guilty, but in that it was caused by the guilt of the first man Adam, and by rebelliousness endeavors to bring us into guilt, unless we be helped by God’s grace through Jesus Christ.” Look at his third sermon in

Psalm 118. Hence it is that Augustine says often that we need not say, “forgive us our trespasses,” for the involuntary motions of our concupiscence, because he held them all forgiven in baptism (epist. 200 ad Asellec., lib. perfect. Justit., in Psal. 118, conc. 3).

4. Sometimes they speak of the external suggestions of Satan, and these indeed are no sins of ours, unless we give our assent unto them, so says Gregory (Moral., lib. 21, cap. 3).

Venial Sin

1. A venial sin which is beside God’s law, and not against it, and its nature binds only unto the guilt of temporal punishment, was not known among the fathers for seven hundred years after Christ. Afterwards it got entrance and patronage. “The reward,” says Haimo (in epist. dominice 8, post pentacosten), “of sin is death, not of all sins, but only of those that are criminal, and whereof John says, it is a sin unto death.”

2. The fathers acknowledge that all sin properly, and of its own nature, deserves eternal death by the just judgment of God. “There is a daily repentance of good and humble believers,” says Augustine (epist. 108), “when knocking our breasts we say, forgive us our trespasses; for we do not beg forgiveness for those which we know are forgiven in baptism, but for them which (though but sin all) yet are often incident unto human’s frailty, and being drawn to a sum against us, would oppress us as much as another heavy sin. For what difference is it in shipwreck to be sunk with one furious billow, or to have the water enter by little and little and never respect it until it sink the ship?” And again (Tract. 12, in Joan.), “Many little, or small, sins, unregarded, kill the soul.” Besides (Exposit. 1, in epist. Joan.), “Many light sins make one heavy one.” “All sin,” says Nazianzene

(Orat. 31), “is the death of the soul.” “And who is he,” says the author Asceticorum, “that dare say this sin is little, whatever it be?” “I know not,” says Jerome (epist. 14), “how we can call any sin light, which is done in contempt of God.” “The reproving sentence of the severe Judge,” says Bede (in Samuel, lib. prim., cap. 10), “does not only condemn those fires of capital sins, wherein the devil’s works are manifest, but even all little ones, and these also which men may hold slender or light.” “Every sin,” says Gregory (in Ezec., lib. 1, hom. 2), “is heavy, because it withholds the soul from ascending.” “To use

“Idle speeches,” says Sixtus III (De malis doct. & oper. fidei), “or to call a man a fool, seem small and slender faults,” but he adds, “if he be guilty of hell that calls his brother fool, what sin can then be not deserving hell, I leave the reader to judge.” “All sin,” says Gerson (De vita spirit, lect. 1), “in that it is an offence to God, against His eternal law, is in its own nature and indignity, deadly, according to the rigor of justice, and severing a man from the life of glory.” Again, “No offence is venial in itself, but only through God’s mercy, who will not impute all offences expressly unto death, when as in justice He might, so that it is concluded that sin mortal and venial, in being so, are not intrinsically and essentially distinguished, but only in respect of the divine mercy, which imputes the one unto death, and not the other.” And thus holds Roffenis (In refut. articul. 32 Lutheri). “That opinion,” says Bajus, professor of Louvain, “is not to be reproved, which says, that even light sins, excluding Christ’s blood, in their own nature bar us from heaven.” This he proves by many texts of Scripture.

3. The fathers call sin venial, not because it is so in itself, but because it is in the person of the righteous, unto whom is given remission of sins in Christ through the grace of God. In this sense Bede (comment. in 1 Johan. 5) says, “Here are some small sins, which

cannot take from the just the merit of their justice, nor diminish it." "Sin," says Cyril (Catec. 2), "is heavy to the retainer, and light to the rejecter." And Cassianus (Collat. 22) says that such sins are pardonable unto the righteous.

4. Also that was called a venial sin which had pardon in the censure of the church. For greater sins were thought worthy of excommunication, and for those was public penance performed. But in these lighter, that is, venial sins, it was not so. And hereupon is venial so often opposed unto criminal. "There are some sins great and pernicious," says Tertullian (de pudicit.), "and other some that we daily run into, and to which we are so incident, that if they were not pardonable, no man could be saved, but for these there is pardon in Christ the Mediator." So Augustine (epist. 89) says, "There are some vices called crimes, and some, without which no man lives." And Caesarius (Homil. 1): "Sin is either capital or small. Capital, as murder, sacrilege, etc." And Bede (in Psal. 3) opposes venial sin unto criminal, taking criminal for that which the magistrate punishes. Now this that the fathers speak of sins after the manner and respect of men, the schoolmen have transferred unto God, and so have set down a kind of sin which needs not Christ's blood to purge it.

5. Third, that is called a venial sin which obtains pardon in the event and consequent, though it be mortal in itself. So Ambrose (lib. de parad., cap. 4): "That fault is pardonable, which a confession of sins follows." "There are some sins," says the author (de vera & falsa paenit. apud Aug, cap. 18), "that are in themselves mortal, but by repentance are made venial." "Now," says Augustine (de Civit. Dei, lib. 21, c. 27), "since we know not the measure of our venial iniquity (though it continues in us), surely we take greater pains to profit in good, and be more fervent in prayer." And "The mortal sin hereunto opposed is the sin that leads unto death," so says Pacian (epist. 3, ad

Sempronian). And Jerome (in Jerem., cap. 2) calls those heavy sins which draw man to destruction, and opposes lighter sins thereto. So the author of the prayers in Prudentius at the end of his Hamartig. says:

"thou judging still,
Of all my sins for pardon hope I will,
Although my words and deeds be ne'er so ill."

6. Fourth, sin is called venial because it is excusable before men, through human good will. So an officious lie is venial. And Augustine, Enchir., cap. 11, says, "Therefore it is a sin, but venial, which benevolence excuses. And they are called venial respectively in reference to greater crimes." So Cassianus, Collat. 22, says of venial sins, "They seem light and small unto men." And Sixtus III, 1. de malis doctor. & operib. fidei: "They seem little and slender, and are esteemed light, and this is in respect of the greater."

Images and Relics

1. There was no use of images received at all in the primitive Church, but only symbolical, and for ornament sake, and that in private places for 380 years after Christ. Irenaeus objected against the Gnostics, lib. 1, c. 24, that first they had the image of Christ painted, then that they crowned it and worshipped it. Look also at Augustine, de haeres. 7, and Epiphanius, in haeres. 27. "We worship no images," says Origen, Contra Cels. Lib. 7, "for we do not bind our invisible and incorporeal God unto any figure." So also Arnobius, or rather Minutius Faelix, contra Gens., lib. 8: "What image shall we make for God, whose true image, if we judge according to truth, is man?" And there he brings in the heathen saying of us: Why have they no altars, no temples, no known images? So also Eusebius, Histor. Eccles., lib.

7, cap. 17: “It was out of a heathenish custom that the ancients did after this sort honor those that they held to be their saviors (that is, with painted images).” “We have decreed,” says the Elib. Council, chapter 36, “that there should be no pictures in the Church, lest that which we worship and reverence should be painted upon the walls.” Epiphanius, Epist. ad Joann. Hierosolym, tore a hanging in pieces in the church because there was the image of a man painted thereupon, against testimony of Scriptures. This mind of his Jerome approves, who translated the epistle into Latin. Hereupon some of the papists do reprehend Epiphanius. Castro, contra haeres., lib. 8, titul imago, accuses him of error, though he clears him of heresy. “He had zeal, but not according to knowledge,” says Waldensis, de sacrament, tom. 3, cap. 157. Others do reject the latter part of this epistle as counterfeit, namely Damascene orat. de imaginilous, Alan, Cope, and Sanders, but without all proof of argument. First, they say this place is not cited in the Council of Nicea. What then? It is cited in the Council of Frankford, Carolus, lib. 4, cap. 25. Second, they say Epiphanius did not reckon image worship among the heresies. It is false; he directly affirms, Haeres. 79, that it is the devil’s invention to make pictures of men and set them up to be worshipped. And again, Haeres. 55, speaking of the Melchisedechians, he says, “They made them an image of Moses, and worshipped it, wherein they were seduced.” And among the heresies of the Carpocrations, Haeres. 27, he reckons that for one, to worship the images of Jesus, Peter, and Paul. Third, they object that of Gregory, lib. 9, Indict. 4, epist. 9, unto Serenus, that broke down the images of the saints: “Tell me, brother, what priest you have at any time heard, or seen, do that that you have done.” But I would have them show that Serenus did not allege Epiphanius and other fathers’ testimonies against images.

2. About 400 years after Christ, images began to get entrance, not only in private places, but even also in the churches of the Christians.

But the use of them was but historical, as Augustine, De consecratione Evangel., lib. 1, cap. 10; Basil, Oratione in Sanct. Barlaam; Nissenus, Oratione Theodorium; Prudentius, Hymn. de Sanct. Cassiano; and Paulinus, epist. duodecim., do testify. For the bare and solitary images of the saints, or their single statues, were not erected until six hundred years after Christ, which Cassander, in Consult. de artic. controv., plainly and freely confesses.

3. Superstition getting head, image worship got foundation, yet never among the learned and godly. Never were images set forth for public worship until six hundred years after Christ. Gregorie, lib. 9, indict. 4, epist. 9, denies that images are to be worshipped. And Sigonius, De regno Italia lib. primo, affirms that they would carry the Virgin Mary's image in solemn pomp, but he makes no mention of any adoration of it, even until the year five hundred ninety-one, about which time some councils approved the images that were then set up in churches, but did not teach that they were to be worshipped. And if this worship got root anywhere before this time, it was not among the teachers, but among the superstitious people. "Pope Sergius," says Regino, "in anno 622, in Saint Peter's vestry, found a great piece of wood of Christ's cross, which from that time forth all the people upon the exaltation day do kiss and adore in the Cathedral Church of Constantine." (Regino)

4. This same image worship was first established publicly in the year 788 by the Second Nicene Council. But on the contrary side, but a little before, a Council of Constantinople (wherein there were three hundred and thirty bishops, held under Copronymus) condemned both the worship of images and relics (P. Æmil., de gest. Francorum). The same did Leo Constantine's father and Philippicus (Petr. Diac., lib. 6, cap. 12). And the Council of Frankford (wherein was present Charlemagne and the Roman legates) did condemn the

Second Nicene Council as heretical. “The Greek’s false synod,” says Regius, lib. 2, ad an. 794, “gathered for image worship is rejected by the pope.” Yes, this Council was condemned by all the princes and bishops of Britain. “Charles, the French king,” says Hoveden in continuatio., Bede ad anno 792, “sent a book of the Synod unto Britain, directed unto him from Constantinople, wherein (alas) were many things set down quite contrary unto our true faith, but chiefly in that was decreed by the uniform consent of very near all the doctors of the east, 300 bishops or more in number, that images are to be worshipped, which the church of God wholly detests and execrates. Against which Albinus wrote an epistle wondrously confirmed by the Holy Scriptures, and in the person of our princes and bishops, carried it with the same book unto the French king.” (Hoveden) Bellarmine, de imag., lib. 2, c. 14, confesses that the Council of Frankford disallowed the Council of Nicea, “but that,” says he, “happened by reason of two errors. 1. Because it thought that the Nicene Council was called without the pope’s authority. 2. Because it thought this council had decreed image worship to be Latria, that is, worship due to God.” Now hear how he is answered by Suarez, in 3 Thoma., quest. 25, disputa. 54: “I can hardly believe,” says he, “that the Council of Frankford could proceed against the Nicene Council by error of fact, for it was gathered a little before under the same Pope Adrian that confirmed it, whose legates were present at the Council of Frankford (as the same authors do confess). How then can it be that all the fathers of this whole council should be ignorant of the doctrine and authority of this Nicene Council, having the pope’s own legate to instruct them in both?” Now Copus, in dialogis, tom. 3 concil., and also Suarez, loco praedicto, do answer that the Council of Frankford defends the honor of images, and that it reproves the Council of Constantinople.

Sometimes by the Greeks called the seventh, which was assembled for abolishing of images. So the Synod of Senona, cap. 14, says that Charles, in the Synod of Frankford, did overthrow the erroneous madness of the Iconomachi. I answer, the Council of Frankford keeps a midway, reserving some honor for images (and so must Aemilus, de gestis Francorum, lib. 2, near the end be understood, when he says that images have their reverence reserved), and therefore condemned the Council of Constantinople, that utterly abolished them, and the Council of Nicea, that on the contrary did establish the adoration of them. "In the Council of Frankford," says Platina, in Adrian, "both the synod which the Greeks call the seventh (that is, that of Nicea) and also the heresy of Faelix, concerning abolishing of images, was taken away."

5. The fathers generally do not defend, but rather refute this worship even after the Nicene Council. Augustine, de Morib. eccles., cap. 24, plainly reproves the worshippers of pictures and sepulchers. "Note this propriety," says Jerome, in Daniel 3, "They say their gods are worshipped, and images adored, both which servants of GOD do abhor." "Pictures," says Walfridus, Strabo de reb. eccl., cap. 8, "are not therefore to be trodden underfoot and abolished, because we know they are not to be worshipped, nor adored." And "The Sixth Council of Constantinople forbade the picturing of the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, or of the wise men under a star, or of Christ under the lamb." Witness Caranza, annot. ad canon. 81. Leo Armenius commanded all images to be broken down by express edict, Zonar., annal., tom. 3. The Almaines and Armenians forbade the worship of images in their countries, Nicet., Choniat. in annal. And the modern authors teach that the images of God are not to be made. Abulensis, in Deut. 4, quest. 5., and Durand., in 3 distinct. 9, quest. 2, say that it is a foolery to make or adore any image of the Trinity, where also he denies that the images themselves are to be

worshipped, but only the figure in the image. And, in Rational, lib. primo, cap. 3, we worship no image, neither call them gods. And Biel, in can. Miss., lect. 49, says that images are suffered in the church, not to be worshipped, but for other ends. So says Hales 3, part., quest. 30, art. ulti., and Peresini, de traditionibus. And Jonus, bishop of Aurelia, De cult. imag., lib. 1, says that image worship is pernicious and superstitious, adding, "Let not our religion consist in worshipping of human works, for they are better that make them, and yet we ought not to worship them; let not our religion be in our fantasies." And Gerson, in compendio Theolog. expositione primi praecept., says, "You shall not bow down to them, nor worship them, between which distinguish thus: you shall not adorare, that is, with bodily worship by bowing knee or body to them; you shall not volere, that is, with the affect of your mind." And a little before: "Wherefore images are forbidden to be made either to be bowed unto or worshipped."

6. The Latin translator of the Bible never observed the distinction of Imago and Idolum, as we may see in very many places of Scripture, viz. Deuteronomy 4:16, and 2 Kings 11:18, Wisd. 13 and 14, Isaiah 40:18 and 44:13, Ezekiel 7:20, imagines sinsulacr., Amos 5:23, imago idolorum, by which, says Jerome, in Isai. 37, "Speaking of idols, we mean images of the dead." So Cardinal Paleotus testifies, that "Image, picture, and idol are taken in one sense," De sacris & proph. imag., lib. 1, cap. 13. "Saint Jerome," says he, "writes that where Idolum was put in the text, Aquila translated it Imagines, or figuras." And we read in Cicero, "Imagines qua vocantur idola," images called idols. And in Plato idola, etc. "Idols are the images which are in the waters or glasses, painted or printed, or such like." So the Latin word Simulachrum, they always put for the Greek word Idolam, for whereas in the Latin translation of the Psalm we read "simulachra gentium," or the images of the Gentiles, the Greek says εἰδῶλα τῶν

ἐθνῶν. And he adds, “The name of an image, if we mark the propriety of the word, signifies any impious and devilish figure.” (7) The primitive church bore a certain honor and reverence unto the relics of the dead saints, keeping and carrying them from place to place and flocking unto them, according to Jerome, contra Vigil. This honor began about 300 years after Christ, but they neither adored them nor bowed the knee unto them for 600 years. “For the fathers used to put them under the altar,” Ambrose, lib. 10, epist. 85, sub fine, “but the papists now put them in glasses and gauderies, above the altar, and that to have them adored.” “In elder times the relics were buried in the earth, and in secret places.” “So Cyril,” contra Julian, lib. 10. Cyril the Eremite, in vita Euthymii, “removed the body of this holy man unto a church he had newly built and laid it into a holy coffin that should never after be opened.” And so says Prudentius, Peristephanon, hymn. 3 of Eulalia:

The sacred bones and dust of her that sleeps, Our mother earth in hallowed bosom keeps.
And a little after,
I love to reverence these bones so blest: And that same altar under which they rest.

“And the multitude there present,” says Victor, De persecut. Vanda. 1, lib. 3, “being full of joy, carried the bodies of the holy martyrs unto careful burial.” So Constantine made him a bridle, and armed his helmet with the nails that Christ was fastened to the cross withal according to Ruffin., hist., lib. 1, cap. 8.

8. At the places of these relics (while the gift lasted) were sometimes miracles done, not by them, but by God, to increase in us an honor to the godliness of their owners. Not that we should adore them, for in

antiquity, adoration was taken for humbling and prostrating the body.

The Sign of the Cross

1. The fathers used to arm themselves against the devil with the sign of the cross, not that they ascribed any such power unto the outward figure, but because they would make show unto others of their belief in the cross, that is, in the death of Christ, with this solemn ceremony, and use it as an item or watchword to stir up their faith which overcomes all evils. And the sign whereby Constantine was victor was not the sign of the cross, but the character of the name of Christ, which we see in many ancient coins of Constantine and other Christian emperors, in form as in the margin here expressed (114), together with this inscription, τούτω νίκα, or as Socrates, lib. 1, cap. 1; Nicephorus, lib. 7, cap. 29; and Zonarus in Constantine, have it, ἐν τούτω νίκα, that is, in isto Deo, non signo, or "In this God, not this character." "It is not requisite," says Chrysostom, Hom. 55, in Matth., "to make a bare cross with your finger in your forehead, but with strong faith in your heart." So that the cross does not signify the figure of the cross, but the passion of Christ crucified, by a metonymy. So says Origen, in Rom., lib. 5, "And the praises given unto the sign of the cross are but rhetorical terms; as when they call it an altar, it is a figurative speech borrowed from the ceremonial law, and when they call it a ladder, it is a transcendent metaphor." And unto all the sayings of the fathers where they call the cross their redemption, hope, and salvation, I answer in a word, the speeches are relatives, all referred to Christ's passion, or unto Himself in that figure represented. For it is ordinary among them to put the continent for the thing contained.

2. The cross was never adored by the ancients, much less adored with divine honors. They allowed it a certain veneration, namely, a reverent use, using it in testimony of their faith, and with all extolling it as the sign of their unmovable belief upon Christ crucified before the Gentiles, yea, even when they were threatened with torments. (115) This end and use is not now among us, because we are not now among the Gentiles. “We neither worship crosses,” says Arnobius (contra Gentis, lib. 8), “nor yet desire them.” “Helene,” says Ambrose (De obitu Theodos.), “finding the title, adored the king (Christ, he means), but not the wood, because that is an error of the heathen, or an ungodly vanity.” But about the 400th year after Christ, the cross began by little and little to be adored by some private men. So says Prudentius (lib. Apotheosis):

“But now the scarlet red
Of the emperor in Christ his courts is spread:
And by this mighty prince the cross is worshipped.”

So says Paulinus (epist. 11): “He (the bishop of Jerusalem), every year at Easter set forth the cross for the people to worship, being himself the chief of the worshippers.” So Jerome, in his epitaph of Paula, says that she did prostrate herself in adoration before the cross, as if she saw the Lord there hanging. And in epist. 17 to Marcella he says, “Paula and Eustochium do wish that they might but have leave to lick the wood of the cross.” So the Apamienses anno 540, bringing forth the cross, do adore and embrace it (Evagr. hist. eccle., lib. 4, cap. 25). But afterwards, the Second Council of Nicea, actio 7, denied that Christ’s image was to be adored with divine worship.

3. The transient or passing cross (that is, the cross which they signed, or the sign of the cross) was commonly used in the purer churches,

not the fixed cross, that is, the cross made of stone, wood, or metal, or yet painted upon walls in churches or oratories for the first 400 years. The first altar and the first cross were set up in England by Oswald in the field where he conquered Cadwall, anno 635 (Polychronic., lib. 5, cap. 2). Also, in the consecration of the sacraments the cross was never called to use until about the 400th year. For the first 300 years after Christ it was but held a sign of a man's outward profession, used in his ordinary actions, but afterwards it was brought into the Lord's supper, at first to signify unto us the good we reap by Christ (Augustine in Joan., tract. 118), but afterward that by it the sacrament might be blessed and consecrated. But that Christ did consecrate the Eucharist on this manner, Analarius utterly denies (De ecclesiast. offic., lib. 3, cap. 24), ascribing it unto Augustine. Besides, the sign of the cross for many ages at first was but a simple and bare ceremony in the sacrament, but afterward that rite being changed, anno 1000, it since has been always used in an odd number (Microlog., cap. 14).

4. The ancient writers held the soul to be defended by the sign of the cross either following Montanus, as Tertullian (De resurrect. carn.): "The body is signed, that the soul may be defended." Or else doubtfully: "I do think," says Augustine (De peccat. merit. et remiss., lib. 2, cap. 26), "that the catechumenists are sanctified by the sign of Christ, and prayer, with imposition of hands after some certain manner." Where note the words, "I think," and "after some certain manner," for these show that Augustine doubted of that ceremony, and besides, you see, he held not the sanctification to be made by the cross only, but with prayer also.

5. At the signs of the cross there have miracles been done because the name of Christ crucified was always adjoined, either in secret or express invocation, and then the saints had a power to work

miracles. “Our faith,” says Tertullian (in Scorpiace contra Gnostic.), “is our defense, and if it be not stricken with distrust when we sign on this fashion, that is, by making this sign, we often do good unto the heathen, God giving us that power which

The apostle showed when he scorned the biting of the viper. And therefore, we see that miracles and casting out of devils are not to be ascribed unto the cross, but unto the faith of miracles and invocation of Christ. “How much this sign terrifies the devils,” says Lactantius (De vera Religione, lib. quarto, cap. 23), “he may soon know, that sees how when they are adjured by Christ, they were forced to flee from the bodies they had possessed.” And a little after, “Christ’s followers can cast out the same filthy spirits out of men, both by their Master’s name, and by the sign of His passion.” “This directs our course,” says Saint Augustine (De Sanctis, sermon 19), “This it does, together with the faithful calling upon Christ’s name, namely, the famous memory of the victorious cross.” “Stand stoutly upon this sign,” says Cyril (Cataches. 13), “for when the devils see the cross, they remember the crucified.” To speak in a word, the fathers give not these wonderful effects so much unto the sign of the cross, as unto prayer and invocation of God. Look in the writings of all those that are of antiquity and see whether this be true. Look in Nazianzene unto Nemesius, Origen against Celsus (lib. tertio & octavo), Theodoret in his Peter and Thalassius, Eusebius in histor. Ecclesiastic. (lib. octavo, cap. septimo), Sulpitius unto Eusebius the priest (Epistol. prim.), the author of the Dialogues in Gregory (Dialog., lib. primo, cap. prim.), Victor of the persecution by the Vandals (lib. secundo), and Paulinus of the life of Saint Martin (lib. secundo). All these will testify my assertion. Nay, the sign of the cross, as the fathers used it, was a certain secret invocation of Christ crucified, so that it is a foolish and an idle forgery to say that it had

that efficacy ex opere operato, by the bare making of it, seeing it had all the power from invocation.

6. Those crosses that were used in the church for the first 400 years had no image at all of Christ crucified upon them. This assertion cannot be confuted by any approved testimony of antiquity. And it seems that this image of the crucifix did first grow in use publicly in or about the year of grace 710, as it appears in the council held in Trullo. “To the end that that which is perfected,” says this synod (Canon. 82), “may be represented unto public view, even in lively colors, we command that instead of the old lamb, the figure of that Lamb that takes away the sins of the world, Christ our God in the likeness of a man, be set up and erected in images from this time forward.”

Churches for Prayer

1. The fathers acknowledge churches as houses of prayer but bind us not to come to the church always when we pray.

2. And they name their churches after their martyrs’ names for distinction’s sake only, appointing the worship unto God and not unto them. “We honor them,” says Augustine (de vera religione, cap. 55), “out of charity, not out of duty or bond, neither build we any churches unto them.” And Contra Maximinum Arrian (lib. primo, titulo undecimo): “Should we not be cursed and cast out from Christ’s truth and His church if we should build any temple of timber and stones unto any angel, although most excellent, because we should give that honor to a creature, which is due only unto the Creator? If therefore we should commit sacrilege in building a temple unto any creature, how is not He the true God, unto whom we build no temple, but are ourselves the temple unto Him?” And here,

as also often elsewhere, Augustine proves the Holy Ghost to be God, because He has a temple. Which argument both Basil (Epistola 14) and Ambrose (De Spiritu Sancto, lib. tertio, cap. 13) do use.

3. The ancient consecration of the churches was with mere words and prayers, not with crossing, or such like rites. And dedication of churches began about the 300th year after Christ.

4. The fathers of the first 200 years never talk of adorning churches, but about Constantine's time this error got root, and so custom bearing sway, the fathers began to look for ornaments for the church. "Then first of all," says Otho Frising, lib. quarto, cap. tertio, "(in Constantine's time) were public edicts given out for building of churches, that is, more stately rooms or temples; for before they used holy houses to pray in."

Canonical Hours

The fathers observed hours both diversely and freely; but that all should be bound unto the same and to so many hours is a tyrannical superstition. And Walfridus oftentimes repeats that it was a long time after the apostles that these hours were instituted and ordained. "We must know," says he, in De reb. eccl., cap. 25, "that there passed many ages after the revelation of the gospel before these hours were ordained to be the solemnities of certain hours in the day and night as they are now." And the purer primitive church had not seven canonical hours. Neither Athanasius, Basil, nor Jerome do at any time mention the first hour; Cassianus indeed does, saying it was ordained about his time, De insti. Caenob., lib. 10, quest. 5, articul. 1.

Wherefore Baronius says falsely, when he affirms that Chrysostom and Basil do often mention the four hours of the day. Besides, the

fathers do prescribe hours for the night as well as for the day. And besides the canonical hours, they set down a night-service, and night-watches, as divers authors, viz. Amalarius, ecclesiast. offic., lib. 4, c. 2, ad cap. 11; Rupertus, De divin. offic., lib. 1, cap. 1, ad cap. 8; Rudulphus, in Observ. can. prop. 14; Cassianus, lib. 2, cap. 4; the Council of Agatha as it is cited Distin. 91, cap. Presbyter; Gregory in the decretals, lib. tertio, tit. 41, cap. 1, de celebratione missarum; and Bede also, lib. tertio in Esdram, cap. 28, do testify. You must rise twice or thrice a night, says Jerome to Eustochium. But they will have the midst of the night especially observed, and namely, Athanasius, De virginit.; Basil, quest. fusius explic. quest. 37; Jerome, Ad Eustoch. de obit.; Paula and Hugo de Sancto Victor, in specul. ecclesi., cap. tertio, et de eccle. offic., lib. 1, cap. primo and 9. These the Church of Rome does not now follow, for three days before Easter the priests do sing the night service and lauds at evensong, and all the three nocturnes are sung together by the whole choir.

Intercession, Invocation, and Worship of Saints

1. Until 200 years after Christ, the intercession of the dead, and thereupon their invocation, was never heard of in the church of God. Let any man give an instance to the contrary.

2. Afterward, Origen for one, and others with him, fell to dispute of the intercession of the saints for us, but very doubtful and inconstant was their doctrine hereof until four hundred years were expired. “Whether the saints,” says Origen, lib. 2, in Epist. ad Rom., “that are with God do anything for us, and labor, let this also be reckoned among the secret and hidden mysteries of God, which may not be committed to writing.” And again, Homily 3, in Cantic., speaking of

these prayers, he says, though not peremptorily, “As for those holy men which are departed out of this world, retaining as yet their love to those remaining here behind, it shall not be amiss to think of them, that they have a care of their welfare, and that they help them with their prayers.” “If you have any care (or understanding, λόγος) of our labors,” says Nazianzene unto Gorgonius’s soul, in Oratio, de laudibus Gorgnio, "if it be granted unto the divine souls to know and perceive things done here below, then receive you my prayer." And in his first oration against Julian, he says, "Hear also, O you soul of great Constantine, if you have any sense, perceivance, or understanding (εἴ τι αἴσθησις)." And in his oration upon Basil, he likewise says that Basil’s soul is in heaven and there offers sacrifice, as I suppose (ὡς οἶμαι). And in his epitaph upon his father, he says, "He now does more good with his intercession than he did in all his life with his doctrine, as I do persuade myself." And by and by he adds, "If it be not too bold a part to speak thus." So Jerome in Nepotianus’s epitaph: "Whatsoever I say," quotes he, "seems mute, because he hears not," and yet a little after he says that he is "among the choirs of angels." So Augustine, in his book of the care for the dead, cap. 16, leaves it undetermined whether the dead martyrs do help us or no, and adds that these things pass our understanding. And, cap. 13, he proves by Scripture, and namely out of Isaiah 63:16, that the saints know not what is done here below. And in his comment upon the 108th Psalm, he dares not grant that the dead do know the pains and pleasures which happen unto their friends. "The souls of the dead," says the author of the book de Spiritu & Anima, which is among Augustine’s works, cap. 29, "are in a place where they neither hear nor see the things which do here happen unto men in this life. Yet they have a care of those that live on earth, though they know not at all what they do, even as we have a care over the dead, though not knowing what they do." "Although the saints do pray for us (as the apostles did for her, meaning the woman of

Canaan), yet shall we be sooner heard when we pray for ourselves," says Theophilact, in Matthew, cap. 15.

3. Besides, the ancient writers do commonly affirm that the souls of the faithful are reserved in secret habitacles (out of heaven), not enjoying the sight of God until the last judgment. So holds Irenaeus, lib. quinto, in fine; Justin Martyr, quest. 60 and quest. 76; Origen, homily septim, in Levit. and lib. 2, periarch; Chrysostom, homil. 39 in 1 Cor. and 18 in Hebr.; Theodoret in Hebr. 11; Theophylact, in Hebr. 11; Euthymius, in Luc., cap. 16 and 23; Aretas, in Apocal., cap. 6; Victor, in Apocal. ibidem; Lactantius, lib. 7, cap. 21; Hilary, in Psalm 138; Prudentius, Hymn. de exequi. Defunctor; Ambrose, de Cain lib. secundo, cap. 2 and de bone mortis; Augustine, Retract. lib. primo, cap. 14; episto. 3, ad Fortunation; Enchirid. cap. 108; de Genesi ad literam, lib. 12, cap. 25; de civit. Dei, lib. duadecium, cap. mono; and in Psal. 36. And Bernard also, Ser. de omnibus Sanct. tertio, & Ser. quart. Here it must follow that the fathers either doubted of the intercession of saints, or else contradicted themselves. And in the same manner it may be concluded that so they held limbus patrum, invocation of saints, and the glass of the Trinity.

4. Intercession of saints, whereof the fathers for many ages do commonly speak, is a general intercession for the church, not for this or that particular man. And this intercession our church very willingly acknowledges. As for that particular intercession of particular saints for particular men, it was not so soon believed, but was first of all drawn out of dreams, and rifled out of revelations. Eusebius in his history, lib. sexto, cap. 4, tells that Potamiena (as it was reported), three days after her martyrdom, appeared to Basilides in the night, setting a crown upon his head, and telling him that she prayed unto the Lord for him. And one Apollo, in a revelation, saw

one of his dead brethren making intercession for him. This is recorded by Palladius, in Histor. Patrum, cap. 52.

5. The fathers teach that the saints do make intercession for us not only openly by prayer, but also mystically, namely, by meriting. “The merits of the mother,” says Anselm, lib. De excellentia Maria, “do make intercession to obtain her audience.” “That which we cannot bring to pass by our own power,” says Ivo, epist. 119, “we hear may be obtained by the merits of the blessed and perpetual virgin.” “Believe,” says Berno Augiensis, Serm. secundo de S. Marco, “that whatsoever you pray for by Saint Mark’s merits, you shall obtain it.” So the author of the epistle unto Paula and Eustochium in Jerome’s works of the assumption of Mary says thus of Mary, “Let her commend us with her merits, and aid and assist us with her prayers, that we also may be found worthy in her commendations.” “The saints,” says the master of the sentences, lib. quarto, distinctio 45, liter. G, “do make intercession for us, both in their merits and in their affections.” Yea, the fathers sometimes give but too much unto the intercession of the saints. So says Severus Sulpitius of Saint Martin, epistola secunda, that that was his only and his last hope, that what he could not possibly obtain by himself, he should merit and deserve it by Martin’s intercession. “We trust and believe,” says Leo, Sermon 1, in natal. Petr. & Paul, “that to obtain God’s mercy, we must have continual aid and assistance by the prayers of our especial patrons, that how much our own sins do weigh us down, so much the apostles’ merits may lift and raise us up again.” “I trust,” says Prosper, lib. De promiss. & praedictione Dei, “to be purely cleansed from all my sins by the prayers of the saints.” So Gregory of Terwin, Lib. quart. vita Sancti Martini in Prolog, says that the saints by their intercession do procure the everlasting punishments to be extinguished, and the language of our offence to be cured. And in the fathers we shall find the saints our immediate intercessors with God.

For so Adrian I, Epist. ad Constant. et Irenen., says that, “The images of the saints are to be worshipped, because it is certain that they are the servants of God and do continually offer up their prayers and intercession unto the Deity for us that do honor them here below.”

6. There can be no invocation of the dead proved to have been in the church from Christ unto 350 years after. For in all the works of the fathers that wrote within this limit, no man is able to show any one fit and plain commandment or precept, nor any sincere example for invocation of saints.

7. This invocation began first to be brought into life in the Catholic Church about the year of grace 380, arising out of a custom of the vulgar sort, and some men’s private devotions. For the fathers of these times do tell how the saints were invocated, but do not teach that they are to be invocated. Nay, in their more serious disputations and sermons, they do reprehend the invocation of the saints. “All your vows, all prayers, all interpellations, and all our thanksgivings,” says Origen against Celsis, lib. quinto, “are to be dedicated unto God the Lord of all things, by and through that High Priest, greater than all angels, the living Word, and God.” And again: “This will restrain all men from offering or daring to offer any prayer unto any person, but only unto the Lord God, who only is all-sufficient unto all, through the Savior, the Son of God.” So Athanasius against the Arians, Sermone tertio, proves Christ Jesus to be God, because He is called upon, for a creature ought not to be worshipped. And so Epiphanius, Haeres. 79, gives a venerable respect unto Mary, but denies her both adoration and invocation. And Ambrose, in Commentar. in Roman. prim., plainly affirms that he thinks them fools that do adore and worship their fellow servants. And Basil, in Psalm. septim, says, “As it is meet and fit we should worship nothing but God, so ought we not to fasten our hopes upon any but upon

God." As for Jerome, he does not so much as in one place help to build up this invocation of saints, but rather the contrary. For writing against Vigilantius, in Epistola ad Riparium, he plainly avers, "We do not worship nor adore, I do not say, the relics of the martyrs, but neither the sun nor the moon, no, nor the angels, lest we should be thought to serve the creature rather than the Creator." "We neither affirm," says Cyril, Contra Julian, lib. 6, "that the martyrs are gods, neither have we accustomed ourselves to adore them." And Thesaur. lib. secundo, cap. primo: "There is no man that knows not that the Scriptures deny adoration unto every created nature and allow that to God only." Chrysostom, in his true writings, neither uses nor defends this invocation, but rather disallows it. As for example in his homily, De profectu Evangeli.: "But you need not any patron before God," says he, "nor with long discourse to curry favor with others, but though you do come alone without ever a patron, and offer your prayers unto God by yourself, yet shall you obtain your petition. For God does not consent unto our request so easily when others pray for us, as when we pray for ourselves, though we be full fraught with manifold evils." "Let not our religion," says Augustine, De vera Religione, cap. 55, "be to worship the dead. We are to honor them for imitation's sake, but not to worship them for religion's sake." And De civit. Dei, lib. 22, cap. 10, he says, "We do not build temples unto our martyrs, as unto gods, but we set up memorials for them, as for men departed, whose souls do live in rest with God. Nor do we set up any altars to sacrifice unto them, but we offer our sacrifice unto one only God, both theirs and ours. At which sacrifice they are named in their order as men of God, who have conquered the world by confessing of Him, but they are not invocated of the priest that sacrifices." (See De civitate Dei, lib. 8, cap. 27.) "Those that defended the law," says Theodoret, in cap. 2, ad Coloss., "drew on the people unto the worship of angels also, saying that the law was given by them. And this vice remained very long in Phrygia and Pisidia, wherefore the

synod which met at Laodicea, the metropolitan city of Phrygia, did by a decree prohibit all men from praying unto angels. And unto this day there are oratories of Saint Michael to be seen among them and in their borders. And hereunto they did advise men out of their (exceeding) humility, alleging that the God of all things is both invisible and incomprehensible, and that none can come unto Him, and therefore that they must use the help of the angels to obtain the favor of God by them." So Augustine, Confession., lib. 10, cap. 42, speaking unto God, says, "Whom shall I find that can reconcile me unto my God? Shall I make means unto the angels? By what prayer, or what instruments?" Look also in the same father in his book De moribus ecclesi,. cap. 34.

8. The invocation which was used in these times was properly a dialogue or conference, as with those that were present. Now they were present, either by a rhetorical fiction (as who should say, I will conceive such a one to be present) or in opinion and conceit, for then it was commonly held that the martyrs' souls were always present at the places of their martyrdom, and some believed them to be everywhere. I prove both these conditions thus:

Basil and Nazianzene (as also other fathers), having occasion given them in their panegyrical orations, did in their conclusions (not invoke their friends departed, but) as orators use to do, speak unto them by a figure called Prosopopoeia (a feigning of a person where none is) as though they were present and make some wishes, but no prayers unto them. As when we Englishmen playing at bowls, do in our play bid one bowl run, or rub, etc.

So speaks Nazianzene unto the Passover: "O great and holy Passover, expiation or cleanser of the whole world, for I talk with you as with a living creature, etc." And Invect. 1, in Julianum, "Hear, O you soul of

great Constantine (or rather Constantius, for Constantine died when Julian was about three years old)" (in Jacobi Bill., annot. 2 in hanc Orat.), "if you have any sense," and a little after, "What is this, O you most divine emperor? For I am forced to expostulate with him, as if he were here present, and heard me, though indeed he be with God." And in his second invective he calls unto Julian, being dead and damned in hell. And after this manner Dionysius Areopagita, Hierarch. eccle. cap. 3, part. 5, or the author of that work under his name, has a rhetorical exclamation unto Christ being represented in the bread. And Victor in his book of the Vandal persecution, speaks unto the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles. And Jerome, in his epitaph of Paula, says, "Farewell, O Paula, and by your prayers help the decrepit age of him that honors you." In which words there is no invocation, but an apostrophe whereby he speaks unto her being dead, as though she were present with him. And the same father in Hilarius's life, says thus of Constantia: she was wont to watch whole nights in his sepulcher, and speak to him as if he were present, to further her prayers. And Nyssenus likewise, Oration in S. Theodorum: "Those that behold," says he, "do embrace, as though the body were living and flourishing, using the eyes, ears, mouth, and instruments of all the senses. And the pouring out the tears of love and duty unto the martyr, as though he were living and present, they offer up their humble prayers unto him, to be an intercessor for them, entreating him as a soldier of God, and calling upon him as one that obtains when he pleases." So Chrysostom, Orat. in Babylam: "If any man," says he, "do but stand by these sepulchers, the very sight of the coffin invading his soul penetrates it, and stirs it up, moving therein such an affect that he deems them that lie therein buried, to be visibly present with him, and offering their prayers together with him." Now that it was commonly believed that the martyrs' souls were still present at their sepulchers, or where they would, Jerome's reprehension of Vigilantius (who denies this)

plainly testifies: “You,” says Jerome, contra Vigilant., cap. 2, “do affirm that the souls of the apostles and martyrs are placed either in Abraham’s bosom, or the place of repose, or under God’s altar, and that they cannot be present at their tombs and where themselves please.” And he answers him thus: “If the Lamb be everywhere, then those that are with the Lamb must be believed to be everywhere. And seeing the devils and evil spirits do wander all over the world, and through their too great celerity are everywhere present, is it like that the martyrs after the shedding of their blood should be shut up in their

Coffins and not be able to get out thereof?” So Maximus Taurinensis, in natal. Martyr Tauricorum, says, “All the saints are everywhere, and assist all men, and are always with us, and stay still with us, that is, do both keep and defend us while we are in our bodies, and also do receive and entertain us when we leave our bodies.” And the like saying has Severus Sulpitius of Saint Martin, epist. 2: “He is present,” says he, “with all that talk of him, and stands by them all.” But that this is very boldly affirmed, and weakly concluded, who sees not? Though for excuse’s sake we may say that these writers used ubiq for passim, or ubilibet.

9. The fathers in their prayers and communion were accustomed to recite the names of the martyrs and other saints, desiring God withal to grant them this or that by their entreaties or intercessions. “When we offer this sacrifice,” says Cyril, Catechis. 5, “we make mention of them that are departed before us, that God may receive our prayers by their intercession.” “Therefore, at the communion,” says Augustine, in Joan., tract. 84, “we mention not them as we do the others that rest in peace, or that we should pray for them, but rather that they may pray for us.” And such are the commemorations of the saints in the liturgies that are named after James, Basil, Chrysostom,

or that of the Church of Rome. But these public prayers (as also many other private ones) were but certain vows and desires, that the prayers which they believed the saints did offer up for the whole church might be beneficial unto them before God, as George Cassander did very well observe. Such also is the vow of Prudentius in lib. Περὶ σεφηάνον, in fine hymni. 10, concerning the punishment of Romanius the martyr:

Would I might chance among the goats to stand,
And be discern'd by all on the right hand;
And that at his entreat the King should say,
Romanus kneels, bring me that kid away:
Be he a lamb, and clothed with my wool, etc.

10. The fathers, especially those after the first 400 years, have erred in the invocation of saints, yea, are guilty even of sacrilege, for they do sometimes put their faith, hope and trust in them. So erred Paulinus speaking unto Felix, in natal. 3:

Obtain that God would pardon us our sin
By thy just prayers and merits.

And again, in natali 6:

Lifting his soul to heaven and comforted
With faith, he hopes he has already sped,
And to Saint Felix courts with haste is carried.

And a little after:

For God has made for wearied souls a rest:
Ease for the grieved, and salve for hearts oppressed.

And in another place, in natal. 8:

Let us unto this patron haste.
Together with hope united fast.
We pray thee Felix be
Our right hand still, and tower of safety.

And so says Fortunatus of Martin, in his life, lib. 2:

Reverend, whom I with heart and voice adore,
Help me poor wretch, it's mercy I implore.
And presently after:
O blessed Mediator be
Receive my grieved Lord and me.

And so Leo, Ser. 1, de nat. Petr. & Paul, c. 7, says, "Look how much our own sins do cast us down, so much the apostles' merits do raise us up." And Gregor., Hom. 32, in Evang.: "Make these the protectors of you in your guilt," says he, lib. 22, epistol. 21: "We hope in the virtue of Almighty God, and of Peter, the prince of the apostles." So Ephrem, Fulgentius, and Damianus do all exceed all means in the praises of the blessed virgin. "He has magnified you," says Damianus, de nativ. Marie., Sermo. 2, "that is mighty, and unto you is given all power in heaven and earth, and nothing is impossible unto you to whom it is possible to elevate those that are desperate, unto hope of blessedness. For how can that power hinder your power, which took flesh of your flesh? For you come unto that golden altar of man's reconciliation, not only as king, but even commanding; not as a servant, but as a lady and mistress."

And sometimes they stick not to say that they do know all things, as Paulinus, natal. 6:

You know their mansions that in Christ's light,
Sees all, though hid and absent from your sight,

And in the all-knowing God, knows everything aright.

So likewise holds Prosper de vita contemp., lib. 1, cap. 4, "No secrets," says he, "shall be hid from the perfect, who are to see God Himself, which is better than all these, with their pure hearts."

11. The use of invocation which in elder times had been but private men's custom, about the 500th year began to become public. For then began Petrus Gnaphaeus to shuffle the invocation of saints among the prayers of the church. For it is called his invention to name the virgin Mary, and to invoke her divine name in every prayer (see Niceph., lib. 15, cap. 8). And about the 600th year, Gregory the Great commanded a litany to be publicly sung, wherein all the saints were invoked. So that the commemoration of the saints was at that time turned into invocation.

12. This opinion of invocation of saints had a large part of the original from dreams, visions, doubtful and uncertain revelations, yea and was most of all confirmed by such means. "It fell out," says Sigonius, De reg. Ital., lib. 1, "that which way soever the image (of the virgin Mary) was carried, the mortal pestilence of the air did depart, and good health followed, for which blessing all men giving thanks, an angel was heard out of heaven, speaking unto the blessed virgin in these words: 'Rejoice, O queen of heaven, allelujah; because she whom you deserves to bear allelujah, is risen again according to his word, allelujah.' Which speech, when Gregory heard, being forthwith inspired by the Holy Ghost, he thus concluded it: 'Pray for us unto God,'" allelujah, ad anno 591. So one Conradus, a German, penitent for his sins, coming unto Rome, Hilderbrand, then pope, commanded him to wear a coat of mail instead of his shirt, and fastened it with five chains, giving him sealed letters, containing the catalogue of his sins, and commanding him to go visit all the holy

places of the earth, to try if he could obtain any pardon or remission for his sins. When he had continued in prayer from the first hour of the day until the ninth (at Saint Steven the king's tomb in Hungary), falling into a dead sleep before the altar, the holy king appeared unto him. "Arise my friend," quotes he. "You shall obtain no pardon of God by any merits or help of mine, but go unto my son Emerike's tomb, which is here hard by, and he by his virginity has deserved chief favor with God." He, awaking out of his dream, invokes the name of that saint, and swifter than thought, his chains wherewith he was bound, burst all in pieces. His letters opened of themselves (the seal being broken up) wherein there was not one sin, no, not one letter to be read or seen. And from that time forward, that chapel was had in such reverence that men came unto it from the farthest countries (according to Bonisinius, lib. 1, decad. 2).

13. The power of canonizing was never heard of with the fathers until the year 880, and then Adrian took up this authority. And Alexander III after him confirmed it in his decrees (according to cap. 1, Extra. de reliquiis Sanctorum).

14. The distinction of religious worship into dulia (saint-worship) and latria (God-worship) was never known by the apostles, nor the Greek fathers, nor the Latins for at least 400 years after Christ. For Scripture in diverse places ascribes latria (in the Greek translation) unto men: Deuteronomy 28:48, Leviticus 23:8; and in other places dulia is attributed unto God, Romans 16:18. So Augustine grants latria unto men (De Civitate Dei, lib. 10, cap. 1), and denies them religious dulia (De Vera Religione, c. 55). "We honor the saints," says he, "with charity, not with service," that is, dulia. And here observe: first, that Augustine denies dulia unto saints. And in Question 94 on Exodus, he gives both latria and dulia unto God; latria as to God, dulia as to the Lord. Second, by latria and dulia he distinguishes

religious worship from civil (De Civitate Dei, lib. 10, c. 1 and 4). Third, latria is always used in the Scriptures for service, as he affirms, much less that it should be anything more than dulia (De Civitate Dei, lib. 5, c. 15; lib. 6, c. 1; lib. 7, c. 32; lib. 10, c. 1 and 4). Indeed, dulia politica, that is, service used in a civil state, was always received, and so ought to be still by all men (Galatians 5:13). But that dulia which is higher than civil worship was not given to men for 400 years after Christ. And no wonder: for δουλεύειν is commonly a greater thing, and used for servitude without any wages, because he that serves is in another's power. But Suidas says, λατρείαν δουλείαν είναι ἐπὶ μισθῷ, that the word latria signifies a service for hire. Hereupon Peresius (De Traditionibus, part. 1, consid. 7) disproves the name dulia being taken for saint-worship, because he will have it given unto God, not unto men, as they are God's servants, unless you take the name of service metaphorically and not properly. So Laurence Valla and Lodwicke Vives (in Augustine, De Civitate Dei, lib. 10, cap. 1) do both take latria and dulia for one thing, and in one sense. Wherefore this distinction was invented by men of the later ages, which indeed Bellarmine acknowledges. Howbeit, it is in Bede upon Luke, in cap. 4, and in Lombard and all his followers (Sententiae, lib. 3, dist. 9).

15. That Christ's image is to be worshipped with latria is denied by many: as by Henricus (Quodlibet 1, q. 6), who says it must be worshipped but with hyperdulia; Albertus Magnus (Mariale, cap. 81); Francis Maira (In 3 Sent., distinct. 9); Gabriel (Lectio 49, in Canonem); and Peresius (De Traditionibus, part. 3). The second Nicene Council (Action 2 and 3) gives worship unto images, but denies them latria. And this latria was not given unto Christ's image for 1000 years after Him. This Catharinus freely confesses in his book De Imaginum Cultu, where also he affirms that Thomas never read that Council of Nicea.

16. The “Glass (or idea) of the Trinity,” wherein the saints are said to see our prayers, is a mere fiction, unknown unto the fathers for the space of many ages after Christ. Augustine (De Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda, cap. 13) affirms that the souls of the departed never know what we do here upon earth, and brings for proof thereof that of Isaiah 63:16: “Abraham has not known us,” and that of the kings in 2 Kings 22: “I will gather you to your fathers,, that your eye see not the destruction which I will bring upon this place.” And the fathers of the first four ages after Christ did commonly affirm that the saints were present with those that called upon them, and therefore heard them. Yet was not this opinion approved of all the latter writers; for some of them do deny that the souls of the godly do know our prayers in the word or divine essence, as Durandus (Distinctio 39, quaestio 3); Soto (ibid., quaestio 3, articulus 3, conclusio 8); and Cajetan (In Thomae part. 3, quaestio 10, articulus 2), but only in their proper kind by particular revelations.

17. The worship given unto the saints, whereof the fathers commonly speak, was a worship of love, society, veneration, and honoring of them, in imitation, gratulation, esteem, praise, and holy remembrance of them, belonging unto the second table, and not any religious worship or adoration; because that at first they were not worshipped with churches, oblations, nor appointed service, as they were afterwards, and are at this day in the Church of Rome. This Augustine testifies in three several places, viz. in Psal. 88; De civit. Dei 8, cap. 27; Contra Faust., lib. 20, cap. 4 and 21. And Eusebius likewise affirms it, Hist., lib. 4, cap. 15. And Alexander Ales, q. 92, memb. 1, art. 4, disputes that God alone is simply to be called upon, and the saints are rather of the number of those that pray continually, than of him that is prayed unto. And this did Cassander very well observe in him, in consultatione super art. Controver., artic. 21.

18. The vows which nowadays are made unto the saints were altogether unknown till Lombard's time. For he defines a vow, dist. 38, lit. A, to be a certain testifying of a voluntary promise, which ought properly to be made concerning God and the things that belong unto God.

Prayers for the Dead

1. Before 170 years after Christ there were no memories of martyrs kept in churches, nor any prayers, offerings, or sacrifices for the dead, until 200 years after the passion. The first mention of them is in Tertullian, and they had their beginning from tradition, as he affirms in his book de coron. Militum, c. 3. "Of these and other orders," says he, "if you require the reasons, you shall find no Scripture for them, tradition will be pretended for the increaser, custom for the confirmer, and faith for the keeper hereof."

2. The fathers of the first 400 years were of opinion that we must pray for all the dead, even for the faithless and the damned. Yet are they uncertain whether the dead may be helped anything by our prayers and alms deeds, or no. And if in any place they set down any certainty hereof, yet not in that sense the papists now do hold it.

"The sacrifices," says Augustine, Enchir., c. 110, "either of the altar or of alms-deeds, are propitiations for the dead which were not very wicked; and for the very wicked, they are means," says he doubtfully, "to make their damnation the more tolerable."

And so holds Prudentius, lib. Cathemerinon, in hymno 5, ad incensum cerei pasch:

Yearly that night, wherein our Lord arose
From the Acherontic lake, the cage of woes,
The torments of the afflicted ghosts do stay,
And all the damned crew keeps holy-day.

And a little after:

Then hell slumbers in soft punishment:
And all the souls in that vast prison spent,
Rejoice in rest: the fire then hurts not sore,
Nor boil the floods with sulfur, as before.

Of these prayers Chrysostom speaks very doubtfully, Homily 3, in Philip. “Say, I pray you,” quotes he, “what hope can remain for them that go from hence burdened with their sins, unto a place where they cannot be disburdened of them? For while they were in this world, there was still hope and expectation that they would be converted and become better men. Let us help them so far as we may; let us procure them some ease (though it can be but little); yet let us help them somewhat. This yet affords some comfort unto them.” And afterward he will have us to pray for all the dead, as we do for all the living, for thieves and robbers, because perhaps there may be some conversion of them. And in this manner he doubts in divers places, viz. Homily 69, ad pop. Antioch. and 70. Again, Hom. 21, in Act: “If we do offer,” says he, “continual prayers, and give continual alms for him, though he be unworthy of them, yet God will be more pacified towards us.” And Hom. 32, in Matth.: “Unto your dead son give his due, that therewith he may cleanse away his spots of sin from him.” So Epiphanius, Haeres. 75, confesses these prayers to have no foundation in God’s Word, but only are appointed by the church to be made, and that they do benefit the dead, although they do not take away the guilt of the whole fault. Damascene, Grat. de fidelibus

defunct., brings in certain examples to prove that the prayers of the faithful do in some part help the unfaithful, and such as are damned unto everlasting torments. And yet in the same place, speaking of the opinion whether the souls of the Christians may by alms-deeds be released of their pains, as also the freeing of the ungodly out of hell, he says thus, “But we define or determine nothing; only we reason of it in brotherly love.” And a little after, “Then is there no time to seek help, for every man shall bear his own burden; but now is the time of aid, now is the time of entreaty, now is the time of reconciliation.”

Augustine, de cura pro mort., c. 5, is uncertain whether prayers for the dead are of any efficacy or no. And if he believed that his soul was helped by the martyrs’ merits, this belief was a kind of supplication, and helped him that way, if he had any help any way. And, cap. 1, he affirms these prayers to be according unto the use of the church. After the same manner he doubts also in other places, de Civit. 21, 27. And truly it is very likely that this kind of prayer had its first spring from the Montanists, the inventors of purgatory. Look at Tertullian, in his book de castitate & monogamia. But there were some that disallowed of these prayers, as Gratian can testify, c. 13. q. 2, cap. In praesent., in one place citing Jerome, in Gal. 6, saying thus: “In this life we may help one another by prayers, or by good counsel, but when we come before the judgment seat of Christ, then neither Job, Daniel, nor Noah can speak for any man, but every man must carry his own burden.” And Petrus Cluniacensis, lib. 1, ad Petrobrusi, confesses plainly that there have been some Catholics that have doubted of this praying for the dead. And so Augustine says, Serm. 17, de verb. Apost., “He injures a martyr, that prays for him.”

3. The prayers for the dead in their first beginning were but thanksgivings and praises, wherein the martyrs’ names were yearly

rehearsed. So Cyprian, speaking of martyrs, Epist. 5, lib. 4, says, “We offer continual sacrifice for them.” And Epiphanius, haeres. 75, contra Aerium: “Let us solemnize the memories of all the just, the prophets, patriarchs, apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and bishops,” whom a little before he affirmed to live with God. And in like manner says Chrysostom, Homil. 12, in Acts, “It is offered for the martyrs, and for all the faithful departed.”

4. The fathers prayed for the dead, not that they might have remission of their sins, as touching the temporal pains of purgatory (for they prayed for all the dead in general without exception, as Cyril testifies, c. 5, Myst.). Wherefore their prayers were made for other ends, and namely:

1. to show their zeal unto them, and their desire to commend them unto God. So does Ambrose, concerning his brother Satyrus, in oratione funebri., “Unto Thee (O Almighty God) do I commend his innocent soul, unto Thee I do offer my sacrifice. Graciously and favorably accept of a brother’s gift and a priest’s sacrifice.” Now lest we should suppose him to be in purgatory, he had said before, he is entered into heaven, because he believed on the Word of God. And likewise, upon the death of Valentinian, he says, “No day shall be passed by me in silence of you; no speech of mine shall pass without your honorable mention; no night shall be spent without some prayer of mine bestowed upon you; and in all mine oblations shall I remember you often.” But he had said before, “Let us believe that he is gone up out of the desert, that is, out of this barren and evil tilled earth, unto those sweet and pleasant delights, where being adjoined unto his brother’s company, he lives in eternal felicity.” As also of Theodosius he says thus: “Theodosius lives in the light, and glories in the armies of the saints.” And yet before he had prayed for him also in these words: “Grant that consummate repose unto your servant

Theodosius, that rest which Thou hast prepared for all your saints." And in like manner Augustine, being about to pray for his mother Monica, Conf., lib. 9, cap. 13, says, "I believe, O Lord, that Thou hast already fulfilled my request, but Lord approve my voluntary petitions." So Matthew of Westminster says that Charles, about the year 797, wrote unto Offa, king of Mercia, to command his subjects to make intercession for Pope Adrian, yet he adds, "Having no doubt that his soul is in rest, but only to show our most dear love and affection unto him."

2. The fathers prayed for the dead, to cherish the hope of the resurrection and the desire of hastening it on. So Ambrose, orat. de Valen., says, "We pray Thee Almighty God to raise up these two young men (Valentinian and Gratian) with a timely resurrection, and recompense their untimely course of this life with as timely a resurrection."

3. They pray for them, that their glory increase until the day of judgment, and that then their sins be not imputed unto them. So says Chrysostom, hom. 32, in Matt.: "Do you think he departed in the corruption of sin? Give him his own wherewith he may cleanse himself from the blots thereof. Do you think he departed in the purity of righteousness? Give him of yours that his reward and payment may be the more ample." And the fathers used to offer their prayers in this manner: "Grant we beseech Thee (O Lord) that this offering may benefit the soul of blessed Leo." Witness Innocentius III, in his decretals, cap. Cum Martha, extra de celeb. mis.

4: "They pray for them that their damnation might be the more tolerable." So says Augustine in his Enchir., c. 110 and 112. "They may think (if this please them) that the pains of the damned souls at some certain times are somewhat mitigated, even so that we must

still understand that the wrath of God, that is, their damnation, remains still unto them." In this sense, Paulinus, epist. 19, prays for ease for a soul that was tormented in hell; and no marvel, since Prudentius, lib. Cathemer., hymno 5, de Pasch. (before him), affirms that at such and such times:

The torments of the afflicted ghosts do stay,
And all the damned crew keeps holy day.

Damascene affirms (Orat. de defunct.) that Trajan and Falconella were delivered out of hell by the prayers of Gregory and Tecla. Wherefore these prayers were properly the vow of such as wished them happiness, or else they were thanksgivings. And in these the fathers regarded the fullness or end of the time, not the midst of it, for they believed all the saints to be kept in one common place of custody until the last judgment, and therefore they wished the region of light and peace unto all good men. And albeit they thought the dead to be helped by the prayers of the living, yet they held not this benefit to fall unto them being in purgatory, rather than in heaven or hell.

5. Their prayer for the dead was an admonition unto the living of the goodness of God unto the dead and of the future reward which they should obtain in following their virtues. So says the author of the book called Hierarchia Ecclesiastica, c. 7: "And therefore the fathers prayed for the dead for other ends than the papists nowadays do."

5. Offerings for the dead at the first were not sacrifices of expiation, but only eucharistical, that is, thanksgivings, or banquets, and gifts and legacies of the dead unto the poor, given as alms, and as we here in England call them, doales; as also they were foundings of churches and schools, or yearly annuities bequeathed unto either of them.

“When we celebrate the memory of the saints,” says Ephrem (lib. de paen., cap. 2, if it be the true Ephrem whose book we have), “let us remember the sick, the widows, the fatherless, the poor, and the travelers.” And hereupon after the death of any one in the primitive church, they sung allelujah. “The breath was no sooner out of her mouth,” says Jerome in his epitaph of Fabiola, “but the report of it gathered the whole city together unto her funeral; the Psalms sounded and the allelujah resounding aloft did shake the gilded roofs of the temple.”

So Epiphanius (Haeres. 75) and Chrysostom (Ad popul. Antioch., hom. 70 and hom. 4, in Heb.) affirm that they used to carry lamps and tapers, and sing hymns at the funerals of the dead, to signify glory and praise unto God that had vouchsafed already to crown the soul departed with felicity. Of this nature also were their offerings at marriages, on birthdays, etc., being all instituted for memories and gratulations, though afterward about Gregory’s time when superstition got head, they were all changed into redemptions of souls out of purgatory:

Therefore, prayers for the dead, that they might be freed from their venial sins, and from that temporal punishment for their mortal sins, which they are to endure in purgatory, was never taught nor admitted by the fathers.

Justification

1. Augustine, and the rest of the fathers that dispute against Pelagius, do take justice for an inherent sanctity, or new obedience, grace for the

With the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and to justify, to make one from unjust, just. But indeed, they hold with us that this new obedience is not in this life perfected, and that we do satisfy God's judgment and attain unto everlasting life only by the sole obedience of the death of Christ. Look at their expositions upon 2 Corinthians, chapter 5, verse 21. For so says Augustine, De verbis Apostolorum, sermon 6: "That we may be God's righteousness in Him, mark here two things: God's righteousness, and not ours, and that in Him, and not in us." And in his book, De Spiritu & litera, chapter 26: "Justification befalls not to the doers of the law but goes before them that fulfill it. Or else it is so said, they shall be justified, as if it were said, they shall be taken for just, or accounted just." And De fide & operibus, chapter 14; Epistle 120, chapter 30: "Good works do follow him that is justified, and not go before him that is to be justified." And again, Expositio inchoata Epistolae ad Romanos: "Men being justified by belief, do thenceforth begin to live righteously." So Jerome likewise on 2 Corinthians 5 says: "So Christ was offered for our sins, taking upon Him the name of sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him, not our own, nor in ourselves." (118) And so says Chrysostom, ibid.: "He made the just a sinner, thereby to make the sinner just." Nay, he said not thus, but far more powerfully: "For he assigneth not the quality, but the substance. He said not a sinner, but sin, that we might be made just. He said not righteous, but righteousness, and the righteousness of God. For that righteousness is of God, seeing we are justified not of works (wherein it is necessary also that there be not spot or stain), but of grace." And again, in his 17th homily upon the tenth of the Romans, he says in like manner: "If you have believed in Christ, you have both fulfilled the law, and far more than it commands, for you have already received a far greater righteousness." And Anselm, on 2 Corinthians, chapter 5, says plainly: "God made Christ sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He therefore was made sin as

we are made righteousness; neither is that righteousness ours, but God's (that is, it is not of ourselves, but of God), not in ourselves, but in Him, as He was made sin, not His own sin, but ours, neither was the sin in Himself, but in us." So Bernard, Sermon to the Knights Templar, chapter 11, says: "Furthermore, death is chased away by Christ's death, and Christ's justice is imputed unto us." And Epistle 190: "Man has another's justice assigned unto him, lacking his own; one man's satisfaction is imputed unto all." And in his 61st sermon upon the Canticles: "Lord I will remember Thy justice only, for it is also mine. For Thou art made righteousness unto me of God. Shall I be afraid that one cannot suffice for us both? It is no short raiment, insufficient to cover two. Thy justice is an everlasting justice, and will cover both Thee and me also, and that largely, being most large and most lasting." Nay, some of the modern writers do acknowledge this imputative justice; as the Antididagma of Cologne does for one, and Albertus Pighius himself, Controversy 2, in these words: "If we speak formally and properly, we are not justified by our own faith nor charity, but by the only justice of God in Christ, that only justice of Christ being communicated unto us."

2. The fathers, howsoever they do speak differently and undefinitively of this place of justification, yet in their serious meditations, and when they were entangled with temptations, they never fled unto any justice by works, or unto any merits. Hear what Ambrose says, epist. 71: "Let no man glory in his works, because no man is justified by his deeds. But he that has justice, has it in gifts, because after baptism he is justified. It is therefore faith that frees him through the blood of Christ, because happy is he that has his sins forgiven and his pardon granted." And Augustine cries out, Confess., lib. 9, c. 13, "Woe also be unto the man of most commendable life, if you sift his actions without the favor of mercy." "Only Christ," says he, ad Bonif., lib. 4, c. 4, "did undergo punishment for us without any

evil desert, that we might attain unto grace by Him, without any good desert." And Serm. 49, de Tempore: "What is that? Enter not into judgment with Thy servant. Stand not in judgment with me, nor exact of me all that Thou hast constrained me, and enjoined me, for Thou wilt find me guilty, if Thou enter but in judgment with me. Wherefore I stand in need of Thy mercy, rather than of Thy most easy judgment." And De grat. & lib. arb., cap. 7: "If that your good deserts be God's gifts, then He does not crown your good deserts as your own deservings, but as His own gifts." And in Psal. 67: "The ungodly is justified by faith without any good deserts of his works." And de spirit. & liter., cap. 13: "We do gather out of many testimonies, that man is not justified by the precepts of good life, but by the faith of Jesus Christ."

And such a speech has Basil in his commentaries upon the 114 Psalm: "Eternal rest is prepared for those that have resisted the devil strongly in this life, not as a debt given to their works, but out of the bounteous grace of the most mighty and merciful God." And in his commentary upon the 32nd Psalm: "If by Himself the judgment of God were sufficient, and if He should deal with us severely according unto our merits, what hope were there remaining for any of us? Which of us all should be saved?"

Hilary in like manner, Psalm 51, affirms that those works of justice are not of themselves sufficient to merit perfect bliss, unless that God's mercy even in this will and desire of justice do not impute the viciousness of man's motions and changes unto him. Jerome, in Ezech., lib. 14, cap. 46: "Let a man attain unto perfection never so much, yet shall he stand in need of mercy for all that; and cannot attain unto the fullness of perfection by his merits in this life, but only by grace." Primasius, in Roman., cap. 8: "It is God's purpose to justify man, without any works of the law or any other merits

whatsoever, by faith alone." Chrysostom, Sermon Octav., in Roman., cap. 4: "This is a wonderful thing, that he who became so famous for his worthy acts, could not be justified by his good works, but by his faith; herein is the power of faith mightily manifested."

And so says Paulinus, epistol. decrim. ad Sever.: "Although we are able to keep His commandments (with His help), yet ought we perforce to acknowledge our unprofitable service, because we cannot impute unto ourselves a just execution of our duty if we keep the commandments only."

"And in the same sense," says Marcus the Hermit in his book De Lege spirituali, "whoever among us is thought worthy of the washing of the new birth does not perform good works for the sake of retribution, but only to preserve the purity and cleanness that has been entrusted to us. The kingdom of heaven is not a reward for any works, but the mere grace of God prepared for His faithful servants."

And Gregory the Great also, Mor., lib. 9, cap. 14, and lib. 21, cap. 15, doubts not to affirm that all man's justice would be found to be injustice, if God should use strict judgment. And lib. 5, cap. 7: "This justice of ours being tried upon the touchstone of the divine justice will be found injustice, and it is filthy in the discussion of the Judge, though it shows fair in the estimation of the doer." And lib. 9, cap. 14: "I grow strong unto life, not by merits, but by pardon." And cap. 28: "Note that the holy man says not, my hands shined being most pure, but my hands shined as most pure, because as long as we are bound under the punishment of corruption, though we take never so much pains in doing good works, yet shall we never attain unto true purity." And the same father, in his seventh homily upon Ezekiel sub finem, says: "Let us repose no hope in our tears, nor in our deeds, but in the mediation of our advocate." And in his commentaries upon

the first penitential Psalm: “I do not entreat Thee to save me, trusting to mine own merits, but presuming to obtain that out of Thine only mercy, which I despair to do out of mine own deservings.”

Eusebius Emissenus in like manner confirms our assertion thus: “Though we sweat in toil of soul and body,” says he, “and exercise all our powers in obedience, yet shall we never attain by any desert to get the kingdom of heaven as a recompense for them.” And Bernard, Sermon. 10, de Aununt.: “You can never merit the glory eternal, unless it be given you freely. Nor are man’s merits of that value to claim heaven as their just due.” And Serm. in Cant. 13: “It is sufficient for me unto all righteousness, to have Him my favorer, to whom only I have given cause of offence. All that He does not impute unto me is as though it were not at all. Not to sin is God’s justice, and man’s justice is God’s pardon.”

This also Anselm, upon Romans 12, directly affirms. “Because all men,” says he, “were enfolded in sin, therefore thenceforth salvation consists not in man’s merits, but in God’s grace.” And in his meditations, “My life terrifies me, for if it be diligently examined, it appears wholly either sin or barrenness. And if there be any fruit therein, it is either so feigned, so imperfect, and some way so corrupted, that it cannot but either not please, or displease God. Truly it is either wholly in sin and damnable, or barren and contemptible.” But this of Anselm is most of all to be noted. “In this death alone,” says he, “place all your trust; unto this death commit yourself wholly, with this death cover yourself wholly, and therein enwrap yourself wholly. If God will judge you, say, ‘O Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ betwixt me and Thee and Thy judgment; no otherwise do I stand out with Thee.’ If He say, you have deserved damnation, say then, ‘I put the death of my Lord Jesus Christ betwixt me and my evil deservings. I offer the merits of His

most worthy passion for the merits which I should have had, and alas have them not.'" And Bellarmine's free confession hereof is not to be overpassed with silence, de Justi., lib. 5, cap. 7: "Because of the uncertainty of our own justice," says he, "and the danger of vain glory, it is most safe and sure to place all our trust upon the only mercy and benignity of God."

3. The fathers sometimes speak unfitly of the article of justification, and that because of three errors:

1. Because they speak of justification rather like philosophers than divines, bending their divinity unto the likeness that moral philosophy bore then among the Gentiles, thereby the more easily to gain the more of them unto God. Look in Clemens of Alexandr., Stromat. 2.

2. Because they confound the law and the Gospel, not distinguishing the justice of the one from the justice of the other, as Origen, hom. 6, in Levi., says, "It is God's law that washes you and purges your sins."
3. Because they extolled man's natural strength too much. For Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens, Justin, and Epiphanius held all, that men were saved by the law of nature and by philosophy.

4. The distinction of justification into the first and second was not known among the fathers for 1500 years after Christ but is an invention of this age.

5. The fathers do often speak improperly of justification according unto common use, putting sometimes the word of justification for sanctification, or the renewing of the whole man, both according unto nature and manners, and this they will have done by inward virtues and works.

6. The fathers affirm that works do justify only declaratively, not effectively. So says Thomas upon the 2nd of James: The works that follow faith are said to justify, not as justification is called an infusion of justice, but as it is called an exercise, a showing, or a consummation. And then a thing is said to be done when it is perfected and made known.

7. The fathers sometimes speak hyperbolically of works, thereby to take away the carelessness of the vulgar, and set them on fire with a greater desire unto good works. Unto this end do Chrysostom's words ad popu. Antioch, Homil. 53, tend, when he says that "Alms do free a man from death (from hell he means), give us eternal life, and are advocates for us." As also that of Hilary, in Matth., Cap. 6: "We must of ourselves deserve eternal life." And Ambrose, de poenit. lib. 2, c. 5, says in the same sense, "Our sins are covered by our works." So does Origen, hom. 1, in Ezech.: "Why do you think much to labor, contend, and endeavor, and by your good works to be the cause of your own salvation, and bliss?"

Merit

1. Merit taken in its proper sense, for due and just desert, was never allowed of the sound professors for a thousand years after Christ. So that merit, in the Latin fathers, signifies to do something which is acceptable and pleasing unto God, and worthy of account, and to obtain or get anything of God, even without any desert of ours. A sincere and peaceable prayer, says Cyprian, deserved (or merited) the Lord (that is, obtained His favor). And Suetonius, in the life of Octavius, says, let him imitate Octavius in deserving his fellows, that is, in getting their good wills by doing them good turns. And so says Ambrose, lib. 10, in Luc., cap. 22, in the beginning: oh water, which

deserves to be the sacrament or mystery of Christ, which washes all, and art not washed yourself? etc. So Pope Cornelius, in Eusebius, lib. 6, cap. 4, says of Novatus, that he was not confirmed of the bishop by the sign, and adds, τούτου δε μή τυχῶν, πιοζ ςν, του αγίου πνεύματος ἔτυχε, which words Ruffinus, c. 33, translates thus: Unde nec spiritum sanctum potuit promereri, "Wherefore he could not deserve (that is, obtain) the Holy Ghost." So Augustine, epist. 12, writes unto Jerome: "I have not yet deserved your writings." And elsewhere, epist. 13, "Would to God I could deserve to be embraced of you." And Serm. 49, de temp: "Let no sinner despair of himself, since Paul deserved pardon." And tract. 3, in Joan., "To the like effect he says that we do deserve God by faith, that is, we are acceptable unto Him." And that of Gregory is most noteworthy: "O happy fault which deserved to have such a redeemer."

2. Merit in the writings of the fathers is not put for the worthiness of the good work in respect of the reward, but it is always put for the good work itself, pleasing unto God and accepted of Him; not of itself and its own worthiness, but through the divine favor, and free acceptation of all good works in Jesus Christ. And therefore, it is so called, namely, a good work, thereby to incite us the more to do these good things. This, Cardinal Bellarmine freely confesses (lib. 2, de grat. & lib. arbit., cap. 22): "And that the word merit is to be taken in this sense, it hereby appears, because all the fathers do ascribe all things unto grace wholly." As Bernard (Serm. 61, in Cant.) says, "My merit is God's mercy." And the same word merit, in its true and proper sense, is by them opposed against grace, as the same Bernard uses it (Serm. 67, in Cant.): "There is no place for grace to enter where merit has taken up all before." And besides (Serm. 68): "It is sufficient unto merit to know that our merit is insufficient, wherefore these works of grace are called merits by a metaphor, not properly, because they are the gifts of God, as life everlasting is called a wage,

not properly, but metaphorically." And unto this end Bernard directs his doctrine in his first sermon of the annunciation, saying that merits in very deed do deserve nothing. "Neither are man's merits of such worthiness," quotes he, "that life eternal should be their due; or that God should any ways injure man in not giving it unto him. For (to omit that all man's merits are wholly the gifts of God, and that man is rather a debtor unto God for them, than God any ways unto him) what are all our merits, being compared with that so admirable glory?" And the distribution of rewards is of God's grace, not the wage of merit, because, as Fulgentius says very well (ad Mon., lib. 1, cap. 10), "It is very rightly called grace, because God does not only accumulate His gifts upon His gifts, but also because the bounty of the Divine retribution is showed in such quantity that it admirably and incomparably exceeds all merit, though proceeding from a will and operation both good and given of God." And even the same saying has Radulphus Ardens (in Dominica 18, post. Trin.): "Because," says he, "we proceed from and by one grace unto another, we can but improperly call them merits." For as Augustine can bear witness, "God crowns nothing in us but His own grace." And again (in homil. Domi. Septua. 10): "To the like effect: let no man think that God is as it were bound by covenant to perform His promise. For as He is free to promise, so is He free to pay chiefly seeing our merits as well as our rewards are of His grace. For God crowns nothing but His grace in us, who if He would deal strictly with us, no man living should be justified in His sight. And therefore, the apostle that took more pains than all, says the sufferings of this life are not worthy of that future glory which shall be revealed, wherefore this bargain is nothing else but a voluntary promise."

3. Also, merit sometimes signifies the dignity and excellency of the thing itself, as when Jerome (in epist. ad Evagr.) says: "All bishops are of the same merit and the same priesthood." So the fathers say

virginity is of a greater merit than the other virtues; but indeed merits seldom signify that which we in England call desert, that is, the worthiness of the work in respect of the wages and recompense.

4. The merit of congruence before justification, whether it proceed or succeed our faith, is condemned by the fathers. “Why is it called grace?” says Augustine (Praefat. in Psal. 31), “Because it is given gratis. Why is it given gratis? Because it cost no more.” And in his Retractations, lib. 2, cap. 31, he corrects his opinion of merits, at least of merits of congruence before justification: “I said,” quotes he (lib. 6, quaest. cont. Peganos), “that in religion, salvation never was wanting unto him that proved worthy. But I said not so, as though any man could be worthy by his own merits, but as the apostle says, not of our works, but of Him that calls us.” And in epist. 105, he says, “To make a man just, merit has not sufficient power.” And again, “Righteousness in Scripture is never called hire.” And in Praefat. in Psal. 31, “You have not done any good, and yet the forgiveness of your sins is given you.” And likewise Prosper (cap. 6, de object. Gal.) says, “The justified man (that is, of unrighteous being made righteous) receives a gift without any good merit going before his justification.” And Soto (lib. 2, de natur. et grat., cap. 4) acknowledges that we have in us dispositions unto righteousness, but denies that they can properly be called merits. And Stapleton (de peccat. orig., lib. 1, cap. 4) says that “Merit of congruence in respect of the first grace is long ago abolished, nor is it allowed of by the most approved schoolmen, as Thomas in his sum, nor admitted by his followers or latter writers at any time.” Indeed, Gregory of Arimin (lib. 2, dist. 26, q. 1) expressly condemns it, as Lyra also (in 1 Joan.), and Thomas Waldensis (lib. 3, de Sacram).

5. But merit of condignity is condemned also by some others, as namely by Augustine’s censure (de verb. Apost., Serm. 2), in these

words: “You were not worthy, whom He might glorify being justified, He crowned you in His mercy and pity. If you have prevented Him by any merits, examine then your merits,” says God, “and you shall find that they are My gifts.” Anselm likewise (de mensurat. cru.) says more plainly than any, “If a man should serve God with greatest fervency a thousand years long, yet should not all his deserts be worth the staying one half day in heaven.” Look in Gregory of Arimin (in 1 d. 17, q. 1, art. 2); Durand. (in 2 d. 27, q. 2 and in 3 d. 18, q. 2); Waldensis (tom. 3 de Sacra c. 7); Burgensis (in additio. ad Lyram super Psal. 35); Scotus (in 1 Sent., d. 17, q. 2) thinks that our good works have no proportion with eternal life, and he therefore accepted of God for reward. “You must know,” says Cusanus (precit. lib. 9), “that Christ’s death only was of ability to merit everlasting life, because it being a consummate death, merits an eternal life. None of all the other martyrs do merit eternal life by their death, because all other death of whomsoever comes short of the greatest death, which only merits the greatest, that is, everlasting life.”

Faith

1. The fathers affirm faith to justify a man not by disposing him inwardly, or preparing him, but by apprehending Christ and applying of Him, which is, when we do stay ourselves upon the mercy of God and merits of Christ, holding God as favorable unto us in Christ. “This is set down by God,” says Ambrose (in 1 Cor. 1), “that whosoever believes in Christ shall be saved without works, receiving by his only faith free remission of all his sins.” And Isichius upon Leviticus (lib. 4, cap. 2): “Grace is given out of mercy and compassion and obtained by faith alone.” And Marius Victor has these words (in Gen. 3):

, but he
Believed, and this sole faith he did confess,
Was held a worthy crown of righteousness:
Thus we by Abraham's great reward are taught,
By faith in God's true word what good is caught.

"As soon as ever a man believes," says Chrysostom, in Rom. 3, hom. 7, "he is forthwith justified." And in his commentaries upon the Hebrews, cap. 11, hom. 23, after he has spoken of the promises made unto the patriarchs, he adds, "These by their only faith conceived an assured trust of these things, seeing them afar off, four generations ere they came to pass. So firmly were they persuaded of them, that they did as it were salute them coming. You see that this receiving of theirs was but an expectation and trust of them. If therefore to trust be to receive, then may we also receive." And it is Augustine's opinion in Prosper, in Sent. 352, that the faith of Christ is to believe in Him that justifies the wicked; to believe in the Mediator without whom no man is reconciled unto God; to believe in the Savior who came to seek and save that which was lost; to believe in Him that said you can do nothing without Me. "Now what it is to believe in Him that justifies the wicked?" the same father, Tract. 29, in Joan. lays down, saying, "What is it then to believe in Him? In believing Him to love Him; in believing Him to depend upon Him; in believing Him to turn unto Him; and to be incorporated into His body." And in other places, and that very often, he uses to affirm that to believe in God is to cleave unto God, and to bend towards God. Look in his narration upon the 77th Psalm, in his 54th tractate upon John, and in his 181st sermon de tempore. He also in his 26th tractate upon John says, "Whoso believes in Him, eats Him and is invisibly fed, because invisibly regenerate." And in his 50th tractate upon John: "How shall I reach my hand unto heaven, and lay hold of Him as He sits there? Why, send but up your faith, and you have hold of Him."

And sermon 33, de verb. Dom.: “Behold, we believe in Christ whom we have received through faith; and in our receiving Him we know what to think upon. We receive but a little, and yet our hearts are fed fat therewith.”

So Bertram, in his book of the body and blood of Christ, says thus: “This body is not to be received, beheld, or eaten with the senses of the flesh, but with attention of a faithful soul.” And the decretals themselves, de consecrat. d. 2, counsel us in this manner: “Behold the holy body and blood of your Lord with faith; honor and admire it, touch it with your mind, receive it with the hand of your heart, and take it wholly with the endeavor of the inward man.” And Lombard, Sent., lib. 3, dist. 19, says, “We are said also to be otherwise justified by the blood of Christ, namely, in that we are cleansed from our sins by the faith of His death. And therefore, says the apostle, ‘the righteousness of God (in us) is through the faith of Jesus Christ.’” And by and by after he says, “‘Whom God has made a propitiator by faith in His blood,’ that is, by the faith of His passion. If therefore we behold Him that died upon the cross for us with the eye of faith, we are loosed from the bands of the devil, that is, from our sins.”

2. That the justification of our souls by faith consists not in apprehension, but in inward preparation and disposition, it is a fantastic invention of the schoolmen.

3. The fathers do hold faith only to be requisite unto justification, even without the works of grace. “We must especially believe,” says Augustine, Serm. 181, de temp., “the remission of sins, for this is the only remedy which looses man from the sentence of death eternal.”

“I am able to show,” says Chrysostom (Hom. de Fide & Lege Natura), “that a faithful man has both lived in this life without works, and has attained unto the kingdom of heaven. And the thief only believed and

was justified. But I dare affirm that only faith by itself has saved some." And in Hom. 7, in cap. 3 Roman.: "What is the law of faith?" says he. "To be saved by grace. Here he shows the power of God in that He not only saved us, but also justified and glorified us, and that without use of any works, exacting only faith of us."

"We have not believed of our own accord," says Theodoret (in Eph. 2), "but came being called, and when we are come, He does not exact purity and innocence of life, but has pardoned our sins accepting of faith only."

"This it is to glory in the Lord," says Basil (Serm. de Hum.), "when a man is not puffed up with his own righteousness, but acknowledges himself destitute of all true righteousness, and justified by faith alone in Jesus Christ."

"They are justified before God," says Ambrose (in Roman. 4), "without any labor or toil, by only faith, no works of penitence being hereto required, but only that they believe."

Origen upon the 3rd of the Romans, after he has alleged the example of Paul, says, "Therefore the just cause of man's glorying is in the faith of the cross of Christ, which excludes all glorying that proceeds from the works of the law."

Augustine, against Pelagius's 2nd epistle (lib. 1, cap. 21), says that, "Of how great holiness soever the saints of either the New or Old Testament are said to be, yet nothing saved them but faith in the Mediator, who shed His blood for the remission of their sins."

"That a man should be saved by his faith that has no good works, it may be, is not a thing out of custom," says Chrysostom (in Rom. 4, hom. 8). "But to see a man who is noted for good works, not to be

saved by them, but by faith, this is an admirable thing, and makes a most manifest demonstration of the efficacy and power of faith." And in Hom. 14, in cap. 8: "We offer but one gift unto God, namely in believing His promises of things to come, and by this only way we are brought unto salvation."

4. Whensoever the fathers do join faith and works together in the matter of our salvation, they speak of an historical and general faith, which is only a knowledge and universal assent, or otherwise of the external profession of faith; or also of faith as it is the pathway to salvation. For although faith, as it is the instrument or means to apprehend Christ unto righteousness and salvation be alone and unjoined with any other mean, yet as it is the way unto salvation, it is not alone. Whence we acknowledge that faith alone is not sufficient unto salvation, and to live a good life by, but must have the assistance of good works and other virtues.

"The help of repentance," says Lactantius (de Divin. Instit. Epit., ca. 9), "is great; which whosoever casts away, bars himself of the way of salvation."

"Some do purge away their sins, by watching," says Chrysostom (in Joan., hom. 38). "You may do this an easier way, namely, by exercising patience unto all men."

"By works of righteousness," says Eucherius (in Reg., lib. 3), "we come to the kingdom of heaven. And we cannot come to these everlasting joys, but by faith, and works of justice." And again, "Let them begin at faith and continue to the end of their journey in good manners, until they come whither they intend" (in Gen., lib. 3).

"Let us make pity our patron in this world," says Caesarius (Hom. 15), "that it may deliver us in the world to come. For there is mercy in

heaven, which is obtained by exercising mercy here upon earth."

"Some hasten unto God by fasting," says Haimo (sup. Psal. 135), "others by alms, and others by other virtues." "Let us hasten unto our country in heaven by doing good works," says another, viz. Ideot., Contemp., lib. 2, cap. 15. And Rabanus says there are many fruits of repentance by which a man may attain unto the clearing of his crimes.

5. Sometimes the fathers, joining works to faith, do speak of faith as it is a persuasion of the impunity and freedom of sins, without penitence, or as it is an imperfect virtue, unto which other virtues are therefore to be joined.

6. The fathers do acknowledge a special and infallible certainty of faith in God. "Trust in God," says Remigius, Altisiodorensis in Psal. 10. That is, "All my faith is in Christ. By Him only I believe to be justified and saved; He is my rock, He is my refuge."

"He that believes with a strong affection," says Theophylact, "extends his heart wholly unto God, and what then? He is united to him. And his heart being enkindled, conceives a most certain assurance to be made partaker of His desire. This do all men find true by experience."

"If you believe that your sins cannot be forgiven," says Bernard (in Mar. 11, De Annum. Serm. 1), "but by Him whom only you did sin against, and who Himself cannot sin, you do well. But add this, that you believe that by Him they may be forgiven; this is the testimony that the Holy Ghost sets down in your heart, saying your sins are forgiven you." And again (epist. 107): "Who is righteous but he that recompenses God's love with his love again? And this is never done but when the Holy Ghost by faith reveals unto man God's purpose

from everlasting, concerning his future salvation." And (ser. 5, Dedica.): "Here it is most plainly necessary that faith do succor us, that that which lies hidden concerning us in the heart of the Father, may by His Spirit be revealed unto us, and the same Spirit testifying unto us, may persuade our spirits that we are the sons of God, and may persuade us by calling us, and justifying us freely by faith." And again elsewhere: "We know that we are translated from death to life by this quickening Spirit, and by a certain and daily experiment (the same Spirit enlightening us) we do prove, that our prayers and contrition do come from Him, and ascend unto God, before whose eyes they do find mercy." And in his eighth sermon upon the Canticles: "What soul among you all," says he, "has at some times felt the Spirit of the Son in his secret conscience, crying Abba, Father. Let that, O let that soul presume boldly, that it is beloved with a fatherly affection that finds itself affected with the same Spirit that affected the Son. Trust to it (you soul whatsoever you are). Trust unto it, and never doubt at anything." And in his 69th sermon he has these words: "Nothing can forbid this soul to say, 'God is my beloved,' which in that it feels itself to love, and to love vehemently, doubts not but that it is beloved, as ardently and as vehemently. And of the singular intent, desire, care, labor, diligence, and study that it shows in endeavoring so incessantly and earnestly to please God, undoubtedly acknowledges all these in itself, remembering that promise, therefore by its own proper affects, it knows how God is affected, and doubts not that it is beloved again, seeing itself loves."

"There is a certain kind of glorying in a man's conscience," says Augustine (in Psal. 149), "and that is, when you know your faith to be sincere, your hope to be infallible, your charity to be unfeigned." And in his 75th tractate upon John, he says this saying: "For now is He in us, and we in Him, but this as now we do but believe, but then we shall know also, although we

“We know it already by believing, but then we shall know it by contemplating.” And in another place, in his 13th book of the Trinity, cap. 1 and 2, he says: “Every man that believes, sees faith to be in his heart, and he that believes not, sees that faith is not in his heart.”

“The mind that is replenished with the Holy Ghost,” says Gregory, Dial., lib. 1, chapter 1, “has most evident signs thereof, namely, virtues and humility, which if they do perfectly concur in one mind, it is certain that they do bring assured testimony of the presence of the Holy Ghost.” And in the sixth book of his register, chapter 187, “The soul that thirsts for God is first touched with fear, and then with love. But when the fear is worn out with the continual languishment of sorrow, then at last enters some security and hope of the presuming of pardon.” And in his Morals, lib. 31, cap. 23, he says that “The security of the righteous man is fitly compared unto a lion, who when he sees any come against him, betakes himself to his wonted (or usual) courage. So the other knows that he shall overcome all adversaries, because he loves Him only whom against His will he can never fall from.”

“There is abiding in us,” says Cyprian, ad Dem., “a fortitude of hope, and a firmness of faith, and an upright and vigorous heart (even among the greatest ruins of this declining world), and a patience always rejoicing, and a soul always secure of the favor of his God.” And de Caena elsewhere: “Our affection knowing itself cured and sanctified, washes itself with tears. And in His (God’s) presence these well-shed tears do beg for pardon.”

“Let the hearts of the faithful,” says Leo, Sermon 10, de quadr., “examine themselves, that finding in themselves any fruits of charity laid up, they may know without all doubt that God is in them.” And Sermon 8, de Epiphan.: “He that will try whether God do dwell

within him or no, if he diligently examines the inward parts of his heart, and finds therein the love of God and his neighbor, assuredly and without dissimilation, he need not doubt that God both governs him and dwells in him."

"He gave Him for us," says Ambrose, de Jacob & vit. beat., lib. 1, cap. 6, "therefore there is no doubt that we need fear anything should be denied us; there is no cause for us to doubt of the continuance of God's munificence towards us." And again, Sermon 7, in Psal. 118, "He that has a good conscience is not troubled nor in doubt, but constantly affirms, 'We be the heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.'" And in one of the sermons under his name, he says, "Whosoever sticks fast unto that leaven Christ, shall also be converted into leaven, as well helpful to himself as convenient unto others, and certain of his salvation and secure of the calling and gaining of others."

"By this that the Holy Ghost infuses charity into us," says Anselm, in Rom. 8, "He declares unto our hearts by an evident testimony that we are the children of God." And, in 1 Cor. 2, "We know by His Spirit, that we have both His gifts, and also received them of Him." And again, "He that has the feeling of faith in his heart, this man knows that Christ is in him," in 2 Cor. 13.

"Whensoever any man feels himself so affected either with his own sins or with others, as we have said," says Basil, Reg contract. q. 296, "then (plhroforhqhtw) let him undoubtedly know that he is free from sin."

And Cyril upon John, lib. 10, cap. 3, "Besides this general knowledge also sets down another, namely, by which the faithful, having received illumination from the Spirit, do with the eyes of their mind see God dwelling in them." "This is not," says he, "the common and

general knowledge of the saints but another, far more clear and more certain, and far differing from that other general knowledge."

"Let us bring faith and obedience," says Chrysostom (in Gen. cap. 29, hom. 54), "and believe as confidently upon God's promises as though they were already performed." And again (in Rom. 8, hom. 14): "Seeing we have the testimony of that supreme essence, who gives us what He promises, and also commands us to ask, who can from henceforth doubt of this dignity?"

"When these three are sealed in the mind," says Hales (sup. 2, dist. 12, q. 20), ", light, gladness, and peace, it is a most sure experiment that the soul has grace."

Yea, Thomas Aquinas (l. 2, q. 112, art. 5) and the most ancient of the schoolmen do rather deny the certainty of knowledge than of faith. "I believe that I have faith," says Scotus (lib. 3, dist. 23) and so affirm all the modern writers. The Enchiridion of Colen teaches that it is necessary unto justification for everyone to believe certainly that his sins are forgiven him. So Catharinus teaches and defends that the faithful may have assurance of faith concerning grace in this life. And Cajetan (in Rom. 8) says that, "The testimony of the Spirit is a gift by which I neither see, nor know, but I believe that I am the son of God." So Marinarius, the Carmelite friar, in his oration unto the Council of Trent, anno 1546, says: "Let a man abhor the fruitless confidence in his own worth, and depend wholly upon God's mercy; let him hold God to be always present with him as a most merciful Father, from whom he is always to expect all joy and all felicity. Nor ought he ever to let this persuasion go out of his mind, although he be molested with the most intolerable and infinite difficulties that the world, the flesh, and the devil can any ways inflict to withdraw us from our trust upon God and His divine worship." And, "Wherefore,

they never wander in the labyrinth of doubt that have obtained righteousness through Christ, but living in security of conscience, in peace of mind, in joy of heart, and taught by that Spirit which testifies unto them that they are the sons of God, they dare be bold to say, 'Abba Father.'"

7. Where the fathers do sometimes seem to deny the special assurance of faith, they do speak of presumption or the carnal security wherein men do dream of lib.ty and peace without temptation and hazard. "Which of all the company of the faithful," says Saint Augustine (de cor. et grat., cap. 13), "dares presume that he is of the number of the predestinate, as long as he lives here upon the earth?"

Sometimes they speak of the certainty of continuance unto the end without fall or defect. "And in this sense," says Augustine (De civit. Dei, lib. 11, cap. 12), "who is he that knows that he shall persevere in increase and acts of justice until the end? Unless he be instructed of this by revelation from Him that instructs all concerning this matter by His just and secret judgment and deceives no man."

Sometimes they speak of the assurance of experience, which is always after the event of the thing. Sometimes of the certainty of grace and salvation of others. Sometimes of assurance by special revelation, or privileged assurance, not the ordinary certainty contained in the Word and sacraments. Sometimes of the demonstrative assurance, begetting knowledge in the mind by peculiar and proper principles, not of the assurance of faith. And sometimes of that certainty which is without any signs or tokens, called the certainty of evidence.

8. The special and particular assurance of faith was never condemned for heresy before the Council of Trent condemned it.

Fulfilling of the Law, Supererogation

1) The fathers do affirm the law to be fulfilled, first by imputing the obedience of Christ by faith, and then by beginning to work it, and endeavoring either according to ability, not perfectly, or in the perfection of parts, but not of degrees.

Testimonies: “All the commandments of God are accounted to be fulfilled when whatsoever is not done, is pardoned.” Augustine (Retract. lib. 1, cap. 19). “Then are we just,” says Jerome (lib. 1, c. 2, contr. Pelag.), “when we confess ourselves sinners, and our justice consists not in our proper merits, but in the mercies of God.” Look at the first book of Bernard’s life, cap. 13. “He that believes in Christ,” says Theodoret (in Rom. 10), “fulfills the scope of the law.” “What will the law do,” says Chrysostom (in Rom. 10, Hom. 17), “make a man just? It cannot, for none did ever fulfill it.” “He has obtained the perfection of the law,” says Sedulius (in Rom. 10), “who believes in Christ. For seeing none is justified by the law, because none has fulfilled the law, faith was set down to satisfy for all omissions in the whole law.” “No man ever fulfilled the law,” says Cusanus (Excit., lib. 10), “which consists in love, but He alone that came not to dissolve the law, but to fulfill it.”

2) Now, that there are two ways of fulfilling the law, properly and perfectly without any breach: one in this present life, and another in the life to come, none that I ever heard of but the schoolmen did never teach. For the ancient doctors do acknowledge no perfection at all in this life, but only that which consists in acknowledging our imperfection and enormities. So says Saint Augustine (cont. 2ep. Pelag., lib. 3, c. 7): “That virtue which is in a man which is just in this life is called perfect with this proviso, that unto the perfection thereof, there do also belong both a true knowledge and a humble

confession of the imperfection thereof." And in ep. 29, ad Hiero: "Such charity as cannot be increased in this life, is in no man. And as long as it may be increased, that which is less than it ought to be is of corruption, by reason of which there is not one just man upon earth that does good and sins not. By which corruption it comes to pass that no living man shall be justified in God's sight." And de perfecta justi. resp. ad Ratiocin. 17, he says: "As long as there are any relics of carnal concupiscence remaining, God is not wholly beloved, nor with the whole heart; for the flesh without the soul has no concupiscence." But in his book, de Spiritu & litera, the last chapter, he seems to hold a contrary opinion. For there he says that here there cannot be so much love of God as is due unto a full and perfect knowledge, this is not for all that to be accounted as a fault. But for the reconciliation of these two places, we must know that there are two sorts of faults: the one when a thing is done directly opposite unto God's will, and by Him forbidden; the other when that is done which God commands, but not altogether with the whole heart as He commands. And this Augustine speaks not of, but of the other in the latter quotation, and contrariwise, of the former in the first.

"We are not justified by works," says Ambrose (lib. 2, de Jacob, cap. 2), "but by faith, because our carnal infirmity hinders our works."

"The saints themselves," quotes Bernard (in Cant., Serm. 73), "had need to pray for their sins, that they may have salvation through mercy, and not in trusting to their own righteousness." And again, in Cant. 50: "How should that be commanded which could not possibly be fulfilled? Or if you will have it to concern only the affect (of charity), I will not stand in contention with you, so that you grant thus much to me, that it cannot, nor ever shall be fulfilled in this life, by any man."

“We can hardly do one good work,” says Radulphus (in Levit., lib. 1, c. 1), “without intermixing of some sin or other with it. And it is to be feared, lest when we look for a complete reward of devotion, the punishment for the fault therewith conjoined be not exacted of us.”

3) Supererogation, wherein a good work of counsel done over and beyond the fulfilling of the law is acceptable unto God, was a stranger unto the knowledge of the fathers. For although they say that virginity is offered more than due, and above the laws, and that many do exceed the commandments with their works and perform more in duty than the precepts do bind them to, yet, that the law is so kept, that the keepers are not transgressors, they do not say. I affirm again, they do not say so. But they will have supererogative works done, not that there can be any duty done which is beyond the moral law, but these works they hold may surpass, first the negative part, for so says Chrysostom (Hom. 8, in Rom. 4): “Not to steal or kill is in every man’s power, but to believe that God can do that which is otherwise impossible, this requires a mind elevated, and a more vehement affection towards God, for this is a sign of a worthy and noble love. He honors God that keeps His commandments, but he much more that can argue and dispute through his faith. The other obeys God, but this ascribes Him…His glory with greater measure and vehemency.”

Second, they held supererogation above external acts, and in this sense Chrysostom (Hom. 3, in 1 Cor.) speaks when he determines that the philosophers had supererogation: “Are not His precepts so easy,” quotes he, “that many have gone beyond them by philosophical reason?”

Third, they held it as it exceeds some one commandment. So is Augustine’s saying understood of the virgins (Serm. 8, de verb.

Apostl.): “The virgins,” quotes he, “did labor for the beauty of the heart. What do You command us? To abstain from adultery; do You command us this? We do perform more in loving You than You command us, that is, in this commandment.”

Lastly, as it exceeds a commandment which is common unto other men. “The apostle Paul did spend more,” says Augustine (de opera. Monac., c. 5), “because (as himself witnessed) he warred at his own charges.” “Virginity is a voluntary thing,” says Optatus (lib. 6, cont. Parm.), “and not of necessity. Saint Paul gives not any precept, but only counsels us unto virginity.” So do some of the other fathers account virginity above the law, that is, above the ordinary observation of the law among other Christians because they thought it to be an angelical state. But yet Athanasius (lib. de incar. Ver.) puts virginity from among the counsels, and in the precepts: “What man,” says he, “either in his life or after his death, has been the author of keeping virginity? Yet our Savior Christ, the King of all men, prevailed thus much in these kinds of commandments, that children not being of maturity to receive the discipline of the laws should profess virginity, which is above the laws.” And in his apology to Constantine: “That holy and heavenly command of eternal virginity is not kept nor fulfilled happily, but only among us Christians.”

4. This kind of supererogation, which the papists now teach, is in some sort reproved by some of the fathers. “None can restore so much as he owes,” says Anselm (de concept. Virg., c. 21), “only Christ restored for all that are saved, more than He ought.” And Thomas (in 2. 2 quest. 184, art. 3) will have perfection to consist really and essentially in the keeping of the commandments, and instrumentally in the executing of the counsels, and for this purpose alleges the words of abbot Moyses: “Fastings, watchings, etc., are not perfection itself, but the instruments of perfection, because that the end of that

discipline does not consist in them, but they are the means to bring us unto that end."

Pilgrimage

1. Religious pilgrimage got footing after Constantine's time, about the year of grace 320, and yet was not as then used by all, but only by the vulgar;

Nor undertaken for any worship of God, or merit's sake, but only for confirmation of faith. "It is a part of faith," says Jerome (Epist. 154), "to worship the ground whereupon Christ's feet did tread." Severus Sulpitius (Historia, lib. secundo) and Paulinus (Epist. ad Sever) say that men's minds do draw them to Jerusalem for no other cause, but only to see and to touch the places wherein Christ was corporally present.

And before Constantine's time, it is told as a rare thing of Alexander, and a wonderful thing, that he hasted unto Jerusalem to worship and visit the holy places, as Eusebius records (lib. 6, cap. 10). But mark there that all this was done by a vision.

2) Afterward, succeeding times changed these pilgrimages into part of God's worship and religion. But yet the most orthodox fathers in that respect did always condemn it. So Nyssenus, in an epistle of his, affirms that it adds not one iota unto piety, and that God is present to those that call upon His name in every place alike. "The Lord says not," says Augustine (Serm. de Mart. 3, inter Serm. de Sanct.), "go into the east and seek justice, or sail into the west to receive pardon. Forgive your enemy, and you shall be forgiven. Do not seek ought of yourself, without yourself. God directs you unto yourself, and your own conscience."

Hildebertus Cenamaonensis, in an epistle to a certain Count, affirms that pilgrimage is an inexcusable sin in them that are bound unto any ministry, and likewise that to prefer things not necessary before things necessary, and things not due before duties, and to wander about the world, no doctor, no Scripture at any time or in any place mentions. And Chrysostom (Homil. 1, in Philem.) says truly that unto forgiveness of sins it is altogether needless to undertake any pilgrimage.

3. But as for set pilgrimages unto certain images, there was never father dreamed of them for 600 years after Christ at the least.

Fastings, Stations, Procession

1. Concerning the Lent-fast, the fathers are uncertain. Some say that it is a tradition of the apostles, of which rank are Jerome (ad Marc. Epist. 54) and Leo (Sermone sexto & nono de Quadrages.). Others say that Christ Himself appointed this fast of Lent. Ambrose (Serm. 25) says it was consecrated by Christ, and in Sermon 34, "A law given by God, a fast enjoined by Christ." And Theophilus of Alexandria (Pasc., epist. 1, ad finem) calls it an evangelical institution. Cassianus (Collat. 21, cap. 30) says that, "In the primitive church, their fast was alike throughout the whole year, and then devotion beginning to grow cold, and fasting to be neglected, the priests commanded this fast of Lent." Amalarius (lib. secundo, cap. quinto) denies that any man can truly assign the first inventor of Lent. And Irenaeus (apud Euseb., lib. quint., cap. 26) says that it is but merely "συνήθειαν καθ΄ απλότητος και ιδιωτισμός," a custom risen out of simplicity, and some private institution.

2. The fast of Lent in the first ages of the church was a fast of great religion and holiness, kept for the maintaining of more commodious

and spiritual exercises of invocation and repentance, and used for a remembrance of Christ's passion.

"What should I stand to relate the often meetings together," says Eusebius (Hist., lib. 2, cap. 16), "and the exercises of the men being placed together in one room, and the women in another apart, and the severe order of discipline, which we as yet do customably observe, and do use to celebrate, especially upon the feast of our Lord's passion, not only in fasting and watchings, but in the diligent hearing of the Holy Scriptures?"

"If we have done no good," says Basil (Hom. 24, in Ebrietat.), "by so many admonitions, which I have never omitted to exhort you with in all the time before, and now especially in these seven weeks of fasting, wherein continually, night and day, I have instructed you in the doctrine of the Gospel without all intermission, etc."

"This fast is not appointed us," says Epiphanius (in fine Panar.), "whereby to render any favor or good turn unto Him that suffered for us, but to confess and acknowledge His passion, which He undertook for us unto our salvation." "For this end," says Chrysostom (Hom. 19, ad pop. Antioch.), "have we our fastings and our Lent. For this end have we so many holy meetings, and hearing, and hitherto tend all our prayers, and all our doctrine, namely, that being by the diligent meditation of God's precepts cleansed from all the spots of sin, whereby we have been any way stained for the whole year, trusting to our spiritual freedom, we may receive that unbloody sacrifice, like as godly and religious men ought to do." And (73 Homil., ad pop. Antioch. de sciun. Quad.): "It is not only required of us (my dearest brethren) to meet here every day, and to hear continually of the same things, and to fast the whole Lent," etc.

3. This fasting of Lent was kept freely, without any bond of conscience or any necessity of command, even unto the year of grace 400. This is true both in respect of the limit of time, as well as of the sorts of meats.

Testimonies: Ambrose (de Elia Jeiu, c. 22), inviting us unto voluntary fasting, says, “Undergo the yoke of Christ…. He does not bind your neck with bands, but couples the mind to Him with favor and grace. He does not compel a man by necessity, but directs the willing of good works.”

“Christians,” says Augustine (cont. Faust. Man., libr. 30, cap. 5), “not heretics, but Catholics do abstain both from some sorts of flesh and also from some kinds of fruits, and that for the taming of the flesh, and to humble and withdraw their soul from brutish and unreasonable motions, not that they think the meats or fruits any ways unclean. And this use is observed either continually, which few do, or at certain times and days, as almost all do throughout the Lent, everyone as much or as little as he is willing, or as he is able.” But whereas he says (at least a sermon under his name, viz. 62, de temp.) that it is a sin not to fast the Lent, this is not to be understood as if there were a law hereof, but in respect of the neglecting of the public penance which was commonly renewed in this fast. So Theodoret (in Epist. divin. Decret.), speaking of the eating of flesh and drinking of wine, says that, “The church does not forbid the use of them, and therefore some do make lawful use of these goods and pleasures allowed by the law, and othersome again do abstain from them. But no man of right judgment or wisdom will condemn him that uses them, for to abstain from them, as well as to eat them, is in his choice and power.” And Augustine (in lib. 1, cap. 33, De moribus Ecclesia) says that abstinence and feasting were both allowed by reason and charity, nor is any man constrained to forbear the use of

this or that meat, but it is left free to every man, as far as every man's health permits him. And Prosper (de vita contemplat., libr. 2, cap. ult.) says that "We ought to fast and abstain, that we do not bind ourselves to the necessity of fasting, lest thereby we should be brought to do a voluntary thing, not of devotion, but of compulsion."

"Concerning fasting," says Primasius (in Roman., cap. 14), "there is no law set down, but every man as he can or will." Spiridion did eat flesh freely, as Sozomene testifies (lib. primo, cap. undecim). And it was Montanus that first prescribed laws of fasting, which Eusebius affirms of him (lib. quin., cap. 16). Telesphorus indeed commanded the clergy to

Fast the Lent, about the year 130. And Ercombert, king of England, did first command the English men to keep it in the year 640 (Sigebert, in Chron.). "This man," says Florentius, a monk of Worcester (speaking of Ercombert), "was the first of the kings of England that commanded the idols to be destroyed, and the fast of forty days to be observed throughout all his kingdom."

4. This fast of Lent in divers churches was diversely observed, both in the time and also in the kinds of meats. "Those that are at Rome," says Socrates, lib. quinto, cap. 21, "do fast three weeks before the Easter, excepting Saturday and Sunday. Those that live in Illyria, and all Greece, and Alexandria, do begin their fasts six weeks before Easter, calling that time their pascha. Others (besides these customs) beginning their fast seven weeks before Easter, and yet fasting but fifteen days only, equally divided by spaces between, do yet call the whole time Lent, which breeds no small wonder in me, that all these dissenting in the number of the days, should nevertheless call all their fasts by the same name."

The fast before Easter, though it were but of few days, yet was called Lent. Perhaps because it consisted of forty hours of day and night, as it is in Eusebius, lib. quinto, cap. 24. And Leo, in his fourth sermon of Lent, says, "Let us fast on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and on Saturday let us watch at Saint Peters." Gregory says, homil. 16, that, "The Lent was a fast of six and thirty days." And it is a received opinion, that before his time, the Lent began not upon Wednesday, because that in the Decretals, in cap. quadragesim. de consecrate, dist. 5 (which were made after him), the four days before the first Sunday in Lent are added to make up the number of forty. This Ambrose testifies in his thirty-fourth sermon, and Cassianus, Col. 21, c. 24, 27, 28, etc., teaching, that the Lent always used to begin upon the Sunday next after Quinquagesima Sunday. So likewise, Alcuine holds, de divin. offic., cap. 40; and Ordo Romanus, in capit. de Septuages.; and Micralogus, cap. 49. I confess there is a sermon extant among Saint Augustine's De Tempore, in Feria quarta, which is entitled, "A Sermon upon the Wednesday in the beginning of the fast," but that sermon is none of Saint Augustine's, and if it be, I say the title is added by some of later time, and that for the reasons before alleged.

"The holy church," says Epiphanius, in via comp., "did accustom to keep all the Lent before the seven days of Easter, in fasting. Now after this fast of 40 days, the church was wont to keep fifty days of feast unto the Pentecost."

5. This fast of Lent was whilom very severely observed, in bread and water, without wines or fishes. For the fathers used to eat dry things, that is, bread and salt, with water. So Epiphanius testifies, in fine Panar.: "They fasted from flesh and wine." So witnesses Gregory of Nyssa also, in his oration of loving the poor; and the fourth Council of Carthage, cap. 85. And Jerome, ad Lat., says they abstained from

oil and apples. And in another place, in Epitaph. Paula, from wine, liquors, fish, honey, and eggs. And Chrysostom, Serm. de jejun, says that the church abstained from flesh and wines. Micrologus, cap. 49, says, “We are not held to fast the Lent according to the canons, if that we eat anything before evening.” And Ambrose, Serm. 34, opposes the faster in Lent unto him that has dined.

Wherefore the popish fast of Lent that forbids flesh and allows white meats and fish was not heard of among the fathers. “Let those that are to fast,” says Molanus, in practic. Theolog. tractat. 3, cap. 11, num. 69, remember that the fathers abstained from wine and delicates.” And again, de Canonic., lib. 1, cap. 26: “If we look into the ancient severity and discipline, scarce any one nowadays shall prove himself a true faster, for they fasted until even; we use to take our dinners.”

6. The fast of Lent was observed by some oftentimes in the year, and not always before Easter. There was a fast of Lent imposed upon the penitents, to be observed after Pentecost, as Micrologus records (de observ. Eccl. cap. 23). The Montanists fasted three Lents in the year. Jerome unto Marcella (Epist. 54) affirms it, and adds, “We according to apostolic tradition do fast one Lent in the whole year, at a time fit for us.” And Methodius of Constantinople decrees of the penitents after abjuration: “Let them fast two Lents, in continued prayer.” Saint Francis and others kept three, five, six Lents.

7. The Stations among the fathers were solemn and public fasts, observed in the church on the day, from morning until night. But the stations of the Church of Rome at this present are not solemnized from morning until night, nor of the same persons, but by others, and others successively observing them. And nowadays the fast is

ended ere the station do begin, which is still celebrated after meat. Look at Ambrose's 25th sermon.

8. Concerning the fastings upon the evens of great feasts, Bernard was the first that ever mentioned them (Ser. de vigil. S. Andr.), and after him Innocentius III (De observ. jeju., cap. 1 and 22).

9. That the fasting of Ember weeks is a tradition of the apostles, Leo testifies in two several places (De jejun 7 mons., Serm. 8 and 2, de Pent.). But how uncertain this is, hereby appears, because Pope Calixtus I, in his epistle unto Benedict, affirms that he did institute the fast of Ember week. And Tertullian (de jejun.) testifies that the Catholics of his time did aver that the apostles did impose no burden of fasting upon them, but only the paschal fast. And Ambrose, in his 34th sermon, affirms all fasts but the Lent fast to be voluntary and at free choice. "They are of free choice," says he, "this is the law: unto them we are stirred up, but unto this we are compelled."

10. To fast upon Saturday is expressly forbidden by the canon of the apostles (can. 65), and by Ignatius in his epistle to the Philippians, wherein he is called a murderer of Christ that fasts upon Saturday or Sunday. Yet the Roman Church now observes this fast.

11. Pope Agapete (de consecrat. 1, distinct. 1), in the year 533, did first ordain processions upon Sundays, as Caranza also testifies. And the Arians of Constantinople had done the same before, which Chrysostom both imitated and augmented in number and solemnity. So Sozomene affirms (Hist. eccl., lib. 8, cap. 8).

Sacraments

1. That there are seven sacraments of the New Testament properly and truly so called, no father for a thousand years either affirms or acknowledges. “The sacraments,” says Isidore (that lived 600 years after Christ) (lib. origin. 6, cap. 19), “are baptism and Chrism, and the body and blood of Christ.” Pasca. (de caena), about the year 900, says “The sacraments of Christ in the Catholic Church are baptism and the body and blood of our Lord.” Hugo de Sancto Victore, in his book of the sacraments, sets down seven of them: but he excludes penance and takes in holy water for one. Nay, some of the fathers do expressly affirm that washing of the feet is a sacrament. So holds Cyprian (de ablu. pedum.); Ambrose (lib. 3, de Sacram. cap. 1); and Bernard (Serm. de caena. Dom.). Lumbard, and his succeeding train of schoolmen, were the first that ever directly affirmed that there were seven sacraments.

2. The fathers, though they do sometimes give the name of sacrament unto other ceremonies, yet do acknowledge baptism and the Lord’s Supper to be the true sacraments, and the chief. Indeed, they do call other things sacraments, but not in that respect and value that they call these two. So Augustine, de Symb. ad Catechu., lib. 2, cap. 6, says that the two sacraments of the church flowed out of the side of Christ. And in Epist. 118, he says that the sacraments are in number most few. And Rupertus Tuitiensis, De victoria verb. Dei, lib. 12, cap. 11, asks this question: “What are the chiefest sacraments of our salvation?” And he answers, “Sacred baptism and the holy Eucharist of Christ’s body and blood, the double gift of the Holy Ghost, the one given for remission of sins and the other for the dividing of the divers and multiplied graces.” “There are some sacraments,” says Hugo de Sanct. Victor., lib. de sacr., part. 9, cap. 6, “wherein our salvation principally consists, and is conceived. Such are the water of baptism, and the receiving of Christ’s body and blood. There are others, which though they be not necessary unto

salvation (because that may be had without them), yet they are helpful unto sanctification." Matthew of Paris in his chronicle writing of William the Conqueror, says that it was the opinion of the fathers, and they had written that the sacraments which are used in the church, namely, baptism, Chrism, and the Lord's Eucharist, have their effect "by the cooperation of the Spirit invisible." Alexander Hales, part. 4, q. 8, art. 2, avers plainly that Christ did by Himself ordain but only two sacraments, baptism and the Eucharist, and he proves it by the flowing of water and blood out of the side of Christ.

3. The name of sacrament in the fathers is sometimes taken largely for any mystery, sign, or figure of some holy and spiritual thing. Augustine, in his 5th epistle, says, "Every sign of a holy thing is a sacrament." In this sense, to Alex. I, epist. 1, holy water is a sacrament, as also, in Augustine, lib. 2, de peccat. merit. & remiss c. 26, holy bread, and in Augustine, lib. 19, cont. Faust. c. 14, the sign of the cross, etc. To speak all in a word, in this sense there are rather seventy sacraments than seven. But sometimes the word (sacrament) is taken properly for the visible sign and seal of the covenant of grace. And in this sense, there are not seven, but two sacraments in the church. This double understanding of the word (sacrament), Bellarmine himself acknowledges.

4. Neither do all the schoolmen and canonists acknowledge seven sacraments of the New Testament called properly sacraments. For Durandus, in his first edition of his work upon the sentences, 4 dist. 26, denied matrimony to be a sacrament, as Capreolus testifies, in 4 dist. 26. But afterwards in the same distinction, quest. 3, he mitigated his opinion, and put down that matrimony is not a sacrament properly called so, and univocally as the rest of the sacraments are. And so also holds Lombard himself, 4 dist. 26 (as Thomas, 4 dist. 26, quest. 2 ad 4, testifies). And so also holds

Hostiensis, in Summa lib. 1, titulo de sacram. noniterran; Bernard's gloss, cap. cum in ecclesia, de Sim. & cap. honora. 32, qu. 2; and Paludane, who avers this to be the common opinion of the canonists, in 4 dist. 26, qu. 1. Some do also deny that matrimony lawfully contracted between Christians is a sacrament. So does Cajetane, in a little work of his concerning matrimony, qu. 1, and Melchior Canus, in his election of penitence, part. 5, and at large, locor com., lib. 8, c. 5, where for his opinion he quotes many testimonies out of the decretal epistles, councils, fathers, and schoolmen. Of this opinion is Francis à Victoria, in his sum de sacram, numer. 244, and Martinus Ledesma, in 2 tom. 4, dist. 41, art. 8. Now many do hold that matrimony is not only a sacrament of the New Testament (as the Council of Trent (Sess. 8, can. 1) will honor it, but that it is also a sacrament of the Old Testament. So will Hales (4 dist. 26, art. 1 & 5) have it, and Bonaventure also (4 dist. 26, qu. 2), and (one that lived before the schoolmen) H. de S. Victore (l. 1, de Sacr., part. 8, cap. 13, and lib. 3, part. 11, cap. 1). And of this mind are many of the later writers, as Roffensis, Hosius (in confess. Petric., cap. 55), Pighius (in Controv. 10), and Alphonsus à Castro (in the word nuptia, haeres. 3), who defends this as the common opinion of the divines. As also Petrus à Sota (lect. 2, de Matrim.), Catherinus (in the question of matrimony) expounds the word sacrament (Ephesians 5) either of the incarnation of Christ, or of the first marriage of Adam and Eve, and adds, "By these opposite questions (to confess the truth), it is not so apparent by the Scriptures that matrimony is a sacrament in that sense that the other six are called." But he adjoins, "Because of the universal consent of the church, we confess matrimony to be a sacrament, and not only because of that law, which commands us to captivate our understanding unto the obeisance of faith, but also because they do infer reasons for it."

Ordination of bishops is not truly and properly a sacrament, says Lombard (4 distinct. 24), and so does Alexander Hales, Thomas, and Bonaventure. To whom, of the later sort agree Dominicus Soto (in 4 distinct. 24, quest. 2, artic. 3, and de jure & justitia, libr. 10, quest. 1, artic. 2) and Josephus Angles (in 4 distinct. 24, artic. 11). There are some also that deny deaconship, and the other lower orders to be sacraments properly. Of which sort Durandus is (in 4 distinct. 24, quest. 2), who alleges many reasons on this side. And Cajetane (in tom. 1 opusc. tra. 11, intreating of the manner of giving and receiving orders, and in 3 part Thom., quest. 64, artic. 4, ad 1), with Francis à Victoria (who num. 226 testifies that this opinion of theirs is most probable). Lombard himself (4 distinct. 24, lit. 1) says that "The church in process of time ordains herself subdeacons and acolytes." Look at Francis à Victoria (in his Summa, num. 226). Thomas (upon the fourth of the Sentences, distinct. 23, quest. 1, artic. 4) says that the form of baptism and the Eucharist are extant in the Scripture, but the forms of the other sacraments are not so.

5. Our sacraments are said to be of greater virtue than the sacraments of the old law, not because these did but signify and prefigure grace, and the other do confer and bestow it, but because the doctrine whereunto they belong, and the manner of revelation, is more apparent, and because they concern Christ already given up for us. Look at Augustine (against the Manichee Faustus, lib. 19, c. 14 and 16). And for the schoolmen: Hales (part. 4, q. 7, art. 4, m. 7), Bonaventure, Scotus, Durandus, Richardus, and Biel (in 4 dist. 1). These affirm that circumcision did give grace ex opere operato, by the works wrought. And among the later writers, Joseph Angles (In 4 distinct. 1, art. 5) holds the same. And so does Francis à Victoria (De sacr. num. 2), adding furthermore that this is the doctrine of all the doctors.

The Work Wrought

1. That the sacraments do give grace by the work wrought, that is, that the action of the minister or the element of itself and by itself by a corporal virtue actively, effectually, and immediately gives grace, it has not been held by the church for whole twelve hundred years; but is a scholastical fiction, approved by the Council of Trent.

2. The fathers say that the sacraments do give grace, but not properly (as the law cuts, not properly), but symbolically, in a mystical respect, by reason of their signification and promise annexed unto them, because when we use them aright as the tokens of grace, God gives that grace immediately. "The man," says Jerome, in Isa., "gives the water, but God gives the Holy Ghost, whereby we are purged from filth and our bloody sins are purified." In like manner Augustine, lib. 15, de Trinit., cap. 26, says, "How then can it be that He is not God that giveth the Holy Ghost? Nay rather how great a God is He that giveth God? For never a disciple that He had could give the Holy Ghost. They did pray that it might be infused upon those upon whom they laid their hands, but they infused it not themselves, which custom the church now observes in its overseers." And in his questions upon Leviticus, lib. 3, quest. 84, "Moses," says he, "in his ministry sanctified by visible sacraments, but the Lord by His invisible grace through the Holy Spirit, wherein lies all the fruit and the worth of the visible sacraments; for without that sanctification of invisible grace, what are the visible sacraments good for?" A little after: "Therefore here we gather that some have had invisible sanctification and the benefit thereof without the visible sacraments, but that visible sanctification which is performed by the visible sacraments cannot be of any value without that other invisible sanctification." "Who so thinks," says another, viz. Author, qq. de

Veteri & Novo test., quest. 59, “that baptism is after a carnal manner, this man is not spiritual, nor can he obtain the gift of God that believes himself changed by water, not by faith; for the water is seen, but that Spirit which is not seen works faith in him.” “Although God does give the sacrament of grace by wicked men,” says Paschasius, de corp. & sang. Domini, cap. 35, “yet He gives not grace itself but by Himself in whom is remission of sins.” And to this assertion the schoolmen themselves do agree. “We may not by any means say,” says Bonaventure, 4 dist. 1, q. 3, “that there is grace essentially contained in the sacraments, as water in a vessel, or medicines in a box. To understand them so, is erroneous. But they are said to contain grace, because they do signify it, and because grace is always given in them (unless there be a defect in him that receives them). It must be so understood, that grace is in the soul, and not in the visible signs.” This also he teaches, q. 4, and herein he is followed by Scotus, Durand., Richardus, Occam, Marsilius, and Biel, in 4 d. 1, and of the later writers very many.

3. Some divines do deny that grace is given by the sacrament of matrimony, among whom the master of the Sentences is the chief, who denies it in his fourth book and 26th distinction. And so does Durandus in his third question upon the same distinction, with which many canonists take part. And Godfridus for one, tit. de Sacram. non iterandis, in his Summe. “The sacraments,” quotes he, “are otherwise divided, for there are some wherein grace is given, and othersome wherein grace is not given, as matrimony contracted.” Hostiensis, in like manner, lib. 2, tit. de sacram. non iterandis, says, “This is the third division of sacraments, because there are some that do give grace, and othersome wherein grace is not given, as matrimony, either in contraction or consummation.” Yea, the extravagants also hold this opinion, de simonia cum in ecclesiae corpore. And Bernard, in Apparatus, says, “We are

forbidden to take anything for the benedictions of those that marry, because by them grace is given, but to give or take anything for matrimony is no sin, because though it be a sacrament, yet grace is not given thereby." Look also in the Decretals, cap. Honorantur, 32 quest. 2, and in other canonists, part of whom Covarrubias alleges in his Epitome of the fourth book of the Decretals, part. 2, s. 2, and part are cited in the Censures of the Gloss of the Canon Law, in Gratian, num. 16, 36, 55, and in Gregory's decretals, num. 25, 29, in Sixtum, num. 11.

The Minister's Intention

1. That opinion which holds baptism to be of no force without the mental and actual intention of the baptizer was not known unto Innocentius, as Angelus testifies in his Summe, where he says that, "It is not necessary unto true baptism for the baptizer to have in his mind to do that which the church does." "The priest," says Chrysostom, Hom. In Joan. 85, "lends both tongue and hands." So Nicholas the pope says unto the Bulgars' demands: "You affirm that there is a Jew among you, you know not whether he be a Christian or a pagan who has baptized many of you. Truly, if he has baptized them in the name of the Trinity, they are not to be rebaptized."

"There is no other intention of the minister required," says Catharinus, tract. de Intent. Minist. Sacram., "but that he intends to do that outwardly which the church does, though he himself neither believes that there is a church, nor that there is any spiritual effect of baptism." But this was some invention of the schoolmen who could not make new articles of faith. And if this opinion be admitted, I would fain know of the papists, how they are able to shun idolatry in

the worshipping of the sacrament in their mass, for they know that no man can be certain of the intention of him that consecrates it.

The Character

1. An unremovable character, which may be imprinted in the soul and consist there without grace, even in a man damned, is never spoken of either in the Scriptures or fathers. “The first tradition of this character,” says Durandus, lib. 4, dist. 4, q. 1, “we have from Dionysius Areopagita, who seems to agree with what we have said of the character, for he recites a certain custom observed in the primitive church at baptisms of men grown, namely, the bishop did lay his hands upon him or her that was to be baptized, signing them with the sign of the cross, and commanding them to be written among the names of the Christians, thenceforth to be with them admitted unto the other mysteries. And this exterior rite in baptism was the characterizing of them, nor did he mean any other character.” Scotus, in Sent. 4, dist. 6, q. 9, thinks it impossible to prove the character either out of Scriptures or fathers, but teaches that we must believe it, because of the authority of the church. And Biel, in 4 dist. 6, quest. 2, doubts whether the church has defined that there is such a character, adding that there is but one authority (namely of Innocent III, cap. Majores extra. de Baptismo) which makes for the character.

2. The ancient writers by the term character do sometimes understand the external form, order, and ceremony of baptism, or baptism itself; and in their writings, to impress or infix the character is to baptize or to profess the faith in baptism. “I attend unto the faith in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” says Augustine, Ser. de gest. cum Emerit., “This is the character of my

Lord and Emperor; Concerning this character did He command soldiers (or rather companions) that they should imprint this in all those whom they gathered into His tents, saying, 'Go baptize all nations in

The name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Paul did fear because he knew that this character was commanded by God to be infixed upon all men." And a little before, "What mean I when I say, the apostate has not sealed with his own character? Donatus has not baptized in Donatus's name." And in his second book against Parmenian, cap. 13, he says, "The character is in the body." And cap. 108, he calls baptism itself the character (lib. 2, contra lit. Petilian).

3. The character or seal of baptism in the fathers oftentimes signifies the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit. "We are signed with the Spirit," says Ambrose (de spi. Sanct., lib. 1, cap. 6), "that we may keep His splendor, and image, and grace, which is still the spiritual seal." And of this opinion is Theodoret, Haymo, Primasius, Anselm, and Theophylact, upon 2 Corinthians 1, verse 21. "We as his sons," says Chrysostom (hom. 2, in Eph.), "are signed with the Holy Spirit."

Baptism

1. The fathers held baptism to be absolutely necessary in those that are of years of discretion.

Testimonies: "The catechumenist," says Ambrose (lib. de his qui initiantur, cap. 4), "believes, but unless he be baptized, he cannot obtain forgiveness of sins, nor partake of the gift of spiritual grace." "To obtain the kingdom of heaven," says Augustine (lib. 4, de Bap., c. 21), "the catechumenist wants baptism, even as the wicked that is baptized wants the true conversion." And tract. 13, in Joan.: "How

well soever the catechumenist profits, yet he bears the burden of his sins; nor can he lay it off, until he attains unto baptism." The same likewise he avers in his 1st book, de anim., cap. 9. "From that moment," says the author (de fide ad Pet., cap. 3), "wherein our Savior said, unless a man be born again,, without the sacrament of baptism no man can obtain heaven, or everlasting life, saving those that being without baptism, shed their blood for Christ in the church." "We believe," says the author of the book (de eccle dogm., c. 74, in August.), "that the way of salvation is open only unto the baptized. We believe that no catechumenist, though dying in good works, can be capable of everlasting life, except by martyrdom, wherein all the sacred things of baptism are fulfilled." Nazianzene (Orat. 40, de Bap.) says that "The catechumenists are upon the threshold of piety, unto which they enter by baptism." And again, that "Some are deprived of baptism, either by infancy, or some other sudden chance whereby they are all debarred from the enjoying of grace, though they desire it." Thus these fathers hold, so that they deny that contrition is sufficient to obtain the first grace, though there be in it a desire of baptism.

2. Concerning infants, Augustine (de orig. anima, lib. 2, c. 12 and lib. 3, cap. 9) teaches us this: "Believe not, neither teach that infants dying before baptism can be capable of the remission of their original sin. Teach not this if you will be a Christian." And this he teaches, viz. epist. 28, ad Hierom. & de natura & grat., cap. 8. So does Fulgentius (de fide ad Pet., cap. 30); Chrysostom (hom. 40, in 1 Cor.); Ambrose (de Abraham, lib. 2, cap. ult.); Isydore (lib. 2, de offic., cap. 24); Gregory (lib. 7, epist. 53); and Innocentius III (in cap. Maje. de Bap.). "We are not ignorant," says the author of the calling of the Gentiles (lib. 2, cap. 8, or rather 24), "how great a cause of slothfulness it would be unto the heart of the faithful, if in the baptism of infants there were nothing to be feared of others'

negligence, and of their mortality." This hold they. But some of these, and chiefly Augustine and Ambrose, being out of their fervent disputations with the Pelagians, who denied original sin, and many others, do sometimes abate much from the strictness of that their assertion. For so does Ambrose in his oration upon the death of Valentinian the younger, speaking unto the sisters of Valentinian: "But I perceive you lament," says he, "because Valentinian did not enjoy the sacrament of baptism. Tell me, what is there in you besides a will and a desire? But this desire he had long since to be made a member of our head, Christ, and signified that he would forthwith be baptized of me. Hath not he therefore that grace which he desired? Hath not he what he required?" And a little after: "Doth this move you, that these mysteries were not celebrated with solemnity? Then are not the martyrs crowned that suffered being catechumenists. For they should not be crowned, unless they be entered into our mysteries. But if they be washed in their own blood, then did his (Valentinian's) piety and good desire purify him." And above, in the same oration: "I did lose him whom I hoped to have regenerated in the Gospel, but he did not lose that grace he so desired."

"That suffering sometimes fulfills the place of baptism, Saint Cyprian gathered no small proof," says Augustine, de Bap. Contra Donatist, lib. 4, cap. 22 (de Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. 4, cap. 22), "from the unbaptized thief, to whom our Savior said, 'Today shall you be with me in paradise,' which thing I, myself, oftentimes considering, do find that the defect of baptism is supplied not only by suffering for the name of Christ, but also by faith and contrition of heart, if that peradventure the strictness of the times do not allow convenience for the celebration of this mystery of baptism. Therefore, how greatly available that of the apostle is (with the heart we believe unto righteousness, and with the mouth we confess unto salvation), even without the visible sacrament of baptism, was declared in that thief,

and is then invisibly fulfilled when the mystery of baptism is wanting by reason of instant necessity, and not of contempt of religion." And in the 23rd chapter, thus: "Even as in the thief that through necessity lacked the corporal baptism, his salvation was perfected, because through his godly faith he had that baptism spiritually. So when we have this piety ready, though we want that which the thief wanted by reason of necessity, yet is our salvation established unto us." And in his questions upon Leviticus, lib. 3, cap. 84 (Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri VII, lib. 3, cap. 84), he affirms that hereby it is gathered that some have been invisibly sanctified without the visible sacraments.

Bernard, Epist. 77 (Epistola 77), having alleged these foresaid testimonies out of Ambrose and Augustine, joins this: "Believe me, from these two pillars (Ambrose and Augustine) I am very hardly withdrawn. I say that with these I confess myself either to know aright or to err, believing that a man may be saved only by faith, and a desire to receive this sacrament, though death afterwards, or any other invincible power, do prevent and anticipate the fulfilling of this godly desire. And it is worthy observation, whether it was for this that our Savior when He said, 'whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' out of His head and vigilancy did not repeat, 'whosoever is not baptized,' but only 'whosoever believes not shall be condemned,' hereby intimating unto us that only faith is sometimes sufficient unto salvation, and that without it nothing is sufficient."

Innocentius III, in his Decretals, in the chapter Apostolicam de presbytero non baptizato (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. 3, tit. 42, cap. 3), writes thus unto the bishop of Cremona: "I answer thus unto your demand, that the priest whom you wrote unto me to have died without the water of baptism, because he continued in the faith of our holy mother the Church, and in the confession of the name of

Christ, is absolved from his original sin, and has attained the joys of his celestial country. This we do undoubtedly affirm." Look also in the chapter Debitum de Baptismo (Decretales Gregorii IX, lib. 3, tit. 42, cap. 2), etc.

In like manner Gerson, in the third part of his sermon upon the nativity of the virgin Mary (Sermo de Nativitate Virginis Mariae, pars 3), says, "It is evident that God does not tie the mercy of His salvation unto the common laws of Christian doctrine, or unto the sacraments themselves, in such manner, but that without prejudice of the said law, He can sanctify the children that are not yet come forth of the womb with the baptism of His grace and the virtue of the Holy Ghost. Wherefore it is the duty of women with child diligently to pour forth their prayers unto God, that if the child yet unborn do perchance die before it can be partaker of the grace of baptism, that Jesus Christ that most high Priest would vouchsafe to consecrate and bless it with His mercy by preventing all inconveniences with the baptism of His holy and blessed Spirit."

"The church," says Biel, in 4 distinct., q. 2, "has not yet set down any general help for the infants that are as yet in the womb. But unto whom is the thought of the Lord revealed?, He therefore thought good to institute remedies against the malady of sin in the church by ministering the sacraments unto such as may be known by the church. But the remedies for those that are not yet come into the world, those has He reserved in His own only power, whom at His own pleasure He can both bless and sanctify without other exterior remedy, as we read in the Scriptures He has already dealt with some. Moreover, that which is but a privilege unto few, can He impute unto whosoever He will, who has not bound His own power unto the sacraments."

Cajetane, upon the third part of Thomas's Summe, quaest. 68, art. 1 and 2, avers that in the case of necessity, the desire of baptism by the parents is sufficient for the salvation of the children. And this he there confirms by sundry reasons. And upon the same question, art. 11, he proves that the child being in danger in the womb may be saved by baptism, not done in deed, but in the desire of the parents, with some blessing of the child, and offering of it unto the Deity, with invocation of the Trinity. And this is very earnestly defended by some of the later writers, as Tilmannus Segebergensis, lib. de 7 Sacram., cap. 1; Thomas Elisius Neopolitanus, in clipeo advers. haeres., cap. de Bap., art. 3; and George Cassander, lib. de bap. infantium.

3. The fathers after the same manner held the supper of the Lord to be necessary for infants unto salvation, by an apostolic tradition. Dionysius Areopagita, De Eccles. Hierarchi., cap. 2, part. 3, after the rehearsal of some rites of baptism, adjoins: "Lastly, the priest brings him being thus made perfect, unto the most blessed Eucharist, and gives him the deifying communion of the consummating sacraments." And likewise, cap. 7, part. 3: "This also (if the bishops do teach Divinity unto unfit auditors) seems rightly ridiculous, that infants not yet being able to understand any divine thing should be made partakers of sacred baptism and of the highest signs of the most blessed communion."

Will not those (infants) say at the judgment, "We have done no evil, nor have we contemned God's sacraments to run unto profane corruption. It is another's faithlessness that has destroyed us; our parents to us have proved patricides?"

"That which your brotherhood says, that they (Pelagians) do teach of infants," says Innocentius I unto Augustine, apud August., epist. 93, "that they may be dignified with the reward of blessedness without

baptism is most foolish. For unless they eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, they shall not have life in them." This is also Ambrose's opinion, Libr. De ijs qui sacris mysterijs initiantur, cap. 7 and 8, and Augustine's, lib. 1, de peccat. merit. & remis., cap. 20, as these words of his do testify: "Dare any man affirm that this sentence belongs not unto infants? And that they may have life in them without the participation of this body and blood? Because He does not say, whosoever eats not, as He says of baptism,"

Whosoever is not born again, but, unless you eat, speaking as it were unto them who can hear and understand Him, which infants cannot do? But he that holds this does not observe that if this saying does not bind all, it is needless for the elder age to observe it." And in the same book and 24th chapter: "From whence but from an ancient and apostolic tradition (as I think) by which they hold it as a doctrine grounded in the church of Christ, that no man can attain either to the kingdom of God or to everlasting life without baptism or participation of the Lord's Supper. If therefore so many and so great testimonies of Divinity do all consent that neither salvation nor life eternal is to be hoped for of any man without baptism and the body and blood of Christ, in vain do we promise salvation unto infants without these." This Augustine almost everywhere affirms (vid. epist. 23 and 107; and contr. 2 epist. Pelag., lib. 1, c. 22; and cont. Jul., lib. 1, cap. 2, and lib. 3, cap. 12). And so does the Council of Toledo (can. 11); Ordo Romanus; Alcuinus (de divi. offic., cap. de sa. Pasc.); and Rabanus Maurus (in his first book de Justit. Cleric., cap. 29).

4. The fathers used some rites and ceremonies in baptism, which are now omitted in all places universally, as kissing of the child which was to be baptized. In Cyprian (l. 3, ep. 8), use of milk and honey. In Tertullian (lib. 1, cont. Marcion), use of milk and wine. In Jerome (in Isa., cap. 55), washing of the feet, which Cyprian says was instituted

of Christ to be observed forever (lib. de uncti. Chrism.). Augustine reckons a great company of rites now quite neglected, in his Symbol. ad Catecum., lib. 4, cap. 1.

5. It was a use for the baptizer to blow in the face of the baptized, and also the party baptized used to exufflate the devil whom he renounced. This testifies Cyprian, or rather the author of the book De duplici martyrio: “You have denounced perpetual enmity (with the devil), you have renounced all his pomps and pleasures, you have blown them away, you have hissed them out, and sworn unto the doctrine of your Redeemer.” And Rabanus Maurus (lib. 1, cap. 27, de instit Cler.) says that the wicked powers are exufflated, and blown away by the baptized. “Then when he has placed him (being attentive and reaching him his hands) towards the west,” says the author of the Hierarchy, “he commands him to exufflate Satan thrice, and withal, to rehearse the words of his abrenunciation.” But the Romish Church has already long ago abolished this custom and ceremony.

6. In ancient times the water of baptism was consecrated and blessed with prayers and ceremonies of oil and the cross before the use and administration of it. And this they (erroneously) held necessary, because the water hereby might receive the virtue of regenerating. This is mentioned by Cyprian in his 70th epistle, by Ambrose in his first book de sacramentis ca. 5 & de ijs qui mysterijs initiantur, c. 3, and by other authors (Apud Aug., Tom. 9).

7. In the beginning of the church (the purest times) they used to baptize out of the church in wells and rivers. Walfrid Strabo (de rebus eccles., c. 26) testifies this in these words: “We must know that at the first the believers were baptized simply in floods and fountains. So was the eunuch in the Acts of the Apostles. But in process of time they ordained vessels for baptism, called fonts, but

these at the first were used without the church." "You first entered the porch of the house of the font," says Cyril (in his first Catech.). "You built that font that stands between the two churches," says Paulinus (in his 12th epistle to Severus). Such a saying has Nazianzene also in one of his orations. Then at length these vessels were appointed to be placed in the parish churches, by the decretals (dist. 4, cap. 106).

The Sacrifice of the Mass

1. A sacrifice of Christ in the mass, being proper, real, and propitiatory for the living and the dead, in the hand of the priest, was not admitted into the Church for the space of twelve hundred years after Christ, for it was not known in Lombard's time (lib. 4, dist. 12). And it differs in all respects from the sacrifice that the fathers speak of. For first, they held the sacrifice without transubstantiation, as hereafter shall be manifested; but this is not so held. Second, the fathers' sacrifice was offered by the whole church, being the oblation of all the faithful. "We all," says Justin (in dialogo cum Triphone), "how many soever we be that are called after the name of Jesus Christ, are made truly the priests of God, as He Himself testifies, saying that everywhere He would have pure and acceptable sacrifices offered Him." And this is also provable out of Augustine (Contra Faustum, lib. 20, cap. 18). Now the popish sacrifice is offered by the priest. Third, the fathers' sacrifice was sanctified by the faith of those that offered. "Every man's sacrifice," says Augustine (Contra literas Petilian, lib. 2, cap. 52), "is such as he himself is that comes to receive it. All things are pure unto the pure. Yes, in the very missal the priest prays unto God to accept that sacrifice as the sacrifice of Noah, whereas on the contrary side, the papist's sacrifice sanctifies those that do offer it." Fourth, the fathers' sacrifice was the whole

action of the Supper; this new one is but the offering of the bread. To knit up all in a word, that was a typical and figurative sacrifice; this a substantial one accounted, wherein Christ Himself is offered unto God.

2. The fathers used to call the Supper of the Lord, or the whole action of the Supper, a sacrifice, as they did also the whole form of God's religious worship, and that for divers respects and in divers meanings. First, because there was therein an offering and giving of alms, bread, wine, etc., which are a spiritual sacrifice out of which the signs themselves in the communion of the Eucharist were taken and the alms were bestowed upon the poor. "But Christ," says Irenaeus (lib. 4, cap. 32), "giving counsel to His disciples to offer the first fruits of His creatures unto God, not as to one that stood in need thereof, but to show themselves neither unfruitful, nor ungrateful, took the creature of bread, and gave thanks, saying this is my body. And in like manner He confessed the cup, which unto us is of a creature, to be His blood, and taught us a new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the apostles offers throughout the universal world unto God that gives us nourishment, being the first fruits of His gifts in the New Testament." "You are rich and wealthy," says Cyprian (lib. de oper. & Eleemos.), "and do you think that you do celebrate the Lord's mysteries when you never regard the alms basket? Coming to these mysteries without sacrifice, and taking part of that sacrifice which the poor has offered?" "Among those, one Hilarius," says Augustine (Retract., lib. 2, cap. 11), "being moved, spoke bitterly against a custom then used at Carthage, of singing hymns out of the Psalms at the altar, either before the oblation, or after the offering was distributed to the people." "It is lawful to offer nothing at the altar," says the fourth canon of the apostles, "but fresh ears of corn,, and incense at the time when the holy oblation is celebrated." And

The Roman Missal says, “Lord, receive the prayers of Thy people, with the oblations of their sacrifices…”. Second, they used the name of sacrifice metonymically, because in these oblations there was a representation of that sacrifice that was offered upon the cross, or like a spectacle or show wherein the sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood accomplished on the cross is showed and delineated unto the eyes of the faithful, described as it were in a table. And in this sense, it is called unbloody, as a tragedy which represented some bloody war is called an unbloody war. For signs and images are called by the names of those things whereof they are signs and images, so that by this it appears that an unbloody sacrifice is no real sacrifice. “We offer,” says Eusebius (lib. 1, cap. 10, de demanst.), “an unbloody and reasonable sacrifice.” And Clement in his Constitutions (lib. 6, cap. 23) says that all the bloody sacrifices of unreasonable creatures were by Christ changed into a reasonable, unbloody, and mystical sacrifice, which is celebrated in remembrance of His death, by the signs of His body and blood. “We celebrate an unbloody sacrifice by our duty in the churches,” says the Council of Ephesus unto Nestorius. In Basil’s Liturgy, the offering is called the unbloody sacrifice of mind and soul. And Lombard, in the 4th of his Sentences (dist. 12), denies that that which the priest offers is truly and properly a sacrifice, or immolation, but he will have it so called, because it is a memorial and a representation of the true and sacred immolation and sacrifice which was offered upon the altar of the cross. And a little after, “These annual commemorations do but only represent that which was done long ago, and so make us to be moved as if we saw the Lord upon the cross.” In like manner, Thomas Aquinas (3 par., q. 83, art. 1) says that the celebration of the sacrament is called immolation for two reasons: first of all, because as Augustine says, signs are called by the names of the things whereof they are signs. Second, because by the sacraments we are made partakers of the death of Christ our Lord. There is not

therefore any iteration of that sacrifice which was finished upon the cross and is held by the fathers to be the only and singular sacrifice. So it is held by Augustine in three or four several places, viz. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 33, and de Trinitate, lib. 3, cap. 13, and lib. 3 contra secundam epist. Pelag. cap. 6. Third, the sacrament is called a sacrifice by a metonymy, because it is a commemoration, and also a representation, unto God the Father of the sacrifice of Christ offered upon the cross. "In this sacrifice," says the author of the book de fide ad Pet. (cap. 19), "there is a thanksgiving, and a commemoration of Christ's body which He offers for us, and of His blood which He the same Christ shed for us." "We offer no diversity of sacraments as the high priest," says Chrysostom (Hom. 17 in Hebraeos), "but still one and the same, or rather we make a commemoration of a sacrifice." And Ambrose (lib. 4 de sacram., cap. 6) says, "Therefore in memory of His passion, and resurrection...we offer unto Thee as a sacrifice... His bread..." But this oblation is intentional, not real, and it is by the fathers so called after Saint Paul's phrase, as they call it unbloody. Look at Eusebius's testimony afore-cited (lib. 1 de demon. Evang.), and Clemens. And in this sense the faithful in their prayers do offer Christ as a sacrifice unto His Father for their sins, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections unto that only and true sacrifice, thereby to procure and obtain God's greater favor unto them. Fourth, it is called a sacrifice

Because it is an application of the sacrifice offered upon the cross unto ourselves by faith, by which we are, as it were, newly sprinkled with the blood of Christ. "When you see God offered," says Chrysostom (lib. 3, de Sacerdotio), "the priest bowed upon the sacrifice, and pouring forth his prayers thereupon, and all the communicants, as it were, purpled with that precious blood, do you think yourself to be upon the earth, or among mortal men? Or rather, are you not translated incontinently into the heavens, where being

lightened of all carnal cogitations, you do with a pure and naked heart and soul, fall into contemplation of the celestial joys?" "Christ once died upon the cross, and then was offered up in Himself," says Lombard (4 dist. 12, lit. G.), "but He is daily offered in the sacrament, because there is therein a remembrance of that which was done but once." Thomas Aquinas (3 p., q. 83, art. 1) says that the celebration of the sacrament is called a sacrifice because by the sacraments we are made partakers of Christ's death.

In this sense was the celebration and participation of the Lord's Supper called the offering of the sacrifice until 869 years after Christ. (See Regino Chron. libr. 2.) "It remains now my son," says Adrian the 2nd, pope, unto Lotharius, "that you come unto Saint Peter's confession, where we, by God's help, will offer the saving sacrifice, not as much for the health of your body, as your soul, wherein you must partake with us, that by this participation of Christ's body, you may deserve to be incorporated again into the church, from whom you seemed to be separated." And then the solemnity of the mass being ended, the pope invites the king unto the table of Christ, and taking the body and blood of the Lord in his hand, he speaks thus unto him: "If you do know yourself guiltless of this forbidden sin of adultery, come unto this table confidently, and receive this sacrament of eternal salvation to the benefit of your soul, and the forgiveness of your sins."

Fifth, it is called a sacrifice, because of the sacrifice of prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, from whence the whole supper is called the Eucharist. Justin in Apolog. 2, reciting the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper used at that day among the Christians, says thus: "We all arise and offer our prayers, which being finished, bread, wine, and water is brought forth, and he that is chief offers his prayers and thanksgiving, as he can, and the people sing unto him."

“It is fitter,” says Irenaeus (lib. 5, cap. 34), “to offer our oblation unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto God the Creator, in pure doctrine, and faith without hypocrisy, in some hope, in fervent love, offering the first fruits of all creatures unto Him. And this pure oblation the church only offers unto God the Creator, offering it with thanksgiving.”

Lastly, it is called a sacrifice by a synecdoche because in the supper we offer ourselves unto God, to be consecrated unto Him, and serve Him in body and soul. “This is the sacrifice of the Christians,” says Augustine (de civit. Dei, lib. 10, cap. 6). “We, being many, are all one body in Christ, which also the church frequents in the sacrament of the altar, which is known unto all the faithful, wherein it showed unto them, that she is offered in that oblation, which she offers.” “But it is meet,” says Gregory (Dialog., lib. 4, cap. 59), “that when we do these things, we do sacrifice ourselves unto God in contrition of heart, because we that celebrate the mysteries of the Lord’s passion should imitate that which we do, for then shall it be a true sacrifice unto God for us, when we make ourselves a sacrifice.”

3. The fathers when they use the word sacrifice do speak after the Jewish manner, alluding unto the worship and sacrifices of the law. So that in

Difference of the offerings of the law, they call the very signs an unbloody sacrifice. “Christ did first of all offer unto God the Father bread and wine, an unbloody sacrifice,” says Photius, in Oecumenium. And Damascus cites these words of Athanasius: “Omit not to burn oil and wax at the sepulcher, calling upon Christ the Lord, for they are acceptable unto God, and do return great recompense. For the oil and the wax are the burnt offering, and the offering of the unbloody sacrifice is the propitiation.”

4. To sacrifice and to offer in the fathers is understood by a metaphor of the celebration, execution, and action of all ecclesiastical matters tending unto the worship of God. Origen, upon the epistle to the Romans, lib. 2, for circumcise, says, offer the blood of circumcision. And Tertullian, lib. 4, against Marcion, calls thanksgiving, oblation. And writing unto Scapula, for to pray for Caesar, he puts, to sacrifice for the emperor. And he used this form of speech the more freely, because it was imputed as a crime against the Christians, that they would not sacrifice, nor offer for the emperor. So in like manner Eusebius, Demonst., lib. 1, cap. 10, for to honor God, puts, to sacrifice prayers and hymns. And Cyprian, lib. 2, epist. 3, for to celebrate the communion, puts, to offer the sacrifice of the passion. And Epiphanius, Haeres. 79, for to preach the gospel, puts, to sacrifice the gospel. And Cyprian again, lib. 3, 13 epi., serm. 5, de Lapsis, for to celebrate the Eucharist, puts, to offer the bread and the cup.

5. Sometimes, to offer sacrifice, and to offer the body and blood of Christ, is figuratively to represent them in the sacrament, not to offer any proper sacrifice, nor to offer properly. And in this sense, they say that Christ is crucified, and dead in the sacrament. But there is no mass, no not the canon of the mass at this day, that says that Christ's body is really, properly, and substantially offered. But suppose it be a real sacrifice; do now but mark the blasphemies of the canon, which teaches, first, that Christ is out of the favor of His Father; second, that the Father accepts Christ's body as the lamb out of the hand of Abel; third, that Christ has a mortal mediator; fourth, that there must be an angel to bear the body of Christ into heaven.

6. Most of the fathers do hold that Melchisedek offered not bread and wine unto God, but unto Abraham expressly. So affirms Tertullian, Contra Judaeos; Ambrose, de Sacrum, lib. 4, cap. 3, and

epist. ad Heb., cap. 7; Epiphanius, haeres. 55; Chrysostom, in Gen., hom. 36, and in Psal. 109; the author of the questions of both the testaments, q. 109; Damascene, de fide orthodoxa, lib. 4, cap. 14; and Lombard, lib. 4, distinct. 8. Besides, they make a similitude between him offering bread and wine unto Abraham, and Christ offering Himself unto us partly on the cross, partly in the supper. Melchisedek never dreamed of offering Christ unto the Father in the Supper.

7. The supper of the Lord is called a true and full sacrifice, not in that Christ Himself is therein substantially offered, but it is true, both in the truth of representation and truth of the effect of the sacrifice of the cross, which we obtained in the communion; and likewise it is called true, because "Therein the church truly offers herself unto God," as Augustine testifies, lib. 10, de civ. Dei, c. 20; and also because it is the figure of the truth, that is, of Christ offered, whom the sacrifices of the Old Testament did shadow. Jerome, in his commentaries upon Amos, cap. 5, says that, "To fast, to give alms, and to promise chastity, are true holocausts," that is, whole burnt offerings.

8. The phrase (missam facere) used in some of the fathers, viz. Ambrose, lib. 5, ep. 33, does not signify to say the popish mass, but to dismiss some out of the assembly. "I, remaining in my duty, begin to dismiss them." Thus says Suetonius, in Caligula, cap. 25. "And behold, after the sermon, the catechumenists are dismissed," says Augustine, de temp., Sermon 237, fit missa catechumenis, "but the faithful will remain." And hereupon the communion was called missa figuratively, because when it began, there was a dismission of some. And this order held for 600 years, as Isidore testifies, Origen, lib. 6, c. 19. Now the popish mass observes no such custom. Therein is no dismission, nor do all that remain receive the communion; wherefore

mass indeed is the excommunication of the people. Unto Gregory of Terwin, and Pope Gregory, it is a new phrase, and they out of propriety do use missa facere, for to celebrate the Supper. The word missa is but seven times (that I can find) in all the fathers that lived before these two, and that in a quite contrary sense.

9. Besides, missa in the fathers signifies a public meeting to the communion, and to prayers, or the solemn dismission of that meeting, or even the form of their religious worship. Gregory Cassander, praefat. in preces suas, says that the name of mass and collect, and to make collects and masses, is all one in signification with sunάγειν, to meet together, συναγεισποιεῖν, to make congregations, and ἐκκλησιάζειν, to gather together. And he adds that as there can be no mass where there is no collect, so there can be no collect wherein there is no mass. So Epiphanius, the translator of the Tripartite History, say that a collect is a prayer which is rehearsed in some collected congregation, and a mass, because there are dismissions of some from that congregation. Leo, epist. ad Dioscorum, distinguishes between the mass and the sacrifice. And the Mileuitane Council, cap. 12, takes prayers and masses both for one thing. So that the name of mass had in those days a far other signification than it has now.

10. The table whereon the communion is celebrated is called an altar, not properly, but by a figure and allusion. And hereupon sometimes it is called an altar, sometimes a table. “The table of my spouse,” says the author, lib. de cultu. agr. Dom. in Augustine, “has holy bread, and a holy cup.” “None say so,” says Augustine, con. lit. Petil. lib. 2, cap. 47, “but those that receive life from the Lord’s table, as Peter did.” And, ad Bonifac., epist. 50, “They rushed in upon Him with horrible violence and furious cruelty, with clubs and such like weapons, as He stood at the altar,, breaking down the wood of the

said altar most barbarously." And the fathers deny (some of them) that they have any altar properly taken. "Celsus," says Origen, lib. 8, contra Celsum, "says that altars, and images and temples, do fly from us, lest they should be built." "Our altar," says Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 7, "is an earthly gathering together of such as do apply themselves to prayers." And a little after: "A just soul is a truly sanctified altar." Arnobius, lib. 6, contra gentes, says that the heathen did accuse the Christians, because they did not make them altars. About the 400th year the use of altars began, but not for sacrifice, but for the honor and memory of the martyrs, as the 5th Council of Carthage records, cap. 14.

11. Sometimes the fathers do use the word sacrifice abusively. So does Saint Ambrose, in his book, Ad virginem lapsam: "If you had died as others do," says he, "your parents would have sorrowed a little, because of natural affection. But they would have exulted in joy, that they had sent an unspotted virgin before them, a living sacrifice unto the Lord, and a propitiatrix for their sins." And of his brother Satyrus: "Unto Thee Almighty God do I offer this innocent soul; unto Thee I offer this my sacrifice; accept of this brotherly gift, of this priestly duty. I do send these my sacrifices before me."

12. The oblation for the dead, and the oblation of the dead, do differ greatly. The offering of the dead was money gathered of the living before their death, for the use of the poor. The other was money gathered by others, for to make commemorations for the dead, and to give thanks for them. Origen upon Job, lib. tertio, says that the Christians did use to give meat and other gifts at the memorials of the dead, for the use of the poor, and the clergy. Augustine, de Confessio, lib. 6, cap. 2, says that his mother carried with her potage, bread, and wine, unto the memorials of the martyrs and saints. But yet Augustine reprehends this custom in his 8th book, De civitate

Dei, c. 27: “Whosoever use to carry their banquets thither,” says he, “which truly the better Christians do not observe, (and in many places of the world there is no such custom) yet whosoever do this, they will have them sanctified there, in the name of the God of martyrs.”

13. The fathers were of opinion that the oblation in the supper did benefit the damned, as Augustine says, Enchirid, cap. 1000, to make their damnation more tolerable, which is also confirmed by Innocentius III, in cap. cum Martha. de celebrat. Miss., in his decretals. And they held also that it helped the saints. Witness Cyril, catach. 5; Cyprian, epist. 34 and 37; Augustine, in his 22nd book, de civit. Dei, cap. 10; and Chrysostom, upon the Acts, hom. 21. Also they held that hereby their reward might be increased, Chrysostom, hom. 32, in Matth.

14. These phrases, to offer for the dead and to sacrifice for their sleep, used in Tertullian and Cyprian, do signify nothing else but to rehearse their names in the communion and to give thanks for them, and to show other signs of joy by banquets, doales, etc. Look in Cyprian’s ninth epistle of his first book, and in his 14th epistle of his third book, as also in Chrysostom’s hom., de Martyribus. In this sense, the Lord’s Supper for 400 years after Christ was called an oblation, or a sacrifice for the dead, because there was therein continued a commemoration for the dead.

15. The fathers sometimes do plainly disallow this proper, real, external and often offered sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ for the remission of sins. Lactantius, in Epitome divin. Instit., cap. 2, says that those things which are done with the hands, or without a man’s self, are no true sacrifices. “Truly I,” says Justin Martyr, contra Triphon., “do account prayers and thanksgivings, if they be

performed by worthy men, for the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices unto God; for those only are the things which the Christians have received to execute." "We have our sacrifices," says Cyril of Alexandria, lib. 10, contra Julian, "namely, spiritual and mental.... For we offer unto God a sweet smell, all the virtues, faith, hope, charity, justice, continence, obedience, gentleness, perpetual praises, and other virtues. For this sacrifice, being not carnal, but pure and plain, in the incorporeal nature thereof is beseeming unto God. And the offerings of mental fragrancy are the means of a truly honest life." And a little after: "Because we have served God better than they (the patriarchs), sacrificing spiritual things unto God, and using the Spirit instead of sensible fire, let not Julian accuse us, by asking us why we bring not sacrifices unto the altar." And again, "We sacrifice mentally and spiritually the sweet savor of virtues, as it were, consecrating them unto God." "Christ's blood," says Augustine (contra Advers. leg., lib. 1, cap. 18), "being the singular and only true sacrifice, was shed for us." And indeed, the fathers ascribe the power of getting God's favor, and the effect which they hoped of the sacrament, unto the prayers and alms then offered, not unto the operation of the act. "The greatest help of souls," says Cyril of Jerusalem (Mystag. 5), "is the prayer of that holy and reverend mystery which is upon the altar." "We entreat for the dead," says Augustine (De cura pro mortuis, cap. 18), "either with the sacrifice of the altar, or of prayers, or of alms." And Chrysostom (Hom. 3, in Philip.) says that the people, lifting up their hands at the time of offering, did appease God's anger in praying for the dead. "We call upon God for them," says Bede (in Psal. 48), "by solemnizing of masses, and by alms deeds. So that the Supper of the Lord is called a propitiatory sacrifice, because it represents the sacrifice of the cross, and is the means that we, making our solemn prayers, do obtain our petitions."

16. The mass had this original: First, the Supper of the Lord was celebrated in most simple and plain manner. Second, it began to admit some increase of ceremonies, especially the offerings for the dead, which was but a gratulation for them, and a thanksgiving until 200 years after Christ. Third, prayers for the dead got entrance into the Supper, about the 400th year, and then came in purgatory, and then redemption of souls from thence, by masses. About the 780th year of grace, Gregory's mass was publicly taken up in the churches of Italy, whereas before, Ambrose's mass was of more general use. Fourth, the disputations of the transubstantiation began about the year of grace 840 and was concluded in the Council of Laterane by Innocent III, after which came in the offering of the body and blood of Christ upon the altar, and after that followed the inclosing of them, carrying them about, and adoration of them.

Therefore, when we do read these topical speeches of sacrificing, and offering, in the fathers, we must not believe that they did admit any other propitiatory sacrifice, but only the passion of Christ, being the only sacrifice of the whole world, nor that they were accustomed to celebrate the popish mass.

Communion Under One Kind

1. The Church of Rome for above 1000 years after Christ, used both the kinds in communion. This Cassander teaches in his defense of his book entitled de officio pij viri. “The use,” says he, “of the blood of our Lord, together with His body in the ministering of the sacrament, is both of the institution of Christ, and observed by the custom of the whole church, for above a thousand years, and unto this day of the eastern churches.” And although the use of one kind came up about the year 1200, yet the most learned of those times never taught that it was necessary so to be observed. But this communion under one kind (against all institution of Christ) was decreed, defined, and determined as a public law in the Council of Constance, about the year 1414. Cusanus (epistol. 3, ad Bohemos) seems to impute this change unto the Council of Laterane, anno 1215. But Biel (lect. 84, in Canonem) says plainly that it was a question held in controversy until the decree of the Council of Constance. Micrologus writes thus of the custom of the Church of Rome about the year 1080. “It is not authentical,” says he, “that some do dip the Lord’s body (into the chalice) and minister it unto the people thus moistened, as the perfect communion; for the Roman

Order contradicts this custom, because upon Good Friday it commands us to consecrate wine that is not consecrated with the Lord’s Prayer, and putting in of the body of the Lord, that the people may have a full communion. And Pope Julius, writing unto the bishops of Egypt, absolutely prohibits this dipping of the sacrament, and teaches that the bread and the cup are both severally to be received as Christ ordained. Whereupon Saint Gelasius commands them to be excommunicated that, having received the body of the

Lord, do abstain from partaking of the cup also. For he, in the said decree, affirms that such separation of these sacraments cannot be done but with mighty sacrilege (De eccles. obser., c. 19, and de consecrate., d. 2, c. coperimus). In Peter Lombard's time, anno 1150, the sacrament was received under both kinds, "That it might appear," quotes he (l. Sent. 4, d. 11), "that Christ took upon Him our whole nature that He might redeem our whole nature. For the bread had reference unto the body, and the wine unto the soul. Therefore, it is celebrated in both the kinds, to signify unto us Christ's receiving of body and soul, and our freedom of body and soul." Leo (Ser. 4, de Quadrag.) says that it is a sacrilegious hypocrisy of the Manichees "to receive the body and reject the blood." Rhemigius, bishop of Rheims, that lived about the year 470, made these verses to be engraven upon the chalice, as Hincmar testifies in his life: Hauriat hinc, etc., in English thus:

Hence let the people in that sacred blood,
Which Christ did bleed, drink out their souls' best good.
These vows, Rhemigius, priest, pays his Lord.

And the said Hincmar records that the same chalice was in his time afterward given unto the Normans for the redeeming of the Christian captives. "The cup," says Haimo (in 1 Cor. 10), "is called communion, as it were a participation, because all do communicate thereof." "The Lord," says Rabanus Maurus (de Instit. Cler., lib. 1, ca. 32), "first consecrated the sacrament of His body and blood, with benediction and thanksgiving, and delivered it unto His apostles, which they in imitation of Him so did, and taught their followers to do the like, which now the whole Church over all the world generally observes." "Only the benediction of the bishop, or priest," says Amalarius (lib. 1, de Offic. in prafat.), "is sufficient to consecrate the bread and wine wherewith the people's souls are to be fed unto salvation, as the

apostles did in the primitive church." And cap. 24: "Christ took the bread into His holy and reverend hands,, and in like manner the cup, as Cyprian says to Caecilius, we find not ourselves keepers of the precept, unless we do that same that the Lord did, and mingling the cup in like manner, we depart not from the divine commandment." Now though Cyprian do conclude his saying about the mixing of wine and water, yet we may understand that this is to be fulfilled of the whole institution of the Lord, wherein there is His command and the apostles' observation. And of like effect unto this is that of Walfrid, in his book de utriusque specie communione, the 22nd chapter.

"Whatsoever he be," says Anselm, super 1 Cor. 11, "rich, mean, or poor, clergyman or layman, that shall receive this body, and drink this blood of Christ unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. He eats and drinks it unworthily, that celebrate this mystery in any other order than Christ observed it Himself." "The prescription of the form," says the author de caena in Bern., "is in bread and wine, and the kinds of bread and wine are both set forth to show that there is full and perfect refreshing in receiving the body and blood of Christ." "By all these proofs," says Albertus Magnus, de offic. Missae, ca. 5, "it is gathered, that Christ delivered His body under the one form of bread, and His blood under the other form of wine, and taught it to be thus celebrated. And seeing Christ's actions are our instructions, He delivered these two most certainly for us to observe, and therefore we give the body under one kind, and the blood under another." "This sacrament," says Thomas, in 1 Cor. 11, lect. 5, "is given under a double kind for three respects. First, for the perfection thereof, because it being a spiritual refreshing, must have a spiritual meat, and a spiritual drink. For the corporeal feeding is not made without meat and drink. Second, for the signification thereof. For it is a memorial of that passion wherein Christ's blood was separate and drawn from His body, and therefore herein the

blood is offered severally from the body. Third, because of the saving effect of this sacrament. For it helps the salvation of the body, and therefore is the body offered; and it helps the salvation of the soul, and therefore the blood is offered. For the soul is in the blood, Genesis 9. And in his 6th lection., he says that "Both (bread and wine) belong to the perfection of this sacrament, as well to show the perfection of the refreshing, as for the representation of the passion, and also for the effecting of the salvation of body and soul." And this is also the opinion of Hales, 4 par. Summa qu. 35, memb. 1, and Cassalius, de caena, lib. 12, cap. 25.

2. The communicants used to carry home not only the bread, but the wine also. This testifies Nazianzene, in Gorgon. ad medium, and Jerome, ad Rusticum. And again, where we find the fathers to make mention of the bread alone, it is a sign called synecdoche partis, whereby part is put for the whole, or else they do take the name of bread only for the bread dipped in the wine.

Wherefore the ministering of the Lord's Supper under one kind is contrary to the ordinary custom of the whole and universal primitive Church.

Private Mass

1. A kind of private mass wherein the priest only receives the consecrated forms, without communicating to others, was never known in the most ancient and purest antiquity, for the space of 800 years. "The Supper of the Lord," says Jerome, in 1 Cor. 11, "ought to be common to all, for He gave the sacraments equally unto all the disciples present." (Jerome, in 1 Cor. 11) And in 3 cap., Sophon., he tells how the people did communicate of the blood. (Jerome, in Sophon. cap. 3) Chrysostom, hom. 2, in Eph., also condemns this

private mass in these words: “In vain do we offer this daily oblation; in vain do we stand at the altar; there is none that partakes with us. This I speak not to invite you to receive in any fashion, but to make yourselves worthy of these mysteries.” (Chrysostom, hom. 2 in Eph.) And in 1 Cor. 11, homil. 27: “You do not communicate of that which is common, for it was broken equally to all, and equally divided.” (Chrysostom, homil. 27 in 1 Cor. 11) “Some require a communion still in the mass, and indeed so I confess did Christ ordain it,” says Erasmus, epist. ad Julium Pflugium, “and so in ancient times it was observed.” (Erasmus, epist. ad Julium Pflugium) Yea, the papists themselves confess that in the

In the primitive church it was set down that the faithful should communicate every day, as Durandus in Rationale, lib. 4, cap. 53, and Hugo Cardinalis in Luke, cap. 24, do both confess. Cusanus, in his seventh epistle to the Bohemians, says that all that were not prepared to receive the Eucharist were put forth of the church. And the Council of Mentz prohibits the priest to receive alone because they held it as an absurd thing to say, “The Lord be with you,” when there was none to answer. Look in Reginald Poole’s first book, De Ecclesiastica Disciplina, c. 191. “If anyone does not communicate, let him give place,” says Gregory, Dialogues, lib. 2, capit. 23. And Charlemagne made a law that all the faithful should communicate and attend at the mass without any other further entreaty, Leges Franciae, lib. 1, cap. 132. And it seems that about Walfrid’s time these solitary masses began, though he himself disallows them. “In the whole mass,” says he, De Rebus Ecclesiasticis, c. 22, “we do pray chiefly, and, as it were, by name for them that do offer and communicate. And we may…say that the rest, persisting in the faith and devotion of these that offer and communicate, are partakers of the said oblation and communion. But, although when the priests only do communicate in their mass, it may be understood that those

do partake with him, for whom these offices are celebrated, and whose person the priest executes in some responsories; yet we must confess that that is the lawful mass, wherein there is present the priest, the answerer, the offerer, and the communicant, as the form of the canon and the plain course of the prayers do show." "The prayers," says Micrologus, cap. 19, "which are said after the communion, are not for them that are to communicate, but for those that have already communicated; therefore, whosoever do desire to be helped with the blessings of these prayers, let them not neglect to receive the communion before they are said." And cap. 18, he says to the same effect.

And indeed, in the year of grace 1080, in the Church of Rome all were bound to communicate after the breaking of the bread. Radulphus Ardens, in his homily upon Easter day, says that there are two kinds of receiving, spiritual and sacramental, and of the latter he says thus: "Notwithstanding my brethren, all Christians must communicate even sacramentally when they have time and place. And therefore, in the primitive Church all the Christians used to communicate every Lord's Day." Thus says he that lived about the year 1050.

2. Private masses had their first original among the friars in their cloisters. For Gregory, lib. 4, Indict. 14, epist. 43 (aliàs c. 87), forbids public masses to be said in one certain monastery, lest there should be any occasion of popular meetings in the private houses of the servants of God. And lib. 5, epist. 46 (aliàs c. 146), he inhibits public mass to be said in a certain place, and yet allows mass to be said therein. Look also in the 71st epistle of his seventh book. Odo of Cambray, in his exposition of the canon, says that whereas at the first they never had mass without convention of the people together for

communion, afterward it grew to a custom in the church to have private and solitary masses, especially in cloisters.

Mixture of Wine and Water

1. The mingling of the wine with water was a general custom in all hot countries for allaying the strength of the wine, as Lyra testifies in 1 Corinthians 11; and hereby it is proved so to be because the water was put in after the consecration, as appears in that mass which is called Chrysostom's. But this was none of Christ's institution, as the fathers do hold, for Chrysostom says that Pope Alexander was the first that mingled water with the wine (Homily 83 on Matthew; Polydore Vergil, lib. 5, c. 9). And Augustine, lib. 3. De Consensu Evang., cap. 1, says that these words, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine," are to be understood of the cup of the Eucharist And the Armenians for above a thousand years together used pure wine without any mixture of water therewithal, as Otho Frisingensis testifies, lib. 7, c. 32. But out of a custom it grew to be a ceremony signifying a mystery. Afterwards the Aquarii used only water, without any wine, against whom Cyprian proves the use of wine, but not of water mixed with wine.

2. The schoolmen hold this mixture to be no essential part of the sacrament, and namely, Thomas, part. 3, q. 74, art. 7, and Scotus, in sent. 4, dist. 11, q. 6, the two chief. And likewise Hales, Bonaventure, Richardus, and Durand., as Joseph Angles, in 4 dist. 8, art. 6 (Joseph Angles, in 4 dist. 8, art. 6), testifies in his comment upon the sentences, adding that this is the common opinion of the doctors. Yea, Bellarmine himself is not ashamed to confess this in his fourth book, de Sacr. Eucharist, cap. 10.

Keeping of the Sacrament

1. The fathers used to keep the sacrament, not for any adoration or public bearing it about, but for their private use in the days next following. “Shall not the husband know,” says Tertullian, lib. 2, ad uxorem, “what you do secretly taste before your meat? And if he does know, he believes that it is but bread, not that which it is called.” And hereto belongs that of Jerome’s relation, concerning the custom of the Romans of receiving every day, and that (as it is probable) in private houses, epist. 50, ad Pammachium, and epist. 28, ad Lucinium. “Every one of the people,” says Basil, in epist. ad Caesream Patrit, “in Alexandria and Egypt has the communion in his house, receiving it of the priest that consecrates and distributes it.”

2. But this reservation of the sacrament was always in private houses, not in the church, as now it is among the papists, who keep it for curing the sick, which was not done by the fathers.

3. And this reservation was sometimes found fault withal by the fathers. “Our Lord,” says Origen, in Levit., hom. 5, “did not lay up the bread which He gave to His apostles, nor did He bid them reserve it until the morrow.” “If there be any man,” says Concilium Caesaraugustanum, capi. 3, “that is proved not to eat the sacrament in the church which he receives, accursed be he for evermore.” “And all the bishops did cry out altogether, accursed be he,” Council. Tolet., 1 cap. 14. “If there be ought remaining of the sacrifice,” says Clement in his 2nd epistle unto James, “let it not be reserved until the morrow, but let it be rid away by the care of the clergy.” And Hesychius, upon Leviticus, says, lib. 2, c. 8, that the remainder is to be burned with fire; others, that it was to be given to the children. Look at Nicephorus’s 17th book, and 15th chapter.

Use of the Latin Tongue in the Service

1. In the purest churches, for the space of 800 years at least, the duties of Christianity, or divine prayers, etc., were never performed in a tongue unknown to the people. “Both the priest and the people,” says Chrysostom, hom. 18, in 2 Cor., “say the same common prayers, and all do say one

“It behooves,” says Isidore (De eccle. offic., lib. 1, c. 10), “that when we sing, we sing altogether, and when we pray, that we pray altogether, and when the lesson is read, that silence be made, and that all do hearken to it with attention. And therefore, the deacon, with a clear voice, warns silence, that there be a unity kept among all, as well when they sing, as when the lesson is read, that whatsoever is preached unto all, may be equally heard of all.” “Let everyone pray,” says Origen (Against Celsus, lib. 8), “unto the Lord in his native and mother tongue.” “Here is a dissonance of voice,” says Jerome (Tom. 1, epist. 17), “but a unity of religion, and almost as many choirs of singers, as there is diversity of nations.” “Let the only Trinity,” says Augustine (epist. 178), “be prayed unto for mercy of all, both Latins and barbarians; let no tongue how barbarous soever, be made an alien from praising one God.” And the Ruthenians, Armenians, Egyptians, and Ethiopians, had all their divine service in their vulgar tongue; and the Moravians, in that Slavonic tongue by a grant from the pope. And the celebration of divine service was, in the year 1215, granted by Innocent III in Council Lateran (c. 9) unto divers places according to the diversity of the tongues. This is also confirmed out of the decretals of Gregory (l. 1, titul. 31, ca. Quoniam plerisq., etc.). “In the primitive church,” says Lyra (in 1 Cor. 14), “benedictions, and all other common devotions were performed in the vulgar tongue.” And in the Council of Mentz (cap. 45, about the year 813) it is

permitted unto him that cannot otherwise learn the Catholic faith, and the Lord's prayers, to learn them in his mother tongue.

2. If a strange tongue at any time were used in divine service, yet it was understood of the hearers. For so was the Latin tongue; and although it was not the mother tongue in all places and provinces of the Roman Empire, yet it was understood generally in them all for the space of 700 years and more. In the provinces of Africa they spoke Latin. And the French men generally did all understand this tongue. In the 3rd Council of Terwin (about the year 770, cap. 17), the homilies are commanded to be translated into the more barbarous Roman or Dutch tongue, that they might be the easier to be understood. And it is credible that the Britons understood this tongue also. For mark what Bede (hist. Anglic. lib. 1, c. 1) says: "Britany," quotes he, "at this present searches out, and professes one and the same knowledge of highest truth, and true highness, in five several tongues: the English, British, Scottish, Pictish, and Latin, which now through the meditation of the Scriptures is grown common to all other." And Valerius Maximus (lib. 2, cap. 1) testifies that the Roman magistrates did seriously endeavor to have their language diffused abroad, because it was not lawful for the Greeks to deal with the Romans concerning anything but in the Latin tongue, though they did it in Greece or Asia. And Camden, that most excellent antiquarian, in his Britannia says thus: "If there be any man that will not believe that our Britons used the provincial tongue of the Romans, surely he knows not how earnestly the Romans labored to have all the provinces speak Latin, nor does he mark what a sway the Latin has already in our vulgar tongue, to let pass the authority of Cornelius Tacitus, who says that in Domitian's time the Britons studied for the eloquence of the Latin tongue." Now afterward when the empire began to decline, and the Latin became corrupted by the Goths in Italy, yet the use thereof remained in matters of religion, as

before, by reason of the old custom, which by greater reason should have been abrogated. But now it is held laudable, yea necessary, to worship in Latin, that is, in an unknown tongue.

3. Any tongue whatsoever, even Latin itself, to those who do not understand it, is barbarous, as Ovid in his Tristia says rightly, "Barbarus hic ego sum," etc. In English thus:

I am but barbarous in this strange land,
For no man here my speech can understand.

Look at Chrysostom and Haimo upon the 14th of the first to the Corinthians.

Transubstantiation or Real Presence

1. The fathers, when they speak of the Supper, have many and diverse terms which may signify conversion. Ambrose, lib. 4, de Sacram., c. 4, uses the word conversion, and lib. de ijs qui mysterijs initiantur, cap. 9, the term of mutation. And Cyprian, de caena, said the bread is (mutatus) changed, not in shape, but in nature. Origen, against Celsus, lib. 8, says that the bread by prayer is made (fieri) the body. And Gaudeneius, Tractat. 2, de Exodo, says that of the bread is made (effice) the body, and of the wine the blood. Eusebius Emissenus, hom. 5, de Pas., says that the priest by a sacred power converts (convertere) the visible creatures into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. And again, that the bread passes (transire) into the nature of the Lord's body. Anselm, epist. de corp. & sang. Dom., says that the bread (migrare) goes into the body. And Fulbertus, epist. ad Berengarium, says that it is transfused (transfundi). Algerus, lib. de Sacram., says that it is transferred and transposed (trajici & transferri) into the body. But the ancient

doctors, when they do speak of this change and conversion of the bread, do mean the change of the use and condition of the bread, and not of the substance. And therefore, in the reading of them, we must distinguish the sacramental mutation of these signs in signifying and sealing, from a substantial mutation. And we ought to hold directly that they never knew of transubstantiation (μετουσίαν) for at least 800 years after Christ, but rather condemned it. Cyprian (or whosoever was the author of the sermon, de caena) says, "Bread retaining the form of bodily substance." And Ambrose, de Sacr., lib. 4, cap. 4, says, "They are what they were, and yet are changed into other." And Theodoret, dial. 2: "The mystical signs do not leave their proper nature after consecration." And Gelas., con Eutyc.: "The signs do remain in the propriety of their nature." And Walfrid, cap. 16: "He delivered the sacrament of His body and blood unto His disciples in the substance of bread and wine." And Paschasius, de corp. & sang. Do., c. 10, aliâs 28: "Bread strengthens the heart of man, and wine comforts, and therefore this mystery of our salvation is rightly celebrated in the same substance." The like unto this has Bertram. And Paschasius again, ca. 17, aliâs 46: "Therefore my son when you come to communicate of this mystery, open the bosom of your mind, cleanse your conscience, and give not yourself to receive that only which the piece of bread contains, but that which faith receives, because that in Christ is contained the fullness of divinity." Hereby it is evident that the canon of the mass for 900 years was never held to be meant of transubstantiation, nor was there in all that time any mouthly receiving of Christ's true body dreamed of. Besides, Druthmar, that lived about the year 800, understood the words of the canon to be spoken of the spiritual changing of the bread into Christ's body, and the wine into His blood. For these are his words upon this place of Scripture, "And taking the cup," Matt. 26: "Thus the Lord commanded us to do, changing spiritually the bread into His body, and the wine into His blood, that by these two we might

remember what He did for us, concerning His body and blood." And Amalarius, about the year 810, understands the words of the canon without either transubstantiation, or real presence, lib. 3, de eccl. offic., cap. 23. And Walfrid, ca. 16: "After the solemnities of the old Passover, He delivered the sacrament of His body and blood, in the substances of bread and wine, and taught us to celebrate them in memory of His passion." Nicetas Choniates, Thesaur., lib. 4, writing against the Ascodrugi, that would not have mysteries represented in corporeal things, says that the institution, wherein our Savior used bread and wine for the salvation and reformation of mankind corrupted, was not such as wanted bodily things. Wherefore the fathers when they speak of the changing of the nature of the bread, do mean the change of the propriety only, whereby of bodily sustenance, by the power of the deity, it is made a food for the soul.

2. In ancient times it was the whole universal and orthodoxal consent of the church that that very bread which Christ broke (and not any other thing under the figure of bread) was His body. And this is the doctrine of Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Theodoret, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine. And therefore, these never so much as dreamed of transubstantiation. Which may be convinced by these seven reasons following. First, because the Eucharist was reserved in private houses for everyone to receive: "Being dismissed," says Cyprian of one, De spectaculis, "and bearing with him as the manner is, the Eucharist, etc." Second, because they used to send it by children unto the sick, as Eusebius testifies in his 6th book and 43rd chapter. Third, because it was used to be carried about in such mean manner, as namely, the body in a wicker basket, and the blood in a glass as Jerome testifies of Exuperius bishop, epist. 4, ad Rusticum. Fourth, because the bishops used to send it unto others (as it is probable) for salvation's sake. Witnesses: Irenaeus, ep. ad Victor. apud. Eusebium, lib. 5, cap. 23, and

Nicephorus, lib. 4, c. 39. Fifth, because they used to give it unto infants, as Augustine, lib. 3, ca. 10, and almost in every work of his testifies. Sixth, because if there remained any parcels of the Eucharist unreceived, the young children that used the church were called to eat them up. This Euagrius, lib. 4, cap. 35, records, and Nicephorus in like manner, lib. 17, cap. 25. Seventh and lastly, because it was a custom in the ancient church to burn the remainders of the Eucharist, as Isychius, lib. 2, cap. 8, upon Leviticus, affirms.

3. Afterwards begun the disputations of transubstantiation but not as yet approved as an article of faith, nor concluded of in Lombard's age, which was about the year 1145, for he, lib. 4, d. 11, says that, "If it be demanded of what sort this conversion is, whether formal, or substantial, or of some other kind, I cannot sufficiently define." Yet the church for a whole thousand years taught no other than spiritual receiving of Christ, and all the fathers of those times understood the words of the supper to be figuratively spoken. Wherefore it is a most impudent and faithless part of Bellarmine to cite 32 writers for the opinion of transubstantiation.

4. But in the year 1215, Innocent III determined the manner of this conversion, in respect of the name, calling it transubstantiation. And for the thing itself, Leo IX determined it, in a conventicle held at Rome, anno 1049. And Nicholas II also, in his decretals, de consecrat. cap. Ego Berengarius, in the year 1060. And yet Berengarius abode in his true opinion of the Lord's Supper until the day of his death, and therefore is said to have seriously detested that absurd recantation. Hildebertus Cenomanensis praises him. And Lanfranke condemns him as a violator of his recantation, and inconstant in his opinion. And indeed there is not a papist in the world that will defend the recantation in Gratian set down by Nicholas, because he says that the body of Christ is sensibly crucified

with the teeth. And divers of the schoolmen, as Biel, in can. Mis., lect. 47, and Richardus, de Media-villa, in 4 d. 8 q. 1, do condemn it as an erroneous assertion.

5. Now the most learned schoolmen after Innocentius disagree both in the thing itself and in the manner of explaining what the pronoun (Hoc) "this" signifies and demonstrates properly in these words, "this is my body." Richardus de Media-villa, in 4 d. 8, art. quest. 1, expounds it thus: "'This,' that is, 'something being under this sensible form,' is my body. Or thus: 'that which will be forthwith present under this sensible sign which is seen,' is my body." Thomas Aquinas, 3 part., q. 78, in corp. art. Hoc: "'This,' that is, 'that which is contained in the general under these kinds,' is my body." Bonaventure, in d. 8, in 2. par. dist. art. 1, q. 1, thus: "'This,' that is, 'the substance of bread.'" And he will have (est) "is," to signify (fit) is made, or (transit) is changed or (convertitur) is turned. Scotus, in 4 dist. 8, q. 2, thus: "'This,' that is, 'this singular essence,' or ens, is my body." Marsilius, in 4 quest. 6, art. 1, thus: "'This,' that is, 'that into which this bread is changed,' is my body." Occam, quadlib. 2, q. 19, thus: "'This,' that is, 'this body, which will be forthwith under these forms,' is my body." But Peter of Aliacu, in 4 Sent., q. 5, art. 1, says that it is not necessary for the priest that consecrates rightly to demonstrate anything by this word "this," or that he should understand anything by that word more than by a word that has no signification, because this word is only given us as a sign, whereby we may know that when these words are rightly pronounced, the body of Christ is immediately under these signs, by God's good pleasure. Holcot, in 4 sen., q. 3, says that by this pronoun (Hoc, this) is signified that which remains under both the terms of transmutation, and is that which is only accidents sensible, and no substance. Biel, lect. 48, in cano. Missae, says that "'This,' that is, 'this content, into which the bread is to be turned, etc., in some part

of time which includes the pronunciation, and the terminating or finishing instant,' is my body." Cajet., in 3 p., q. 78, art. 5 says, "'This,' that is, 'this singular substance,' is my body." Now Guitmund, that is elder than them all, lib. 2, thus expounds this word, "'This,' that is, 'which hitherto was bread, henceforth it is my body, not bread.'" Or thus: "'This,' that is, 'that I now give you,' is my body, for this pronoun (this) in this place has no relation to anything before spoken but is a demonstrative of the thing present."

6. These phrases of the fathers (that Christ's body is eaten; goes into the mouth; is touched with the hands; His blood is drunk, etc.) are to be understood tropically, that is, symbolically, signifying the efficacy of sacramental receiving, and admonish us to embrace the body of Christ that is in heaven with an unpolluted heart. For it is the fathers' doctrine that the bread and wine are truly and properly the signs of the body and blood of Christ. "Our Lord," says Cyprian, Tract. De unct. Chrismatis, "at the table where He took part of His last feast with the apostles, with His own hands gave them bread and wine, but upon the cross He gave His body to be wounded by the hands of the soldiers, that the sincere truth and true sincerity which He had more secretly imprinted in the apostles, might declare unto the world how the bread and wine were His body and blood, and upon what reasons the causes thus agreed with the effects, and divers names or forms were reduced to one essence, and the things signifying and signified should be called both by the same names. "Our Lord," says Augustine (contra Adimunt, c. 12), "did not stick to say, 'this is my body,' when He gave the sign of His body." And again (Contra Maximinum): "Wherein (in which signs) we must not respect what they are, but what they represent, because they are signs of things, and being in essence one thing, are in signification another." Origen, likewise upon the 15th of Matthew, says that if all that goes into the mouth descends into the belly, and so is cast forth into the draught, that

meat also which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as far as the material part thereof, goes the ordinary course of other meat. So Chrysostom (or whosoever was the author of that epistle) unto Caesarius says, “Even as we call the bread before it be sanctified, bread, and when God’s grace has sanctified it by the priest’s means, it loses the name of bread, and is held worthy to be called the Lord’s body, although that the nature of bread do remain therein, and is not called two bodies, but one body of the Son.” “Christ’s flesh,” says Maxentius (Dialog. 2, cont. Nestor.), “is not called the body of God as the church is, nor as the bread, which the whole church partakes in memory of His passion, but it is so called the body of God, as is a man’s proper vesture or apparel, wherewith he is arrayed.” “He (Christ),” says Augustine (De civit. Dei, lib. 21, c. 25), “in saying ‘he that eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, lives in me, and I in him,’ shows what it is to receive His body not sacramentally, but truly, and drink His blood.” Here mark an opposition between sacramental eating and true eating.

7. These words of Christ, “my flesh is meat indeed” (John 6, etc.), are by Clement (Padag, lib. 1, cap. 6); Tertullian (de resurrectione carnis); Origen (in Levit., hom. 7); Chrysostom (in Joan., hom. 46); and Augustine (tract. in Joan. 25 and 26), taken in an allegorical sense.

8. And the words “this is my body,” most of the fathers take figuratively, and namely these: Tertullian (l. 4, con. Marc.); Origen in two places (in Levit., hom. 7 and in Mat., cap. 15); Cyprian (de unct. Chrismatis); Nazianzene (de Paschate); Ambrose in three places (de ijs qui myster. initiantur, ca. 9; de Sacr., lib. 4, cap. 5; in 1 Cor. 11); Jerome in two (in Matt. 26 and in Mark 14); Augustine in seven or eight (lib. 3, de doct. Christ., lib. 3, cap. 16; de Trinit., lib. 3, ca. 4 and 10; epist. 23; in Levit., q. 57; cent. Adimant., ca. 12; and Psal. 98);

Chrysostom (in Psal. 22); Theod. (dial. 1); Prosper (in Sent. August.), and he is cited (de consecr. d. 2, c. Hoc est); Bede (in Luc. 22); and Bertram (de corp. & sang. Domini).

9. But the fathers speak not only figuratively of the sacrament, but even sometimes hyperbolically thereof, to beget it the greater reverence, and to pierce men's minds, and follow the phrase of Scripture, and lest the supper should seem a tragic fiction. In this sense says Chrysostom (in 1 Cor. 10, hom. 24), "What is in the cup? That which flowed from His side. And again, that which He suffered not upon the cross, He suffers for you in the offering, suffering Himself to be thrust through." And hom. 21 (ad populum Antioch): "Think what you take in hand. For it is a pernicious thing to use that tongue unto reproaches that has ministered at such divine mysteries, and been purpled with the color of that blood, and made a sword of gold."

10. That which the fathers speak of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, the same they speak in like manner of baptism and the Word of God. "We are said," says Origen (Hom. 16, in Num.), "to drink the blood of Christ, not only in the sacraments, but when we hear and receive His words." And in another place: "Bind not yourself unto the blood of the flesh, but rather seek after the blood of the Word, and hear Him that says unto you, 'This is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of your sins.'" "No man must any way doubt," says Augustine (in one of his sermons, ad infantes, cited by Bede, in 1 Cor. 10), "that every faithful Christian is made partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when he is made a member of Him in baptism, nor that he is alienated from the communion of that bread and the cup, although he being in unity with Christ, be taken out of this world before he come to communicate of the said sacrament. For he is not

deprived of the participation and benefit thereof, since he has already attained to that which that sacrament signifies."

11. The fathers by the form of bread (speciem) do still understand the substance, not the accidents without the substance. In this sense, says Cyril of Jerusalem (Mystag. 4), "Under the form of bread is given the body, and the blood under the form of wine." "I see not the form of blood," says Ambrose (De Sacram, lib. 4, cap. 4), "but the likeness it has." And (lib. de ijs qui mysterijs initiantur, c. 9) "If Elijah's speech were of so great power, that it was able to fetch down fire from heaven, shall not Christ's words be of the power to change the forms of the elements?" "To make the form of visible bread," says Augustine (Sermon, ad infantes, recorded by Bede, in 1 Cor. 10), "many grains of corn are compact together, and in the wine likewise, brethren, consider how it comes to be one liquor." "Under that visible form of ointment," says Theodoret (in 1 Cant.), "they do receive the invisible grace of that most Holy Spirit." And the same meaning sometimes they have when they use these phrases: the figure, or outward shape of the bread. And they do use these words to turn our eyes from the external signs unto the heavenly matter therein signified, upon which we ought to fix the eyes of our minds. And hereupon Chrysostom says that there is nothing seen upon the table, but the body and blood of the Lord, and yet intends not to put accidents without a substance. Contrariwise, the word "nature" sometimes in the fathers signifies the quality and condition only, and not the essence of the thing. And in this sense, Cyprian (de caena) says the bread changed not in form or shape, but in nature; by the words' omnipotency is made flesh.

12. Cyril (lib. 10, cap. 13, in Joan., and elsewhere), and Hilary (lib. 8, de Trin.), with some other fathers, will have Christ to be in us naturally, and corporally, and so they will have us to receive Him.

But they do not speak of the manner of our union with Christ herein, but of the limits of our union. They will have us united with Christ in one mystical body, according to the truth of nature, and to be joined truly and really with His flesh and spirit, and yet after a spiritual and uncorporal manner.

13. Damascene's commutation μεταποίησις (l. 4, c. 14), and Theophylact's transelementation μεταστοιχείωσις, is the change of the bread into another state or condition, not into another substance and being, because it is united to Christ's body in a sacramental union, and of a corporal food made a spiritual. For after the same manner, they affirm that we, κατ᾽ αυτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα, είς έχείνην άνακεράθηναι τὴν σάρχα, that is, are really converted into that (Christ's) flesh (Chrysostom, hom. 45, in Joan.), and are transelementated into Him (Theophylact, in Joan., cap. 6), and yet they do not feign any abolishing of our substance for all this. And this same μεταποίησις is not always a changing of substance but sometimes a correction or changing of a thing into better. But however, this transformation helps not the papists a jot, for that which is transformed remains not in regard of its exterior form. "Although the ancient fathers," says Suarez, upon Thomas, tom. 3, quest. 75, disput. 50, sect. 1, "used many words in the explanation of this mystery, yet they are all either general, as are the words conversion, mutation, passing into, and changing, or they are properly applied to the accidental change, as the word transfiguration and such like." Only Theophylact's word transelementation comes nearer the explanation of the mystery's true property and signifies a change of the things even unto the first elements, unto the first matter. But yet that word is too unapplicable, and too unfit for this mystery. For it may signify the conversion of one element into another, or the resolution of a mixed body into the elements, but transubstantiation most properly and most fitly

signifies the conversion or commigration of one whole substance into another whole substance.

14. The fathers, when they say that the bread or wine remains no more, do not mean simply, but in respect of his intent that is to receive them, when he receives them rightly, because then we must not think of the bread or the wine, but fix both our mind and senses wholly upon Jesus Christ.

15. Where they deny that the bread is a figure of the body, they speak of the bare sign, which is without fruit. “There is not only a certain figuring of Christ’s flesh,” says Theophylact, in Joan. 6. “He said not, these are the signs of my body,” says Euthymius, in Matth., cap. 26, “but, this is my body. We ought not therefore, to look into the nature of that which is set before us, but into the virtue.”

16. To consecrate is not to transubstantiate, but to dedicate a profane thing unto a holy use. And that the consecration of the bread is included in these five words, “for this is my body,” and of the wine in these, “this is my blood,” or such like, no father did ever teach. Cyprian, Serm. de caena, says that in his time they did consecrate with these words: “Do this in remembrance of me; this is my flesh, this is my blood.” Basil and Chrysostom held that it was done by prayers, as we may read in their liturgies. “Will you know,” says Ambrose, de Sacram, lib. 4, cap. 5, “what are the heavenly words of consecration? These are they: the priest says, ‘Make this oblation ascribed unto us, reasonable and acceptable for us, who the day before His passion took bread in His holy hands, and giving thanks, blessed it, broke it, and gave to His apostles, saying, take, eat, etc.,’ and so unto the end of the institution.” But Jerome, in 3 c. Soph., says that to make the Eucharist, there is not only a necessity of solemn prayer, but also of merit in the priest. “We call that only the

body and blood of Christ," says Augustine, de Trinit., lib. 3, cap. 4, "which we, taking from the fruits of the earth and consecrating with mystical prayer, do receive in due order, for our soul's health; and as a memorial of our Lord's suffering for us." "Presently, after this prayer," says Gregory, lib. 7, Indict. 2, epist. 63, "we say the Lord's Prayer, because it was the apostles who used to consecrate the host of oblation at that prayer only." "Unless Christ do come Himself," says Hesychius, lib. 2, in Lev., cap. 8, "at the priest's prayer, and sanctify the supper, and lay the foundation of the action, there can by no means any sacrifice of the Lord be made." "It is not credible," says Innocentius III, lib. 4, de myst. Missae, cap. 6, "that He distributed His body before He had consecrated. But it may be said that Christ consecrated by the divine power, and afterwards showed the form that others should follow in their solemnizing, for He of Himself consecrated by His own power, but we, by that virtue which He has given to the words." "If any priest," says Scotus, in 4 d. 8, q. 2, art. 2, "should begin to say these words, 'This is my body,' and omit the words that do go before them, I say that in all such cases we may not worship (the Eucharist) simply, but with this condition: if it be truly consecrated." And of the consecration of the blood he speaks in like manner: "We are not infallibly taught, whether unto the form of the consecration of the blood do belong any of the words which are after these words, 'of my body,' or any of them that follow until these, 'do this.' Therefore, it is dangerous to aver anything without sufficient authority be had for the confirmation." Likewise, Biel, in 4 dist. 8, q. 3, concl. 3, says that the necessary and precise form of consecrating the supper is not sufficiently determined of in the canonical Scriptures, which assertion he afterwards affirms by reason. The learned man D. Redman, observing the tumultuous wrangling of the schoolmen about the words of consecration, was not afraid to affirm that not one almost of all the whole school did rightly understand the word 'consecrate' (History Martyr. Anglicana).

17. The body of Christ in the fathers' writings, is threefold: real, that is His body assumed; mystical, the church; sacramental, the bread in the supper. "The body of Christ taken from the altar," says the decretals, de consecr., d. 2, ca. 79, "is a figure, if we view the outward forms of bread and wine, but the truth, when we believe the body and blood of Christ to be truly there within." "The flesh is a sacrament of the flesh," says Augustine, in Sent. Pros., "and the blood of the blood." "The bread is Christ's body, not corporally but spiritually," says Aelfrike, Archb. of Canterbury, in his sermon in Saxon, wherein he distinguishes the body crucified, and the sacramental body. "And to make Christ's body, is to consecrate the bread into the sign of His real body. Let the word come to the element," says Augustine, tract. in Joan., 80, "and it becomes a sacrament." "This is the body which the fathers say so often to be daily made, blessed, eaten, broken, divided, falls to the earth, is handled, swallowed, and torn with the teeth," Cyprian, sermone de Lapsis. "The nature of the bread and wine," says Bede in Epiph. Do., "is by the ineffable sanctification of the Spirit, translated into the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord." "The flesh and blood of our Lord," says Jerome, in Ephes. 1, "is understood two ways, either for His spiritual, and divine flesh and blood, whereof He said, 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my body is drink indeed,' or for the flesh which was nailed on the cross, and that blood which was shed by the soldier's spear."

18. And the creation that the fathers speak of was always without transubstantiation. "When the oil is consecrated for the sick," says Amalar, de eccl. offic., lib. 1, ca. 12, "we conclude thus: by whom Thou (O Lord) always creates all these good things."

19. The fathers say that we receive Christ in the bread, or under the form of bread, as the bread is a sign of Christ's flesh, and instrument of the soul's nourishment, not as the receptacle of His body. And

likewise, they say that we, in the water, do receive the remission of our sins (Lomb., Sent. 4, d. 3). But this is, as we say that we have possession given us in writings, when as the writings do but assign the same unto us, and so we receive Christ in the bread, as the signified in the sign, not the contained in the continent.

20. The sacrament is honored, received, and respected, as it is the expressive seal and sign of our mystical union with Christ, by whose body we are, after an admirable manner, quickened. Hence it is called a mystery to be trembled at, because by these creatures through the operation of the divine majesty, we are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ. And hence it was that God has shown some miracles about this supper to make the institution more honorable, not to prove the real presence. And upon this, the fathers had a care that none of it should fall to the ground, and reverenced all the ornaments of the Church, and suffered not the catechumenists to communicate. And Chrysostom, in Ephes., hom. 3, says that it is a King's table, that the King Himself is present, and angels do minister to Him. By this he moved all to reverence, and hence he called it an oblation to be trembled at (Vid. Loc.).

21. The fathers give but one place at once unto Christ's body. "Our Lord is above," says Augustine (tract. 30, in Joh.), "but here also, and our Lord is truth. For His body wherein He rose again, may be but in one place, but His truth is spread abroad everywhere." Basil (de Sp. S., cap. 22) proves the Holy Ghost to be God, because He can be in many places at once. "He ascended into heaven," says Augustine (epist. 57, ad Dardan.), "sits at God's right hand, from whence and from no other place He shall come to judgment." And again, "In that He is God, He is everywhere; but as He is man, He is but in heaven." And, "Doubt not that as God He is everywhere present, but His circumscriptible body is in some certain place of heaven." "According

to His human substance," says Fulgentius (l. 2, c. 17, ad Thrasimund), "he left the earth, when He ascended up to heaven." "The flesh," says Vigilius (contra Eutyc., lib. 4), "while it was here upon earth, was not in heaven; and now that it is in heaven, it is no more upon the earth."

22. Lastly, when transubstantiation was once established, the most learned stuck to the opinion of consubstantiation, as most congruent unto Scripture, receiving the opinion of transubstantiation, either solely or chiefly, because the Church had so decreed. Scotus (in 4 dist. 11, q. 3, art. 1) holds expressly that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not expressed in the Scriptures, adding this: "It seems to move us chiefly to hold transubstantiation, because we must hold of the sacraments, as the Roman Church has set down in the extravagant de haeret., c. Ad abolendam, where note these words, in Paris edition, anno 1497, in the margent: 'The faith of this sacrament is only because of the determination of the Church.'" And in the same article (resp. ad. arg. 3), says thus: "We say that the church has resolved that this meaning (that the bread is transubstantiate) is the truest faith, in the creed of Laterane under Innocent III beginning, Firmiter credimus, etc., where the truth of some things to be believed is declared, and that more plainly, than either in the Apostles' Creed, Athanasius's, or that of the Council of Nicea. Briefly, whatsoever is there said fit to be believed, we must hold to be of the Substance of faith. If you ask why the Church would make choice of so hard an understanding of this article, when the Scripture may be salved with an explication both more easy and in appearance more true, to this I say that the Scriptures are expounded by the same Spirit that made them. And we must imagine that the Catholic Church explains this to us with the same Spirit that it taught us our first faith, namely, the Spirit of truth. This opinion, both in the same sense and almost in the same words we may read in Biel (lect.

41, in Canon. Miss.), with this addition moreover: “That this ordination (of transubstantiation) was not known perhaps in the church until after the institution. And it is thought to have been first revealed unto the holy fathers or found out by them through their labor in explaining of the Scriptures.”

“Though Christ’s body,” says Petrus de Alliaco, in 4 Sen. q. 5, art. 2, Concl. 2, “as a quantity, and the bodily quantity thereof be in heaven, and in the sacrament, yet is it not in the sacrament as a quantitive body, or a bodily quantity. And again, q. 6, art. 2: “That manner (of consubstantiation) which says the substance of bread there remains, where the body of Christ begins to be, is possible and neither opposite to reason nor Scriptures. Nay, it is easier to understand, and more reasonable to conceive, than any of those that separate the substance from the accidents and make Christ’s body a non-substance. For this puts no accidents without a substance, which is one of the difficulties in this question. And therefore, it seems not any way inconvenient to follow the first way, if so be that the Church had so determined.” And again: “The fourth, and more common opinion is, that the substance of bread remains not, but ceases simply to have a being,, and though it be not so probable out of Scripture, nor in my judgment, out of the determination of the Church. Yet since it favors this opinion, as the common opinion of doctors and holy men, therefore I also do hold it.” Thus he.

“It is most plain,” says Durandus, in 4 dist. 11, q. 1, “that it is a rash part to say that Christ’s body by divine power cannot be in the sacrament otherwise than by having the bread converted into His substance.” And again: “But if that manner (which teaches the substance of bread to remain after consecration) were true, de facto, of the thing done, we should have many doubts taken away which fall about this sacrament, in teaching the bread does not remain. For

first, there is a doubt how anything can be nourished by this sacrament; and then how the forms may be corruptible, or how anything can have generation by them. All which doubts the other sense would clear. But because this way may not be held expressly, since the Church has determined on the contrary way, whom we presume not to err in such cases, therefore by holding expressly that side, we must answer unto the arguments on the contrary side." And in his third question: "Saving the reverence of a better judgment, it may be thought that in the sacrament there is a conversion of the substance of the bread into Christ's body, and that in this manner: the form of the bread being corrupted, the matter thereof is under the form of Christ's body, suddenly, and by the eternal power of God, as the matter of food or nourishment is under the form of that which it feeds by the power of nature." And afterwards: "Therefore said manner of the conversion is evidently possible; and the other (transubstantiation) is not intelligible, neither is the one more approved or reproved by the Church, than the other."

"Whereas the words of the Scriptures," says Cajetane, in 3 part., Thom., q. 75, art. 1, "are expounded two ways: either properly, or metaphorically. The first error in this point was theirs that interpreted these words of our Lord (this is my body) metaphorically, which the master of the Sentences, in his fourth book and tenth distinction, speaks of, who in this point is reproved. And the force of his reproof consists herein, that the Church understands these words properly, and it behooves them to be verified properly. I say the Church, for indeed there is not any forcible motive in the gospel to make these words be taken properly." But Joseph Angles, in florib. Theolog., in 4 dist. 11, q. 4, de Eucharistia, art. 1, admonishes us of circumspection in reading this place of Cajetane. "Seeing it is certain," says Ferus, in Mat. 26, "that Christ's body is there, what need we dispute whether the bread remain or no?" Thus he. Now

before the schoolmen's time, there was one Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, who in his forenamed Saxon sermon, which was wont to be read every feast of Easter in the English churches, speaks expressly against the same transubstantiation, and Bertram likewise in his book of the body and blood of Christ.

Adoration and Elevation of the Sacrament

1. The adoration in the sacrament belongs unto Christ sitting in heaven, and is an inward worship of the heart, or lifting up of the mind being stirred up with these outward signs. "The signs," says Augustine, de catech. rudi., cap. 26, "are visible sacraments of divine things, but invisible things are therein honored."

2. "If the worship be referred to the sacrament only, it is but a reverence, and no adoration, given as well to baptism as the supper," as testifies Augustine, de doctr. Christ., lib. 3, cap. 9.

3. Honorius III, anno 1220, was the first that ever instituted the adoration of the sacrament. And after him Urban IV ordained a feast in honor of the body of Christ.

4. The elevation of the host was used, not that it should be adored, but to signify the mystery of Christ taken down from the cross. Amalar., lib. 3, cap. 26. The priests' and deacons' elevation signify the taking down of our Lord from the cross. The host and the cup signify the Lord's body. And the liturgy of Chrysostom does not affirm that the elevation of the bread was used, that Christ therein should be adored: but the priest elevating the sacred bread cries out, holy to the holy.

The Appurtenances of the Mass, at This Day

1. The tapers that are now lighted in the church on the day at mass time, before and after the reading of the Gospel, are not approved by the fathers. “We light no torches on the day time,” says Jerome against Vigilantius; yet he confesses that they were lighted in the churches of the east, by some of ignorance, and by others that had zeal, but not according to knowledge, cap. 3. But Tertullian, de Idololat., says that this was the custom of heretics. And Lactantius wisely reprehends it, lib. 6, Instit., cap. 2, saying, “They do light up lamps unto God, as though He lived in the dark.” So does the Council of Elib.is, cap. 34.

2. The primitive church never used incense. “We buy no frankincense at all,” says Tertullian, apolog. 42. “We go not into Arabia to seek frankincense,” says Augustine, in Psal. 49, “It is the sacrifice of praise that God requires at our hands.” And Psalm 50: “Offer wisely, you have your offering within yourself, go not abroad to seek frankincense, but say, in me O God are Thy vows, the praises which I will give Thee.” Arnobius, in his 7th book against the Gentiles, infers many reasons against the burning of incense.

3. “The vessels wherein our sacraments are put and consecrated,” says Walfrid, cap. 24, de reb. eccles., “are cups and dishes. Pope Zephyrine ordained that the celebration should be performed with dishes of glass, and Urban after him caused them, and all other church vessels, to be made of silver. Thus, as in all the rest, so in this, has the churches’ gravity and state in ceremonies increased daily with the times.” Thus says he.

4. The linen vestures (be they albs or surplices) were at first the raiments of noblemen, and for honor's sake given unto priests, but not unto any monk, save only in divine service time, as Erasmus testifies in the life of Jerome. Theodoret, lib. 2, hist., ca. 27, relates that Constantine gave Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, a robe wrought with gold for him to use in baptism.

5. "The priests' ornaments," as Walfrid reports, "grew up by little and little unto the height that they now be in". For first they said their masses in common attire, as they do unto this day in some churches of the east. But Pope Stephen ordained that the priests should have holy vestures to wear in no daily use saving in the church. It was decreed in the Council of Bracarea that no priest should celebrate mass without a typet. Others added other vestures in the church, either in imitation of the habit of the ceremonial priests, or to bear some mystical signification. Thus says Walfrid, de reb. eccles., cap. 24. And indeed, the gaudy shows that are now used about the apparel of the mass were neither seen nor heard of in whole or part for about 400 years after Christ.

6. And for 800 years after Christ, there were but eight vestures used in all the whole mysteries of religion, as the said Walfrid, cap. 24, and Amalarius, lib. 2, c. 22, de offic. eccles., do both testify. Whereas now there are fifteen: six priestly vestures and nine of the bishops.

7. The clergy of antiquity, as well in the western as eastern church, did use to have the head polled, but not shaven as the papists have now, and which the fathers reprove. "The hairs of the head," says Clemens Alexandrinus, Pedag., lib. 3, capit. 11, "are to be cut, not with a razor, but with barber's scissors". "Show you," says Optatus to the Donatists, lib. 2, contr. Parm., "where you are commanded to have the priest's head shaven, whereas contrariwise innumerable

examples show that it is unlawful to be done". "We learn here," says Jerome upon the 44th of Ezekiel, "that we neither ought to be shaven to the bare, with razor, nor to be cut so near, that we seem as shaven, but let our hair grow, so that it covers our skin". As for the shaving used nowadays, the church thought not of it for many ages after Christ, for the first mention that was ever made of the shaving of the crown like a circle is in Germanus of Constantinople's Theoria. "The shaving of the priest," says he, "and the cutting of his hair round upon the crown, is in sign of the crown of thorns which Christ bare upon His head". This also is spoken of by Hugo Sanct., de Sacram. lib. 2, par. 3, c. 1; Lombard, lib. 4, dist. 24; Thomas and Bonaventure, being indeed all one with the shaving of the lay-penitents, as the Council of Agatha, cap. 2, and the third Council of Toledo, cap. 12, both record. As for the priests' modern shaving, it is absolutely condemned by the fourth Council of Toledo, canon. 40, in these words: "Let all clerks or readers, as the Levites and priests, polling their hair all their head over above, leave but a circle like a crown below (about their ears). Not as the readers do in some part of Galatia, who wearing their hair long, like laymen, do only clip a little circle in the top or crown of the head, for this the heretics in Spain do use unto this day". The Greeks used no round polling, as Bede in two places testifies, viz., hist. Eccl., lib. 4, cap. 1 and lib. 5, cap. 22.

8. The crown in the fathers signifies the episcopal glory, dignity, and reverence, or the hoariness of their hair, which to old men is as a crown. Or it may be the polling used in those days, not the wearing of the hair about the temples, and the crown shaven as the center of the circle. And so must that epistle of Jerome to a certain priest be understood: the crown upon the clerk's head signifies the kingdom they have in God. And that of Augustine, epist. 26: "I pray your crown to salute your two brethren, my Lords Alipius and Euodius, in my name."

9. The priest's cut, and the monk's, in ancient time (for all Baronius's talking, annal. tom. 1, p. 631), was both one. For both used to cut all their hair, leaving but a ring round about their ears (see, Tolet., Conc. 4, cap. 40).

10. The beginning of this clergy clipping was thus: the people at the first were delighted with long hair, which afterwards the clergy used to cut for soberness and modesty's sake. And this in process of time through a grown general use became a significant ceremony. So says Isidore, de offic. eccles. lib. 2, cap. 4: "The cutting of the hair, and leaving a circle below, I take to signify priesthood, and the rule of the church in them." And Amalar., de of., lib. 2, c. 5, says, "We bear our crown upon the lower part (of our head) when we do equalize with reason those necessaries of the world, which we ought to govern." Thus, of ceremony, superstition is grown.

11. Organs were erected about the year 660, as Platina says, in Vitaliano; about 820, as Aimonius says, de gest. Fran., lib. 4, cap. 114; not until after Aquinas's time, as Navarre witnesses, in lib. de orat. & hor. cano., c. 16. As for church music, in set songs, Gregory, in his 4th book, epi. 44, de gest. Sym, habitae in urbe, disallows it.

12. In the ancient church, such sincere simplicity was accepted that they never used any ceremony in their ordination of bishops, but only imposing of hands upon him. Afterwards crept in the ceremonies of delivery of a book and anointing of the hands of the priest with chrism. The hierarchy under Areopagita's name speaks of imposition of hands, but not of unction at all.

Penance Sacramental, and Satisfaction

1. The sacrament of penance arose from these beginnings: first, in the primitive church, the public penance with its rites was in use; not any private penance used, or at least not imposed. Afterwards about Gratian's time, anno 1130, entered the disputations of the necessity of private confession and satisfaction, getting footing, but not foundation until Peter Lombard. And he was the first that did aver it to be a proper sacrament. And the succeeding schoolmen could not agree about the matter and form thereof, for all his determination. But in the Council of Laterane, anno 1215, they made a judicial proceeding of confessing and absolution.

2. The fathers' satisfaction was an ecclesiastical and public mulct imposed upon the offenders, as this: that they should be put in some separate corner of the church, and there that in abstinence of meat, drink, and raiment, and also in tears and sorrows, they should at an appointed time acknowledge their offence, testify their repentance, and thereby satisfy the church whom they had offended, and which doubted of their repentance. This Saint Augustine testifies, Enchir., 65.

3. The satisfactions which are said to be made unto God were no redemptions of temporal pain, but actions and rites whereby the sinner thought to satisfy God's precept, commanding true and unfeigned repentance, and the fruits thereof, according to the manner and measure of the sin, whereby the actions became not only pleasing to the church, but even to God also. In this sense, Radulph. Ardens, in feria 4, in ca. Ieiunij, says, "Satisfaction for sins done consists in three things: in satisfaction of work, compunction of mind, and confession of mouth. And in this sense are alms called satisfaction; not that they are the price of our sins before God, but because they are signs of true and unfeigned repentance." This the fathers do approve, and Augustine for one, de Dogmat. eccl., ca. 54,

in these words: “The satisfaction of repentance is to cut off all causes of sin, and not to dally with the entrance of their instigations.”

“You shall mortify your inborn vices,” says Bede, in Psal. 4, “by bringing forth fruits worthy of penitence, everyone afflicting himself for every sin, as far as true and worthy repentance exacts.” And how confession abolishes our sins, the canon declares, c. Omnis qui. De paenitentia, distinct. 1, in these words: “Confession is made to show repentance, not to obtain pardon.” And in the same distinction, c. 1, Medicine, the gloss expounds these words, “alms do redeem sins,” thus, “do show them to be forgiven.”

Paludanus, in 4 dist. 25, denies that works can satisfy for sin, being otherwise due of themselves. And this phrase, “redeem your souls,” is reproved by Optatus, lib. 3, contra Parm. And Mark the Hermit, in his book de baptismo, denies that our sins can be abolished by prayer, fasting, gifts, humility, etc., but that such things are means to preserve us from relapse. And his reason for the first is because sins are taken away only by the cross of Christ.

Here it is not amiss to recite a saying of Lauspergus, a Carthusian, not so tedious as it is true and religious: “I would not have you think,” says he, “that you can do penance for your sins. Do not dream of it. Why? Because your sins are in number above the sands of the sea, too, too many, and all too great. You are not able to satisfy for one; what can you do for many, for innumerable? Think not therefore that you can do works satisfactory for your sins. For what, alas, can you account of these, in respect of the many mountains of your enormities? They that do great good works and commit but small offences, they satisfy for their sins. But whatsoever you do, refer it to God’s glory. And what good soever you do, think and resolve you have done it for His pleasure. Let the honor, the love, and

the good will and pleasure of God, be the motives unto all your good works. Do all things to please Him, to win His favor, to purchase His friendship, to honor Him, that fulfilling His pleasure, you be not offensive to Him. And yet think all your works of far smaller moment than able to satisfy for your sins. For, for them you must offer unto God the works of Jesus Christ, His sorrows, wounds, death, in the union of that love wherein He endured all these for you. These are the means of your satisfaction; but whatsoever you do, or suffer, offer it not unto God for your sins, but for His love and good pleasure; either do, or suffer, still wishing increase of grace from Him, whereby you may perform greater, more and more acceptable works. Wherefore let the love of God be the cause of your good life, and the scope and level of all your good works." Thus said a friar.

4. Among the Latins, the word satisfacere is sometimes used for "to please another in executing of some office." "I," says Tully, lib. 1, epist. 1, "in all duty and zeal, do rather satisfy, or please all others, but not myself at all." Besides, satisfaction among men is the recompense made for an injury, either in retribution of damage, or in obtaining of pardon by submission. And after this second way, are works of repentance termed satisfactory before God, being real supplications for pardon, which God in Christ approves.

"It behooves the deacon whom you write of, to satisfy the bishop that governs him, with perfect humility," says Cyprian, lib. 3, cap. 9. And, lib. 1 epist. 3, "They pray that Christ would be entreated with prayers and satisfactions. And I embrace with ready and perfect charity, those that turn from their sins with repentance, and confess them with humble and simple satisfaction." And, ad Demetrianum, he exhorts the faithful to satisfy God, while they have time here upon earth. But this can be nothing but to beseech Almighty God for remission of sins, and to acknowledge them.

And the effect of this satisfaction he affirms to be the attaining of pardon. “The acknowledging of sin, and entreaty of pardon, is a satisfaction not unto the strictness of the Judge, but unto His mercy,” as Cyprian says very well in another place; that is, unto God’s merciful acceptance. And very rightly: “For these acts of the penitent do include in themselves a faith laying hold upon Christ’s satisfaction, by which they have their acceptance.” And in this sense, Chrysostom, hom. de B. Philogonio, says that, “If you return from your old sins wholly, and promise unto God truly that you will never turn again unto them, God requires no more for a further satisfaction.”

5. “So then the works of piety are called satisfactions, as they are referred unto our prayers. God takes away the sin,” says Mark the Hermit, lib. De baptisimo, “which we entreat for by alms, prayers, and patience.” “Our sighs and sorrow,” says Climacus, de memor. mortis, grad. 7, “do cry out unto God, and our tears do go the embassy of fear.” “God’s mercy is obtained by the entreaty of alms,” says Radul. Ardens, homil. in dom. 1. quad., “so that satisfactions are such, by the means of obtaining in prayer.” “Wherefore it behooves us to believe that we must repent,” says Ambrose, de paenitent., lib. 1, ca. 8, “and shall obtain pardon, and yet to hope for pardon out of faith, not as of debt. It is one thing to deserve, and another thing to presume. Faith obtains as it were from covenant in writing, but presumption is nearer the arrogant than the suppliant.”

6. In process of time the doctrine of satisfaction began to be delivered and taught in unfit and ill-applied terms, as when the fathers say that hereby our sins are redeemed, expiated, purged, and purified, etc. “The general Lord of us all,” says Chrysostom, hom. 1, in Genes., “desiring to purge away all that ever we have offended, has found out a cure thereof, which is performed by fasting.” “Alms-

deeds do cleanse the whole man," says Prosper, lib. de promiss. & praed., part. 2, c. 7. "If we be contaminated with any spot," says Leo, Serm. 2, de Collectis, "by conversing in this earthly habitation, it may be wholly washed out by the power of alms-deeds." "The man that has undone himself, by his own satisfaction may redeem himself," says Caesarius, hom. 1. And Chrysologus, Hom. 42, holds that fasting opens the gates of heaven, and lets us in unto God. "Alms extinguishes sin," says Maximus Taurinensis, hom. de diversis, "even as baptism does, and puts out the fire of hell. So that alms is as a second fount of purgation for the soul." But here we must note that the fathers speak not in the papistical sense of remission of any temporal pains, but speak wholly and absolutely of the whole crime, and whole punishment together, so that they speak both in these and in other like cases after a figurative metonymy, by which that is given to the means, way, instrument, and occasion, which in itself is due and proper unto another. For it is the only blood of Christ which is the satisfaction and purgation of all the sins of the world, as the fathers themselves acknowledge. "There is but one expiation for sin," says Basil, in cap. primo Esay, "namely, that blood which was offered and shed for the salvation of all the world." And Ambrose, in Luc. 22, and serm. 46, says that "Tears do wash away and purge our sins," and yet he adds in express terms, "I read of Peter's tears, but not of his satisfaction." "It is a common phrase with us to say, this journey has made me rich; and the pardoning of an injury is not the cause of the forgiveness, but the article and condition upon which the pardon is given." So said Adrian unto Frederik. "We have given you the ensign of the imperial crown, that is, our hands have consecrated and crowned you," Sigon. de Regno Italia, lib. secundo.

7. The fathers say in like manner that the works of penitence do take away our sins, but not by themselves, but only in respect that they are annexed unto that faith which apprehends and lays hold upon

Christ for the remission of sins. Look at the place of Ambrose, cited in the 5th section of this article: “I do not deny,” says the same saint, De paenit., lib. 2, c. 9, “that sin may be diminished by extending often our bounty unto the poor, but then must your faith approve your alms and expenses.” Look also at his 1st book, and 30th chapter of his offices.

8. Sometimes the fathers use a hyperbolical metaphor in their phrases. “As oft as we give alms after our sins,” says Gregory, in Job 12, cap. 14, “so often we do, as it were, pay a price for our evil deeds.” And lib. 6, in 1 Regum, cap. 15: “The third kind, that is, revenge (for sin), is as a necessary medicine, that the impostume of guilt which we lance in our conversion, be purged by confession, and cured by the salve of affliction.” Thus the fathers have alms to obtain us justice and salvation, but this is figuratively spoken, not properly, for such things as we bestow upon the poor, they say we ‘lend unto God,’ after the Scripture phrase, and that He becomes our debtor, who pays back the whole sum with profit, a hundred fold, as Chrysostom says, Hom. 3, in Gen. And Gregory, lib. 7, epist. 20, says, “Whatsoever is given unto the poor, if it be well considered, is not given, but lent, because that which is laid out, is doubtless returned with a multiplied gain.”

9. Again, “Our sins are taken away after a double manner: first, in respect of the guilt, and fault, and this is called remission, being peculiar unto God alone; second, in respect of the exercise of sin, which is termed purgation, wherein the exercise of sin is ceased.” “To have our sins absolved, and to have them remitted,” says Jerome, in Isai. 40, “are two several things. For he that has his sins remitted, needs not absolution, but he that has them absolved, has them so because they are purged and loosed by punishment.” And in this sense, says the same father, in Jerem. 2, that “Sins are purged by

warnings." "The expiation," says Radulphus, in Levit., lib. 12, ca. 2, "belongs unto Christ, but the cleansing to ourselves." So that there is a double satisfaction in the fathers: expiatory, which belongs unto Christ alone; and amendatory, or approbatory, which they will have to belong unto ourselves. "Turn unto your Father with true satisfaction," says Pacianus, paranes. de paenit., "running no further in errors, heaping no more unto your old sins, and in saying some lamenting and mournful prayer, as this: 'We have offended before Thine eyes.'" "In this sense," says Hugo de Sanct. Victore, de sacramantis, lib. 2, part. 14, c. 2, "that sin is punished and corrected by satisfaction, and that satisfaction is the correction of the offence." Eucherius, in lib. Regum, lib. 2, says that "Both David's guilt and ours (for the fault already pardoned) is purged and absolved by afflictions, because God endeavors to wipe away all spots of iniquity from His elect, by temporal afflictions." "It is a worthy satisfaction to correct our offences, and having corrected them to beware of them," etc., says Bernard, de domo interior., cap. 1. And in this sense, they do take redemption.

10. The fathers will have great sins taken away by public penance, and small sins by saying of the Lord's Prayer (see Augustine, Enchir., ca. 71). And Augustine likewise will have this prayer to take away great sins also (de civit. Dei, lib. 22, c. 27). So that this kind of speech is to be understood comparatively: that it should not be thought requisite to use public penance for all sins; the difference is in the exterior discipline, which sets down a diversity of penance in great and small offences. And if that venial sins be taken away by the Lord's Prayer, to what end serves the punishment of Purgatory after death?

11) Secret satisfaction for sins was never used but in the corrupted estate of the church. Besides, satisfaction in the fathers goes before

absolution, by which the sinners by imposition of hands received lib.ty to communicate, and remission of sins. But at this day it is otherwise in the Church of Rome. Wherefore satisfaction, taken as the redemption of the temporal pain only, after the remission of the guilt of the sin, and following the absolution, was unknown to the fathers.

Purgatory

1. Tertullian, a Montanist, and Origen were the first that ever talked of purgatory in the church. And yet Origen will have purgatory to be in this life (in Levit., lib. 8, apud Cyrillum), and also to remain even after the resurrection (hom. 14, in Luc.). “In sum,” says Tertullian (de anima, cap. 55 and ultimo), “since we understand that prison that the gospel speaks of to be hell, and do interpret, that to pay the very last penny, every slender sin shall be there punished during the stay of the resurrection, none need to doubt that the soul shall pay anything in hell by the body also, after the fulfilling of the resurrection. This also the Comforter has often commended. If any man admit his speeches, by the acknowledging of his promised graces….” Roffensis against Luther, artic. 18, confesses that purgatory was long unknown, and lately known and received into the church; and so, after men began to be afraid of the fire of purgatory, in crept indulgences.

2. Afterwards the fathers fell to speak, both of the manner of the pain, and of purgatory itself, but not as of an article of faith, but only of a probable thing probably. “It is not incredible,” says Augustine (Enchirid., ca. 67 & 69), “that some such thing should be after this life, it may be demanded whether it be so or no, and it may either be known or unknown, that some of the faithful, as their love to

temporal things has been more or less, so are saved either sooner or later, by a certain purging fire." And (de civit. Dei, lib. 21, cap. 26): "But whether it be there alone, or there and here, or here alone, that these parts of the worldly building, pardonable from damnation, shall find a burning fire of transitory tribulation, I do not dispute against it. It may be it is true." And (de fide & op., cap. 16): "Whether therefore some such judgments follow us in this life only, or after this life also, it does not (as I think) disagree from truth, if we understand this sentence in this manner." Jerome (in Isa., lib. 28, cap. ultimo, ad finem) would have such things left wholly unto the knowledge and judgment of God, and yet he says that he thinks that there is a moderate and gentle sentence of the Judge concerning the burning away of the sins of Christians. "Do you leave no punishment for the souls," says one in Boetius (in Prosp. 4, lib. de Consolat. Philosophie), "when the bodies are dead?" "Yes, and that great," says another, "part whereof is exercised in penal bitterness, and part (I think) in purgatory clemency."

3. But contrariwise, the fathers do expressly raze the foundation of the popish purgatory. "There is no middle place," says Augustine (lib. de pec. mor. & rem., cap. 28), "that a man may be anywhere, but with the devil, who is not with Christ." And the author of Hypognost., lib. 5, says: "We acknowledge no third place at all." "When we once depart from hence," says Cyprian (tract. ad Demetr.), "there is no more place of penance, nor no more effect of satisfaction." "The guilt being taken away," says Tertullian (De Baptismo), "so is the punishment." "Sin is so utterly abolished in the remission," says Chrysostom (De paenit. Ser. 3), "that no print of it is left remaining." And (in Genes., hom. 5): "He that has not purged away his sins in this life, shall find no comfort in the life to come. This is the time of acting, and of wrestling, and striving; that is, for coronation and reward."

And hom. 69, ad pop. Ant.: “The just that depart hence, are altogether happy, for they are gone to Christ, they are with the King, and there most near Him, not by faith, but face to face.” (Hom. 69, ad pop. Ant.) And again, hom. 16, in ep. ad Ro.: “Death severs not us from Christ but joins us unto that quiet which is with Him, and makes us partakers of that glory.” (Hom. 16, in ep. ad Ro.) “Here only is the place for mercy;” says Bede, in Psal. 6, “after this world is place only for justice.” (Bede, in Psal. 6) “After the departure of soul out of the body,” says the author of the question in Justin, quest. 75, “presently distinction is made of the good and the evil, and both are led by angels to the places provided for them; the souls of the good unto paradise, where they enjoy the blessed company of angels, and of their Savior, Christ.” (Justin, quest. 75) “The saints in honor, they rest in glory, and their departure from hence is into perfection,” says Epiph., Haer. 78, sub finem. (Epiph., Haer. 78) “The preachers of the church,” says Anselm, in 2 Cor. 5, “departing from their bodies, are not deferred from the enjoying of their heavenly country, by spacious delays, as the old fathers were, but instantly upon their leaving of the flesh, they do rest in heavenly faith.” (Anselm, in 2 Cor. 5) “What is it to you,” says Bernard, epist. 266, “and your earthly vestures, that being about to go to heaven, hast the robe of glory to put on instantly?” (Bernard, epist. 266) And Otho Frisingensis, in his Chron., lib. 8, ca. 26, says that some affirm that there is a purgation place in hell, wherein the souls of those that are to be saved, are either punished with darkness only, or with the fire of expiation also. (Otho Frisingensis, Chron., lib. 8, ca. 26) “If we look upon Him with a right faith, that for our sins hung upon a tree,” says Lombard, Sen. 3, dist. 19, lit. A, “we are loosed from the bands of the devil, that is, from our sins; and we are so loosed, that He shall find nothing in us punishable after this life, because by that His death as the only true sacrifice, what fault soever we had in us whereby the devil might bind us to punishment, Christ so extinguished, that the devil cannot

prevail over us by tempting, no, not in this life." (Lombard, Sen. 3, dist. 19)

4. The ancient Greek and Latin fathers believed that the souls of the dead were kept all in one common receptacle out of heaven until the resurrection. So holds Lactantius, in his work de divino praemio, lib. 7, cap. 21. (Lactantius, de divino praemio, lib. 7, cap. 21) And Irenaeus, in fine, lib. 5. (Irenaeus, lib. 5) Tertullian likewise against Marcion, lib. 4, capit. 35, and in his book, de anima, cap. 55, where he says that every soul is sequestered in the lower places, until the judgment day. (Tertullian, adv. Marcionem lib. 4 cap. 35; de anima cap. 55) So holds Justin. (Justin) And even the canon of the mass, which prays for the region of light and peace unto all men. So that they admitted not this purgatory.

5. The fathers say that all sins, even mortal, are purged and remitted by this purgatory fire. So says Origen, in Jerome, hom. 13: "If our sin be mortal, we cannot be purged with nitre or borith (which is a kind of herb), but with the spirit of justice, the spirit of burning and punishment." (Origen in Jerome, hom. 13) And hom. 24, in Num., he says that all that we carry with us, is to be tried by fire or water. (Origen, hom. 24 in Num.) "That prayer," says the book that is called Dionys. Hierar. Ecclesiast., page 3, cap. 7, "intreats God's clemency to pardon the dead for all sins committed through human infirmity." (Dionys. Hierar. Ecclesiast., p. 3 cap. 7) "The offerings for the dead," says Theophyl., in Luc. 12, "are of no small value for those that died even in great sins." (Theophyl., in Luc. 12) "Some," says Bede, in Psal. 37, "commit greater venial sins, and some lesser, and therefore it is meet to have them put into the fire of purgatory, now in the space between this and the judgment." (Bede, in Psal. 37)

6. The fathers teach also that all are to be purged by fire, as well the saints of God, as the infidels. “All must come to the fire, all must come to this

“Furnace,” says Origen, in Exod., hom. 6. And, in Psal. 36, hom. 3 (as I think), “It is necessary for us all to come to that fire.” “The sons of Levi,” says Ambrose, in Psal. 36, “shall be purged with fire, and so Ezekiel likewise with fire, and Daniel also. But although these shall be tried by fire, yet they shall say, we have passed by fire and water.” And, in Psal. 118, oct. 20, “While we live here, let us keep our humility, that when any of us do come unto the judgment of God, and unto those fires which we are to pass through, He may say,” besides a little before, “‘It behooves all men to pass through these flames,’ whether it be John the Evangelist or Peter.”

7. The place wherein there is no water, which Zachariah speaks of, cap. 9, signifies the pains eternal, after Jerome, and the depth of human misery, after Augustine, de civit. Dei, lib. 18, cap. 35.

8. The fathers also speak very often of a purgatory in the last judgment, that is, of the pains which are to be suffered not immediately after death, but after the resurrection. For they affirm that all men except Christ are to be tried, and in some sort to be tried with the fire of burning in the day of judgment. “I think,” says Origen, in Luc., hom. 14, “that after the resurrection from the dead, we shall all need a purging, and purifying sacrament, for none can arise again without some stains.” And this also he affirms in divers other places of his works, viz., in Psal. 36, hom. 3; in com. in epist. ad Rom., lib. 8 in fine; in Jerome, hom. 13. And Lactantius, de divin. praem., lib. 7, cap. 21, says that there is a trial to be made by the fire, when God has judged all men. “Out of this which is already spoken,” says Augustine, de civit. Dei, lib. 20, cap. 25, “we do plainly see that

there are some that in that judgment shall be punished with certain purging fires." "After the end of the world," says Ambrose, in Psal., 118, Serm. 3, "this shall be the future baptism, when iniquity shall be burned away by the furnace, that the just may shine as the sun in the kingdom of God." Look also the other places of this father, viz., in Psal. 118, Sermon 20; in Psal. 36, ad verba, Framea peccatorum. As also Jerome upon Isaiah, in fine, and also upon Amos, cap. 3, who nevertheless upon the same later prophet, cap. 9, overthrows the same point of purgatory. Look also Hilary, in Psal. 118, upon the words Concupinit anima mea justitiam. And Basil, in Isa., cap. 4, upon the words Expurganit Jerusalem.

9. Although Gregory by his apparitions and visions do make for purgatory, yet in his dialogues (or rather some others), he speaks not confidently, as the papists do, but with a plain doubtfulness. "Herein," says he, Dialog, lib. quarto, c. 58, "we must consider that it is a safer way for a man to do that good himself in his own life, which he hopes to obtain at others' hands after his death." And indeed, Gregory in his unforged works, flatly overthrows purgatory. "Because we are redeemed by the grace of our Creator," says he, in Job, lib. 13, cap. 20, "we have this heavenly gift bestowed upon us, that when we leave our carnal habitation, immediately we are carried unto our heavenly rewards, because seeing that our Maker and Redeemer breaking up the gates of hell, took thence all the souls of the elect, surely He suffers not us to go thither from whence He brought all the rest in His descension."

10. That place of Paul which speaks of the trial by fire (1 Corinthians 3:13, 15), by the common consent of the ancient fathers, was never spoken nor intended of purgatory. For first of all, by the builders, Augustine understands all Christians (Enchirid. 68). Others, the ministers and preachers of the gospel, as do Ambrose, Sedulius,

Anselm, Thomas, Lyra, and Cajetane, all upon this place. Second, by the name of straw or stubble, some do understand mortal sins, as Chrysostom and Theophylact. Others, heresies, as Ambrose upon this place, and Jerome in Isaiah 5. Others, bad hearers, as Theodoret and Oecumenius. Others, carnal affections, as Augustine in his book De Fide et Operibus, chapter 16. Third, by that day, they do understand the day of the last judgment, no middle day; and so do Theodoret, Theophylact, and Anselm understand it. Fourth, by the fire some understand the tribulations of this present life, so does Augustine (De Fide et Operibus, cap. 16), and so does Gregory in his Dialogues, book 4, chapter 39. Others take it for the eternal fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact; others for the fire that shall consume the world; and others for the fire of God's judgment, which they affirm shall not purge and afflict, but prove and try, as the Jesuits hold.

11. But the foundation of the popish purgatory (namely, that the guilt being abolished, some penal satisfaction is to be undergone) was never received by the learned teachers of the church for at least 1,100 years after Christ. Lombard indeed teaches that there is pain of purgatory to be endured after this life, but not after the full and plenary remission of the fault. For he will have such a fault as is remitted in part to be reserved for the temporal pain to abolish (lib. 4, dist. 20). Wherefore a purgatory, supposed to be between death and the last judgment, serving only for the purgation of venial sins by temporal pains, was unknown to the fathers of the first 600 years.

Sacramental Confession

1. Auricular confession, that is, the special recitation of all mortal sins, necessary for the remission thereof, made in secret unto a

priest, began to be urged and commanded in the church about 800 years after Christ. Alcuine (De Divinis Officiis, cap. 13, in cap. ieiun) taught it in these words: “Being willing to forgive all that have offended against him, let him confess all his sins which he can remember.” “We find this thing needful of reformation,” says the Second Council of Chalons (cap. 32), “that many confessing their sins unto the priests do it not fully nor perfectly. Wherefore, because that a man is made of two substances, soul and body, and sins sometimes by the motion of the mind and other times by the frailty of the flesh, both these kinds of sin ought to be very narrowly searched after, that a plenary confession may be made thereof accordingly. Namely, that both the sins that have been committed by the body be confessed, as also by the sole cogitation. Wherefore he that is to confess his sins is to be instructed to make his confession of the eight principal sins, without which we can hardly live in this world.” “The priests must call those parties to confession that are in danger of death,” says the Council of Mentz in Gregory IV’s time (cap. 26). Now we have indeed some examples of this private confession before these times, but no precept at all. Andoenus, in the life of Saint Eligius (lib. 1, cap. 7), says that he, desiring to make himself a sanctified vessel unto God and fearing lest some of his sins might darken his soul, confessed all his acts from his very youth.

Before the priest. But indeed, this use had its first invention in monasteries. “Before all things,” says Climacus, in Scala paradisi grad. 4, circa anno 580, “let us confess our faults unto our worthy Judge alone, and if He command us, let us be ready to confess them unto all men.” And Studites, in his funeral oration upon the death of Saint Plato, c. 8, says, and (which was more laudable) he did often confess his secretest thoughts and deeds unto one that was his superior, which was a great sign of his religion. And truly, the most strict manner wherewith he did it, made him that heard his

confession to be amazed with admiring of him. But to speak truly, this universal law enjoining to confession, as to a necessary act of salvation, was not promulgated until the Council of Lateran under Innocent III, Pope.

2. That this kind of confession had the institution from God, divers learned men have either denied, or doubtfully affirmed. Chrysostom refuses it flatly, Hom. 4, de Lazaro. “Take heed,” says he, “how you tell your defects unto a man, lest he cast you in the teeth withal. You are not to confess unto your fellow servant, that he may divulge it, but unto Him that is your Lord, to Him that cares for your soul, to Him that is most courteous, to Him that is your physician do you show your wounds.” And indeed, this father tosses this doctrine of confession in many places, viz., hom. 2, in Psal. 50; hom. 31, in Epist. ad Heb.; hom. 5, de incomprehensib. nat. Dei; hom. 8, de paen. hom. de paenit. & confessione. And so does Cassian, in his Collations, 20, cap. 8. And Augustine also, Confession., lib. 10, c. 3. And indeed, private confession of great crimes was abrogated about the year 396, by reason of the discovery of a whoredom committed between a deacon and a noble woman, as history testifies (Hist. tripart., lib. 9, c. 36). But if the fathers had thought it to have been a divine ordinance, doubtless it should never have been disannulled by them. And the gloss, de Paenit., dist. 5, cap. 1, in Paenitentia, says that it is better to say that it was instituted by a tradition of the universal church, rather than by the authority of the Old or New Testament. And Gratian himself staggers in this question, De Paenit, d. 1, q. 3, c. 89, Quamvis, “Upon what authority, or upon what grounds of reason both these opinions of satisfaction or confession do rely, we have briefly laid down. But which of them to stick unto, I leave unto the reader’s choice, for there are both wise and religious men on both opinions.” Here he allows every man his judgment free, therefore he thought it not to be of divine institution. And, dist. eadem c.

Convertimini. “Here may we understand that we may obtain pardon though our mouths be silent, and…our Lord shows that a sinner is not cleansed by the judgment of the priests, but by the bounty of the divine grace.” And yet farther, cap. Quis aliquando. “Hence it is most evidently apparent, that our sins may be taken away without the confession of the mouth.” Panormitane, De paenit. & remiss., ca. Omnes utriusq, sexus, likes that opinion very well, that says that confession arose from a certain general tradition of the church, and that the Greeks do not sin in not using of it, because this custom sprung not up among them. And Scotus, in sent. 4, dist. 17, quest. 1, is very doubtful to say it is of divine institution. Either we must hold the first member, that is, that it is of divine institution published by the gospel, or if that be not sufficient, we must say that it is of the divine positive law published by Christ, unto the apostles, and unto the church, by the apostles, without all Scripture, as the church holds many other things from the apostles’ mouths without any Scripture. “Among the writers of the pope’s law,” says Rhenanus, in argumentum in Tertull. de paenitent., “there are some (and those famous men), which do

Draw this confession, which at this day we use unto the priest, and every little circumstance thereof, from the institution of the church. For first, public confession, that is, the act of penance done before the whole church, as taken out of the Old Testament, of public seems to have been made private, for which it was necessary…to make certain laws for penances…for satisfaction, and observation of which laws, it was fit (for the laity especially) to make a priest partaker of their secrets and counsel.” And again, “This secret confession (as far as we can conjecture) sprung out of that public one, through men’s voluntary piety, for we read no precept of old for it.” And like unto this has he another place, in admonitione de Tertullian Dogmatis, where he says, “Concerning secret confession, you shall scarcely find

any of the fathers speak of it as of a thing commanded." Thus said he. Cajetane, upon the 20th of John, affirms: 1. That Christ instituted but a voluntary confession, and therefore not as necessary to salvation; and 2. That Christ instituted no auricular confession.

By confession in the fathers is generally meant confession before God (only) or a public acknowledgement of some public crimes incurring the censure of excommunication, and that in an ecclesiastical convention. Of the necessity of this they speak very often. Yea, Origen, in Psal. 37, hom. 2, and Cyprian, De lapsis, serm. 5, do exhort the people to make a public recitation of all their small and secret sins, and of all their evil intentions. Leo also, ep. 80, mentions this custom of writing down the secrets of their consciences that made confession into a little book, and in rehearsing of it publicly in the audience of the people; and holds this fullness of faith to be laudable, which for the fear of God, sticks not to blush before men. But yet he disallows the custom and abolishes it in these words: "Let the guilt of the consciences be shown only unto the priests in secret confession." And by and by after: "Let that confession suffice which is first offered unto God, and then unto the priest, who becomes an intercessor unto God for the sin of the penitents." But there is no proof to show that this secret confession was universal, of all the sins, but it rather seems to concern such offences only as did trouble the conscience. "Let us open the uncleanness of our souls' leprosy unto the priest, as the law commands us," says Bede, in Jacob 5.

And wheresoever the fathers do urge this same special confession, they do not teach it to be necessary unto salvation, nor as a mean universally necessary unto the remission of sins, but propose it freely, and exact it as a good and commodious course for the obtaining of consolation for the soul. Yea, they make mention of confession unto laymen, for such were the fathers of the Egyptian

monks, and yet they did absolve. Theon said unto Serapion, confessing his sin of theft, “Be of good courage son, your confession absolves you from your bondage, though I hold my peace.”

Therefore, secret confession, wherein is necessarily required a recounting of all a man’s mortal sins, together with the circumstances that alter the kind, and wherein the priests alone that are the confessors do sit as spiritual judges, and impose satisfaction upon the penitents according to the quality of the sins, was never received of the Church until the later times.

Confirmation; Chrism

1. The chrism, or anointing of the baptized (which was used in antiquity), had its institution from Sylvester, as Platina says in his life. He it was that first made a law of the use of chrism in baptism, which before was either free or none. Athanasius, Contra Arian, orat. 2, tells the Arian that Christ was never anointed with external oil, and infuses the Spirit into us without any such ceremony. Eusebius, lib. 1, cap. 4, says that the Christians are no more anointed by types and figures, but by the virtues themselves alone.

And indeed in Justin the Martyr’s time there was no use of chrism in baptism. Augustine, Adversus Judaeos, cap. 4, says that, “Christ was He that changed the carnal (or real) unction into spiritual.” And Jerome, Adversus Luciferianos, dialog. 4, says that confirmation by unction was rather instituted for the honor of priesthood than for any bond of necessity.

2. There be some of the fathers, as Cyprian and Tertullian, which do either fall flatly into Montanism, or at least do foully err, in ascribing more unto this chrism than unto the water of baptism. For they will

have it to consummate the work that Christ has begun in baptism (Cyprian, ep. 70, 72, 73). And what they give to this unction, they give in like manner to the sign of the cross. Cyprian, epist. 73, says that the baptized are consummate and perfected by this sign. And Tertullian, de resurrectione carnis, says that the flesh is signed that the soul may be fenced.

3. As for the use of oil, in antiquity it was common and vulgar in baths after washing, whence perhaps it crept into baptism. Yea, they used to pour oil into their water. Celsus prescribes to sweat in the hot house, and there to anoint, and by and by to go down into the bath.

4. This chrism now, that the fathers mention, is quite different from the papists' confirmatory unction. The fathers' was common oil, and so often called and mentioned by that name, the papists' must have balsam therein mixed (Fabianus epist. 2), which is a substance now not to be had uncounterfeit. Look at Pliny's natural history, lib. 12, c. 25.

5. The fathers used their chrism not only in the forehead, but in other parts of the body also. "This holy oil," says Cyril, Catecheses, 3, mystagog., "is the gift of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, made powerful by the presence of His divinity, wherewith the forehead, and the organs of the senses are figuratively anointed, and the body in like manner with this visible unction, but the soul is sanctified with the holy and quickening Spirit." That it was used upon the nose, ears, and eyes, the Trullan synod testifies, cap. 95.

6. This unction (in the fathers' times) belonged unto baptism as an appendix and a ceremony, sometimes used before baptism, sometimes after, as it was in the east church for many years after Christ. "By chrism are represented the gifts bestowed in baptism," says Basil, De spiritu sancto, cap. 28. "Those that are to be baptized

are anointed like champions," says Chrysostom, in Coloss. 2, hom. 6. "Remember this mystery of holy baptism," says Theodoret, in Cant. c. 1, "wherein those that are to receive it, being anointed with the chrism of spiritual unction, under that visible form of anointing, do receive the invisible grace of the Holy Spirit." Nazianzen, orat. 40, in Sanct. Baptism., says that, "In baptism, the soul and the body are sealed with the unction of the Spirit." And so says Damascene, De fide, lib. 4, cap. 10: "We admit," says the Synod in Trullo, cap. 95, "the Arians, Macedonians, and Novatians that give up a bill of their faith, and curse and abjure all heresy, and all doctrine which the holy catholic and apostolic church allows not of, and first of all, signing their forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears with holy chrism, we say, the seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost." "Holy baptism, and unction," says Theophylact, in Naum. cap. 2, "are great and solid monuments, unto which all are to make haste, that are not yet endued with the blessing of Christianity." "Because baptism is a type of the burial and resurrection of our Lord," says Theodorus Balsamon, ad c. 48, Syn. Trul., "therefore those that are baptized are justly anointed with chrism, that they may be buried and rise again together with Christ." "It is necessary," says Simeon of Thessalonica, De Mysteriis, li. 2, "that every faithful Christian be signed herewithal in his baptism, that he that is baptized, may have his baptism most divine and consummate."

7. This unction (we speak of now) pertained unto baptism in the west until above 300 years after Christ. For then was there another confirmatory unction devised by Melchiades, or as some say, before him by Urban I. Howsoever it was before used, as we have said. "After their baptism he signs his soldiers in their foreheads," says Tertullian (De praescript., ca. 36, 40). "We are to know," says Bede (in Psal. 26), "that that unction which is done by the bishops, with imposition of hands, is different from the other two, and called by

the name of confirmation, is indeed all one with the second (to wit, whereby we become professors of Christ), but because of arrogance, it is not granted unto every one of the priests, no more than many other like things." Jerome (Contra Lucifer, cap. 4) says that neither priest nor deacon has power to baptize without chrism, and the bishop's commandment.

8. The anointing in baptism was used by the fathers as a significant sign of the preparation unto the fight and contention with the devil, whereas now the unction that the papists use is a sign of a sacrament distinct from baptism, and yet unto the same end and use. "Your breasts are anointed," says Cyril (Cateches. 3, Mystag.), "that being armed with the breastplate of righteousness, you may resist the devil's assaults more strongly." "By baptism," says Nazianzene (Orat. 40), "you have fortified yourself, and have provided you of a most firm and during help, signing your body and soul with the unction and the Spirit." "They that are to be baptized," says Chrysostom (in Coloss., hom. 6), "are anointed like champions, or as those that are to run a course." "The anointing of the baptized with oil," says Germanus (in Theoria), "is to this end: that the devil should not overcome us with his power of sin and death." Look also the saying of Theophylact, cited section 6. "By the benefit of this unction," says the author de unctione Chrism. apud Cyprian, "both wisdom and understanding is given us from above, and counsel and fortitude comes down upon us from heaven."

"We come unto the fount," says Ambrose (de Sacram. lib. 1, c. 2); "you enter, and are anointed as a champion of Christ, as one that is to undergo the fight of this world," etc. "The name of Christ," says Prosper (in sentent. Augustine, Sent. 342), "is derived from chrism, that is from unction. Wherefore because of this, every Christian is sanctified, so that he may understand that he is not only partaker

both of priestly, and of kingly dignity, but also made a warrior against the devil." "By the anointing of chrism in baptism," says Rabanus Maurus (Inst. Cleric., lib. 1, c. 28), "the Holy Spirit gives vigor of heavenly grace unto all the faithful. Therefore," says he, "that chrism is well used in baptism." Now the schoolmen will have chrism in confirmation used to the same effect and end. "The perfection of confirmation," says Thomas (in Sent. 4, dist. 7, q. 3), "is to make a man stand strongly in himself." And a little after: "The child is made fit for the conflict, with this sacrament." And Soto (in Sent. 4, dist. 7, art. 7) says that, "By confirmation a man is made a warrior."

9. The fathers did not hold their chrism and imposition of hands to give grace by the work wrought, or by doing of the bare action, but used it as a sign, signifying the powerfulness of the Spirit which is given in baptism: "Calling him out that is (thus) anointed, unto these sacred conflicts, in type or figure," says the book of the Hierarchy (cap. 2, part. 3). "The gift of the Holy Ghost," says Origen (hom. 8, in Levit.), "is signified by the figure of oil." "Your forehead and your other senses are anointed, typically," says Cyril (Catech. 3). But this anointing was accounted of small effect, without the invocations which they used therewithal, as the fathers themselves do testify. "The hands are put upon them by benediction, with invocation, and calling upon the Holy Ghost," says Tertullian (lib. De baptismo).

"Imposition of hands," says Augustine (De bapt., lib. contra Donat., cap. 16), "what is it but prayer over the person?" "I do not deny," says Jerome (Adversus Lucifer), "but that it is a custom in some churches for the bishops to go, and with invocation of the Holy Spirit, put his hands upon those that are baptized by the priests and deacons, in smaller cities afar off. But nowadays it is held a true doctrine, that this unction gives grace, and confirms truly and properly, whereas in

ancient times there was no sacramental confirmation used without baptism, and the Lord's Supper."

10. It was once a custom to give the infants this confirmatory chrism immediately after their baptism. As witness, Innocent I (epist. 1); Augustine (De eccle. dogmat., c. 52); Ordo Romanus; and Amalarius (De eccl. off., lib. 4, cap. 29). Now it must be differed (at least it is so in the general practice of popery) for five, six, or seven years after. Nay, moreover they confirmed (the baptized) by giving the holy communion, as Alcuinus himself (De offic. eccle. cap. de sabb. Sanct. Pascha) testifies.

11. The schoolmen cannot agree upon the original of this supposed sacrament. Alexander of Hales (in Sent. 4, quest. 24, memb. 1) will needs have it instituted by the Council of Meld (Meldensi). Bonaventure (in Sent. 4, dist. 7, ar. 1, quest. 1) says it was not of Christ's ordaining. And so says Marcilius (in 4 Quest. 14). Molanus says that concerning the form of this sacrament, it is no marvel if the fathers make but small mention thereof, seeing Innocentius I says, "I dare not set down the words, lest I should seem to betray (a secret mystery)." The masters of the Church of Rome are the first that published the form hereof in their book called Ordo Romanus, where we read these words: "I confirm you in the name of the Father, etc." (de Sacra., tract. 4, cap. 6). Bellarmine (De sacram. confirmat., lib. 2, cap. 10) confesses that the fathers have not set down the form of confirmation, nor of divers other sacraments, because they were already known unto every one. He had spoken more truly if he had said, unknown unto everyone, for they do set down both the form of baptism, and of the Supper in divers places. What reason had they then to keep the forms of the rest from our knowledge? But this is but one of Bellarmine's conveyances. "Of the form of confirmation," says Suarez (in 3 part. Thoma.), "we find nothing in Scripture. And if

we betake ourselves to tradition, we shall find great ambiguity and variety hereof in the fathers." Thus says he. Ergo.

Marriage

1. In the purest times, the canonical account of the degrees of consanguinity as it is called, was never heard of. For Ambrose (l. 8, epi. 66) says that brothers' children are four degrees distant in legal supputation, not canonical. But this legal supputation also crept into the church by degrees and was free without bond of law until 1,070 years after Christ; and then Alexander II decreed that the degrees were to be reckoned after this canonical supputation, and that under pain of excommunication (ca. 35, q. 5, cap. 2, Ad sedem).

2. The forbidding of the fourth degree (and much more of the seventh) according to canonical supputation, remained unknown in the most pure and ancient churches unto at least 500 years after Christ. About the 300th year of Christ there was no degree at all prohibited, but only such as were expressly named in the written Word of God. But afterwards, was marriage of cousins-germains forbidden, as Ambrose (l. 8, epi. 66) and Augustine also (De civit. Dei, lib. 15, c. 86), with Petrus Diaconus do testify. But this prohibition was abrogated by the laws of Honorius and Arcadius, and by Justinian's also, though afterwards it was renewed in the church by the Council of Epanne, c. 30, about the year of our Lord 490. And afterwards, anno 500, began these prohibitions to extend unto the third degree inclusively, for the third Council of Aurelia, c. 10, and the second of Terwin, cap. 22, do forbid marriage of the brother's or sister's children and so does Altisiodor, cap. 34, circa anno 614.

Thus stood these prohibitions, in this third degree, for a long time, in the Latin Church, but about the 600th year, the popes Gregory,

Nicholas, etc., decreed that all the degrees of consanguinity should be kept unto the seventh generation. (Gratian, 35, q. 2) But afterwards, Innocent III in the Council of Laterane, anno Dom. 1215, limits this prohibition at the 4th degree inclusively, and allows all matches without this 4th degree. But by this allowance of his are many unlawful marriages made. For example:

Peter and Paul are brethren, and their stock descends thus:

John

|

Peter Paul

Rachel Susanna Joanna Leah

Here Peter may not be joined in marriage with Leah, though 6 degrees distant, because that being the brother of Paul, he is a father unto all that descend in Paul's line, and so in that respect unto Leah also.

3. The fathers do sometimes reprehend the second marriage of either person in case of divorce upon fornication, but yet they do hold such marriages to be true and firm. This did hold for 400 years after the incarnation. So that they held, that in case of adultery the marriage (among the faithful) is dissolved, not only in respect of bed, but also of bond, wherefore they were not acquainted with the distinction of a double divorce. Origen, hom. 7, in Matth., says that these marriages (after separation) are against Scriptures, but yet not without cause he allows them for avoiding of a greater evil, and holds them no otherwise permitted. And these Ambrose, in 1 Corinthian. 7, allows unto a man. And so does Epiphanius also, contra Caethar. haeres. 59.

Jerome, epist. 30, ad Oceanum, disallows them in Fabiola, but he goes not so far as to disannul the marriage which he himself excuses. It was a use to enjoin a public penance upon this act, and that was used also upon smaller faults. The fathers used to note such second marriages as they held lawful with penance, and they punished the husband that kept his wife after her adultery, with three years penance. (3. 2. q. 1, ca. Siquis) The Council of Arles, cap. 10, counsels the guiltless person of the two, to abstain, but does not compel or command him to it. And this the church afterwards did for one while allow of and follow. For in one place of the Decretals, 31, q. 7, c. Concubuisti, it is appointed as lawful for the innocent person to join with another, after that his first yokefellow has polluted the marriage bed. And this is also allowed, 31 q. 1, cap. Siqua mulier, if either party have endeavored to kill the other.

4. Afterwards, Augustine and others held these marriages of no force at all. And yet Augustine, De fide & operibus, cap. 19, writes that, "He that finds his wife in adultery and puts her away, seems not to be equaled with him, that puts her away for some other cause, and marries again. And it is so doubtful in the Scriptures themselves, whether he (who doubtless may put away his wife for adultery) be an adulterer if he marries again, that surely I am of opinion, that any man may herein be pardonably mistaken." Thus says Augustine.

Priest's Marriage and Single Life

1. The marriage of the clergy for the space of 300 years after Christ was a thing always freely allowed, without prohibition or vow of perpetual continency. If there were any that lived single, it was out of some private and unbinding purpose, or else for some custom taken

up out of a good and honest end. This cannot be disproved out of any lawful authority, whereas

There are these testimonies to confirm it. “There are many of the bishops,” says Athanasius (Ep. ad Drac.), “that have not married, and contrariwise many monks we see daily become fathers of children. Again, you may observe many bishops to be fathers of children, and many monks that have not sought to see their own generation, for this is lawful, and the other is not forbidden, but everyone as he likes, let him undertake to live.” “Whereas we read,” says the decretals (dist. 26, c. Caeno.), “that the sons of priests have come to the honor of the papacy, we must not understand them to be begotten by fornication, but by lawful marriage, which was lawful for the priests everywhere, until the time of prohibition, and in the east churches is allowed unto them as lawful until this day.” And Cyprian (or the author of the sermon, de nat. Christ) says that there is neither command nor necessity to compel us unto continency or virginity. And Cassiodorus (in Psal. 57) says it is free to vow virginity, or not to vow it. “We impose no necessity hereupon,” says Epiphanius (Haeres. 4), “but out of good will we counsel it, exhorting him that is able to take it upon him, but not compelling him that is not able, nor rejecting him from salvation.” “Virginity only,” says Ambrose (exhort. ad virginis), “is to be persuaded, not to be commanded, being a thing rather of vow, than of precept.” “In the east,” says Socrates (Hist. Tripart, lib. 9, ca. 38), “all, even the bishops, do abstain of voluntary choice, not of any necessity; and many of them in the time of their being bishops, have had children by their lawful wives.”

2. But in these aforesaid ages, there were promises of continency used to be made publicly in the church. For Clement (Stromat., lib. 3, who wrote in the year 170) says that continency is a despising of

the body, κατά τ¾ν τέρας θέον ὁμολογίαν, according to the promise, or covenant made unto, or with God. Their manner of covenant was thus: It was asked of these that were to take ecclesiastical orders, whether they would abstain from marriage or no? If they said they would, it was not thence lawful for them to marry (Dist. 27, cap. diacon). If they said they would not, it was allowed them after their election to take them wives (Council Aucyr, c. 10). But the election was deferred, that if it might be possible, they might have a single man to elect (Dist. 28, ca. de Cyracus). Now these promises were exacted, not that marriage in this case was held an unclean thing, or that the clergy were bound from it by vow, but especially because of the poverty of the churches, wanting sufficient means to maintain so many families of bishops, priests, and deacons (d. 28, c. de Syr.), where Pelagius I says that the singleness of priesthood was instituted because that the goods of the church should not be dispersed among the priests' wives and children. This is to be marked diligently. But Leo says very well in those words (Novel. 2): "I sometimes have occasion to wonder much that some are not afraid utterly to abrogate many holy and divine laws, and institute others, as though these were not absolute. For whereas the holy canons treating of the election of bishops, do ordain that he that has children by lawful matrimony (if there be no impediment in other of his actions) may be made an archbishop, these men dare set down the contrary, that it is not possible for these encumbrances, that any that have children (though they be the blessing of lawful marriage) should undertake the dignity episcopal. It may be these lawgivers supposed, that the natural affection unto their children (for what

Other thing can be alleged for them?) would be a great annoyance to their ecclesiastical maintenance. But this reason is founded upon false grounds; for if it were so, the like reason might convince, that none that has either brethren or other kinsmen alive, should be made

bishops, for consanguinity begets the same union of love between them. Moreover, the holy canons foreseeing this, gave the bishops authority, that if they had any poor alliance, they might relieve their miseries out of the revenues of their bishopric. Wherefore our imperial majesty (which is of God, if we keep ourselves to God's commandments) perceiving that to be far more convenient, makes a law agreeable to the holy canons, that as it seemed good unto them, that he might be promoted to be bishop, who in other respects was worthy of that honor, although he had children (provided they were legitimate), so it shall be lawful now. And that with this resolution, that we do from henceforth abrogate forever, to punish their boldness, any law that gainsays hereto." This he. Now if the priests, or bishops broke these promises (we spoke of before) they were deposed, and put to penance among the twice married, but their marriages still did continue indissoluble. And in this sense are the Councils of Ancyra and of Neocaesarea to be understood. Wherefore at the beginning, marriage was not forbidden the priests by reason of any vow annexed unto their order, but by reason of the greater freedom, and conveniency.

3. The perpetuity and necessity of this vow of continence was established first in the western church, and annexed unto orders about 380 years after Christ. It was used before, but out of private and particular devotion, not by any public and decretory judgment of the church. But then, by a common decree (if that decree be not a counterfeited forgery) priest's marriage was prohibited in all the western churches, as a thing impure and unsanctified, and that by Pope Siricius (Dist. 82), which decree, Innocentius I (Dist. 82, c. Proposuesti), renewed, but yet with grant of pardon to all such as had not seen the epistle of Siricius. So that the gloss (dist. 82, c. 3, Cum in praeterite, ad gloss. verb. qui sacramentis) shows plainly that Siricius was the first author of this prohibition in the church of God,

in these words: They say that these chapters were made before Gregory's time, who enjoined continency upon the ministers (31 dist. ca. Ante triennium), that is, unto the subdeacons. But Siricius commanded the priests and deacons to observe it. Nay, they say that before Siricius's time the priests might marry, and so did Moses. Wherefore they expound it thus: "The apostles taught this doctrine of continency in work, example, and counsel," as Hugo says, "not in constitution and ordinance, as others say." Now the censure of friar Thomas Mantriq published by command of Pius V, pope in the year 1572, commands this gloss to be razed out, together with the marginal note, which says that priests might once marry. And indeed Augustine (lib. 6, confess. 3) greatly admires the single life of Ambrose, so that single life was more rare among the priests of those times than marriage. Gratian also (Dist. 28, ca. de Syracus.) yields that before the Ancyran Council, anno 308, the vow of continency was never proposed unto the priests. Wherefore the decree was neither of Calixtus, nor Lucius's framing.

4. Now as for this decree, it had no universal admission until the time of Pope Hildebrand, in the year 1007, for hereof speaks Aventine, in history Boiorum lib. 5, in these words: "The priests at that time as other Christians, had wives in public, and begot children, as appears in the instruments of the Donatians which they gave to the churches, priests, and monks, where these wives and their husbands are named as witnesses, and they are called by the grave and honest name of presbyteresses." Sigebert also testifies the same in his chronicle upon the year 1074: "Pope Gregory," says he, "forbad

The married priests to use their function, and prohibited the laity to hear their masses, a deed without example, and (as many thought) done unadvisedly against the opinion of the holy fathers, who have

written, that whether the sacraments be ministered by good or evil persons, yet they are neither amplified by the merits of the good minister, nor lessened by the sins of the evil", by which act arose such a scandal that never in the heat of any heresy was the church rent in sunder with a greater schism and division. And truly it is a thing of worthy memory that Florentius, a monk of Worcester, has recorded in his chronicle, ad ann. 1106, of this Gregory, that being upon his death bed, he confessed unto almighty God, and Saint Peter and unto the "whole Church, that he had offended greatly in his pastoral charge, and by the persuasion of the devil, had stirred up anger and wrath among mankind, and that he sent his confessor to the emperor and to the whole Church to pray for pardon for him, that he did loose the bands of all that were outlawed, and all his excommunications against the emperor, and all other Christian people, clergy and laity, quick and dead," etc. And indeed, "Marriage of priests was allowed here in England until 970 years after Christ," as the history of Iornall records in the life of Edgar: "Alfer, King of Mercia," says it, "and many others, casting forth the monks out of the great monasteries which king Edgar had lately founded, brought into them the clergy and their wives." And Fabian, in Chron. page 263, relates that, "Bishops and priests were married for a thousand years together, no law enjoining the contrary." And Florentius afore-named testifies that, "The English clergy married for 997 years together, which marriages were never forbidden by law or edict, until Anselm's time." "In the same year (1100)," says Henrie Huntington, lib. 7, "Archbishop Anselm held a council at London, wherein he forbade the English priests to marry, who were never forbidden before. Which law seemed most pure unto some, but most dangerous unto othersome, lest that endeavoring continency above their power, they should fall into more horrible and more unchristian impurities." Now at the promulgation of this law, these priests that were already married, were not divorced. Nay they continued marrying for all this,

two hundred years after Anselm, as M. Foxe shows in his history, publishing the very conveyances of those contracts then used.

5. Now this prohibition of marriage, there are many fathers that do not approve nor allow of, and namely these that follow.

1. Theodoret: “It is affirmed,” says he, in 1 Tim. 3, “that the holy apostle says that he that lives chastely with one wife alone, is worthy to be elected a bishop, and, in 1 Tim. 4, rightly did the apostle put in (forbidden to marry), for he dislikes of continency and singleness of life, but he accuses those that will command and enjoin them by a law.”

2. Ambrose: he says, Offic., lib. 2, cap. ultimo, that, “Unto the ministers of the altar it is allowed once to marry, not the second time.”

3. Chrysostom: he says, in Tit. Hom. 2, that “Marriage is so honorable, that under it a man may come to ascend unto the holiest preferment and dignity.”

4. Isidore: “The clergy,” says he, Reg. de vita Cleric., dist. 23, c. His igitur, “ought to keep their bodies chaste and unpolluted for ever, or else to join themselves in one band of matrimony.”

5. Bernard: “Take honorable marriage out of the church,” says he, in Cant., Ser. 66, “and the unpolluted bed and do you not fill the church with fornicators, incestuous, unclean, effeminate, and sodomitical persons, and finally with all manner of uncleanness?”

6. Theophylact: “Husband unto one wife,” says he, in 1 Tim. 3, “is taken in this sense, that he that is to undertake the function of a bishop, should not have many wives, but one.”

7. Salvian: “Men of religion,” says he (De provident, lib. 5), “do abstain from carnal copulation, but not from rapine and stealth. How are we deluded by foolish persuasion? It is iniquity and not matrimony, which God prohibits.”

8. Gregory III: “Let no man maintain either harlot or concubine,” says he, writing to the bishops of Bavaria (lib. 3, pag. 290), “but let him either live chastely, or take him a wife, whom it shall be lawful no way to refuse.”

Besides, the whole Council of Nicea calls the priest’s accompanying of his proper wife, chaste, lawful, and honorable. And Gratian says that this Council commended Paphnutius’s opinion, and determined of marriage after every man’s will, not imposing any necessity thereupon, or on the contrary, and cites the testimony of Socrates (dist. 31, c. Nicaena). Now whereas it is objected that the Synod says that abstinence from marriage is a tradition of the church, I answer, that there was indeed such a tradition, but never universal, but particularly only. For the universality got first head in the Council of Ancyra (ca. 10), which was twenty years before the Nicene Council. And the council of Gangra following that of Nicea, condemns their opinion, that held that the priests might not celebrate the divine mysteries, by reason of their marriage. And it is apparent out of the first Council of Toledo (c. 4 and 7), that the priests then married. And Patronus commands the institutions of the Nicene Council to be kept inviolate for evermore, in his preface to the said Council. Pope Sylvester decreed that a priest should content himself with one order, and with one wife also. This Philippus Bergomensis records in his chronicle. And so does Sabellius also (Ennead. 7, lib. 8). The first Council of Terwin (ca. 5, anno 460), after the prohibition of marriage, adds this: “Notwithstanding we being willing to moderate this strictness, and rightly to mollify it, do decree that a priest, etc.,

abiding still in fleshly concupiscence, and ceasing not to beget children, be not capable of any higher preferment.... But let it be sufficient for those, not to be separated from the communion." Now the 2nd Council of Terwin (c. 8 and 9), allows a bishop to have a wife as a sister, and calls her episcopa, a bishoppess. And Innocent III says this of married priests, about the year 1200 (Decretal, lib. 3, tit. 1, cap. ut clericorum): "Those that (according to their country's custom) have not abstained from the bond of wedlock, if they do fall, let them be severely punished, because they may use their lawful matrimony." And here are two worthy observations: First, that neither all priests, nor all places had then admitted this singleness. Second, marriage of priests was then held lawful for such as pleased to undergo it. Pius II, pope, did determine (as Platina says) that even as matrimony was forbidden the priests for great reasons, as he thought, so it ought to be permitted them again for far greater reasons. "We think," says the said Pius, or Aeneas Sylvius (epistol. 308), "that you follow no bad counsel, if you take yourself to marriage, being not able to contain, though that this were to be considered of before your admission unto holy orders. But we are not all gods, that we should have knowledge in things to come. Since it is come to this, that you cannot resist the law of the flesh, it is better to marry than to burn." Leo (Novell. Con. 3) says that there is a tradition of the church, which commands that those that are to be elected priests, let them either vow singleness for their whole life (if they think to be able to keep their promise), or if they think it impossible to be kept, let them first marry lawfully, and then enter into the order of the ministry.

Epiphanius makes for this vow of perpetual singleness, but he cannot prove it out of Scriptures, but is fain to fly unto traditions. And the sixth Synod of Constantinople, cap. 13, condemns whatsoever the Roman Church has set down concerning the single life of priests.

And this Synod was held 50 years after Gregory the Great and is approved by the decretals of the canon. The words are these, dist. 31, c. Quoniam: “Because we know that it is taught in the order of the Roman canon, that those that are thought worthy to be ordained priests or deacons, should profess, that from thenceforth they would not use any more the fleshly company of their wives; we following the ancient canon of apostolic diligence, and the constitutions of holy men, will have these lawful marriages from henceforth to be of force, by no means dissolving their wedlock with their wives, or depriving them of familiar resort together, at convenient times.”

By this canon we understand that for above 700 years together, the churches of the east did not approve (at least did not establish) this singleness of life in the ministers of the church. And hereunto add the testimony of Theodorus Balsamon, in Can. 5, Apost.: Before the sixth Synod in Trullo, it was lawful for the bishops to marry and have wives, yea, after they had received that dignity.

Besides, this interdiction is reproved by Volusianus (or, as others will have it, by Huldricus), in his answer unto Nicholas I: “Whether he be priest, deacon, or subdeacon,” says Gratian in the decree, dist. 28, cap. de Syracus, “it is plain (by the opinion of Pope Pelagius) that being invested in the foresaid orders, they may use matrimony lawfully.” And, dist. 31, cap. 1, about three years before, the subdeacons throughout all the churches of Sicily were according to the use of the Roman Church, forbidden to have any meddling at all with their wives, which seems unto me to be a very hard and incompetent thing, that he that has not attained unto the use of continency, nor made any former promise of chastity, should be compelled to forsake his wife, and by this means to fall more perniciously (which God forbid).

And Causa 26, q. 2, c. Sors: “Before the Gospel came to the luster and brightness, many things were permitted, which in the arising of more perfect discipline were utterly abolished, as the marriage of priests, and of cousin-germanes, which is not prohibited by any authority either of the law, gospel, or apostles, and yet is absolutely taken away by ecclesiastical constitution.

Leo, epi. 87, wills the priest to choose him a virgin to his wife, not a widow, so that thereby he allows priests to marry. And Panormitane says that continency is but of the positive law, and that the Greeks allow not that institution. Thomas, in 2.2, quest. 88, art. 11, affirms this, that the vow of continency is not added as an essential part of the solemnity of ordination, but only accidentally, by a statute of the church. Durand, in 4 Sent., dist. 37, q. 1, says that “Holy orders do hinder the solemnization of marriages and abolishes those that are already consummate, not absolutely, as they are orders, but as they are holy, and herein by disposing so of them,, but it hinders these marriages fully, out of the institution of the church.”

“Neither probable by reason nor authority,” says Cajetane (in opusc. tom. 2, tract. 31, de caelib. Sacerd.), “that a priest in marrying commits sin absolutely.” Nay, reason rather draws a man to the contrary, because as we read in Lombard’s sentences (dist. 37, lib. 4), neither orders as they are orders, nor holy orders as they are holy, do hinder matrimony. And in the western churches (dist. 28, c. Diaconi), it was once lawful for the deacons to marry, besides, it is manifest that the priests and ministers of the eastern churches do marry (dist. 31, ca. Aliter). “Neither does priesthood take away contract in marriage, whether precedent or subsequent, if we seclude all constitutions ecclesiastical, and stick only unto that which we had taught us by Christ and His apostles.” This teaches Cajetane; and so does Medina also (de Continentia, lib. secundo, cap. primo); and

Soto (de Jure, lib. 7, quest. 6, artic. 2). And this prohibition the whole clergy of Germany disallowed of in the year 1074, says Schasnaburgensis.

Pope Hildebrand decreed in many synods that according to the ancient canons, no priest should have a wife. Such as had, should either put them away, or be put from their dignities. Nor should any be admitted hereunto that would not vow perpetual continency and singleness of life. Against this decree, the whole clergymen bent themselves extremely, calling him a heretic absolutely, and a man of a damned opinion, who (having forgotten the Lord's Word, that says, all cannot take this upon them; he that can take it, let him. And the apostles that said, he that contains not, let him marry, for it is better to marry than to burn) with a violent exaction, would constrain men to live like angels, and by denying them the accustomed course of nature, opens the way to fornication and uncleanness. But if he proceeded in confirming this decree, they had rather leave their priesthoods, than their wives, and then they should see, where he that despised men, could get angels to govern the people throughout the church of God. And afterwards he declares that it held a long time as a custom that the priests should take them wives.

6. The history of Paphnutius, delivered in writing by Socrates (lib. 1, cap. 8), and Sozomene (libr. 1, capi. 22), and approved by Nicephorus (libr. 7, cap. 19), Suidas in verbo Paphnutius, and Gratian (dist. 31, c. Nicaena), the papists of these times do reject and contemn most boldly, as if it were false and forged. Sotus for one (de Jure, lib. 7, quest. 6, art. 2). Melchior Canus for another (in loc. comm., lib. 5, cap. ult.). And Bellarmine for a third (de clericis, lib. 1, cap. 20). Their first reason is that, "Sozomene," as Gregory says (lib. 6, epistol. 31), "fains many things. And Socrates lies flatly in the history of his time." I answer, Gregory accuses not Sozomene of

forgery in this thing by name, and in so famous a thing as this was, they could not err unwittingly.

Their second reason is this: it is the common consent of the Greek fathers, that none should be ministers of God's mysteries, but the chaste and continent. So says Origen (hom. 17, in Luk. and 4 in Levit.); Eusebius (l. 1, de Demonst. Evang. cap. 9); Epiphanius (in compend. doctr. & haeres. 59, con. Catharos); Cyril (catechis. 12); Nyssenus (de Virginitate, cap. ult.); Chrysostom (hom. 2, de patientia Job); Basil (in Isa., c. 3); and Jerome (contra Vigil.). What shall the churches of the east do? What of Egypt, and of the apostolic see, who receive either virgin priests, or continent; or if they have wives, they leave to be husbands? I answer two ways: First, that the Greek priests did abstain from the use of their wives.

But only at such times as their course came to celebrate, not continually; and so some of these aforesaid fathers do require this temporal continency, not perpetual. Second, in the east their ecclesiastical customs were diverse. In some places the clergy contained, and in others they married. So says Socrates directly, lib. 5, c. 21. Thus are the aforesaid fathers reconciled with this history of Paphnutius.

7. The testimonies of the ancient writers concerning the single life of priests were but private opinions and conjectures. "Me thinks," says Origen, hom. 23, in Numer., "that it is his part alone, to offer sacrifice, that has vowed himself unto endless and perpetual chastity." Neither do they confirm these opinions out of the Word of God, besides the great difference among them. Again, what they speak of single life, they speak it but of those that have this gift, and while they have it. And therefore, they require it not of those that are not willing, but of those that willingly promise continency. And by

those that are willing, they do mean them that know surely that they have this gift of continency. And in this manner was it that Cyprian kept his virginity free without vow, or monastical like.

8. The fathers do permit those that have made such vows to marry notwithstanding if they cannot contain, Cyprian, lib. primo, epistol. 11. Neither do they acknowledge any vow of continency wherein marriage is abjured, or by which it is annihilated. Augustine, De bono viduit, cap. 9, 10, 11, says that the breach of the vow is worse than adultery, but yet he will have these marriages that are made after the vow to be firm and lawful. “Such as do thus contract, do herein,” as he says, cap. 10, “offend, not in the marriage, but in the breach of vow.” Some answer that Augustine speaks not of the vow solemnly made, but of a simple vow. But I say that this distinction is frivolous, a trick of the schoolmen, unknown to the fathers, never found but in the schoolmen’s writings, and in the sixth of the Decretals. Boniface VIII, lib. 3, tit. 15, says that the solemnity of vow has the original only upon the constitution of the church. So says Scotus, Petrus de Palude, in 4 dist. 38; Cajetane, in 22 q. 88, art. 7; and Panormitane, in cap. Rursus. All these think that it is only a decree of the church whereby the solemn vow dissolves the contract of marriage made after the vow.

9. For 200 years after Christ, there was no received opinion in the church concerning the excellency and merit of single life above marriage. “He that has attained unto true perfection,” says Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromat. 7, “has the apostles for his patterns, and is truly counted a man, not in that he has made a choice of monastical life; but he conquers and excels men, that exercises himself in matrimony and increase of children, and in care and governance of his family, without either pleasure or sorrow.”

10. But afterward, most of the ancient writers began to defend the excellency of virginity before marriage, and speak somewhat hyperbolically (beyond mean) in praise thereof. So says Cyprian, De bono pudicit, that, “Virginity is equal unto angels; nay, if we seek it willingly, it exceeds them, because in striving in the flesh, it obtains a victory against nature, which the angels have not.” And Athanasius, de Virginitate, cries out: “O continency, the prophet’s joy, the apostle’s glory! O continency, the life of angels and the crown of sanctity!” But for all this, sometimes they speak more moderately of virginity. “Because we see,” says Origen, lib. 8, in Rom., “that divers of the saints, yea, and some apostles, have had wives, we cannot think thus of virginity only.” “Use your marriage with modesty and moderation,” says Chrysostom, hom. 7, ad Hebr., “and you shall be the chief in the kingdom and enjoy the fullness of blessings.” Now the fathers did sometimes ascribe this excess unto virginity, to make choice of the extreme which was most opposite unto the vice then predominant; for the heathen polygamists (having of many wives) were not as yet utterly cashiered from among the people. And besides, they did it to eschew the suspicion of disorderly copulation together, as also because that the single men had the least encumbrances, and so endured persecution with less grief.

11. Besides, the fathers took such pains in the praise of virginity, not because of itself, but by reason of the offices and duties of godliness, and hence sprung all these commendations of virginity. And this is hereby apparent, because that they will have matrimony (already contracted) to be dissolved by the entrance into religion. Look at Justinian’s institutions, cap. de Episcopis & Cleric., lib. finali; Basil, in quest. fusius explicatis, qu. 12; Cassiannus, Collat. 21, cap. 9.

12. The fathers, urging the singleness of the priests, do sometimes detract from the praises of marriage, and sometimes reprove it as an

unclean thing. Syricius, epist. ad Hym. Episc. Tarra, stuck not to say that, “Those that are in the flesh,” that is, in matrimony, “cannot please God.” And in like manner, Tertullian, lib. de monogamia, says that, “It is evil to contract matrimony,” and by the word evil, he means sin. And Jerome, Contra Jovin., lib. 1, goes thus far, that he says, “In the fulfilling the duty of a husband, I fulfilled not the duty of a Christian, and it is an evil thing to touch a woman.” And Athanasius, lib. de virginitate, says that, “The woman’s body is polluted by her husband’s.” “To the end,” says Leo I, Epistol. ad Anastasium, “that we may bring continency unto his perfect purity, we do not permit any carnal marriage so much as to the subdeacons.” Gregory, in Pasto., part. 3, admonit. 28: “I speak this as permitting, it is intimated to be a fault, which is forbidden to be favored.” And Ambrose, Offic., lib. primo, cap. ultimo, will have the priests to be pure from marriage, and to be contaminated by marriage. “Let those that meddle with the holy mysteries,” says Isidore, De offic. divin., lib. 2, c. 10, “be chaste, and continent, and free from all fleshly uncleanness.” Arator, in Acta Apostol., says that:

The church’s purest faith commands that all
The priests live ever chaste, etc.

And Origen, homil. 23, in Num., makes chastity and marriage direct opposites. Look at his words in the seventh section before. Now Rhonanus, in Argumento libri Tertullian, de exhortatione ad castitatem, acknowledges that all the fathers as well as Jerome were no equal judges in the value of matrimony.

13. The original of the popish singleness was thus: First, the votaresses (143) that married after their vow were found fault with for their inconstancy, but yet their marriages were not dissolved. “If that out of faith they have dedicated themselves unto God,” says

Cyprian, epist. 11, lib. 1, “let them persevere in chastity and pureness, without any let or molestation, and so being strong and constant, let them expect the reward of virginity. But if they will not continue so, or cannot, they had better for to marry than to fall into the fire by their sins.” And the Council of Ancyra, ca. 19, appointed but a very light penance upon those that break this vow, namely, in ranking them among the twice married. Epiphanius says that marrying after a vow is a sin and commends repentance for it; but yet holds it better to marry so than to burn. And in like manner does Jerome, and Augustine, de bono viduit., cap. 19. But afterwards these marriages began by some to be held for more heavy offences. After 380 years Basil calls them incests, and the sins of whoredom and adultery, lib. de virginit. And the Council of Chalcedon, ca. 15, excommunicates the parties thus marrying, yet commands the bishops forthwith to absolve them, neither willing the dissolution nor suspension of these marriages, which were not frustrated and broken off until after-ages.

Extreme Unction

1. The fathers never speak of this extreme unction, that is, of a ceremony of anointing in manner of a sacrament without the gift of healing, until Innocentius I, in the year 402. For Sigebert in anno 404 ascribes the decree of anointing the dead unto Innocentius I, who howsoever he calls it a kind of sacrament, yet he will have it ministered by all Christians. “It is lawful,” says he (epist. 1, ad Decentium, c. 8), “not only for the priests, but also for all Christians to use the oil of chrism, made by the bishop, and to anoint therewith in their own or their friends’ necessity.” And Bede (in Luc. 9) thinks that it belongs not only to those that are weak in body, but also unto the weak in faith. And (in Jacob, c. 5) he will have the ministering thereof free unto all Christians, not binding it only to the priests. And

this is the opinion of Alcuine also (de divin. offic., cap. 40), that wrote about the year 750.

2. The fathers used this unction in the beginning of sickness, and in the parts that were most affected. Unto the deaf and dumb, they poured oil into the mouth and crown of the head (Greg. Turon, history. Franc. lib. 6, c. 7). And in the pestilence, they anointed the arm with this holy oil (see Fortunat., in vita S. German.). But this unction was not instituted as then, whereby to give spiritual grace. "The oil," says Victor of Antioch (ad Marci, c. 6), "which we use in this holy unction, signifies both the mercy of God, the cure of the sickness, and the illumination of the heart. But it may be said, that the prayer effects all these, and that the oil is but an outward sign only of all these effects." "This oil," says Theophylact (in 6 Marc.), "being of great use in labor, and nutriment of light, and an increaser of mirth, signifies the mercy of God, and the grace of the Spirit, by which we are freed from labor, and obtain light, joy, and spiritual gladness. But the case is altered nowadays; for now it is not given as a cure to the sick, but as a necessary purveyance for the dying."

The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome

1. The primacy of dominion, or (as Turrecremata calls it, Summa de Eccles., lib. 3, c. 23) of authority, was not acknowledged to be in the Romish bishop, but was unheard of, and unknown until the year of Christ 600, and began to be public and manifest in Boniface, about the year 607, for he obtained of Phocas the emperor, that the apostolic see of Rome should be the head of the church, whereas the see of Constantinople would needs write itself the first or chief of all. So says the chronicler Sigebert. In the year 607, "Boniface," says he, "obtained of Phocas the emperor, that the Romish Church should be

the head of all churches." These be his words, and the very same in effect are to be found in Marianus Scotus, Martinus Polonus, Otto Frisingensis, and Hermannus Contractus. And Phocas decreed this, not as affirming, declaring, or pronouncing anything that was before, but as founding and establishing a new thing, which before was not. For this primacy thus by him established was but seven years before reproved, yes even condemned by Gregory I, then bishop of Rome. "I confidently affirm," says he (lib. 6, epist. ex Registro, c. 194), "that whosoever calls himself, or is willing to be called universal priest or bishop, in this loftiness and pride of his, he is the forerunner of Antichrist." And the bishops of Constantinople took in very ill part this ordinance of Phocas, as Sabellicus affirms (lib. 6, Ennead. 8). And to the same purpose Aeneas Sylvius (Epist. lib. 1, epist. 188), who himself was afterward pope, says thus: "Otherwise," says he, "diversity of opinions would divide the church, and loose the knot of unity, as we may see was done before the Council of Nicea, while everyone depended on themselves, and but a little regard was had to the Church of Rome."

But the papists here object that John of Constantinople was therefore reproved by Gregory of Rome because he would be accounted the only bishop, so that no other were to be so called or esteemed, but only as his suffragans or vicars. And this they would fain prove out of the words of Gregory in the fourth book of his epistles, ep. 38, to John of Constantinople, where thus he says: "You that once confessed yourself unworthy the name of a bishop, are now (in time) come to this pass, that despising the rest of your brethren, you desire to be called the only bishop, or you alone seek after the name of a bishop." The like words to these are in the same book, the 34th epistle unto Constantia the empress. Hereunto I answer in two points.

1. Gregory in that very same 38th epistle, and in the 36th, and elsewhere, affirms that that very name or title which John of Constantinople did thus arrogate to himself, was offered to his own predecessors in the see of Rome by the Council of Chalcedon. But is it either possible, or likely, that that reverend general council, especially those 150 bishops therein assembled, should yield that honor to the Roman bishop, that he should be deemed the only bishop of the world, and themselves to be no more but his vicars or substitutes? Hardly can any man persuade this, especially seeing it is certain that those same bishops in that council did yield unto the see of Constantinople, that it should be equal in privileges unto the see of Rome.

2. I say, it was not the title of only bishop, but of ecumenical bishop which he sought after. He desired not to be bishop alone, or the only bishop in the world, but universal bishop, or the bishop of all other bishops. And this appears to be true out of Gregory's own words, in divers places, viz., Epistol., libr. 4, epistol. 39 and libr. 7, epistol. 69.

But then (you will say) how that stands with those other words of Gregory, out of which the papists ground their objection. I answer, Gregory, being as he was, had indeed more cause than any to be moved at this arrogancy of John, and therefore in aggravation and detestation of his so great pride and ambition, fell into these hyperbolical terms, and yet not much improperly; for he who among equals seeks a superiority, and will usurp power over those that be as good as himself, after a sort takes away all place and power from the rest, inasmuch as he will needs be alone that which they are as well as himself. And even so says Gregory, explaining himself, epist. lib. 4, cap. 36: "If one be called universal patriarch, the name and honor of patriarch is taken from all the rest. But far be this, far be it from a Christian mind, that any man should be willing to arrogate that to

himself, by which the honor of his brethren should seem in the least measure to be diminished." And somewhat after he reproves John for that he endeavors to ascribe all things to himself, and to subdue all the members of Christ unto his own yoke, who are knit only to one head, namely, to Christ. And in the 38th epistle of the same book, he thus speaks to John, Patriarch of Constantinople: "What will you answer to Christ, the head of the universal church, you that go about to put under your feet by the title of universality, all the members of His body?" And it is very considerable that he says, "John desired to be deemed and named the only bishop, by despising, not by deposing, his brethren bishops, by putting them under, not by putting them down."

2. Second, the power of making laws and of dispensing with them, the bishop of Rome had not, nor exercised out of his own province, for 600 years after Christ. Gregory indeed, Epistol. libr. 12, cap. 31, dispensed with the English men, touching degrees of marriage forbidden, but he did this as a patriarch. Also, he did it as directing, not as commanding, out of a directive, not a coactive power. For they, doubting, and asking of him, being both a patriarch, and a learned man, he gave counsel what were to be done in that difficult point, namely, of two evils put together, what were best to be chosen. In lib. 7, epist. 30, he says, "This word of commanding, or command, I pray you take it away, let me hear no more of it; for I know who I am, and who you are. For by your places you are my brethren, in virtues and good examples, my fathers. I have therefore commanded nothing, but I have labored to show what in my opinion is most profitable or convenient." Furthermore, Gregory used no other canons for laws, but the imperial ecclesiastic, namely, such laws of the emperors, as concerned ecclesiastical matters and persons.

3. During the foresaid time of 600 years, such of the fathers as be of undoubted credit, speak nothing of any primacy of power, dominion, jurisdiction, or authority. See Chrysostom, in his third homily on the Acts, and Cyprian, de Sympl. Praelat., whose words are these: “The rest of the apostles were even the very same that Peter was, partakers of the same fellowship with him, both of honor and power.” Jerome, against Jovinian, lib. 1, c. 14, says that the church was built upon all the apostles, and every one of them received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the church was founded on them all equally, yet that among the twelve one was chosen, that a head or chief being appointed, the occasion of schism might be taken away. Cyril on John, lib. 3, cap. 20, says, “God gave the apostles and their successors full and plenary power in the church. Therefore, it is apparent, that the fathers speak of the primacy of order, dignity, vocation, majesty, or respect, for they acknowledge a certain excellency or preeminence, both of Peter, and of the bishop of Rome: but that was in respect of the glory and authority of the city, which being the chief of all, therefore purchased that honor to her bishops.” For this point, see the Council of Chalcedon, cap. 28, act. 15. And thence was it that many sought to him for aid and assistance in some wrongs, but not expecting any commandment or edict from him. Covarruvias, a doctor of both laws, one of great account among them, 1 tom., 2 part., Relect., Sect. 9, pag. 421, col. 4, edit. Frankofurt, says, “By the authorities and testimonies of catholic fathers, and the traditions generally received of all, it is concluded, that the apostles received from the Lord Jesus equal power with Peter, of order or jurisdiction, insomuch as everyone of the apostles had from God equal power with Peter, over the whole world, and that to all ends and purposes, and for all acts whatsoever that Peter could do; whereby it is clear that he afterwards fights with himself, when he says that this power of theirs was subordinate and subject to Peter’s.” The same also in effect is to be found in Gratian, in the decrees, in

the pope's old canon law, dist. 21, cap. In novo, ex Anacleto. And if ever the fathers speak of a primacy of power or dominion, it is plain enough, they meant not any universal power over the world, but of that absolute power, which he might exercise in his own limited province; and so are they to be understood. Likewise, subjection is either in regard of power, or of order; and in this second sense it is, namely, in respect of order, that some fathers write, that bishops and all things are subject to the Roman seat. See Gregory in his epistles, lib. 7, cap. 63.

4. Sometimes even bishops, for their painfulness, faithfulness, and needful care of the churches, were preferred before others. Thus, Basil was accounted the doctor of the world, as Theodoret calls him (l. 4, c. 19), and Polycarpus the apostolical and prophetical teacher of those times, as Eusebius reports (l. 4, c. 15). And Cyprian is said to have been, as it were, a bishop, and to have had authority in every church. For so says Nazianzene in his sermon of him: "For," says he, "he was not set over the Church of Carthage only, no, nor only over the churches of Africa, all which have received much honor and renown by him and from him, but he was, as it were, a bishop, even over all the western churches, yea almost over all the eastern also, and over the southern and northern churches, even as far as his name and admiration could spread itself." Basil also says of Meletius (epist. 50), that he was set over, or governed the whole body of the church. And of Ambrose, the said Basil (epist. 55) says that the mastership or government of the great ship, meaning the church, was committed unto him. Nicephorus (l. 14, c. 34) says that the bishops of Alexandria, after the Ephesine Council, were wont to be called popes and judges of the whole world. And in respect of their care it was that bishops of Rome had their vicars or legates in foreign provinces of other bishops, but no vicars of power until these later ages.

5. The speeches of the fathers concerning Peter are to be understood inclusively of the other apostles; and their speeches of the pope of Rome are also to be taken of other bishops. Cyprian (epist. 27, ad lapsos) says the church was constituted upon bishops, and not upon Peter only. Nicephorus (l. 14, c. 34) reports that Cyril was called a pope and judge of the whole world. Augustine on the 36th Psalm calls all the apostles and prophets foundations. Jerome against Jovinian (l. 1, c. 14) says, "You will say, the church is founded upon Peter, although the same in another place is done upon all the apostles, and equally on them all is the strength of the church established."

6. Peter is called by some of the fathers a rock and the foundation of the church, not properly, but by a metonymy, because by his doctrine he labored greatly in founding the church, and for that he first of all, in the name of all the apostles, confessed the church's faith. Nazianzene in his oration De moderandis disputationibus says, "Peter is called a rock, and has the foundations of the church committed to his trust." If he seems harsh, let Ambrose (serm. 47) explain him: "Peter," says he, "is called a rock, for that he first laid the foundation of faith in the nations." And in the same manner and meaning in the fathers is Peter's seat also called a rock. So says Augustine (in Psal. contra partem Donati): "Number the priests, even from the very seat of Peter, that is, the rock which the gates of hell cannot overcome." So likewise, the confession of Peter or his faith is often by the same fathers called a rock, namely by Augustine (on Saint John's first epistle, tract. 10); by Hilary (in his 6th book of the Trinity); by Chrysostom (in his hom. 55 on Matthew); Ambrose (l. 6, c. 9 on Luke) says, "Your faith is the rock." And with Origen, "He is a rock, whosoever is an imitator of Christ." And that Peter himself was the rock seemed to Augustine after good delib.ation so harsh a speech that he recanted it in his retractions (lib. 1, c. 21). It is

also to be noted that the fathers do oftentimes speak too hyperbolically of the bishop of Rome, as when they call him the head and spouse of the church. And so Bernard, de consid. ad Eugeni., lib. 2, cap. 8, saying he is Christ by his anointing, and Leo, saying that, "Peter was assumed into the fellowship of the undivided Trinity," in his 89th epistle. See also his third sermon of the assumption to the same purpose.

7. By the rock in that speech of Christ, Matthew 16, "Upon this rock I will build my church," all the ancient fathers do not understand Peter, but many of them Christ, as Tertullian against Marci., lib. 4, cap. 13; Gregory Nyssen., in testim. de Vet. Testam. de Trinitate contra Judaeos; Hilary in his second book of the Trinity; Chrysostom in his homily of the cross of Christ; Ambrose, sermon 84; Jerome, in Matt., lib. 1, c. 7; Augustine in three places, viz., sermon 13, De verb. Dom., and tract 120, in Joan., and lib. 2, de Trinitate, cap. 17; Theodoret in 2, viz., in Psal. 47 and in 1 Cor. 3. And to these ancients add some of the chief later: Bede, Anselm, Lyra, the Interlinear Glosse in Matth. 16. Further, many understand by the rock the faith and profession of Peter, whereby he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." So says Saint James's liturgy; Ambrose in Ephes. 2 and de Incarnat. Domin. Sacram. ca. 5; Hilary, lib. 6, de Trinit.; Epiphanius, haer. 59; Chrysostom, hom. 55, in Matth., and hom. de Pentecost., tom. 3; Cyril, dialog. 4, de Trinit.; Bede, in Job 21; and Theophylact, in Matth. 16.

8. The fathers urge a communion or fellowship with the bishop of Rome as far forth as he sat in Peter's chair, that is, as far as he taught the true doctrine of Christ, which nowadays he does not at all. For Peter's chair is the church, where not so much the person of Peter, or his personal successor, as his doctrine is resident. So says Cyprian, lib. 1, epist. 3. The ancient emperors ascribed to the bishop of Rome

a power to discern and judge of matters ecclesiastical, because then they followed the written Word of God, and judged out of it.

9. That Peter was ever at Rome at all is uncertain. Indeed, most of the fathers say so, and some of them say more too, namely that of an apostle he was made bishop of Rome. But all this is affirmed, but not proved, and it is affirmed only by such as lived not till the age after Peter.

10. The bishop of Rome exercised honorable authority and power, but it was not properly belonging to him and his own by perpetual right. In this manner he was oftentimes in some civil causes made an honorable arbitrator. Thus, he visited churches; thus he confirmed and deposed bishops; thus he made canons and dispensed with them again within his own province. And if at any time he did any of these out of his province, he did it not by office or authority, but either at the entreaty and request of others, or in the name and authority of the emperor; or if otherwise, it was tyrannical usurpation. And the place and power of judging which some of the fathers sometimes give him was only directive as of discretion, not coactive as of authority.

11. Appeals were sometimes made to the bishop of Rome, but not as to the judge to whom it belonged to give the determining and concluding judgment, but as to an able and honorable helper, who by his place and power was able to procure their wrongs redressed. And so oftentimes men upon wrongful sentences appealed to other bishops of the west, that so by procuring their consent, they might make their cause the stronger. Neither did they of old take any more upon them, for Marcion, being excommunicated in Pontus, came to Rome to be absolved, but they returned him this answer: “We cannot; we may not do this without the permission or sufferance of your reverend father,” meaning his own bishop. So reports

Epiphanius (Haer. 42). And Chrysostom (Epist. ad Innocent. I, tom. 5), in his wrongful persecution, craves help not only of Innocentius I, then bishop of Rome, but of the other bishops of the west. “And therefore,” as Socrates in his story (lib. 6, cap. 14) says, “He appealed to a council.” But Chrysostom received this answer from the pope, that (alas) it lay not in his power to help him, neither might he call a council for his help. Basil writing to Athanasius thus counsels him in his troubles (ep. 52): “It seems to me the best course,” says he, “that letters be written to the bishop of Rome, desiring him to consider how these matters be here carried, and to give his advice what were best to be done.” To this purpose see also his epistles to the bishops of Italy and France (epist. 70). Joan. de Terra-rubea, a doctor of the law, in a treatise of his touching the government of the kingdom of France, says, “If the pope have at any time intermeddled in the premises, he did not thrust in himself as with authority, but came in as being thereto requested, or called in for assistance. And this conferred not any power of jurisdiction unto him, even as when a judge requires the advice and assistance of another judge in matter of law or judgment, he does not hereby confer unto him any jurisdiction which afore he had not, but only makes use of, or entreats the use of that he has.”

12. Furthermore, even those appeals that were made to Rome were oftentimes disallowed and rejected by the ancient fathers. Thus writes Cyprian (lib. 1, ep. 3), to Cornelius, then pope: “It altogether behooves that those who be under our jurisdiction keep themselves at home, and gad not abroad unto foreign jurisdiction. But here to let their cause be tried, where both the accusers and the witnesses are ready at hand, and where the crime being committed may be judged.” And in his 4th epistle he says that those who do communicate with Basilides do neglect that discipline and government which God has established in His church. The African

Council (cap. 92) thus concludes: “If any think they have cause to appeal from their own bishops, or the judgment they receive at home, they shall not appeal but unto the Councils of Africa; and if any do appeal to any authority foreign, beyond the seas, or if any hold that man should so appeal, let none of the churches of Africa hold him fit for their communion.” The Milevitane Council (Can. 22), almost in the same words, inhibits all bishops and clerks from appealing to any authority beyond the seas. Sozomene (lib. 3, ca. 8) reports that the bishops of the east wrote to the bishop of Rome, that it was not lawful for him by any cunning device, nor under pretence of any appeal, to frustrate or annihilate that which they had acted and concluded. Damasus, as we may see in Ambrose (ep. 79), being himself pope, says that after a provincial council has concluded anything, he has nothing to do to meddle with the judgment. These be his words: “Seeing the council assembled at Capua has thus pronounced that Bonosus and his accusers shall have such judges appointed them as be near unto them, especially the Macedonians, who, together with the bishop of Thessalonica, should examine his doings and consider of the whole matter. We advertise you therefore that it cannot belong to us to deal with the judgment of this matter; neither is anything to be attempted against your sentence, who have decreed that which you thought most agreeable to justice, and to whom the synod had given authority for that they did. Therefore, the first thing to be done is that they give judgment to whom the power of judging (in this case) is committed, for your determination is in the place and room of the whole synod. And it is no reason that we should take upon us to judge (as it were) of the authority of this synod.” Thus far Damasus. To conclude, Justinian in the imperial laws, col. 9, tit. 6, c. 22, appoints that the last appeal be made to the patriarch of the diocese.

13. In England, appeals were prohibited till Henry II, of whom, and whose times, Matthew Paris in his Chronicle or history, in Henrico 2, anno 1164, says thus: “Concerning appeals, if they fall out, they must be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, etc., and lastly, they must come to the king himself, from and beyond whom no man may proceed further, without the assent of their lord the king.” The same was done in France by Louis IX (who was called Louis the Godly) about the year 1278 in that edict (called the pragmatical sanction) of Saint Louis. The words are these: “We will not by any means that those heavy actions, and huge sums of money be levied or collected, which the court of Rome has imposed, or which hereafter it may impose upon the church of our kingdom, it being a means whereby our kingdom is miserably impoverished. Nor will we that any such sums be levied at all, but only upon a most reasonable, godly, and urgent cause, or else upon some inevitable necessity, and that also to be upon our willing assent and express commandment, together also with the voluntary consent of our church in this kingdom.” The same was also afterward done by Philip the Fair about the year 1296, and afterward by Charles V, surnamed the Wise, and after by Charles VI, as Aimonius reports, de gestis Francorum, lib. 5, cap. 25.

Further, Hildebertus thus writes to Honorius: “It has not been heard on this side the Alps that all manner of appeals should thus be received and maintained in the court of Rome, neither do we find it delivered as a tradition from the holy and ancient ordinances. But if such novelty as this has sprung up, that you will accept indifferently of every appeal, surely the pontifical authority and censure will come to naught, and all force of ecclesiastical discipline will utterly be dashed and broken in pieces. What priest or clergyman, if he be wickedly disposed, will not do any mischief, in hope to have relief by these defrauding appeals, and so will they lie, as it were, buried in the filth of their sins? And what bishop shall have in readiness any

power at all to punish (not all as indeed he should) but any disobedience at all, if this may be admitted?"

14. In the Council of Nicea the custom and fashion of the Church of Rome was made equal to others, and no way superior; namely, that as the bishop of Rome has a power over all his bishops (that is, all in his province), so by the same custom the bishop of Alexandria shall have over the bishops of Egypt. For in the authority of patriarchs the ancient custom must be observed (9 q. 3, Conquestus). To this purpose are the words of the Council, as Cusanus (himself a papist) takes them, 1. 2, de concor. cath., c. 12. And even so Ruffinus, an ancient writer, expounds the council's meaning in his history, lib. 10, cap. 6; and so Theodorus Balsamon does, in his explication of these canons, and also Nilus, in his book of the primacy.

15. The pope's temporal jurisdiction and dominion was partly snatched by violence, partly stolen by fraud, and partly grew by other men's lib.alities and donations. And by these means it grew up to that intolerable height it was of late. Urspergensis, himself a popish chronicler, reports that in the year 753 Pope Stephen besought King Pipin of help against the king of Lumbardy, and King Pipin came with his army into Italy, and besieged him in Papia, and compelled him by the straitness of his siege to perform what afore he had promised; and so having received of him Ravenna and Pentapolis, with the whole exarchy belonging to Ravena, he gave them to St. Peter, and having thus dispatched these matters he returned into France.

And again, speaking of the year 1228, he says, "In the same year and the year following, there was a treaty of peace betwixt the emperor and the sultan, and their countries. But the pope, taking the opportunity of the emperor's absence, had sent a strong army into

Apuleia, and took by plain force (a most horrible thing to report) the lands of the emperor being then in the war and service of Christ, and the church, and having subdued them to himself, and signed them with the cross, he prohibited by all means, both them in Apuleia and in Lumbardy, that they should pass over the sea." Who is it that rightly considering such facts as this, does not deplore and detest them as being tokens portending and forerunning the ruin of the church?

And a little after: "While these things were thus a doing, in the parts beyond the seas, the pope with his accomplices, as men reported, made a rumor to be raised and divulged over all Apuleia, that the emperor was dead, whereupon such strong cities as had yet reserved themselves for the emperor (which for their strength the pope could not so easily subdue) did now prepare to dispose and yield themselves to the pope's dominion, and most cruelly and wickedly to kill all the Almaines returning from the holy land, and abiding in Apuleia."

Otto Frisingensis, lib. 7, in praefatione, tells us that no man doubts but the church was exalted and enriched by the strength of kingdoms, and beneficence of kings, and that it is apparent that the church could not so far bring under the state and strength of kingdoms or the civil state, until the civil state, for the love and honor it bare to priesthood, had, as it were, unbowelled itself, and exhausted all its own strength: "And so the civil state of the kingdom," says he, "ruined and fell, smitten not only with the spiritual sword of the church, but especially by its own, namely, with the material sword." Thus far Otto.

Augustinus Steuchus, lib. 2, writing against Valla touching the donation of Constantine, has these words: "Gregory III

excommunicated Leo the emperor, and so withdrew Rome and Italy from his empire, absolving all their subjects from their oath and fealty of obedience."

And that confession of Bellarmine is notable, in his 5th book of the bishop of Rome, c. 4, where he says, "Christ as he was man, while He lived on the earth, accepted not, nor would have any temporal lordship or dominion: now the bishop of Rome is Christ's vicar, and represents Christ unto us, as He was when He lived here among men on earth; therefore the bishop of Rome as being Christ's vicar, and consequently as bishop of Rome, or as highest bishop, has no temporal dominion nor authority." But Bellarmine, whether checked for this speech, or upon more consideration, thinking he had gone too near the truth, in his last edition seems to recant this, or at least to mitigate it. For thus he corrects it, "Therefore the chief bishop, as Christ's vicar, and consequently as chief bishop, has no authority or dominion merely temporal over any city or province."

16. The English nation, for 1000 years after Christ, was not subject to the pope's authority in causes ecclesiastical. Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was the first that did offer to cast off or refuse the king's authority in causes spiritual; he indeed denied his obedience to the king further than with this condition, Salvo ordine suo, saving always his own order, and by this means he infringed the lib.ties of the English Church. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, long before Becket, in his epistle to Pope Paschal (ep. 36), says, "The king would not suffer the pope's nuntio, or apostolical legate, to be received into England, without his leave and express commandment, neither would suffer me to write or send any letters to him, nor to receive any sent from him, nor to obey any of his decrees." And a little after: "In all these, and in matters of literature, if I asked counsel of others what I might do, all the subjects of that kingdom,

yea even my own suffragan bishop denied to yield me any advice or assistance, but according to the will and pleasure of the king." Matthew Paris, in his story of Henry I, reports that William, the King of England's proctor or agent at Rome, confidently alleged among other things before the pope, that the "King his master, Henry of England, would not (no not for the loss of his kingdom), lose the right of presenting to his churches." And this he boldly affirmed and urged it with great and threatening words. The same author in his story of Henry II, about the year 1164, among many other customs and lib.ties of the former kings of England, recounts this for one: "Concerning the advowsons or patronages of churches, or presentations to benefices, if there arise any question either among laymen, or betwixt laymen and clerks, or betwixt clerks themselves, it shall be heard, debated, and determined, in the court of our lord the king." And in the same place in the king's letters to his justices, he says, "Let no man appeal either to the pope, or to Thomas the archbishop, neither let any plea be holden at their commandment, neither let any mandate or commandment of theirs be received within England. And if any man either receive, or retain, or have anything to do with any such commandment, let him be apprehended and safely kept." Indeed, King John did homage to Pope Innocent, resigning up his crown and kingdom to the Church of Rome, but for his so doing all the barons of his kingdom opposed themselves against him, and chose for their king, Louis, the King of France, as Matthew Paris reports in his story of King John. And Jeffery of Monmouth reports in his history (l. 11, c. 12), that the English churches, being well constituted and excellently ordered, would not be subject to Augustine, the pope's legate, in the year 600. Indeed, England made itself tributary to the pope by taxing every house at a piece of silver to be paid to the pope; and this was first begun about the year 847. But the investitures of bishops, and authority to receive appeals, the pope obtained not till Henry II, who

much against his will was brought to subject himself and his kingdom to the court of Rome, which was done 300 years after, namely about the year 1172. Therefore, the decretal epistle of Adrian IV to Thomas, the Archbishop of Canterbury (which is to be found in the pope's decretals), lib. 3, tit. 30, cap. Commissum, is but a bastard. For the pope had no dominion nor power at all in matters spiritual over the English Church but after Thomas was dead. And of no better stuff is that other decretal of Alexander III unto the Archbishop of York (which is also there extant in the decretal), lib. 2, tit. 16. c. à memoria, for there he says that Honorius his predecessor by his apostolical authority granted a certain privilege to the Archbishop of York, over whom as yet he had no power nor authority.

17. The pope has not a determining judgment infallible; more plainly, he has no power to judge or determine, so as he cannot err. So taught all that ever wrote of it for 1400 years, yea, even papists themselves. The ancient fathers, as well Greek as Latin, did hold and censure Honorius I to be a Monothelite heretic, that is, one who held that Christ had one will only. So does also the sixth general council, Act. 12, 13, 18, where he is condemned by the name of a heretic, and his epistles burnt. The second Council of Nicea, act. ult., curses or lays anathema on Honorius. So does also the eighth Synod of Constantinople, Act. 7; and Leo II, in his epistle to the emperor at the end of the council; and Tharasius, in his epistle to the patriarchs, which is to be seen in the 3rd Act of the seventh Synod; and Psellus in his poem of the seven synods; and Epiphanius the deacon in his disputation with Gregory the heretic, which also is extant in the 6th Act of the seventh Synod; and Bede in his book of the six ages of the world, about the year 4639 (147); and the pontifical itself in the life of Leo II; and Anastasius, the keeper of the pope's library in the life of the same Leo II.

And suppose that all these so many councils and fathers were deceived in these their reports and testimonies by taking it from the 6th general synod, whose decree in that point suppose also to be corrupted; notwithstanding, it follows that all the said fathers and councils affirming Honorius to be a heretic did therefore undoubtedly believe that the pope, even as he is pope, might err. But to put this matter out of all question that they thought so of him, look at the epistle of Leo II to Constantine, at the end of the council, wherein he execrates and curses Honorius, as not having illustrated the apostolical church with apostolical doctrine, but rather had defiled it with his heresy. And the 6th general council, Act. 13, curses the said Honorius by the name of pope of old Rome, for his decretal epistle which he had set forth: nay even Gratian himself, the compiler of the decrees, d. 40, c. Si Papa, takes it as a thing for granted, that the pope may err from the faith. And Robert Grosted, an ancient bishop of Lincoln, says that the pope may be a heretic and Antichrist, and he added further, that the decretal says that upon such a fault as heresy is, the pope may and ought to be accused. Thus reports Matthew Paris in his story of Henry III, about the year 1253. Lyra on the 16th of St. Matthew says that many principal and chief bishops have been found to have been apostates from the faith. Gershon (in his treatise on whether it be lawful to appeal from the pope in matters of faith) says that as well the pope as a bishop may err from the faith, and is therefore inferior to a council. Antoninus, in his sum, part. 3, tit. 22, c. 4, sec. 3, says that it is lawful and reasonable that the pope should ipso facto be deposed for heresy. Panormitan, a great canonist, de Elect, sec. significasti, says that the council may depose the pope for heresy, and alleges a chapter (148) out of the canon law for it, where it is said that the pope may be a heretic, and be judged for heresy. “Yea further,” says Panormitan, “in matters concerning faith, the word or affirmation of the private man is to be preferred before the pope’s, if he speak upon better grounds

out of the Old and New Testament than the pope does." The Council of Constance, sess. 37, calls Pope Benedict a schismatic, and a heretic, and such a one as has erred from the faith. And not much otherwise speak they of John XXIII in the 11th session of the same council. The Council of Basil, in the 3rd of their synodal epistles, has words to this effect: "The holy church is endowed of Christ our Savior with such privileges that we believe firmly she cannot err; and beside the church, we do not read that any other (ordinarily) and at any time the same or so great a gift given unto them, to no angels, to no men, to no popes or chief bishops, whereof many are reported (and so also we read), that they have fallen into errors and heresies." And Aeneas Sylvius, after he was pope himself, relating the acts of the Council of Basil, says that the opinion of such as hold that councils may not be called without the pope's consent, if it may stand, will bring with it the very ruin of the church. "For," says he, "if that may be so, what remedy or help will there be, if a scandalous pope, or one whose life is tainted with foul crimes do trouble the church, if he destroys souls, etc., if he set forth doctrines contrary to the faith, and instill heretical opinions into their minds that are under him." Catharinus, a great papist, in his commentaries on the 2nd of the Galatians says, "There is nothing against it, but that the pope may err, yea even in faith, and fall from it, howsoever certain late writers and young upstarts have presumed to defend the contrary, contrary to the common and ancient opinion of the doctors." Alphonsus de Castro, in his first book against heresies, chapter 2, says, "The pope, by himself, without the assembly and assistance of a council, may err even in such things as belong to faith, by the opinion of many divines of great authority, who have so affirmed and taught. Yes, it is found by experience, that divers popes have erred in the faith." And in the 4th chapter of the same book, "Every man may err in faith, although he be the pope himself, for Platina reports of Lib.ius the Pope, that he held with the Arians." And to conclude, this truth is so clear that

Bellarmine himself, de Ro. Pont., lib. 4, cap. 9, confesses that Lib.ius the Pope did after a sort, namely, in his mind and judgment, consent to the Arian heresy, inasmuch as he suffered Athanasius to be condemned, whom he knew to be persecuted for that cause of faith only, and because he communicated with Valens and Ursatius that were Arians, for which cause he was put from the popedom by the clergy of Rome.

18. Touching Antichrist, the eldest fathers held no certainty, because he was not as then revealed; therefore, they bring conjectures, yet sometimes they do as good as say that he is to be found in the Roman Church. Chrysostom, upon the 2nd to the Thessalonians 2, homily 4, directly affirms that Antichrist is to succeed the Roman emperor, namely, after that the empire is taken out of the way. Hilary, in his epistle to Auxentius; Jerome, to Algasia, question 11; Oecumenius, on 2 Thessalonians 2; do all hold that Antichrist shall not sit in Jerusalem, but in the church of God. Abbot Joachim implies plain enough that the pope of Rome is the very Antichrist. “Many,” says he in his Revelations, lib. 10, art. 5, “under the pretence of God’s seat, that is, of the see of the universal church, are become indeed the seat of the beast, which is the kingdom of Antichrist, who reigns everywhere in his members from the beginning of the church, and namely in the clergy, monks, monasteries.” And again, “We have plainly taught and delivered, that Rome in the spirit is Babylon.” And a little after: “The merchants of the earth (spoken of in the Revelation) are the priests themselves, who sell prayers and masses for money, making the house of prayer a shop of merchandise.” And again: “We see that not only many bishops and clergymen are ensnared in the businesses of Babylon, to make themselves rich thereby, but even many abbots, and monks, and religious persons. And yet why do I call them religious? For they are not so but seem to be.” Otto Frisingensis, in his Chronicle, lib. 7, ca. 3, says, “There

shines a certain resemblance betwixt Babylon and Rome, inasmuch as that which here with us in the city of Rome, is given to the pope our chief bishop by the Christian emperors, the very father is there by the pagan kings of Persia (to whom for a long time Babylon has been subject) granted unto their high priest, and the kings of Persia themselves having the imperial city, as our emperors make their seat at Aquisgrave, etc. So they at Ecbatane, and so translating the seat of the kingdom, they held nothing of Babylon for themselves, but the bare name of an empire." And again, lib. 8, c. 2: "Some," says he, "do interpret this departure spoken of in the Thessalonians and that whereof the apostle says, 'that which withholds, will withhold until it be taken out of the way,' and do refer it to the kingdom or empire. And thereupon they also say, that the apostle purposely delivered his meaning under this covering and obscurity of words, lest he might seem to slander by this presage, or weaken the state of the Roman Empire, which to the statesmen and emperors of those days, was thought so sure, that it should never have an end. And to that purpose (say they) it was, that the apostle said, 'and what withholds, you know,' as describing it, and yet not naming it." To conclude, Aventinus the Chronicler, lib. 5 and 7, affirms that the most both of the princes and bishops of Germany and of Italy held and proclaimed Gregory VII and John XXII plain Antichrists and no better.

19. The monarchical or sovereign authority of the pope of Rome over the church and general councils, was of many men ever reproved and condemned, and was not allowed, nor admitted of the church till very lately, namely, after the year 1500. Krantzius, a German historiographer, in his Metropolis, lib. 7, c. 45, speaking of the year about 1240: "In those days," says he, "there needed not any apostolical confirmation from the pope; it was sufficient that the election was approved by the archbishop. But now the Church of Rome has drawn to herself all the rights, honors, and privileges of

other churches." Hear a Frenchman, Duarenus, in his 3rd book of ecclesiastical livings, c. 3, who says thus: "In the apostles' times, whensoever as any were to be ordained either bishop or deacon, or anything else of what nature soever was to be considered and determined which concerned the church, Saint Peter did never arrogate nor take it upon himself, but permitted and put the matter to the whole church. The most he did was this, that as being a principal apostle he used to assemble or call together the rest, and to them so assembled to make a speech, declaring the cause of their assembling, and the particular affairs that were to be handled, even as with us at this day (here in France) he that is the president of the court of parliament calls together the whole senate, and speaking first in the assembly, etc. Neither for all this is he greater or superior than the whole court, neither has he any jurisdiction or eminency of power over the whole parliament, neither may he judge or determine anything against their judgment and opinions, etc. Thus indeed stood the case in times past. But I know not how it is now come to pass, the supreme and sovereign power over all Christians is ascribed to one, and that he shall be (even like an emperor) free, exempted, and discharged from all laws, edicts, canons, and synodal constitutions. For Pope Paschal in a decretal epistle has expressly taken order or decreed that no councils may prescribe or command the Church of Rome, nor make any law to bind the Roman Church. And they brought the matter to that pass, that in divers synodal decrees or canons of councils, the authority of the Roman bishop is accepted and provided for." (149) Glaber Rodulph, in his histories, lib. 2, c. 4, reports that, "One Fulco erected a goodly church in a village about Tours; and having finished the whole work, he sent to Hugh the Archbishop of Tours, that he would come and consecrate the church he had built. But the archbishop prolonged his coming, and made no great haste to do it, for that Fulco had taken from the church divers lands and lordships. Fulco therefore, seeing himself so

answered by the archbishop, furnished himself with a great mass of gold and silver, went straight to Rome to Pope John that then was, and with great complaint laid open the matter before him, who forthwith sent one of those whom they call cardinals, with the said Fulco to consecrate the foresaid church, and gave the said cardinal in strait charge and commandment that he should there take upon him the authority of the bishop of Rome, and by him, and under that authority, without fear or delay, perform whatsoever the said Fulco thought expedient to be done touching the premises, which when the rest of the bishops and prelates of France did hear of, they knew well enough, that this sacrilegious presumption proceeded from blind and filthy covetousness, to wit, that while one would steal, and another receive, among them they brought it to pass, that a made schism and division was risen in the Romish Church. All of them therefore together disliked and detested this dealing of the Romish bishop, judging it a very unworthy and unseemly thing, that he who took upon him to govern the apostolical seat, should first of all himself transgress the tenor and rule of apostolical order, and of the ancient canons, especially it being a thing notorious, and confirmed with manifold authorities of antiquity, that no bishop presume to exercise any authority within another man's diocese, unless the bishop of that diocese do either urge him to it, or give him leave to do it, etc. For although the bishop of the Romish Church, in respect of the dignity of the apostolical seat, be esteemed of more reverently than the bishops of the others' seats, which are constituted in the world, yet may not he, for all that, transgress the order established by the canons, but in everything is to be ruled by them as others are. For as every bishop of the true and orthodoxal church, being as it were the husband of his proper and peculiar flock, bears the person of our Savior in that charge, as well as any one does, so it cannot possibly belong to anyone, to intermeddle presumptuously in another bishop's diocese." Thus far Rodulphus. All which is so much the

more remarkable, seeing these things were said and done, not of late, but above 600 years ago, namely, about the year after Christ 1000. Casanus, in his 2nd book of catholic concord, c. 13, says that, “The dioceses are distinct, and one bishop is set over many pastors for the conserving of unity. “That is,” says he, “of a positive law, and human constitution.” And again: “The pope is not the universal bishop, but the first above or among others.” “And we do build and found,” says he, “the vigor of holy councils, not in the pope, but in the consent of all.” And again, in the 20th chapter: “It is clear,” says he, “that Pope Leo, in certain points, did never receive nor allow the constitutions of the Council of Chalcedon (as for one especially, that the church or see of Constantinople should have the precedence before that of Alexandria), but he always spoke against them, as also did some others after him, and yet for all that, the decree of the council ever took place. But if the pope had it in his power to be able to abrogate or nullify the decrees concluded by general councils, certainly Pope Leo, or some of his successors, would have prevailed in this point, which it is apparent they did not, as I said before.” And a little after: “Though Pope Leo opposed himself mightily against three chapters or constitutions of the Chalcedon Council, etc., yet he made not this resistance out of his own authority only, but by and from the authority of the Nicene Council.” And again, in the 34th chapter: “A universal council of the catholic church has the sovereign, most absolute, and highest power in all things, yea even over the bishop of Rome.” And in the same book and 12th chapter: “We see,” says he, “how far the bishop of Rome is gone, or how much he has encroached beyond the holy and ancient observations, out of the custom and practice of subjectional obedience.” “In the year 1337, all the prelates and princes of Almaign concluded and agreed on this, that a council is above the pope in matters of faith and state, and therefore that the appeal from the pope to the council was good.” Thus reports Nauclerus, generat. 45. And as for this absolute,

sovereign, and indetermined power of the pope, it was first of all approved and granted in the 2nd Council of Lateran, in the time of Leo X, within these 100 years, namely, about the year 1516.

Of Bulls, or Indulgences

1. These indulgential bulls of the Roman bishop, wherein is given absolution from the guilt of temporal punishment, by application of the merits of Christ and of the saints, were not known to the catholic church for 1000 years and more after Christ. Alexander III, who began to sit at Rome about the year 1159, in an epistle to the Archbishop of Canterbury, thus writes, as is yet extant to be seen in the pope's own decretals, lib. 5, tit. 38, c. 4: "And for the point wherein you demanded my counsel, whether the remissions which are wont to be made at dedications of churches, or to such as contribute to the building of bridges, be available to any other than those who be of the parish and diocese of those that grant them, we would have your brotherhood to know thus much, that seeing no man can either be bound or absolved by him that is not his proper judge, we therefore are of opinion that the foresaid remissions are profitable only to those to whom and whose good their own proper judges that granted them did specially intend them." These be his words. And hence I gather these conclusions: 1. That it then pertained to all bishops to give and grant indulgences or remissions. 2. That these indulgences were scarce known in those days of Pope Alexander, which appears thus, in that the Archbishop of Canterbury held it a matter so rare and difficult that he sent to Rome to know the virtue and valor of them, and to whom they were especially available. Whereupon it is clear that even the great masters and prelates of England were but little or not acquainted with them, although some 60 years before, Pope Urban II granted to them that undertook a

pilgrimage to the holy land, about the year 1095, releasement of all penances for their sins, as Nauclerus has it, gen. 37; or as Mat. Paris, in Willielmo II, says, “He granted them pardon of all their sins, and in the retribution of the just at the last day, he promised them an increase of glory.” Out of the Council of Laterane under Innocent III, can. 62, it appears that all bishops had authority to give indulgences. And as for the great indulgences of the year of jubilee, they came in practice some 300 years ago, viz., about the year 1300 as Platina reports in the life of Bonif. VIII. And that these kinds of indulgences were not known in the primitive church, Roff. himself (that is, our own countryman, Fisher, the bishop of Rochester) confesses in his book against Luther, art. 18: “I answer,” says he, “that it is not sufficiently manifest, by whom these indulgences were first given out.” And concerning purgatory he says, “There is very little or no mention at all among the ancient fathers of it. But after the same purgatory began to fear the world, and men trembled at the torments thereof, then indulgences began to be in request.” Durandus also thus says concerning indulgences, in his commentaries on the sentences, libr. 4, d. 20, q. 3: “Little can be said of them, with any certainty, forasmuch as the Scripture speaks nothing at all expressly of them. As for the holy fathers, namely, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, there is not a word to be found in them that touches indulgences.” Alphonsus de Castro upon this matter, lib. 8, says, “Among all the questions or points which we dispute of in this book, there is none at all which has so little footing in the Holy Scriptures, and whereof the ancient fathers have spoken less.”

2. For the space of a thousand years after Christ, the indulgences (that were) were relaxations or releasements of canonical satisfaction, that is, of the discipline or correction of the church. But they were not ordained, nor used as satisfactions before God for temporal punishment; and the fathers and councils speaking thereof

are thus to be understood, as namely, the I Nicene, c. 11, the II at Arles, c. 10, that at Ancyra, c. 2. Sometimes also they be declarations of the forgiveness or remission of sins, and in this sense the word indulgences is often taken. For in the letters of indulgences, we may read that absolution is granted, sometimes from the fault and punishment both together, and pardon of all sin, sometimes the half, sometimes the third part of their sins. Such were the indulgences granted within 1000 years after Christ, by Gregory I, Leo III, Sergius II. And it is worth observing that in the writings of Burchardus and Gratianus, there is nothing to be found concerning indulgences. No, nor in Peter Lombard, who lived about the year 1150.

3. In ancient times, the indulgences remitted 3, or 7, or more years of penance, because so many or more years were set down, wherein the penitents were to give full satisfaction to the church of the sincerity of their repentance. Now after the same manner, indulgences are granted for certain years, but in the other point they are fallen far from the just severity of the ancient church, for penances are not enjoined for certain years.

4. The ancient fathers do not teach that indulgences were profitable to the dead. And no less is both avouched and taught by Biel, lect. 57, upon the Canon of the mass, and by Hostiensis, in his sum, lib. 5, tit. de remis., nu. 6, two famous papists.

5. The power of loosing and binding in the church, or which the church has, is not proper, but is exercised only by declaring or publishing that it is so. So says Jerome (l. 3, Commen. in Mat., on these words: “to thee will I give the keys,” etc.): “Priests have no power of binding or loosing, but to show and declare that sinners be bound or loosed.” Radulphus Ardens, about the year 1050, in Dominio 1. post. Pasc., says, “In what authority must priests absolve?

Not in their own, but in God's. For the power to remit or release sins, is only God's. But the ministry of it (which also we sometimes improperly call a power) He has granted to His vicars or deputies on earth, who after their manner, or in a sort do bind and loose, that is, show and declare them bound or absolved." Hugo the cardinal on the same place of Saint Matthew, says, "As for the bond of sin or guilt and due penance, the priest neither can bind a man in it, nor loose a man from it, but only show and declare that a man is bound or loosed; as the Levitical priest, neither made a man a leper, nor healed him being a leper, but only pronounced that he was polluted or healed." Durandus upon the Sentences says that, "The power of the keys works nothing to the forgiveness or taking away of the fault or blot of mortal sin."

6. The treasure of the church, supposed to consist in the merits of Christ and the saints, the disposing and dispensing whereof is committed to the pope, was altogether unknown in the church of God for many ages after Christ. For the ancient fathers never said nor signified, wrote, nor imagined that indulgences were given out of the treasure of satisfaction. Franciscus de Mayrone (in 4. d. 19, q. 2) and Durandus (in 4 d. 20, q. 3) do both of them teach that the treasure of the church does not consist upon the merits of saints. Angelus, the great lawyer, has these words upon the matter of indulgences, part. 9: "The common opinion that is holden both by divines and canonists, is that indulgences arise from the abundance of merits which Christ and the saints have performed beyond the measures of their own demerits. But I hold for my part with Franciscus de Mayrone, that whereas the merits of saints are already rewarded of God beyond their desert, and thereby are exhausted, therefore they come from the merits of Christ alone and His passion."

Of the Power of Kings

1. The pope of Rome was subject to the emperor, or to the imperial laws in all matters or causes (as they say) concerning persons and things ecclesiastical, for at least 850 years after Christ. Tertullian (ad Scapulam) says, “We honor the emperor, etc., as a man next to God, and inferior only to God.” Optatus (contra Parme., lib. tertio): “There is none above the emperor, but only God, who made the emperor.” Leo (in his epistle to the emperor, epistol. 59): “Because we are by all means to obey your godly authority, and your religious will, I have therefore willingly yielded my opinion and consent to the synodal constitutions concerning the confirmations of the catholic faith, and damnation of heretics, which did very much like me.” Gregory (in an epistle to the emperor, Epistol. lib. 2, cap. 100): “I,” says he, “being subject to your command, have caused that your law or edict be sent and published in divers parts of the world.” And afterwards: “I have yielded obedience to the emperor, and yet have I not holden my tongue in the cause of God but have spoken what I thought.” (l. 4, c. 76) “I for my part do perform obedience to the princely commandment of his highness.” Nauclerus, generat. 23, in his Chronography, speaking of the year 605 or thereabouts, says, “Constantine the emperor, conceiving a great opinion of the holiness of Benedict, made a decree and sent it to him, granting thereby, that hereafter whosoever the Roman clergy, people, and soldiers should choose for their pope, all men should forthwith esteem and take him for Christ’s true vicar, without waiting for any further authority or allowance, either from the Emperor of Constant. or the Prince of Italy. For till that time, it was usual and approved, that when a new bishop of Rome was to be created, either the prince himself, or else his lieutenant of Italy, did confirm him.” Sigonius, in his 4th book of the kingdom of Italy, says, “Charles the Great challenged to himself

the kingdom of Italy, as being his own by victory and conquest. The exarchy of Ravenna, Pentapolis, the dukedoms of Perusia, Romania, Tuscia, and Campania, he permitted to the pope, yet reserving to himself the right principality, and dominion, the rest he retained to himself in name of the kingdom." And afterward in the 7th book, about the year 973: "The bishop of Rome held Rome, Ravenna, and some other provinces, rather by authority, than dominion. For the cities respected the pope as a prince of the country, but the king or emperor as their sovereign lord, and unto him they did their homage, and paid their tributes." Leo IV, writing to Lotharius the emperor, as is yet to be seen in the canon law (apud Grat., distict. 10, cap. 9), says, "Concerning those the royal commandments, and imperial decrees of your highness, and your bishops our predecessors, we promise and profess, that by the help of Christ, as far as we were, and are able, we have and will inviolably keep and observe them, and so will do for ever hereafter." Again, the same Leo submits himself to be censured by the judgment of the emperor, and his commissioners, or delegates sent from him to that purpose (causa 2, quest. 7, cap. Nos si). To conclude, Bellarmine himself (de Pontif., lib. secundo, cap. 29) yields that as long as the princes of the world were heathen, the pope was not their judge, but contrariwise was subject to them in all civil causes, as well as other men: "Well said, then upon this I affirm thus: but they lost nothing either of their power, or honor by becoming Christians, therefore they ought still to have that sovereignty over bishops in civil causes."

2. The pope deposed not princes, especially the Roman, till a thousand years and more after Christ. Hildebrand was the first that did offer to depose the emperor. So testifies Otto Frinsingensis (lib. 6, cap. 35): "I read," says he, "over and over again, the stories of the Roman kings and emperors, and I never find any one of them to be excommunicated or deprived of his kingdom by the bishop of Rome,

before this Henry IV, unless peradventure some would judge it an excommunication, that Philip the emperor was for a little time placed among the penitents by the Roman bishop, and Theodosius for that cruel massacre and slaughter of Christians, was by Ambrose forbidden for a time to enter the church." Likewise, Sigebertus (about the year 1088): "Let me say thus much with the leave of all good men, this novelty, not to call it a heresy, was not known in the world, as yet (that is, before Hildebrand, Victor, and Urban, as he says, in the year 1111), that the clergy should teach the people that they owe no subjection unto evil kings; and though they have made them an oath of fealty, yet that they owe no fealty unto them, and that they are not perjured, who in this case do hold against the king; yea, that he who shall obey the king, or stand with him, is to be held for excommunicate, and he that shall take against the king, is to be absolved from all crime of injustice, disobedience, and perjury." And Onuphrius himself confesses in his book of the dignities of the Roman Church, that in the time of Alexander III, the Roman Church was lifted up to the height of worldly honor, Frederick the emperor being trodden under foot. Aventinus, in his Chronicles, lib. 7, page 684, reports that one Eberhardus, the Archbishop of Inva (now called Saltzburgh) spoke thus: "Hildebrand," says he, "about 170 years ago, first of all under the pretense of religion, laid the foundation of Antichrist's empire. He first of all began that ungodly war, which by his successors is hitherto continued. These popes first of all thrust out the emperors from their assemblies and translated them unto the people and the priests; afterward they scorned, and, as it were, hissed out them also. And now what intend they but even to restrain us also, and to bring us into slavery, that so they may reign alone?" Thus says Eberhardus. And again: "He that is the servant of servants, covets to be the king of kings, and Lord of Lords, as though he were God Himself. He speaks huge things, and high matters, as though he were God. He imagines new devices continually and is

every day hammering new things in his head, and that he may erect to himself an empire, and bring all power into his own hands, he changes laws at his pleasure, abrogates the old, and establishes his own. All this that man of perdition does, whom men used to call Antichrist, in whose forehead is written the name of blasphemy, and in whose mouth are these words of presumption, 'I am God, I cannot err.' He sits in the temple of God and domineers over all far and near." And Aventinus himself again, lib. 7, page 675, reports that "The pope sent his bulls and breves to all the bishops of Germany, but none of them obey him; therefore he writes to the abbots, and commands them to curse the bishops, but neither will they yield unto him. What does he then? He sends to the priests and commands them to choose new bishops, and to the monks to choose new abbots, such as they themselves pleased, unless these would yield and obey. Everyone was amazed at the strangeness of this course, being without all former examples. Nay, the like was never heard to have been attempted. No marvel therefore, though this commandment and embassage of his displeased all that heard it, for in no place had it any acceptance." Conrade, the bishop of Friesingen, appealed to the emperor, and taught openly that the great priest of Rome had no power in Germany without the consent of the bishops of Germany. "Let the Romish priest," says he, "keep him at home, and feed his own Italians. As for us, though he holds us dogs, yet we are such dogs, as seeing God has constituted us over our flocks, we will bark at the wolves, and will especially keep such wolves from our flocks, as shroud themselves under sheep's clothing." "But what will this fellow," says he, "this usurping vicar, do to others and ordinary men, judge by this, when he dares to take up, and so evil entreat us that are his brethren and his companions?" And again, the same author elsewhere relates that Gerochius, who was Gregory's advocate, said thus: "The Roman bishops usurp to themselves divine honor, refuse to give account or yield a reason of their doings, and think it

unreasonable that any man should say unto them, why do you so? In a word, they have always both in their words and practice that of the poet, Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas." Thus far Aventinus.

3. The empire was translated from the Grecians to the Germans, not by the pope's power, but by the counsel, voice, and decree of the senate and people of Rome, and the bishop of Rome was only a counselor or assistant of this change, or, as it were, the interpreter. For Sigebert, in his chronicle, anno 801, thus writes: "The Romans, having long ago fallen from the Emperor of Constantinople in their thought and resolutions, did now with one consent choose king Charles for their emperor, giving him the salutation, applause, and acclamation of an emperor, and did crown him by the hand of Leo their pope, calling him Caesar and Augustus." Aventine also, in his history, lib. 4, fol. 344, says that, the bishop of Rome, what alone? No, but "The bishop, the senate, and the people of Rome, decreed to transfer the empire from the Greeks unto the Germans, and that by their own right, or as being a thing in their power to do, and by a free and quiet choice, gave it to Charles, with the voices both of the senate and the people." Yea, Aeneas Sylvius himself, c. 9 (afterwards a pope), speaking of the authority of the Roman Empire, says that, "The people of Rome, who with their lives and much blood, had won to themselves such an empire, did also with their blood make Charles the Great (king of France) the emperor, together with the consent of the Roman bishop." Nay, this point is so clear to all that are not too partial, that Onuphrius, a late and learned papist, says, "Charles being crowned and consecrated King of France, in a town of France, called Carifiaco, by Pope Stephen II, about the year of Christ 752, was also chosen and saluted Emperor of Rome, in the Church of Saint Peter in the Vatican, by the consent of the clergy, senate, and people of Rome, and was there crowned by Leo III, in the year of our

Lord 801." Therefore, from these it is apparent that where the histories or chronicles say that Charles was crowned, or anointed, made, called, ordained, or designed emperor by the pope of Rome, they are to be understood not of the power of conferring the authority and jurisdiction imperial, but of the ceremony of coronation or inauguration, and of the public renunciation, and solemn signification of the emperor's place, power, and dignity. That also which a man shall often meet in histories, namely, that Leo gave or conferred the empire to Charles is to be understood that he consented to them that gave it. For besides all before alleged, even Adrian the Pope confesses it in his epistle to Frederick, to whom he wrote thus: "I do not believe," says he, "that you have forgotten how great honor I gave you, and how carefully and willingly I bestowed on you the royal crown of the empire; and I am nothing sorry for that I have done, but would much rejoice if I had given you far greater favors." But after perceiving the emperor to be offended at these phrases, and that he would by no means acknowledge his empire to be the pope's benefit or gift, he therefore expounds himself and says, by benefit he means bonnum factum, a good deed, and by conferred or bestowed, nothing else but I put upon you, or put you into possession. For thus he writes: "I said I conferred or bestowed on you the imperial crown, because in this word bestowed or conferred, I meant nothing else, but I set it upon your head, or I crowned you with it." Sigenius, speaking of the Kingdom of Italy, lib. 12, writes that Charles obtained the empire by right of war, by his own prowess, and at last by plain bargain and covenant with Irene and Nicephorus. Otto Frisingensis, lib. 2, cap. 21, reporting the deeds of Frederick I, writes that Frederick thus (among other things) spoke to the Roman ambassadors: "You boast," says he, "that I was called by you, that you first made me a citizen, and then Emperor of Rome; that the honor I have was first of you, and that I received it from you. But the novelty of these unusual terms, how far from reason, and how void of truth

they be, I leave it to the venture of your credit, and the judgment of the wise. Let us overlook the deeds of the late emperors, and we shall soon find that those heroical princes of ours, Charles and Ottho, took possession of Rome and Italy, and annexed them to the crown of France, receiving them of no man's gift, but even recovering them by force and valor out of the usurping hand of the Greeks and Lombards. If you doubt of this, you may soon see it by Desiderius and Berengarius (those tyrants of yours) in whom you did boast, and to whom you did trust as unto great princes. For we have it from undoubted relation, that they were not only conquered and captivated by our French nation, but that they even grew old, and at last ended their days in that captivity. And their very ashes which are laid up with us, and which we keep to this day, do yield unto us a most evident argument of this truth. But you will say unto me, you came hither being called by me? I confess I was called, but tell you the reason why, and the manner how I was called: you were assaulted, and even beaten by the enemies, and neither by your own power, nor much less by the effeminate Grecians could you be delivered; therefore the French power and prowess was your refuge, unto them you fled, and earnestly invited him to your help, thus was I called. But is not this rather an imploring, than a calling? Surely, I should so esteem it. For you did not call or invite me, as not needing me, or being in good case to do me honor, but you, being in misery, implored help of me being in happiness, you weak of me being then strong, you doubtful of me being then secure. On this manner being called, if this may be termed a calling, I came unto you." Thus far Frederick in that place.

As for the deposing of Childeric, the King of France, it was done by the peers and people of the land, but the pope only devised the way and gave counsel how to do it; to which end Sabellicus in his Ennead 8, lib. 8, thus writes: "The peers and people of the kingdom

perceiving and honoring the prowess of Pipin, asking advice first of all of Zachary, the bishop of Rome, took away the name and title of king from Childeric, and bestowing it on Pipin, created him their king." Blondus, in his Decads 1, lib. 10: "I find," says he, "in Alcuinus, Paulus, and very many other writers, that the nobles and communalty of the French nation, weighing with wisdom the valor and virtue of Pipin, and contrariwise the childishness and unworthiness of Childeric, consulted with Zachary, then the bishop of Rome, whether they had reason any longer to tolerate so foolish a king, and whether he held it reason that Pipin should be any longer defrauded, and kept from the possession of the royal crown, which he so well deserved. And the pope answering, that he was to be accounted the king, who knew better, and was better able to discharge the duty of a king, they forthwith by the general consent of the whole nation, declared Pipin for their king, and took Childeric, and shaving his crown, they put him into a cloister. Nauclerus also reports, almost to the very same purpose, generat. 26.

4. The power of deposing kings and princes was first established by Innocentius III, in the Council of Laterane, about 1215 years after Christ, and yet, as I have showed, it was often reproved and spoken against. To this end see Nauclerus in the chronicle of those times, generat. 42, anno 1242, who reports these words of Frederick to the King of France, touching the sentence of deposition, given out against him: "Although," says he, "the Roman bishop has plenary power in matters spiritual, in as much as he can bind and loose any sinners at his pleasure, yet it is nowhere to be read, that either by God's or man's law, he may translate kingdoms as it pleases him, or judge and dispose of kings and princes temporally, or deprive them of their kingdoms."

5. The ancients would have temporal princes debarred from meddling in matters ecclesiastical, not simply and every way, but in regard first of absolute judging and determining of holy things; second, in regard of ministerial actions, in respect whereof, even kings themselves are sheep of the flock. But not in regard of the ordering or governing of the church and ministry ecclesiastical. In which respects they are above all persons and causes, even ecclesiastical, within their own dominions.

6. The anointing or anointings of kings and the chrism or oil with which they were anointed by priests, were not in use in the churches of Greece for 1200 years and more, as appears in the Decretals, lib. 1, decret. 15, tit. De sacra Unctione, cap. 1. In the western church, the first that used this ceremony, was the emperor Justin II. In France, Pipin, father of Charles the great, was the first that was anointed, and it was done by Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz.

Cardinals

1. The office of cardinals was common with priests, bishops, and deacons, from the time of the apostles downwards for many hundred years, and there was not any office properly belonging to them till long time after the apostles. The first that makes mention of them is Gregory the Great, for (as Bellarmine himself confesses, de Cler. lib. 1, cap. 16) in the first 800 years, the bishop of Rome for determining the great and weightiest affairs of the church, used to call his council of the bishops of Italy, and for these 6 or 700 years past, they began (by little and little) to lay down those episcopal councils, and reduced all business to the consistory of cardinals; and that the rather, because in the times of Pipin and Charles the great, there was an access of much temporal principality unto that see. Further, Nicholas

Clemangis, in his book of the not paying of annats (154), says that, “The cardinals have of old a double duty or charge: the first, to hear confessions, preach and baptize. But the second,” says he, “they took upon themselves when the Roman Church got wealth, authority, and worldly preeminence.”

2. The cardinals that now are, are foully degenerated from their original state and first condition. Gregory, in his time (600 years after Christ), speaks of them as though they were parish priests of Rome, or curates of churches. And in old time, all bishops whatsoever took the place of any cardinals, if they were not bishops. In the sixth Council of Carthage, the priests of Rome sat after the bishops. And in elder ages a cardinalship was but a step to a bishopric. See Onuphrius’s book of cardinals, and Joan. Diaconus, lib. primo, cap. septimo, in the life of Gregory. Therefore, the office or place of cardinals is not most ancient, nor begun in the times of the apostles, and since then continued.

Monks

1. The fathers are very uncertain of the original of monastical life. Sometimes they refer it to Elijah and Elisha. “Elijah is our prince,” says Jerome, Epistol. 13, ad Panlinum, “and Elisha ours, the sons of the prophets that live in the forests and wilderness, are our captains.” Sometimes unto John the Baptist: “John the Baptist the prince of the monks,” says Chrysostom, homil. prim., in Marc. “Otherwhile unto one Paul, a Thebane, Amathas and Macarius,” says Jerome, in prolog. ad vitam Pauli Heremita, “the disciples of Antony, do affirm even now, that one Paul, a Thebane, was the first author thereof, which we also allow of, not so much in name, as in opinion.” Otherwhile unto the apostles: “The discipline of the cloisterers,” says

Cassianus, Collation 18, cap. quinto, “had the beginning from the time of the apostles’ preaching.” But Chrysostom, hom. 25, in Hebraeos, counts this for a plain untruth, saying that in Paul’s time there was no sign nor step of any monk. And Jerome says, in vita Hilarionis, that there was no monk in Syria, before Hilarion, who was the founder of that profession in that province.

2. Monastical profession began in the church about 260 years after the redemption, by Paul, a Thebane, or rather about the 300th year by Anthony. For the first was the first pattern of hermitical life, and the second was the first master or teacher thereof. “In those days,” says Frisingensis, lib. quarto, ca. quinto, “lived the two most famous princes of the kingdom of Christ, Paul and Antony, the two first hermits.” Nazianzene, in Monodia, says that Basil first invented monasteries, and was the head of the monks. And Basil himself, Epistol. 63, says that the neo-Caesarians objected the novelty of monastical life against him.

3. But as for cowls, copes, and other monkish habits, as also choir-singing, vowed fasts, choice of meats, and other superstitions now used, these were in those days far to seek.

4. That which Eusebius, lib. secundo, capi. decimo septimo, and after him Epiphanius, haeres. 29, and Jerome, De vir. illustr. in Marco, do say, namely, that Philo Judaeus, De vita contemplativa, speaks of Christian monks which Saint Mark ordained in Egypt, is to be thus taken, that they meant that those monks (whom they call Christians) were by birth Hebrews, that as yet lived like Jews, and followed the orders of the Essenes. For thus Jerome, in Epistola ad Enstochium, speaks of the monks of Egypt. Such Philo (Plato’s imitator), Joseph (that Grecian Livy), in his second book of the Jews’ captivity, reports the Essenes to have been. Cassiodorus, in Histor. Tripartit., lib.

primo, cap. undecimo, says that the conversation which Philo writes the Egyptian monks to be of, is not to be found in any profession elsewhere. And that which Eusebius, lib. tertio, cap. 17, says in his history of the monks, the very same almost he in another place, viz., De praeparatione Evangel. lib. octavo, cap. quarto, ascribes to the Essenes. Sozomene, libr. primo, cap. 12, says that they were Christians living like Jews. But it is very likely that Eusebius herein erred first, and misled others also that followed him. For Philo writes professedly of the old sect of the Essenes, not of any other newer one, and I can hardly believe that he, being a Jew, would write in the commendations of Christians.

5. Necessity was first parent unto hermetical life, for shunning of persecution. “Some record,” says Sozomene, lib. primo, cap. 13, “that the storms of persecution, by which Christian religion was diversely tossed, did compel men at the first to undertake this kind of life. “And so it is said of Paul the hermit, that he, flying from the persecution of Decius, and desiring to keep himself secret in the deserts, turned necessity into willingness,” Otto Frising., lib. 4, cap. 2. This made Basil so earnest in the praise of this monastical life.

6. The ancient monks differ from our popish monks in the very fundamental points of their profession. For first, they lived solitary of necessity, to be the safer from persecution. Second, they were not constrained to give all they had unto the poor. Third, they were not bound by any solemn and perpetual vow to a certain rule or to monastical life, but might alter their manner of living when they thought good. “In that writing (which was brought from heaven by an angel unto Pachomius) there were laws,” says Nicephorus, lib. 9, cap. 14, “set down, that every man should be permitted to eat, drink, and work as much as he could, or would, and in like manner to fast and not fast according to every man’s liking. And that those that fed

the more strongly, should use greater labors, and those that were of but sparing diet or more ready to exercises of piety, those should have less labor enjoined them." "And among these," says Augustine, de morib. eccl., cap. 33, "no man is urged with more severe impositions than he can bear, none burdened with that he refuses to do, nor despised of the rest, for confessing his insufficiency in such performances. For they remember how greatly the Scriptures do commend charity, they remember that to the pure all is pure, and nothing that enters in at the mouth defiles the man, but that which comes forth, so that their industry is not employed in rejecting sorts of meat, as unclean, but in taming concupiscence, and preserving brotherly love." "Others of these," says Sozomene, lib. 3, ca. 15, "living in the frequented cities, do show themselves abjects in men's conceit, and nothing different from the vulgar." And Athanasius, epist. ad Dracontium, says that he knew many both monks and bishops that were married, and had children. Fourth, the monks at the first were laymen, not of the clergy, much less priests or deacons. Jerome, ad Heliodor., makes the monks of the most strict orders to be laymen: "The clergy are one sort," says he, "and the monks another. The clergy are pastors, but I am the sheep." And the Council of Chalcedon, cap. 4, decrees that no monks should put themselves any way in the affairs of the church. Leo, epist. 62, forbids the monks, and the laity (though men be proud of their learning) to be admitted either to teach or preach. (Vide Augustine, de moribus eccles., cap. 3; Gregory, lib. 3, epist. 11.) Fifth, there was no merit set down for monastical life until these later times.

7. There were no nuns until above 200 years after Christ, but some virgins, despising the world's wickedness, lived solitary, but without vow solemn, or perpetual, known by their veil, not when they went forth of their monasteries, but in going out of their fathers' houses, or their own. Many such there were before Jerome's time that lived

continent, out of monasteries, privately, and freely, yea, and some of them were noble women, living in their own houses, attended upon by many maid servants (Jerome, ad Demetriad). But in Rome, Marcella was one of the first of all the nuns. “At that time,” viz., circa ann. 400, says Jerome, in Epitaph. Marcellae, “none of all the noble women at Rome were privy unto the intent of the monks, nor did they adventure, because of the strangeness thereof to take so base and reproachful a name upon them, as the people then held it.” “About that time,” says Nauclerus (generat. 41, ad ann. 1215), speaking of Helena and Constantine’s time, “the holy virgins were chosen by Helen, Constantine’s mother, who were nourished by the common stipend, for the celebration of the praises of God in purity of life, and frequency of prayer.”

8. But as for the monastical life now professed, it is absolutely condemned by the fathers. Augustine does not like their idleness, but reprehends it in divers places of his work, de opera Monachorum, cap. 17. “The solitary life,” says Ivo Carnotensis (ep. 258), “is inferior unto the common and ordinary life, because it is full of importunate cogitations, which rising like flies out of the mud, do buzz about the eyes of the heart, and interrupt the Sabbath of the mind.... Neither do we speak this out of bare conjecture but have learned it of those that have tried it to be true.” In Basil’s Ascetica (tom. 2, c. 7), it is taught that the solitary life contradicts the law of charity, and he cites that of the preacher: “Woe unto the man that is alone, for if he falls he has none to raise him again.” “What do you command us to do,” says Chrysostom (hom. 8, in Matth. 2), “to go into the desert mountains, and become monks? Alas, what is it that I grieve at, but only that you think that none do live a pure and honest life, but only those men?”

9. The monasteries of antiquity generally were the schools of learning, and communities, colleges of teachers and learners. “What? Shall we call our children,” says Chrysostom (Contra vituperat. vita Monast., lib. 3), “from the habitations of the desert? No, but let us suffer them to have the discipline of heaven soundly founded, and deeply rooted in them, and although they stay ten, yea, twenty years in the monasteries, let us not be any whit molested thereat.”

10. But concerning the vow of regular obedience, it was not admitted, nor exacted in the church until four ages after Christ.

11. Voluntary poverty, that is, either without necessity, calling, or limit, made necessary by vow, joined to the opinion of supererogation, and annexed unto monastical profession, was not received into the church until many ages after Christ. Let any man give an instance to the contrary. Origen seems to require the forsaking of earthly possessions of his auditors (Eusebius, hist. eccles., lib. 6, cap. 3), and prescribes the same unto all priests. “Let us hasten from the priests of Pharaoh,” says he (homily 15, in Gen.), “who have earthly possessions, unto the priests of the Lord who have no portion of livings upon earth.” Now Chrysostom (homil. 9, in Mat.) prescribes it unto all men in general. “Shall not we cast all things away,” says he, “and leave all things that we may go unto heaven with a clear and free countenance?” “He that possesses the Lord,” says Jerome (Ad Nepotian & habetur, c. 12, qu. 1, apud Gratianum, c. Clericus), “can possess nothing but the Lord; but if he have anything besides the Lord, he has no part in the Lord.” Eusebius (lib. 3, cap. 31) writes that some apostolic persons did distribute their goods to the poor, but they did it to the end that they might be more free to exercise their evangelical function throughout the world. Paul, the first hermit, did undergo this poverty, because he lost all his goods for confession of his faith. And Paulinus of Nola

sold all his goods to nourish the poor in time of persecution, war, and hunger.

Mary

1. It was the common opinion of the fathers and writers until Lombard's time (which was in the year 1150), that the virgin Mary was conceived in Original sin.

Witness: Augustine, ser. 2, in Ps. 35, and de Bapt. parv., lib. 2, cap. 24, and de Genes. ad liter., libr. 10, cap. 18; Ambrose, Conc. 6, in Psal. 118; Chrysostom, in Mat., hom. 45; Eusebius Emissenus, de nat. Dom., ser. 2; Maximus, ser. de Assumpt; Bede, sup. hom, Missus est; Remigius, in Ps. 21; Anselm, in li. cur Deus homo, cap. 16; Ruportus, in Cant., lib. 1 ad fin.; and Lombard himself, 3 sent., d. 3. Bernard, Ad Lugdun canonicos, epist. 174, says that Mary were equal unto Christ if that she was conceived without original sin. And that this was the more common opinion, Bonaventure, in 3 Sent., dist. 3, q. 1, art. 2; Thom., 3 part., q. 27, art. 2; Antonine, par. 1, tit. 8, c. 2; and Lyra, sup. Luc. 1, do confess. Turrecremata, De consecrat., dist. 4, cap. Formissimo, quest. 3, num. 11, avouches that he had gathered a hundred authors for this opinion, in his book of the truth of the conception of Mary. And very many are alleged by Melchior Canus in his common places, lib. 7, cap. 1.

2. Again, some of the fathers say that Mary was guilty of actual sin. For example, Chrysostom, hom. 20, in Joan., ca. 2, touches her with ambition and rashness. So does Theophylact and Euthymius, ibid.; Athanasius, contra Arianos, serm. 4; and Irenaeus contra haereses, li. 3, cap. 18. Origen, in Luc., hom. 17; Tertullian, lib. de carne Christi, cap. 7; and the author of the book of the questions of the Old and New Testament, quest. 73, in August., accuse her of infidelity.

3. Later, an opinion emerged that Mary was preserved from original sin by a singular and extraordinary privilege. Scotus was the first schoolman to propose this, though he spoke of it only tentatively in 3 dist. 4, q. 1, saying it was probable that such an excellence should be ascribed to Mary, provided it did not conflict with the authority of Scripture or the Church. Francis Mayro later adopted this view in 3 distinct. 3, q. 1, art. 4. Nevertheless, it was explicitly contradicted by Bonaventure (3 sent., dist. 3, art. 1, q. 2), Thomas (par. 3, q. 27, art. 2), Cajetan (ibid.; tract. de concept. virginis), Antony (par. 1, tit. 8, c. 2), Ales (3 part., q. 9), Hugo of St. Victor (De Sacra, lib. 2, part. 1, c. 5), Richard (3 dist. 3), Capreolus (ibid.), Albertus (ibid.), Ariminensis (2 dist. 30–31, q. 2, art. 1), and Durandus (3 dist. 3, q. 1), as well as by many Dominicans and B. Medina (3 part., Thoma, q. 27). So that it is no such catholic doctrine to hold that Mary was conceived and born without original sin.

4. Now whereas Irenaeus calls her Eve's advocate (lib. quento, cap. decimo sexton), this is a hyperbolical speech, and if you take it simply, altogether untrue. For it is in the conception and birth of Christ that she is mediatrix unto Eve (for in bringing forth her redeemer), not in praying for her. And in that respect there were some who called her their only help, lady, queen of heaven, and hope, as Fulgentius, Cyril, and Damascene do.

5. In the year of our Lord 1096, Urban II decreed in a Council at Claremount that the hours of the blessed virgin should be said every day, and that her office should be solemnly sung upon the Sabbath (Rad. Tungrens., Proposit. 20).

6. As for the Roman office of these times dedicated unto her, it is most impious, for the honor of their Savior is transferred unto her. But Bonaventure (in tertia dist., quest. 2) gives other counsel when

he says that we must beware lest we do not diminish the Son's glory in amplifying of the mother's, and therein provoke the mother to wrath, who had rather have her Son honored than herself, as the Creator ought to be before the creature. Urban II did first appoint the office of the Virgin Mary to be sung, anno 1077 (Vide Durand. enchir. lib. 5, cap. 1, num. 9, and lib. 6, cap. 2).

Feast Days

1. Abbot Panormitane, in ca. 3, deserijs, Angelus, in verbo feria, sec. 43, and Sylvester, verbo, Dominica, q. 1, verse 77, do hold that the Lord's Day, or Sunday, was instituted by the divine law, and do affirm that this was the common opinion in their days, which is most true, for it has been observed from the apostles' time (1 Corinthians 16).

2. The first day of the Sabbath (which is our Sunday) is accounted for the Lord's Day, by Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Remigius, as also by Primasius, in 1 Corinth., and so thinks Augustine also, epistol. 119, cap. 13. "The Lord's Day," quotes he, "was declared by the resurrection of the Lord, and has the festival institution from Him." And ep. 86 ad Casulan. Look Isidore also, lib. 1, de officijs, c. 2, and Waldensis, de sacramental., tit. 16, cap. 140.

3. Whereas Constantine decreed by a law that the Lord's Day should be observed and kept (as Eusebius, de vita Constant., lib. 4, cap. 18, and Sozomene, lib. 1, c. 8, affirms), therein he gave but a general law unto the whole empire of the Romans, imitating the apostles. And this was no beginning of the keeping of this day, but a renewing of an apostolic tradition for the more diligent and heedful observation thereof. For before him, Origen against Celsus, and Tertullian, de coro. mili., and lib. 2, ad uxo., make mention of this day, and

Jerome, cont. Vigilan. Justin, quest. 115, says that it was observed from the apostles' ages. See also his second apology. Basil, de Spiri. Sanct., cap. 27, says that it is an apostolic tradition.

4. Theophilus, in edict. cum Theophan., is one of the first that mentions the feasts of the birth, and epiphany of Christ; and Chrysostom another, orat. in Sanct. Philogon. And Nazianzene, orat. in S. Lumin, puts them both for one. And that use the Greek church did follow and practice, though the western church made two divers feasts. The feast of the circumcision was unknown in the church for at least 1000 years after Christ. The feast of the Trinity was known before indeed, but not allowed of publicly, but reproved. Alexander III, c. Quoniam, de ferijs, Decretal, libr. 2, cap. 9, says that in his time it was not used at Rome. Micrologus, De eccles. observ., c. 60, and Pothon priest De stat. dom. dei, lib. 3, do both reprehend the keepers of this feast. Corpus Christi feast was of Urban IV's creation after the 1200th year of our Lord. And Potho Prumiensis finds fault with the feast of the transfiguration, anno 1160, ibid.

5. In the purest times of the primitive church there were no vigils in honor of the saints. Basil, in Psal. 114, is the first that mentions them, and now they are laid aside.

6. The feast days of the saints were first instituted for the worshipping of God observed diversely and freely without bond or punishment for breach thereof. For in the most ancient fathers was never read of any feast but of Easter, nor were they counted holy in themselves, but because of the mysteries of God ministered at such times; not a feast can be proved for 200 years after Christ (Socrat., libr. 5, cap. 21). As for Easter and other feasts, men did keep them of custom at their own pleasures.

7. “The martyrs’ suffering days were called their birthdays and their yearly Easter” (Durand., Rational., libr. 7, cap. primo, num. 38). “Because then they were truly born again and passed from this miserable life to immortality.” “We call the martyrs’ passions their birthdays,” says Emissenus, ser. de S. Genesio, and so does Polydore Virgil, lib. 6, cap. 8.

8. Justinian instituted the feast of Simeon’s meeting of Christ on the second of February, to the honor of Christ for the ceasing of the plague, about the year 540 (Paulus Diacon., lib. 15; Niceph., lib. 17. c. 28). But afterward the popes changed it into the feast of Mary’s purification.

9. The feast of the annunciation was first ordained for the honor of God, not of Mary, as it appears in a sermon said to be Athanasius’s, De Sancta Deipara. “This feast,” says he, “is one, and the first of the Lord’s.” And hereupon the ancient writers called it the annunciation of the Lord (vide Durand., Ratio., lib. 7, cap. 2, num. 2).

10. Urban VI instituted the feast of Mary’s visitation (Bellarmine). And the feast of her nativity was not kept in the church of old (Durand., lib. 7, cap. 28, num. 2), but had its origin by a night revelation. Gregory is the first that names it.

11. The feast of Pentecost was no Christian feast in the apostles’ time, for they followed the Jews’ manner in keeping of theirs (Francolinus, de horis canon, cap. 84).

12. The fathers took not Pentecost for the last day of the Quinquagesima, but for the whole time between Easter and the fiftieth day. “Take all the heathens’ solemnities,” says Tertullian, “and place them in a rank, they will not make up one Pentecost.” And again, De coro. milit., “We hold it a sin to fast, or to pray kneeling

upon the Lord's Day. And the like privilege we have from Easter day through the whole Pentecost." "Our fathers taught us," says Ambrose, in Luc. 17, "that all the 50 days of Pentecost are to be celebrated as Easter is, because the beginning of the eighth week makes the Pentecost." The same saying he has (sermon 60). But now the fiftieth day is the feast only.

13. The feast of the assumption of Mary was never universally received, by place and person. Nay, in Charlemagne's time it was doubted whether this feast should be kept: "We have left the feast of the assumption of Saint Mary to be inquired of," says he in his constitutions, lib. 1, c. 158. And Ludovicus Pius's son adds it unto the other feasts (anno 818, witness Aventine, lib. 4).

14. That Mary was assumed body and soul, it is not certain in the fathers. "How, or at what time, or by what persons, her sacred body was taken thence, or whether it was translated," says the author, serm. de Assump. ad Paul & Eustoch, "or whether it be risen again, it is unknown." "But although some seem to have erred," says Epiphanius, Haeres. 78, "let them search the Scriptures, and they shall neither find the death of Mary, nor whether she was buried or not buried." "I cannot confirm this of her," says the author of the book, de Assumpt. Maria, fathered upon Augustine, "by any special testimony. And, if I have spoken as I should, Christ and His saints approve it; if otherwise, Christ and His saints pardon it." Now all that he affirms is but this: that it is not ungodliness to say that her body saw no corruption. Augustine, Serm. de sanctis 35, dares not define whether she was assumed with her body or without it; no more dare others (as Breviar, Quignonij, pag. 231). Ado, in Martyrologio, says that the church celebrates her sleeping, but not her assumption. And again, "What is become of her holy body, the church's sobriety has chosen rather to be ignorant with godly zeal, than to teach any

frivolous or apocryphal doctrine thereupon." So says Usuard also. Durandus, Rational., lib. 7, cap. 24, num. 1, affirms that her bodily assumption into heaven is uncertain, and those that hold it have but their opinion from common report (Orat. Apud Damasc. de dorm. deiparae).

15. The feast of the Exaltation of the Cross was not ordained before the year 630 (Otto Frising., lib. quinto, cap. nono). But Nicephorus (lib. octavo, cap. 29) says that Helene instituted it. Manuel Coromenus (Varior. Impp. miscell. constit. cap. septimo, de ferijs) makes mention of such a feast, and so Balsamon does (in Photij Nomocan, titul. septimo).

16. The feast of Mary's conception was not ordained at first because of her immaculate conception. Petrus (de natalibus) says it began to be instituted because of her sanctification in the womb. But Bernard (epist. 174) reproves this feast. And Pothon, a priest, says that it is an absurd thing to celebrate it (De statu. dom. Dei, lib. tertio, ad finem). Nor was it generally received until the decree of Sixtus quartus in the year 1470, as appears (ex Extravag. Cum praexcelsa. De reliquijs).

17. The feast of her purification was instituted in Justinian's time (Nicephor. lib. 17, c. 28; P. Diacon., lib. 10, rerum Rom.).

The Church, Succession, Antiquity

1. By the catholic church, the fathers mean the company of the elect, by faith grafted into Jesus Christ. So Augustine (in Psal. 92 and 62, de catech. rud. c. 20, and Psalm 36); Cyprian (lib. 1, ep. 3 and de unit. eccles.); Jerome (in ep. ad Galat., cap. 4 and in Job, c. 26); Epiphanius (Haeres., 35); Chrysostom (hom. de Turture and in Psal. 114); Ambrose (in Eph., cap. 1); and Bernard (sup. Cantic., ser. 76)

understands it. Now in acknowledging a visibility thereof, they speak of the outward estate, and parts thereof, or of the particular church. And in saying that the wicked are of the church, they speak of the external state of the particular church of their times.

2. They used also to appeal unto the church, but no farther than they thought she did follow the canonical Scriptures; for thereby, and only thereby, is the church known, as Augustine says (contra lit. Petil. lib. 3, cap. 11).

3. They praised the Roman Church (some of them) by a supposition, because it had kept the faith in greatest purity unto the times wherein they wrote, not because the Holy Ghost was bound or tied to that seat. Note this supposition.

4. They hold that the church is not always visible upon the earth. "The whole congregation of the saints shall be hidden," says abbot Joachim (in Revelat., page 2), "for so shall the elect of God (being wise) be wise unto themselves, so that they shall not presume to preach openly, because that the darkness shall prevail. Not that they shall leave to animate and exhort the faithful in secret, but because they dare not adventure to preach publicly."

5. In the fathers' writings some particular churches are called catholic, yea universal, because of their catholic faith. So that catholic and universal church is very often taken for the orthodoxal church, and hereby distinct from the conventicles of heretics. "Theodosius made a law," says Sozomene (lib. 7, cap. 4), "that their church only should be called catholic, that did worship the Holy Trinity with equal honor, that all others should be called heretics, noted with ignominy, and punished for their iniquity." And hence it is that the orthodoxal bishops were often called the bishops of the catholic or universal church.

6. The fathers do acknowledge a succession, and appeal thereunto, because they lived before any schism, when it stood without breach in the Roman Church, and because the truth of apostolic doctrine was withal reserved. “Eleutherius for his order and doctrine has the twelfth place from the apostles,” says Nicephorus (l. 4, c. 15). Tertullian (De praescript, ca. 32) speaks of some churches which cannot produce their original from the apostles or their scholars, because they were begun long after, and yet holding the same faith, are called apostolic also, because of the unity of their doctrine. And this succession they urge against the schismatics only.

For those that mangled the Scriptures, and invented others, as Valentinus, etc. “They have not Peter’s inheritance,” says Ambrose (De paenit., lib. 1, cap. 6), “for they have not his faith.” “The succession of faith,” says Nazian (Orat. de laud. Athanasii), “is the true succession: for those that profess the same doctrine of faith, are partakers of the same throne.” Augustine (De unit. eccl., c. 18, 19) will have the church proved by the Scriptures, not by succession of bishops, nor authorities of councils. And Bellarmine (De notis Ecclesiae) grants that it is no necessary consequent that the church should be where there is succession.

7. The fathers noted the succession of the see of Rome because the bishops were then famous, and the place renowned, and more known to the doctors by reason of the nearness of it (Tertullian, De praescript. advers. haeretic.).

8. This succession of Roman bishops drawn from Peter is but uncertain, and of human institution. Jerome (De script. eccles.) puts Linus the second and Clement the fourth. Irenaeus (lib. 3, c. 3) puts Linus the first. But Clemens succeeded Peter, as in the epistle to James under his name he affirms. Now the great Council of

Chalcedon (Action. 15) held that the Church of Rome had the primacy with the fathers because that city ruled all the world. “We decree,” says Justinian (Novell. 131, cap. 2), “according to the ancient canons, that the holy bishop of Rome be esteemed the primate of all priests.” “This is to be well noted,” says Canus (Loc. comm., lib. 6, ca. 8), “that the bishops of Rome succeeding of Peter, is not revealed in Scriptures, but has the authority from most grave histories.... But if this be not sufficient to the learned, we have another, that is, that though we have no Scriptures for this succession of the Roman bishops from Peter, yet it is a tradition of the apostles unto the church, from hand to hand as it were.” And thus also says Covarruvias (tom. 1, 2 par., Relect. sec. 8, p. 242, col. 1) that it is plain by catholic doctrine that Peter’s successors had their primacy given them by Christ. D. á Stoto (3 dist. 24, q. 2) says that the said succession is annexed to this see of Rome by an ecclesiastical law. And like to this has Cajetane (Opusc. de Rom. Pontif. institut., cap. 13). And Bellarmine (De Pontif., lib. 2, cap. 12) says that, “The bishop of Rome, in that he is so, is Peter’s successor, this he has from Peter’s deed, not from Christ’s first ordinance.”

9. The fathers urge succession of other sees indifferently, as well as of the Roman Church. “We can reckon them,” says Irenaeus (lib. 3, cap. 3, and lib. 4, ca. 63), “that were made bishops in the churches by the apostles.” Look also at Eusebius (l. 4, c. 19) and Augustine (Contra lit. Petil., lib. 2, cap. 51).

10. The fathers urged antiquity against the heretics, not respecting it for itself, as it consists of years and ages, but in being joined with the doctrine of the prophets and apostles, and beginning at least at the apostles’ time. “This good has the antiquity, which was adorned with divine knowledge and doctrine, done unto me,” says Tertullian (in

his Apolog. in fine). “Custom without truth, is but an antiquity in error,” says Cyprian (epist. 74, ad Pomp.).

Councils

1. The fathers’ praising of councils mean only those that prove the doctrine of faith by the Scriptures.

2. The appeal from a council unto the bishop of Rome was not because he was a judge over the councils, but because of his credit and authority with the emperor. And oftentimes this was out of Africa by reason of the small distance of place.

3. Emperors and kings in the primitive church called councils by their own authority, not by the pope’s, for above 800 years together. “The emperor,” says Theodoret (lib. 1, cap. 7), “called that noble Council of Nicea.”

“Emperor,” says Sozom., lib. 1, cap. 26, “called a council at Nicea in Bithynia, setting down a day for all the rulers of every church in all places, to be there present.” And he reckons Pope Julius for one that was commanded thither. “The king,” says Epiphan., Haeres. 69, “having a care of the church, called a general council.” And again: “We bishops, assembled from divers provinces, as Selvica in Isauria, at the command of our high and mighty prince Constantine.” “The emperor,” says Socrates, lib. 5, cap. 8, speaking of Theodosius, “without delay called a council of bishops that embraced his faith.” “By the emperor’s command,” says Zonaras, Annal., tom. 3, “the second council was called because of Macedonius.” “Innocent, bishop of Rome,” says Sozom., lib. 8, cap. 28, “sent five bishops and two priests unto Honorius and Arcadius, emperors, to entreat a council of them and the time and place thereof, who notwithstanding

obtained it not." "Tell me," says Jerome, in his Apology against Ruffin., lib. 2, ca. 5, "who were consuls that year? What emperor commanded this council to be called?" "We went unto his sacred majesty," says Chrysostom, epist. ad Innocent I, "and entreated him to call a council." "I cannot find," says Aeneas Sylvius, De actis Conc. Basil., lib. primo, "neither in ancient history, nor in the Acts of the Apostles, that it was a use at any time for the popes alone to call councils." And if we so proceed through all times, we shall find nothing in the primitive church approving this authority of calling councils to belong only to the popes of Rome. Nor was the assent of that bishop ought esteemed in Constantine's time, and other emperors after that. And therefore, the Council of Chalcedon says thus of itself: "The holy, great, and general council, which by the grace of God, and the decree of the most holy and Christian emperors, Valentinian and Martian, was gathered at Chalcedon the metropolitan city of Bithynia," etc., but makes no mention of the pope, though it had his assent also. Leo I, ep. 9, desires of Theodosius to grant his entreaty and supplication, that there might be a council of the bishops called in Italy. "Although we know," says Frederick the emperor in the council to the bishops, Apud Radevicum de Gestis Frederic I, Imperatoris, lib. 2, c. 64, "that by the place and dignity of the empire, the calling of councils is in our power, but especially in such great dangers of the church. For so it is recorded that Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, and of latter times, Charlemagne and Otto, all emperors have done before us, yet do we leave the authority of deciding this great and weighty business, unto your power, and prudence." "We read," says cardinal Cusanus, "that the general councils were often called by the emperors, yea all of them (as we see by the records) until the eighth, called at Constantinople in Basil the emperor's time." And again: De concord. catholica, lib. 3, c. 2 and 25, "All the eight general councils…were called by the emperors," so that he confesses this power to be in the

emperor's hand and not in the pope's for above eight hundred years after Christ. Now Turrecremata, Summa de ecclesi., lib. 2, c. 23, makes a double presidency in councils, to wit, of honor or sitting, and of authority. And that of session and honor the pope sometimes had vouchsafed him, but this other of authorizing, never until later times, and namely about the year 1516, in the Lateran Council under Leo X, cap. 11, condemned before, in the Councils of Constance, sess. 4 and 5, and Basel, sess. 2 and 16, and by Gerson also in his treatise, whether it be lawful to appeal from the pope in matters of faith or no.

Benedictions, Hallowings

1. The benedictions or hallowing of water, ashes, salt, candles, oil, and palms are never spoken of in the Fathers, but only of the water of baptism. Augustine, De tempore, ser. 37, says that all the waters of Jordan were consecrated by Christ. Ambrose, de sacram, lib. 2, ca. 5: "And the faithful were wont to take of the water of baptism home with them, and sprinkle it about their houses," Alcuin, de div. officiis, cap. de Sabbato Pasch. Bellarmine plainly confesses that holy water is but a human invention, De extrem. unctione, lib. 1, ca. 61, because, quotes he, "In baptism men were cured of their bodily infirmities," as Augustine witnesses, epist. 23 and de Civit. Dei, lib. 22, c. 8: "Therefore some began to use holy water, besides baptism, for curing diseases."

2. Sometimes there were miracles done by this sanctified water, as Theodoret, Hist., lib. 5, cap. 22, and Bede, Hist. Anglor., lib. 1, ca. 17, do relate. But that proves not the ordinary use thereof in the church, nor that it was therefore hallowed that it might have power to work supernatural effects.

3. It is a profane novelty to say that it is a medicine for venial sin, and in itself powerful against devils. This Molanus, Practic. Theologiae, tract. 1, de paenit., cap. 17, prop. 24, 25, 26, perceived, when he said that, “The sprinkling of holy water, and such other like acts have their reference unto the public prayers (then made); for I dare not say as some do, that holy water has any effect against anything, by virtue of the work done.”

4. They used to bless men with prayer, and the ceremonies of chrism and imposition of hands. “What else is the laying on of hands,” says Augustine, De Baptis. contra Donat., lib. 3, cap. 16 (Et habetur apud Gratian. Caus. 1, q. 1, cap. Manus), “but a praying over a man?”

5. It was called holy bread because it was given in sign of the divine blessing, which is to be received by the body and blood of Christ, of them that were not as yet permitted to receive those mysteries or received by them but seldom. “There are divers kinds of sanctification,” says Augustine, De Pecc. merit. & remiss., lib. 2, cap. 26, “for I think the catechumeni have one kind of sanctification by the sign of Christ and the prayers made with putting of hands upon them, and that which they receive, though it be not the body of Christ, yet it is holy, and holier than our ordinary meat.” Hence it appears that this hallowed bread was then given to the catechists to whom the Eucharist was denied, but nowadays it is given unto all that do not communicate. In the 3rd Council of Carthage it is recorded that they used to give salt instead of the Eucharist unto the catechumenists.

6. It was called the blessing, or benediction, because it was given as a token of commendation and unity from one to another. “The bread which we sent you,” says Paulinus (Apud Aug., epist. 31), and ipse Aug., ep. 34, “shall become a more fruitful blessing by the love of

your goodness that receives it." And again, in his epistle to Alipius (epist. 35), note that he says, "You shall make this bread a benediction by vouchsafing to receive it." For hence it seems that it was not sanctified before by the sender. And again, also in his epistle unto Romanianus (apud August., epist. 36 and epist. 31 ad August.), he says, "We pray you to sanctify this bread by receiving it, which we send unto your love to signify our unity and accord." And in like manner they used to send money, apparel, and keys to hang about their necks with their letters for a blessing, Greg., lib. 1, epist. 29 and 30, and lib. 8, epist. 31.

7. The benediction of this bread for health of soul and body against all diseases and snares of the enemy began in the Council of Nantes (cap. 9) and was never mentioned before Augustine's times.

8. There were many hundreds of years passed before that ever the Roman Church knew how to consecrate an Agnus Dei. Alcuine, ca. de Sabbato Pasch., and Amalarius, de eccl. offic., lib. 1, cap. 17, are the first that mentioned it.

The Clergy, and Laity

1. The fathers distinguish the clergy from the laity because the one bears a public charge in the church, which specified them from the other which bear none. Again, in respect of the punishment inflicted upon either, the clergy had the greater imposed upon them, the laity the lesser. So that it is an abuse of this distinction to say that the people are profane, and that the clergy should be exempted from civil governance.

2. The exemption of the clergy from political judgment in civil causes began to be in common use about the year 536, for Justinian

ordained that in causes merely civil, the bishops alone should hear and determine of the cases of monks and nuns (Const. Novell. 79, cap. 1). And that the clergy should first be examined before their ordinaries; but if that the nature of the case, or some other difficulty arising, be such that the bishop cannot possibly decide the business, then let it be lawful for them to go unto the civil judges (Const. Novel. 83, in praefat. and 123, cap. 21). "I say in causes merely civil, for in criminal causes, the civil judge is by him appointed to inquire and censure thereupon, and if he finds the clergy man worthy of punishment, then shall he be by the bishop despoiled of his priestly dignity, and so become punishable by the law" (Const. Novel. 83, cap. 1 and 123, cap. 21). Nor is it any wonder that the clergy had not this exemption before, because that the clergy besides that their function, are citizens and members of the political body, and in that respect ought to be in all things subject to the political power. I add: in common use, for before Justinian's time in some peculiar churches the exemption was practiced before. "Let no man presume," says the Council of Agatha, cap. 32 (Et habetur apud Gratian, Caus. 11, quest. 1, ca. 17), "to summon a clergy man before a secular judge, without the license of the bishop. If any such be summoned, let him not appear or defend, or dare to propound a criminal cause unto a secular judgment." Now before Justinian's time, the bishop's ordinary jurisdiction was but a power of inquiry and restraint for violating and corrupting the ecclesiastical discipline (see Conc. Chalced., cap. 9; Carthag. 3, cap. 9; Tolet. 3, c. 13; Matiscon, cap. 8).

3. About the 400th year after Christ, the clergy of some churches were free from paying tribute unto secular princes (Eusebius, lib. 10, cap. 7, and Jerome, in Matth. 17), and in othersome it was not so. "The churches' livings do pay their tribute," says Ambrose (in orat. de traded. Basilicis, against Auxentius). "The emperors Valentinian,

Valens, and Gratian, do exhort the Asian bishops that were suspect of heresy, to return unto them that were of sound judgment, whom they commend in this among other things, that they refused not to pay the tax that was exacted of them" (Theodoret, hist. lib. quarto, cap. septimo). Neither is this meant only of the patrimonial tributes for every inheritance, but of the personal also, for every head. "If the Son of God paid his tax," says Ambrose (in 5 Luc, lib. 3 and citatur. ca. Magnum, caus. 11, quest. 1), "who are you that thinks it should not be paid?" But some will say that this arose out of custom, and not out of law? Then let him know that there is no divine law that exempts the clergy from paying dues unto secular princes if their need so requires. Chrysostom (homil. 23, in Roman.) will have that subjection exacted even of the priests and monks, which Paul speaks of (Romans 13). And paying of tax is no little part thereof, as Covarruvias, in l. practic. quest., ca. 31, observed very well. Thomas, in Roman. 13, says that it was the prince's gift to exempt the clergy from these taxes, and therefore a human law. And so says Covarruvias, in the place afore named; and John Median, tract. de Restitutione, quest. 15.

4. The right of assent and suffrage (in elections of the churchmen) was taken from the people about the year 870, Distinct. 63.

Additions

1. The modern papists hold these positions: 1. Lawfulness of equivocation in oath, or to swear equivocally that he did not that which he did, though he had done it. 2. That to pray for their enemies in special is no command, but a counsel. 3. That in a fast it is lawful to drink often, and to take medicines. 4. That many atheistical thoughts and filthy imaginations are no sins. 5. That to take away

any small thing whose loss brings no great damage to the owner is no mortal sin. But these are strangers to the fathers' ears, yea, until of late, unto all Christians.

2. Not a father of the first 400 years taught nine choirs of angels, but contrariwise some do overthrow this distinction. "I think," says Theodoret, in 1. ad Coloss., "that he calls the cherubim the thrones (for the prophet Ezekiel saw the throne of the deity placed upon them), and by dominations, principalities, and powers, he means those that governed the nations." Augustine calls them all by the general name of angels, Enchir., cap. 58. "Whether the archangels be called virtues," says he, "or what the difference is between these four words, 'thrones, dominations, principalities, and powers,' let them tell that can, if they prove what they say. I confess plainly, that I am altogether ignorant." Hence may the antiquity of the books under Dionysius Areopagita's name be gathered, that teach nine orders of angels so undoubtedly.

3. The fathers hold generally that the first precept of the ten commandments concerns the having or choosing of God; the second is of idols; the tenth of concupiscence. So teaches Philo Judaeus, De decalog.; Josephus, Antiq. lib. 2, cap. 6 and 8; Origen, in Exod., hom. 8; Athanasius, in Synops.; Nazianzene, in vers. de Decal.; Ambrose and Jerome, in Eph., cap. 6; Procoplus and Rupertus, in Exod., cap. 20, with others, viz., author operis imperfect. in Matth., homil. 49. Augustine is variable, one while affirming it, and another while denying it, vide Quest. vet. and nov. Test., q. 7, Quest. super Exod., lib. 2, cap. 71, Epist. 119, cap. undecimo.

4. The fathers generally either deny, or suppress in silence, that the souls of the dead can return unto the living. Chrysostom, De Lazaro, hom. ultimo; Tertullian, lib. de anima; Isidore, Etymolog., lib. 8,

cap. 9; Theophilact, in Matth. 8; and others, viz., Author quest. ad Antioch, quest. 11 and 13, apud Athanas., do all deny this. Augustine seems to be of another opinion in his book of the care for the dead, cap. 15 and 16.

The Consequent

No apostle, no holy father, no sound catholic, for 1200 years after Christ, did ever hold or profess that doctrine of all the principles and grounds of religion, that is now taught by the Church of Rome, and authorized by the Council of Trent.

SOLI DEO GLORIA

---

[1] In the original, this is the third section; for the sake of practicality, we have chosen to omit the second section entitled: *"A Catalogue of the counterfeit, doubtful, or corrupted works of the fathers; together with some errors which the grosser of them have sprinkled in their works."*