

ST
BELLARMINE
COLLECTION:
Antichrist
Purgatory
Church Militant

Contents

ON ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER I: A Disputation is Proposed on Antichrist

CHAPTER II: Antichrist is Going to be a Certain, Specific Man

CHAPTER III: It is Shown That Antichrist has not yet Come.

CHAPTER IV: The First proof: the Rule of Antichrist has not yet Begun.

CHAPTER V: The Second Proof: Desolation of the Roman Empire.

CHAPTER VI: A Third Proof: Enoch and Elijah

CHAPTER VII: The Fourth Proof: the Persecution of Antichrist.

CHAPTER VIII: The Fifth Proof: the Duration of Antichrist

CHAPTER IX: The Sixth Proof: the End of the World

CHAPTER X: On the name “Antichrist”.

CHAPTER XI: On the Mark of Antichrist.

CHAPTER XII: On the Begetting of Antichrist

CHAPTER XIII: On the Seat of Antichrist

CHAPTER XIV: On the Doctrine of Antichrist

CHAPTER XV: On the Miracles of Antichrist

CHAPTER XVI: On the Kingdom and Battles of Antichrist

CHAPTER XVII: On Gog and Magog

CHAPTER XVIII: The Absurdities of the Heretics are Refuted

CHAPTER XIX: The Trifles of the Smalchaldich Council of the Lutherans
are Refuted

CHAPTER XXI: The Lies of Calvin are Refuted

CHAPTER XXI: The Lies of Illyricus are Refuted

CHAPTER XXII: That the Pope is Truly a Bishop

ON ANTICHRIST

by

St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J.

Doctor of the Church



CHAPTER I: A Disputation is Proposed on Antichrist

Up to this point we have proved that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the supreme rule of the whole Church. It remains that we should see whether at some time the Roman Pontiff might have fallen from that degree; certainly our adversaries contend that at this time there is not a true Bishop of Rome, whatever he might have been before. Even Nilus of Thessalonika, at the end of his little book against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff says: “But the chief and principle point of my discourse, is that as long as the Pope shall preserve the heavenly and agreeable order formerly instituted in the Church; as long as he shall adhere to Christ, the supreme Lord and head of the Church, I shall easily suffer him both as head of the Church and high Priest, even the successor of Peter or the Apostles; I will allow that all obey him, and that nothing should diminish that which pertains to his honor, but if he would have fallen from truth, nor wished to return to it, then rightly he ought to be held for one condemned and cast out.” Thus Nilus.

But he ought to have shown into what errors the Roman Pontiffs have fallen, as well as both when and by whom they were condemned. Certainly we know that in the General Council of the Lateran under Innocent III, Lyons under Gregory X, and Florence under Eugene IV, the Greeks were convicted of error and returned to the faith of the Latins. Thereafter, they always went back to their vomit and for that reason were gravely punished by God. Yet we read nowhere that the Latins ever came to the faith of the Greeks. Nor can any Ecclesiastical judgment be brought against the Latins, as we have brought many against the Greeks.

On the other hand, Calvin says: “Let us grant all these things are true (although we have already forced the contrary from them), Peter was constituted Head of the universal Church by the voice of Christ, and that honor being conferred upon him he laid down in the Roman See, and it was ratified by the authority of the ancient Church, confirmed by long use, that the Roman Pontiff always had supreme power over all, and was in his

person the judge of all cases and men, and was subject to the judgment of none; let them have many more if they want. I respond that still, in one word, it will avail them nothing, except that there ought to be a Church and a Bishop in Rome.” [1](#) And below that: “Let the Romans untie this knot: I deny that the Pontiff is the Prince of bishops, since he is not really a Bishop.” [2](#) And further: “Rome was rightly the mother of all Churches once, but from the time it began to be the seat of Antichrist, it ceased to be that which it was.” [3](#) And again: “We appear to some to be cursed and petulant since we call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist; but they who think so do not understand they charge Paul with immodesty, after whom we speak, nay more, we speak thus from his own mouth. And lest anyone would cast before us words of Paul which might pertain to another matter and wrongly, distort them away from the Roman Pontiff, I will show briefly that it can be understood in no manner other than that the Papacy is the seat of Antichrist.” [4](#)

All the heretics of this time teach similar things: Firstly, Luther in his computation of the seasons, as well as in his Assertion, article 28 and 36, and often in other places. Likewise the Lutheran Centuriators in all of their Centuries; [5](#) Illyricus in his book on the Primacy; David Chytraeus in his work on the Apocalypse (the ninth and thirteenth chapters); Wolfgang Musculus in his work *de Ecclesia*, in common citations; Theodore Beza; [6](#) Theodore Bibliander; [7](#) Heinrich Pantaleon in his *Chronologia*; Henry Bullinger in his preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse and above all John Wycliff who is among those condemned in article 30 of the Council of Constance, sess. 8. All of these pronounced that the Pontiff is the Antichrist.

Therefore, in order that this question should be carefully explained, it will be treated in nine chapters. The first will be on the name of Antichrist. The second on whether Antichrist might be one man, or a race of men. Thirdly, on the time of his coming and his death. Fourth, on his proper name. Fifth, from which nation he is going to be born, and especially by whom he will be received. Sixth, where he is going to set up his seat. Seventh, on his doctrine and morals. Eighth, on his miracles. Ninth, on his kingdom and battles. From all these it will appear very clearly, with what impudence the heretics make the Roman Pontiff out to be the Antichrist, in which we will add a chapter proving not only that the Roman Pontiff is not Antichrist, but that he could by no means cease to be the Bishop and

Shepherd of the whole Church, and such that no part of the objections of Calvin shall remain unanswered.

Now in regard to the First, some of our adversaries teach, that the name “Antichrist” properly means Vicar of Christ, and hence the Pope, who asserts he is the Vicar of Christ, is himself Antichrist. Wolfgang Musculus teaches this in his citations, in the chapter on the power of ministers and he tries to show that the word *anti* means in place of, whence *antichristos* is in place of Christ, just as *antisrategos* means he who thrusts himself in place of a Leader, that is, one who would have it that he is the Vicar of a Leader. The Centuriators also teach that the Pope is the true Antichrist because he makes himself the Vicar of Christ.

But without a doubt they are deceived or are trying to deceive. The name “Antichrist” can not mean Vicar of Christ in any manner, rather, it merely means someone contrary to Christ; not contrary in any way whatever, but so much so that he will fight against that which pertains to the seat and dignity of Christ; that is, one who will be a rival of Christ and to be held as Christ, after he who truly is Christ has been cast out.

The meaning of this noun is proved in three ways. Firstly, because in Greek, the term *anti* properly means opposition, and they are said to be opposed not only to those among whom they oppose, but even those whom they exert influence over. From there, it comes to pass that *anti*, in composition, sometimes means contrariety and sometimes equivalence but never subordination, as is clear in the examples of all such names. For instance, *antipalos* means feigning mourning; *antidoton* a contrary remedy; *antiphrasis* a contradiction; *antisrophos*, equivalence; *antitheos* means equal to God; *anticheiris* that is the thumb, because from that region it is opposed and rules the rest of the hand, and so on and so forth. But Vicar does not mean opposition but subordination to another thing, and therefore, cannot be expressed through the term *anti*.

Hence, the term *antistrategos* does not mean the Vicar of a leader but ordinarily a contrary leader just as *antisratenomai* is a civil war. Moreover, sometimes one who is in place of a leader is not subject to him but rather equal to him in the way that the Latin words *Propraetor*, or *Proconsul*, do not mean the Vicar of a Praetor, or a Consul, but one who is in some province, that which is a Praetor or a Consul in the city and in this Musculus was deceived because he read with Budaeus that *antisrategos*

means a Propraetor, and he reckoned it meant Vicar of a Praetor, which is false.

Secondly, the same is proven from Scripture. Although there is some ambiguity about this noun still, as it is received in Scripture it is not ambiguous; our question ought not to be on the term *antichristos* in an absolute sense, but as it is found in the Scriptures. Next, in the Scriptures the one who is called Antichrist is he: “who is extolled above everything which is called God.” [8](#) That is certainly not a Vicar of Christ but an enemy of Christ, the true God. In the First epistle of John, Antichrist is said to be he “who denies Jesus is the Messiah,” [9](#) i.e. he who denies Jesus is the Christ, that he would claim for himself that which is for Christ. And in Matthew, it is said that Antichrist will affirm himself to be Christ, [10](#) which can hardly be a Vicar but rather would be an imitator.

Thirdly, from all the authors who wrote on Antichrist and from the common consensus of all Christians we understand by “Antichrist” a certain man as a distinct Pseudochrist. This is how St. John Damascene explains this term from the Greek Fathers, [11](#) and in the same manner Jerome explains it from the Latin Fathers, [12](#) and he was also an expert in the Greek language.

Next, Henry Stephan gives a similar explanation in his *Treasury on the Greek Language*, albeit he is from the number of the Swiss heretics. Thus, we have our first argument against our adversaries. Since the noun “Antichrist” means an enemy and imitator of Christ, and the Roman Pontiff is from the household of Christ declaring that he is subject to Christ in all things, it is clear that he would in no way say he is Christ, or that he makes himself equal to him; therefore, it is manifest that he is not Antichrist.

CHAPTER II: Antichrist is Going to be a Certain, Specific Man

NOW in what pertains to the second, we agree with our adversaries in one thing and differ in another. We agree in the fact that just as the name of Christ is received in two ways, sometimes properly concerning the specific and individual person of Christ, who is Jesus of Nazareth, and sometimes commonly concerning all those who have a similitude with Christ in regard to anointing, just as all Priests, Prophets and Kings are said to be of Christ: “Do not touch my Christs,” [13](#) so also Antichrist is received properly sometimes for a certain distinct enemy of Christ, on which the Scriptures teach, and sometimes commonly for all who oppose Christ in some way. We read in the First Epistle of John: “You have heard, that Antichrist is coming, and now there are many Antichrists;” [14](#) in other words, you have heard Antichrist is going to come, and now, although that singular Antichrist has not yet come still, many seducers have come who also can be called Antichrists.

But we differ on Antichrist properly so called, whether he might be one individual man. All Catholics think that Antichrist is one specific man, but all the heretics cited above teach that Antichrist, properly so called, is not a single person but a single throne of a tyrannical kingdom as well as the seat of its apostasy that presides over the Church.

The Centuriators say: “The Apostles teach that Antichrist is not only one person, but a whole kingdom through false teachers in the temple of God that is presiding in the Church, in a great city, i.e. the city of Rome, whose works are compared to the deception and deceit of the devil.” [15](#) The others we cited say similar things.

These are their reasons. First, Paul says that already in his time Antichrist began to live in the world: “The mystery of iniquity is now operating,” [16](#) and still he says in the same place that Antichrist must be killed by Christ at the end of the world. Hence, Beza concludes in his commentary on this citation in Thessalonians that: “They are clearly

hallucinating when they think this can be understood about one man; unless they give me someone who remains alive from the age of Paul even to the day of judgment.” Calvin argues in the same way from this passage. They confirm this reasoning from John who, in his First Epistle says: “Every spirit that denies Jesus, it is not from God and this is Antichrist whom you have heard is coming, and is now in the world.” [17](#)

The Second reason is of Beza: because Daniel VII does not understand individuals by the individual names of the beasts of bear, lion and leopard, but rather individual Kingdoms, one of which contains many kings. Therefore, Paul, who wondrously agrees with Daniel, does not understand the man of sin and the son of perdition as one individual person but a figure as a body of many tyrants.

The Third reason is of Calvin who argues from what is said in 1 John II that those who believe that one man is going to be Antichrist are mad and err of their own accord, since Paul in 2 Thessalonians II wrote that Apostasy was coming and his head is going to be Antichrist. Accordingly, Apostasy is a certain general defection from the faith which indeed makes one body and one rule, and is not a matter of a few years that it could be completed under one king.

With all of these notwithstanding, the truth is that Antichrist is one individual man. The fact is proven from all the Scriptures and the Fathers who treat on Antichrist. There are five passages of Scripture. The First is in the Gospel of John: “I have come in the name of my Father, and you did not receive me, if another will have come in his own name, you will receive him.” [18](#) Musculus and Calvin would have these words on false prophets understood in general, not on some individual, following Marloratus in his commentary on this passage. But their explication is opposed to the ancient Fathers and the text itself. For these words were spoken on one Antichrist, as Chrysostom, Cyril and all the Fathers witness on this citation. [19](#)

Besides this, the Lord opposes himself to another man i.e. person to person, not kingdom to kingdom or sect to sect, as is clear from the pronouns and phrases: “I,” another “in my name,” that is in his own name, “me”, etc. Therefore, just as Christ was one and an individual man so also Antichrist will be one and an individual man.

Next, Christ says here that Antichrist will be received by the Jews for a Messiah. Moreover, it is certain that the Jews wait for one certain and singular man. All false Prophets come not in their own name but in that of

another. “Prophets that falsely prophesy in my name, these are not sent, etc.” [20](#) But the Lord spoke about one specific man who will come in his own name, that is, who does not recognize some God, but “will extol himself,” as Paul says, “over everything which is called God.”

Next, many false prophets came before the coming of Christ and many were going to come after. Therefore, if he were speaking on false Prophets the Lord would not have said: “If another will have come,” but that many are coming.

The Second passage is of Paul. “Unless first dissension will have come, and the man of sin will have been revealed, the son of perdition . . . And then that wicked man will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will kill by the breath of his mouth.” [21](#) Our adversaries understand these words on the true Antichrist, but the Apostle speaks on a certain specific and particular person, as is clear from the articles in the Greek: “*apochaluphthē ho anthropos tēs amartias hō huios tēs apoleias . . . kai tote apochaluphthesetai hō anomos*,” as Epiphanius teaches, the Greek articles draw together the meaning to one certain matter, that *anthropos* will mean a man in common but *hō anthropos* an individual man. [22](#) It is quite the wonder, that none of our adversaries who boast of their expertise in language happened to notice this.

The Third citation is that of 1 John II, where we read thus: *hēkousate hoti ho antichrisos epketai kai nun antichrisoi polloi gegonasin*.)” or, “You have heard that [the] Antichrist is coming, and now there are many Antichrists.” There, he places an article ahead of Antichrist properly so called but without the article it would convey the name of Antichrist received commonly, clearly indicating that Antichrist properly so called is one certain person while Antichrist commonly received is not a certain person, but every heretic in kind.

The Fourth passage is from Daniel chapter VII, XI and XII, where he speaks on Antichrist, which Jerome and Theodoret as well as other fathers teach on this passage, [23](#) and even Calvin, the Centuriators, and Beza in their citations above. Moreover, in Daniel, Antichrist is not called one kingdom but one specific king from ten kings whom he will discover in the world; he will altogether abolish three from the midst and subject the other seven to himself. Add what Calvin says, that Daniel speaks literally on Antiochus Epiphanes [24](#) and allegorically on Antichrist whose figure was Antiochus, which Cyprian and Jerome also teach. [25](#) But Antiochus

Epiphianus was a certain specific and singular person; therefore, Antichrist ought also to be a certain, specific person.

The Fifth and last passage is in the book of the Apocalypse XIII and XVII. Such passages are understood on Antichrist, as Irenaeus teaches, and it is clear from the similarity of the words to those places in Daniel and John. Each make mention of ten Kings who will be on the earth when Antichrist will come and each predicts that the kingdom of Antichrist is going to endure for three and a half years. Just as Daniel speaks on one king so does John in the book of the Apocalypse.

The same is proven from the Fathers who teach in a common consensus on Antichrist. Firstly, that he will be the chosen instrument of the Devil to the extent that a plenitude of diabolic malice will inhabit him corporally, just as in Christ the man the plenitude of Divinity dwelled in him corporally. Secondly, Antichrist will not reign more than three and a half years and hence they teach Antichrist was going to be only one man. [26](#)

Now I shall respond to the first argument of Beza: in the time of the Apostles Antichrist began to live secretly but not in his own person, rather in his precursors. Just as Christ began to come from the origin of the world in the Patriarchs and Prophets (who came before him and signified him so that it could be said the mystery of godliness began to operate from the beginning of the world) he did not come in his own proper person until the time when he received flesh from the Blessed Virgin Mary. In like manner, Antichrist began to come soon after Christ was assumed into heaven in his precursors, and the mystery of iniquity began to work, namely in heretics and tyrants persecuting the Church; especially in Simon Magus, who said he was Christ and in Nero who first began to oppose the Church. Just the same, he will not come in his own person until the end of the world. Therefore, the spiritual persecution of Simon Magus and the temporal persecution of Nero is called the mystery of iniquity because they were signs and figures of the persecution of Antichrist.

That this is the true explication of the Pauline passages can be shown in two ways. Firstly, from all the interpreters of this passage. Certainly, all understood through the mystery of iniquity in Paul either the persecution of Nero, as Ambrose and Chrysostom on this citation, as well as Jerome, [27](#) or heretics who secretly deceive, as Theodoret and Sedulius remark on this verse along with Augustine. [28](#)

Secondly, from reason picked out from the admission of our adversaries who say that Antichrist is properly the seat of the Roman Pontiff.

Therefore, if Antichrist, properly so called, was born in the time of the Apostles it follows that Peter and Paul were properly said to be Antichrists, although in secret, and Nero and Simon Magus were the true Christ. It is certain in the time of the Apostles that there were no other Bishops at Rome than Peter and Paul. Irenaeus eloquently affirms that the Roman See was founded by Peter and Paul and that they sat there as its first Bishops. [29](#) All the fathers whom we cited in the last book teach the same thing. It is also certain that Simon Magus and Nero battled with the Apostles Peter and Paul.

But if this does not please our adversaries, that Peter and Paul were Antichrists and Simon and Nero the true Christ, they are compelled to affirm that Antichrist did not exist in the time of the Apostles *per se*, rather only in his specific type. The consequence of that makes Beza's point, that Antichrist could not be one man unless we would grant that he lived from the time of the Apostles even to the end of the world, utterly ridiculous.

To confirm this, I say John spoke on that mode in which the Lord spoke on Elijah: "Elijah indeed is going to come and he will restore all things but I say to you that Elijah already came, and they did not recognize him." [30](#) In other words, Elijah was going to come in his own person but he already came in one like him, that is John the Baptist.

Now to the Second argument. In the first place, we must deny that Daniel always understands individual kingdoms for individual beasts. For sometimes he means one kingdom for one beast, as in chapter VII where he understands the kingdom of the Assyrians for the lion; the kingdom of the Persians for the bear; the empire of the Greeks for the leopard; and through another unnamed beast the empire of the Romans. Sometimes he understands one king, as in the eighth chapter where he understands King Darius, the last king of the Persians, through the Ram and Alexander the Great through the goat. Next, the consequent of the argument is denied. For Paul understands for "the man of sin" not someone from the four beasts described by Daniel but that little horn which, in Daniel, prevails over the ten horns of the four beasts, i.e., that one king who rose from modest circumstances to subjugate all other kings to himself.

I respond to the final argument in several ways show how impudent Calvin is when he writes that those who do not gather from his argument

that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist err from their own will. Firstly, Antichrist can correctly be understood through “apostasy” in Paul’s citation. Thus, the Greek interpreters understand it in a common consensus. [31](#) Moreover, Antichrist is called apostasy both through metonym, [32](#) because the case will be that many will recede from God, and through a certain excellence; there will be a characteristic apostasy that can be called apostasy itself.

Secondly, Apostasy can be taken up as the defection from the Roman Empire, as many Latins explain. [33](#) For, as we will show in the following chapter, Antichrist will not come until the Roman Empire shall altogether fall to ruin.

Thirdly, if we were to admit that through Apostasy defection from the true faith and religion of Christ is understood (as Calvin claims), still we would not be constrained by difficulties on that account. For Paul did not necessarily speak of the Apostasy of many ages; he could speak on a certain great and singular Apostasy that will only be in that brief time in which Antichrist will reign. St. Augustine writes that he was also understood in this way by many of the Fathers and that they taught when Antichrist appears all secret heretics or false Christians will go to him and from that event the greatest apostasy was going to occur, such as had never been before.

Fourthly, if we were to concede to Calvin that St. Paul speaks on the Apostasy of many ages, he still gains nothing. Accordingly, we would be able say that Apostasy does not necessarily pertain to one body and kingdom of Antichrist nor demands one head but is a defection to the kingdom of Antichrist that will happen in different places, under different kings and on different occasions; we now see that Africa defected to Muhammad, a great part of Asia to Nestorius and the Monophysites, and other provinces to other sects.

Fifthly and lastly, if we were to grant to Calvin a general Apostasy from the faith and that the kingdom of Antichrist endured for many years it would not immediately follow that the Pope is Antichrist. For it still might be asked whether certain men have defected from the faith and religion of Christ; it could be us or them, that is, Catholics or Lutherans. Although they say we are the ones who have defected nevertheless, they have not yet proved it nor has it been declared by any common judge.

We can much more easily prove that it is the Lutherans that are the ones that defected than they can prove Catholics defected. Accordingly, they defected from the Church in which they were first and they do not even deny it. For (that I might pass over the rest), when Erasmus of Rotterdam says on that passage of 2 Thessalonians II: "Then that wicked man will be revealed," he ingeniously confesses that nearly all the predecessors of the Lutherans and himself at one time obeyed the Roman Pontiff. Therefore, they defected from the Church and religion of their predecessors. On the other hand, they have not shown to this point that we have defected from some Church, nor could they ever show it. Therefore, since they read Paul: "Until a dissension will come, or apostasy and that wicked man will be revealed, etc.," and they know they have left the Church in which they were while we have persevered in the same one that was always established, it is a wonder that they do not at least fear lest Paul might have spoken about them.

From this second chapter we have the second argument: to prove that the Pope is not the Antichrist. Therefore, if Antichrist is one person yet there were and will be many Popes provided with the same dignity and power then certainly Antichrist must be sought somewhere other than in the Roman See.

CHAPTER III: It is Shown That Antichrist has not yet Come.

MANY false suspicions and errors exist in regard to the Third proposition, on the time of the coming of Antichrist both among Catholics and heretics. Yet with this distinction, Catholics know that Antichrist is not coming until the end of the world (which is true), but some err in that they think the end of the world is nearer than it really may be. On the other hand, the heretics err in the fact that they think Antichrist is coming long before the end of the world and that he really already has come. Therefore, we shall speak on each error.

In the first place, all the fathers who noticed the malice of their times suspected that the times of Antichrist approached. Thus the Thessalonians thought in the time of the Apostles that the day of the Lord approached, which the Apostle corrected in 2 Thessalonians II. Likewise, St. Cyprian says: "Since Antichrist threatens, let the soldiers be prepared for battle, etc." [34](#) He also says in another epistle: "You ought to know, as well as believe and hold for a certain fact, that the day of persecution of the head has begun, and the end of the world and time of Antichrist approaches." [35](#) Jerome says: "He who held fast arises in our midst and we do not understand that Antichrist approaches?" [36](#) St. Gregory the Great: "All which has been predicted comes to pass, the proud king is near." [37](#) Gregory also boldly pronounced the end of the world. [38](#) But these were suspicions not errors, since these holy Fathers did not dare to define a certain time.

Next, others more boldly constituted a certain time. St. Jerome relates in *de illustribus viris*, that in 200 A.D., a certain Jude thought Antichrist was coming and the world was ending, clearly he was deceived. Again Lactantius says: "Every expectation is no more than two hundred years, etc." [39](#) There he teaches that Antichrist was coming and the world was to end two hundred years from his time. He also lived in the times of Constantine, around the 300th year of Christ, therefore, he thought the world

would by chance end in the year 500; but experience shows he was also deceived.

St. Augustine relates the error of some who said that the world would end around the year 400 from the ascension of the Lord, [40](#) and also some who established the thousandth year. They were all deceived. It also happened even to the Pagans, who, as Augustine witnesses in the same book, gathered from I know not what divine oracle that the Christian religion would only endure for three hundred and sixty five years. There was a certain Bishop, Florentinus by name, around the year 1105 who asserted that Antichrist had already been born, and hence the end of the world was closing in. The Council of Florence, having three hundred and forty bishops was gathered for this reason by Pope Paschal II. [41](#)

Next, there was also a famous opinion that had many defenders, [42](#) that the world was going to endure for 6,000 years, since God had created the world in six days, and a thousand years is to God one day. The writers of the Talmud also agree with this opinion and they say that they had a vision of the Prophet Elijah in which it is asserted that the world will endure for six thousand years.

This opinion cannot yet be refuted from experience because according to the true chronology more or less 5600 years have elapsed since the beginning of the world. Ambrose rejects this opinion, asserting in his time that six thousand years had already elapsed, though obviously he is misled. [43](#) The moderation of St. Augustine is the best, since he thought the opinion probable, and followed it as probable. [44](#) From here, it does not follow that we know the last day. Moreover, we say it is probable, that the world will not endure beyond six thousand years, but we do not say that it is certain. On that account, St. Augustine bitterly rebuked those who asserted that the world is going to end at a certain time, when the Lord said: "It is not for us to know the time and the hour which the Father has placed in his power." [45](#) Laying all these aside, let us come to the heretics.

All the heretics of this time teach that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, and now openly lives in the world, but they do not agree among themselves on the time in which he appeared. They have six opinions.

The First are the Samosatens, who bide their time in Hungary and Transylvania. They teach in a certain book which they titled: *Premonitions of Christ and the Apostles on the abolition of Christ through Antichrist*, that a little after the times of the Apostles Antichrist appeared; that is without a

doubt when it began to be preached that Christ is the eternal son of God. They think, on the other hand, that Christ is a pure man, and that there is only one person in God, and this faith was preached by Christ and the Apostles. Thus, a little after the death of the Apostles, Antichrist came to Rome and after abolishing Christ the pure man, introduced another eternal Christ, and made God triune, and Christ twofold.

This opinion is easily refuted, apart from the arguments which we asserted above against all the heretics, and in two ways. Firstly, because when Antichrist will have come, *he will make himself God*, not someone else, as the Apostle says. [46](#) Moreover, they themselves claim that the Roman Pontiff does not make himself God, but preached Christ and made him God from a true man. Secondly, because they say, soon after Christ and the Apostles slept, the true faith of Christ was thoroughly extinguished and the whole world began to worship Christ as God. But Christ preached that the gates of hell were not going to prevail against the Church, and the Angel Gabriel preached that the kingdom of Christ would be forever. [47](#) David preached that all kings would serve Christ. [48](#) Therefore, how true is it that in the very beginning the nascent Church was destroyed by Antichrist?

The Second opinion is of the Lutheran, Illyricus, who teaches in his Third Catalogue that Antichrist came when the Roman Empire fell into ruin. Moreover, it is certain that the Roman Empire began to fall after the tenth year of Honorius, when Rome was first taken, that is in the year of the Lord 412, as Blondus showed; [49](#) yet, Illyricus seems to understand this concerning the conception, not the birth of Antichrist. Accordingly he teaches the same thing in the Centuries, [50](#) that Antichrist was conceived in some manner at the beginning of the year 400, thereafter animated and formed in the womb of his mother, around the year 500; and at length was born in the year 606, when the Eastern Emperor Phocas conceded to the Roman Pontiff that he could be called head of the whole Church. He teaches the same thing in another place, that Antichrist was going to rule savagely with the spiritual sword for 1260 years, but with the temporal sword for 666 years, and then the end of the world would come.

The first number he gathers from Apocalypse XI, where it is said the time of Antichrist would be 1260 days. Illyricus would have it that a day is taken as a year. The second number he gathers from Apocalypse XIII, where the number of the beast is 666.

This opinion can be refuted in two ways. Firstly, it follows, that Antichrist was not only born but also died, and hence the end of the world already came. For the Roman Pontiff took up the temporal sword, that is temporal dominion, at least in the year 699. Then Aripertus gave to the Roman Pontiff the Coctian Alps, where Genoa is now. Later, in the year 714, Luitprandus confirmed that donation, as Ado of Vienna and Blondus affirm, not to mention the Centuriators and Theodore Bibliander, who remarked for the year 714, that this province became the first Papist province.

Not long after, that is, in the year 760, Pepin gave the Exarchate of Ravenna to the Roman Pontiffs, along with a great part of Italy as many historians witness—even the Centuriators and Bibliander. Therefore, if Antichrist began to reign in the year 760, and endured for 666 years, then the end of the world happened in the year of Christ 1421, and now there have been more than 150 years after Antichrist died. But if the beginning of his reign is placed earlier, that is in the year 699, then the end will be placed in the year 1360 and now more than 200 years will have transpired from the death of Antichrist.

Perhaps they will respond that after the 666th year of his reign Antichrist did not die but only lost his temporal dominion. Thus, they might say that the spiritual kingdom of Antichrist endured for 1260 years, which still would not have ended, and if they were to begin from the year 666, consequently they ought to say that the spiritual kingdom of antichrist ought to endure considerably beyond his temporal kingdom. But that is certainly absurd and against all authors, and besides, it at least follows that the Popes ought to have lost their temporal dominion 200 years ago, which is opposed to the obvious fact.

Secondly, the same error can be refuted because it follows from the error of the Centuriators, who thought they discovered exactly when the world will end, which is against the words of the Lord in Acts I and Matthew XXIV. What should follow is clear since, if they know that Antichrist began to reign with the spiritual sword in the year 606, they know that he was going to reign only 1260 years and then the Lord is going to come to judge right after, as they gather from Paul in 2 Thessal. II. Therefore, they know the last judgment is going to be in the year 1466. But if they do not know this, they are compelled also to not know whether Antichrist has come.

The Third opinion is of David Chytraeus who teaches with Illyricus in his commentary on chapter 9 of the Apocalypse, namely that Antichrist appeared around the year of the Lord 600, and that this is sufficient to show that St. Gregory was the first Antichrist Pope. Chytraeus, however, does not agree with that which is asserted by Illyricus, in so far as the time and duration of Antichrist, but he prudently advises that it is not to be defined so boldly. He attempts to show with three reasons that Antichrist appeared in the year 600.

Firstly, because in that time Gregory established the invocation of the Saints and Masses for the dead. Secondly, because in the year 606, Pope Boniface III asked the title of universal Bishop from the Emperor Phocas. He adds the third reason in his commentary on chapter 13, that this time plainly and especially agrees with the number of the name of Antichrist, which contains 666 as it is contained in the Apocalypse, ch. 13.

Furthermore, Chytraeus adds that from this same number of the name Antichrist the time can be gathered wherein Pepin confirmed the reign of Antichrist. For as many years as there are from the year 97 in which John wrote the Apocalypse even to Pepin, is without a doubt 666 years. Likewise the time is reckoned from Pepin to when the Roman Pontiff was declared Antichrist by John Huss to be about 666 years.

This opinion can be easily refuted, as it rests upon frauds alone. For in the first place Gregory was not the first who invoked Saints and taught that Masses were to be offered up for the dead. All the Fathers taught this very thing as we showed in another place. For the present Ambrose suffices, who preceded Gregory by 200 years. He says in his book on widows: “The Angels are to be observed, the Martyrs prayed to.” [51](#) He also says in his epistle to Faustus on the death of his sister: “Therefore, I deem that she is not to be wept for with tears but pursued with prayers, you ought not grieve for her but commend her soul to God with offerings.” [52](#)

Next, Phocas did not give the title of universal to the Pope but addressed him as head of the Churches. Even Justinian had already done the same long before, in an epistle to John II and before that the Council of Chalcedon had done so in an epistle to Leo I. Therefore, there is simply no reason to place the coming of Antichrist in the time of the Emperor Phocas.

As to what Chytraeus adds on the number 666, it is altogether inept because that number does not agree precisely with the times that he would have it Antichrist appeared, or was confirmed, or declared to be so. For

from Christ to the sanction of Phocas there are 607 years, not 666. From the revelation in the Apocalypse to Pepin 658 years, and from Pepin to John Huss there are, as he says, 640. But certainly John the Apostle in the Apocalypse recorded a precise number since he also adds minute details. Moreover, John Huss was not the first to declare that the Pope is Antichrist, Wycliff had already done that. Nay more, John Huss never even said that the Pope is Antichrist. For in art. 19 of the Council of Constance, after being condemned, he says that the Clergy, through their avarice, prepare the way for Antichrist. Next, all Lutherans boast that Luther was the first to unmask Antichrist, which brings us to the next opinion.

The fourth opinion is of Luther in his computation of time, where he places two arrivals of Antichrist. One, with the spiritual sword, after the year 600, when Phocas called the Roman Pontiff the head of all Churches. He also says that Gregory was the last Roman Pontiff. The second is when he arrives with the temporal sword after the year 1000. Bibliander teaches the same thing. [53](#) Therefore, Luther and Bibliander agree in the first arrival with the Centuriators and Chytraeus—with the exception that Luther and Bibliander say that Gregory was a good and holy Pope while the Centuriators and Chytraeus say that Gregory above all did his best to introduce Antichrist and hence, he was the worst Pope, which is a horrendous blasphemy. In the second arrival, Luther and the Centuriators clearly disagree.

This opinion, apart from the common arguments which will be made afterward, is easily refuted. Luther places the arrival of Antichrist in the year 600 and 1000 altogether without reason. On the year 600 we have already spoken in refutation of Chytraeus. Concerning the year 1000 it can easily be shown since Luther places the beginning of the temporal reign of Antichrist in that time when Pope Gregory VIII deposed the Emperor Henry IV, for then he ruled temporally as well as waged wars. Well now, all of these things already happened, as Gregory II excommunicated the [Byzantine] Emperor Leo, and deprived him of the rule of Italy in the year 715, as the historians Cedreno and Zonara witness in the life of the same Leo. Furthermore we already showed the Roman Pontiffs had temporal dominion in the year 700, three hundred years before the first millennium.

Next, the Centuriators witness that Stephen III waged wars around the year 750, [54](#) and Adrian I could be said to have done the same thing, as well as other of their successors. In like manner, around the year 850, Leo

IV, a holy man as well as famous for miracles, waged war against the Saracens. He reported a singular victory and fortified Rome with towers and ramparts still, he girded the Vatican hill with a wall, which thereafter was called after his name *civitas Leonina*, as nearly all historians of that time relate, and even the Centuriators themselves. [55](#)

The Fifth opinion is of Henry Bullinger. In the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse he wrote that Antichrist appeared in the year 753. Such an opinion disagrees with all those whom we cited above, and thence can easily be refuted because it rests upon a very weak foundation. Bullinger teaches in the Apocalypse, ch. XIII, that the number found there of the name of the Beast 666, means by that number the time of the arrival of Antichrist, in other words, so many years after the Apocalypse was written, Antichrist was going to come. And because it is certain from Irenaeus that the Apocalypse was written around the end of the reign of the Emperor Domitian, i.e., around the year 97, he gathers Antichrist was going to come in the year 753, by computing 666 years from the year 97.

To this point the opinion of certain Catholics can also be related, such as Jodocus Clichovaeus, who reckoned from the commentaries of St. John Damascene [56](#) that Muhammad was Antichrist properly so called because he came around the year 666 according to what John had said before. But this reasoning amounts to nothing. In the first place, the Centuriators protest and contend that the number in the book of the Apocalypse does not mean the time of the birth of Antichrist, but of his death. Moreover, John the Evangelist, in chapter XIII of the Apocalypse, rejects the commentary both of Illyricus and Bullinger, since he explains himself that the number is not of the times but the name of Antichrist, i.e. Antichrist is going to have a name, whose letters in Greek form the number 666, as Irenaeus and all other Fathers explain.

Besides, no change is read in the Roman Pontiffs for that year 753. Moreover, Muhammad could not come then since he was born in the year 597 and began to call himself a Prophet in the year 623. Next, he died in the year 632, as Palmerius witnesses in his Chronicle. Therefore, he did not make it to the year 666.

The sixth opinion is of Wolfgang Musculus, who in his works under the title *de Ecclesia*, [57](#) affirms that Antichrist came a little after the times of St. Bernard, i.e. around the year 1200. He attempts to show this because St. Bernard enumerates many vices of men, and especially of Churchmen and

very serious persecutions of the Church, adding: “It remains only for the man of sin to be revealed.” [58](#) But this opinion is refuted without much effort: St. Bernard merely suspected from the evils which he saw that Antichrist was near, just as we said many Fathers suspected it from their times, such as Cyprian, Jerome and Gregory, and Bernard was deceived in that suspicion just as they. Besides, the Popes from the year 900 to 1000 were without comparison worse than the Popes from 1100 to 1200. So if the former were not Antichrist, why would the latter be?

CHAPTER IV: The First proof: the Rule of Antichrist has not yet Begun.

THEREFORE, the true opinion is that Antichrist has not yet begun to reign, nor come, rather he is going to come and rule around the end of the world. Yet, in as much as he has not yet come he cannot be known. This opinion destroys all those mentioned above and clearly shows that the Roman Pontiffs are not Antichrists. It is proven by six reasons.

It must be known that the Holy Spirit gave us six certain signs of the arrival of Antichrist in the Scriptures: Two preceding Antichrist, namely preaching of the Gospel and the desolation of the Roman Empire; two accompanying it, certainly the preaching of Enoch and Elijah, and a great and remarkable persecution, so much that public religion would altogether cease; two subsequent signs, namely the desolation of Antichrist after three and a half years and then the end of the world which we see presently still exists.

Hence, the first proof is taken from the first sign preceding Antichrist. The Scriptures witness that in the whole world the Gospel must be preached before the last persecution will come, which will be roused by Antichrist: "This Gospel of the Kingdom in testimony to the whole world, in witness to all the Gentiles." [59](#) The fact that this should happen before the arrival of Antichrist can be proved by this reason: because in the time of Antichrist the cruelty of that last persecution will impede all public exercise of the true religion.

Yet, because our adversaries do not admit this reasoning (nor is it now the time to deduce from their own principles), we will prove it from the testimonies of the Fathers. Thus Hilary, explains these words of Matthew: "The Gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world, and then the consummation will come." Clearly he teaches that Antichrist, which he calls the abomination of desolation, is not going to come unless the preaching of the Gospel will precede him throughout the whole world.

St. Cyril, Theodoret, and St. John Damascene teach the same thing with eloquent words, [60](#) and besides, the same is gathered from the text because

the Gospel says that before that greatest and last tribulation shall come, the Gospel must be preached such as it was not before nor will be afterward. The Fathers and above all, St. Augustine, teach that the persecution of Antichrist is meant by such a tribulation. [61](#) Yet the Gospel was not preached in the whole world, in the time that the new Samosatens say Antichrist came, that is around the year 200 or 300. It is clear from Origen, who asserted at that time the Gospel was not yet preached everywhere. [62](#) Likewise from Ruffinus, who witnesses that in the time of Constantine the Emperor, that is, after the year 300, that the Gospel was preached in the furthest parts of India, since before they had never heard anything about Christ. [63](#) Next, we learn it from St. Augustine who says with certain experience that found there were many nations in his time that had not yet heard anything about Christ. [64](#)

Now, it is clear that the preaching of the Gospel was not completed around the year 600 or 700, in which the Centuriators, Chytraeus, Luther and Bullinger place the arrival of Antichrist. It is so from the conversion of the Vandals, the Poles, the Moravians and similar nations, who it is certain had not heard the preaching of the Gospel until after the year 800, as the Centuriators themselves affirm in their histories. [65](#) Likewise, the preaching of the Gospel had not been completed in the times of St. Bernard, where Wolfgang Musculus places the arrival of Antichrist. This is clear from Bernard himself who asserts in book 3 of *de Consideratione* that still, in his time there were nations who had not heard the Gospel.

Next, experience teaches that even in our time the Gospel has not been preached in the whole world. Very vast regions were discovered in both the East and West in which no memory of the Gospel exists. Nor can it be said the faith was ever there but later extinguished, for at least some vestige would remain, either there or in the writings of the Fathers. Besides, we know where all the Apostles preached and the places were marked by many, though I would not say by all; but the new world was recently discovered, it was not known in Apostolic times or any other until a little before our age.

Only one objection can be made against this proof: that perhaps Scripture, when it says the Gospel must be preached in the whole world does not speak absolutely but rather receives the whole for a part by a figure of speech, just as Luke II when it is said: "An edict went out from Caesar Augustus that the whole world should be enrolled." Otherwise what Paul says would be false, that already in his time: "The sound of the

Apostles has gone out through all the earth,” [66](#) as well as what he says in Colossians: “The truth of the Gospel which has arrived even to you, just as it bears fruit and increases in the whole world. . . which has been preached to every creature which is under heaven.” [67](#)

I respond: Without a doubt it is not through a figure that the Gospel ought to be preached and Churches constituted, but properly and absolutely in the whole world, that is in every nation. In the first place, St. Augustine expressly teaches this, [68](#) as well as the other fathers we have cited, such as Origen and Jerome in their commentaries on Matthew XXIV.

Next, it can be proved by three reasons. 1) Christ said preaching in the whole world is a sign of the consummation of the age. Therefore, he adds: “And then the consummation will come.” But if this is not properly, but synecdochically the Gospel ought to be preached in the whole world, it avails to nothing as a sign. For in the first 20 years the Gospel was preached by the Apostles in the whole world. Secondly, as Augustine reasons, all nations were properly promised to Christ, “All nations will serve him.” [69](#) Christ generally died for all and as a result (as related in Apocalypse VII), the elect will be described as being from all nations, peoples, tribes and tongues. Therefore, even preaching properly ought to be general. For that reason, in Matthew XXIV it is said that the Gospel must be preached in the whole world, “in testimony to all nations;” that is, lest any nation could be excused in the day of judgment for its infidelity on account of ignorance. So, before the general judgment, general preaching ought to precede.

Augustine responds to those passages of Paul in Epistle 80, and says that Paul, when he spoke in Romans X, received the past for the future, just as David did who uses the same words. Moreover, when he says in Colossians: “The Gospel is in the whole world,” he did not wish to say it was in act but in potency, because without a doubt the seed of the Divine Word was thrown out by the Apostles in the whole world so that little by little in bearing fruit and increasing it was going to fill the whole world. Just in the same way that someone could suppose the flame from different parts of the city could truly be said to burn the whole of that city because the fire was applied little by little by burning and was going to take up the whole city; this is the same thing the Apostle indicates when he says: “In the whole world it is bearing fruit and increasing.” Therefore, it did not plainly overtake the whole world since still it had to be propagated but still has seized it in some way—that is, in potency not in act.

A response can be made with Jerome and St. Thomas that the Gospel arrived to the nations in two ways: in one way through report; in another through proper preachers and the foundation of Churches. Indeed, in the first manner the Gospel arrived to all the Nations of the whole world then known in the time of the Apostles and in this way Paul could speak. Chrysostom should also be understood in the same way on Matthew XXIV. In the second manner it could not have arrived then but was going to in its own time, and on this the Lord speaks in Matthew XXIV as well as in the last Chapter of Luke and Acts I.

Lastly, add that it is not absurd were we to concede the Lord spoke properly but the Apostle figuratively, whereby we would be compelled to take the words of the Lord in their own meaning; they do not have the same force if they were to be accommodated to the words of St. Paul, especially when the Lord spoke on the future, while Paul spoke on the past.

CHAPTER V: The Second Proof: Desolation of the Roman Empire.

THE SECOND proof is taken from another sign that will precede the times of Antichrist, which will be the *desolation* in every way possible of the Roman Empire. At length, it must be known that the Roman Empire was divided into ten Kings, none of whom will be called “King of the Romans,” although all will occupy some provinces of the Roman Empire in the same way that the King of France, the King of Spain, the Queen of England and by chance some others hold parts of the Roman Empire, at length they are not Roman Kings or Emperors; but until they cease to hold those dominions Antichrist cannot come. [70](#)

Irenaeus [71](#) proves this from Daniel, chapters II and VII, as well as from chapter XVII of the Apocalypse. In Daniel there is a description of particular kingdoms even to the end of the world and a certain one is described whose golden head signifies the first kingdom, that is, of the Assyrians; its silver chest is the second kingdom, that is of Persia; the bronze mid-section is the third kingdom, that is of the Hellenistic Empires; the iron legs represent the fourth kingdom, that is of Rome. Now Rome was divided into two parts for a very long time, just as there are two legs and they are the longest part of the body. Next, ten toes arose from the two legs, and with these the whole statue ended; certainly this means that the Roman Empire was divided into ten kings, of none whom will be King of the Romans, just as no toe is the leg. But now, in chapter VII, Daniel clearly marks out through the four beasts the same four kingdoms which mean the last ten kings, who will arise from the Roman Empire, yet they will not be Roman Emperors; just as the horns begin from the beast but are not the beast itself.

Next, John describes a beast with seven heads and ten horns, upon which a certain woman sat, and explains the woman is a great city which sits upon seven hills, that is Rome; [72](#) the seven heads are those seven mountains, and also the seven kings, by which number all the Roman Emperors are understood. He says the ten horns are ten kings that will rule together at one

time, and lest we think these by chance will be Roman Kings, he adds that these kings will hate the harlot and will make desolation, because they will so divide the Roman Empire among themselves that they will almost destroy it.

Next, Paul proves the same thing in 2 Thessal. II:6 when he says: “And now you know what withholds, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already works, only that he who now holds, should hold until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one will be revealed, etc.” There, Paul does not dare to write openly on the toppling of the Roman Empire, because he still explained openly in the presence of Romans and he spoke as if to say: You know what should impede the arrival of Antichrist. I said to you, the Roman Empire impedes it, because its sins have not been filled and Antichrist, who shall abolish this empire on account of its sins, will not yet have come. Therefore, the one who now holds the Roman Empire should hold it, that is, he will rule, until it comes to pass from our midst, that is, it shall be abolished, then the wicked one will be revealed. The Greek and Latin Fathers explain it alike. Cyril of Jerusalem teaches on this passage: “The aforesaid Antichrist will come when the times of the Roman Empire have been completed.” [73](#) St. John Chrysostom explains: “When the Roman Empire has been abolished from our midst, then Antichrist will come.” Theophylactus and Oecumenius teach similar things.

From the Latins. Tertullian says that Christians prayed for the Roman Empire to long endure, because they know that when the Empire has been overturned, the supreme destruction of the world threatens. [74](#) Lactantius, explaining the signs which precede Antichrist and the end of the world, says: “The Roman name, which now rules the world (the soul shudders to say it, but I will speak on what is going to come), will be abolished from earth, and the Empire overturned in Asia, and again the East will rule and the West will serve it.” [75](#) St. Ambrose, speaking on 2 Thess., says that Antichrist is going to come after the disappearance of the Roman Empire.

St. Jerome, explaining the same citation of St. Paul says: “Christ will not come unless first there will be such a dissension that all the nations which now are subject to the Roman Empire will recede from it and unless the Roman Empire will already have been made desolate and thus Antichrist precede him.” [76](#) Next, St. Augustine explains on this citation: “Such a one who merely commands, let him command, until he shall be taken from the

midst; that is, abolished, and then the wicked one will be revealed, whom no one questions means Antichrist.” [77](#)

But this sign was not fulfilled in those times, in which the Transylvanian Anti-trinitarians say Antichrist came, that is, around the year 200, because then the Roman Empire particularly flourished and would do so long after.

But it is clear that this sign has never been fulfilled even to this point, because the succession still remains, and the name Roman Emperor, even by a wondrous providence of God seeing that the Empire failed in the west, which one of the legs of the statue of Daniel, remained unharmed in the East, the other leg. But because the Empire of the East was to be destroyed by the Turks (and now we see this has come to pass), again God erected in the West the other leg, that is, the Western Empire through Charlemagne, and that Emperor still endures.

Moreover, the fact that Rome itself, according to the prophecy of John would fall in a certain measure, and lose the Empire, does not impede us. For the Roman Empire can stand well without the city of Rome, and the Roman Emperor can be so called when he lacks Rome, in the manner that he succeeds another Roman Emperor in the same dignity and power, whether he should have more or fewer provinces in his Empire. Otherwise Valens, Arcadius, Theodosius the younger, or their other successors even to Justinian, who all lacked Rome, could not be called Roman Emperors. Nor even would Charlemagne and his successors, who also did not possess the city of Rome, ever have been Emperors, which is false and that is clear for two reasons.

First, by this reason alone, the Emperor, who now is, precedes all Christian Kings, even if they are otherwise greater and more powerful than he is. Next, because it is certain that Charlemagne was created Emperor with the agreement of the Romans, as Paul the Deacon witnesses, [78](#) and by the Greek Emperor himself through legates sent to greet the Emperor, as Ado witnesses, [79](#) as well as by the Persians and Arabs, that the Emperor should be adorned with gifts, as Otho of Frisia relates. [80](#) Next, the Lutherans boast that they have three Prince electors of the Roman Empire. Hence they cannot deny that the Roman Empire still endures. [81](#)

Orosius rightly compares the Empire of Babylon with Rome, and he says that God by far more agreeably managed things with the Romans than with the Babylonians. For after 1,064 years, from which Babylon was founded, in one day Babylon, the head of the Empire, was taken, and the Emperor

killed, and the Empire was destroyed and desolate. But after so many years, 1,064 from which Rome began, Rome was taken by the Goths, but the Emperor Honorius, who then ruled, was unharmed, and the Roman Empire was preserved.

Hence the deception of our adversaries appears. They think the decay of the Roman Empire suffices for the coming of Antichrist: but Paul, John and Daniel, as well as the Fathers we mentioned above, did not say that decay was necessary, but desolation.

On the other hand, Luther, Illyricus and David Chytraeus object that this proof rather more makes their case, for it was preached by John in the Apocalypse, chapter XIII, that the Beast, which signifies the Roman Empire, was to be wounded to death, and was again healed by Antichrist. This certainly came about when the Pope restored again the Western Empire, which had already perished, in conferring upon Charlemagne the title and dignity of Emperor. Therefore, it is clearly understood from this translation or restoration of the Empire, that the Roman Pope is truly the Antichrist. [82](#) Illyricus confirms this argument from Ambrose, who, while explaining the words of St. Paul, says that Antichrist is going to return freedom to the Romans, but under his own name. The Pope seems to have done this when he created an Emperor for the Romans, who still depended upon him.

I respond: we read nowhere in John that when the beast is going to be healed by Antichrist that it signified the Roman Empire. But we read this, that one from the heads of the beast will die, and a little after going to rise again, the works of the dragon, that is the devil, which nearly all the Fathers explain concerns Antichrist himself, who makes himself dead, and again by some diabolic craft he himself raises himself, that he would imitate the true death and resurrection of Christ, and in that manner will seduce many.

St. Gregory so explains this, as do Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Anselm, Richardus and Rupertus on chapter XIII of the Apocalypse. And the text itself compels us that through the head of the beast, which was dead and brought back to life, we should not understand Charlemagne, but Antichrist. Accordingly, that head, as John writes, had power only for 42 months, and blasphemed God and those who dwelled in heaven, and commanded in every tribe and people, tongue, nation, and all who dwelled on earth adored it, but of such things we do not read on Charlemagne or any of his successors. Furthermore, Charlemagne ruled for more than 42 months and

he did not blaspheme God and the Saints, but rather more wonderfully venerated them, and many of his successors imitated his piety.

Next, neither Charlemagne himself, nor his successors, held power over every tribe, people, tongue and nation, as is known by all. Hence St. Ambrose did not speak on what the Pope did when he said a new Roman Empire that was to be created by Antichrist, rather after the Roman Empire had been overturned freedom was to be restored to the Romans, which it is not read the Pope ever did.

CHAPTER VI: A Third Proof: Enoch and Elijah

A THIRD proof is taken from the arrival of Enoch and Elijah, who are still living and do so for the purpose that they might oppose the arrival of Antichrist, preserve the elect in the faith of Christ and finally convert the Jews; it is certain that this still has not been fulfilled. There are four Scriptures on this matter. The First, from Malach. IV: "Behold, I will send the Prophet Elijah to you, before the great day of the Lord will come, and convert the hearts of the Fathers toward the sons, and the hearts of the sons to their fathers." The Second, from Eccles. LXVIII, where we read on Elijah: "You who were received in a fiery whirlwind, in the whirlwind of vast horses. You who are inscribed in the judgments of the times, appease the anger of the Lord, reconcile the heart of the father to the son, and restore the tribe of Jacob." And in chapter LXIV: "Enoch pleased God, and was lifted up into paradise, that he should bring repentance to the nations." Third, from Matthew XVII: "Elijah is going to come, and will restore all things." Fourth, from the Apocalypse XI: "I will give my two witnesses, and they will prophecy for 1,260 days."

Even Theodore Bibliander relates all these citations in his Chronicle, but he says through Enoch and Elijah all the faithful ministers are understood, whom God rouses in the time of Antichrist, such were Luther, Zwingli and the others. At length, he concludes: "This is why it is a puerile imagination, or a Jewish dream, to await either Elijah or Enoch as definite persons in their properties." Chytraeus teaches the same thing in his commentary on that citation of the Apocalypse. And they attempt to show that the Lord taught that those passages in Malachi which speak about Elijah must be understood on John the Baptist: "He is Elijah who is going to come." And St. Jerome, in chapter 4 of Malachi, shows on all the choir of Prophets, that is on the doctrine of all the Prophets.

Now, it does not seem to be a puerile imagination to us but a very true teaching, that Enoch and Elijah are going to come in their own persons—and the contrary is either heresy or an error proximate to heresy. Firstly, it is proved from those four Scriptures, since the words of Malachi could not be

understood concerning anything at all, such as on teachers, like Luther and Zwingli and similar things, it is obvious, for Malachi says that the Jews must be converted by Elijah, and that they must be sent especially on account of the Jews which we see in that verse: "I will send to you," and in Ecclesiasticus: ". . . to restore the tribe of Jacob." Yet, Luther and Zwingli have converted none of the Jews.

Moreover, it is certain that these cannot be understood on John the Baptist to the letter, but only on Elijah. We know that Malachi speaks on the second coming of the Lord because it will be to judge. For he says: "Before the great and terrible day of the Lord should come." The first coming is not called the great and terrible, but the acceptable time, and the day of salvation. For that reason it is added: "Lest by chance coming I shall strike the earth with a curse;" in other words, lest coming to judgment and discovering all the wicked, I shall condemn the whole world. Therefore, I shall send Elijah, that I should have others whom I shall save. But in the first coming the Lord did not come to judge, but to be judged, not to destroy, but to save.

I will respond a little later to the words of Matthew XI. Now I speak to Jerome, in his commentary on Malachi he also did not think that Malachi spoke about Elijah, but in his commentary on Matthew XI and XVII he thought and taught the contrary. Next, this is the common interpretation of the faithful, as St. Augustine witnesses. [83](#)

Moreover, Ecclesiasticus speaks on the very persons of Enoch and Elijah not on others. It is proven because Ecclesiasticus says about this Enoch, "He who was taken into paradise [is going to come] that he should give punishment to the nations." Also this Elijah, who was taken up in a chariot of fiery horses was going to come to restore the tribes of Israel. Certainly, such verses do not fit, unless they are about these particular persons.

I cannot marvel enough at what comes to mind from Bishop Jansenius on this passage. He wrote on it that although it was the opinion of the Fathers that Elijah himself was going to come, still he is not convinced from this passage, for it can be said that the author of Ecclesiasticus wrote that according to the received opinion of his time, wherein it was believed from the words of Malachi that Elijah was truly going to come in his person before the Messiah, although this would not be fulfilled in his own person, but in the one who was going to come in the spirit and power of Elijah. Yet, if that is so, as Jansenius says, it follows that Ecclesiasticus erred, and wrote

falsely. Rather, unless I am mistaken, Jansenius changed his opinion; writing on chapter XVII of Matthew he teaches that the passage of Malachi cannot be understood literally except concerning the true Elijah, which likewise would compel him to say the same on the verse in Ecclesiasticus, which he expressed with no doubt on Malachi.

Now that the words of the Lord in Matthew XVII are understood on the true Elijah, not on John, is clear because John had already come and run his course, and still the Lord said: "Elijah is going to come." Moreover, it can be proved that all the Doctors only understand this to be on the true Elijah. Firstly, because the Apostles, who advanced the question on Elijah, were Peter, James and John, and they took up the occasion from the transfiguration of the Lord, where they saw Moses and Elijah. Therefore, when they ask: "What about what the scribes say, that Elijah must come first," they spoke on that Elijah whom they saw on the mountain with Christ. Therefore, when Christ responded, "Indeed, Elijah is going to come and he will restore all things," he also spoke on that particular Elijah who had appeared in the transfiguration. Secondly, the same is clear from the words themselves: "And he will restore all things." Truly, John the Baptist did not do that, nor anyone else. For to restore all things, is to recall all Jews, heretics and perhaps many Catholics deceived by Antichrist to the true faith.

But Bibliander insists that the Lord speaks of John the Baptist in Matthew XI: "He is Elijah who is going to come," that is, he [John] is the Elijah promised by Malachi. I respond: The Lord wanted to say that John was the promised Elijah, not literally, but allegorically. Therefore, he sent him ahead, although you wish to receive him, as if to say, indeed the Elijah promised in his person is going to come in the last coming. Still, if you also wish to receive some Elijah in the first coming, then receive John. For that reason he also added: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear," thereby showing it was a mystery that he had said John was Elijah.

Next, that the words of John in Apocalypse XI should be understood on the individual persons of Enoch and Elijah is clear not from all the doctors but for the very reason that John says, in the same place, that they will be killed by Antichrist and that their bodies will remain unburied on a street in Jerusalem, and after three days they will rise again, and they will ascend into heaven. No one has yet done that.

Still, David Chytraeus tries to respond in a commentary on this citation. He says first: John wanted to signify the many Lutheran Ministers that would be killed by Papists, to whom God at length restored to life, although he brought them into heaven, they were going to live forever. Secondly, he adds a little below that after the ministers were killed, life of the body was to be restored on the last day of resurrection. Thirdly, he adds in the same place, that it can even signify through this restoration of life, that we shall see many other ministers roused by God in place of those who have been killed with the same zeal and power.

Yet these are very weak responses. The first cannot be defended, because the beatitude of the soul is not the restoration of lost life, but the acquisition of new life. Next, these two witnesses in the Apocalypse will rise in the sight of all and with their bodies restored, turning they will be lifted up, which certainly is not fulfilled in the beatitude of the soul. The second answer avails to nothing since, John says that those two witnesses were going to rise before the last day, while the state of this world still endures. But John adds that it is to strike great fear to their enemies by their resurrection and a little after the movement of the world is going to happen, and seven thousand men are going to perish. Next, the third answer is not to the point. For the Scripture says, those same who were dead are to be roused to life, and taken up into heaven. Moreover, we have not yet seen any Lutheran Minister resurrect, or be assumed into heaven. Why, John says that Enoch and Elijah are going to preach wearing sackcloth, and the Lutherans so hate sackcloth that if by chance Enoch and Elijah wear it while they are Lutherans, they will immediately be cast out.

Secondly, it is proved that Enoch and Elijah are truly going to come in their persons in the time of Antichrist from the consensus of the Fathers. For Hilary, Jerome, Origen, Chrysostom and all other interpreters of Matthew XVII assert this about Elijah. In like manner do Lactantius, [84](#) Theodoret, [85](#) as well as Augustine [86](#) and Primasius. [87](#)

On Enoch together with Elijah, many who write on the Apocalypse assert that they are going to come to oppose Antichrist, such as Bede, Richard, and Arethas. Arethas also adds that it is believed without exception by the whole Church. Moreover, John Damascene [88](#), Hippolytus [89](#) the martyr, St. Gregory the Great [90](#) and Augustine [91](#) teach the same.

Thirdly it is proved because otherwise no reason can be given why these two should be taken up before death, and still live in mortal flesh who are

going to die someday. Albeit the Jews say, as Rabi Salomon, [92](#) that Enoch was killed by God before his time, because he was light and inconstant, and they assert Elijah, when he was born in the fiery chariot, was burned in his whole body by the flame. Perhaps the Lutherans who deny they are coming back think likewise; still all Catholics hold with certain faith that both live in their bodies. For the Apostle teaches that Enoch has not yet died, [93](#) Enoch was born up lest he would see death and that both he and Elijah were not yet dead but were going to die. Apart from those cited above, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine and Epiphanius clearly teach this.

Irenaeus, speaking about Enoch and Elijah, says: “The priests who are disciples of the apostles say those, who were born up thence (into early Paradise) were born up and there remain even to the end, tasting incorruption.” [94](#) Tertullian says about Enoch: “He has not yet tasted death as glittering in eternity.” [95](#) Epiphanius says about Enoch and Elijah: “These two remain in body and soul on account of hope.” [96](#) Jerome in an epistle to Pammachius against John of Jerusalem says: “Enoch was born up in the flesh; Elijah still was taken up in the flesh into heaven, still has not yet died, being a tenant of Paradise, etc.” Augustine says: “We do not doubt that Enoch and Elijah live in the bodies in which they were born.” [97](#)

CHAPTER VII: The Fourth Proof: the Persecution of Antichrist.

THE FOURTH proof is taken from the fact that it is certain the persecution of Antichrist will be the most severe ever known, to the extent that all public ceremonies and sacrifices of religion will cease. We still do not see any of that. Now, the fact that the last persecution is going to be very severe is clear from what we read in Matthew XXIV: “Then there will be a great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world, nor will be.” Moreover, we read in Apocalypse XX: “Then Satan must be loosed,” who was bound even to that time.

St. Augustine, disputing on this citation, says in the time of Antichrist the Devil will be loosed, and hence that persecution will be much more severe than all the ones that preceded it; [98](#) the Devil can rage so much more cruelly loosed than bound. Therefore, he says, then the Devil is going plague the Church with all his own and their strength. Further, Hippolytus the martyr and St. Cyril say that the Martyrs, whom Antichrist will kill, are going to be more illustrious than all the previous ones because the old martyrs fought against the human ministers of the devil, but these will fight against the Devil himself prowling personally. But certainly we have experienced nothing like that from the year 600 or even 1000.

The heretics say that they suffer a great persecution from Antichrist because some of their number are burned. But what comparison is there of that sort of persecution with that carried out by Nero, Domitian, Decius, Diocletian, and others? Accordingly, for one heretic who is burned, a thousand Christians formerly were burned—and that was exercised in the whole Roman world, not only in one place. Furthermore, at present when the supreme penalty is given a man is merely burned, but in ancient times they exercised the most diverse and unbelievable torments. [99](#)

Pope Damasus writes in the life of Marcellinus, that over seventeen thousand Christians were killed by Diocleatian, and Eusebius, who then lived, writes that all the prisons were so full with martyrs that no place was left for criminals. [100](#) Moreover, in the whole of the book we cited, so

many crowns were conferred for martyrdom in two hundred years, that it would be impossible to undertake their number. Besides, the fact is that the heretics killed many more Catholics in the last ten or fifteen years in France and Flanders than inquisitors burned heretics in perhaps the last hundred. Therefore, they cannot call this persecution, but rather more civil war. For as Augustine teaches, when the true persecution of Antichrist will come, tribulation will only be upon the sons of the Church, but not upon their persecutors, just as in the time of Diocletian and the princes of this world, Christians alone were slaughtered, but they did not slaughter.

For all that, were this to be called a persecution then Catholics have a better claim to have suffered it than the Lutherans and Calvinists. For Catholics are the ones who were cast out from many areas and lost their Churches, patrimony and even their country, without a doubt, to invaders seizing their things for the Ministers of this new Gospel and, as we said from the commentary of Laurence Surius and other historians of this time, it can be recognized that the fury of the Calvinists has taken up many more Catholics in a few years than heretics by the judgment of Catholic Princes were given punishment for the denial of faith.

Nevertheless, Augustine proves the fact that the persecution is going to be well-known and manifest, while commenting on those words of Apocalypse XX: "And they surrounded the camp of the Saints, and the beloved city." [101](#) By these words, it is meant that all the wicked were going to be together in the army of Antichrist, and were going to assault every church of the Saints in open battle. For now there are many false men in the Church, who concealing their malice, are outside the Church in heart but within the body. St. Augustine says: "But then they will all break out in open persecution from their hiding places of hate." Certainly, this has not yet been fulfilled in our time even though there never was a greater number of false brethren and feigned Christians. That this persecution is neither known nor manifested neither they who say they suffer nor we who are alleged to cause it can say when this will begin.

Without a doubt the persecutions of Nero, Domitian and of other Roman Emperors were recorded diligently by Eusebius, Orosius, and Sulpitius. Nobody questions when these persecutions began and when they ended, just as no one questions when Christ came, because it was true and manifest and we absolutely know when it was and by whom it was made manifest. Nor are there any opinions on our side on the matter. But the heretics who say

that Antichrist has come and now for so many years has exercised persecution, still cannot advance one author who recorded when Antichrist came or to whom he appeared first, or when he began the persecution. They even disagree among themselves, so much so that one might say he came in the year 200, another in the year 666, while another in 1273. Another yet will say the year 1000, while another 1200 so they do not speak as men who are awake, but seem like men who dream in quiet.

Next, the fact that in the time of Antichrist, on account of the atrocity of persecution, the public office and daily sacrifice of the Church will cease which Daniel clearly teaches: "From the time when the continual sacrifice will have been taken away for 1290 days." In that place, by the consensus of every writer, he speaks on the time of Antichrist. Furthermore, Irenaeus, Jerome, Theodoret, Hippolytus the martyr and Primasius all express the same thing, that Antichrist is going to forbid all divine worship which is now exercised in the Churches of Christians, especially the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist. That this sign has not yet been fulfilled is evident from experience.

From that we can gather three things. 1) Antichrist has not yet come, since the continual sacrifice is still in force. 2) The Roman Pontiff is not the antichrist, rather he is quite contrary to him since the Pope carefully honors and guards the sacrifice which Antichrist is going to take away. 3) The heretics of this time, apart from all other things, are precursors of Antichrist since no one more ardently desires to altogether abolish the sacrifice of the Eucharist than they.

CHAPTER VIII: The Fifth Proof: the Duration of Antichrist

THE FIFTH proof is taken from the duration of Antichrist. Antichrist will not reign more than three and a half years, yet now the Pope has reigned spiritually over the Church for more than 1500 years. Further, not one of them can be assigned that will have reigned precisely three and a half years so as to be accounted for Antichrist. Therefore, not only is the Pope not the Antichrist, but the latter has not yet come.”.

Now, that the reign of Antichrist is going to be for three and a half years is gathered from Daniel [102](#) and from the Apocalypse. [103](#) There we read that the reign of Antichrist is going to endure through time, times and half a time. For time is understood as one year, through times two years, through half a time, half a year. John argues this same thing, for in Apocalypse XI and XIII, he says Antichrist is going to reign for 42 months which correctly corresponds to three and a half years. The Hebrews use years and lunar months, even if they reconcile them to the solar by adding one lunar cycle to the sixth year. Moreover, three and a half lunar years correctly makes 42 months, or 1260 days, correspondingly the lunar year is full and complete in 12 months, of which each has 30 days, as Augustine teaches. [104](#)

What Daniel XII says, namely that Antichrist is going to reign for 1290 days is not opposed to us, even though it is 30 more days than John had said. This is because John speaks on Enoch and Elijah, who will be slain by Antichrist a month before Antichrist shall perish.

Our adversaries respond to this in three ways. First, Chytraeus [105](#) says that times (*tempora*) cannot be taken for three and a half years because it is opposed to experience: and Paul says Antichrist is going to endure even to the coming of Christ. [106](#)

Secondly, he says a certain time can be placed for an uncertain one; hence, more than a thousand years ought to be understood for 42 months or 1260 days. Bullinger says the same thing, [107](#) and his reason seems to be the one which Luther insinuates in his supposition of the times; because without a doubt it is certain from Apocalypse XX that the Devil will be loosed for a thousand years. Thus, the coming of Antichrist with the

temporal sword was in the thousandth year from Christ and he has already reigned more than 500 years, therefore, it is fitting to receive those 42 months as an uncertain time.

Thirdly, the Centuriators respond that Daniel and John take a day for a year, and hence for 1260 days, 1260 years should be understood. [108](#) The reason can be that in Daniel IX, 70 weeks are understood to be 700 years, not days. And Ezechiel IV says: "I gave you a day for a year." And Luke XIII: "Today it is fitting for me to walk, and tomorrow as well as every day;" that is, to live for three years. Chytraeus puts this reasoning in chapter XI of the Apocalypse, where he says the years and months of the same are called Angelic years and months, not human.

Now, the common opinion of the Fathers is to the contrary. Let us look at those who assert that Antichrist will only reign for three and a half years due to the passages we have noted. Hippolytus the martyr, in his Oration on the Consummation of the world, says: "Antichrist will reign over the earth for three and a half years, afterward his kingdom and glory will be snatched away from him." Irenaeus said: "He will reign for three years and six months, then the Lord will come from heaven." [109](#) Jerome adds: "The time means a year; the times, according to the propriety of the Hebrew terminology, which has dual numbers, prefigures two years; half of the time, six months, in which the saints must be entrusted to the power of Antichrist." [110](#) St. Cyril said: "Antichrist will reign for merely three and a half years which we say not from some Apocryphal book, but from Daniel the Prophet." [111](#) Likewise St. Augustine said: "Even a man who is half asleep and reads these things can hardly doubt that reign of Antichrist against the Church will be very savage, although it is to last a scanty space of time. For time and times, and half a season is one year and two, and half which makes three years and a half, and through this, the number of days that were placed in the Scripture, makes clear the number of months." [112](#) Theodoret says like things on chapter VII of Daniel, as do Primasius, Bede, Anselm, Haymo, Arethas, Richard and Rupert on the Apocalypse.

Secondly, the same is proven from the fact that the Scriptures say that the time in which the Devil is unleashed, as well as of Antichrist, will be very brief. "Woe to the earth and sea, because the devil descends to you having great wrath, knowing that he has but a short time." [113](#) And again: "He bound him for a thousand years, and after these he ought to be freed for

a short time.” [114](#) How I ask, will this be true, if Antichrist will reign for 1270 years? For he will be free longer than he was bound.

Thirdly, because, as Augustine [115](#) and Gregory the Great [116](#) argue, unless that fearsome persecution were brief, many would perish who are not going to perish. This is why the Lord also says: “Unless those days would be brief, all flesh would not be saved.” [117](#)

Fourthly, Christ preached for only three and a half years. Therefore, it would be fitting that Antichrist is not permitted to preach longer.

Fifth, the sum of those 1260 years, which our adversaries constitute, can in no way be accommodated to those words of Daniel and of John: “Time, times and half a time.” For through time it ought to be understood without a doubt one certain number like one day, one week one month, one year, one purification, [118](#) one jubilee, [119](#) one century, one millennium. But if we receive one millennium, then Antichrist will reign for 3500 years, which our adversaries do not admit. If we receive one century, then the time of Antichrist will be 350 years, which they also do not admit, and the same is clear concerning one jubilee, etc.

Sixth, when we read Daniel IV, we read the number of times that will pass are seven in which Nebuchadnezzar will be going to be outside his kingdom but for those times all understand seven years. If we would understand years of years, as our adversaries would have it in their treatment of Antichrist, it would behoove them to say that Nebuchadnezzar lived outside his kingdom for 2,555 years.

It is not difficult to answer their petty syllogisms. For when Chytraeus said what Daniel and John spoke of cannot be received as three and a half years, nor properly for our usage of years, because experience witnesses that Antichrist has already been prowling for a longer time, he manifestly begs the question, as the Logicians say. For he assumes what is in question. That very thing is asked, whether Antichrist has come. But when he adds, that by the opinion of St. Paul, Antichrist was going to rule even to the second coming of Christ and concludes that he must reign longer than three and a half years, he does not see that he either again begs the question or says nothing. For no order can be made, unless it is assumed that Antichrist has already come—but that what the very question is about.

But to that, which both he and Henry Bullinger say, that a certain number is taken up for an uncertain period in this passage, I respond: a certain number is only placed for an uncertain one when some full and

perfect number is placed, such as ten, a hundred, or a thousand, but not when different numbers are assigned where great and small are mixed. Then a certain number must be taken up for an uncertain one, just as when the Scripture says in Apocalypse XX that the devil was bound for a thousand years, as Sts. Augustine and Gregory say, [120](#) but not when it assigns time, times and half time, or 1260 days, or 42 months. For to what end are there a variety of numbers, if an uncertain time is meant?

Now I will address the argument of Illyricus. In the Scripture one does discover what can rightly be called weeks of years. Still, not days for years, or months for years. For weeks of years we read in Leviticus XXV: “You will count for yourself seven weeks of years, etc.” And certainly it is right to say that week is counted by the number seven in Greek, Latin and Hebrew. In Hebrew they say *sha-bo-ach*, (seventh) from *sha-bach*, which is seven, as is also said in Greek by *hethdoumas* and in Latin by *septimana*, through a number containing seven; just as seven days are called a week of days, so seven years are a week of years. But month of years, or day for year we never read, nor would it be correct to say it because a month is not counted by some number, but by the cycle of the moon, which finished in thirty days. Hence the Hebrews call month *ya-rech*, that is moon, or *ko-desh*; that is the beginning of the moon, and in Greek month is *mēn* because moon is called *mēnē*.

In like manner, day does not mean a number, but a time of light, as in Genesis: “God called the light day, and the darkness night.” Nor is the passage of Ezechiel opposed to this: “I give to you a day for a year.” [121](#) There, he did not wish to say years are literally meant by days, otherwise it would behoove Ezechiel to have slept on his left side for 390 years, which is impossible. For God had commanded that he should sleep upon his left for 390 days and added: “I give to you a day for a year.” So if those days were received for years, Ezechiel ought to sleep on his side for 390 years. Yet he did not live that long. Therefore, it must be said that in that passage a day is truly received for days, but can mean years through a type, because those 390 days in which Ezechiel slept were a sign of the sleep of God, through which he tolerated the sins of the Israelites for 390 years.

Now, to the objection made by Chytraeus from Luke XIII: “It is fitting for me to walk today and tomorrow, as well as the day after,” I respond: When Christ said this, he did not mean by these words that he was still going to preach for three years since the Lord said this in the last year of his

life. For, as Jerome notes, [122](#) the matter speaks for itself. Matthew, Mark and Luke did not write the deeds and words of the first two years of Christ's public ministry, rather only the third year. Therefore, the Lord either understood by those three days the triduum which was about to be taken up on the journey to Jerusalem (as St. Albert and Cajetan explain), or he certainly wished to show by that manner of speaking that he was going to remain and preach still a little while, as Jansenius rightly teaches. Lastly, where in the world did Illyricus and Chytraeus find days and found Angelic months? None are found in Scripture.

CHAPTER IX: The Sixth Proof: the End of the World

THE SIXTH proof is taken from the last sign following Antichrist, that the end of the world will come about. For the arrival of Antichrist will be a little before the end of the world. Therefore, if Antichrist would have come a long time ago, as our adversaries say, the world should have ended a long time ago. Daniel spoke twice about Antichrist, [123](#) once explaining the vision, adding each in turn; the second, that after Antichrist the last judgment immediately follows. “I considered the horns and behold a little horn arose, and three from the first horns were torn from his face. I watched until thrones were placed, and the ancient of days sat, etc.” And later, explaining the vision: “The fourth beast will be the fourth kingdom; the ten horns mean there will be ten kings and another kingdom will rise after them, and it will be more powerful than the first, and it will lay low the three kings . . . And they will be betrayed into his hand through time, times and half a time, and he will sit in judgment, etc.”

The Prophecy of John is similar: “After these it will be fitting for him to be freed for a short time, and I have seen the seats, and they sat upon them and gave judgment upon them, etc.” [124](#) Daniel said the same thing again afterward, in chapter XII. The reign of Antichrist will endure for a 1,290 days, and he adds: “Blessed is he who waits and attains even to 1,335 days;” this is, even to sixty days after the death of Antichrist because then the Lord will come to judge and he will render the crowns of justice upon the victors, just as Jerome and Theodoret show in their commentary on this citation.

Next, the same is gathered from Matthew XXIV: “This Gospel of the kingdom will be preached to all nations throughout the whole world, and then will come the consummation,” that is, the end of the world will be a little after. Then: “But immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; and then will appear the sign of the son of man, etc.” St. Paul says the same thing: “Then that wicked man, whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the breath of his mouth, and by the glory of his coming he will bring him to ruin, etc.” [125](#)

The Apostle teaches that almost immediately after Antichrist, Christ is going to come because he will intervene in that very short time so that the frauds and deceits of Antichrist, which will have begun to be destroyed by Elijah and Enoch, will be utterly destroyed by the very arrival of Christ as well as the horrible preceding signs.

Moreover, the same is seen in 1 John II: “Little children, now is the last hour, and just as you heard that Antichrist has come, and now there are many Antichrists, whence you know it is the last hour.” In other words, John says that this time from Christ even to the end of the world is the last hour, that is, the last time or the last age, as St. Augustine says. And he proves this most beautifully from this principle that we know Antichrist is going to come at the end of the world. But now we have already spoken of his many forerunners, or lesser Antichrists. The sign is certain, this is the last hour, or age. It is in the same way that one could so argue about the last hour of night for we know the sun is going to rise at the end of the night. Furthermore, we see now many of its rays already illumine the sky, therefore, we know this is the last hour of the night.

Next, this is also the common consensus of the Fathers: Irenaeus, [126](#) Tertullian, [127](#) Augustine [128](#) and many others; we even see it in the testimony of our adversaries. They affirm that Antichrist is going to reign even to the end of the world, hence a little after his ruin it is going to be the end of the world. So from this sign, joined with that above, we make an unanswerable proof whereby it is proven both that Antichrist has not yet come and he is not the Roman Pontiff. For if the world is going to end immediately after the death of Antichrist and Antichrist will not be alive three and a half years after he appears, then it is clear that he will not appear or begin to reign except for three and a half years before the end of the world. But the Pope now, according to our adversaries, has reigned with both swords for more than five hundred years but still the world still endures.

CHAPTER X: On the name “Antichrist”.

NOW the fourth disputation follows, which will be on the proper name and character of Antichrist. Everyone agrees that these words of John in the Apocalypse pertain entirely to Antichrist: “He will make all small with the great, rich and poor, free and slave to have his mark on their right hand, or on their foreheads so that no one will be able to buy or sell unless he shall have this mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name: ‘this is wisdom’. He who has the knowledge, will reckon the number of the beast. His number is of man, and that number is 666.” [129](#)

Now, there are a great many opinions on this number. The first is of those who say that this number does not designate a name, but the time of the arrival or the death of Antichrist. Bullinger would have it thus in the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse, that this is the time of the arrival of Antichrist. Similarly, the Centuriators say it designates the time of the death of Antichrist. [130](#) Still, some like Clithoveus claim that in the writings of St. John Damascene, [131](#) it means the death of Muhammad, whom he calls the Antichrist. Lyranus, on this citation, agrees with those who do not quite think Muhammad is the Antichrist, but still believe this number means the death of Muhammad was going to be in the year 666 A.D.

This opinion is most absurd. Firstly, because John says that he speaks concerning the number of the name of the beast. Secondly, because the beast, whose number this is, will command all businessmen, so that they will use that number in contracts, as is obvious from Apocalypse XIII. Therefore, the number does not pertain to the death of the beast, but rather to the period when he is living. The Third is also false, that Muhammad died in the year 666. Some say he died in the year 637, such as Matthew Palmerius, others in the year 630 like Cedrenus in his compendium of histories, while others still in the year 638, as John Vaseus in his Chronicle of Spain.

The second opinion is of David Chytraeus, who teaches on this place in the Apocalypse that the name of Antichrist is *lateinos*, or in Hebrew *Rom-yi-yet* which is Roman. Hence the Pope, who is a Latin prince, since he

rules in Latium, and is the Roman Pontiff must be Antichrist. Theodore Bibliander teaches the same thing, [132](#) and for that reason the eleventh table of his Chronology, which he begins from the year 600 he titles “the Latin Popes”. There are two reasons: 1) what Irenaeus teaches in book 5 which has the appearance of truth, that this is going to be the name of Antichrist; 2) that really the letters of this name add up to that number, as follows:

ק.	200.	א.	30.	ט.	300.
ך.	6.	ב.	1.	י.	5.
מ.	40.	ג.	300.	י.	10.
ל.	10.	ד.	5.	ט.	300.
נ.	10.	ה.	10.	ו.	1.
ס.	400.	ז.	50.	ז.	50.
	666.	ח.	70.		666.
		ט.	200.		
			666.		

This opinion is completely careless. In the first place, Irenaeus indeed says that the name *lateinos* can probably be accommodated to Antichrist; but he adds it is much more probable that the name of Antichrist is *lateinos* not but *teitan*, which also expresses that number and the name is much more clear since it means the light of the sun.

Besides, the conjecture of Irenaeus, which was something at that time, is nothing now. For he says it is probable that Antichrist will be called Latinum, not because he ruled in Latium, but because the Latins then ruled so extensively and held almost the whole world. Since Antichrist ought to be a very powerful king, without a doubt he will seize the most powerful kingdoms that he will discover. Moreover, Irenaeus says that the kingdom of the Latins is the most powerful, since they really ruled then. Certainly that conjecture avails to nothing in our times, for the Latins no longer rule throughout the world; instead the Turks really rule, and among us the Spanish and the French, not the Latins.

Besides the name *Latin*, that it would mean Rome, is not written for ei(but through the simple Iota; and thence it does not render that number. In the same way the comment can be refuted on the word *Rom-yi-yet*. For Roman can not end in a *ט* (tav), since it would be a Masculine noun. For that ending is feminine in Hebrew. Without that letter *ט*, the number 400 is missing for the name of Antichrist. Moreover, the noun *lateinos* if it will be

the name of Antichrist, will be proper to him especially in use, just as Arethas teaches, because it will need to be shown in a sign by all who buy or sell, yet the name *lateinos* is common. Still, no Pope has ever been called Latinus either for their own name or for the name they take up; the Popes never call themselves Latins, only Bishops or Popes.

Next, Romanus was a proper name of only one Pontiff, though still he could not be Antichrist since he did not live more than 4 months. Secondly, such a name is common.

Next, if only this name *lateinos* or Romanus would effect the number 666, our adversaries would have an argument. But innumerable names are discovered that render the same number. Hippolytus the Martyr, in his sermon on the consummation of the world, recorded another name which renders that number, arnoumai, that is "I refuse." Arethas records seven: lampetēs, that is *renowned*; teitan, that is *the sun*; ho niketes, that is *victor*; kakos ho dēgos, that is *wicked general*; alēthēs blaberos, that is *truly wounding*; palai baskanos, that is *once hating*; amnos adikos, which is a Gothic name, and in Latin comes out to DCLXVI, which makes 666 if we receive a D in Latin for 500, C for one hundred, L for fifty, X for ten, V for five, and I for one.

From more recent writers William Lindanus remarks that Martin Luther rendered the number 666 if Latin letters would be received for numbers after the customary usage of Greek and Hebrew in this way: A:1 D:2; C 3; D, 4; E5, F, 6; G, 7; H 8; I, 9; K, 10; L, 20; M, 30; N, 40; O, 50; P, 60; Q, 70; R, 80; S, 90; T, 100; V, 200; X, 300; Y, 400; Z, 500. Gilbert Genebrardus remarks in the last book of his Chronology, that even the name of Luther in Hebrew makes the number rtlwl (Luliter).

α.	4.	σ.	200.
β.	2.	α.	1.
γ.	10.	β.	60.
δ.	4.	γ.	70.
ε.	20.	δ.	50.
ζ.	10.	ε.	5.
η.	400.	ζ.	10.
θ.	200.	η.	70.
ι.	10.	θ.	200.
κ.	6.		
	666.		666.

I add two other things for the sake of Luther and Chytraeus, namely that wyrtyk dybd, (David Chytraeus), and *saxoneis*, (the Saxon) render 666, and the latter agrees with Luther just as the name Latin does to the Pope.

The third opinion is of many Catholics who suspect Antichrist will be called *antemos* both because this name properly agrees with him and also that it renders the number exactly, as Primasius, Anselm and Richardus argue.

This opinion is correctly refuted by Rupert, since the name which John insinuates will not be the name imposed on Antichrist by his opponents, but the name which he will take unto himself and boast in, so much so that he will command it be written on the foreheads of men. Moreover, it is not believable that he is going to take a name so odious and vile, such as *antemos* and being mindful of all others noted above.

The Fourth opinion is of the same Rupert, who believes this number does not mean the name of Antichrist but means the three fold prevarication carried out by the devil in Antichrist. For a series of 6 numbers, because it does not reach as far as the sevens, in which there is rest and beatitude, is the number of the creature perishing through prevarication from rest. But the devil incurs a threefold prevarication, or rather more, he makes one threefold. First he transgressed when he sinned in himself; next, when he made the first man sin he added 60 to a simple six; then thirdly he will transgress when he will seduce the whole world through Antichrist, and then will have added 600 to 60.

The Fifth Opinion is of Bede, who proceeds on a contrary path, and teaches the number six is perfect, because God created the heaven and the earth in six days. Sixty then, is more perfect and six hundred the most perfect, from which he gathers that Antichrist is meant by the number 666 because he will usurp for himself the most perfect tribute which should be given to God alone. We read a figure of it in the book of kings, where a weight of gold, which is offered to Solomon each year, was six hundred and sixty six thousand talents. [133](#) These two opinions do not appear to sufficiently square with what John says, since that number is the number of a name not a dignity or a prevarication. Yet these Fathers would hold their opinions on this passage with as much suspicion and conjecture.

Therefore, the truest opinion of this matter is of those who confess their ignorance and say that they still do not know the name of Antichrist. Such an opinion is of Irenaeus, [134](#) Aertbas and others on this place of the Apocalypse. If I may, I will ascribe the words of Irenaeus, because Chytraeus exhorts his readers to do the same, saying: “Being zealous I exhort you that you view the last pages of Irenaeus on this place of the

Apocalypse, 333 and 334, which profitably and piously dispute on this number, and among the rest he judges that Latin or Roman is the name of Antichrist, that is *lateinos*, etc. Now Irenaeus says the following: "It is more certain and less hazardous to await the fulfilment of the prophecy than to be making surmises and casting about for any names that may present themselves, inasmuch as many names can be found possessing the number mentioned and the same question will, after all, remain unsolved. For if there are many names found possessing this number, it will be asked which among them shall the man bear when he comes. It is not through a want of names containing the number of that name that I say this, but on account of the fear of God, and zeal for the truth. For the name *euanthas* contains the required number, but I make no claim regarding it. Then also Lateinos has the number six hundred and sixty-six; and it is very probable, this being the name of the last kingdom [seen by Daniel]. For the Latins are they who at present bear rule. I will not, however, make any boast over this. *Teitan* too, the first two syllables being the Greek vowels e and i, among all names which are found among us, is rather worthy of belief. . . . In as much, then, as this name 'Titan' has such arguments to recommend it, that from among the many names we could gather lest perhaps he who is to come will be called 'Titan', it has the greatest appearance of truth. We will not, however, risk the matter nor pronounce in earnest that Antichrist is going to have this name, knowing that if it were necessary for his name to be publicly revealed at the present, the one who beheld the vision of the Apocalypse would have made it known."

So, let Chytraeus hear the profitable, pious and erudite difference of Irenaeus, and not falsely impute to him what he never said. For Irenaeus judged that Antichrist might be Latin, or Roman, but he says that as often as it was repeated, the name of Antichrist could not be known in this time, and he proved this opinion with two reasons. First, because many names are discovered which make that number, nor is it permitted to divine the name from so many like it, because it happens that it will be one which has been predicted. Next, because if God wanted it known in this time, he would have brought this out through John himself. But he adds, that it is not due to any poverty of names, but from fear of God and zeal for truth. And for that reason he brings forth three names, *euanthas*, *lateinos* and *teitan*, whereby the second has a greater appearance of truth than the first, and he affirms

the third to have more than the second, while he avows none of them for certain.

We could add a third reason from the same passage of Irenaeus. A little before we disputed against those who were gathering false names of Antichrist for their own purpose. For this reason, he says they fall into many troubles. For they express themselves with the danger of erring and deceiving others, and also of effecting that both they and many others will quite easily be seduced by Antichrist. When he will come, he will have some name which they will persuade him to have; he will not be held by them as Antichrist, and so he will not shun it. All such dangers without a doubt come upon the Lutherans, and especially this last one, because they have persuaded themselves that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist. When the true Antichrist arrives they will not easily recognize it and hence, will not avoid him.

Here we must remark that when he will have come, the name of Antichrist will be well known. Before Christ came, the Jews did not know for certain by what name he would be called, although the Prophets preached much concerning his name. Even one of the Sibylls, in the first book of the songs of Sibylls, remarked that the number of the name of Christ was going to be 888, even as John writes that Antichrist's number is 666. But after Christ came, all controversy was abolished, and everyone knows he is called Jesus.

I.	10.
II.	8.
III.	200.
IV.	70.
V.	400.
VI.	100.
VII.	888.

“But,” says the Sibyll, “I will teach you what his number may be.
For eight monads there are as many tens over it.
And also 8 groups of ten, will mean faithless.
But you bear in mind that is the name for the human race.”

It happens, that it is common to all prophecies of the prophets to be ambiguous and obscure until they are fulfilled, just as Irenaeus rightly teaches and proves. [135](#)

From these we take up the unanswerable argument to prove the Roman Pontiff is not the Antichrist and that Antichrist himself has not yet come. If Antichrist would have come and was the Roman Pontiff, his name would established for certain, as predicted by John, just for us Christ—now there is no question—not even amongst the Turks, Jews, and Pagans, to the extent that he is named. But on the name of Antichrist there is still a great controversy, we make it plain by so many opinions that have been recited and refuted. Therefore, the prophecy of John has not yet been fulfilled. Hence, Antichrist has not yet come nor is he the Roman Pontiff. Add the confirmation from the Confession of Augustine Marloratus, who in a great explication gathered from various Lutherans and Calvinists on the New Testament, so writes on this citation: “There are nearly so many explications of this place whereby it appears it is very obscure and enigmatic.” Yet if the prophecy is still very obscure and enigmatic, then it is not fulfilled; Antichrist has not come. Accordingly, all prophecies, when they are fulfilled are made evident. Therefore, why does Marloratus, lay down in his preface in the Apocalypse that it is so clear that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, that if you were silent, the very stones would cry out?

CHAPTER XI: On the Mark of Antichrist.

INDEED, there are also two or three opinions on the mark of Antichrist. Firstly, the Heretics of this time teach that the mark of Antichrist is some sign of obedience and union with the Roman Pontiff, yet they do not explain in the same way what that sign will be. Henry Bullinger would have it that it is the anointing of Confirmation, in which all Christians are marked on their forehead as obedient to the Roman Pontiff. [136](#) Theodore Bibliander says the character of Antichrist is the profession of the Roman faith because a true worshiper would not be considered a true Christian unless he professed that he adheres to the Roman Church. [137](#) Additionally, David Chytraeus adds the oath of fidelity, which many are compelled to furnish to the Roman Pontiff. In like manner the priestly anointing that they receive on their forehead and hand, saying: “He impresses, as the Papists call it, an indelible character.” Therefore, he sinks down to statues and consecrated bread, as well as to be present at funeral masses. Now, what Sebastian Meyer and others along with Augustine Marloratus teach on this citation of the Apocalypse are not much different. But these petty arguments are easy to refute, both because they do not agree with the words of the text itself and also because all these signs were in the Catholic Church before their opinion holds Antichrist appeared.

1) We have from the text that there is going to be one mark, not many. For Scripture always speaks on an individual number both for a mark and for the name and number of the name of Antichrist. Therefore, the mark will be one. Likewise the proper name of Antichrist and his number are one. Hence, when our adversaries multiply so many marks they show that they do not know what it is that John is speaking about.

2) That mark will be common to all men in the reign of Antichrist and such is plain from the words themselves. He will make all the small and the great, rich and poor, free and slave receive his mark. But the oath of obedience, and the priestly anointing agree with a very few individuals.

3) Scripture shows that the mark is of a type that could be born without distinction on the right hand or on the forehead. He says: “He will make all receive the mark on the right hand or on their forehead.” Moreover, this

agrees with none of the arguments which our adversaries advance because the anointing of chrism cannot be received in the right hand and the Profession of the Roman Faith can not be received in the hand nor on the forehead; it is made by the mouth through profession and preserved in the heart by faith. The oath of fidelity is furnished by hand and mouth but in no way can it be born on the forehead. Priestly anointing is received neither in the right hand properly, nor on the forehead, but above the crown and on the fingers of each hand. Then the last point, to be present at funeral masses and to kneel before statues and the Eucharist are not obligations for the forehead or the hand, but rather of the whole body, and they are particularly felt in the knees.

4) The same Scripture says that in the reign of Antichrist, nobody will be allowed to buy or sell unless they show the mark, or the name or the number of his name. But how many people buy and sell in the dominion of the Roman Pontiff who have not yet been anointed with chrism, nor furnished an oath of fidelity and are not priests? Are there not in Rome itself, where the Roman Pontiff has his seat, a great many Jews who publicly conduct business, buying and selling, yet none of them have these signs?

Let us come to the another account, whereby we prove all of these signs are older than Antichrist. Antichrist, in the opinion of our adversaries, did not come before the year 666. Yet Tertullian flourished around the year 200 and still called Chrism (Confirmation) to mind. He says: “The Flesh is washed so that the soul will be cleansed, the flesh is anointed so that the soul consecrated.” [138](#) Cyprian lived around the year 250, and he remembered the Chrism: “It is necessary for anyone who has been baptized to be anointed, so that after he has received the Chrism, that is, anointing, he may be able to be the anointed of God and have in himself the grace of Christ.” [139](#) Augustine lived around the year 420, yet he says on John: “What is it that all believers know to be the sign of Christ, but the cross? What sign is it that is applied to the forehead of believes, or in the water, by which we are regenerated, or in the oil in which we are anointed with chrism, or the sacrifice whereby we are nourished, but the cross? Without it, none of these can be done rightly.” [140](#)

For equal reason, *to adhere* to the Roman Church before the year 600 was a sign and mark of a truly Catholic man. Augustine writes about Cecilianus, who lived around the year 300: “He paid no attention to the

multitude of his conspiring enemies since he saw himself through communicatory letters joined to the Roman Church, wherein the supremacy of the Apostolic See always flourishes, and with the rest of the world, whence the Gospel came into Africa.” [141](#) Ambrose, who lived around 390, said: “It was inquired of the Bishop whether he thought with Catholic bishops, that is, whether he thought with the Roman Church.” [142](#)

Victor of Utica, who lived around the year 490, writes of an Arian priest that wished to persuade the king not to kill a certain Catholic man using these words: “If you destroy him with a sword, the Romans will preach that he is a martyr.” [143](#) In such a place, by the name of Romans he means African Catholics, for certainly the Arians would not speak on behalf of a Roman unless he meant the faith of the Roman Church, since they did not follow the Arian treachery.

The oath of obedience made to the Roman Pontiff is found in the time of St. Gregory, [144](#) and hence is before the year 606, since St. Gregory did not survive to that year.

On priestly anointing we have the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, who lived around 380. In his Apologetic to his father, when he was made Bishop of Sasimi said: “When the anointing and the Spirit came over me, again I fell weeping and sad.” There he calls to mind two anointings, one which he had received when created a priest, the other which he had to receive in the Episcopal ordination. Speaking about Basil, who, after he was created a bishop refused a province, he said: “When he believed the spirit and the business of the talents and the care of the flock was consigned to him, and he was anointed by the oil of priesthood and perfection, still he delayed to receive a prefecture from his own wisdom.”

Now on the Sacrifice for the dead, it will be enough to cite the testimony of Augustine, who says that it was a dogma of the heretic Aërius that it was not fitting to offer sacrifice for the dead. [145](#)

Concerning the Adoration of images one testimony of Jerome, who lived in the year 400, will suffice for us. He said, in the life of Paul: “He worshiped, prostrate before the cross, just as if he discerned the Lord hanging there.” Next, in the adoration of the Eucharist, St. Ambrose should be sufficient testimony. While explaining that verse: *adore scabellum pedum eius*, he said: “Therefore, through a footstool the earth is understood; for the earth, the flesh of Christ, which today also we adore in the mysteries and which the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus, as we said above.” [146](#)

Augustine says nearly the same thing in the same words in his explication of Psalm 98 (99).

So, since all these things which our adversaries suggest are marks of Antichrist were in the use of the Catholic Church for many years before Antichrist would have been born [by their reckoning], necessarily it must be that Antichrist either learned from the Church, and so to say this is to confuse Antichrist with Christ, or none of these pertain to the marks of Antichrist. Now follows what we contend. These suffice for that rash and absurd opinion of our adversaries, which they try to show with no witnesses and no proofs.

The second opinion is of some Catholics, who think the mark of Antichrist is a letter wherein the name of Antichrist will be written. So Primasius, Bede and Rupert, who seem to have been deceived from something which they read. Unless someone will have the mark of the name of the beast, or the number of his name. But John does not say this, rather he said: “Unless one will have the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” The Greek text agrees: *ei mē ho echōn to karagma to onoma tou theriou ē ton arithmon tou onomatos autou*. [147](#)

The Third opinion is of the martyr Hippolytus, and of certain others. He thought that the mark of the beast was going to be that he would not use the sign of the cross, but rather would curse and abolish it. In this the Calvinists would be outstanding precursors of Antichrist. At any rate, I believe it is a positive character that will be devised by Antichrist, just as Christ had the sign of the cross made known to all. Yet no one will know what this character will be until Antichrist comes, just as we said on his name.

CHAPTER XII: On the Begetting of Antichrist

ON the Fifth, concerning the begetting of Antichrist, there are some things that are clearly erroneous asserted by some individuals, then some things that are probable, and others that have been investigated and are certain. Firstly, there were once many errors on Antichrist.

The first error is that Antichrist was going to be born from a virgin by a work of the devil, exactly how Christ was born by a work of the Holy Spirit.

An author of a little work on the Antichrist relates this error, which is held under the name of Augustine in the end of volume IX (though it is probable that the work is of a Rabi, certainly it cannot be of Augustine). It is clearly erroneous, for to produce a man without the male seed is a work of God alone, who can supply all efficient causes, because he alone is of infinite power and contains every perfection of creatures in his essence. The devil, however, is a creature, certainly he can do wondrous works by applying active things to passive things in a short period; but he cannot supply the active power of a cause. For this reason St. Augustine says, that to be born of a virgin was such a miracle in Christ, that greater things could not be expected from God. [148](#)

Still it would not be an error if someone would say that Antichrist was going to be born from the devil and a woman, the same way that certain people relate men are born from liaisons with demons. Although the devil by himself cannot produce a man without the male seed, still he can exercise a carnal act with a man taking on the form of a woman, and take his seed; and then exercise a like act with a woman in the form of a man and place the seed received from the man into the womb of the woman to beget a man in that manner. St. Augustine witnesses this, [149](#) and adds that experience has so proven it that it seemed to him that one would be impudent to deny it.

The Second error was of the Blessed Martyr Hippolytus, who in his sermon on the end of the world, teaches that Antichrist is the devil himself, who will assume false flesh from a false virgin. For as the word of God,

which is truth itself, assumed true flesh from a true virgin, so Hippolytus thought it probable that the devil, who is the father of lies, was going to simulate that he had taken human flesh from a virgin. This opinion is refuted, both because in 2 Thessalonians II Antichrist is called a man, and also because the rest of the Fathers write in a common consensus that Antichrist is going to be a true man.

The Third error is, that Antichrist is going to be a true man, but at the same time also the devil, through the incarnation of the devil, just as Christ through the Incarnation is true God and man. Several Fathers relate and refute this error. [150](#)

Origen believed this opinion is possible, in as much as he asserted that some Angels were truly incarnate, which Jerome refutes in his preface to Malachi as well as in the first Chapter of Haggai. And without a doubt, it is erroneous since a person cannot be created and thus sustain two finite natures in the way that the word of God, who is infinite, can. There is no controversy on this amongst Theologians, although some may teach that it altogether implies contradiction, others teach it does not imply one. Nevertheless, all agree on the point that creatures, such as the devil, cannot do that by their power alone.

The Fourth error is that Nero is going to rise from the dead and he is going to be the Antichrist, or certainly that he will still live and be preserved secretly in the vigor of youthful age and appear as he did in his own time. Sulpitius suggests this error; [151](#) but St. Martin writes that Nero himself will not be Antichrist, rather he is going to come with Antichrist and at length, must be destroyed by Antichrist. [152](#) Yet, because all these are said without any proof from reason, St. Augustine rightly calls this opinion a remarkable presumption. [153](#)

Apart from these errors there are two probable opinions of the holy Fathers on the begetting of Antichrist.

1) That Antichrist is going to be born from a woman by fornication, not from a legitimate marriage. St. John Damascene teaches this, [154](#) as well as certain others. Still, since it cannot be shown from the Scriptures it is not certain, although it is probable.

2) Antichrist will be born from the tribe of Dan, which many Fathers and doctors assert. [155](#) They prove this from Genesis XLIX: "Let Dan be a snake on the path, let him be a horned snake on the path, etc." Likewise in Jeremiah VIII: "From Dan we heard the growling of his horses, etc." Next,

because in Apocalypse VII, where twelve thousand from every tribe of the sons of Israel is signified by the Angel, the tribe of Dan is left out, which appears to be done in hatred of Antichrist.

This opinion is exceedingly probable on account of the authority of such Fathers, still it is not altogether certain, both because a great many of these Fathers do not say they know this but hint that it is probable, and because none of those passages of the Scripture clearly prove it. In the first place, in Genesis, Jacob seems literally to speak about Samson, when he says: “Let Dan be a serpent on the way, a horned snake on the path, and let him bite the hoofs of the horses so that the rider falls upon his back.” For Samson was from the tribe of Dan, and was truly a serpent in the road for the Philistines. For he resists and plagues them everywhere. Jerome shows this in *Hebrew Questions*. It appears well enough that Jacob prayed well for his son when he said this, and hence did not predict evil but good.

Nevertheless, if this were to be accommodated to Antichrist allegorically, such as is lead in from the spiritual senses of Scripture, the argument could not be said to be more than probable. Moreover, Jeremiah VIII without a doubt does not speak on Antichrist, nor on the tribe of Dan but Nebuchadnezzar, who was going to come to destroy Jerusalem through the region which was called Dan. [156](#) But why Dan, whose tribe was one of the greatest, is omitted in Apocalypse VII is not sufficiently established.

Apart from these two probable opinions, there are two certain ones.

1) Antichrist will come particularly on account of the Jews, and will be received by them as if he were a Messiah;

2) He is going to be born from the nation and race of the Jews, be circumcised and shall observe the Sabbath, at least for a time.

The first opinion is certain from the following. It is in John’s Gospel where the Lord says to the Jews: “I have come in my Father’s name, and you have not received me. If another will have come in my name, you will receive him.” We proved that this citation ought to be understood to be about Antichrist in the second chapter above. Then, from the Apostle: “For the reason, since they do not receive the charity of truth that they may be saved, God will send to them the operation of error, that they would believe lies, etc.” [157](#) Calvin and other heretics in commentaries on these words, argue that these words are about us [Catholics], who, because we do not receive their Gospel, he permitted to be seduced by Antichrist. But we have

all the interpreters on our side, who show it speaks about the Jews. See Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylactus, and Oecumenius.

Apart from them, Jerome says the following: “Antichrist will make all these things not with virtue, but from the concession of God on account of the Jews and because they refused to receive the charity of truth, the spirit of God through Christ, that having received the Savior they would be saved; God will send upon them not an operator, but the operation itself, that means the font of error, that they would believe lies, etc.” [158](#) Even without so many commentaries of the Fathers the matter speaks for itself, the Apostle speaks about the Jews. For he says Antichrist must be sent to them who refuse to receive Christ. Moreover, who else is there that can be said to ought to have received Christ, but refused more than the Jews? It also must be remarked, the Apostle did not say because they will not receive the truth but because they have not received it. Therefore, he speaks on those who refused to believe the preaching of Christ and the Apostles. It is certain in the times of the Apostles, the Gentiles eagerly received the Gospel, but the Jews refused to.

So apart from Jerome and other citations, all the other Fathers teach the same thing. [159](#) Even reason argues for it. For Antichrist, without a doubt, will join himself to those who are prepared to receive him; the Jews are of this sort, who await the Messiah as a temporal king and Antichrist will be such a king. For the Gentiles await no one. Moreover, Christians indeed wait upon Antichrist, but with fear and terror, not with joy and desire. Therefore, just as Christ first came to the Jews to whom he had been promised and by whom he had been awaited, and at length also joined the nations to himself, so also Antichrist will first come to the Jews, by whom he is awaited, and thereupon little by little subjugate all the nations to himself.

Now to the second opinion, that Antichrist is going to be a Jew and circumcised; this is certain and is deduced from the aforesaid. For the Jews have never received a non-Jewish man, or an uncircumcised one for a Messiah. Nay more, the Jews also await a Messiah from the family of David and the tribe of Judah, certainly Antichrist, although he could be from the tribe of Dan, will pretend that he is from the household of David. Next, all the Fathers very clearly teach that Antichrist will be a Jew, such as those twelve cited a little while ago, who say he is going to be from the tribe of Dan. Besides, Ambrose, in 2 Thess. II, asserts that he will be

circumcised; Jerome teaches in his commentary on Daniel XI that he is going to be born from the Jewish people; St. Martin teaches that Antichrist is going to command that all be circumcised according to the law, [160](#) and St. Cyril asserts that he will be exceedingly zealous for the temple of Jerusalem to show himself to be from the progeny of David. [161](#) At length, even Gregory says that Antichrist is going to keep the Sabbath and all the other ceremonies of the Jews. [162](#)

From these we have the most evident proof that the Pope is not the Antichrist. For from the year 606, in which our adversaries say Antichrist came, it is certain that no Pope was a Jew, whether by race or religion or any other manner. It is also certain that the Pope to this point was never received by the Jews as a Messiah, but on the other hand is held as an enemy and a persecutor. For this reason they ask God in their daily prayers that God would give to the living Pope a good mind toward the Jews and that he might send a Messiah in their days who would liberate them from the power of the Pontiff, and a Bishop such as the Supreme Pontiff especially is, which they call *tey-na-mon* but in Syriac means tail, and is opposed to head. For while we call a Bishop the head of the people, they on the other hand call him a tail as an insult, the head is absent so that they might be prepared to receive a high priest as a head for their Messiah.

Therefore, R. Levi Gerson, in chapter VII and XI of Daniel, explains all those things which are said about Antichrist concerning the Roman Pontiff, whom he calls another Pharaoh and opposed to the coming Messiah. See the *orationes Mahasor*, fol. 26.

CHAPTER XIII: On the Seat of Antichrist

WE continue to the Sixth. Our adversaries impudently affirm that the particular seat of Antichrist is Rome, or even founded upon the Apostolic Throne at Rome. For they say Antichrist is going to invade the see of Peter, and will carry off the summit to the highest place and thence tyrannically preside over and dominate the whole Church. They try to show that Rome is the royal city of Antichrist from Apocalypse XVII, where John, speaking on the seat of Antichrist, says it will be a great city which will sit upon seven hills and which has rule over the kings of the earth.

Moreover, they try to show that Antichrist will have his seat at Rome, not in the palace of Nero but in the very Church of Christ from what Paul says in 2 Thess. II, that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of God. For when he says absolutely, “in the temple of God,” they understand the true temple of the true God. There is no such thing unless it is the Church of Christ, since the temples of the Gentiles are true temples but of demons not God. Moreover, the temple of the Jews was indeed for God but had already ceased to be a temple when the sacrifice and priesthood of the Jews ceased. For these three (the temple, the sacrifice and the priesthood) are so joined that you cannot have one without the other. Besides, that temple of the Jews was laid desolate and never in the future to be rebuilt, as Daniel says: “And even to the end of the world the desolation will continue;” [163](#) therefore, the Apostle does not speak about it.

The argument is confirmed from the Fathers. Jerome says: “In the temple of God he will sit, either in Jerusalem as some men think or in the Church, as we reckon is more true.” [164](#) Oecumenius: “He did not say the temple of Jerusalem, but the Church of Christ.”

Theodore Bibliander adds the testimony of Gregory, who wrote in a letter to John of Constantinople: “The King of pride is near, and it is not unlawful to say that an army of priests is prepared for him.” From such words he takes up a two-fold argument. One is thus, John of Constantinople is said to be a precursor of Antichrist, because he wished to be called universal Bishop, therefore, that will be Antichrist, who really will make himself a universal Bishop, and will sit in the Church as the head of all. On the other hand, the army of Antichrist will be priests, therefore, Antichrist

will be a prince of priests. From this the heretics reckon that they have clearly shown that the Roman Pontiff is Antichrist seeing that he rules at Rome, he sits in the temple of God and he is called universal Bishop as well as prince of priests.

Just the same, the true opinion is that the seat of Antichrist will be Jerusalem, not Rome, and the temple of Solomon as well as the throne of David, not the temple of St. Peter or the Apostolic See. We can prove the fact by a two-fold argument: First, by refutation, then from the Scriptures and the Fathers.

First, I will establish the argument. Let us say that Antichrist will sit in the Church of Christ and he will be held as prince and head of the Church, and in that he will manage magistracy and offices, as Melanchthon, Calvin and other heretics teach. [165](#) Moreover, the Roman Pope is Antichrist, as these writers teach in the same places; therefore, the Roman Pope sits in the true Church of Christ, and is the prince and head of the Church. But there can only be one true Church of Christ, just as Christ is one, as even Calvin teaches; [166](#) therefore, the Lutherans, Calvinists and all others are foreign to the Church, which is under the Pope, that is outside of the true Church of Christ.

Calvin sees this argument and responds that the Church is not under the Pope as much as the ruins of the Church of Christ are seen there. He says as much in the *Institutes*: “Still, as in ancient times, there remained among the Jews certain special privileges of a Church, so in the present day we do not deny that the Papists have those vestiges of a Church which the Lord has allowed to remain among them amid the dissipation. . . . He provided by his providence that there should be other remains also to prevent the Church from utterly perishing. Yet, when they pull down buildings the foundations and ruins are often permitted to remain, so he did not suffer Antichrist either to subvert his Church from its foundation, or to level it to the ground, but was pleased that amid the devastation the edifice should remain, though half in ruins. . . . Hence, we scarcely deny that churches remain under his tyranny.” [167](#)

But, his solution provides two arguments for us. 1) If only the ruins of the Church of Christ remain, therefore, the Church of Christ is ruined; hence truth lied when it said: “And the gates of hell will not prevail against it.” [168](#) 2) The Church is ruined as well as its ruins, and foundation so that the papists also hold semi-ruined buildings; therefore, the Lutherans and the

Calvinists have no Church. For they do not have the whole Church of Christ, since it is now a ruin, and still the ruins remain, but they do not even have the edifice, for that is with the Papists under Antichrist. Therefore, what is it that they have? By chance a new building? But that which is new is not of Christ. But who, unless he were blind, does not see that he is safer in the true Church of Christ (even if an edifice), than to remain in nothing?

Now I come to the Scriptures, whereby it is proved that the seat of the Antichrist is going to be in Jerusalem, not Rome. The First is in chapter XI of the Apocalypse, where John says that Enoch and Elijah are going to fight with Antichrist in Jerusalem, and must be killed there by the same Antichrist: "And they will throw their bodies in the streets of the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom, and Egypt, where even their Lord was Crucified." Arethas in this citation says: "Their bodies he will cast out unburied in the streets of Jerusalem, for in it he will reign as King of the Jews." Likewise, all other interpreters show, and this can rightly be said to be Jerusalem, and it cannot be denied. For what City is it in which the Lord was crucified but Jerusalem?

This is why Chytraeus, who would rather this city were Rome, passes over the words "Where even their Lord was crucified," as if they did not pertain to the matter, or as though he had not read them. Nor is it opposed to what Jerome says, when he tries to show that Jerusalem cannot be called Sodom, since everywhere in Scripture it is called the holy city. For in that epistle he persuades Marcellus that, after leaving Rome behind he should come into Palestine and there he can heap up all those places in praise of Jerusalem and in censure of Rome, and try to excuse Jerusalem in every manner. Nor does he do it in his own name, but in the name of Paula and Eustochius, to whom he thought forgiveness must be given, if they were to explain something a little differently than the matter stood. That the earthly Jerusalem can be called Sodom on account of the lust and the crimes of the Jews is also clear from Isaiah, who when he prefaced a title to the first chapter: "The Vision of Isaiah, which he saw over Judah and Jerusalem," he next added: "Hear the word of the Lord, O Princes of Sodom! Perceive with your ears the law of God, O my people Gomorrah!"

Further, it is not a valid argument that Jerusalem is called holy, therefore, it cannot be called Sodom. For just as in the same epistle Jerome says that Rome is called Babylon by John, and the purple whore on account of the heathen emperors and still, the same is holy on account of the Church of

Christ, and the tombs of Peter and Paul. So also Jerusalem is the holy city, on account of the Prophets and Apostles, who preached there, on account of the cross of Christ and his tomb and like things, still it is Sodom and Egypt on account of the crimes of infidelity of the Jews and their blindness.

The Second place is Apocalypse XVII, where John says there will be ten kings who divide the Roman Empire and from such rulers Antichrist will come, having hatred for the purple whore, that is Rome, and are going to lay waste to her and even burn her with fire. How, therefore, will it be the seat of Antichrist, if he should overturn and burn it at that time?

Add that, as we showed above, Antichrist will be Jewish, and the Messiah of the Jews, and a king, therefore, without a doubt he will constitute his seat in Jerusalem, and he will hasten to restore the temple of Solomon. For the Jews dream of nothing other than Jerusalem and the temple, nor do they seem ever to be going to receive anyone for a Messiah who would not sit in Jerusalem and restore the temple in some way. Lactantius says for this reason, that in the time of Antichrist the supreme kingdom is going to be in Asia and the West will serve, the East will rule. [169](#) He also determines the part of Asia, in which this kingdom will be and says it will be Syria, that is, Judaea, which is part of Syria, and which is always called Syria by the Latins. [170](#) In like manner, Jerome and Theodoret, commenting on chapter XI of Daniel, gather from Daniel himself that Antichrist is going to set up his tents in the region of Jerusalem, and at length it will end on mount Olivet. Further, Irenaeus clearly said that Antichrist was going to rule in Jerusalem. [171](#)

The Third place is in the words of Paul: "So that he would sit in the temple of God." [172](#) Although different expositions are given by the Fathers, some also understand the minds of the faithful through the temple of God, in which Antichrist is said to sit after he will have seduced them, as Anselm expresses. Some understand Antichrist himself through the temple, with his whole people; Antichrist would want himself and his own to seem the true spiritual temple of God, that is, the true Church, as Augustine explains. [173](#) There, he deduces this exposition from the manner of speaking which Paul uses, who did not say in Greek *en tō naō*, (in the temple) but *eis ton naon* (into the temple), as if to say Antichrist will sit within the temple of God, that is, just as if he, with his own, were the temple of God. Although this annotation of Augustine is not necessary, for even if in Latin it is not correct when it says to sit within the temple, rather

than in the temple, still in Greek it is not said incorrectly: *kathezoumai eis tēn ekklēsian*, or *eis ton naon*, as it is commonly read.

Some also understand the Churches of Christians, which Antichrist will command to serve him, as Chrysostom interprets; still the exposition is the more common, probable and literal of those who teach that for the temple of God is understood the temple of Solomon, in whichever renewed temple that Antichrist will sit in. Especially in the New Testament, the Churches of Christians are never understood for temple of God, rather that is always understood as the temple in Jerusalem. What is more, the Latin and Greek Fathers for so many centuries never called the Churches of Christians temples, which in Greek are called *naos*, as St. Paul says in this passage, rather they call them *euchtēria*, that is oratories, as Churches, or houses of prayer, or basilicas, or martyria.

Certainly neither Justin Martyr, nor Irenaeus, nor Tertullian, nor Cyprian use the noun “temple” when they treat on the Churches of Christians, and Jerome says that Julian the Apostate ordered that the basilicas of the Saints either be destroyed or turned into temples. [174](#)

Further, the reason why the Apostles do not call the Churches of Christians temples is two-fold. 1) Because then they did not have any temples, but only certain places in private houses that they set aside for prayer, a sermon and the holy celebration of the Mass. 2) Because while the memory of the Jewish temple still flourished, the Apostles were to introduce something similar to distinguish the Church from the Synagogue, so they avoided the use of the word “temple”, just as on account of the same reckoning the Apostles in Scripture never call Christian priests “priests” [*sacerdotes*], but only Bishops and Elders. But after Jerusalem was destroyed and the temple burned, and the memory of the old temple and its priesthood abolished, everywhere the holy Doctors began to use the word “temple” and “priesthood”.

Therefore, since the Apostle, writing that Antichrist was going to sit in the temple of God, said something which he wished to be understood by those to whom he wrote, and then they did not understand in the word “temple” anything else but the temple of Jerusalem, which appears for certain to be what the Apostle spoke about. But it is also confirmed from the common exposition of the Fathers.

Irenaeus says: “When Antichrist will have sat in the temple of Jerusalem, then the Lord will come.” [175](#) Hippolytus the martyr, (loc. cit.) says: “he

will build a temple in Jerusalem.” St. Martin (loc. cit.), teaches the same thing. Cyril of Jerusalem says: “What kind of temple does the Apostle speak of? In the temple that is the relic of the Jews. God forbid that it should happen in this, in which we are.” [176](#) Hilary says on Matthew XXV, “Antichrist, being received by the Jews, will stand in the place of sanctification.” It is certain that he is talking about the temple of the Jews, for he calls it the place of sanctification, which is what Christ calls it in Matthew XXIV when he said: “When you will have seen the abomination standing in the holy place.” Ambrose says Antichrist, according to history, is going to sit in that temple in which the Romans threw in the head of a pig, in the time of the Emperor Titus, according to the mystical sense, he is going to sit in the interior temple of the Jews, that is, in their faithless minds. [177](#)

Sedulus explains, in this place of the Apostle, that in the temple of God, “He will try to restore the temple of Jerusalem, etc.” John Damascene says: “In the temple, not ours, but the old Jewish temple.” [178](#) Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylactus (who say Antichrist is going to sit in the Churches of Christians), also say he is going to sit in the temple of Solomon. Chrysostom says on this verse: “He will command himself to be worshiped as a God, and to be placed in the temple, not only in Jerusalem, but even in the Churches.” Theophylactus and Theodoret says the same thing; even Augustine and Jerome [179](#) do not deny Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of Solomon.

There is only Oecumenius, who denies that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of the Jews, but he is the more recent of all of them, and by no means do we put him before the other Fathers. By chance his text might have been corrupted and lacked only one sentence, for it is strange that he would suddenly recede from Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylactus whom he otherwise always follows.

Now we respond to the arguments of our adversaries given above. To the first I respond in three ways. 1) It can be said with Augustine, [180](#) Aretha, Haymon, Bede and Rupert on chapter XVII of the Apocalypse, for a whore, which sits upon seven hills and has a kingdom over the kings of the earth, that Rome is not understood, but the universal city of the devil, which in scripture is always called Babylon and is opposed to the city of God, that is the Church, which is called Jerusalem. Through the seven hills is

understood the universality of the proud, and especially of the kings of the earth.

Secondly, it can be said and in my judgment better, that for the whore is understood Rome, as Tertullian [181](#) and Jerome [182](#) explain it; but Rome ruling the heathen, worshiping idols and persecuting Christians, not Christian Rome, for the same authors explain it in the same way.

One must truly marvel at the impudence of the heretics, who, as they try and show the Roman Church to be the purple whore, use the testimony of Tertullian and Jerome. For when in that time, heathen Rome was contrary to Christian Rome, which, I ask, do those Fathers call the purple whore? If heathen Rome, why therefore, do the heretics abuse the testimony? If Christian Rome, therefore, already then the Roman Church had already sunk and then Antichrist already reigned, which not even they concede. Besides, if Christian Rome was then Babylon, why does Tertullian say: “O Happy Church, into which the Apostles poured the whole doctrine with their own blood.” [183](#) And why does Jerome, speaking about Rome, say: “I shall say to you, O great Rome, you have blotted out the blasphemy written on your forehead by the confession of Christ”? Next, the same is clear from John himself, who speaks about that Rome, which held empire over the kings of the earth and that was drunk in the blood of the saints and from the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus. That certainly did not take place except in that Rome which cut down the martyrs under the rule of Nero and Domitian.

3) I say, although that woman could be Christian Rome, as the heretics would have it, still their argument has no force. As we showed above, Antichrist will have hatred towards Rome, in no matter what way he takes it up, and he will fight with it and lay it desolate, and burn it. From which it manifestly follows that Rome is not the seat of the Antichrist.

Now to the Second argument: we have already said Paul treats on the temple of Solomon in that passage. Hence to the reasoning which we made, I respond: after the Jewish sacrifice and priesthood ceased that temple ceased to be a Jewish temple; but it did not immediately cease to be the temple of God. The same temple could have been the temple of Christians and really was so long as it remained. For the Apostles preached and gave praise there after the ascension of Christ and the arrival of the Holy Spirit, as is clear from the words of Luke: “They were always in the temple praising and blessing the Lord.” We read the same in Acts III: “Peter and

John went up into the temple for the prayer at the ninth hour.” [184](#) And in Acts V, the Angel says to the Apostles: “Speak in the temple all the words of this life to the people.”

To the argument from Daniel I respond: either Daniel would have it that the temple is not going to be rebuilt, except at the end of the world (which is true since Antichrist will be present at the end of the world), or it is going to remain desolate in eternity because although it will be rebuilt, still it will never be a temple not profaned after the destruction carried out by Titus. When it will be raised up by Antichrist, then the abomination of desolation will especially remain in it, i.e. either Antichrist himself or his image, or the temple will never be perfectly rebuilt, but will still be in the beginnings of rebuilding, and Antichrist is going to sit in that temple at its beginning stages.

We have already responded to the passages of the Fathers that either assert, or at least do not deny, that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of Solomon. Moreover, many add the fact that Antichrist is also going to sit in the Churches of Christians; that is true and not opposed to our position. The Fathers would not have it that Antichrist is going to sit in the Church as a bishop, like the heretics dream up, rather he is going to sit as a god. Antichrist will command all temples of the world to be converted to his worship, and he will make his own person worshiped. “He will command,” (says Chrysostom on this citation), “himself to be worshiped as a God, and to be venerated and placed in the temple, not only in Jerusalem, but even in the Churches.” The rest speak in the same manner.

Now to the arguments taken up from the words of St. Gregory the Great, I respond: from his words we deduce the contrary to those which the heretics have mustered. They argue thus: The bishop of Constantinople was a precursor of Antichrist, because he made himself universal Bishop, therefore, Antichrist will be some universal Bishop, who will usurp all things to himself. But the opposite is gathered, since a precursor ought not be the same with the one he foreshadows, but by far lesser, even if in some matter he is similar to him just as we see in John the Baptist and Christ. So if he is a precursor of Antichrist, who makes himself universal Bishop, the true Antichrist himself will not make himself this, but something greater, without a doubt he will extol himself over everything that is called God. Or if the true Antichrist will only make himself a universal Bishop, then John of Constantinople, who did this, was not a precursor of Antichrist, but the

true Antichrist, which still Gregory never says, nor our adversaries. So the sense of the words of Gregory is that because Antichrist will be very proud, and the head of all the proud, so also he will suffer no equals; whoever usurps something not due to him and wishes to go beyond and be over others, he is a precursor to him. Such were the Bishops of Constantinople, who, although in the beginning were only an Archbishop, first usurped the title of patriarch, and then the title of universal.

With equal reasoning, when Gregory says: “an army of priests is prepared for him,” he did not mean priests as in priests pertain to the army of Antichrist, since he will gather his own in that army: but priests as in the proud, prepare an army for Antichrist, since he speaks on the same John and priests like him that elevated themselves unjustly above the rest. It does not follow that Antichrist will be a prince of priests, but prince of the proud.

From this chapter we have an outstanding argument that the Pope is not Antichrist, seeing that his seat is not in Jerusalem, nor in the temple of Solomon, nay more, it is believable that from the year 600 to the present (1589) no Roman Pontiff has been to Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XIV: On the Doctrine of Antichrist

ON the doctrine of Antichrist there is a great deal of controversy between us and the heretics. It certain from the Scriptures as well as from the testimony of our adversaries that there are going to be four points of doctrine of Antichrist.

1) He will deny Jesus is the Christ and hence he will oppose all the things our Savior established, such as Baptism, Confirmation, etc. He will teach that circumcision and the Sabbath have not yet ceased, as well as other ceremonies of the old law. “Who is a liar, but he who denies Jesus is the Christ? And this is Antichrist, who denies the Father and the Son, etc.” [185](#)

2) After he will have persuaded the world that our Savior is not the true Christ, then he will assert that he is the true Christ promised in the law and Prophets. “If anyone will come in my name, you will receive him,” [186](#) that is as the Messiah.

3) He will declare that he is God and will demand to be worshiped as a God. “So that he shall sit in the temple, showing himself just as if he were God.” [187](#)

4) He will not only say that he is God, but even that he alone is God and will oppress all other gods, i.e., both the true God and false gods, and all idols. “Who extolls himself over everything which is called God, or that is worshiped.” [188](#) And in Daniel: “He will not think God is his father, nor will he worship anything of the gods, because he will rise against them all.” [189](#)

All of these are true in some manner and pertain to Antichrist; even our adversaries agree with us on this point. But the question is on the understanding of these four points. For Catholics understand simply according to the words of Scripture that Antichrist is going to deny the true Christ; he is going to make himself Christ, he is going to preach that he is God; and he will curse all other Gods and idols. From these four arguments we endeavor to show the Pontiff is not Antichrist. It is certain the Pope does not deny Jesus is Christ, nor has he introduced circumcision, or the Sabbath

in place of Baptism, and the day of the Lord. In like manner, it is certain the Pontiff has not made himself Christ or God, and it is especially certain, that not only has he not made himself God (since he clearly worships Christ and the Trinity), but our adversaries maintain that he also worships idols and images and dead saints.

Nevertheless, our adversaries by far read it otherwise. They say in the first place, that Antichrist is not openly going to deny Jesus is the Christ by word, but by work, because under the appearance of Christianity and the Church he will corrupt the doctrine on the Sacraments, on Justification, etc. Calvin says: “We gather the tyranny of Antichrist is such that he abolishes not the name of Christ or the Church, but rather uses the name of Christ as a pretext, and lurks under the name of Church as under a mask.” [190](#) The Centuriators of Magdeburg say: “Such is certain, that while professing Christ in doctrine he will still deny his office and merit. . . John shows that Antichrist is going to deny that Christ came in the flesh, this is, that Christ redeemed us wholly in his flesh and saved us; but that good works will confer salvation upon us.” [191](#) Next, they say Antichrist is not going to make himself Christ or God by his own word, but by work, because he will take up the place of Christ and of God, making himself head of all the faithful in the Church, which is proper to Christ alone. The Centuriators remark: “He will show himself for God, that he might be vicar of Christ and head of the Church and can set up and tear away the articles of faith.”

Next, they say Antichrist is not going to reject idols, nay more he shall openly adore them and they try to show from Daniel, after he had said Antichrist was going to rise against all Gods, he adds: “He will venerate the god Maozim in his place, and a God whom their fathers did not know, he will worship with gold and silver and precious stones, etc.” [192](#) For Maozim, however, the heretics understand the Mass, images, relics and like things of ornate temples. So Illyricus argues in his book *Contra Primum*.

Moreover, when the Apostle says that Antichrist is going to elevate himself above everything which is called God or which is worshiped, they try to prove this was written about the Roman Pontiff, who makes himself vicar of Christ and usurps greater authority than Christ had. Illyricus tries to show it in his *Catalogue of Witnesses* (for I have not seen how the rest try to show it), page 3. Without a doubt, Christ declared nothing other than to show himself to be God, nay more, to effect that he and his cult is above God, which is to come in the name of Christ; from which it follows that the

Pope, who offers himself for Christ's vicar, is himself the truest Antichrist. Likewise, Christ subjected himself to Scripture, he did and suffered such things that he would fulfill the Scripture, while the Pope said that he can dispense against the Apostle and the Evangelist, to make straight crooked and vice versa. This is the chief point especially of the side of the doctrine of our adversaries on Antichrist which rests upon the Scripture alone through new glosses incorrectly explicated. It is a clear indication of the matter that they cannot even cite one interpreter or doctor for their side.

Then let us begin from the first argument that Antichrist is going to openly deny Jesus is the Christ by public profession and in as much as all his sacraments will have been discovered he will trample them under foot. It is proved: 1) from the aforesaid, chapter 5 & 6. For if Antichrist by nation and religion will be Jewish, and received by the Jews as a Messiah, as we have shown, certainly he will not preach our Christ, but will publicly oppose him. Otherwise, the Jews would receive our Christ through Antichrist, which is completely absurd. Besides, since there cannot be two Christs, how will Antichrist be able to thrust himself on the Jews as the Christ unless first he had taught that our Christ, who preceded him, was not really the true Christ?

2) It is proved from 1 John II:22, "Who is a liar but he who would deny Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist." For all heretics who deny Jesus is the Christ are called Antichrists in some manner, therefore, the true Antichrist himself will simply deny Jesus is the Christ in every way. It is confirmed because the devil is said to work the mystery of iniquity through heretics, because they deny Christ secretly, but the arrival of Antichrist is called revelation, because he will openly deny Christ.

It is also proved by the Fathers. Hilary says the devil tried to persuade men through the Arians that Christ was not the natural son of God, but adopted; yet through Antichrist he is going to try to persuade men that he was not even adopted so as to utterly extinguish the name of the true Christ. [193](#) Hippolytus the martyr says that the character of Antichrist will be that men are compelled to say: "I deny Baptism; I deny the sign of the Cross," and similar things. Augustine asks whether men are going to be baptized at all while Antichrist rages. At length, he answers: "Certainly they will be strong, both parents to baptize their children, and these who shall then first believe, that they shall conquer that strong one, even though he has been unbound." [194](#) Here St. Augustine presupposes that Antichrist is not going

to permit them to be baptized, and still some pious parents would rather suffer than that their sons should be unbaptized.

Jerome says in his commentary on Daniel chapter XI: "Antichrist will rise from a modest nation; that is from the people of the Jews, and he will be so lowly and despised that he will not be given royal honor, but he shall obtain rule both through treachery and deceit. He will do this because he will feign himself the leader of the covenant, that is the law, and the covenant of God." There, Jerome teaches that Antichrist is going to acquire rule over the Jews, because he will show himself zealous for the Judaic laws. Sedulius, commenting on 2 Thessalonians II:6, says that Antichrist is going to restore all Jewish ceremonies so as to abolish the gospel of Christ. Gregory says: "Because Antichrist will compel the people to judaize so that he might restore the rite of the exterior law, he will want the Sabbath to be kept to place the faithlessness of the Jews in himself."

Then, in the time of Antichrist, all public offices and divine sacrifices will cease on account of the vehemence of the persecution, as we showed above in chapter III. It is evident from this that Antichrist is not going to corrupt the doctrine of Christ under the name of a Christian, as the heretics would have it. Rather, he will openly assault the name of Christ and the Sacraments while introducing Jewish ceremonies. Since the Pope does not do that, it is evident that he is not Antichrist.

Moreover, Antichrist will say openly that he is the Christ by name, not his minister, or vicar, as is clear especially from the very words of the Lord: "If another will come in my name, you will receive him." [195](#) There, the Lord seems to add on purpose "*in his own name*", foreseeing that the Lutherans and Calvinists were going to say that Antichrist was not coming in his name, but in the name of our Christ as if he were his vicar.

Besides, the Fathers everywhere teach this. Irenaeus said: "He will try to show that he is Christ." Ambrose says: "He will argue from the Scriptures that he is Christ." [196](#) Theodoret says: "He will declare that he is Christ." [197](#) St. Cyril of Jerusalem said: "He will induce a certain man to falsely call himself the Christ, and through this title of Christ he will deceive the Jews who await him." [198](#) All the Fathers, as we showed above, say Antichrist will be received briefly as a Messiah by the Jews, thus he will openly and by name make himself the Messiah, that is, the Christ. Hence the Roman Pontiff, who does not do this, as is known, is not Antichrist. For this very

reason, he calls himself the vicar of Christ, he asserts that he is not Christ, but his minister.

The fact that Antichrist will openly declare himself to be God and desire to be worshiped as God, not only by usurping some authority of God, but by the name of God itself is proved from the express words of the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians II: "So that he will sit in the temple of God, revealing himself as though he were God." Paul not only says that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple, (for even we sit in temples yet still we are not Antichrists), but he even explains the manner in which he will sit, that he will sit as a God, the only one to whom the temple is properly raised. In Greek this is much more clear. For he does not say: *hōs theos*, as a God but *hoti estin theos*; that is, revealing that he is God. All the Fathers so understand that verse.

Irenaeus says: "Proving to be an Apostate and a robber, he will wish to be worshiped as if he were God." Chrysostom said on that verse: "He will command that he be worshiped for God, and be placed in the temple." He says elsewhere on this same verse: "He will confess himself as God of all." [199](#) Ambrose, commenting on 2 Thessalonians II, said: "He will assert that he is God himself, not the Son of God." They all explain the verse similarly. From that we understand that the Roman Pontiff, who does not claim to be God, but the servant of God, is not Antichrist.

Furthermore, Antichrist is not going to permit any God whether true, false or an idol, and this is proved from the very words of Paul in the same passage: "Who is extolled above everything which is called God, or that is worshiped." Here, we must remark that for, "that which is worshiped," the Greek is *sebasma* which the Centuriators think means worship, that is, *the act of worshiping*, not *that which is worshiped*. From there, they try to show that the Apostle would have it that Antichrist is not going to adore idols, but is going to distort the worship of the true God by mutilating the sacraments or by adding various ceremonies. Yet, certainly *sebasma* properly means not the act but the object, that is what is worshiped, such as an altar, shrines, idols, etc. Worship is *sebas* or *theosebeia*, not *sebasma*. This is why the Paul himself says in Acts XVII: "*Dierchomenos gar kai anatheōrōn ta sebasmata humōn euron kai bōmon*, etc." He says "Disregarding and considering your idols, I discover the altar, etc." Here, Paul clearly means through *sebasmata* the very things that are worshiped, such as the shrines, altars and idols. We also read in Wisdom: *Kreitton gar estin tōn sebasmatōn*

autou ōn autos men ezēsen ekeina de oudepote. That is: “Man is better than the idols (*sebasmatōn*) which he made. For he lives for a time, but they do not.” [200](#) I do not know from what source someone would so dare to twist things to deny that *sebasmatōn* means idols themselves, or simulacra, which men make with their hands; things that seem to have life when they do not live.

Therefore, all Greek texts (even that of Erasmus, whom all the heretics celebrate, both in his version and in annotations), teach that *sebasma* ought to be rendered as a god. Next, the words of Daniel are rather clear: “He will not worship any of the gods, but will rise against them all.” Jerome, writing on that verse, says this cannot be understood to mean Antiochus, as Porphyrius thought, because it is certain Antiochus worshiped the Greek gods; but it can be understood on Antichrist who will worship no god.

At last we come to the consensus of the Fathers. Irenaeus said: “Indeed he will put away the idols and will lift himself up as the one idol.” [201](#) Hippolytus from the same sermon on the end of the world says: “Antichrist will not permit idolatry.” Cyril of Jerusalem says: “Antichrist will hate idols.” [202](#) St. John Chrysostom says on this place in Daniel: “He is extolled above everything which is called God, or divinity. For he will not induce to idolatry.” Theophylactus, Oecumenius, and Theodoret all teach the same thing, and the last beautifully notes that the devil wondrously fools and is going to fool the sons of perdition. For of old he persuaded that there were many gods and that various idols must be worshiped and in that way he took a great profit. In the time of Antichrist, however, because he will see that through the doctrine of Christ idols and the multitude of false Gods have been expunged through nearly the whole world, he also will accuse idols and their multitude and in that way will still deceive men. In this it seems the Pope, who according to Catholics acknowledges God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and according to the heretics worships many idols, in no way can be called the Antichrist.

But they say Daniel chapter XI affirms that the God Maozim must be worshiped with gold, silver and precious stones.

The first response is that though the God Moazim, which is interpreted as strength (that is, very strong) Antichrist himself can be understood. Accordingly, that “He will be venerated,” in Hebrew is not *yah-shea-ti-ka-veh*, he will worship, but *ya-ka-bed*, he will glorify. In the same way, in psalm 90 (91) God says: “I will raise him and glorify him.” In Hebrew that

is *eh-ka-bey-day-hu*, and certainly God is not going to glorify men by subjecting them to themselves but by exalting them. Therefore, Antichrist will glorify himself when he will be worshiped by all. For this reason the Septuagint renders this *doxasei*, and Theodoret expresses it in this way: “For this ‘Moazim’ means a strong and powerful god, and he will call himself this. For he placed it in his own place for himself. He will raise temples to himself, and adorn them with gold, silver, precious stones.”

The second response, which I prefer, is that Antichrist is going to be a magician and by the custom of other magicians he will worship the devil secretly, by whose work he will do wonders. He will call this one whom he is going to adore Maozim. Hence, for Maozim we do not think the name of a God, but of a certain strong and secret place in which there will be special treasures of Antichrist and in which, as we said, he will worship the devil himself. For it follows from Daniel that he will also see to it that he fortifies Moazim with a strong God, whom he knows. And truly *ma-koz* means both a strong place and a citadel. Nicholas Lyranus explains it in this way. Moreover, it must necessarily be said that Antichrist is himself the God Moazim, or if he is someone else, Antichrist must worship him only in a very secret place, secret from all others. The very words of Daniel compel us that otherwise they would oppose themselves; if he will worship no god, how will he openly worship an idol?

Now, the two arguments of Illyricus are very weak. For in the first argument he errs three times. First, he asserts that the words of Paul were explained by Christ, when it ought to be the other way around. Secondly, that he would say in Matthew XXIV to come in the name of Christ, means the same thing as to be the Vicar of Christ. For the very explanation of Christ is opposed to this argument of Illyricus. Where the Lord says: “Many will come in my name,” soon he adds: “saying, I am Christ.” Therefore, to come in the name of Christ, in that place is to usurp the name of Christ to one’s own person. Once, Simon Magus did this very thing, as Irenaeus witnessed, [203](#) and in our times David Georgius. At length, Antichrist will do this very thing. But the Pope, because calls himself the Vicar of Christ, does not make himself Christ.

Thirdly, Illyricus errs because he makes Christ an inept interpreter of Paul. For he does not rightly explain what Paul said: “Extol himself over every thing that is God” for the verse: “many will come in my name,” that is, as he sees it, make themselves my vicar. The vicar of God is not over

everything that is God, but below it, just as the vicar of a king is below everything of the king. It can not be thought or pretended that one who professes himself to be the vicar of some king will boast to be above all kings. From that we see the blindness and impudence of our adversaries who babble this nonsense which they would abhor in its common meaning.

Now, to the argument of Illyricus wherein he tries to show the Pope usurped a greater authority than even Christ had, I respond: the proposition and assumption of this argument involves two lies, and besides the consequence avails to nothing. 1) It is false that Christ subjected himself to the Scriptures since it should be certain that he is the author of the Scriptures, and hence, is above them. Moreover, when we read Christ did what he did so as to fulfill the Scriptures, the *that* is not a cause but means the event, as Chrysostom and Augustine teach in chapter XII of John. For Christ did not die because Isaiah wrote this, but Isaiah wrote this because it was going to happen.

Next, it is also false that the Pope ever said by word or deed that he can dispense against the Evangelists or Apostles. For even if he can dispense on some precept placed by the Apostles, still this is not against the Apostle but according to him, who without a doubt knew the Apostolic power whereby he, being put in charge of something, stood in the Church for a time and that there were going to be successors that they could moderate or change the same things so long as it would be expedient for the Church. But, no Catholic ever said a Pontiff can dispense in any way from the Gospel, i.e., the divine precepts.

Then, the consequent is bad. For in the major proposition Illyricus speaks on the subjection of Christ under the Scriptures, not in regard to precept, but in regard to prophecies while Illyricus is not ignorant that Christ abolished the Sabbath and abrogated the ceremonial law. Yet in the minor he speaks about precepts, and so the argument has four ends, and thence nothing can be concluded.

This will be sufficient in this place on the doctrine of Antichrist.

CHAPTER XV: On the Miracles of Antichrist

HOLY SCRIPTURE contains three things about the Miracles of Antichrist. 1) He is going to do many miracles. 2) These will be of some quality. 3) Three examples are posited. The Apostle teaches in 2 Thessalonians II that Antichrist is going to do miracles, saying:

“His arrival will be accompanied by signs and wonders according to the operation of Satan.” The Lord says in the Gospel of Matthew: “They will give signs and great wonders, so that, if it is possible, even the elect will be led into error.” He said, “They will give,” not “he will give.” This is because not only Antichrist, but his ministers will perform signs, to the extent that St. Gregory said even the torturers of the holy Martyrs are going to perform signs and wonders at that time. [204](#) Next, in Apocalypse XIII, “And he will perform great signs in the sight of men.” Paul explains what type they will be in Thessalonians, saying in one word, they will be lies: “In all power, signs and lying portents.”

Hence the signs will be lies by an account of all the causes, final, efficient, material and formal. For the end of those miracles will be to show Antichrist is God and the Messiah, which will be the most pernicious lie. Chrysostom teaches in this place, that these lies are called miracles because they will induce men to lie. And Ambrose in this place teaches that the purpose of the miracles of Antichrist are going to be that he will try to show himself to be God, just as our Christ proved his divinity with true miracles.

Next, the signs are called lies in regard to their efficient cause; for the principle efficient cause will be the father of lies, that is the devil. For the Apostle speaks thus: “His arrival according to the operation of Satan.” And all the Fathers assert Antichrist is going to be an outstanding magician. Moreover, the devil is going to dwell in him in his very conception, or at least from infancy, and through him perpetrate signs.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem also teaches that Antichrist is going to be a magician, and instructed in sorcery, incantations and evil arts, he shall announce himself; his miracles are called lies because they begin from the father of lies. [205](#)

There will also be many lies from those by reason of the material cause, because there will be certain imaginary deceptions, as Cyril says above and Theodoret teaching on the same places of Scripture. For he will appear to raise the dead and heal the sick, but they will be illusions of demons, not true miracles. Due to the fact that in Apocalypse XIII Antichrist is said to be going to do miracles in the sight of men, i.e., appearances and delusions in the sight of men not solid and true as Arethas remarks in the same place.

Next, there will be certain lies from those miracles by reckoning of the form, although they will be true from a reckoning of the matter, because it will seem that true things will be worked, but they will not conquer the power of the whole nature. Therefore, they will not formally be true miracles. True miracles are only called those which can be done by God, that is which do not have natural causes, nor secret or manifest ones. Therefore, these miracles are not only in the sight of men, but even in the sight of demons and angels. But the miracles of Antichrist will all have natural causes, though they be secret from men.

In the Apocalypse, [206](#) they place three examples of the miracles of Antichrist. One, that he will cause fire to come down from heaven. The second, that he will make an image of the beast speak. Third, that he will feign himself to be dead and resurrect. Due to these particular miracles nearly the whole world will admire him.

From such miracles there will be two true earlier ones, (true in regard to matter, not form) but the third will be no miracle at all.

Moreover, it could be objected against this that they do not all seem to be miracles attributed to Antichrist. For John, in that place, introduces two beasts, one which has seven heads, one of which seems to be dead and rises again. The second smaller one makes fire descend from heaven and the image speak. Therefore, if Antichrist will be before the beasts, these two miracles of the fire and image are not attributed to him; if he will be later than the beast, then the miracle of the resurrection cannot be attributed to him.

I respond: the first beast means either the Roman Empire or the multitude of the impious, as we said above, while one, that is the head which seems to be dead and resurrects, is Antichrist. He will also be the supreme and last head of the impious; he will be the last king who will hold the Roman Empire, still without the name of Roman Emperor. And the Fathers teach that this feigned miracle of the resurrection is also certainly to

be attributed to Antichrist. [207](#) St. Gregory argued in an epistle against Lyranus, who thought it was about the son of a certain Cusro, the King of Persia, whom he pretended was wounded in a battle but still not killed. [208](#) For no other proven history relates such a tale about the son of Cusro, nor can what follows in the Apocalypse agree with the son of Cusro: “And the whole world will admire the beast, saying who is like the beast?”

Hence, the second beast in the Apocalypse, according to Rupert, means the same Antichrist. The same Antichrist is expressed through two beasts: The first by reason of royal power and tyranny, whereby he will violently compel men; the other by reason of magical arts whereby he will subtly seduce men. Still, according to Richardus, Anselm and others, the second beast means the preachers of Antichrist, who will try to show with miracles that Antichrist is the true Messiah. Therefore, all these miracles will be either of Antichrist, or of his ministers. Thus, it follows that the Pope is not Antichrist, seeing that no Pontiff has ever feigned that he was dead and risen again, nor has he, or any of his ministers ever made fire come down from heaven or an image speak.

But the Centuriators object that the Pope has made many lying miracles: “Such as visions of souls talking from purgatory, and asking Masses to be said for them and the healing of plagues, such as happened to those worshiping statues or calling upon the saints.” [209](#)

I respond: In the first place, these are not the miracles which John writes that Antichrist is going to do, he will die and rise, make fire fall from heaven and to give the power of speech to an image. Therefore, let them show any Pope who did these signs, let alone any bishop. Next, these three kinds of things that they say are the miracles of Antichrist were used in the Church before that time in which our adversaries said Antichrist came openly. St. Gregory writes about Paschasius the Deacon, who lived in the time of Pope Symmachus, around the year 500. [210](#) His soul appeared to St. Germain, the Bishop of Capua asking the bishop to pray for him so that he might be freed from the torments of purgatory. Certainly, this miracle happened a hundred years before “Antichrist appeared,” in the opinion of all the heretics of this time. For no man places the arrival of Antichrist until after the year 600 and around the death of Gregory I. The same Gregory relates other apparitions of souls, asking for Masses. [211](#)

On the miracles of healing from the veneration of images, Eusebius relates an example of a bronze statue made of the savior in the spot where

the Lord cured a woman from the flow of blood. A certain plant customarily grew under that statue which rose even to the fringes of the image and it cured anyone who touched it of all types of evils. [212](#) It is evident from such a miracle that God wished to approve the cult of holy images.

On the healing divinely conceded to those who had vowed something to the saints, there are innumerable testimonies among the Fathers and an outstanding testimony is extant in Theodoret. He writes that in his own time the temples of the Martyrs were full of pictures or simulacra of hands, feet, eyes, heads and other human members, whereby various gifts of healing were shown, which men received from the holy Martyrs for a matter of devotion. [213](#)

CHAPTER XVI: On the Kingdom and Battles of Antichrist

WE READ four things in the Scriptures about the kingdom and battles of Antichrist. 1) Antichrist shall come forth from the lowest place and will receive the rule over the Jews by frauds and treachery. 2) He is going to fight with three Kings, namely over Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia, and at length will occupy their kingdoms. 3) He is going to add to himself seven other Kings, and in that way evade the monarchy of the whole world. 4) With a countless army he will persecute Christians throughout the world, and this is the battle of Gog and Magog. It manifestly follows that none of these things agree with the Roman Pontiff, so that he in no way can be called Antichrist.

Daniel speaks on the first point: “He will stand, despised in his place, and neither honor nor royalty will be given him, and he will come secretly and obtain a kingdom in deceit.” [214](#) St. Jerome, writes in this place that these are also understood as concerning Antiochus Epiphanes, still by far they are more perfectly fulfilled in Antichrist. In just the same way, the things which are said in Psalm 71 (72) about Solomon are understood on Solomon himself, but are more perfectly fulfilled in Christ. For that reason the same Jerome, after he had shown this place on Antiochus, having followed Porphyrius, so added: “We, however, interpret better and more rightly that in the end of the world Antichrist is going to do this, who has his rise from a small nation, that is the people of the Jews, and will be so lowly and despised that royal honor would not be given him, and through plotting and deceit he shall obtain rule, etc.” Jerome means, this is the common exposition of Christians. Daniel in chapter VII also compares Antichrist with a small horn because of its worthless and obscure beginning.

Yet this definitely does not agree with the Roman Pontiff in any manner, or it would be necessary for one to say that the Roman Pontiff, even to the year 600, was very obscure and of no name, and then quickly, through deceit began to occupy some high place, but this is certainly false. For, as Augustine says: “In the Roman Church the rule of the Apostolic See always flourishes.” [215](#) Prosper of Aquitaine said: “Rome is made greater through

the rule of priesthood in the citadel of religion, than in the throne of power.” [216](#) And the Council of Chalcedon, in an epistle to Leo, asserted that at Rome the Apostolic rays shine so that from there they expand to all and communicate their goods with everyone else. Next, even the heathen writer Ammianus Marcellinus, writing on the schism of Damasus and Ursicinus, says that he did not marvel if men contend with such zeal for the Roman Pontificate, since it has such power and importance.

Daniel speaks on the second point in chapter VII: “I considered the horns and behold, that small horn arose from the midst of the others, and tore out three from the first horns from his face. ... Hence the ten horns will be ten kings and another will rise after them. He will be more powerful than the first, and he will lay the three kings low.” And explaining who these three kings are in chapter XI: “He will send his hand into the earth and the land of Egypt will not put him to flight, and he will be in control of the treasures of gold, silver and all the precious things of Egypt. He will also pass through Lybia and Ethiopia.” St. Jerome, writing on these citations, and especially chapter 7, says: “Let us say what all Ecclesiastical writers hand down, that at the end of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans was to be destroyed, there were going to be ten kings who divide the Roman world amongst themselves and an eleventh little king (Antichrist) was going to rise up who was going to conquer three of the ten kings, that is Egypt, Africa and Ethiopia; after they are dead, the other seven kings will submit their necks to the victor.” Other fathers writing on Daniel VII and XI teach the same thing on the three kings killed by Antichrist. [217](#)

This especially refutes the insanity of the heretics who argue the Pope is Antichrist. Let them say, if they can, at what time the Roman Pontiff slew the kings of Egypt, Lybia and Ethiopia, and occupied their kingdom? Theodore Bibliander, in his *Chronicle*, says that the Roman Pontiff is just as a little horn that first tore off one of the horns from the beast when Gregory II excommunicated the Greek Emperor Leo the Iconoclast, and forbade taxes to be rendered to him from Italy, and little by little occupied his territory, that is, he obtained the Exarchate of Ravenna. Second, he says the horn tore off another when Pope Zachary deposed Childeric, the King of the Franks, and commanded Pepin to be made King in his place. He does not say the third clearly, but seems to indicate that the third horn was torn off when Gregory VII excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Henry IV. There is a certain epistle extant from the Emperor Frederick the II, written

against the Pope in which he asserted three horns had been torn out by Antichrist, the kingdoms of Italy, Germany and Sicily, which the Roman Pontiff especially compelled to serve him.

But these are most untrustworthy. For in the first place, Daniel does not speak about France or Germany, but Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia. Next, no Pope has ever killed their kings, but Antichrist will kill three kings, as St. Jerome says. Besides, Antichrist will take possession of their kingdoms, not hand them over to others. Yet the Pope did not take the kingdom of France for himself, but gave it to Pepin and after deposing the Emperor, bid another to be created; so he did not usurp the Empire to himself. In like manner, when the Pope deprived the Emperor Leo of the rule of Ravenna he did not take possession of it himself, but permitted to the kings of the Lombards. Pepin, after the Lombards were conquered, gave it to the Pope. Next, if to depose Princes is to tear out the horns, there will not be three, but many more torn out by Antichrist. For it is certain that apart from Leo III, Childeric and Henry IV, the Popes have deposed many others: Innocent III deposed Otho IV; Innocent IV deposed Frederick II. All six of these lost their Empire.

On the third, we have the clear testimony of the Fathers. Lactantius and Irenaeus say that after three of the ten kings will be killed by Antichrist, the other seven will be subjected and he will be the ruler of them all. [218](#) Jerome remarking on chapter XI of Daniel where it says, "And he will do what his fathers did not," says: "None of the Jews except for Antichrist will ever have ruled the whole world." Chrysostom asserts in his commentary on 2 Thessalonians II, that Antichrist was going to be a monarch and succeed the Romans in Monarchy, just as the Romans succeeded the Greeks, the Greeks the Persians, and the Persians the Assyrians.

Next, St. Cyril of Jerusalem says that Antichrist is going to obtain the monarchy which before hand was of the Romans. [219](#) This is sufficiently deduced from the opinion of the Fathers and Apocalypse, chapter 17, where we read: "And ten horns, which you saw, are ten kings. These have one plan, and power and they will hand their rule to the beast." That this in no way agrees with the Roman Pontiff is certain. For the Pope was never a king over the whole world.

On the Fourth, John says in the Apocalypse, chapter XX: "And the thousand years were ended, Satan was freed from his prison and went out, and seduced the nations, which are over the four corners of the earth with

Gog and Magog, and he will gather them into battle, the number of which is like the sand of the sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and surrounded the camp of the Saints and the chosen city. And fire came down from heaven and devoured them, and the devil, who seduced them, was sent into the lake of fire, and sulphur, where both the beast and the false prophets were tortured day and night for ever and ever.” In these words the last persecution and its end are described. St. Augustine says the following about this: “This will be the last persecution before the impending judgment, which the holy Church will suffer throughout the world, the whole city of Christ by the whole city of the devil, in whatever degree each will be over the earth.” [220](#) Similar things are in Ezechiel XXXVIII and XXXIX, which must be briefly explained on account of the many errors that arise from it.

CHAPTER XVII: On Gog and Magog

HEREFORE, the first opinion, or rather error, is of the Jews, who teach that Gog is Antichrist, Magog is the innumerable Scythian nations that hide within the Caspian mountains. Gog is going to come, that is Antichrist, with Magog, that is, with this army of Scythians, in the time which the Messiah will appear in Jerusalem, and then battle will be joined in Palestine, and there is going to be such a slaughter in the army of God, that for seven years the Jews will have no need to cut wood from trees to build fires because they will have spears, shields and like instruments thrown down everywhere with dead bodies, and then the golden age will come.

Jerome relates this opinion while commenting on chapter XXXVIII of Ezechiel, as well as the writings of Peter the Galatian, [221](#) and Rabi David Khimhi in their commentaries on the Psalms. Firstly, what they think is the coming battle of Gog and Magog that will take place is the first coming of Christ, confounding the first with the second, since the Scriptures clearly teach in the first coming Christ is going to come with humility, and finally will be immolated just as a tame sheep. [222](#) Secondly, that they think Antichrist is going to come to fight against them and with their Messiah is erroneous, since Antichrist really is going to be their Messiah, and will fight against the true Christ, our Savior, on behalf of the Jews.

The Second opinion is of Lactantius, who thinks the battle of Gog and Magog is going to be a thousand years after the death of Antichrist. [223](#) He teaches that Antichrist is coming six thousand years from the beginning of the world and will reign for three and a half years. Then Antichrist must be killed, Christ will appear and the resurrection is going to happen and the Saints will rule with Christ there for a thousand years in the greatest peace and tranquility, meanwhile the infidels will not be exterminated, but will serve them peacefully. Again, after a thousand years the devil will be loosed again, and a most atrocious war will be aroused in all nations, where those who served the saints for a thousand years will fight against the same Saints, and this is the battle of Gog and Magog, about which Ezechiel and John speak. But a little while later, all the impious will be slaughtered and then the second resurrection is going to take place, and the world will be completely renewed.

This opinion was also of many of the older Fathers, such as Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Apollinaris and of a few others, as Jerome relates in chapter XXXVI of Ezechiel, and Eusebius. [224](#) But for a long time it had been refuted as an investigated error. For the Lord clearly teaches that after the persecution of Antichrist the last judgment will immediately follow. [225](#) Then, all the good are going to eternal life, while all the wicked into the eternal fire, hence there is not going to be another thousand years, nor any battle. [226](#)

The Third opinion is of Eusebius. He thought that Gog is the Roman Emperor, and Magog his Empire. But this rests upon a false foundation, for he deduces this opinion from chapter XXIV of Numbers, where according to the Septuagint we read: “The Kingdom of Gog will be lifted up, and his kingdom increased. God led him from Egypt, etc.” There the Scripture seems to say, that when Christ will return from Egypt in his time of infancy, then the kingdom of God will be lifted up. But it is certain that while Christ was an infant no kingdom was lifted up except that of the Romans.

But without a doubt this has been corrupted in this edition of the Septuagint. For the Hebrew does not have Gog, but Agag: *vey-ya-dom me-agag ma-ley-ko*, “and it will be abolished on account of Agag,” or his king before Agag. And the sense is, according to Jerome, commenting chapter 38 of Ezechiel, the first King of Israel, Saul, was removed on account of Agag because he will sin by not killing him. Or according to others, Saul will be raised up before Agag, that is he will prevail and conquer Agag himself. Both are true, and that citation of Numbers is certainly understood to be about the kingdom of the Jews, not about Christ or the Romans. For it begins: “How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, thy tents O Israel, etc.”

The Fourth opinion is of others, who understand the wars of the devil through Gog and Magog and his angel, formerly completed in heaven with the good Angels. Jerome refutes this, just as he refutes the literal argument in chapter XXXVIII of Ezechiel.

The Fifth is of Theodore Bibliander whom Chytraeus follows in his commentary on Apocalypse XX. Therefore, Bibliander in his *Chronology*, accurately treats on Gog and Magog, and at length teaches the prophecy of Ezechiel and John do not pertain to the same time. Instead, the prophecy of Ezechiel was fulfilled in the time of the Maccabees, whereas Gog and Magog were Alexander the Great and his posterity that were Kings of Syria

and Egypt that enjoined battles with the Jews and at length were conquered by the Maccabees. But the prophecy of John was fulfilled in the time of Pope Gregory VII and as many pontiffs who followed him, thus Gog and Magog were Popes, and other Christian princes and their armies, who so long fought against the Saracens for the holy land, and to recuperate the tomb of the Lord. [227](#) The first part of this opinion is also that of Theodoret in his commentary on Ezechiel XXXVIII, but it cannot be defended. Firstly, because without a doubt the prophecy of Ezechiel and John are one and the same, and hence each must be fulfilled after the coming of Christ. For John says the army of Gog is going to come from the four corners of the earth; Ezechiel says the same thing, namely showing the army of Gog is going to be Persians from the East, Ethiopians from the South, Tubal, that is, Spanish from the West, and Togorma, that is, Phrygians from the northern parts. Next John says that this army must perish from fire sent from heaven, and Ezechiel asserts the same thing at the end of chapter XXXVI. "Fire and sulphur will rain above him and over his army." Next, John adds to this battle the renewal of Jerusalem, that is, the glorification of the Church and in a similar vein Ezechiel from chapter XL even to the end of the book treats on nothing but the wonderful renewal of Jerusalem.

Besides it is proved in the second place, that the prophecy of Ezechiel was not fulfilled in the time of the Maccabees. In Ezechiel XXXVIII, it is said to Gog "you will come at the end of your years." But Alexander the great came in the middle of his years. Next, Ezechiel says that in the army of Gog there are going to be Ethiopians, Libyans, Spanish, Cappadocians, etc, who still never fought against Jerusalem, and particularly not in the time of the Maccabees. For the Syrians and Egyptians alone fought against them.

Next, Ezechiel describes such a victory against Gog and Magog, that afterwards there would be no fear of enemies, rather it was going to be the end of all battles. But such was not the victory of the Maccabees against the kings of Syria and Egypt. For the Jews never completely conquered the kingdom of Syria or Egypt, and a little after the Jews were again disturbed by the Romans, captured and never freed from their hands, as Augustine deduced from the history. [228](#) Therefore, the prophecy of Ezechiel was not fulfilled before the times of Christ.

The second part of the opinion of Bibliander, which is his own, is not only false but impious. For in the first place John speaks of the battle of

Gog and Magog that is going to be against the camp of the Saints, and the chosen city, that is, against the true Church of God. But the war of Christians to recover the Holy Land was wholly against Muslims, unless by chance Bibliander would have it that the Muslims are the true Church of God and the camp of the Saints. Next, John says that men are going to be in the army of God from the four corners of the Earth, but in the Christian army they were only from the West and the North, that is French, Germans and Italians. Besides, John says that after the war of Gog and Magog Jerusalem would be renewed and glorified; the devil, Antichrist and the false prophets are going to be cast out into the eternal fire. On the other hand, the war of the Christians for the holy land ended long ago, and still we have not seen any renewal of Jerusalem, nor the devil and the false prophets thrown into hell. For now, as even our adversaries affirm, the devil and the false prophets greatly flourish.

Besides, God himself manifestly showed by means of clear signs and wonders, both at Antioch in Syria, and on other places that he was pleased by that war. [229](#)

Next, St. Bernard, whom the same Bibliander calls a saint in his chronicle, where he treats on the times of Eugene III, was one of many authors of this war. For he persuaded a multitude of French and Germans by words and miracles to set out for that war, as he himself shows. [230](#) The author of the life of St. Bernard writes that after the battle was completed Bernard gave sight to a certain blind man in testimony that the war he had preached was in the name of the Lord. [231](#)

The Sixth opinion is of the Centuriators, who teach that Gog and Magog mean the kingdom of the Saracens or the Turks. [232](#) Such an opinion is plainly opposed to that of Bibliander and therefore, it is better or at least less bad. Yet still, it is absolutely false. Gog will come in the end of his years and will not endure for a long time, as is gathered from John and Ezechiel. But the kingdom of the Saracens began a long time ago and has endured for nearly a thousand years, which is by no means a little while.

The Seventh opinion is of St. Ambrose. He taught that Gog represents the Goths, who had devastated many provinces of the Roman people. [233](#) St. Jerome calls to mind this opinion and says: "Whether it may be true or not, the end of the battle will show." [234](#) And now rightly the end of the battle shows that it was not true, since after the wars of the Goths we saw neither a renewal of the Church nor did all wars end.

The Eighth opinion is of St. Jerome himself. While commenting on chapter XXXVIII of Ezechiel he saw the difficulty of the matter and expressed it in the mystical sense on heretics after he omitted the literal sense. For he would have it that Gog, which in Hebrew means roof, signifies heresiarchs who have the character of a roof; they are elevated and proud. Magog, on the other hand, since it is translated “from the roof,” means those who believe heresiarchs and are to them as a building is to its roof. This opinion, provided it is received in a mystical sense is very true, but it is not literal. Ezechiel says that Gog is going to come in the end of years and John says in Apocalypse XX that after a thousand years the same Gog is coming. (However, all Catholics understand the thousand years as the whole time which is from the arrival of Christ even to Antichrist). Therefore, since Gog is not going to come until the end of the world, and the heretics began in the beginning of the Church while the Apostles were still alive, it is properly certain that Gog does not literally mean heretics. It must also be known, that Jerome, when he says Gog means roof and Magog means from the roof, he did not wish to say that Gog and Magog were the Hebrew for our words roof and from the roof. Rather, he meant they are almost the same. Properly in Hebrew roof is not Gog, but Gag (gg) and from the roof they do not say Magog, but Miggag (ggm).

The Ninth opinion is of St. Augustine. He understands for Gog the devil, who is the character of a great roof, that is, of a great house in which many of the wicked inhabit; while for Magog he understands the army of Antichrist gathered from all the nations of the whole world. [235](#) Such an opinion without a doubt is the truest and must be embraced, in so far as it relates to Gog and Magog in the times of Antichrist. Both because all Catholic authors follow him, but also because everything which they say on Gog and Magog from Ezechiel and John rightly agree with Antichrist. For then, there will be truly the last and greatest persecution, and after it Jerusalem will be renewed, e.g. the Church will be glorified and no more wars are heard of. In so far as he understands the devil for Gog it doesn't seem to be true. For John says the devil, being freed, is going to call Gog and Magog into battle; therefore, the devil is one thing, Gog is another.

Therefore, our opinion, which is the tenth, contains three things. Firstly, we assert that the battle of Gog and Magog is the battle of Antichrist against the Church, as Augustine rightly teaches. Secondly, we say it is probably quite true that Antichrist is signified by Gog while through his army,

Magog. For Ezechiel perpetually calls Gog the prince, and Magog the land, or nation. Thirdly, we say it is probable that Gog is called by Magog, not the other way around, so that Antichrist should be called Gog, because he is the prince of the nation which is called Magog. Hence, the army of Antichrist is called Magog from the nation of Scythia not because it is certain to be made of Scythians, which the Jews mean by beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian sea, but either because a great part of the army of Antichrist will consist of barbarians arising from Scythia (such as Turks, Tartars, and others), or what I rather more believe, because it will be an immense army and very cruel. For those whom we wish to say are savage, we call Scythian.

Now, that Magog really means a Scythian nation is clear from Genesis X, where we read that the second son of Japhet was called Magog, whereby it was called the region of Magog, which his posterity inhabited, which is Scythia as Josephus taught, [236](#) as well as St. Jerome. [237](#) This is the same as from the three sons of Cham, that is, Chus, Mizraim and Chanaan: Ethiopia was called Chus, Egypt was called Mizraim, and Palestine was called Chanaan; thus from the son of Japhet Scythia was called Magog.

Moreover, when Ezechiel names Magog he regarded a nation denominated by Magog, the son of Japhet, because he adds as allies to it Gog and other nations denominated by other sons, or grandchildren of Japhet, such as Gomer, Togorma, Mosoch, Tubal, etc. Therefore, we conclude that the battle of Gog and Magog is the last persecution which Antichrist will excite against the Church in the whole world.

What Ezechiel says in chapter XXXVIII is also not opposed to this, that the arms of Gog and Magog will be burned for seven years, since still it will be certain that after the death of antichrist there will be but 45 days until the end of the world, as is gathered from Daniel. For Ezechiel does not speak literally, but figuratively as is the custom of Prophets. He did not really mean that those arms would be burned for seven years, but that the slaughter would be so great that one could suffice for a very long time to keep the fires going with spears and shields of the slain men, if one needed to.

One doubt remains, whether on account of the savage persecution of Antichrist the faith and religion of Christ must be thoroughly extinguished throughout the world. Domingo de Soto believes that it is going to happen: "The loss and defection of the whole world from that see will be a sign of

the end of the world. ... After the faith has been extinguished through the defection from the Apostolic See, the whole world will be empty and then continue in vain. ... Mortals will become frightened, as their love shall be pestilent. Thence its glorification and pride which under the leadership of antichrist will at length cause the city of God to shake.” [238](#)

But, in my judgment, this opinion cannot be defended. For in the first place it is opposed to what Augustine says, that the Church is going to always be unconquered by Antichrist: “He will not desert his army which was called by the word ‘camp’.” [239](#) Next, it seems opposed to the Gospel, for we read in Matthew XVI: “Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” But how will they not prevail, if they will utterly extinguish her? Likewise in Matthew XXIV, the Lord says on the ministers of Antichrist: “They will perform great signs, so that they will lead into error, and if it were possible, even the elect.” There, the Lord meant the many chosen in that future time that will not allow themselves to be seduced by the miracles of Antichrist. Next, all writers who speak on the persecution of Antichrist, such as Ezechiel, Daniel, Paul, John and all the Fathers cited above, say that the victory of this war or persecution is going to be in the power of the Church. And the reasoning is evident. Who would believe that in this battle, in which the whole camp where God and the devil, Christ and Antichrist will fight that God will be conquered by the devil, and Christ by Antichrist?

CHAPTER XVIII: The Absurdities of the Heretics are Refuted

ALTHOUGH what we have treated up to this point on Antichrist could suffice, seeing that we have clearly shown that no place attributed to Antichrist in the divine Scripture agrees with the Supreme Pontiff, still so as to leave nothing wanting and because the impudence of our adversaries is so manifest that I propose briefly to refute that which Luther, Calvin, Illyricus, Tileman and Chytraeus assert trying to show that the Pope is the Antichrist.

1) Luther, everywhere calls the Supreme Pontiff the Antichrist, and especially in his book *de Captivitate Babylonica*, in his work *Contra Execrabilem Bullam Antichristi*, in his assertion of articles, and in his book against Ambrose Catharinus. [240](#) Though he does this, only one argument can be found in all these books whereby he tries to prove this, namely in his assertion of article 27. He says: “Daniel foretold in the eighth chapter that Antichrist will be an impudent king by face, this is, as the Hebrew has it, powerful in regard to pomps and ceremonies of external works, meanwhile the spirit of faith is extinguished just as we saw fulfilled in so many religious orders, colleges, rites, vestments, deeds, Churches, statues, rules and observances—and you can scarcely recite their number.” And these same faces of Antichrist, as he calls them, he enumerates and profusely explains in his book against Ambrose Catharinus on the vision of Daniel.

For all that, this argument of Luther errs in three places. First, in the very foundation, since the Hebrew word *sha-panim* [241](#) means “robust in the face,” and it is a Hebrew phrase that means a man with a smooth forehead who does not know how to be ashamed. For especially the Septuagint so renders it: *anaidēs prosōpōn*, that is modest in the face. St. Jerome and Theodoret also so render it, and Francis Vatablus so explained it in the rules of Rabbis: “Strong in face, that is he who does not blush, who has no shame.”

Next, the same is gathered from Ezechiel III: “The house of Israel has been rubbed clean in the forehead, and is hard of heart; behold I have given your face more vigor than their faces, and thy forehead is harder than theirs.” The Hebrew for that is: “The house of Israel is robust in its

forehead, and I gave your face to be more robust than theirs.” The words have no other sense than this (as Jerome rightly explains): they are indeed impudent, but you shall not yield to their impudence. Although they boldly and without shame do wicked things, you boldly and without shame shall rebuke them. Since that is so, Luther should see to it lest he shall be impudent in face if he would have his interpretation be put before that of the Rabbis, Theodoret, Jerome, the translators of the Septuagint and Ezechiel himself.

2) The argument of Luther goes astray because from this opinion, whatever at length he means, he does not rightly gather that the Pope is the Antichrist. Even if it were certain that Antichrist is going to be powerful in pomps and external ceremonies, it is still not immediately gathered that Antichrist is whoever comes in pomps and external ceremonies. The Logicians teach that nothing can be gathered from affirmative particulars. Otherwise Moses would be the Antichrist because he established so many ceremonies in Exodus and Leviticus that one can hardly begin to count them. And when the same thing is said about Antiochus, and in his figure of Antichrist, that understanding is perhaps enigmatic. If the reasoning of Luther would avail, it would follow that all who could answer the enigma are Antichrist. But that is certainly false and ridiculous.

3) Luther errs in attributing the institution of all orders and Ecclesiastical ceremonies to the Roman Pontiff, when it is certain that a great many of these were established by the holy Fathers, not by the Roman Pontiff. The Greek Church has always had, and still has, monasteries, rites, observances and ceremonies which they received from St. Basil, St. Pachomius and the other Greek Fathers, not from the Roman Pontiff. [242](#) In the west also we have the orders of St. Benedict, St. Romauld, St. Bruno, St. Dominic, and St. Francis which, while approved by the Pope, were established and devised by these holy men with the teaching of the Holy Spirit. So, if orders pertain to the face of Antichrist, these holy Fathers must rather more be called Antichrist than the Pope.

I add, lastly, that the words of Daniel (except in regard to revealing Antichrist in his own time), agree more suitably to no man better than Luther. For he was impudent in his face above all, for as a Priest and Monk he openly married a consecrated virgin when no example of such a thing can be shown in all of antiquity. Likewise, he wrote lies without number which have been recorded and published by many. John Cochlaeus writes in

the acts of Luther for the year 1523, that in one book of Luther he noted fifty lies. From another Luther was found to have placed 874 lies. Next, how great was his impudence when, in his book against the Bull of Leo X, Luther dared to excommunicate his Pope when the universal Church adhered to him still? Who ever heard that a priest could excommunicate a Bishop?

To be sure, the Council of Chalcedon abhorred the rashness of a certain Dioscorus, who, while presiding over the Second Council of Ephesus (that is, the robber council of Ephesus), presumed to excommunicate Pope Leo the Great. Yet, what comparison can there be between Dioscorus, the Patriarch of the second See, presiding in what was supposed to be a general Council, and Luther, a simple monk writing in his cell? Nevertheless, leaving Luther, we come to Melanchthon.

CHAPTER XIX: The Trifles of the Smalchaldich Council of the Lutherans are Refuted

HERE is a little book extant on the power and primacy of the Pope, or the reign of Antichrist, published in the name of the Smalchaldich Council of the Lutherans, which seems to me to be the work of Melanchthon. At any rate, whoever wrote it, it has nothing but words and inane boasting. The author of the book says: “It is certain that the Roman Pontiffs, along with their members, defend impious doctrine and impious worship, and this plainly fits the mark of Antichrist in the rule of the Pope and his members.” To this point we have seen the proposition, now let us hear the proofs: “For Paul, when describing Antichrist in his letter to the Thessalonians, calls him the adversary of Christ, extolling himself over everything which is called or worshiped as God, sitting in the temple just as God. Therefore, he speaks of someone ruling in the Church not on heathen kings; he calls this man the adversary of Christ because he is going to devise doctrine opposed to the Gospel and he will arrogate divine authority to himself.”

Though all these things, even if they were true, would hardly impede us still, I ask on what foundation does this interpretation rest? Paul clearly says Antichrist is going to elevate himself over every God and is going to sit in the temple, not as a king or as a Bishop, but plainly as God and Chrysostom, Ambrose and the rest of the fathers interpreting this passage, concur with this. Therefore, by what principle does he affirm without a witness or any reasoning that Antichrist is he who sits in the temple not as God, but as a Bishop, and does not raise himself above every God to such an extent that he not only worships God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but even prostrates himself before the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the sight of all, as well as before the tombs of the Apostles, Martyrs, the cross and images of Christ and the saints, which he himself, although impiously, usually calls foreign gods and idols? But let us see whether he can make this very thing fit the Pope.

“First, it is certain that the Pope rules in the Church and constituted this reign under the pretext of Ecclesiastical authority and ministry. The pretext is these words: “I give to you the keys.”

For certain he says that the Pope rules over the Church, but he does not prove it. On the other hand, we can show the contrary with little labor. One who rules suffers no superior, but the Pope professes that he is the vicar of Christ the King. And although in the whole house of God, and also in the whole kingdom of Christ he uses the fullest power, still this power is not in excess of the economy, rather it is the condition of a servant. For even Moses (as Paul says in Hebrews III) “was faithful in the whole house of God,” but just as a servant, while Christ is as a son in his own. But let us continue.

“Thereupon, the doctrine of the Pope is in many ways opposed with the Gospel and he arrogates to himself divine authority in three ways. First, because he takes for himself the right of changing the doctrine of Christ and the worship established by God, and wills his own doctrine and worship to be observed as though it were divine.”

Likewise, he says this but does not prove it. Not only is this false, but it seems to be an impudent lie. Doesn't he know that in the Catholic Church the doctrine of Christ is taught by the mouth of all, and the worship cannot be changed not only by any man, but even by an Angel, nor was there ever any question of whether what Christ taught or commanded should be believed or done. Yet, it remains to be seen whether he or we interpret the doctrine and precepts of Christ better. In such a question he brings nothing other than his customary interpretation; but we bring the consensus of the Fathers, and of the Catholic Church, as well as decrees and customs. For we do not oppose the consensus of the Fathers and the decrees and customs of the Church (as he falsely boasts) let alone the word of God but only his interpretation and judgment. But let us hear the second proof.

“Secondly, because he takes power to himself not only to bind and loose in this life, but even the right over souls after this life.”

Again, this is said but not proven. For the Supreme Pontiff does not take the right unto himself over dead souls. He does not absolve their sins or punishments by his own authority but only in a manner like prayers of intercession, and he will also share the good works of the faithful with them. Moreover, prayers and fasting of the living benefit the dead, and especially the sacrifice of the Mass, as all the Fathers teach. On that matter

we will dispute profusely elsewhere, on this place one testimony of St. Augustine will suffice. “It is without question that the dead are assisted by the prayers of the Holy Church and the salutary sacrifice, as well as almsgiving which is expended for their souls.” [243](#) Still, let us go on.

“Thirdly, because the Pope refuses to be judged by the Church or by another and advances his authority in judgment of Councils and of the whole Church. This is to make oneself God, to refuse to be judged by the Church or by anyone.”

Here also, he says two things that he cannot prove. For particularly by what Scriptures, what Councils, by what criterion ought the Pope be judged by Councils or the Church? For we read (that I might pass over many other things which were disputed in the previous book) that Christ said to Peter: “Feed my sheep.” [244](#) We believe it cannot be doubted that the sheep must be ruled and judged by a shepherd, not the shepherd by the sheep. We also read that in Luke the Lord said to Peter: “Who do you think is the faithful and prudent steward, whom the Lord constituted over his household?” [245](#) We see in that passage a specific steward was proposed for the whole household of Christ and certainly that he would rule it, not be ruled by it.

Still, perhaps someone would object that if that steward were wicked, in the end who will judge him if the steward is in charge of all but subject to none? That is why the Lord added immediately after: “What if that servant would have said in his heart, ‘my Lord delays his coming’ and began to strike the servants and maidservants, to eat, drink and be drunk; the master of the servant will come on a day on which he hopes not, and at an hour which he does not know, and he will divide his lot and share it with infidels.” [246](#) Who doesn’t hear that there is a judge of that wicked steward whom the Lord constituted over his household? Christ does not say that he will be judged by a Council, but the “Lord will come on a day he hopes not, etc.” Therefore, the Lord reserves judgment for himself over the one he himself constituted over his whole household. Hence, the Pope does not steal his authority from the judgment of Councils and of the whole Church when he does not suffer himself to be judged by it. He cannot steal what was never given in the first place. Rather, Councils duly gathered have never taken to themselves (outside the case of heresy), to pass judgment on the Supreme Pontiff. There is much to say on this matter in the proper place.

The second thing that he says and does not prove is that one makes himself God if he refuses to be judged by the Church or by anyone. For when he says “by anyone”, he certainly understands any man; doesn’t Melanchthon know that the Pope must be judged by Christ himself, and that he believes and professes this? By what arrangement does someone make himself God when he believes God must judge him?

Next, earthly kings attain judgment on earth in regard to matters of state, they recognize no one and by his scheme, where he removes coercive power from Bishops, these kings have no judge in Ecclesiastical affairs. Will there not then be as many gods as there are kings? I do not think he is that insane that he would say this. Therefore, it remains that it is not true that one who would not be judged by any man thereby makes himself God.

Finally, he adds: “He defends such horrible errors and this impiety with supreme savagery, and he kills anyone who dissents.”

Since he lies so impudently here, let him also, if he can, recognize that I myself who write this openly assert—and at that in the very city of Rome (and not without the Pope’s knowledge)—it is not lawful for the Pope to change Christ’s doctrine, or worship, or establish new worship which should be held as divine, or which is opposed with the Gospel by any reasoning; I am not killed for that, nor do I suffer on that account. Without a doubt the Pope knows well that I speak the truth, but Melanchthon lies. Just the same he also adds a little after: “The doctrine on penance has been altogether twisted by the Pope and his members; for he teaches that sins are remitted on account of the dignity of our works; in like manner they never teach that sins are remitted by grace on account of Christ.” These, however, are not our teachings but his lies. For we do not teach that, but altogether the contrary as the Council of Trent clearly shows. [247](#) But enough has been said on this. Let us now turn to Calvin.

CHAPTER XXI: The Lies of Calvin are Refuted

JOHN CALVIN, explaining 2 Thessal. II,: “He who extolls himself over everything that is called God,” says many things with great flamboyance, but proves nearly nothing. “Paul means by these words that Antichrist was going to take as his own what is of the one God, that he will raise himself above everything divine and every god, that he might lay at his feet all religion and the whole worship of God. . . . Now whoever will have been informed by the Scripture, even if he be a boy of but ten years, will notice certain things which are especially proper to God and which, on the other hand, the Pope usurps to himself, and he need not expend much labor to recognize him [the Pope] as Antichrist.” This shows wonderful promise!

But let us, at length, hear by what reasoning he shall prove what he proposes. Perhaps it will be of the kind that even a boy of ten years will not labor much to refute it: “The Scripture proclaims that God alone is the legislator [248](#) who can preserve and destroy, [249](#) one king whose office is to rule souls by his word; it makes the same one the author of all sacred things; it teaches that justice and salvation depend upon Christ alone, and it assigns the mode together with the reasoning. The Pope asserts every one of these pertains to his right; and he boasts that what seems fit to him he binds upon consciences by means of laws and subjects them to eternal punishments. He establishes sacraments at his pleasure which are either new or corrupted from the ones which Christ had established, and he vitiates, nay more, altogether abolishes these so that in their place he substitutes the sacrileges that he had made. A foreign means of attaining salvation is devised that is altogether foreign to the Gospel. Lastly he does not hesitate to change the whole religion at a nod. What, I ask, is it to raise oneself over everything which is called divine if the Pope does not do it?”

Didn't I say that Calvin says much, but proves little or nothing? For Calvin says all this, that the Pope boasts to bind men with laws upon their consciences as he sees fit, that he establishes new sacraments but abolishes the old, that he devises a means of salvation foreign to the doctrine of the

Gospel, that he changes all religion—but he does not prove any of it. In other words, for him to say something is to prove it; by equal reasoning to deny it ought to refute it.

Certainly, however, many of us are Catholic, and we obey the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, we speak freely and without any injury to him that he is not allowed to bind men with any law he pleases, i.e. pernicious and wicked ones, neither can he establish new sacraments nor corrupt or abolish the ones established by Christ, nor is he permitted to confect a means of salvation foreign to the doctrine of the Gospel, or overturn the Christian religion, or change it. We, in truth, more gladly say that we know he also thinks and says the same thing. For if he did not think so, if he thought he was allowed to fashion wicked laws, establish new sacraments or abolish the old or do other things of this sort, how would he knowingly and willingly suffer us, who are in his power here in Rome rather than in I know not what corner of the world, to teach the contrary?

But they will say the Pope does not say he is permitted to do these things, but still in reality he contends that he is by his deeds. Therefore, it should be proven that he has done any of these things. Otherwise, that is to assume what must be proven, which although customary for our adversaries, the Logicians call “begging the question.”

Next, Isaiah XXXIII and James IV, the only two passages of Scripture that Calvin advanced, do not impede our position in the slightest. For Isaiah and James say: “One is king, judge and our lawgiver,” certainly that is not opposed with those words of Proverbs: “Through me kings rule and makers of laws determine what is just.” [250](#) And with these, the Psalm: “And now understand ye kings, you are taught to judge the earth.” [251](#) Another six hundred passages could be added. Therefore, Isaiah and James in whatever way do not make God the one king, judge and lawgiver, but only by reason that he alone is so king, judge and lawmaker that he ought to render an account to no one since he depends upon no one. He will rule and judge and impose laws by his own authority, i.e. he does not receive authority from another. Lastly, that he alone in regard to execution can destroy and save, as James says, we attribute none of that to the Pope or any other princes.

CHAPTER XXI: The Lies of Illyricus are Refuted

NOW we turn to Illyricus. In a book which he wrote against the primacy of the Pope, he says: “But among our other arguments it ought to be the most solid, truly and clearly proven that in this time, the Pope teaches and defends impious doctrine and is himself the very person of Antichrist, and I repeat the reasons of this matter here. 1 John II defines that Antichrist is he who denies Jesus is the Christ. The Pope clearly does this, not by words but by deed. Messiah is the Hebrew, Christ the Greek, it is a divinely sent person that he should be a perpetual priest and king over the people of God. The office of the priest is to teach, pray, sacrifice, but it is for a king to rule and defend.”

Let us see how he will prove the Pope has snatched up these offices from Christ, and what testimony and proofs he advances. Still, unless I am mistaken, we will only see inane words. Therefore, he continues thus: “The Pope has seized the priesthood from Christ; not only does he wish to be heard as the beloved son, but what is more, he and his pseudo-apostles advance another Gospel. Likewise, he substitutes other mediators in heaven between us and Christ who intercede for us in the presence of the Father by neglecting the severe judge, Christ. Likewise, because he substitutes infinite sacrificing priests in place of Christ, who pleased God on behalf of the human race, to whom he says the priesthood passed from Christ through Peter. Thereupon, he wills us to be saved through their spiritual merits and those of the saints.”

See how Illyricus conquers us with the clear proofs of scripture! What if we were to show that all these things were merely lies? For where, I ask, have you read that the Pope wishes to be given more authority than Christ? We deny it and say: prove it. Rather, we see that supreme honor is given to the Scriptures by the Pope and he holds for heretics those who teach something against Scripture. Next, isn't it clearly a lie that the Pope has established other mediators for Christ and wants them to intercede with God the Father while neglecting Christ? Doesn't our Litany begin with *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison*? Are not all the prayers of our Church, which we

read in Mass or in the Divine Office directed to God and don't they end: "through Christ our Lord"? Don't we acknowledge the mediation and intercession of Christ when, whatever we ask from God, or if we desire the saints to be asked on our behalf, we ask entirely through the merit of Christ? We do not have saints in place of God or of Christ, but we ask from them that they might join their prayers with our own so that whatever we wish of God we might obtain easier through Christ.

By equal reasoning it is a lie that the Pope substituted sacrificing priests for Christ. Neither would we say the priesthood of Christ has passed to sacrificing priests through Peter. He has not proved any of these things, nor will he ever prove them. There can be no doubt whether if you had some means you would advance it. But it is as we say; Christ, who is a priest forever, and lives always to intercede for us, offered himself once to God in a pleasing sacrifice by death on the cross: but now he offers himself again and again and again in the liturgy through the hands of the priests.

Just the same, although many in our time baptize, still we read that: "This is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit." [252](#) It does not follow that the office of baptizing passed from Christ to the priests, but that he is the one who always baptizes through the ministry of the priest; thus even though many priests today offer Christ in awe-inspiring mysteries still, he is the primary priest and truly the high priest who through the ministry of all priests offers himself: "These works are not of human power. Who then in that supper consecrates, now also operates and perfects; we merely hold the rank of ministers." [253](#)

But I would gladly say to Illyricus, since all the ancient writers both Greek and Latin make mention of the sacrifice of the Eucharist and of the Christian priesthood (which no man denies unless he doesn't read), why at length does he attribute this to the Roman Pontiff, that he transferred the priesthood of Christ to sacrificing priests? But let us continue with the rest.

Hew adds in the last passage: "He wishes us to be saved through their spiritual merits, and of the saints." This is also a characteristic lie. Otherwise advance a place where the Pope will have said this. St. Peter says in Acts: "For we believe we are saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, just as even our Fathers were saved." [254](#) Nor do we acknowledge any other savior but Jesus Christ crucified who gave himself for the redemption for all. [255](#)

Hence, it cannot be denied that the merits and prayers of the saints benefit us according to their mode, unless one does not know or does not believe there is communication and connection among the members of the body of the Church. Although we will treat this matter in another place, it will suffice to add two testimonies here. St. Augustine says: “That we might be advised in that mode, should what we deserve so weigh us down, that it seems we are not loved by God we can relieve ourselves from it by the merits of those whom God loves.” [256](#) He also repeats often in *City of God* that some obtained forgiveness by the merits of the Saints. [257](#) This is what the Lord meant when he said: “Make unto yourselves friends from the mammon of iniquity, that when you falter, they might receive you in eternal dwellings.” [258](#) St. Leo the Great says: “Just as we have been put to the test and the Fathers proved, we believe and trust among all labors of this life to obtain the mercy of God when we are oppressed by our own sins that we are always, in equal measure, in need of the help by the prayers of special patrons, we are raised up only by Apostolic *merits*.” [259](#)

Moreover, although we do not customarily so speak, as Illyricus says, that we are saved through spiritual merits still, if anyone were to so speak and mean by the merits of the Saints we are helped to obtain salvation through Christ, he could be no more rebuked than the Apostle Paul, who said: “I am all things to all men that I might save all.” [260](#) And the Apostle Jude, who speaks in a similar fashion said: “And indeed reprove those that have been judged, but save others, pulling them out of the fire.” [261](#) That is enough on the priesthood of Christ.

Nevertheless, Illyricus continues: “He steals the kingdom from Christ, because he wishes to be head of the Church on earth, but in heaven he constitutes other helpers and saviors for us, to whom he bids us to flee when in misery. Therefore the Pope denies Jesus is the Christ.”

First I ask where in the world the Pope, or any Catholic, calls the saints “saviors”? I add this: if he asserts that he is head of the Church under Christ, as his vicar and minister, which the Pope does, is that to deny Jesus is the Christ? By the same reasoning does anyone who is a viceroy, or affirms himself as the governor of some province, thereupon deny his master is king?

Next, if to turn to the Saints as helpers is to deny Jesus is the Christ, how, I ask, did Paul not deny Jesus is the Christ when he said: “I ask you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ and through the charity of the Holy

Spirit, that you help me by praying for me to God, that I might be freed from the unbelievers who are in Judea.”? [262](#) How did Basil the Great not deny Jesus is the Christ when, in his *Oration on 40 martyrs*, he said: “Anyone who is oppressed in narrow straits, let him flee to them; again who rejoices, let him pray to them; that he may be freed from evils; that he would endure to prosperous times?” I omit the remaining Fathers, as I fear lest we might search too much and discover who else denied Jesus is the Christ.

Still, Illyricus continues. “In Daniel XI, Antichrist is distinguished by a great many signs, first, that he will do what he wants, and the Pope does what is pleasing to him.”

But when Holy Daniel says of Antichrist, “He will do what he wishes,” he means Antichrist will have no one greater than he, not even God. For it follows: “And will be lifted up against every God.” Therefore, Antichrist will live for his own will in place of the law of God, and command and subordination. Certainly the Pope does not do this, rather he affirms that he is constrained by the law of God, and acknowledges Christ as his judge and superior.

Illyricus continues: “He confesses in canons [263](#) that he himself drags infinite souls with him into hell, still no man ought to say to him what he does? And the Gloss says the will of the Pope is held as the rule.”

The Canon that begins *Si Papa* was not (as Illyricus falsely says) written by any Pope, but by St. Boniface, the bishop of Moguntium, Apostle of Germany and a martyr. He does not deny that the Supreme Pontiff, if he will have lived badly, must be corrected and also admonished by fraternal charity, rather, he denies that he can be convicted by authority and judged when he is the judge of every man. In those words, which come before that canon (as is seen in the new edition of the decree), Boniface also calls the Roman Church the *Head* of all Churches with eloquent words, and affirms that the safety of the whole Church, after God, depends upon the safety of the Roman Pontiff.

I ask, therefore, from Illyricus, whether the teaching of St. Boniface, the apostle of the Germans, is true or not? For if it is not true, why object to us? If it is true, why does he not receive it? I will put the matter more plainly. If his teaching is not true, therefore, it is not true that the Roman Pontiff drags a great many souls with him to hell. What then? But if it is true, then the Roman Pontiff is truly the head of all Churches and the judge of all, judged

by no one. For this reason, Illyricus should cease to argue with canons which can benefit him nothing. What pertains to the Gloss, Illyricus should know, that citation was either held by the Pope as false and thus purged from the new edition, or else it was never in that decree, I could not find it anywhere.

Illyricus goes on: “Secondly (Daniel) says that he will lift himself above God. The Pope did that as is clear from the foregoing. Likewise, because he wishes to make himself heard more than God blaspheming he loudly proclaims the Scripture the font of all heresy, schism, ambiguity and obscurity, etc.”

It would behoove him to at least relate the words of Daniel faithfully. It doesn’t say he will lift himself above God, but “he will be lifted against every God.” And below: “Nor will venerate Gods because he will rise against all of them.” This very clearly shows the Pope has nothing in common with Antichrist, since Antichrist will worship no gods but the Pope worships the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Not only that, but if we were to believe Illyricus then he openly worships as many Gods as there are saints in heaven and images on earth, not to mention relics under the earth.

Moreover, when he adds: “The Pope loudly declares the Scriptures are the font of heresies and schisms,” I have certainly never read that in the writings of any Pope; but I have heard the word of Luther, that Scripture is the book of heretics. [264](#) If that were received in the right sense then I do not see why it would be duly condemned. For St. Hilary also, in his last book on Councils, shows that a great many heresies were born from bad understanding of Scripture. Tertullian also boldly stated: “Nor am I trying to say that the Scriptures themselves were so arranged by the will of God as to furnish materials for heretics when I read ‘there must be heresies,’ which could not exist without the Scriptures.”

Not only does the Pope very truly teach that there is ambiguity and obscurity in a great many passages of Scripture, but so also do all the Fathers. Even Luther himself, whether he wished to or not, was compelled to affirm this when he wrote in a preface to the Psalms: “I would not have it presumed by any man in my regard that I have done what still none of the saints or the most learned could furnish, i.e. to teach and understand the Psalter in its legitimate sense in all places. It is enough for some men to have understood some things for their part, but the Spirit has reserved many things to himself so that we would always have students. It only shows

many things so as to attract, and hands down many things to influence. . . . I know that anyone who would dare to profess that he had perfect understanding of one book of Scripture in all its parts would be guilty of the most impudent temerity.” Luther also writes the same thing in his book *de Conciliis et Ecclesia*, pag. 52. Doesn’t he clearly affirm that he, with great sweat, sought the true and genuine teaching of Scripture? And, at length, are there not so many versions of Scripture, so many interpretations, so many different sects among our adversaries, why do they shout, on the other hand, how ambiguous and obscure the Scripture is?

“Third, [Daniel] says that things will go well for him [Antichrist] until they shall be put an end to by the wrath of God. The Pope oppressed as he willed both kingdoms and innumerable Churches with his tyranny and impiety.”

And this is the reason by which the author proves his case? Could not someone say what states and which Churches the Roman Pontiff has oppressed? What if we were to show the contrary, that this mark of the Pope were plainly contrary to this third mark of Antichrist? In that time, in which according to Illyricus, the Pope began to be Antichrist not only did his rule not increase, but in fact it decreased all the more. In the time of Leo the Great, that is, one hundred and fifty years before our adversary says Antichrist was born, the Roman Pope presided over as many nations as there were boundaries of the Roman Empire. For he thus writes: “Through the holy See of Blessed Peter, Rome was made head of the world, you preside more broadly in divine religion than earthly domination. Although by many victories the authority of your rule increased, you conferred it over land and sea, still what bellicose labor has subdued for you is less than what Christian peace has added.” [265](#) And Prosper of Aquitaine says:

Rome, the See of Peter, which for pastoral honor
Was made head of the world,
Whatever she does not possess by arms
She holds by religion. [266](#)

Yet afterwards, while Antichrist was ruling (as Illyricus would have it) the Roman See little by little lost Africa, the greater part of Asia and all of Greece; in our own times they cry out that Anticrhist is raging, yet all his affairs go so well that he has lost a great part of Germany, Sweden, Norway,

all Denmark, a good part of England, France and Switzerland, Bohemia and part of the Balkans. Therefore, if things going well is a mark of Antichrist, it is not the Pope, who has lost so many provinces, but Luther, who by preaching carnal freedom has seduced so many people and for whom things go so well that from a private monk he became Prophet of the whole of Germany and just as the Pope evades it, he rightly can be called Antichrist. Nevertheless, continue.

“Fourthly, Daniel says ‘he will have no care of the God of his Fathers.’ This is truly said about the Pope, as we clearly proved above from the passage of John.”

And we more clearly disproved it in the same place.

“Fifthly, he says he will have no care for the love of women: but the Pope became celibate both by instructing celibacy to his own, and by his homosexual lusts.”

Here, I omit to say with what temerity Illyricus dares to say these things. Meanwhile, he has a simple task; either he could prove what he says or he cannot. I will not omit that the words of Daniel, although they sound this way in the Greek text, still the Hebrew source is plainly contrary in the opinion of St. Jerome, who rendered the verse: “And he will be in lust for women.” And although the Hebrew words *re-kal ke-me-dat na-shis* only mean reeling from lust for women, they also do not have any other words joined to them whereby it could be understood whether it will be or not be Antichrist that will lust after women. Still there are two conjectures which the version of St. Jerome makes more probable.

1) It is certain that Antiochus, whom Daniel is literally speaking about, was exceedingly addicted to the love of women: “Antiochus,” Jerome says, “is said to have been very lustful and so greatly disgraced the royal majesty through foul deeds and corruption, that he publicly had relations with mimes and harlots, and satisfied his lust in the presence of the people.” [267](#) If this is so, how believable is it that Daniel was going to speak about such a king that will not be lustful for women?

2) Another conjecture is that since Antichrist is going to come as the Messiah of the Jews, and the Jews await a multitude of wives from the Messaiah, apart from other goods, it is not in any way probable that Antichrist is going to command or praise celibacy.

Lastly, I add that if it is a mark of Antichrist that he will proclaim celibacy, then not only the Pope, but all the Fathers and even the Apostles

themselves were Antichrists. For (that I might pass over the rest which will be advanced in its proper place) listen to what the Fathers of the II Council of Carthage say, in canon 2 of that Council: “All are pleased that Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who confect the sacraments ought to abstain from wives as guardians of chastity, that what the Apostles taught and antiquity itself preserved, we also would safeguard.” But let us continue.

“Sixth, Daniel says that he will worship the God Maozim, and with gold and silver, which he did, while he placed his whole piety in it, so that many wonderfully splendid temples were built and rested upon every kind of precious ornament and songs would resound.”

Many things were written above on the god Maozim, where we showed that he is either Antichrist himself or the devil whom Antichrist will secretly worship. But it seems to me that our Illyricus makes Jesus Christ the god Maozim, which is an intolerable blasphemy. For all the temples which the Roman Pontiffs have splendidly built and adorned with gold and silver are consecrated to Christ our God, and no man can be said to not know that. If, therefore, the one who is worshiped in temples of this kind is the God Maozim who does not see that Christ himself would be the God Maozim? Moreover, the building and adorning of temples did not begin in the year 666, the year our adversaries would have it that Antichrist appeared but nearly three hundred years earlier.

Listen to Eusebius (from Ruffinus’ version): “From that fact joy was infused over us as if by a divine gift, especially at the sight of these places which a little before were destroyed by the treachery of the impious tyrants, that were now brought back to life with a more glorious construction and high temples rose even higher for the humble assemblies.” [268](#) St. Cyril of Jerusalem also says: “These who are now kings built this holy Church of the Resurrection, in which we are now, clothing it with silver and gold from their piety, and they made it splendid with silver monuments.” [269](#)

See, if you will, the magnificence of the temples of Christians and the splendor of the vessels of the Church in Eusebius’s life of Constantine, [270](#) and Gregory of Nyssa; [271](#) Gregory Nazianzenus; [272](#) Chrysostom; [273](#) Cyril of Alexandria; [274](#) Damasus; [275](#) Ambrose; [276](#) Jerome; [277](#) Augustine; [278](#) Paulinus; [279](#) Prudentius in a hymn on St. Laurence and Procopious in a book on the buildings of Justinian. Certainly, they all lived before the times of Antichrist, and still they witness that in each age their

buildings were full of the ornaments of Christians, as we see these now, and they are beyond compare.

“Seventh, Daniel says that Antichrist will enrich his friends; the Pope has done that.”

Clearly he so enriched John of Eck, John Cochlaeus, John Fisher of Rochester, Latomus, Driedo, Tapper, Pedro de Soto and so many other learned men, who, although they labored for days and nights to refute the frenzies of our adversaries, still, they received not even a penny from the Roman Pontiff. Although they expected no reward from men, they labored chiefly for the glory of God. But if the Roman Pontiff allots priestly opulence to Cardinals and Bishops, it is not as much that he believes they must be enriched as the piety of the faithful, who donate wealth to this purpose.

Illyricus continues: “Paul places five marks of Antichrist in 2 Thessalonians II. 1) That he will sit in the temple of God. The Pope does this. He, by styling himself vicar of Christ, reigns over the consciences of men. For if he were to profess that he is the enemy of Christ, as the Mohammadans, he would be outside the Church.”

But Paul does not only say Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of God (for every Bishop sits in the temple of God) but he explains in what manner he is going to sit in the temple, showing himself *hoti estin Theos*. The Pope, on the other hand, by Illyricus’ own testimony, makes himself the vicar of God, not God himself. A vicar of God cannot be God unless he would fabricate lesser gods as well as greater ones. Thereupon, I ask, if the Pope is not outside the Church, as he says in this passage, and hence is within the Church, where, I ask, is Illyricus with his own? Is he outside the Church? For the Church is one, and the Pope sits in it. He who is not in it, is in no Church at all. But let us hear the rest.

“2) The fact that Paul says that now a great mystery is worked: I think it looks to the fact that the Bishop of Rome, a little later, would begin to raise his head above that of others.”

Without a doubt, as we wrote briefly above, following Nicholas Sanders who had already seen and written this very thing, Illyricus would make St. Peter the Antichrist, but Simon Magus or Nero Christ. For Paul did not say the mystery of iniquity will be worked a little later, but was being worked in his time. Why, if this mystery pertains to the Roman Pontiff, is it necessary to pertain to St. Peter, and if St. Peter, (the mind shudders to think and the

hand fears to write) was the Antichrist, who does not see that Simon Magus and Nero, the enemies of St. Peter were Christ and God? Let Illyricus have Gods and Christs of this sort for himself, we will not envy him.

“3) What Paul says, that Antichrist is going to come with characteristic lies, which the Pope has done, as experience witnesses.

4) That God will permit the efficacy of illusion: this manifestly happens in the Papacy. For by far we believed the Pope more strongly than God.”

We have already treated on the miracles of Antichrist above (chapter 15) and what Illyricus says is “from experience” is a very impudent lie. The Popes have never done either true or false miracles (not in this age nor in a previous one), whereby Antichrist is said to principally rule. What he adds on the efficacy of illusion, anyone should see how easily this has been twisted into an adverse meaning. What greater efficacy of illusion can be contrived than that in our time some are discovered who prefer to trust two or three apostates than the universal Church, all Councils and all the Fathers, who apart from admirable doctrine and outstanding sanctity of life, are glorified with many miracles?

Moreover, what Illyricus advances in his fifth mark from St. Ambrose, was refuted above in the second proof in which we showed that Antichrist has not yet come.

Lastly, Illyricus adds a little from the epistle to Timothy: “In the last times many will leave the faith. [280](#) The Pope denies there is another faith apart from the historic one. They attend impostor spirits; the Pope proves all things by visions of spirits and souls. They forbid marriage, the use of food, each of these from the Pope is very true and well known.”

But, my good man, the Pope learned there is one faith from Paul, you seem to have learned from there something besides one faith; The Apostle says to the Ephesians: “One God, one faith, one baptism.” [281](#) Paul never defined this one faith as a trust resting upon the promise and word of God, as you define it. [282](#) But he said to the Romans: “This is the word of faith which we preach, because if you shall confess the Lord Jesus in your mouth and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved.” [283](#) He also said to the Hebrews: “By faith we believe the world was arranged by the word of God.” [284](#)

Who does not know that it pertains to sacred history that Christ rose from the dead and the ages are suited to the word of God? Still, we do not call the one, only and true faith with which we certainly believe whatever

God deigned to reveal by the Apostles and Prophets historic faith, but Catholic faith. For we leave novelties of names to our adversaries.

What he adds, that the Pope proves all things by visions of spirits and souls, I do not know what spirit revealed to him. For to confirm those things which pertain to the state of souls, we apply something from apparitions of souls and from the approved writings of ancient authors. Such is what Eusebius writes on the apparition of St. Potamina [285](#) and that which St. Augustine relates on the apparition of St. Felix Nolan. [286](#) On the other hand, I do not know who ever advanced visions of Catholic souls to prove dogmas. But that is not his first lie.

What he advances in the last place on the prohibition of foods and spouses, is easily refuted by St. Augustine: “So, again, if you were to encourage virginity just as the apostolic doctrine does, ‘He who gives in marriage does well, and he who gives not in marriage does better;’ if you taught that marriage is good, and virginity better, as the Church teaches (which is truly Christ’s Church), the Holy Spirit would not have heralded you as forbidding marriage. What a man forbids he says is evil, but he does not do so when he places something better before a good. . . . You see, then, that there is a great difference between exhorting to virginity by proposing it as the better of two good things, and forbidding to marry by denouncing the true purpose of marriage; between abstaining from food as a symbolic observance, or for the mortification of the body, and abstaining from food which God has created for the reason that God did not create it. In one case, we have the doctrine of the prophets and apostles; in the other, the doctrine of lying devils.” [287](#) It is not necessary to add anything.

Illyricus concludes: “Therefore, it is certain from these clear signs that the Pope is himself the true Antichrist, about whom the Scriptures prophecy.”

But perhaps he would more suitably conclude in this way: Therefore it is certain from these clear lies, that Illyricus is one of his precursors, whom the Holy Prophet Daniel long ago foretold would have an impudent mouth.

CHAPTER XXII: That the Pope is Truly a Bishop

IT only remains that we prove what we had proposed in the last place, that the Roman Pontiff is not only not Antichrist, but that he has not lost his pontificate in any way. Calvin attempts to show by means of a certain conjecture that today he is not a true bishop, saying: “I should like to know what quality of a bishop the Pope himself might have? 1) The office of a bishop is to instruct the people in the word of God; 2) The next is to administer the sacraments 3) admonish and exhort, to correct those who are in fault and restrain the people by whole discipline. Now, which of these things does he do? Nay more, which of these things does he pretend to do? Let them say then, on what ground they will have him to be regarded as a bishop when he does not even resemble any part of the duty with his smallest finger.

“It is not with a bishop as with a king. The latter, if he were not to execute the proper duty of a king nevertheless, he retains the title and the honor. Yet, in judgment about a bishop, the command of Christ is regarded, which ought to always avail in the Church. Let the Papists then untie this knot. I deny that their pontiff is the prince of bishops, seeing that he is no bishop.”

Unless I am mistaken, the whole argument can be reduced to a syllogism. Since there is this difference between a bishop and a king, that the king is the name of a power and a prefecture to which is connected the duty of ruling the people, whereas the Bishop is the name of only an office to minister the word of God and the sacraments, certainly then, if neither king nor bishop exercise their office then the name of king retains its dignity while the name of bishop loses it. Moreover, the Roman Pontiff does not even exercise the episcopal office in any clear manner, seeing that he does not preach the word of God to the people or administer the sacraments; therefore the Roman Pontiff has lost the name and dignity and thus cannot be called a bishop.

I respond: Calvin is either talking about the signification of the name, or about the thing itself when he says that *bishop* is the name of an office, but *king* is the name of a dignity. If the former, then he is clearly deceived, since a bishop is called from the Greek *episkopein*, (to consider or inspect) and it means the duty of overseeing. In the same way a king (*rex*) is called from ruling (*regendo*) and means the office of ruling. Just as king is the name of a magistrate, so also is *episkopos* among the pagans for whom the name meant a magistrate, that is a praetor. [288](#) What is more, the Holy Scripture attributes to a bishop the name of shepherd and king. [289](#)

But if Calvin speaks on the matter itself, then he is no less deceived. Just as royal authority is not a simple office to judge, as a judge of others, but is a true prefecture in political matters (the power to rule men subjected to him by commands and punishments), so also the episcopate is not a simple office to preach, as it is for others who preach yet are not pastors, but is a true Ecclesiastical prefecture that has the power to rule men in spiritual and divine matters—hence to command and punish. We have spoken about that matter and many others above, and we will have much to say elsewhere. For the moment, a few passages will suffice to make the matter crystal clear. The Apostle Paul teaches: “As for the rest, when I come I will distribute it.” [290](#) “Therefore, I write these things being absent because being present I will deal much more severely, according to the power that the Lord has given me.” [291](#) And in Hebrews he says: “Obey those who have been placed over you and be subject to them.” [292](#) Again, in 1 Timothy he says: “Do not receive an accusation against a priest unless it is with two or three witnesses.” [293](#) Besides, it is also false that Popes do not exercise episcopal office. For they are not held to give sermons and minister the sacraments *per se*, if they are impeded by some just cause, rather it is sufficient if they will see to it that these things are done by others. Otherwise bishops would be obliged to do the impossible since there is no place so scanty that a bishop can suffice by himself to preach and minister the sacraments through the whole diocese. Therefore, just as it satisfies if he will preach through another in some place where he cannot be present, so also it satisfies if he will preach in every place through others when there is no way he could be present there. We do not lack the examples of antiquity. Possidius writes that St. Valerius, the Bishop of Hippo commissioned St. Augustine in the duty of preaching when he was still a priest, because being a Greek he could not preach to the people in Latin. [294](#) Possidius also

relates that in the Eastern Church a great many bishops customarily demanded from their priests that they take up the office of preaching which they could not carry out by themselves. Nevertheless we cannot say that either S. Valerian or others who did not preach the word of God themselves were not bishops.

Finis

Soli Deo honor et Gloria,
in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

Footnotes

[1](#)

Instit., lib. 4, ch. 7, § 23.

[2](#)

Ibid., §24.

[3](#)

Ibid.

[4](#)

Ibid., §25.

[5](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, ch. 4, column 434, and in all subsequent books of the centuries.

[6](#)

Beza, *Commentario 2 Thessalon.*, 2.

[7](#)

Chronicum, tabul. 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14.

[8](#)

2 Thessalonians II.

[9](#)

1 John II.

[10](#)

Matt. XXIV.

[11](#)

De Fide, lib. 4, ch. 28.

[12](#)

Quaestione undecima, ad Algasiam.

[13](#)

Psalm 104 (105). We have rendered Christ directly to retain the sense of the original, the term in Greek (Christos) means “anointed”, and thus Jesus, the anointed one, the culmination of every precursor of “anointing” in the Old Testament. -Translator’s note.

[14](#)

1 John II.

[15](#)

Cent. I, lib. 2, ch. 4, colum. 435.

[16](#)

2 Thessalonians II.

[17](#)

1 John IV:3.

[18](#)

John V.

[19](#)

Ambrose on 2 Thessal. II; Jerome, *epist. Ad Algasiam*, quest. 11; Augustine, *Tract. In Joann.*, tract 29; Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.*, lib. 5; Theodoret, *in Epitome divionorum decretorum*, chapter on Antichrist, and others.

[20](#)

Jeremiah XIV.

[21](#)

2 Thessalonians II: 3, 7-8.

[22](#)

To make this clear for those who do not know Greek, the citation is the original for 2 Thessalonians, where a definite article is used for man [*anthrōpos*]. In Greek there is a definite article before every noun, normally if it is not included, it means “a” thing instead of “the” thing, except in the case of a predicate nominative (linking verb) in what is called the attributive position. Therefore, by saying “The man” [*ho anthrōpos*], St. Paul is identifying a specific man, not “a man” in general which he would have done by dropping the article. Lest anyone think this is a weak argument or a semantic point, in the Greek language the poets and dramatists make use of the articles for this very same purpose. -Translator’s note.

23

Irenaeus, lib. 5; Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, ch. 23.

24

Antiochus IV (Epiphanes, i.e. the Illustrious) was the successor of Alexander the Great’s empire in Syria. After losing to the Romans in a war in Egypt he retired to Syria and began the persecution of the Jews which lead to their uprising recorded in the books of the Maccabees in the Bible. - Translator’s note.

25

Cyprian, *de exhortations martyrii*, ch. 11; Jerome in Daniel 11 and 12.

26

See Irenaeus, lib. 5 near the end. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesi* 15. Chrysostom, in 2 *Thessal. II*; Theodoret, *hist.*, ch. 11; Ambrose in *cap. 21 Lucae*; Jerome, in *cap. 7 Danielis et quaest. 11 ad Algasiam*; Augustine, *de civitate Dei*, lib. 21, for many chapters, and in *Psalm 9*; Gregory, *Moral.*, lib. 32, ch. 12; Damascene, lib. 4, ch. 28; and Hippolytus the Martyr, in *oratione de consummatione mundi*.

27

Ad Algasiam, quaest. 11.

28

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 19.

29

Irenaeus, lib. 3, ch. 3.

30

Matthew XVII.

31

Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylactus and Oecumenius. Additionally, St. Augustine in *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, ch. 19.

32

Metonym is a linguistic device in classical languages such as Greek and Latin to use a name associated with a certain subject to indicate people carried out a verb in relation to it. Common examples would be “We were busy with Mercury” which would mean we transacted business, because Mercury is the god of commerce, or in the Aeneid book IV it speaks of the keels of the ships to mean the ships themselves. Thus calling Antichrist Apostasy is to mean there will be a great Apostasy. -Translator’s note.

33

Ambrose, Sedulius and Primasius.

34

Lib. 3, epist. 1.

35

Lib. 4, epistle 6.

36

Epistola ad Ageruchiam de Monogamia.

37

Lib. 4, epistle 38.

38

Homil. 1 in Evangelia.

39

Diviarum institutionum, lib. 7, ch. 25.

40

De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, ch. 53.

41

See the Chronicle of Matthew Palmeri, and Platina in *vita Paschalis II*.

42

Justin, q. 71 *ad Gentes*; Irenaeus *adv. Haer.*, lib. 5; Lactantius, lib. 7, ch. 14; Hilary on ch. 17 of St. Matthew; Jerome in Ps. 89 to Cyprian.

43

Ambrose in *Lucam*, lib. 7, ch. 2.

44

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 7.

[45](#)

See Augustine, Epistle 80 *ad Hesychium*, in Psalm 89, and *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 18, ch. 53.

[46](#)

2 Thess. II.

[47](#)

Luke I.

[48](#)

Psalm LXXI.

[49](#)

Decadis Primae Historiarum, lib. 1, ab Inclinatione Romani Imperii.

[50](#)

Cent. 6, ch. 1.

[51](#)

De Viduis.

[52](#)

Lib. 2 epist. 8 ad Fuastum de obitu sororis.

[53](#)

Chronicum, tab. 11 & 13. ,

[54](#)

Cent. 8, ch. 10.

[55](#)

Cent. 9, ch. 10.

[56](#)

St. John Damascene, *De Fide*, lib. 4, ch. 28.

[57](#)

Chapter 12.

[58](#)

Bernard, serm. 6, in Ps. 90.

[59](#)

Matthew XXIV: 14.

[60](#)

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesi* 15; Theodoret in 2 Thessal. II; Damascene *de fide*, lib. 4, ch. 28; as well as many others.

[61](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 8 & 19.

[62](#)

Origen, *homil. 28 in Matthaeum*.

[63](#)

Ruffinus, *Hist.*, lib.. 10, ch. 9.

[64](#)

Epistle 80.

[65](#)

Cent. 9, ch. 2, col. 15 & 18.; *Cent 10*, ch. 2, column 18 & 19.

[66](#)

Romans X.

[67](#)

Collosians I: 6.

[68](#)

Epistle 80 to Hesychius.

[69](#)

Psalm. LXXI.

[70](#)

Although this is an attempt to interpret prophecy on Bellarmine's part combined with history it is not, strictly speaking, impossible even after the revolutions of the 18th and 19th century as there are still kings over England, the Netherlands, Spain and a few other areas once controlled by the Romans. -Translator's note.

[71](#)

Adv. Haere., lib. 5.

[72](#)

Apocalypse XVII: 1-5.

[73](#)

Catechesis 15.

[74](#)

Apologeticus, ch. 32.

[75](#)

Lib. 7, ch. 15.

[76](#)

Quaest. 11 ad Algasiam.

[77](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib.. 20, ch. 19.

[78](#)

Rerum Romanarum, lib. 23.

[79](#)

Chronicum, for the year 810.

[80](#)

Hist., lib. 5, ch. 31.

[81](#)

In this place it is worth noting that Greek Orthodox apologists often reject this and claim Charlemagne usurped the title. Modern research, however, bears out what Bellarmine is saying. Dimitri Vasilev, in his work *The Byzantine Empire*, notes that Charlemagne had proposed marriage to the Empress Irene was honored by her and a subsequent Emperor who acknowledged him as Emperor of the West. -Translator's note.

[82](#)

See Illyricus, *Contra primatum Papae*; *Centur.* 8, ch. 10, col. 751; Chytraeum, in *Apocalyps.*, ch. 13.

[83](#)

De civit. Dei, lib. 20, cap 29.

[84](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 17.

[85](#)

In cap. ult Malachiae.

[86](#)

Tracta. 4 in Ioannem.

[87](#)

In cap. 11 Apocalypsis.

[88](#)

Lib. 4, capite 28.

[89](#)

In oratione de mundi consummatione.

[90](#)

Moralium, lib. 21 36 & lib. 9 cap. 4.

[91](#)

Genes. ad litteram, lib. 9, cap. 6.

[92](#)

In cap. 5 Genes.

[93](#)

Hebrews XI.

[94](#)

Lib. 5.

[95](#)

Contra Iudaeos, cap 1 de Henoch.

[96](#)

In Ancorato.

[97](#)

De peccato Originali, cap. 23.

[98](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 8&9.

[99](#)

From the pagan side, see Cornelius Tacitus on Nero, and from our side Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.

[100](#)

Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, lib. 8 cap. 6.

[101](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[102](#)

Daniel VII and XII.

[103](#)

Apocalypse XII.

[104](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 15, cap. 14.

[105](#)

In cap. 11 & 13 Apocalypsis.

[106](#)

2 Thess. II.

[107](#)

Sermon 46 in Apocalypsim.

[108](#)

Cent. I, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 438.

[109](#)

Lib. 5, towards the end.

[110](#)

In Danielis, cap. 7.

[111](#)

Catechesis, 25.

[112](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 23.

[113](#)

Apocalypse XII.

[114](#)

Apocalypse XX.

[115](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20.

[116](#)

Morales lib. 33, cap. 12.

[117](#)

Matthew XXIV.

[118](#)

The Romans had a purifying ceremony every 5 years (*lustrum*) and the word was used as a term for a period of 5 years. -Translator's note.

[119](#)

In the Old Testament, a Shemita (Jubilaeus) or Jubilee was every 50 years, and here would be used to denote a 50 year period. -Translator's note.

[120](#)

Loc. Cit.

[121](#)

Ezechial IV.

[122](#)

Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, in Ioanne.

[123](#)

Daniel VII.

[124](#)

Apocalypse XX.

[125](#)

2 Thessalonians II.

[126](#)

Lib. 5.

[127](#)

De Resurrectione.

[128](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[129](#)

Apocalypse XIII.

[130](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4.

[131](#)

Liber 4, cap. 28.

[132](#)

Tabul. 10.

[133](#)

3 Kings (1 Kings) X.

[134](#)

Lib. 5, cap. 30, 3.

[135](#)

Irenaeus, lib. 4, cap. 43.

[136](#)

Serm. 61, in Apocalypsim.

[137](#)

Chronicus, tab. 10.

[138](#)

De Resurrectione Carnis.

[139](#)

Lib. 1, epist. 12.

[140](#)

Tractatus in Joannem, 118.

[141](#)

Epistola 162.

[142](#)

De obitu Satyri.

[143](#)

De Persecutione Wandalica, lib. 1.

[144](#)

Lib. 10, epist. 31.

[145](#)

De Haeres., cap. 53.

[146](#)

De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3, cap. 12.

[147](#)

Apocalypse XIII:17. We have revised the Greek text Bellarmine made use of (where three printers errors were found) with the 1904 Nestle-Aland. - Translator's note.

[148](#)

Epist. 3 ad Volusianum.

[149](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 15, cap. 23.

[150](#)

Jerome, *in Daniel.*, cap. 7; Bede, *in Apocal.*, cap. 13; Damascene, lib. 4, cap. 28.

[151](#)

Sacrae Historiae, lib. 2.

[152](#)

Dialogus de virtutibus, lib. 2.

[153](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[154](#)

Lib. 4, cap. 28.

[155](#)

Irenaeus lib. 5; Hippolytus *in oratione de mundi consummatione.*; Ambrose, *de Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*, cap. 7; Augustine *in Iosue*, quaest. 22; Prosper of Aquitaine *de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, pars 4; Theodoret, *in Genesin.*, quest. 109; Gregory *Moralium*, lib. 31, cap. 18; Bede, Rupert, and Anselm, *in Apocal.*, cap. 7.

[156](#)

Jerome, *in Hieremia.*

[157](#)

2 Thessal. II.

[158](#)

Quaest. 11, ad Algasiam.

[159](#)

Irenaeus, liber 5; Hippolytus *in oratione de consummatione mundi*;
Theodoret in *Epitome divinorum decretorum*, capite de Antichristo;
Sulpitius ex B. Martino, *libro 2, Dialogi*; Cyril *Catechesi* 15; Hillary, *in
Matthaeum*, can. 25; Ambrose *in Lucam* lib 10, caput 21; Chrysostom,
Augustine, and Cyril of Alexandria, in chapter 5 of John; Gregory
Moralium, lib. 31; cap. 10; Damascene lib. 4, cap. 28.

[160](#)

Found in Sulpitius, *Dialog.*, lib. 2.

[161](#)

Catechesis 15.

[162](#)

Liber II, epist. 3.

[163](#)

Daniel IX.

[164](#)

Quaest. 11 ad Algasiam.

[165](#)

Melancthon, *in apologia confes. Augustanae*, art. 6; Calvin, *Instit.*, lib. 4,
cap. 2 § 12, and cap. 7 § 25; Illyricus, *Cent.* 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[166](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 1, § 2.

[167](#)

Lib. 4, cap. 2, § 11-12.

[168](#)

Matthew XVI: 18.

[169](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 15.

[170](#)

Ibid, cap. 17.

[171](#)

Lib. 5.

[172](#)

2 Thessalonians II.

[173](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[174](#)

Ep. Ad Riparium.

[175](#)

Lib. 5.

[176](#)

Catechesi 15.

[177](#)

In cap. 21 Lucae.

[178](#)

lib. 4, cap. 28.

[179](#)

Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, cap. 19; Jerome, Quaest. 11 ad Algasiam.

[180](#)

In Ps. 26.

[181](#)

Lib. Contra Judaeos; contra Marcionem, lib. 3.

[182](#)

Loc. Cit.

[183](#)

Praescriptionibus contra haereticos.

[184](#)

Acts III; The ninth hour is 3pm. -Translator's note.

[185](#)

1 John II:22.

[186](#)

John V:43.

[187](#)

2 Thessalonians II:4.

[188](#)

Ibid.

[189](#)

Daniel XI.

[190](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 7, § 25.

[191](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[192](#)

Daniel XI.

[193](#)

De Trinitate, lib. 6.

[194](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 8.

[195](#)

John V:43.

[196](#)

In Caput 21 Lucae.

[197](#)

In 2 Thess. II.

[198](#)

Catechesi, 15.

[199](#)

Homil. 40.

[200](#)

Wisdom XV:17.

[201](#)

Loc. Cit.

[202](#)

Catech., 15.

[203](#)

Lib. 1, cap. 20.

[204](#)

Moral., lib. 32, cap. 12.

[205](#)

Catechesis 15.

[206](#)

Apocalypse XIII:14-15.

[207](#)

Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Richardus, Rupertus and Anselm interpreting
Apocalypse XIII.

[208](#)

Lib. XI, epist. 3.

[209](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, co. 436.

[210](#)

Dialog. Lib. 4, cap. 40.

[211](#)

Ibid, lib. 4, cap. 55.

[212](#)

Hist. Eccl., lib. 7, cap. 14.

[213](#)

Theodoret, lib. 8 *ad Graecos*, which is on the Martyrs.

[214](#)

Daniel XI:21.

[215](#)

Epistle 162.

[216](#)

De vocatione Gentium, liber 2, cap. 6.

[217](#)

Irenaeus, lib. 5; Lactantius, lib. 7, cap. 16; Theodoret in cap. 7 et 11 Danielis.

[218](#)

Lactantius, lib. 7, cap. 16; Irenaeus, lib. 5.

[219](#)

Catechisis 15.

[220](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[221](#)

Contra Judaeos, lib. 5, cap. 12.

[222](#)

Isaiah LIII.

[223](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 24-26.

[224](#)

Hist., lib. 3, last chapter.

[225](#)

Matthew XXIV.

[226](#)

This opinion, common in some of the early Fathers, is called Chiliasm, or Millenarianism, and today, under a different form, the “Rapture”. The early Fathers treat it as an opinion, and the later Fathers universally reject it, as do all later Theologians. It appears to originate first in the early Father Papias. -Translator’s note.

[227](#)

Chronologia, tab. 14.

[228](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, cap. 45.

[229](#)

See William of Tyre, *de bello sacro*, lib. 6; Paulus Aemilius, *de rebus Francorum*, lib. 4.

[230](#)

De Consideratione, lib. 2.

[231](#)

Vita B. Bernardi, lib. 2, cap. 4.

[232](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[233](#)

De fide, lib. 2, cap. ult.

[234](#)

Quaest. Hebraicis in Gen., cap. 10.

[235](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. XX, cap. 11.

[236](#)

Antiquit., lib. 1, cap. 11.

[237](#)

Quaest. Hebraicis in Genes., cap. 10.

[238](#)

Sent., lib. 4, dist. 46, q. 1, arctic. 1.

[239](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[240](#)

Lacelotto Politi, a Dominican canon lawyer. -Translator’s note.

[241](#)

This is the Hebrew word as in the Ingolstadt and subsequent editions of the *Controversies*, but it is misspelled and we have not been able to discover the Hebrew word that Bellarmine intended. -Translator's note.

[242](#)

See the books of Cassian in the Institutes, and the Constitutions of St. Basil.

[243](#)

Serm. 34.

[244](#)

John XXI.

[245](#)

Luke XII:42.

[246](#)

Luke XII:45-46.

[247](#)

Sess. 6, ca. 5-8

[248](#)

Isaiah XXXIII:22.

[249](#)

James IV:12.

[250](#)

Proverbs VIII.

[251](#)

Psalms 2.

[252](#)

John I:33.

[253](#)

St. John Chrysostom, homil. 83 in Matth.

[254](#)

Acts XV:11.

[255](#)

1 Tim. II.

[256](#)

Quaest. 149 in *Exodum*.

[257](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. XXI, cap. 27.

[258](#)

Luke XVI:9.

[259](#)

Leo I, *serm. 1 de natali Apostolorum*, Bellarmine's emphasis.

[260](#)

1 Corinth. IX:22.

[261](#)

Jude I:22-23.

[262](#)

Romans XV:31.

[263](#)

Dist. 40, *si Papa*.

[264](#)

Luther, in a preface to the history that happened in Stasfort, in the year 36.

[265](#)

Serm. 1 de natali Apostolorum.

[266](#)

Liber *de ingratis*.

[267](#)

Comment. huius loci.

[268](#)

Hist. Eccles., lib. 9, cap. 10.

[269](#)

Catechesi 14.

[270](#)

Vita Constantini, lib. 3 et 4.

[271](#)

In oratione de sancto Martyre Theodoro.

[272](#)

Orat. 1 in Iulianum.

[273](#)

Hom. 66 ad populum Antiochenum.

[274](#)

De recta fide ad reginas.

[275](#)

Vita Sylvestri.

[276](#)

De officiis, lib. 2, cap. 21.

[277](#)

In comment. cap. 8 Zachariah.

[278](#)

In Psalm 113.

[279](#)

Natali tertio Sancti Felicis.

[280](#)

I Timothy IV:1.

[281](#)

Ephesians IV:5.

[282](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 262.

[283](#)

Romans X:9.

[284](#)

Hebrews XI:3.

[285](#)

Hist. Ecclesi. lib. 6, cap. 5.

[286](#)

Lib. *de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 16.

[287](#)

Contra Faustum, lib. 30, cap. 6.

[288](#)

Aristophanes, *Birds*.

[289](#)

Isaiah XLIV; Ephes. IV.

[290](#)

1 Cor. 11.

[291](#)

2 Cor. 13.

[292](#)

Hebrews XIII.

[293](#)

1 Timot. V.

[294](#)

Vita S. Augustini.

ON Purgatory

Contents

ON PURGATORY

BOOK I: ON THE EXISTENCE OF PURGATORY

CHAPTER I: *On the word “Purgatory”*

CHAPTER II: *On the Errors Concerning Purgatory*

CHAPTER III: *Purgatory is Proven from the Scriptures of the Old Testament*

CHAPTER IV: *Purgatory is Proven from the New Testament*

CHAPTER V: *1 Corinthians 3:15*

CHAPTER VI: *1 Corinthians 15:29*

CHAPTER VII: *Matthew 5:25 and Luke 12:58*

CHAPTER VIII: *Matthew 5:22, Luke 16:9, Luke 23:42, Acts 2:24 and Philippians 2:10.*

CHAPTER IX: *Purgatory is Asserted in the Testimonies of Councils*

CHAPTER X: *Purgatory is Asserted in the Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers*

CHAPTER XI: *The Same is Asserted from Reason*

CHAPTER XII: *Arguments from the Scriptures are Answered*

CHAPTER XIII: *Objections from the Fathers are Answered*

CHAPTER XIV: *Answer to Objections Raised from Reason*

CHAPTER XV: *The Confession of Purgatory Pertains to the Catholic Faith*

BOOK II: ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF PURGATORY

CHAPTER I: *On the Persons for whom Purgatory is Suited*

CHAPTER II: *In Purgatory, Souls can Neither Gain Merit nor Sin*

CHAPTER III: *Objections are Answered*

CHAPTER IV: *The souls in Purgatory are Certain about their Eternal Salvation*

CHAPTER V: *Objections Made from the Prayers of the Church are Answered*

CHAPTER VI: *On the Location of Purgatory*

CHAPTER VII: *Whether after this Life, There is Some Place for Just Souls apart from Heaven and Purgatory*

CHAPTER VIII: *Whether Souls of the Dead might Avail to Leave their Receptacles*

CHAPTER IX: *On the Time in which Purgatory Endures*

CHAPTER X: *What Kind of Punishment is in Purgatory?*

CHAPTER XI: *The Fire of Purgatory is Corporeal*

CHAPTER XII: *It Cannot be Known how Corporeal Fire Burns Souls*

CHAPTER XIII: *Whether Souls in Purgatory are Tortured by Demons*

CHAPTER XIV: *On the Gravity of Punishments*

CHAPTER XV: *The Suffrage of the Church Benefits the Dead*

CHAPTER XVI: *How many Kinds of Suffrage are there?*

CHAPTER XVII: *Who can Assist Souls*

CHAPTER XVIII: *Who Benefits from Suffrage?*

CHAPTER XIX: *On Funerals*

ON PURGATORY

ST. ROBERT BELLARMINE, S.J.
Doctor of the Church

Translated from the Latin by
Ryan Grant

MEDIATRIX PRESS
MMXVII
www.mediatrixpress.com

Copyright Information

ISBN-13: 978-1976108679

ISBN-10: 1976108675

© Ryan Grant, 2017

All Rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced without the express permission of the publisher, except for educational purposes of a Church, reviews, or citations.

Cover art: *Purgatory*, by Annibale Carracci

Mediatrix Press

607 E. 6th Ave Ste. 230

Post Falls, ID 83854

<http://www.mediatrixpress.com>

PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR

ITHERTO we have made our dissertation on the part of the Church which is on earth: Now we must dispute on that which abides within the earth; then we will dispute lastly on that part of the Church which reigns in heaven; and because the faithful who have already died but are not yet among the blessed abide within the earth, although their body and soul are in different places, so first we will speak about the place of souls, secondly on the place of the bodies, that is, on burial.

But before we come to the questions, we must preface three things. 1) What we understand in this place by the name of Purgatory; 2) What errors there are about Purgatory; 3) In what order this disputation should be explained.

Moreover, there are many that have written on Purgatory. John Fisher of Rochester against the articles of Luther; John Eck (lib. 4 *de Purgatorio*); John Bunderius in his *Compendium*, tit. 18; Joannes Garetius (libro de oratione pro defunctis); Jacobus Latomus in explicatione arctic. sexti Lovaniensium; Jodocus Clichtovaeus in libro de Purgatorio; Bernard Lutzenburg, lib. unico de Purgatorio; Alphonsus de Castro, *verbo Purgatorium*; Martin Persius Aiala de traditionibus; Claudius Coussord contra Waldenses; Cajetan tomo 1. tract. 2, 3, et 24; Francis Orantius, libro 4 de locis Catholicis; Hugo Etherianus de regressu animarum ab inferis; Catharinus libro de veritate Purgatorii.

BOOK I: ON THE EXISTENCE OF PURGATORY

CHAPTER I: *On the word “Purgatory”*

IN Scripture we find three passages to which a purgation of sinners is attributed, and they can be called purgatories. 1) Christ himself, about whom Hebrews 1:3 says: “making purgation for sinners.” and John 1:29, “Behold the lamb of God, behold he who takes away the sins of the world.” Yet, we do not say this is about Purgatory, both because Christ is not usually called a “Purgatory” and because it is beyond controversy that he is the one who purges sins.

2) The tribulations of this life, on which it seems Malachi must be understood literally, “He is like a refining fire, and the fuller’s herb; he will sit refining and cleansing the silver, and he will purge the sons of Levi and will refine them just like gold and silver.” (Malachi 3:2-3). For, as St. Jerome rightly explains, here it is a question of the tribulation which precedes the day of judgment to purge the sins of the faithful, and John 15:2 says, “Every vine not bearing fruit will be cut down and every one that bears fruit, he will cleanse that it should offer the fruit.” Yet we do not say this is about Purgatory, both because it is beyond controversy and also because the tribulation of this life is not always a purgatory. For there are many just men that are afflicted, not that they be purged, but that they should be cultivated and proved according to the saying of Sirach 27:6, “The furnace proves vessels of clay, just as tribulation the just man.” And many unjust are afflicted, not that they be purged, but that they should begin to taste the punishments of damnation.

Therefore, 3) Purgatory is called a certain place in which, like a prison, souls which were not fully purged here on earth are purged after this life, that so purged they may undoubtedly avail to enter heaven, in which nothing tainted will enter. On this is the whole controversy.

CHAPTER II: *On the Errors Concerning Purgatory*

HERE were many errors on Purgatory which contradict each other. First of all, are those who were against Purgatory. It seems that the heretic Aërius was such, as Epiphanius (*haer.* 75), and Augustine (*haer.* 53) witness since he taught that one must not pray for the dead. Hence it follows, that they either do not need prayers or cannot be helped, and both of these oppose Purgatory, at least in the mode of its existence which is posited by the Church.

Moreover, the Waldensians denied Purgatory, as Guido the Carmelite relates (*Summa de haereticis*) as well as St. Antoninus (4 *parte*, tit. II, cap. 7, §2, *summae Theologiae*).

The Apostolics taught the same thing, as St. Bernard relates (serm. 66 in *Cantica*) and perhaps the Waldensians are the offspring of the Apostolics; for they agree in the errors that are attributed to them and they were near to each other in time. The sect of the Waldensians arose around 1160 AD, according to the *Chronicle* of Trithemius, or around 1170 according to Guido in his *summa* (c. 1), and Reynerius, who lived three hundred years ago, and one can see his testimony at the end of the book of Claudius Cussordius against the Waldensians. Moreover, the Apostolics are a little earlier, since they began in the times of St. Bernard, who died in the year 1153. That the Waldensians also wanted to be called Apostolics, because they would follow the poverty of the Apostles, is manifest from their history, related by Aemilius (lib. 6 *de gestis Francorum*), and the Abbot of Ursburg in his *Chronicle* for the year 1212.

Henry and Peter Bruis taught the same thing with the Waldensians in the same time, against whom St. Bernard (epist. 240), and Peter the Cluniac (*in epistola ad omnes Episcopos*) wrote.

Later, the Albigenians taught the same thing, and they not only denied Purgatory, but also abolished hell, as St. Antoninus witnesses (4 p.t. II, c. 7, §5).

Bernard of Lutzenburg, in the preface to his book on Purgatory, attributes the same thing to the followers of Wycliffe and Hus, but perhaps falsely, since neither the Council of Constance nor Thomas Waldens attribute any such thing to them, while Aeneas Sylvius, who also numbered this among the errors of the Hussites in his book on the origin of the Bohemians, (chapter 35), seems to have confused Hussites with Waldensians.

The same is attributed to the Armenians and the Greeks by Guido the Carmelite in his *Summa de Haereticis*, and although the Greeks themselves, at the Council of Ferrara (sess. 1), affirmed that they do not deny Purgatory, but only the fire, and think that Purgatory is a dark place and full of labors, still it is credible that the Greeks were at least suspect of this heresy. St. Thomas, in his work *Against the Errors of the Greeks* also refuted this error, and proves that there is a Purgatory, and in the last session of the Council of Florence, the same error was condemned. Nevertheless, in that Council only the errors of the Greeks were condemned, or at least those in which the Greeks were suspect.

At length, Luther and all of his posterity, although divided into different sects, nevertheless agree to abolish Purgatory, although Luther himself was very different. For 1) He plainly admitted Purgatory in a Catholic sense in the Leipzig debate, which is still extant: "I, who firmly believe, nay more dare to say that there is a Purgatory, I am easily persuaded that mention is made of it in Scripture."

The next error does admit Purgatory, but it is mixed with many errors. The first error was that Purgatory cannot be proven from Scripture. The second, that it is not certain that the souls in Purgatory will attain salvation. The third error, is that souls in Purgatory can merit or lose merit. The fourth, that souls in Purgatory sin without pause, while they abhor punishment and seek rest. Fifth, that the souls which are freed by the suffrage of the Church are less happy than if they had made satisfaction by themselves. These five are contained in various articles condemned by Leo, at the end.

The last error simply abolishes Purgatory in regard to suffrage for the dead, and asserts there is no Purgatory after this life, but only in life and in death; for the horror and the punishment of death itself purges if anything remains which must be purged. Luther so taught in his book *On the Abrogation of private Mass*, where he says it is better to deny the whole of

Purgatory than to believe the reference of St. Gregory to apparitions of souls begging for suffrage, and in the book to the Waldensians, *de Eucharistia*: “I also approve of everything [you have said] that when you deny Purgatory, you also deny Masses, vigils, monks, monasteries and whatever is erected by this cheat.”

All the heretics of this time follow the last position. The rigid Lutherans, such as the Centuriators (*Cent.*, I, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 460; *Cent.* 4, cap. 4, col. 304), soft Lutherans, as Melanchthon relates (*in locis ca. de satisfactione*), and Brenz in the Wurtemberg Confession, in the chapter *de Purgatorio*. Likewise, the Zwinglians, as Cochleus relates in the acts of Luther for the year 1526, and Bernard Ochinus in his *Dialogo de Purgatorio*, and Calvin in the *Institutes* (lib. 3, ca. 5, §6), where he says that Purgatory is a deadly fiction of Satan which makes void the cross of Christ, because it inflicts an insupportable contumely on the mercy of God, which undermines and overturns our faith. Peter Martyr, in chapter 3 of 1 Cor. 2, says two things. First, whether there is or is not a Purgatory it is certainly not a dogma of faith. Second, he says it is not probable that Purgatory exists. And then the Trinitarian Anabaptists, in chapter 1 of book 2 from those they recently published in the year 1567, say Luther laid the foundation of the Reformation of the Church when he abolished Purgatory, Masses and like things. The foundation of all the Lutherans is that they abolish satisfaction and the distinction of mortal and venial sin, for after they have posited that foundation, it necessarily follows that there is no Purgatory.

Moreover, they are not lacking, who would so prove Purgatory that they acknowledge no penalties but the purgatories after this life. Origen so thought that it was promised to all impious men and demons that at length they would be saved, as Epiphanius relates in his epistle to John of Jerusalem, and Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, lib. 2, ca. 17), where he adds the opinion of others who acknowledged, not indeed the penalties of demons, but those of all men to be only purgatories. He also says in the same work, book 21, ca. 13, that the same opinion was that of the Platonists: clearly there is no punishment after this life but purgatory, and it was clear from those verses of Virgil in the *Aeneid*:

Blunt not the beams of heav’n and edge of day.
From this coarse mixture of terrestrial parts,

Desire and fear by turns possess their hearts,
And grief, and joy; nor can the groveling mind,
In the dark dungeon of the limbs confin'd,
Assert the native skies, or own its heav'nly kind:
Nor death itself can wholly wash their stains. [1](#)

Although we read another thing in the works of Plato, for in the *Phaedo* as well as in the *Gorgias*, there are three kinds of men who are called to judgment after death. One of these, who lived piously and justly, he says are immediately transferred to the islands of the blessed. The second of these, who committed curable sins, he asserts are punished for a time, until the wickedness is cleansed from them. The third of these, who committed incurable sins, he says are cast into hell to be punished forever, whose punishments benefitted them nothing, but still benefit as an example to others, and Virgil is also not silent about it, for he says:

And bound with burning wires, on spokes of wheels are hung
Unhappy Theseus, doom'd for ever there,
Is fix'd by fate on his eternal chair;
And wretched Phlegyas warns the world with cries
(Could warning make the world more just or wise):
'Learn righteousness, and dread th' avenging deities.' [2](#)

And that is sufficient for these.

The whole disputation is contained in ten headings. 1) We will show there is a Purgatory; 2) That it is held by faith; 3) To what persons it is fitting, whether the just, or all sinners, or only certain ones; 4) On the state of those who are in Purgatory, whether they are certain of salvation; 5) They can neither merit nor lose merit; 6) On the place of Purgatory; 7) On the time in which it endures; 8) On the punishment itself, what kind it might be and upon whom it is inflicted; 9) On the remedy for punishment; 10) On the burial of bodies.

CHAPTER III: *Purgatory is Proven from the Scriptures of the Old Testament*

HEREFORE, we will prove that there is a Purgatory by five types of arguments. We will bring forward firstly the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Secondly, the Scriptures of the New Testament. Thirdly Councils. Fourthly the Fathers. Fifthly reasons, and then at length we will answer the opposing arguments. The first passage is contained in 2 Maccabees 12, where after the Scripture says that Judas Machabaeus sent 12,000 silver drachmas to Jerusalem for sacrifices to be offered for the dead, it adds: “Therefore it is a holy and beneficial thought to pray for the dead, that their sins would be forgiven.”

Hence it follows: 1) After this life the dead can have their sins forgiven and so there is Purgatory. 2) The sacrifices and prayers of the living benefit the dead. 3) Not all the remnants of sins are expiated in death, as Luther says, since those for whom he commanded prayers to be offered died a violent death, and for religion; nevertheless Judas still believed they were not fully cleansed; 4) a man can die in a holy and pious manner and still have some debt to pay, either on account of venial sins that were not remitted in this life or on account of incomplete satisfaction for mortal sins that were forgiven, as the Scripture says about all those for whose sins Judas commanded prayers to be offered, when he obtained their rest by piety; 5) This is *de fide*.

To this passage our adversaries respond in several ways. *First*, they say this book is not canonical since the author himself seeks forgiveness if he has erred in anything. “Therefore,” Brenz says, “pardon is at length his because he erred when he praised patronage for the dead.”

Secondly, at least this part (verse 44) cannot be canonical (thinking about the resurrection in a holy and pious manner, for unless those who fell hoped that they would rise from the dead, it seems vain and superfluous to pray for the dead), for it contains a discovered error, namely that souls die and rise again with the bodies, otherwise it would not be vain and superfluous to pray for the dead, even if they would not rise again. Ochinus adds, from this very clause purgatory can be abolished, for if there were a purgatory, but no

resurrection of the dead, still it would not be vain to pray for the dead because the prayer would benefit them unto liberation from the punishments of Purgatory.

Thirdly, because that conclusion: “Therefore, the thought is holy and beneficial, etc.” does not seem to fit the historian, and perhaps it was some marginal annotation and from there was violently intruded into the text.

Fourthly, because no mention is made in this Scripture of purgatory, but only of the resurrection. It is said that Judas commanded them to pray for the dead while thinking about the resurrection in a holy and pious manner.

Fifthly, because Judas commanded sacrifices and prayers be offered for those whom it is certain died in mortal sin, since we have in the same place that certain things from votive offerings of idols were found under the tunics of those that were slain, which they took against the express prohibition of Deuteronomy 7: “They found,” it says, “under the tunics of the slain the votive offerings of idols, of Jamnia, which the law forbade to the Jews.” The fact was made manifest to all, and this is why they came to ruin, therefore what Judas did was either superstitious, or they did not pray so as to help their souls, but merely to console themselves.

Sixthly, because it does not follow that because prayer and sacrifice was made for the dead that therefore they were in Purgatory; those they were praying for could have been in hell, and those that prayed could have offered prayer and sacrifice so as to show their feelings of respect and remembrance toward them, and to console themselves.

Seventhly, because that Scripture does not advance some law or decree, but merely the example of one man, we are not held to imitate it, since by no means can we imitate all the examples of the Scriptures. Nor does the fact that Judas’ example is praised in this passage counter this argument, since in the same book the example of Razias is praised, who killed himself (2 Macc. 14:42).

I say to the *first*, the book of Maccabees is not canonical with the Jews, but it is with the Christians. Accordingly, the universal Church reads this book in Mass and read it in former times, as is clear from the epistle of Peter of Cluny against the Petrobrusians, notwithstanding that it was forbidden in the third Council of Carthage (c. 47) for any book to be read in the Church under the name of the divine books unless they were canonical. Besides, the same canon of that Council numbers the book of Maccabees among the divine books, as well as the epistle of Innocent I to Exuperius,

and from the fathers, St. Augustine in his *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 18, ch. 36, where he says: “The books of the Maccabees are not held for canonical by the Jews, but by the Church.”

From such testimonies that most impudent lie of Ochinus is refuted, who, in his dialogue on Purgatory, says: “They are apocryphal, from Laodicea and manifested in an African Council, and out of all the sacred doctors who enumerated the catalog of the Sacred books, they make no mention of Maccabees.” Anyone that has read the Third Council of Carthage, which Ochinus calls “an African Council” will know how openly he lies, and besides this, Pope Innocent I in the place we cited, as well as St. Augustine in book 2 of *de doctrina Christiana*, Gelasius in the decree of the canonical books which he published in a Council of seventy Bishops; Isidore in book 6 *etymolog.* c. 1, and other fathers in the places we cited in *de Verbo Dei*, lib. 1 cap. 15.

Peter Martyr responds (on 1 Corinthians, c. 3) citing Augustine, that the Church itself received this book into the Canon, not of those books which avail to confirm doctrines, but of those which avail for the building up of morals, and he proves it because Augustine, in book 2 against the epistle of Gaudentius, c. 23, says this book is not of equal authority with the law, the prophets, and the Psalms, but it was still useful if read soberly. Likewise, Cyprian says in his exposition of the Creed that these books do not avail to prove doctrines.

But the Pseudomartyr is deceitful in his use of St. Augustine, since the holy doctor so thought this book availed to confirm dogmas that in book 1, ch. 1 *de Cura pro Mortuis*, he seeks his argument from this book alone to prove that one must pray for the dead and that it is a dogma of faith. He teaches the same when in his book *de haeresibus*, c. 52, he places Aërius in the number of the heretics because he denied that prayers could be made for the dead. In his book against Gaudentius, c. 23, he does not say that the books of the Maccabees are not equal to the Psalms, the Law and the Prophets in the Church, but among the Jews: “And truly the Jews do not hold this Scripture, which is called of the Maccabees, as the Law, and the Prophets and the Psalms, but it has been received by the Church and not without profit, if it is soberly read and listened to.” From this the typical trickery of Peter Martyr is apparent. Moreover, when Augustine says it ought to be soberly read, he does not mean because there are some errors in this book, but because there are some examples related such as some who

killed themselves, and they must not be imitated; in this way even Genesis must be soberly read, lest we might think Judah the Patriarch, who committed incest, must be imitated.

Moreover, the same Peter Martyr was deceived when he adduced Cyprian in place of Ruffinus; that explanation of the Creed is not from Cyprian but Ruffinus, as is clear from the preface, where the author indicates that he is from Aquileia and was baptized as well as educated there, and in the same place he calls to mind the heretic Photinus, who was a hundred years later than Cyprian, and where he enumerates the sacred books, he calls to mind the names of Donatus, Manichaeus, Arius, Eunomius and other heretics who arose after the death of Cyprian. Nor should it be a surprise if Ruffinus did not think these books were canonical, since the books of the Maccabees are from that number over which there was uncertainty for a time even among Catholics, and later they were nevertheless received by the universal Church as truly canonical.

To the first proof I say, the author does not seek pardon for errors but for his style, in the same way that St. Paul excuses himself for inexperience in discourse.

To the *second* I say that the teaching of this book would appear inept, because it misses that among the Jews it was customary at that time to hold that on the resurrection and that on the immortality of souls as the same question, although they are really distinct. For among the Jews, those who denied one, denied the other, *as* the Sadducees, and those who affirmed one also affirmed the other, *as* the Pharisees, as is clear from Acts 23:8. And not without reason, for since the rational soul is the true form of the body, and hence a true part of man, it does not have the appearance of truth that God meant for the soul to live perpetually without the body. Hence, the Lord in Matthew 22:32 proved the resurrection to the Sadducees by using the testimony of Scripture: "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," and he added, "God is not God of the dead, but of the living," from which he meant to argue that the dead rise again.

But this argument concludes nothing unless it is presupposed that the question on the immortality of souls and that on the resurrection of bodies were received for one and the same, for otherwise the consequence can be denied. For God will be God of the living even if the dead do not rise, inasmuch as the souls themselves live. With the same reasoning, the Apostle says, "What good is it if the dead do not rise again? Let us eat, and

drink for tomorrow we will die” (1 Cor. 15:32); unless he presupposes that souls are mortal, if bodies do not rise again, he concludes nothing. For if the soul is immortal, even if the bodies do not rise again, it is very beneficial to fast and to live well, because it is beneficial to acquire the glory of the soul. Therefore, the Scripture of the book of Maccabees speaks altogether in the same mode, in which here St. Paul speaks, and he presupposes the same thing. He means to say, if the dead do not rise, then it follows that souls are mortal and hence it is superfluous and vain to pray for the dead, unless one were to hope in the resurrection.

To the *third*, I say the adverb “therefore”, (*ergo*) is not in the Greek text, for we so read: “εἰ τ’ ἐμβλέπον τοις μετ’ εὐσεβείαν κοιμωμένοις κάλλιστον ἀποκείμενον καριζήριον, ὅσια καὶ εὐσεβῆς ἢ ἐπίνοια, οθεν περὶ τῶν τεθνηκοτῶν τὸν ἐξιλασμὸν ἐποίησατο, τῶς ἁμαρτίας ἀπολυθῆναι, this is: “Then considering, that the best grace is reserved to those who fell asleep in godliness, which was a holy and pious consideration, for that reason he made expiation for the dead, that they would be freed from sin.” Nevertheless, the sense is altogether the same. The Latin reading cannot be rejected unless one were also to reject the Greek. Nor is it unusual for historians sometimes to gather something from events and deeds which pertains to imitation and good morals.

To the *fourth* I say, it is not necessary for there to have been express mention of purgatory, since it is gathered clearly enough from the events which are contained there. For we are not contending about the name, but about the reality. Nor indeed when it is said that Judas bid prayer to be made for the dead, thinking well and religiously about the resurrection, would the sense be that he commanded them to pray for the dead so that they would rise; rather, the sense is that when Judas thought religiously about the future resurrection, and hence souls being immortal, and he feared lest the souls of his slain soldiers, on account of some sin, would be punished in another age, so he commanded prayer and sacrifice to be made for them so that they would be freed from sins as it is expressed at the end of the chapter.

To the *fifth* I say, their sin was either venial, since perhaps they were ignorant of the prohibition of the law, and did not receive those votives in order to honor idols, but only from the lust to enrich themselves, which can be venial; or certainly if it was a mortal sin, those soldiers were sorrowful for their sin at the moment of death, and it was remitted them as to guilt,

according to the saying of Psalm 77(78):34, “When he killed them, they sought him and they turned back”; or at least Judas Machabaeus so thought, otherwise the Scripture would not have said he considered those who fell asleep in godliness to have the best grace reserved for them. I add lastly, at least their state was uncertain, and for that reason it was lawful to pray for them, even if they were damned.

To the sixth I say, our consequent is not: They prayed for them therefore they were in Purgatory; rather they prayed for certain dead men, therefore they thought it could be the case that they were in purgatory, or, that prayer for the sins of the dead is praised in Scripture, therefore there is a Purgatory in another life; for otherwise they made their prayer in vain and the Scripture erred in praising a prayer of this sort. Nevertheless, in this passage prayer for the expiation of sins is praised, and is clearly shown not to have been for human affection; it is clear for two reasons: a) the occasion of this prayer was the sin of those men that had died on whom pagan votive offerings had been found under their clothes, as the history says; b) it is expressly said that Judas sent 12,000 drachmas for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, and below, that it is so that their sins might be forgiven. Add that if there were no Purgatory, it would indeed be permitted to weep so as to show human affection, but not likewise to pray; to what end would one offer prayer for those who either do not need it, or whom it cannot help?

To the seventh, I say the argument is not taken from the example of one man but partly from the ancient and solemn rite of the Church of the Old Testament and partly from the infallible testimony of Sacred Scripture. That this was a solemn rite of the Old Testament Church is proven when it is said in this passage: “All those who were with Juda turned to prayers,” and then: “he took up a collection,” *i.e.* each man gave something, a great deal of money was collected, and sent by Juda in the name of all of them to Jerusalem, for sacrifices for the dead; and this indeed is a great argument; but what is greater, establishing the Catholic faith, is what is taken from the words of Scripture praising the prayer made on behalf of the sins of the dead as holy, pious and religious. Next, the instance in regard to the praise of Razias, who killed himself, does not avail, for as St. Augustine shows (*lib. 2 contra epistolam Gaudentii*, cap. 23), Razias is praised because he acted courageously and bravely, not piously and with holiness, or, if they would have it that the deed is approved by the author of this book, it must

rather be said that Razias had a peculiar inspiration and precept of God to do this just as Samson had (as Augustine witnesses, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 1 cap. 21) than that this author could err.

Apart from this passage there are certain others which only furnish probable arguments, which nevertheless the holy Fathers have used. Therefore, we will briefly note them here.

The second passage is Tobias 4:18, “Lay out your bread and wine upon the burial of a just man and do not eat or drink of them with sinners.” There can be no other sense than that which the exegetes hand down in common, namely: prepare dinner and call the faithful poor so that they, after they have received an alms, might pray for the soul of the dead man. For hence that custom was born, which was once in the Church, and still exists, that the kin of the deceased should have a dinner and also send food and drink to the poor and religious, so that they would pray for the soul of the dead. St. John Chrysostom asks: “Why do you call the poor together after the death of your own? Why do you beg the priests to pray for them?” (Hom. 32 in Matt.). The commentary of Munster does not have any validity, which interprets tombs to be the mouths of the righteous poor because it is written in Psalm 5:11, “their throat is an open sepulcher,” meaning, place your bread in the mouth of the just so that they might not die of hunger. For this explanation is false. *Firstly*, because no scripture calls the mouth of the just a tomb, but only the mouth of the sinner, from where they exhale the stench of their vices. *Secondly*, because Tobias commended the living poor in the same chapter with many words, and then passed over to the commendation of the dead, as is clear in the text.

The third passage is 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 31:13, in the last chapter, where we read that the inhabitants of Jabes Galaad, having heard about the death of Saul, fasted for seven days. And in 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 1:12, David wept and fasted for Saul and Jonathan after they were killed, and he did the same for Abner in 2 Kings 3:35. Although these seem to be done as a sign of sorrow and sadness, nevertheless, it is believable that it was especially done to help the souls of the dead, as Bede explains at the end of his commentary on the first book of Kings, and thus we gather two points from it. 1) It would be unreasonable to fast for seven days as a sign of sorrow; 2) from what David did in 2 Kings 12:20 when he fasted and prayed for his infant son, while he was sick, but later, when he heard it died, he no longer fasted, from which fact he showed that he customarily fasted in order to ask

something of God; therefore, he did not fast after the death of the child because he knew it could not be returned to life and did not need prayers. This is also seen in the solicitude of the patriarchs, who desired to be buried in the promised land (Gen. 47:30 & 50:5), surely that they might be partakers of the prayers and sacrifices which were offered there.

The fourth passage is Psalm 37: “Rebuke me not, O Lord, in your indignation; nor chastise me in your wrath.” Even if these words can be explained differently, nevertheless, St. Augustine so explains them that to be rebuked by God in indignation, means in eternal damnation; to be chastised in wrath, to be severely punished after this life, for correction and emendation. Wherefore, he adds: “In this life, cleanse me, render me such that I shall not need the corrective fire.” In the same way Bede, Haymo, Dionysius the Carthusian, and others explain this passage.

The fifth passage is Psalm 65(66):11, “We passed through fire and water, and you led us into rest.” This passage can also have many senses, nevertheless, Origen (hom. 25 in num.) and St. Ambrose (in Ps. 36 and ser. 3 in Ps. 118) explain by water, Baptism, but by fire, Purgatory: “The latter,” he says, “through water, the former, through fire, through water to wash away sins, through fire that they might be burned.”

The sixth passage is Isaiah 4:4, “The Lord will cleanse the filth of the sons and daughters of Sion, and will cleanse the blood from their midst by the spirit of judgment, and the spirit of burning.” St. Augustine explains this passage to be about Purgatory in *City of God*, book 20 cap. 25.

The seventh passage is Isaiah 9:18, “Impiety burns as a fire and devours thorns.” St. Basil says on this passage that through confession sin withers away, so that it can be taken away by a purgatorial fire after this life, and he proves it from this passage.

The eighth passage is of Micah 7:8, “O my enemy, do not rejoice over me; for if I am fallen, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, I will bear the wrath of the Lord, until he judges my cause. He will lead me forth into light; I will see his justice.” This passage is usually adduced in favor of Purgatory, as St. Jerome teaches in the final chapter of Isaiah, and the *Glossa Ordinaria* explains it: I will bear the Lord’s anger here or in Purgatory.

The ninth passage is Zachariah 9:12, “You also, by the blood of your covenant, have led those bound out of the pit wherein there is no water.” [3](#) Even if they normally adduce this passage for the liberation of the fathers

from limbo, nevertheless it agrees better with the liberation of souls from Purgatory, whom Christ lead out when he descended after his death. Firstly, because the souls in purgatory are more rightly said to be bound; secondly, because in Purgatory there is no water of consolation, as there is in limbo, as is clear from Luke 16:25, in regard to Lazarus: "Here he is consoled." Wherefore, Augustine contends that Christ, when he descended to hell, not only visited the fathers, but even those who were tortured in hell, that is, in Purgatory, and freed many of them from there (epist. 99 ad Evodium, and in Genes. lib. 42 cap. 33).

The tenth passage is Malachi 3:3, "He will sit as a burning fire, and will cleanse the sons of Levi, and will purify them, etc." Origen (hom. 6 in Exod.), St. Ambrose (in Ps. 36), St. Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, l. 20, cap. 25) and St. Jerome, explain this passage as about purgatorial punishment, and although those purgatorial punishments are not those which we are now arguing about (since they will cleanse the living, whereas we argue on the punishment of the dead), nevertheless purgatory is rightly inferred from there. For on that account, at the time when the final tribulation runs its course, afterwards the fire will also descend and quickly purge all the remnants of sins in just men, since, as Irenaeus also notes at the end of book 5, then the Church on earth will immediately be taken to her spouse, and there will no longer be a time of further purgation, as there is now after death and before the Judgment.

CHAPTER IV: *Purgatory is Proven from the New Testament*

THE *first passage* is Matthew 12:32, where the Lord says there is a certain sin which is not remitted, neither in this age nor in the coming age. From here, the holy Fathers gather that certain sins are remitted in the future age through the prayers and offerings of the Church (St. Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21 c. 24 et *in Julianum*, lib. 6, c. 5; St. Gregory, *Dialog.* lib. 4, c. 39; St. Bede in Mar. c. 3; St. Bernard, hom. 66 *in Cant.*, who was content with this testimony alone against the heresy which denies Purgatory. Likewise Peter the Cluniac, *in epist. contra Petrobrusianos*; Rabanus, *de Instit. Cleric.* lib. 2 c. 44, and all the Glosses, such as the ordinary and interlinear, etc.).

But there are several objections to this. *Firstly*, Peter Martyr argues that Christ spoke by way of exaggeration.

I respond: In this way we can also abolish hell, and say it was an exaggeration when the Lord said, “Go into the eternal fire.” Besides, an exaggeration ought not to be inept, such as when a partition is made and nothing corresponds to one part.

Secondly, some say it is said to be a threat.

I respond: We answer just as we did the first objection.

Thirdly, others object that Christ compares the sin against the Holy Spirit with the most serious mortal sins, with blasphemy against the Father and the Son; therefore, if he meant to say some sins can be remitted in another age, he particularly understood this about those to which he compared the sin against the Holy Spirit at that time; but this is false, because only venial sins are forgiven us in another age, etc.

I respond: Christ spoke of the perfect remission which embraces the remission of guilt and punishment, which is how the most serious sins are remitted in another age, because there their remission is completed.

Fourthly, they say that Christ would seem to mean that more serious sins are remitted in the coming age, but in this one only lighter ones, if he meant that some are remitted there, otherwise he would not have said, “Neither in this age, nor in the coming age”; on the contrary he would have said it will

not be forgiven either in the coming age or in this one, that the discourse might crescendo.

I respond: The discourse builds to a climax because in the coming age there is a greater space to wash away sins than here, and besides, this age is put first because the remission of sins begins here, but it is completed there.

Fifthly, Calvin objects that the Lord spoke about the remission of guilt, consequently, this passage is wrongly alleged for the remission of the punishment of purgatory.

I respond: In purgatory at least venial sins are remitted; besides, it is false that Christ spoke only about guilt. For this is the sense: sin against the Holy Spirit is not remitted in this age nor in the coming age, neither in regard to guilt, nor in regard to punishment, although other sins are either remitted in this age in regard to guilt, and in another in regard to punishment, such as mortal sins; or remitted both in this life and the next in regard to guilt, and in regard to punishment, such as venial sins.

Sixthly, Calvin says that by “in this age and in the coming one,” he meant to say, in this judgment and in the final judgment it will not be remitted, and so no mention is made of purgatory. On the other hand, who are they, for whom the sin is not remitted here, and for whom it will be remitted in the judgment? Is it not those who either need purgation of venial sins or, who only owe a debt of punishment? For whoever leaves this life in unrighteousness, certainly will not be absolved in the judgment.

Seventhly, Peter Martyr objects: since in good Logic an affirmation does not follow from a negation, therefore one may not infer that because the sin against the Holy Spirit is not remitted in the coming age, therefore certain other sins can be remitted there. In the same way, it does not rightly follow that King Philip is not king of the Venetians, therefore someone else is king of the Venetians. And Ochinus confirms it; for Christ could say: This sin is not remitted in this age, nor in hell, yet we would not gather that certain sins are remitted in hell.

I respond: What we infer from the Lord’s words may not follow according to the rules of the logicians, nevertheless it follows according to the rule of prudence, because otherwise we would make the Lord the ineptest of speakers. If nothing is remitted in the coming age, then he said ineptly: This sin will not be remitted in this age nor in the coming one. Just as one would speak ineptly if he were to say: King Philip does not absolve you either in the court of Spain or of France. But he would not speak

ineptly if he were to say: Either in the court of Spain, or in that of Brabant. [4](#) Hence, in John 18:36, when Christ said: “My kingdom is not of this world,” Pilate inferred: “So you are a king?” Christ did not respond that an affirmative does not rightly follow from a negative, rather he approved it. Nor does the similitude brought by Ochinus avail since Christ could not say: Neither in this age nor in hell, unless he meant to speak ineptly, firstly because an age is a time but hell a place; hence they are not opposed like the present age and the future age, then besides, because it is certain that no remission of sins takes place in hell.

Eighthly, they object that, “Neither in this age nor in the coming one,” mean the same thing, which is never, or forever (*in aeternum*), as Mark shows, who in 3:29 says, “He will never (*non in aeternum*) have remission.” And as Peter says in John 13:8, “You will never (*non in aeternum*) wash my feet.”

I respond: One ought not to explain Matthew by Mark but rather Mark by Matthew, since Matthew uses many more words and it is certain he wrote more copiously, whereas Mark made something like a compendium from the Gospel of Matthew. Nor did Mark use the expression “*in aeternum*” in the same sense as Peter in John’s Gospel. For Peter would have spoken ineptly if he were to say: You will not wash my feet, neither in this age nor in the next, although feet are not going to be washed in the coming age. But the Lord did not speak ineptly in Matthew when he said: “It will not be remitted, neither in this age nor in the coming age.” Consequently, Peter in John’s gospel takes the term: “*In aeternum*” improperly for the time of this life only, but Mark properly for the whole space of this age and the coming age. Besides, Christ either spoke as Matthew has it, or as Mark has it, or in each mode; if first or third, I hold it was intended; if the second, although this is not probable, then Matthew, led by the Holy Spirit, explained the words of Christ, and unless he explained ineptly, he indicated some sins are forgiven in another age.

Ninth, they say it is a Hebrew expression.

I respond: This is false. It is indeed a Hebrew expression when Peter says, “*In aeternum*”, for the Jews say everywhere: לעולם [lehholam] even about temporal things; “But neither in this age, nor in the next,” is not a proper Hebrew expression. Nor did Mark use a Hebrew expression, rather, he spoke properly.

CHAPTER V: *1 Corinthians 3:15*

THE second passage is 1 Corinthians 3:15, where the Apostle says, “He himself will be saved, yet so as by fire.” In the first place, note that the passage of the Apostle is one of the most difficult and useful of the whole Scripture, for Catholics establish two ecclesiastical dogmas from it: purgatory and venial sins, against the heretics and the supporters of heretics, such as Erasmus was at first, who in his annotation on this passage tried to show that neither purgatory nor venial sins could be established from it.

Augustine attests to the fact that it is a very difficult passage in his book on *Faith and Works* (c. 15) where he says: “We must attend diligently, how that teaching of the Apostle Paul must be received which is clearly difficult to understand, where he says: “If anyone builds upon this foundation, gold, silver, etc. ... In these places we must pay heed to what Peter says, that certain things in the Scriptures are very difficult, and men ought not pervert them to their own destruction. ... I affirm, that I prefer to listen to those who are more intelligent and more learned.” He repeats the same thing in q. 1 *ad Dulcitium*.

Therefore, that we might diligently explain this passage, we will first explain the metaphor which the Apostle used; then we will propose and answer difficulties which occur in regard to this passage. As to the *first*, then, these are the words of the Apostle: “According to the grace of God, which was given to me, as a wise architect I placed a foundation, and another builds upon it, but let every man look to how he builds upon it; for no man can place another foundation apart from that which had been laid, which is Christ Jesus. So, if anyone builds upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, grass, straw, the work of every man will be made manifest. For the day of the Lord will declare it, because it will be revealed in fire, and fire will prove every man’s work, of what sort it is. If anyone’s work will remain, which had been built upon it, he will receive his reward; if anyone’s work will burn, he will suffer detriment, but he himself will be saved, yet so as by fire.”

The Apostle uses in this teaching a similitude of two architects, one of whom, upon a solid stone foundation, built a house out of precious

materials which do not fear fire, such as are gold, and silver, and precious stones such as Jasper, Porphyry, Parian marble. For from gold and silver plates and pillars are made, as we read about the temple of Solomon. From Parian marble and porphyry even whole walls can be erected. Another architect, upon a similar foundation, namely a solid stone one, erected a house in the manner of poor country-folk out of stakes and boards, and covered it with grass and straw.

Now that we have posited this similitude, let us imagine that fire is applied to each house, and we will see that the first one is completely unharmed, and if the architect is by chance inside, he similarly will suffer nothing. But we will see the second house will immediately catch fire and the whole shall be burnt up in a short time, and if the Architect is inside and wishes to get out safe, we will see that he cannot go out, except through the fire. In such a passage he indeed will not die, but still his beard and hair will not escape unharmed, unless perhaps the miracle of the three children, who were not burned in the furnace in Babylon, is repeated. This is the similitude which St. Paul uses when he says, “He himself will be saved, yet so as by fire.”

In regard to the *second*, there are five difficulties. First, who is meant by the builders; second, what is meant by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, grass and straw; third, what is meant by the day of the Lord; fourth, what is meant by the fire, which on the day of the Lord will prove every man’s work; fifth, what is meant by the fire, about which it is said: “he himself will be saved, yet so as by fire.” After we have explained these, the teaching will be clear.

The first difficulty is, who are the architects that build? St. Augustine, in his book *on Faith and Works*, ch. 16, as well as in *Enchirid.*, cap. 68, and elsewhere, thinks that all Christians are called architects by the Apostle, and all build upon the foundation of faith either good works or bad works. It seems to me that Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylactus, and Oecumenius teach the same thing on this passage.

Many others teach that here the Apostle only calls doctors and preachers of the Gospel architects. So think Ambrose, and Sedulius on this passage. Jerome insinuates the same thing in *Iovinianum*, lib. 2. St. Anselm and St. Thomas receive the same thing on this passage, even though they do not reject the prior opinion. Many more recent authors teach the same thing on this passage, such as Dennis the Carthusian, Lyranus and Cajetan.

Each exposition is good and from each exposition the assertion of purgatory and venial sins can be deduced, nevertheless the second is more literal, which is manifestly clear from the preceding and following words of the chapter. For he had said earlier: "I planted, Apollo watered." Then, in the same sense he immediately added: "I as a wise architect placed a foundation, but another builds upon it." And likewise: "He who plants and he who waters are equal; each shall receive his own reward according to his labor, for we are helpers of God, you are the field of God, you are the building of God." There he very clearly compares himself and other preachers of the Gospel to farmers and architects, but the people who are taught he compares to fields and buildings. Likewise, in the following words he again speaks about teachers when he says: "If anyone seems wise among you, let him be a fool so that he might become wise." And again, "Let no man boast of men, for all are yours, whether Paul, or Apollo or Cephas", *i.e.* do not boast in your teachers and preachers, and say: "I am of Paul, but I of Apollo." For all are one and they all labor for you. Therefore, just as he had said that he planted and Apollo watered, so now he says, I placed the foundation by preaching the faith of Christ, but others build upon it by teaching those things which pertain to life and morals, and even explaining more fully the mysteries of faith. And in this first question Calvin, Peter Martyr, and Ochinus agree with us.

The second difficulty is a little more serious, and there are six opinions. Certain men understand by the term "foundation" the true faith, but unformed. By the terms gold, silver, and precious stones, good works. By wood, grass, and straw, mortal sins; Chrysostom so thinks on this passage, whom Theophylactus follows.

But this cannot be defended. 1) Because, as St. Gregory says (lib. 4 *Dialog.* c. 39), mortal sins are better compared with iron and lead. 2) Because it would follow that the heresy of Origen is true that all men are saved, since the Apostle says, "He will be saved as if by fire."

The Greeks respond that he will be saved, *i.e.*, never be altogether consumed, yet so as by fire, since he will burn forever. This answer is especially hard and forced; then also it is against every manner of speaking in the Scriptures. For in Scripture, the word salvation is never received in a bad sense, but always in a good, as the Latin theologians showed at the Council of Florence before the first session. Besides, the word "by" (*per*) means the passage, not the lodging. The Apostle does not say he will be

saved, yet as if *in* the fire, but “he will be saved, yet as if *by* fire,” *i.e.*, according to the similitude, he evades death by passing through fire. Finally, from the common consent of the Doctors. For all others in the greatest consensus, both Greeks and Latins, would have it that this passage be understood of venial sins, whose opinions we will present in the fifth difficulty. Furthermore, let no one think from this discussion that Chrysostom denied purgatory or venial sins. For he frequently teaches purgatory, and especially in homil. 3, on epist. to Philipp., and hom. 69 to the people of Antioch. Likewise, he concedes venial sins (hom. 24 in Matth.), but on this passage he explained it otherwise to refute the heresy of Origen, which taught that the penalties of hell are not eternal, as is clear in the homily.

The second opinion is that by the term foundation Christ is to be understood, or the preaching of the faith, while “silver, gold and precious stones” refer to Catholic expositions; “wood, grass, and straw” are understood to be heretical doctrines, as the commentary of Ambrose seems to teach, and also Jerome explaining Isaiah 5:8, “Woe unto you that join house to house.” Also inclining to this opinion are Calvin, Peter Martyr and Ochinus, who teach that by wood, grass, and straw we should understand human traditions and inventions opposed to the word of God.

This opinion is even less defensible than the previous one. *Firstly*, because heretics are not saved by the fire of purgatory, but are condemned to eternal fire. *Secondly*, because heretics do not build upon the foundation, which is Christ, except in name only. For every heresy speaks wonderfully about Christ, yet does not preach the true Christ, but another which it invents for itself. Nor are these opinions that we refute those of Ambrose and Jerome, since the commentary of Ambrose understands by “wood, grass, and straw” heresies and false doctrines advanced out of imprudence and without pertinacity, for he says teachers of this kind will be saved by the purgatorial fire. On the other hand, Jerome clearly speaks about heretics, but according to the mind of others, not his own, since when he posits his own exposition, he adds: “But certain others understand this to be about heretics, etc.”

The third opinion understands living faith for the word “foundation”. For gold, silver and precious stones it understands works of supererogation; by wood, grass, and straw it understands the omission of counsel and a certain carnal attachment to the goods of this world which are indeed licit, but

which bring sorrow when they are lost. So Augustine thinks in his book *on Faith and Works*, c. 16. Such an opinion is true, but it does not fit this passage, unless we are to understand by that carnal attachment at least venial sins, for neutral works are not spoken of in particular. Therefore, that carnal love is either good or bad: if good, why will it burn after the fashion of straw? If bad, then at least it has been mixed with venial sin.

The fourth opinion is that of those who explain by gold, silver, etc. to be good works, but by straw, grass, etc., venial sins. This is what St. Gregory thinks (*Dialogue*, book 4, c. 39) and others, which is good, but another opinion is better.

The fifth opinion is that of those who understand gold, silver, etc. to be good students of the word, but straw, bad students. The students are the workmanship of the teacher, and indeed the teacher will be saved; but some of the students will, and some will not. So think Theodoret and Oecumenius, but Chrysostom rightly refutes this; for “loss” is attributed to the architect, and he himself is said to have built with straw, therefore the guilt and punishment is not that of the hearers alone.

The sixth opinion, which we put ahead of all the rest, understands Christ by the foundation, announced by the first preachers, such as were the Apostles, who conveyed the faith and Gospel of Christ to those peoples who had never heard of Christ. Hence, St. Paul says: “I planted” and “I, as a wise architect, placed the foundation.” Hence, those also who first preached the faith in some region are said to be the apostles of that region. Then, by gold, silver, and precious stones, is meant the useful and salutary doctrine of other preachers, who teach those who have already received the faith, and who teach not only by word, but also by example, so that they truly build up their students and further them in religion and piety. But by wood, grass and straw, is understood the teaching, not heretical or bad, yet curious, useless, and vain, of those preachers who preach to the Catholic people in a Catholic manner, but without that fruit and usefulness which God requires. As a result, the former preach with great merit, but these preach not only without great merit, but even not without venial sins.

Three things most especially prove this exposition. 1) Because, as we will show, by the term “builders”, only teachers are understood, therefore by the term “their work”, their doctrine ought to be understood.

2) This similitude thus explained is very appropriate for the doctors of Corinth. For they were more favorably given to eloquence and philosophy

which, although it is permitted to make use of them, nevertheless sometimes impede the fruit of preaching, and St. Paul rebuked the Corinthians because of both things in this epistle.

3) Because this whole chapter is best explained if St. Paul posits three similitudes: a) of farmers planting and watering, which only embraces good teachers; b) on builders building upon a good foundation, which embraces both good and bad teachers; c) on the corruptors of the temple, in which he meant only the bad to be included, and not bad by a certain measure, but completely bad, such as heretics teaching error for truth and vices for virtues, about whom he does not say they shall be saved, as if by fire, but that God will destroy them.

The third difficulty is in regard to the “day of the Lord”. Some understand by the word “day” the present life, or the time of tribulation in which the good are often picked out from the bad, such as St. Augustine (*de fide et operibus*, cap. 16), and St. Gregory (*Dialogue* lib. 4, ch. 39).

This opinion does not seem to be according to the mind of St. Paul. 1) In Greek “day” is with the article, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα, from which it appears that a certain and defined day is meant, just as in 2 Tim. 4:8, “Which the Lord will render to me on that day,” and in 2 Tim. 1:12 “I am certain that he is able to keep what has been entrusted to me until that day.” And below, “May the Lord grant that he may find mercy on that day.”

2) The present time is not called the day of the Lord in the Scriptures, but rather our day, just as, on the other hand, the time of the next life is called the day of the Lord, not ours, such as in Luke 19:42, “And indeed on this your day, the things which are to your peace;” Luke 22:53, “This is your hour;” Galatians 6:10, “While we have time, let us do good;” Psalm 74 (75):2, “When I appoint a time, then I will judge with justice;” Zephaniah 1:14, “The great day of the Lord is near;” and Joel 2:1, “The day of the Lord will come, the day of darkness and gloom.”

3) The quality of everyone’s work shall not be declared in the time of the present life. For tribulations are common to good and evil, just and unjust.

4) All doctors understand this day to be the day of judgment; for although Augustine and Gregory taught that the day could be referred to this life, nevertheless, they teach in the same places that it can also be understood of the time to come after this life. In fact, since the day of judgment is two-fold, one day of the particular judgment and another day of the universal judgment, then, as Cajetan and others say, the Apostle speaks

of the day of the particular judgment. a) Because after this day of which the Apostle speaks, some are going to be purged by fire; but that cannot be after the day of the last judgment. b) Because if this day, which the Apostle speaks about, were the day of the final judgment, it would follow that none of the saints could enter into heaven before the day of judgment, which is an error condemned at the Council of Florence, in the last session. The consequent is proved; for on this day all buildings are to be examined, and after the examination some are going to be immediately crowned while others are punished; besides, since nothing polluted shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, if a purgation of venial sins does not take place except on the day of the last judgment, all who leave this life with venial sins should await that day before they can enter into heaven.

c) Because the Greek text does not have “it will be revealed,” but it is revealed: “ὅτι ἐν περὶ ἁποκαλύπτεται,” because it is revealed in the fire. But the day of the last judgment is not revealed, thus, he speaks of the day of the particular judgment, which is revealed every day, now to one, now to another. Nevertheless, all the older authors seem to understand by that day the day of the last judgment, such as Theodoret, Theophylactus, Anselm and others, whose opinion seems quite true to me, although neither opinion opposes purgatory.

Firstly, because everywhere in the Scriptures, the day of the Lord means the day of the last judgment.

Secondly, because it is said “on that day,” by which one certain day is designated, on which the works of all men shall be proved at once; but the day of the particular judgment is not one, but manifold, nor are the works of all men proved on it.

Thirdly, because the Apostle says: “The day of the Lord will declare,” in other words, then all things will be manifested to everyone, as he says in the following chapter: “Until the Lord shall come, who will bring to light what is hidden in darkness, and manifest the counsels of hearts,” but that will not take place except in the last judgment.

Fourthly, because it follows in verse 13: “Because it will be revealed in fire.” For the day of judgment is said to be revealed in fire, since the conflagration of the whole world will be the last sign and it will be made known to all, which is why the day of judgment is almost always described by fire, such as in Psalm 96 (97):3, “Fire will precede him;” Joel 2:3, “The consuming fire before his face;” 2 Thessalonians 1:7, “In the revelation of

our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven with his powerful angels in the flame of fire;" 2 Peter 3:12, "The elements will melt in the flame of fire." And if it does not please one to accept here a material flame for the fire, but rather the judgment of God itself, as others explain, still only the last judgment can be understood by "this day". For then, the sense is that it is revealed in fire, *i.e.* because that day will be notorious on account of the great and bitter judgment which will be exercised on it; but the day of the particular judgment is not notorious on account of judgment, but rather on account of death, since the particular judgment is known to few. The arguments to the contrary do not move me.

To the first, I say, after the last judgment there will be no purgatory, and therefore those words: "He will be saved, yet as if by fire," do not mean he will be saved provided he first passes through fire, but he will be saved provided earlier he passed through fire; or, he will be saved, just as those who pass through fire.

To the second, I say if one were to concluded this, it would follow that even if there were no purgatory, no one is beatified or condemned before the day of judgment; for Scripture everywhere attributes the distribution of rewards and punishments to the last judgment; nay more, even an examination of the works, and the sentence of the judge, as is clear from Matthew 25:41 and elsewhere. Therefore, just as sentence is pronounced upon the death of anyone, and then some men begin to be punished, and some rewarded, and nevertheless these same things are said to happen in the last judgment because then they will occur in the presence of the whole world, and with the greatest honor for the just but the greatest ignominy for the impious, so also the examination can take place at the death of everyone privately, and later again publicly in the final judgment.

To the third I say, for the one word which we have in the present tense in Greek we have three in the future, namely: φανερόν γερήσεται, ἡμέρα δηλώσει. ... πᾶρ δοκιμάσει; and it is also very believable that this one word ἀποκαλύπτεται in the more correct texts was in the future tense, ἀποκαλύψεται, seeing that our translator rendered it "it will be revealed" (*revelabitur*). Add, that frequently the present tense is not used to mean an action of a certain time, but a custom, opinion, profession, or something similar, *e.g.* "I do not know man," as the Blessed Virgin says (Luke 1), and what the Sadducees said: "The dead do not rise," or, what the Carthusians say: "We do not eat meat." In this difficulty we dissent from Calvin and

Peter Martyr, since they understand Paul to be speaking of the particular judgment, but this does nothing for the question on purgatory.

The fourth difficulty is what is the fire, which will prove every man's work on the day of the Lord? Some understand the tribulations of this life, such as St. Augustine and St. Gregory (*Il. cc.*), but we already rejected this. Others understand eternal fire, but that cannot be since that fire will not examine the building made of gold and silver, nor even the building made of wood and grass, as is clear. Others seem to understand the fire as the conflagration of the world, which precedes the general judgment. That also cannot be, because that fire does not burn anyone except the enemies of God, as we read in Psalm 96 (97):3, "The fire precedes him, and will burn his enemies all around." But this fire, of which the Apostle speaks, touches everyone, even those who built upon the foundation with gold and silver. Besides, that fire cannot prove works, since it is a material fire and works will not exist anywhere but the mind, because they have passed away.

Others understand it as referring to the punishments of purgatory, but neither can this rightly be said. *a)* Because the fire of purgatory does not prove the works of those who build with gold and silver, whereas the fire which we are talking about, "will prove the quality of every man's work." *b)* The Apostle clearly distinguishes between works and workers, and he says about that fire that it burns works, not workers, for he says: "If anyone's work remains," and "if anyone's work burns." But the fire of purgatory, which is a true and real fire, cannot burn works because they are transitory actions and they have already passed.

Next, it would follow that all men, even the holiest, pass through the fire of purgatory and are saved through the fire, for all pass through this fire of which we speak. Yet that all pass through the fire of purgatory and are saved by the fire is clearly false, since in this passage the Apostle clearly says only those who built with wood and grass are going to be saved as if by fire. Moreover, the Church has always understood that the holy martyrs as well as infants dying after baptism are immediately received into heaven without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches (final session). The Holy Fathers, St. Jerome (*in Jovin. lib. 2*) and St. Augustine (in Psalm 37/38) also teach this. St. Augustine says: "If they built with gold, silver, or precious stones, they will be safe from both fires, not only from the eternal one, which is going to torture the impious forever, but also from that which will correct those who are saved by fire."

Consequently, it remains for us to say that here the Apostle speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a cleansing or afflicting fire, but an examining and proving one. St. Ambrose explains it this way in Sermon 20 on Psalm 118 (119), on the verse *Vide humilitatem meam*, “The furnace will prove all of us, therefore, because we are going to be examined, so let us act that we may be worthy to be proved by the divine judgment; let us possess the humility here depicted, so that when each and every one of us shall come to the judgment of God, to those fires that we are going to pass through, he may say, ‘see my humility,’ etc.” Sedulius speaks likewise on this verse: “He wished to compare the examination of judgment to a fire, according to the custom of the Scriptures.” Dennis the Carthusian, Lyranus, Cajetan and others give the same exposition on this passage.

That this position is the truest is proven by the following:

a) Because it cannot be understood otherwise how the fire proves those that built with gold and silver.

b) Because this exposition best fits the words of the Apostle, when he says: “Fire will prove the quality of every man’s work. If anyone’s work will remain, he will receive his reward; if anyone’s work will burn, he will suffer detriment.” For, although their works have passed before the eyes of men, and cannot be examined by a material fire, nevertheless, they have not passed before the eyes of God, but, as it is said in Ecclesiastes 12:14, “All the things that are done, God will bring to judgment,” and he will examine them, and if someone’s “work will remain,” that is, if the work can withstand the judgment of God, as gold withstands fire, he will receive his reward and be proved and crowned by God. If anyone’s work burns, *i.e.* if someone’s work does not withstand the judgment of God, as grass and straw do not withstand fire, he will suffer detriment, and be reproved and rejected.

c) Because the judgment of God is most rightly called a fire, seeing that it is the purest, quickest, most efficacious, and most penetrating. This is why we read in Daniel: “A fiery river will proceed from his mouth” (Daniel 7:10). [5](#) And because God is all justice, all judgment, therefore He also is called a fire in the Scriptures. “He is like a refining fire” (Malachi 3:2). “For our God is a consuming fire” (Hebrews 12:29). And in this we do not dissent from Calvin and Peter Martyr.

The fifth and final difficulty is, what is understood by fire, when he says: “And he will be saved, yet as if by fire.” Some understand the tribulations of this life. But this cannot be said congruently, because then also those who build with gold and silver would be saved, as if by fire. Accordingly, St. Augustine and St. Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, although they do not relinquish it, also advance another opinion which we will relate below. Some understand the eternal fire, such as Chrysostom and Theophylactus, but we have already refuted this. Others the fire of the conflagration of the world. That also cannot be said on account of the reasons we posited previously; besides, it would follow that those who have venial sins could not attain to beatitude before the day of judgment, seeing that nothing impure can enter into heaven.

Calvin and Peter Martyr, as well as Ochinus and Luther (arctic. 37) understand by this fire the judgment of God, which sanctions true doctrine and confutes false, just as fire finishes gold and consumes grass. Moreover, they say this judgment takes place when someone is converted, and especially in the hour of death, for then many are enlightened and so understand that they were deceived, and throw away their doctrine, and are also confounded and blush, and so will be saved by fire. Peter Martyr adds that he does not doubt that St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Dominic and other fathers were saved in this way, since without a doubt, being enlightened by God at the point of death, they understood and condemned their errors on monasticism, on the Mass, etc.

Sed contra: 1) Since that judgment would only happen at the time of death, it either happens while the man is still alive, or it could also take place after death. If it could also happen after death, therefore, after death there is some remission and purgation of sins, at least through that shame and contrition, which they will in no way admit, for this would be a certain type of Purgatory. But if this judgment would only happen during death itself, how, I ask, would it happen with those men who built upon the foundation with wood, grass, and straw but died so suddenly that they had no time for repentance? They are not saved as if by fire, who do not experience this fire of judgment and refutation of their errors, nor can they be condemned to hell because they had Christ as a foundation, and Paul declares about all such men that they would be saved. Indeed, it is not possible for them to be saved unless Purgatory is admitted, for since they died in sin with their straw and grass, they cannot be saved except by fire.

2) That fire, which Paul is speaking about, will properly and truly inflict penalties apart from the loss of their works, and the shame which thence arises, therefore that judgment refuting their errors is not the fire which is treated on here. The preceding is proven firstly from that phrase: “he will suffer detriment,” which in Greek is *ζημιωθήσεται*, he will be punished, or he will pay penalties. Few words are more frequent in Greek than *ζημιωσθαι θανάτω*, that is to be punished with death. Likewise, from that: “He will be saved, as if by fire.” The similitude of one passing through fire means punishment and sorrow, for he that passes through fire without any harm, would not be said to pass through fire, as through fire, but as if through flowers, as we read about St. Tiburtius.

3) The Apostle opposes this passage through fire to the reward. As he had said: “If his work will remain, he will receive his reward,” so now he says, “if his work burns, he will suffer detriment and he will be saved as if by fire.” But that reward means something apart from the good work, and apart from the joy which the good work produces of itself, since he would not say he will receive the reward if the reward were nothing else than what he had from the act of building with gold, etc., itself. Consequently, the detriment and the passage through fire of the man who built with straw, is likewise some punishment apart from the loss of the works, and apart from the shame it produces of itself.

4) Because that judgment refuting errors does not bring detriment, but profit, for it is a certain enlightenment of the mind, as they say, and a knowledge of the truth. And as a man that has brass thinking that it is gold does not think it is a loss, if someone would take away that brass and would give him true gold, so also one that had errors in his mind and learns the truth by divine illustration does not suffer detriment, but acquires profit. But Paul says: “He will suffer a detriment,” therefore, etc.

5) It would follow that everyone that is saved is saved as if by fire, which is contrary to the distinction of the Apostle, for even if here Paul only treats on sins which are committed in teaching, nevertheless, the reasoning for all other sins is the same. For as God will judge doctrine, so also all works. But according to Calvin, and all Lutherans, all of our works, no matter how just they seem in the eyes of men, are still sins in the sight of God, nor can they bear divine judgment, rather, they will be clearly convicted in the way false doctrine is. This is why if the fire, about which Paul is speaking, is the judgment of God, all will be saved as if by fire. Nor

does the response avail that the works of the just are not going to be convicted, because they are covered over through non-imputation, but the works of the impious who are not justified by faith are going to be convicted; for when Paul says, "He will be saved, as if by fire," he speaks about the just who built with straw, yet having retained the foundation, namely, true faith in Christ.

Now, what Peter Martyr says about Sts. Bernard, Dominic, and Francis, is a most impudent lie, since even to their last breath they commended to their followers perseverance in religious life and obedience to the Roman Church. In chapter 14 of his life, St. Bonaventure writes about St. Francis: "With the hour of his passage nearing, he caused all the brethren present in that place to be called to himself, and soothing them with consoling words on account of his death, he exhorted them with paternal affection to divine love, and he spoke at length on patience, poverty, and the faith of the holy Roman Church which must be kept, and above all, he added, 'Remain strong, all ye my sons, in the fear of the Lord, and remain in him always, and since temptation will come and tribulation approaches, happy are they who will persevere in what they have begun. Now I hasten to God, to whose grace I commend you.'" This must surely be the recantation which the Pseudomartyr Peter dreams up!

Now it is the common teaching of Theologians that by the term "fire" in this passage some purgatorial and temporal punishment is understood, to which those who are found in the particular judgment to have built with wood, grass or straw are assigned after death. This exposition, apart from the fact that it best agrees with the text, is sufficiently proven from the common consensus of the Fathers. All Latins teach this. St. Cyprian, in his epistle to Antoninus (book 4, ep. 2) says: "It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to attain to glory; it is one thing to be thrown into prison and not get out until one pays the last penny, but another to immediately receive the reward for faith and virtue; it is one thing, having been crucified by long suffering, to be corrected for sins, and to be purged at length by fire, and another to be cleansed of all sins by martyrdom." Here, Cyprian does not clearly call to mind this passage of St. Paul, but nevertheless, since nowhere else in Scripture is mention made of fire in a passage which is clearly about Purgatory, there is no doubt that St. Cyprian alluded to this passage.

St. Ambrose, commenting on this passage, says: “But when Paul says ‘yet as if by fire’, he shows indeed that he is going to be saved, but he will suffer the punishments of the fire, so that having been purged by the fire he will be saved, not tormented in the eternal fire forever like the faithless.” He says the same thing in Serm. 20 in Psalm 118.

St. Jerome, while explaining “You have become just as a firebrand taken from the fire” explaining Amos chapter 4 says, “Like what we read in the Apostle, he will be saved as if by fire, therefore whoever is saved by fire, is taken out just as a firebrand from the fire.” He taught the same thing while commenting on the last book of Isaiah, and in book 2 in *Jovinianum*, just past the middle.

St. Augustine, in Psalm 37 (38) says: “In this life may you cleanse me, and render me such that a cleansing fire is no longer needed.” And below, while explaining the passage of the Apostle, he says, “It is related that he will be saved as if by fire, and because it is said, ‘he will be saved’, that fire is disregarded. For all that, though he is saved by the fire, yet that fire will be more grievous than anything a man can suffer in this life.” St. Gregory the Great, in book 4 of the *Dialogue* (c. 39), while explaining this passage of 1 Cor. 3:15, says: “Although this passage could be understood of the fire of tribulation applied to us in this life, nevertheless, if someone were to take it as referring to the fire of future purgation, it must be carefully considered, because by that fire he is said be saved, not who builds upon this [foundation] with iron, bronze, or lead, that is, greater sins, and on that account harder, and hence impossible to be loosed, but wood, grass and straw, *i.e.* minute sins, and the very lightest, which the fire easily consumes.”

Alcuin (lib. 3 *de Trinitate*), Rupert (in. 3.c. *Gen.*, explaining that which is said there on the flaming and revolving sword), Peter Lombard (4 d. 21) and with him St. Bonaventure and other Scholastics. Likewise, St. Anselm, Haymo, and St. Thomas on this passage. And then, Innocent III on Psalm 37 (38), and all more recent Latins so explain it.

From the Greeks we have in the first place Origen clearly teaching this in homily 6 in Exod. and homily 14 in Leviticus, as well as homily 12 in Jeremiah. In homily 6 in Exodus, he says: “But even to that point it is congruous, if anyone carries many good works and some little iniquity, that little bit must be melted and purged like lead in a fire, etc.” Besides, Oecumenius on this passage, who also witnesses Basil’s opinion,

understood it to be about the purgatorial fire. St. Thomas also adds Theodoret explaining this passage in these words: “Hence we believe in the fire of purgatory, in which souls are cleansed, as gold in a crucible.” (*Opisculum contra Graecos*) Gagneius relates the same teaching of Theodoret from the schools of the Greeks cited as follows: Τουτο τὸ πυρ πηξένομεν καθαρτήριον ἐν ᾧ καθαρίζονται αἱ ψυχαι, καθά περὶ χρυσίαν ἐν τῷ χωνευτηρίῳ.

But objections are made against this. *Firstly*, it is absurd that in the same sentence the Apostle would use the word fire in different ways, once for judgment and once for the purgatorial fire.

I respond to the first: we are compelled by the text itself to admit not only one, but two changes in the meaning of fire: for when he says that the day of judgment is manifested by fire, it seems he altogether speaks of the fire of conflagration; when he adds that fire will prove the work of each man, he cannot be speaking about a material fire, which cannot prove works which have passed; again, the Apostle says all works must be examined with that second fire; but with the third, not the works, but the workers are examined, and not all of them but only those who build with wood, grass and straw; necessarily the fires must be different. Still, it seems to me that what we see in the words of St. Paul is not properly an equivocation, but an elegant play on words. For, this is the sense of the whole passage: The day of the Lord will be declared by the fire of conflagration; and just as that day will be declared by fire, so the same day will be made manifest by fire, namely of the judgment of the work of every man; and just as the works will be manifested by fire, so also the workers, who need purgation, will be purged by a certain type of fire.

I say *secondly*, it is not unusual for St. Paul to use some term in different ways in the same sentence, as he receives the word “sin” in different ways when he says, “He that did not know sin became sin for us” (2 Cor. 5), and then “For sin He condemned sin.” (Romans 8).

I say *thirdly*, if anyone altogether would not admit a variety of meanings, but would receive the fire everywhere for judgment, still it would not change the fact that we establish Purgatory from this passage. For then the sense would be: “If anyone’s work will burn, he will suffer a detriment, but he will be saved, yet as if by fire,” *i.e.*, if anyone’s work cannot withstand the judgment of God, indeed the work will be condemned, but he will be saved, yet in the manner of one who has passed through the fire of divine

judgment, which judgment being most just, certainly inflicted some penalty upon him.

The second objection regards the conjunction “as if” (*quasi*), which usually signifies not a truth but a similitude. *I respond*: the conjunction, *quasi*, does not mean the fire is a similitude, as if the fire were not real, but imaginary, but that the passing through is a similitude, so that the sense would be: The man that built with grass will arrive at salvation, but he will arrive in the way one arrives at some place who passes through fire, just as it is said in John 1:14, “We have seen his glory, the glory as (*quasi*) of the only begotten of the Father”, *i.e.* we have seen him glorious in the manner in which it is fitting for the only begotten Son of the Father to be glorious.

CHAPTER VI: *1 Corinthians 15:29*

THE third passage is 1 Cor. 15:29, “What will they do, that are baptized for the dead, if the dead will not rise again? Why are they then baptized for them?” This passage clearly establishes what we want, if it is understood rightly, therefore we will briefly expound upon it. I have found six expositions of this passage.

1) The first is that the Apostle proves the coming resurrection, from the error of certain men who received Baptism in the name of some friend that had died without baptism; for they thought that just as the prayers and fasting of the living benefit the dead, so also Baptism would benefit them. Tertullian explains it this way in book 5 in *Marcionem*, as well as in his book *de Resurrectione*. Likewise, Ambrose, Anselm, and Haymo, according to which exposition prayer for the dead is gathered from this passage, because these Fathers teach that the Apostle, although he does not approve of their error, nevertheless approves of the intention which they had of helping the dead, and from this the argument is taken up: If the Apostle approves of the intention of helping the dead, certainly it cannot be condemned, nor should it be by any Christian; still, I do not think this is the true explanation.

Firstly, because the Apostle should have at least insinuated this was an error, lest he give occasion of erring. *Secondly*, because the Apostle would not have made a solid argument; for one could respond that the resurrection is not well proven from something that certain men believed in error. For just as they erred in baptizing one for another, so they could err in believing in the future resurrection. *Thirdly*, because no ancient historian hands down that this error existed in the time of the Apostles; for Phylaster attributes this error to the Montanists who arose around 100 years after the death of St. Paul, and Chrysostom and Theophylactus attribute the same thing to the Marcionists, who began 80 years after the death of Paul; next Epiphanius (*haeresi* 28) attributes this to the Cerinthians, a sect of which arose twenty years after the death of Paul. Add that Chrysostom and Epiphanius attribute this error, not to Marcion and Cerinthus themselves, but to their posterity, and rightly so. For otherwise, how could it be that Irenaeus and Tertullian did not refute this error, who diligently refuted all the errors of Cerinthus

and Marcion? Indeed, Tertullian says that this error was in the time of the Apostles, but one does not have it on any authority but his; consequently, Chrysostom and Epiphanius, as well as Theophylactus, rightly reject this explanation as false.

2) Another exposition is that the Apostle understands by “the dead” sins, when he says “they that are baptized for the dead,” in other words, what will they do who are baptized for the dead, *i.e.* for washing away sins? So think Sedulius and St. Thomas on this passage of the Apostle.

On the other hand: Firstly, because the Apostle adds: “If the dead do not rise, why are they baptized for them?” undoubtedly, for dead men who do not rise; therefore he clearly teaches he is not arguing about sins, but about men. For he does not wish to show that sins rise, but that men rise. *Secondly*, because the whole force of the argument perishes if it is said, what will they do, who are baptized to wash away sins, if the dead do not rise? For the response could be made that to wash away sins is of much benefit, even if the dead do not rise, because it is good in this life to enjoy the testimony of a good conscience. *Thirdly*, because sins are not called dead, except when they are blotted out and extinguished, therefore Paul does not understand by “the dead” sins which still must be blotted out.

3) The third exposition is that to be baptized for the dead is simply to be baptized in the Baptism of Christ, but receiving baptism is called being baptized for the dead, because before one is baptized, one recites the Creed, which contains the article, “the resurrection of the body,” so that “for the dead” means for the hope of the resurrection, or for dead bodies, *i.e.* so that in the end, our bodies which are going to die, may someday rise again immortal. So think Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylactus; but certainly this exposition is hard and violent to the text.

Firstly, because the Apostle would not have said: “What will they do who are baptized for the dead,” but what will *we* do who are baptized for the dead? For everyone is baptized, not merely a few, yet the Apostle only speaks about certain men, as is clear from the form of the words as well as from what follows, “Why also are we in danger all the day?” *Secondly*, because it is unheard of that by the term “the dead” the hope of the resurrection is understood, or dead bodies, since in Greek νεκροὶ (the dead) is in the masculine gender but bodies are in the neuter gender, σώματα. *Thirdly*, because if we were said to be baptized for the dead because we recite the article on the resurrection of the dead, we could also be said to be

baptized for God the Father, and for Christ and the Holy Spirit, and for the Church, because we recite all these in the Creed. *Fourthly*, because the Apostle seems altogether to understand by “the dead”, dead men and nothing else, for when he says: “If the dead do not rise, why will they be baptized for them?” what can we understand by the word, *them*, except those dead who do not rise?

4) The fourth exposition is that to be baptized for the dead is to be baptized in the baptism of Christ; but Baptism is said to be for the dead because while we are baptized, we act and represent the role of one dead, while we are drowned in water, and of one rising while we rise from the water, and thus we profess the resurrection, and by this profession the Apostle proves the coming resurrection. So Theodoret and Cajetan explain it.

On the other hand, firstly because to act for something does not mean to represent it either in Hebrew, Greek or Latin, but rather to act in its place, or for its advantage. Who ever said about acting in a theater the role of Davus, or Pamphilus, that he acts *for* Davus or Pamphilus?

Secondly, because those who are baptized represent the death of Christ, and at the same time their own death, as is clear from the Apostle: “All of us who have been baptized in Christ Jesus, have been baptized into his death, for through baptism we were buried with him, etc.” (Romans 6). Therefore, to be baptized for the dead will be to be baptized for oneself and for Christ, which is most absurd. The phrase to be baptized for Christ is never found in the Scripture, rather only to be baptized in Christ, or in his name, as is clear from Romans 6, Galatians 3, Acts 10 and 19.

Thirdly, because the argument of the Apostle would be null, since from the fact that one who is baptized acts the role of a dead man, it does not follow that he professes the resurrection. In that case, the Apostle would have needed to say: What will they do who are baptized for the risen, or for the dead and the risen? But even if he had said this, still it would be a trifling argument, because one could answer that in Baptism is represented the resurrection, not of the flesh from death, but of the soul from sin. For the Apostle means that in Romans 6 where he says: “That we might walk in the newness of life,” and in Coloss. 3: “If you have risen with Christ, then seek those things which are above.”

5) The *fifth* exposition is that of Epiphanius (*Haeresi* 28) which Peter Martyr relates, that Paul spoke about the baptism of those who were

baptized in their bed, since they were *in extremis*, who formerly were called *Clinici*, and whom Cyprian jovially opposed to the Peripatetici (lib. 4, epist. 7 *ad Magnum*), namely that the *Clinici* did not walk, but remained confined to their bed, since in Greek κλινῆ means bed. Hence, certain men would have it that the sense of the Apostle is this: What will they do who are baptized for the dead, that is, who are baptized when they are considered more dead than alive, and when it is certain they are not baptized for any use in this life, since they are considered as dead.

This exposition is refuted *firstly*, from the words, “why are they baptized for them”? For he ought to have said, why are they baptized for *themselves*, not for them. *Secondly*, because that “for the dead” cannot be said except regarding actions which happen to the dead. *E.g.*, we rightly say he fell from a high place and was taken for dead, or he was washed and buried for dead, even if he were still living. But it is not rightly said, he walked or ate or spoke for dead. But to be baptized is of the living, not the dead, as a result, it is not rightly said that someone is baptized for dead, even if he is *in extremis*; he ought instead to be said to be baptized for living, even if he were nearly dead.

6) Consequently, the *sixth* exposition is true and germane, that the Apostle spoke about the Baptism of tears and penance, which is received by praying, fasting and almsgiving, etc. And the sense is this: “What will they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead do not rise?” In other words, what will they do who pray, fast, weep, and afflict themselves for the dead, if the dead do not rise? St. Ephraim explains this passage in this way in his *Testamentum*, as well as Peter of Cluny in his book *Contra Petrobrusianos*, Dennis the Carthusian, Hugh of St. Victor, Gagneus and others on this passage.

This exposition is the truest. *Firstly*, because often both Scripture and the Fathers receive “to be baptized” for “to be afflicted”, as in Mark 10, “Can you drink the chalice which I am going to drink, and be baptized with the baptism with which I am going to be baptized?” Or, in Luke 12: “I have a baptism to be baptized with.” The fathers everywhere call the affliction of penance a laborious baptism, and a clean slate. St. Cyprian, in his sermon on the Lord’s supper, says, “He baptizes himself with tears.” And in the beginning of his book *de exhortatione martyrii*, he frequently calls dying for Christ a baptism. Furthermore, St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration *de*

Epiphania says, “I know the fourth baptism which happens by martyrdom and blood, and I know the fifth of tears and penance.”

Secondly, because the very punishment of purgatory is called a baptism by Scripture and the Fathers, as we read in Matthew 3, “He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit, and with fire.” St. Jerome explains “with the Holy Spirit” as what takes place in this life, but by fire, what will take place in the next life. Before him St. Basil had explained the same thing in his book on the Holy Spirit, ch. 15, and after them St. Bede, commenting on ch. 3 of Luke. St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration *de Epiphania*, calls the fire of purgatory in another life the “last baptism”. Therefore, the Apostle very neatly said that they are baptized for the dead who, afflicting themselves with prayer and fasting, take upon themselves the lot of that baptism of fire, in which souls are baptized in Purgatory.

Thirdly, this exposition especially squares with what follows: “Why also are we in danger all the day?” In other words, Why do certain men afflict themselves with prayer for the dead, and I afflict myself by preaching the Gospel, if there is no resurrection of the dead?

Fourthly, because this opinion is the same as that in 2 Maccabees 12: if the dead do not rise, it is superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.

But two arguments are made in objection to this exposition. 1) The first is that the Apostle should not have said, what will they do who are baptized for the dead, but what will we do who are baptized for the dead? For all Christians pray for the dead.

I respond: The Apostle meant to argue not by the custom of Christians, which could be rejected as a novelty by unbelievers, but by the custom of the Jews, who prayed and fasted for the dead from ancient custom and the examples in the Scriptures. In other words, what will they do, who imitating the ancient fathers, pray and fast and afflict themselves for the dead, if the dead do not rise?

2) The second argument is that it does not seem the resurrection of the dead is sufficiently proven from the fact of prayer for the dead, because therein one does not pray that they may rise, but that they may be freed from punishments, and that they might make the passage to eternal rest.

I respond: the questions on the resurrection and on the immortality of souls were so joined in the time of the Apostles, that they were considered one, as we showed above when we explained the testimony from the books of the Maccabees. Therefore, we either follow this exposition, which seems

the truest to us, or the first, which is better than the other four; from which prayer for the dead is clearly gathered.

CHAPTER VII: *Matthew 5:25 and Luke 12:58*

THE *fourth* passage is Matthew 5 and Luke 12. “Readily consent unto your adversary while you are with him on the way lest perhaps he would hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the torturer, and you are sent into prison. Amen I say to you that you will not go out from there until you pay the last farthing.” Here we must explain what are the road, the adversary, the judge, the torturer, the prison, and lastly the farthing.

On the *first*, Chrysostom teaches on Matthew 5 that the way is properly understood as a real road on which one journeys to a judge in this world; for Chrysostom thinks this is no parable, but that the Lord means this literally so as to terrify the anxious with the threat of human danger, so that the judge is understood to be a man, the torturer a man, the prison a physical prison of this life, and the farthing a real golden coin. Ochinus contends that the passage must be explained in this way. I have two things to say in response to this.

In the first place, it is simply not probable, not only because it is opposed to all the other expositors (Origen, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Bede, Anselm and the more recent ones, such as Abulensis, Lyranus, Cajetan, Jansen and others), who teach that the road means the present life, just as when it is said: “Blessed are the immaculate on the road” (Psalm. 118/119), and they consider this discourse to be for the most part metaphorical. Besides that, the Lord does not usually teach and instruct human prudence in earnest, since he often witnessed that the sons of this age are more prudent than the sons of light. Moreover, the Lord would not have so definitively said: “Amen I say to you, you will not go out from there until you have paid the last farthing,” if he were speaking of a human judge, since we often see that the contrary happens and the guilty are freed because they have the favor of someone, or they escape, and pay nothing.

Secondly, I say that if we must consider the opinion of Chrysostom probable, it can only be accepted for the words as found in Matthew 5:25 which he explains. In regard to the words of Luke 12:58, by no means can it

be accepted, for as Ambrose rightly noted, the Lord spoke these words twice, different occasions having been offered. For in Matthew 5 he spoke these words when he was speaking about the love of enemies and on bearing injuries, and therefore the exposition of Chrysostom can be tolerated to that extent. But in Luke 12 the Lord speaks about the future judgment, for he says: "Gird your loins." And then, "Watch, because at an hour you think not, the Lord will come." And at the end he concludes: "Therefore, when you go with your adversary to the Prince," where he clearly shows that he speaks about the future judgment, which will take place after this life; which is also confirmed from what he says right before this: "Why do you not judge for yourselves what is just? For, when you go with your adversary, etc." For he intends to admonish them, this parable being taken from what men usually do; for debtors normally expend every labor to free themselves from a creditor before it comes to trial. This is why Theophylactus and Euthymius, who follow Chrysostom on Matthew 5, nevertheless on Luke 12 rightly say that life is meant by the way, and God by the judge, etc.

On the second, even if it makes little difference who the adversary might be and delays our thesis on purgatory, nevertheless, since it is a worthy matter to discover, we will explain it briefly. Some men understand the adversary to be the devil, such as Origen (hom. 35 in Luke), Ambrose, Euthymius, and Theophylactus (in c. 12 of Luke) as well as Jerome in epistle 8 to Demetriadis. Jerome does not rebuke this opinion in his commentary on Matthew 5 when he says: "Certain men explain it with an even more forced interpretation, etc." For that "more forced", is an error of the printers, and ought to be read "more cautious".

You might ask how we ought to consent to the devil when on the contrary we are bid to resist him? Jerome responds that we ought to consent to him insofar as we are held to stand in the pact initiated with him in Baptism. For then we renounced the devil and his pomps, but if we again desire and take possession of his pomps, which we have renounced, he will rightly accuse us before the Lord. This opinion is not very probable, and is refuted by Augustine (lib. 1 *de Sermone Domini in monte*, c. 22) for the Greek is ἐννοών, that is, *friendly and harmonious*, but we cannot be friends with the devil; next, when he desires that we lust for his pomps, and tempts us for this purpose, then we should be consenting to him, if we were to desire his pomps and would offend God.

Others explain by the adversary, the flesh, but this is rightly refuted by Augustine, since it cannot be commanded to the spirit to consent to the flesh, since this would be a sin. Others understand the spirit as the adversary, to which the flesh is bid to consent. Jerome refutes this, because it is not credible that the spirit is going to hand over its own flesh to the judge; nor will the flesh go into prison without the spirit, but either the spirit alone, or the spirit and flesh together. Others, by adversary, at least in Luke, understand sin because Luke says: "Labor by every means to be freed from him." Ambrose thinks thus, but it is not probable, for to be freed from the adversary is not to flee from or extinguish him, but to settle up with him, which is clear both from Matthew and from the word ἀντίδικος, namely a litigant or a plaintiff. Others understand by adversary another man, who evidently has harmed us, or we him. Hilary, Anselm and Jerome argue this from Matthew 5, and although it is probable, at least in regard to the text of Matthew 5, nevertheless, Augustine refutes it (*loc. cit.*). *Firstly*, because it seems that here the Lord speaks about an adversary that is always with us on the way, and with whom we can always make an agreement as long as the road endures: but a human adversary often dies before his adversary and deserts him on the road. Nor yet may it be said that the just man who is on the road cannot be saved by repentance, if he cannot come to an agreement with his adversary.

Secondly, because properly speaking one man does not hand another to God the judge; or at least there are many other things which are more properly said to hand one over, as we will say, especially because the Greek is ἀντίδικος, which does not mean an adversary by reason of injury but of a lawsuit, that is a plaintiff or an accuser.

Consequently, the truest exposition is that the adversary is the law of God, or God himself, insofar as he commands things contrary to the flesh, or the conscience, which always objects the law of God to the sinner, since these nearly coincide in the same thing. Thus Ambrose, Bede, and Bonaventure (in c. 12 of Luke) explain it. Likewise, St. Anselm and St. Augustine on Matthew 5, and also the same Augustine in hom. 1 *de verbis Domini*, hom. 5 in his book of 50 sermons, and in his book *de decem chordis* c. 3, St. Gregory hom. 39, and Bernard, serm. 85 *in Cantica*. For the law of God and our conscience are always with us on the road, always opposed to wicked desires, and it is of great advantage to be at peace with

them, and to be freed from their enmity; at worst they will be accusers and witnesses against us in the judgment.

There seems to be only one obstacle to this exposition, which is that in Matthew 5 just before this parable the Lord was speaking on reconciliation with a human adversary.

I respond: After the Lord taught that man ought to be reconciled with man, he meant to advise with this parable that we must also remember to be reconciled with God or with his law. Besides, even if it is probable on account of this reason that in Matthew 5 the adversary is understood to be a man, nevertheless, in Luke 12 we cannot understand anything but the law of God, or conscience. This is why Cajetan, who explains Matthew 5 to be on a man, explains Luke 12 to be on conscience.

On the third, all agree that the judge is Christ, since the Scriptures everywhere teach this and especially John 5: “The Father has given all judgment to the son.”

On the fourth, Ambrose (in c. 12 of Luke) as well as Augustine (lib. 1 *de serm. Domini in monte*, c. 21) understand by ministers, the good angels. St. Gregory (homil. 39) and Theophylactus, on Luke 12, understand the demons; both opinions are probable.

On the fifth, all likewise agree that the jail is hell, in which there are many mansions, some for the damned, others for those who are purged. Formerly the most absurd heresy of Carpocratis stood out, as Irenaeus relates (l. 1 c. 24), who said everyone should be exercised in every type of punishment, and therefore souls going out from the body, as if from prison, are examined by the judge, and unless they had suffered all tortures, they would be remitted to another body just like a prison, and this would happen as many times as needed until they had altogether passed through every torment; and he thought the Lord meant this when he said: “You will not go out from there until you pay the last farthing.” But this opinion is too absurd to be worth refuting.

On the sixth, nearly everyone also agrees that by the last farthing petty sins are understood, for the farthing is the smallest coin. For what Augustine says, that the last farthing means earthly sins, because earth is the final element, seems very hard and forced, because still the Lord does not mean to say one must merely pay a farthing, but the whole debt even to the last farthing. There remains a doubt, however, whether this payment is made in hell or in purgatory? Augustine thinks it is a question of the eternal

punishments of hell and therefore he says that “Until you pay,” does not mean a certain time, but eternity, like when it is said in Matthew 1: “He did not know her until she gave birth to her son.” And in Psalm 109: “Sit at my right, until I place your enemies as your footstool.” And in 1 Cor. 15: “He must uphold heaven until all are subjected beneath his feet.” [6](#) But one may not gather therefore that after Mary gave birth Joseph knew her, and so on for the rest.

Others, such as Albert the Great and Cajetan, explain it about hell and purgatory together, so that the sense would be: If the debt is unpayable, you will never go out; if it is payable, you will go out when you have paid everything exactly. Others understand it to be only on purgatory, namely those whom we will cite in a moment.

This third opinion is the truest of all. It is proved: 1) Because the most ancient fathers understood this passage in this way. Tertullian (*de Anima*, c. 17), “...he commits you to the prison of hell, from where you will not be dismissed unless even your smallest offense has been paid off during the time before the resurrection.” Note there, he must only remain in the prison of purgatory to the end, up to the resurrection.

Cyprian, (lib. 4, epist. 2) says: “They are two different things, to stand for pardon and arrive at glory; to be sent into prison to not go out from it until one pays the last penny, and right away to receive the reward for faith and virtue; to be freed from sins after a long period of torture, and to be purged for a while in fire, and at the last to have purged all sins by martyrdom.” (see above, ch. 5)

Origen (hom. 35 in Lucam) says: “But if we owe a great deal of money, like that man of whom it is written that he owed ten thousand talents, I cannot clearly say how long we will be shut up in prison. For if a man who owes a little will not go out until he pays the smallest farthing, then certainly someone that is liable to such a debt will have centuries numbered for him to repay.” And on the Epistle to the Romans he says: “Although he is promised to go out from the prison at some point, nevertheless, it is indicated that he cannot go out from there until he shall pay the last penny.”

Eusebius Emisenus, or rather Caesarius of Arles, or whoever was the author of these homilies, (hom. 3 *de Epiphania*) says: “But these men, who have acted so as to be worthy of temporal punishments, to whom God has so directed his pronouncements that they do not go out from there until they have paid the last farthing, will pass through the fiery river, etc.”

Ambrose, explaining this passage in chapter 12 of Luke, says: "We recall that a farthing is usually given in the baths, the offering of which is made so that each man that pays receives the opportunity to wash there; so here he receives the opportunity to wash. because each man's sin is washed by the kind of situation described, although for a long time the guilty man is trained by punishments to pay the penalties of the error committed."

Jerome on chapter 5 of Matthew says: "This is what he says, you will not go out from prison until you have satisfied also for the smallest sins." Bernard (*serm. de obitu Huberti*), says: "Know this, for after this life in the confines of purgatory you will pay a hundred fold for the things which were neglected here, even to the last penny."

Secondly, it is proved because it does not seem possible to rightly say, "Until you shall pay the last penny," unless at some point there will be an end of the payment. The examples of St. Augustine do not satisfy, for when it is said: "He did not know her until she gave birth," it is indeed not lawful to infer that therefore, later he did, but it is lawful to infer that therefore, she gave birth at some point. Likewise, when it is said: "Sit at my right until I will place, etc." it is rightly inferred that therefore at some point all the enemies of Christ will be put beneath his feet; otherwise that: "*Until*" would be said ineptly. So therefore when it is said: "You will not go out until you have paid the last farthing," we rightly infer: Thus at some point he will pay the last farthing, and consequently he will go out from there.

Thirdly, it is proven from the foundation and scope of this parable; for the similitude is not taken from a murderer or adulterer, or traitor, who are condemned to death, or to life in prison, or to be a galley slave, but from a debtor who, not on account of a crime, but on account of a monetary debt is thrown into prison until he pays. And men of this sort ordinarily go out after some time, as is clear. Therefore the scope of the parable is that in this life we should settle with God, when we can easily obtain the remission of the penalty due for our sins, nor should we wait for a future age, in which it will be exacted severely. That is all for this passage.

CHAPTER VIII: *Matthew 5:22, Luke 16:9, Luke 23:42, Acts 2:24 and Philipians 2:10.*

THE FIFTH passage is Matthew 5. “Anyone that is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment, and he who says to his brother, racha, will be liable to the Council, he who says ‘you fool,’ will be liable to the Gehenna of fire.” Note here the discussion is certainly on the punishment enjoined in the court of God, as is clear from that: “he will be liable to the Gehenna of fire.” This is why St. Augustine (lib. 1 *de serm. Domini in monte*, cap. 19) explains all three as referring to the penalties for souls after this life. Note *secondly*, that it is also certain that here three kinds of sins and penalties are distinguished, as Augustine explains in the same place, and eternal damnation is only given for the third kind of sin, *i.e.* for crimes. But for others inasmuch as they are lighter sins, lighter punishments are given, and hence temporal ones. From that it is inferred that some souls after this life are punished with temporal punishments.

Someone might say, but Christ said: He that kills will be liable to judgment, thus, to be liable to judgment is to be condemned to hell, for murder is a lethal crime. *I respond*: When the Lord says: “It was said to the ancients, he who murders shall be liable to judgment,” he speaks about human and temporal judgment, whereby murderers are punished with temporal death; for the old law threatens murderers with no other death, as is clear from Exodus 21. So the Lord meant to say that homicide is punished by death in this world, but in the next life the agitation of internal anger, although it is a venial sin, is punished with a certain penalty which is indeed temporal, but which is equal with temporal death; and anger protruding outwardly is punished still more severely; but a contumelious word, and murder much more so, is punished with eternal death.

Someone might insist: Granted, the Lord speaks in this passage on the penalties to be inflicted by the judgment of God, still, it does not follow that there are temporal punishments in another life; for God can inflict punishments of this sort in this life.

I answer *firstly*, this passage is understood by Augustine and other fathers to be about penalties after this life. *Secondly*, I say, from this passage it can be deduced that at least some purgatorial punishments take place after this life, for hence we have it that certain sins do not merit anything but a temporal penalty, but it can happen that someone might die with such sins, for one can die suddenly, or while sleeping, so that he would have no space for penance. Therefore, in the next life he will be purged, otherwise either he will go into heaven tainted or unjustly be condemned to eternal punishments, when he did not merit anything but temporal punishments.

The sixth passage is Luke 16: Make friends for yourselves from the mammon of iniquity so that when you falter, they might receive you in the eternal dwellings.” For falter (*deficere*) all understand to die; for *friends*, they understand the saints who reign with Christ, from which it follows that men are helped after death by the prayers of the saints.

Yet, because someone could say that here it is a question of the virtue of almsgiving and the sense is, those who gives alms, when they die are saved on account of the good works they did, it must be observed that not only does the Lord mean this, but also he means that after death souls are aided by the prayers of the saints. 1) For this purpose they bring forth the words: “Make friends ... so that they will receive you.” For almsgiving which is made to wicked men, yet with a good intention, is meritorious, but nevertheless does not make friends who could receive you in the eternal dwellings. This is why St. Jerome (at the end of his book *Contra Vigilantium*), says that the Lord exhorts us to give alms more to the good than the bad, so that those who give alms might be saved by the intercession of good men. Ambrose argues in like manner on this passage, as well as St. Augustine (lib. 21 *de civitate Dei*, c. 27), and they say that by friends the saints reigning with Christ are understood, who help us with their prayers, and will help us when we die.

2) The similitude itself compels us to this conclusion, for the parable was taken from a certain steward who was deposed from office, and having become poor and needy implored help of his friends; and that in the application of the parable to be deposed from office is to die, the Lord himself explains.

3) Add that Augustine (*loc. cit.*) proves purgatory from this passage, for he says there are some so holy that they fly straight to heaven after death and who are not only saved themselves, but can also help others; again

certain others are so bad that they can neither help themselves nor be helped by others, but descend to eternal punishments without a remedy. Then, there are some in the middle who die in such a state that they are neither worthy of eternal death, nor do their own merits suffice for them to enter unto salvation, namely to be received right away into heaven, and these, he says, are the ones that are received into the eternal dwellings by the prayers of their friends.

Peter Martyr has no response to this passage, but objects to himself in the name of Catholics, the words that follow after this parable, and he says that we assert the rich man was in purgatory since he asked assistance of Abraham, and he painstakingly answers this argument as if it were our Achilles, and at the same time deduces from there that souls cannot be aided by the living, seeing that neither Abraham nor Lazarus could help the rich man. Peter Martyr jokingly wonders why the rich man did not also seek to have Mass said for him on his anniversary. But nearly all Catholics say that the rich man is in hell, hence Peter Martyr is fighting the wind.

The seventh passage is Luke 23:42, “Remember me when you come into your kingdom.” The good man, instructed by the Holy Spirit, would never have said this unless he believed that after this life his sins could be forgiven, and that souls need help and can be helped. Certainly, St. Augustine proves from here that some sins are remitted after death. (*Julian*. lib. 6, c. 5).

The eighth passage is Acts 2:24, “The man whom God has raised up, having loosed the pains of hell, because it was impossible that he be held by them.” St. Augustine understands this passage to mean that when Christ descended to hell, he freed many from the tortures of hell, which since it cannot be understood about the damned, seems necessarily to be understood of those who were being purged (epist. 99 ad Evodium; Gen. 1. 12, c. 33). Epiphanius also upholds this in his relation of the heresy of Tatian, which is the last of the first book. There, Epiphanius said that when Christ descended to hell he freed those who had sinned by ignorance but had not departed from the faith of God. And apart from the authority of these Fathers, it is proven from the very words of Scripture. The phrase, “having loosed the pains of hell,” cannot be understood about the pains of Christ himself, since the pains of Christ were completed on the cross, as is clear from the words of Luke 23:43, “Today you will be with me in paradise.” It is also not about the pains of the damned, which is clear because they have been condemned

to the eternal flames. It is also not about the sufferings of the holy fathers, for they suffered no pains, as Augustine teaches (*loc. cit.*) and also St. Gregory the Great (hom. 22). Therefore, it remains that this passage refers to the sorrows of the souls of Purgatory.

But someone will say the Greeks do not read, “having loosed the pains of hell,” rather, having loosed the pains of death, το θανάτου, not το ᾄδου.

I respond: Firstly, the ancient Latin vulgate edition is with us. Secondly, the Syriac, which reads likewise: “God raised him and loosed the ropes of hell.” Thirdly, the most ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, for St. Polycarp, at the beginning of his epistle, citing this passage, writes: “having loosed the pains of hell.” Likewise, St. Cyprian (Serm. *de cœna Domini*, at the beginning), looks to this passage and says: “But the pious teacher willed to show it was impossible for his soul to be detained by hell.” Epiphanius and also Augustine, without a doubt, read the verse in this way. Next, it is proven from the following words, for Peter proves what he had said from Psalm 15 (16): “You will not leave my soul in hell, nor will you allow your holy one to see corruption.”

The ninth passage is Philippians 2:10, “That at the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven, on the earth and in hell.” St. Augustine uses this passage (*de Gen. lib. 12, c. 33*) although it is not improbable that “in hell,” refers to demons. Similar to this is that passage in Apocalypse 5: “Who is worthy to open the book and break its seven seals? And no one was found in heaven, or on the earth, or under the earth.” By those who are in heaven angels are understood, by those who are on the earth, just men, by those who are under the earth, none can be understood except the souls of purgatory, for this is not attributed to the damned. And the fathers who had been in limbo had already been liberated.

Our own use this passage, but it does not seem to carry much weight; for it is probable that for those who are under the earth the fathers who were in limbo could be understood, for even if when John wrote this the fathers had gone out from limbo, still they had not gone out at the time of which he is speaking. He speaks about a time which preceded the death of Christ, therefore he adds: “The Lion from the tribe of Juda, the root of David, has prevailed to open the book, etc.” For Christ, by his death, opened the mysteries of the book which had been closed even to that day. Likewise, that which is asserted in the same chapter, where creatures who are in heaven, and on the earth and who are under the earth are said to have given

praise to God, does not convince, for here, by creatures inanimate things could be understood such as fire, and hail, etc., which in Psalm 148 are invited to praise God, especially since John adds even those which are in the sea.

CHAPTER IX: *Purgatory is Asserted in the Testimonies of Councils*

THE *second* argument is taken from Councils and the custom of the Church. In the first place, what the African Church thought is clear from the third Council of Carthage, c. 29: “And the sacraments of the altar are not celebrated except by men that fast, but if the commendation of some dead men is to be made in the afternoon, let it be done with prayers only.” You can see similar things in the fourth Council of Carthage, c. 79.

The Spanish Church thought the same thing, as is clear from the first Council of Braga, cap. 34, where it commands that prayers should not be offered for those that committed suicide. In chapter 39 it is commanded that the offerings made should be divided among the clerics so that they might pray for the dead.

The French Church thought the same, as is clear from the Council of Cabilonense (Chalon-sur-Saône), in *de consecr.* dist. 1, Canon *Visum est*: “Besides, it has been seen that in all solemn rites of Masses in church the Lord is beseeched for the spirits of the dead in a fitting place.” See also the second Council of Arles, cap. 14.

The German Church thought the same thing, as is clear from the Council of Worms, c. 10, where it is defined that prayer and sacrifice must be offered even for those that are hanged.

The Italian Church thought the same, as is clear from the sixth Council under Symmachus, where it is said to be a sacrilege to cheat the souls of the dead of prayers.

The Greek Church thought the same, as it is clear from the Council of the Greeks gathered under the Bishop Martin of Bracara (can. 69). Nay more, some Greeks seem even to have wanted to help the souls of the dead too much, for in the 3rd Council of Constantinople, can. 83, those who tried to force the Holy Eucharist into the mouths of those who had died without holy communion are rebuked.

Next, we add the general Councils of the whole Church: Lateran III under Pope Innocent (c. 66), Florence, in its last session, in the decree on

Purgatory, and the Council of Trent in its 25th session, in the beginning, and all the liturgies, that of James, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, etc. For in all prayer is made for the dead.

Peter Martyr responds with three arguments, in the place we already cited.

1) He says: “It is usually objected to us that the Church has always prayed for the dead, and I do not deny this. Yet, I declare that this deed has authority neither from the word of God, nor from an example which is taken from the sacred letters. Men are easily moved by an impulse of a certain natural charity, and love for the dead, to wish them well, and they break out into some prayers for them. But this very forceful affection appears to be opposed to faith and just piety.” With these words Peter Martyr argues against the whole Church, that it prays for the dead without the testimony of Scripture, and that it does this from a very forceful affection toward the dead, which is opposed to faith and piety.

a) St. Augustine suffices for the *first* part of the accusation in his book *De Cura pro Mortuis*, c. 1, where he says: “You add that one cannot be unacquainted with the fact that the universal Church customarily prays for the dead” And below, approving this opinion of St. Paulinus, to whom he writes: “In the books of the Maccabees, we read that a sacrifice was offered for the dead, but even if no such thing were read at all in the Old Testament Scriptures, the authority of the universal Church, which is well known for this custom, is no small thing; where during the prayers of the priest which are poured forth to God at his altar, the commendation of the dead also has its place.”

b) We can easily respond to the *second* part of the accusation. What arises from natural affection in prayers for the dearly departed, even if someone thought they did not benefit them at all, can happen in private prayers as well as those which are recited spontaneously, but how could that happen in the solemn prayers of the Church which are read from a book, and have been composed with mature judgment and approved by a Council of Bishops?

c) St. Paul satisfies *the third* part when he says: “The Church is the pillar and firmament of truth.” (1 Timothy 3). Also St. Augustine, who says in epistle 118, that to dispute against that which the universal Church does is the most insolent insanity. Next, reason itself, for if the universal Church can be opposed to true faith and just piety, as Peter Martyr says, therefore

the whole Church can fall to ruin, against the explicit prophecy of Christ in Matthew 16:18: “The gates of hell will not prevail against it.” Which is more believable, that the universal Church could fall to ruin and Christ and Paul lied, or, Peter Martyr labors in the most insolent insanity? I leave that to the judgment of any sane man.

2) *The second* answer of Peter Martyr is that the Church does not pray for the dead so that it might free them from Purgatory, but so as to preserve for itself a witness of their memory, and to also preserve as richly as it can. “And the Church may have made prayers for the dead for other reasons besides purgatory. For they did not want the name of the dead and their memory to perish so easily.” But St. Augustine treats this question in *De Cura pro Mortuis*, ch. 1, whether the prayers of the Church benefit the souls of the dead, and he says they benefit those who were not very wicked in this life, and who merited so as to benefit themselves; but not those that were very wicked and hence merited nothing such as this. Hence, the imagination of Peter Martyr is answered.

3) The third response is that the Church merely exercised its office toward the dead, as if they were still living, and therefore it asked for them that which it thought that they already attained, in the way that Christ prayed for the raising of Lazarus, even though he knew that he already received what he asked for. St. Ambrose, in his prayer on the death of Theodosius congratulates him because he already reigned with Christ, and still at that very instant he prays for him that God would concede to him the rest he desired. Epiphanius (*haeresi* 75), says they pray even for the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs.

I respond: If that were so the Church would pray for all equally, even for Martyrs; but it does not do this. As Augustine says (*Tract. in Joan.* 84), “Therefore, we do not commemorate martyrs at the altar, as we do other dead who rest in peace, so as to pray for them, but rather so that they would pray for us.”

Nor does it appear to fit in any way that someone asks for what he already has; when Christ prayed for Lazarus, he had not yet received what he asked, as Lazarus had still not risen. It is one thing to ask for that which we know we are going to receive, and another to ask for that which we have already received. Furthermore, Ambrose hoped that Theodosius was already in heaven, and therefore rejoiced for him, and at the same time, because he did not know for certain whether this was so, he prayed for him.

Epiphanius in truth does not say anywhere that in the Church the saints are prayed for, but he does say that the commemoration of all the faithful departed is made in the Church, both of sinners and of the just, and he adds: “of sinners,” that we might implore mercy for them from God and, “of the just”, so that we might distinguish them from Christ.

But we distinguish the saints from Christ not, as Peter Martyr says, because we pray for the saints, and not for Christ, but because we offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving for the saints; whereas we do not offer it for Christ, but rather to Christ with the Father and the Holy Spirit, which can be understood from the Greek liturgy about which Epiphanius speaks, and which is extant in volume 5 of Chrysostom. There the commemoration is made of all the saints, and it is said: “We offer to you, O Lord, the sacrifice for the Patriarchs, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and especially the most blessed Theotokos.” But that this sacrifice is not offered for their sins, but for their glory, is clear, for the liturgy immediately adds: “And remember all the faithful departed who have fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection, and let them rest where the light of your countenance is seen.” The same thing can be understood from Augustine (tract. 84 in *Ioan.*), and from St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 5, *Mystagogica*), and from our liturgy, which is altogether the same sort of thing which Cyril, Epiphanius and Augustine describe.

CHAPTER X: *Purgatory is Asserted in the Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers*

THE first of the Fathers, Clement (lib. 8 *const.* c. 48), describes a long oration customarily said for the dead. Dionysius (*de Ecclesiast. Hierarch*, c. 7, par. 3) said, “Then the venerable Bishop approaching carries out the sacred prayer for the dead; that prayer asks for divine mercy so that he might forgive all the sins committed by the dead man through human frailty, and place him in the light, and the land of the living.” Athanasius, or whoever is the author of q. 34 *ad Antiochum*, asks whether souls perceive an advantage from the prayers of the living? He answers that they altogether do. Basil instituted prayer for the dead in his *Liturgy*.

Gregory Nazianzen (*Oratione in Caesarium*) says: “We commend to the same God our souls and theirs, who like those more prepared on the road arrive at their lodging earlier.” In the same oration he prays for the soul of the Emperor. St. Ephraim says in his *Testamentum*: “Continually remember me in your prayers, for truly I lived my life in vanity and iniquity.”

Cyril, in Catechesis 5, *Mystagoga*, says: “Next, we pray for all those who have lived among us, believing this to be of great assistance to those souls for whom the supplication of this holy and awesome sacrifice is offered.” Eusebius (lib. 4 *de vita Constantini*), says that Constantine wanted to be buried in a famous Church so that he could be made a partaker of many prayers. Epiphanius, at the end of his work against heresies, numbers prayer for the dead among the dogmas of the Church, and in *haeresi* 75 he says Aërius was a heretic because he denied this.

Chrysostom (hom. 41 on 1 Corinthians) says: “The dead are assisted not with tears but prayers, supplications and almsgiving... Let us not tire of bringing aid to the dead, offering prayers for them.” Again in homily 69 he says: “The commemoration of the dead that is made in the awesome mysteries was not rashly ratified by the Apostles, for they knew that from it they obtain much fruit and profit.” He says the same thing in other places (hom. 32 in Matth., and 84 in John, hom. 3 in epist. ad Philipp., and 21 in Acts of the Apostles). Theodoret writes that Theodosius the younger laid

prostrate before the relics of St. John Chrysostom and prayed for the souls of his parents Arcadius and Eudoxia that had recently died (lib. 5 *hist.* c. 26).

Theophylactus (in cap. 12 Luc.) said: “I say this on account of the sacrifices and distributions which are made for the dead, which bring no small benefit, even to those who died in grave crimes.” St. John Damascene, in his book on those that had died in faith, proves this truth with many testimonies of Dionysius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and others. See also Palladius in *historia Lausiaca*, cap. 41.

Now let us come to the Latins. Tertullian in *de Corona*, numbers suffrage for the dead among the Apostolic traditions, and in his book *de Monogamia* he says: “Let her pray for his [the dead spouse’s] soul, and beg for him refreshment in the meanwhile, and to be a partaker in the first resurrection, and offer sacrifices on the anniversaries of his death, for unless she will do these things, truly she repudiates him, so far as it lies in her.” He says the same thing in his book *de exhortatione castitatis*.

St. Cyprian (lib. 1 epist. 9), says: “Our predecessor Bishops decreed that no brother at the point of death shall name a cleric as a trustee for his last will and testament, but if anyone were to do this then no offering will be made for him, nor will the sacrifice be celebrated on the anniversary of his death... And therefore Victor, since against the form recently given by the priests in a Council, he has dared to constitute Geminius Faustinus, a priest, as his trustee, is not one for whose eternal rest you will make an offering, or any prayer.”

St. Ambrose (l. 2 ep. 8 ad Faustinum *de obitu sororis*): “Therefore, I reckon that her soul is not so much to be lamented as to be escorted with prayers, nor to be mourned with your tears, but rather to be commended to God with sacrifices.” See also the orations on the death of Theodosius, on the death of Valentinian and on the death of Satyrus, in all of which he prays to God for the souls of the aforesaid, and promises that he will offer sacrifices for them.

St. Jerome, in an epistle to Pammachius on the death of his wife Paulina, says: “Other husbands scatter violets, roses, lilies and purple flowers over the tombs of their wives; our Pammachius waters her holy ashes and venerable bones with the sweet balsam of almsgiving. With these spices and

perfumes he keeps her ashes at rest, knowing that it is written: As *water extinguishes fire, so also almsgiving sin.*”

St. Paulinus of Nola, in an epistle to the same Pammachius, praises him because he had satisfied for both the body and soul of his deceased wife, her body by tears, her soul by almsgiving. The same saint says in epistle 5 to a Bishop named Delphinus, commending to him the soul of his brother: “See to it that by your prayers he might receive pardon, and from the least finger of your holiness the trickling drops of eternal rest might sprinkle his soul.” And, in the following epistle, which is the first to Amandus, he says similar things, commending the same soul to the Bishop Amandus.

St. Augustine says in his book *de cura pro mortuis*, ch. 2: “In the books of the Maccabees, we read that a sacrifice was offered for the dead, but even if no such thing were read at all in the Old Testament Scriptures, the authority of the universal Church, which is well known for this custom, is no small thing; where in the prayers of the priest which are poured forth to God at his altar, the commendation of the dead also has its place.” And in ch. 4: “So, when the mind recollects where the body of a very dear friend lies buried, and thereupon there occurs to the thoughts a place rendered venerable by the name of a martyr, to that same martyr it commends the soul in affection of heartfelt recollection and prayer. And when this affection is shown to the departed by faithful men who were most dear to them, there is no doubt that it profits them... Supplications for the spirits of the dead are not to be omitted: which supplications, that they should be made for all that die in Christian and Catholic communion, even without mentioning of their names, under a general commemoration, the Church has received, so that they who have not parents or sons or whatever kindred or friends to pray for them, may have the same afforded unto them by the one pious mother which is common to all.” (You can see the same thing in the following: *Enchirid.* c. 110, lib. 9; *Confessiones*, c. 13; Sermon *de verbis Apostoli*, 17 and 34; *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, ch. 24; *in Joann.* tract. 84, q. 2; *ad Dulcitium*, and at length, *de haeresibus*, c. 53, where he makes Aërius a heretic because he denied that sacrifices must be offered for the dead).

St. Gregory the Great (*Dial.*, lib. 4, cap. 55) says: “The sacred offering of the salutary host customarily assists souls even after death, so that sometimes the souls of the dead themselves seem to demand this.” And in ch. 50 he says: “It benefits the dead who are not weighed down by serious sins if they are buried in the Church, because their neighbors, as often as

they gather in the same sacred places, see their sepulchers, remember them, and pour forth prayers to the Lord for them.”

Isidore (lib. 1 *de officiis divinis*, c. 18) says: “Unless the Catholic Church believed that sins are remitted to the faithful departed, she would not give alms or offer Mass to God for their spirits.” Victor (*de perseq. Wandal.*, lib. 2) says: “Who of us that are dying will be buried with the solemn prayers?”

Lastly, St. Bernard (serm. 66 in *Cantica*), and Peter of Cluny (in lib. *contra Petrobrusianos*) have written against this error directly. St. Malachi as quoted by Bernard says: “No small hope is laid up for me for that day, in which such benefits are bestowed upon the dead by the living.”

But it will be worthwhile to listen to what Calvin and Peter Martyr should say in response. Peter Martyr answers that nearly all the fathers erred in some matter, and he enumerates their errors. But they erred in private opinions which others refuted; they cannot all agree at the same time in one error, otherwise the universal Church would err and perish.

But Calvin says four things in *The Institutes*, book 3, ch. 5 §10.

1) *Firstly* he says: “1300 years ago the custom was received of offering prayers for the dead.” And after interposing some remarks he adds: “But I declare they were all carried off into error.” This confession is certainly enough to condemn Calvin, for how is it believable that the Church persisted in such a crass error for 1300 years and there was not one of the ancients who resisted it, with the exception of Aërius, whom both we and the Calvinists hold for a heretic?

2) *Secondly*, he says the ancients prayed for the dead not in order to help them, but to show pious affection for them and to console themselves. But this is a lie since clearly the cited fathers say it helps souls, and they distinguish the solace of the living from the help conferred upon the dead, especially St. Augustine in *Enchiridion*, c. 110 and throughout his book *de Cura pro Mortuis*.

3) *Thirdly*, he says the common Christian people began to pray for the dead out of imitation of the gentiles, and moreover, the Fathers accommodated themselves to the opinion of the flock, as is clear from Augustine, in his book *de Cura pro mortuis*, where he especially argues on this matter. In regard to this, Calvin says, “He disputes so doubtfully, hesitatingly and tepidly, that by his chill he could extinguish the zeal of those defending Purgatory. He prayed what he did for his mother because

he did not examine the womanish wish of his mother by the Scriptures, and wanted to approve of all this from a certain private emotion.”

But this is also a lie, for in the first place there was never anyone more diligent than the Fathers in forbidding pagan rites, especially when many pagans were converting. Certainly Tertullian and Cyprian were most severe castigators of every pagan superstition, so much so that Tertullian bitterly rebuked Christian soldiers who wore a crown in the custom of heathen soldiers, yet even they urged prayer for the dead. Besides, the Fathers not only do not rebuke this custom, but even decide in their Councils that it must be done, and urge it to be done, and lead the way by their own example, and finally many of them say this is Apostolic tradition, and number Aërius among the heretics for teaching the contrary. What more could they say? Furthermore, St. Augustine, in his book *de Cura pro Mortuis*, ch. 4, precisely says that there is no doubt that souls are assisted, and in the whole book there is not one syllable which would insinuate the slightest doubt, of which Calvin speaks. Moreover, that he calls St. Monica’s wish “old womanish”, and blames St. Augustine for taking care to fulfill it, is no wonder, since Calvin customarily rebukes and ridicules the saints.

4) *Fourthly*, he says that the Fathers never asserted anything precisely on purgatory, so they held it for an uncertain matter. But this is also an intolerable impudence, or else ignorance. In the first place, even if they had never used the word Purgatory, nevertheless, what the Fathers thought about it could be sufficiently understood from the fact that they so clearly taught that the souls of certain faithful need rest and are helped by the prayers of the living.

Next, there are the clearest passages in the Fathers where they assert purgatory, a few of which I will cite here.

Gregory of Nyssa, in his oration for the dead, says: “Either having been purged in the present life by prayers and the study of wisdom, or after death having made expiation in the furnace of the purging fire, he willed to return to original happiness ... After going out from the body he will not be able to be made a partaker of divinity unless the purgatorial fire takes away the stains intermixed with his soul. ... While others wipe away their stains by a material purgatorial fire after this life.”

Ambrose, on the words of Psalm 36, “Sinners unsheathed their sword,” says: “Even if the Lord will save his servants, we will be saved by faith, yet

so saved as if by fire. Even if we are not burned up, still we are burned. Yet how some remain in the fire, while others pass through, let another passage in divine Scripture teach us, for truly the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, but the Hebrew people passed through; Moses crossed, but Pharaoh was cast down because weighty sins drowned him, in the way the sacrilegious will be thrown headlong into the lake of burning fire, etc.” See also the same thing in serm. 20 on Psalm 118.

St. Augustine (lib. 21 *de Civitate Dei*, cap. 16) speaking about the death of baptized infants: “Not only do they not undergo eternal punishment, but neither do they suffer any purgatorial torments after death.” And in ch. 24, speaking about adult faithful who died while they still had light sins, he says: “It is certain that such men, having been purged before the day of judgment by the temporal punishments which their spirits suffer, will not be handed over to torments of eternal fire.” He says the same thing in hom. 16 from the book of 50 homilies: “Those who lived in a manner worthy of temporal punishments will pass through a certain purgatorial fire, about which the Apostle speaks when he says they will be saved, yet as if by fire.” And in book 2 *de Genes.* against the Manicheans, chap. 20, he says: “He who perhaps did not cultivate his field, and permitted it to be oppressed with thorns, has in this life the curse of his land in all his works, and after this life he will have either the fire of purgation, or eternal punishment.” Lastly in Psalm 37, he says: “Because it is said he will be saved, that fire will be avoided, so plainly although he will be saved by fire, still that fire will be graver than any fire a man can suffer in this life.” (see above, ch. 6).

This is why when Augustine says (lib. 21 *de Civitate Dei*, cap. 26, *Enchirid.* Cap. 69) there can be hesitation and questioning as to whether after this life souls are tortured in purgatorial fire, he does not doubt the fact of the punishment of souls, but about the mode and quality; for in the former passage he only doubts whether the purgatorial fire is the same in substance with the fire of hell, of which Matthew 25 says: “Go into the eternal fire.” And in the latter he doubts whether after this life souls will burn with that fire of sorrow over the loss of temporal things, with which they usually burn here, when they are very much compelled to lack delightful things.

St. Jerome, at the end of his commentary on Isaiah, says: “As we believe in the eternal torments of the devil and of all the unbelievers and impious who have said in their heart ‘there is no god’, so we believe that for sinful

and impious Christians, whose works must be proved in the fire and also purged, the sentence of the judge will be moderated and mixed with clemency.”

St. Gregory says in the *Dialogue* (l. 4 c. 39) “It must be believed that the purgatorial fire is for certain light sins before judgment.” And on the third penitential Psalm he says: “I know that after the departure from this life some men will be purged by purgatorial flames, while others will undergo the judgment of eternal damnation.”

Origen (homil. 6 in Exodum) says: “He who is saved is saved by fire, so that if perhaps one were to have mixed in some species of lead, the fire shall cook it out and purify it so that all may be made pure gold.”

Gregory Nazianzen, in an oration on the Theophany (39), says: “Let these men then if they will, follow our way, which is Christ's way; but if they will not, let them go their own. Perhaps in it they will be baptized with Fire, in that last Baptism which is not only more painful but also longer, which devours wood like grass, and consumes the stubble of every evil.”

Basil the Great (*in Isaiah*, ch. 9) “If therefore we have disclosed our sins by confession, we have dried up the grass as it was growing, clearly suitable to be consumed and devoured by the purgatorial fire... It does not altogether threaten destruction and extermination, but beckons to purgation, according to the teaching of the Apostle, ‘he will be saved as if by fire’.”

Eusebius Emissenus (hom. 3 *de Epiphania*) says: “This infernal punishment will remain for those who, having let go of and not kept their Baptism, will perish forever; but these who lived in a manner worthy of temporal punishments, will pass through the fiery river, through the fearsome ford with fireballs.”

Theodoret in his commentary of the Greek of 1 Corinthians 3:15, says: “We believe in this very purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the dead are proven and cleansed, just as gold in a casting furnace.” Oecumenius says on the same passage: “He will be saved but not before suffering, as is proper for him who passes through fire, and atones for certain lighter sins.” Cyprian in lib. 4, epist. 2 says: “It is one thing for sins to be cleansed by a long period of suffering, and emended by a long fire, and another for all sins to be cleansed by martyrdom.” (see above, p. 23)

Jerome, in book 1 against the Pelagians, says: “But if Origen says that all rational creatures are not to be destroyed, and attributes penance to the devil, what for us who say the devil and his followers, and all the impious

and transgressors perish perpetually, and Christians, if they have been forestalled by sin, are going to be saved after penalties?

Paulinus (epist. 1 ad Amandum), says: “On account of this we eagerly ask that, as a brother of prayer you might unite your labors to ours, that the merciful God would grant rest to his soul by the drops of his mercy through your prayers, etc.” Boethius (lib. 4 *Prosa* 4), “Do you bequeath no prayers for souls after the death of the body? And indeed, I think some suffer bitter punitive punishments, others purgatorial clemency.” St. Isidore (lib. 1 *de divinis officiis*, c. 18), “For when the Lord says, ‘Whoever sins against the Holy Spirit, it will not be remitted to him either in this life or in the next,’ he shows that there are certain sins which will be forgiven, and will be cleansed in a certain purgatorial fire.”

St. Bede, commenting on Psalm 37, says: “Certain men commit some graver and lighter venial sins, and therefore it is necessary that such men as these be rebuked in wrath, that is, be placed in the purgatorial fire in the meantime before the day of judgment, so that the things which are unclean in them might be burned by it, and so at length they will be suited to be among those to be crowned at God’s right hand.” In the same place he says that this fire is graver than the punishments of thieves, of martyrs, etc.

St. Peter Damien (*in serm. 2 de S. Andraea*), “Do not flatter yourself if a lighter penance is assigned for a more serious sin due to mildness or dissimulation, since whatever you do not do here must be completed in the purgatorial fires, because the Most High seeks fruits worthy of repentance.”

St. Anselm on 1 Corinthians 3:15 says: “For the purgatorial fire must be believed to be before the resurrection of bodies for certain lesser faults.”

St. Bernard (*serm. de obitu Humberti*), says: “Time flies irrevocably, brethren, and while you think you are avoiding this minimal punishment, you incur a fuller one, for know this, that after this life whatever was neglected here will be repaid a hundred-fold in purgatory, even to the last farthing. I know how hard it is for a man of dissolute life to take up discipline, for a talkative man to endure silence, for a man accustomed to wandering to remain in one place, but it will be harder and much harder to bear the discomforts to come.”

Lactantius (lib. 7 cap. 21), said: “Whose sins are greater by weight or number, will be bound in the fire and burned, etc.”

Hilary on Psalm 118, on the words: *My soul desired and longed for the judgments of thy justice*, says: “We will face that indefatigable fire, in which

those grave punishments will be suffered by the soul to be cleansed of its sins.

CHAPTER XI: *The Same is Asserted from Reason*

THE *fourth* argument is taken from reason.

T 1) *The first reason*: Certain sins are venial, and only worthy of temporal punishment. But it can happen that when a man dies with only these sorts of sins, it is necessary for them to be purged in the next life.

Moreover, that certain sins are venial is proven from James 1, “Each and everyone is held by his concupiscence, when concupiscence begins it prepares sin, when the sin has been consummated, it begets death.” Here he describes venial sin from the imperfection of the act. Nor does the distinction of the heretics on imputation have place here, for James explains the process of sin *secundum se*, and he teaches after the temptation of concupiscence, which can be present without being carried out, that sin immediately follows if someone is not careful; for from concupiscence delectation arises in the lower part, which is some sin, but still not deadly, if deliberate consent of the mind is not present, therefore he adds: “But if the sin will have been consummated,” namely, adding clear consent, “it begets death.”

Besides, 1 Corinthians 3:15 says: “He that builds with wood, grass and straw will be saved as if by fire.” Here venial sin is described from the levity of matter, and seeing that we understand the words of the Apostle to be either on this life or on the next, either on doctrine or on all works, he necessary is compelled to explain by wood, grass and straw, venial sins, seeing that one who so has them, is saved, as if by fire.

St. Augustine, lib. 83, quaest. 26, says: “Some are sins of weakness, some of inexperience, some of malice; weakness is contrary to strength; inexperience to wisdom; malice to goodness; thus, whoever knows what is strong, the wisdom of God, can judge what are venial sins, and whoever knows what is the goodness of God, can judge that a certain penalty is due for some sins, both here and in the coming age, which has been treated enough, it can be judged with probability who will not be compelled to fruitful and lamentable penance, although they professed sins and for whom

there is altogether no hope of salvation, except they will offer sacrifice to God, with a contrite spirit by penance.”

Lastly, from reason: for it is not understandable how an idle word by its nature would be worthy of God’s perpetual hatred and eternal flames, for this man would be held for the stupidest man in the world, who, on account of the lightest offense of a friend, that was not done in a bad spirit, would refuse to be his friend any longer, nay more, to even pursue him unto death, who had just a while earlier been his friend. Therefore, it remains that there are certain venial sins that are worthy of merely temporal punishment. Moreover, the fact that some men die with venial sins, and hence they need temporal purgation in another life is proven in this way. Someone can, while he dies, have a will to remain in venial sin, therefore such a sin cannot be blotted out in death. Furthermore, “the just man falls seven times a day” (Proverbs 24:16), and many die immediately, so how credible is it that some men do not die with venial sin? This is the first reason.

2) *The second* reason: When sinners are reconciled to God, the whole temporal punishment is not always forgiven, but it can happen and often does, that in someone’s whole life he will not make satisfaction fully for those temporal punishments: therefore, necessarily he ought to be put in Purgatory. The major proposition is briefly proven since it is expressly shown in other places: 2 Kings 12:13, when David said: “I have sinned against the Lord,” and the prophet said, “The Lord has also taken away your sin, you will not die. Just the same, because you have caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme on account of this word, the son that was born to you will die.” Numbers 12:10, when Miriam murmured against the Lord, she was punished with the plague of leprosy, by when Moses prayed for her, her sin was forgiven and still God wanted to punish her so that she would suffer punishment for one week.

Calvin responds to these and similar things (*Institutes* lib. 3 cap. 4 § 31), that there are two types of scourges of God: certain ones are properly for punishments and inflicted by God as a judge, in vengeance for sins committed to satisfy justice; and certain ones that are castigations that are inflicted by God, as father, not in vengeance for sins committed but as a remedy for the future; without a doubt as a man is admonished by a whip, lest he would again sin so easily. Calvin says the first kind pertains to enemies alone, the second only to friends, and hence, when these

punishments are suffered not for justice, it is not necessary that their debt would remain after death, when there is no danger of falling back into sin.

But Calvin labors in vain. Even if one affirmed the whip of the just is really paternal castigations and remedies against future sins, still it must be acknowledged as a true punishment, and satisfaction is due for a past fault *from justice*. For, in 2 Kings 12:14, the reason why David is punished is clearly expressed, and it is not said: Do not sin again, but “Because you have caused the enemies of God to blaspheme.”

Next, death is the true punishment for original sin, and just men suffer the punishment not to abstain from sin but to satisfy divine justice, which is clear because it is not inflicted by God after sin, like paternal castigations, rather it is established in law before our sin just like a punishment for sin, and the same perseveres after sin and even the remission of sin, which we see in Genesis 2:17, “On whatever day you shall eat, you will die,” and Romans 5:12, “Through one man sin entered into this world, and through sin death, etc., in which all have sinned.” And Romans 6:23, “The wages of sin are death.” And Calvin himself in the *Institutes* (lib. 2, c. 1 §8) clearly confesses that death is a true punishment for sin. *Lastly*, how can death be a paternal scourging to establish fear of sin? For one that dies can no longer be corrected.

Apart from this common death, which is the penalty of original sin, we have other examples in the Scripture of those who were punished with a violent death although they were forgiven for sin. Nevertheless, there are many examples showing that death cannot be a paternal castigation in remedy of a future sin. Exodus 32:14, where God spared the people at Moses’ prayer, and still Moses ordered many thousands of the people to be killed in vengeance for sin without any crime; likewise in Numbers 14:45 when the people murmured and God was pleased by Moses, still a great many perished in the desert. Moreover, it is unbelievable that from so many thousands there was not even one that did penance for the crime. 3 Kings 13:24, the Prophet of the Lord, because he disobeyed the voice of the Lord, was snuffed out by a lion, according to what had been foretold to him by another prophet, and still that we should understand that his sin was remitted, and that he died in a holy death, the lion touched neither his body nor the beast of burden that carried him, but instead guarded them both until men came to bury him. *Lastly*, 1 Corinthians 11:30 where it says: “There are many fools among you, and many sleep.” There, Ambrose and others

explain that the Apostle indicates that in the primitive Church there were many that took communion unworthily and were punished by God with death, still that this sin was first remitted is clear from the very thing the Apostle adds in verse 32: “We are rebuked by the Lord lest we might be condemned with the world.”

Let two famous testimonies of St. Augustine be added to this. *The first* is in *Joann.* tract. 124: “A man is compelled to endure [trial] even after his sins have been forgiven, although the first sin was the reason why he came into the first misery. The penalty is more protracted than the fault, so that the fault would not be considered small were the penalty to end with itself. This is also why it is, either for the demonstration of our debt of misery, or for the amendment of our passing life, or for the exercise of the necessary patience, that man is kept through time in the penalty, even when he is no longer held by his sin as liable to everlasting damnation.” The *second* is his commentary on Psalm 50 (51), where he says: “*You have loved truth*”, this is, the unpunished sins of those whom you forgive you have not yet dismissed, so you have preferred mercy to also save the truth, you forgave the one confessing, you forgave, but he underwent punishment, so that mercy and truth would be preserved.”

The assumption of this argument is proved because many who committed a very great number of sins are converted at the point of death when they cannot do penance. This is why certainly it follows that after this life they must make satisfaction. They answer that in death all things are blotted out. *On the other hand*: Death is a penalty for original sin, and therefore common to all, even infants, so other punishments ought to be found for actual sins. Besides, God would act unjustly if it did not seem that he had providence for our affairs, if with one and the same penalty, *i.e.* natural death, he were to punish great sins as well as small, many and few.

3) *The third* reason is taken from the common opinion of all nations, *i.e.* the Jews, Mahometans, pagans, and among them both philosophers and poets confess it. From the Jews, it is clear from 2 Maccabees, 12:42, for, at least the trust which is placed in Livy must be placed in that book. Besides, Josephus, the son of Gorion, in his book *On the Jewish War*, c. 19, he indicates that the Jews customarily prayed for the dead, but not for those who killed themselves.

From the Mahometans, it is clear from the Qur'an, where they precisely confess a purgatory. From the pagans it is clear from Plato in the *Gorgias*,

and Phaedo from Cicero in *Scipio's dream*, and Virgil (*Aeneid* lib. 6):

*For this, the chastisement of evils past
Is suffered here, and full requital paid.* [7](#)

And from Claudianus, book 2, in *Ruffinum* near the end:

*For thrice a thousand years he had forced these through countless
shapes,
he sends them back purged by Lethæus' stream.* [8](#)

Nor would someone say this argument is especially erroneous and fabulous, seeing that the Pagans and Mahometans think it; those matters upon which nearly all nations agree can hardly otherwise come about except from the natural light common to all men. Those things which are devised and created by men are manifold and different for the difference of every nation. So, just as God exists, on which point all nations agree, we say it is most true, but we do not, nevertheless, receive different gods in particular, many of which each nation makes for itself, and just as after this life there are punishments and rewards, on which all agree, we receive as true but do not receive the different fables in which they explain this (that there are punishments and rewards after this life, the knowledge of divine providence teaches all men, but the fables they make by themselves), so also the confession of purgatory, in which nearly all nations agree, we must say is a confession of the light of reason; for knowledge of the same providence taught Purgatory that also taught hell and paradise, at least in a general and somewhat confused manner, because without a doubt we see punishments and rewards so distributed in this life that the wicked have many goods and the good many evils, as many as you like, thence we judge the divine providence distributed justice in another life, as well as the true distribution of rewards and penalties.

Again we see from these those who depart from this life that some are very good, others very evil, and others somewhat good and somewhat bad; this is why we judge by the natural light that there is, after this life, eternal punishments for the very wicked, eternal rewards for the very good and temporary punishments and by these the passage to the rewards for those

who are somewhat evil or good. Plato and others followed this reasoning, who confessed purgatory provided only with the light of natural reason.

4) *The fourth* reason is taken from apparitions of souls that declared they were in purgatory, and also implored assistance from the living; seeing that very serious men relate these apparitions, we do not unduly consider them true, although Luther and the Centuriators mock them. St. Gregory (*Dialog. lib. 4, cap. 40*) writes about the soul of Paschasius, who appeared in the baths of Puteoli to St. the Bishop St. Germane, and he was freed by the latter's prayers. And ch. 55, he writes another similar example. Besides, in regard to a certain monk for whom Gregory himself offered 30 Masses that he had commanded said, he later learned that he was liberated by that apparition.

Gregory of Turin, in his book *de gloria confess.*, ch. 5, writes that a certain holy Virgin by the name of Vitalina that had just died showed herself to St. Martin and that she abided in purgatory on account of a certain light sin, and a little later she was freed by the prayers of the same St. Martin.

St. Peter Damian, in an epistle to Desiderius, writes that Blessed Severinus, the Bishop of Cologne, appeared to a certain priest of the same Church, and showed to him that he was still severely tormented in purgatory because he did not say the canonical hours at distinct times, but piled up all the hours together in the morning, so that he could be more freely employed in Imperial business for the whole day.

St. Bede (*lib. 3 hist. Anglorum, ch. 19*) writes about St. Fursæus who rose from the dead to tell many things which he saw in regard to the punishments of purgatory, and in book 5, ch. 13, he relates a marvelous vision of a certain Diethelm, who similarly was dead and later came back to life by a miracle and related about hell, purgatory and paradise, and his life following, as well as the spiritual fruit which is worked in many other places, and Bede witnesses that this was a true vision.

St. Bernard, in the life of St. Malachi, relates that St. Malachi's dead sister did not appear to him once, although she still abided in purgatorial punishments, and at length, after frequent offering of the Eucharist to God, she was liberated; and in book 1 of the life of St. Bernard (ch. 10) William Abbas, who wrote the life of Bernard, relates that while he was still living a monk that had died appeared to Bernard, laboring in purgatory and a little

later he was freed by the prayers and sacrifices of the holy man. The author of this life wrote that St. Bernard himself usually related this vision.

In the first book of the life of St. Anselm we likewise read that St. Anselm consumed a whole year with daily sacrifices, and at length a dead friend appeared to him, for whom he had prayed so long, and learned that he was liberated from Purgatory. Many similar things can be read with Vincentium, lib. 23, *Speculi historialis*, in the revelations of St. Bridgett and in the life of the extraordinary St. Christina; what we have advanced here, however, is more authentic.

The Centuriators respond that these are fables. But it is not believable that so many holy men would have wanted to deceive, nor even to have been deceived themselves, seeing that they had the spirit of discretion and were friends of God.

Lastly, it stands to reason that because the opinion which abolishes purgatory is not only false, but even pernicious; accordingly, it makes men sluggish in avoiding sins and doing good works. For one that thinks there is no purgatory, but that all sins are abolished by death for those who die with faith, will easily say to himself: To what end do I labor in fasting, prayers, continence, almsgiving? Why do I cheat my heart of delights and pleasures? Seeing that in death I will have a few or many sins they will all be blotted out. But someone that thinks that apart from hell, the most bitter fire of Purgatory remains and whatever was not blotted out here by due works of penance are going to be washed away there, certainly he will go out more diligent and cautious.

CHAPTER XII: *Arguments from the Scriptures are Answered*

IT remains to answer the arguments of our adversaries, which are taken partly from partly from Scripture, the partly from the Fathers and from natural reason.

1) *The first* objection is from Psalm 126 (127):4, “When he gave a dream to his beloved, behold the inheritance of the Lord”; therefore, there is no Purgatory between the death of the faithful and the attainment of the heavenly inheritance.

I respond: The Psalm treats on the general resurrection, as St. Augustine rightly explains, and this is the sense of the words: When he gave a dream to his beloved, that is, when all the elect sleep by corporal death, behold the Lord’s inheritance, *i.e.* then the inheritance of Christ, will immediately appear to those rising in glory with all his elect. That inheritance is also the wages of the same Christ, who acquired us by his passion and death. Therefore, the inheritance and the wages of the son are the same thing, as well as the fruit of the womb; for sons of God by adoption are the Lord’s inheritance and the same sons who are called the fruit of the womb, are the wages of the same Lord.

Add, that in the Hebrew text which our adversaries prefer to the Latin, it does not say, “when he gave,” but “he will so give,” *בן יתן* [*chen itthen*]. Hence, the whole of the argument comes to ruin, for when the inheritance of the Lord will come is what is explained.

2) *The second* objection is from Ecclesiast. 9:10, “Whatever your hand can do, do it with urgency, because neither work, nor reason, nor wisdom, nor knowledge will be in hell, where you are rushing headlong.” For it seems the wise man means with these words that there is no remedy in the next life.

Some respond that these are said by Solomon in the person of the impious, who not only remove Purgatory, but even hell and believe in nothing apart from this life. Others teach that Solomon spoke to those who live idly and shamefully, and are on the road to hell: in such a passage it is most true that there is no remedy or solace. St. Jerome touches upon each

exposition in his commentary. But St. Gregory (*Dialog.* lib. 4, c. 39) accommodates all these things suitably enough to those also which are deduced to Purgatory; for only those can be purged and assisted by the prayers of the living, who, while they lived here on earth, merited it by their good works so that they could be assisted in the next life. This is why everyone ought to do whatever good they can in this life, because in the next they will not be helped except for those things which those alive here can merit for their assistance.

3) *The third* objection is from Ecclesiastes 11:3, “If a tree will fall to the south, or to the north, in whatever place it fell, there it will lie.” Thence, a third place is not given, namely Purgatory, from where one may go out at some time.

I respond: Wisdom literally speaks on *corporal death*, and means to say, so men necessarily are going to die and when they are dead, *per se* they are never going to rise, just as a tree when it falls, stays there and will rot where it fell. Nevertheless, if we wish to accommodate these things to the state of the soul, the men who pertain to Purgatory fell to the south, *i.e.* to the state of eternal salvation and in that state will remain saved forever; or certainly it could be said for “the south” heavenly glory, but through the north Gehenna is understood, but not all fall to the south or north. Moreover, this passage impedes no assertion of Purgatory, because it can also be understood that if it would impede the assertion of Purgatory, it would also impede an assertion of that place to which the Fathers descended before Christ came there, whether that place, the bosom of Abraham, or the limbo of the Fathers, remained perpetually in that place. See Jerome in his commentary, and Bernard, sermon 49 *ex parvis*.

4) *The fourth objection* is from Ezechiel 18:21-22, “If the impious will do penance for all his sins, which he committed ... I will not remember his iniquities.” But how, Peter Martry says, shall God not remember the iniquity of his friends if he punishes them so severely in purgatory?

I respond in two ways. *Firstly*, to not remember iniquity is nothing other than to not preserve enmity with someone that sinned; for if to remember iniquity were to punish wicked merits, to remember justice would be to reward good merits. But our adversaries do not concede that to reward justice is to remunerate good merits, lest it would seem they are compelled to admit the merits of the just, so they ought also not concede that to

remember iniquity is to punish iniquities, for Ezechiel speaks on justice and iniquity in the same way.

Secondly, it can be answered that to remember iniquity is indeed to punish, but to punish *forever*; for when we read the same thing in verse 24: “If the just man turns away from justice, no one will remember his justice.” We are compelled to so explain that justices are said to be handed over to oblivion, not because they would have been paid back with some temporal reward, but they will not free a man from hell, nor will they be remunerated with the eternal reward; for otherwise, the good works of the impious are not cheated of temporal reward, as the Fathers teach (Chrysostom, homil. 67 ad populum Antiochenum; Jerome, *in cap. 29 Ezechiel*; Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 5, cap. 15; Gregory, *Homil. 40 in Evangelia*), and it is gathered from the very words of Luke 16:25, “You have received good things in your life.”

5) *The fifth* objection is from Matthew 25, where we discover only two classes of men: “Come ye blessed,” (v. 34) and: “Depart ye cursed” (v. 41). Likewise, in the last chapter of Mark, verse 16: “He who believes and will be baptized will be saved, but he that does not believe will be condemned.” Then in John 3:18, “He who believes shall not be judged, he that does not believe, has already been judged.” “Therefore,” Brenz says, “no place remains for purgatory, although there are only two places after this life.”

I respond: In the last judgment, which is argued in Mathew 25, there rightly are only two classes because then Purgatory will end, and thereafter only two places remain, Paradise and hell. Moreover, he who believes will be saved and is not judged, *i.e.* he is not condemned, provided he also adds the other things which are required, for faith of itself justifies and saves, if there is no other impediment. Just as we usually say the tree is born from this seed, or if the heat of the sun does not cease, the humor of the waters, and if some other things are required, but not right away, the one who will be saved by faith will be saved without Purgatory, for many are saved, still thus as if by fire, as we proved above from the words of the Apostle.

6) *The sixth* objection is from Luke 23:43; Christ tells the thief that converted in the last hour: “Today you will be with me in paradise.” Therefore, Peter Martyr and Bernadine Ochinus say that purgatory does not remain for those who do not do penance in this life. *I respond*: that very hard death born with a patient spirit, and so admirable a confession at a time when the Apostles themselves denied Christ, could justly be accounted to

have made full satisfaction. Add, that the privileges of a few do not make law.

7) *The seventh* objection is from Romans 8:1, “There is no damnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.”

I respond: Paul, in that place, does not argue about concupiscence, and means to say: those who are in Christ Jesus, and fortified by his grace do not consent to the motions of their flesh. Therefore, this passage is not opposed to purgatory, rather the heresy of our adversaries, who would have it those movements are also true sins, even when the just man does not consent to them.

8) *The eighth* objection is from 2 Corinthians 5:1, “We know if our earthly house of this habitation were destroyed that we have a building of God, a house not made by hand, but eternal in heaven.” Consequently, after death pious men pass into heaven without purgatory.

I respond: St. Paul only asserts that the heavenly home is open after death, not that it is open before death; but he does not say that all pious men make the passage to heaven immediately after death, but shows the contrary when he says in verse 3: “Nevertheless, that we be found clothed, not naked.” For by these words he means they are clothed by those merits and virtues and hence they did perfect penance in this life, right away they are led into their heavenly home; but others are saved, yet, as if by fire, as he himself says in 1 Corinthians 3:15.

9) *The ninth* objection is from 2 Corinthians 5:10, “For we must all be made manifest before the tribunal of Christ so that each and every one may receive what is proper to the body, insofar as he has done, whether good or evil.” But if after this life sins are remitted and there was a place for purgation, certainly each and every man would not receive according to what he did in body.

I respond: The teaching of St. Paul is most true, for even those that find the place for remission and purgation in the next life receive nothing, except what they did in body; for they merit that they persevered in faith and charity even to death, so that even after death they can be cleansed and assisted. By that reasoning even holy men after death, even if they properly merited nothing, still might beg from the Lord whatever they want, because they merited it in this life by right living, so that even after this life they are heard by the Lord. You can see the very thing that we teach in Dionysius, in his book *de Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, last chapter part 3, with St. Augustine

(*Enchir.* c. 110 and *de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 1), and with Gregory (*Dialog.* lib. 4, cap. 39). And these things must be understood according to the same mode: “Let him render to each according to his works,” (Romans 2:6), and “Bear each other’s burden” (Galatians 6:5), and “As a man has sown, so shall he reap” (*ibid.*, 8).

10) *The tenth* objection is from Apocalypse 14:13, “The blessed dead, who died in the Lord, from this time forward the Spirit already says that they should rest from their labors, for their works follow them.” But all the pious die in the Lord; so all the pious after death rest, and none suffer in Purgatory.

I respond with St. Anselm, in his commentary on this passage, that “from this time forward” (*amodo*), does not mean each man from death, but from the last judgment, on which St. John speaks throughout the chapter. Therefore, this will be the sense: The blessed dead, who died in the Lord, from this point forward, *i.e.* from the end of this judgment, on which we are speaking now, they will rest from their labors forever; or if that is not proof enough for someone, we can respond with Richard of St. Victor and Haymo on this passage, that St. John speaks about perfect men, and especially on the holy martyrs (those he means to console in this passage), who simply die in the Lord and do not bring anything with them to be purified; for anyone who dies with venial sins, or with punishment due for some temporal thing, they do not simply die in the Lord, but partly in the Lord, by reason of charity, which they carry with themselves, and partly not in the Lord, by reason of the sins which, just the same, they bring with them. Nor will it seem a marvel that we say some men die partly in the Lord and partly not in the Lord if we read St. Augustine (*Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, lib. 3 cap. 3) where he says the same men in this life are partly sons of God and partly sons of this world. And that is enough from the Scriptures.

CHAPTER XIII: *Objections from the Fathers are Answered*

RENZ advances objections from the Fathers.

B 1) *Firstly* from Cyprian, who in the first treatise against Demetrianum, says in the end: “When they will have left here, now there is no place for penance, no effect of satisfaction.”

I respond: He speaks on the satisfaction for sin which precedes justification, for the Fathers precisely place a two-fold satisfaction. One before justification, whereby God is pleased from what is fitting and inclined to grant remission for sin. Daniel speaks about this (4:24), “Redeem your sins with almsgiving.” The other is after justification, whereby he condignly satisfies God for punishment. Here Cyprian speaks on the first kind, which is clear from the preceding words, in which he says: “We exhort you, to make satisfaction to God while still some time remains in this world and emerge from the depths of the darkness of superstition to the pure light of true religion.” Likewise, from the following words: for after what Brenz cites, it immediately follows: “This life is either lost, or held.”

2) *Secondly*, he advances Chrysostom (hom. 2 *de Lazaro*), who says: “When we will have departed from this life, it is no longer for us to do penance, nor to wash away what we have committed... For those men that do not wash away sins in the present life, they will later find some consolation.”

I respond: He speaks on the remission of mortal sins, for example, of the rich man, who is tortured in hell, he warns us not to delay conversion for another life. But no Catholic teaches that mortal sins are remitted in Purgatory.

3) *Thirdly*, they advance Ambrose (*de bono mortis*, ch. 2), and he says: “Whoever does not receive the remission of sins in this life, he will not there, namely in the country of the blessed.”

I respond: Ambrose speaks about the remission of mortal sins, for he adds, explaining: “But he will not, because he cannot come to eternal life

since eternal life is the remission of sins.” He calls eternal life the grace of justification, which is a certain life beginning with eternity; unless we begin eternal life here we will never come to the glory of the blessed.

4) *Fourthly*, Peter Martyr objects with the same St. Ambrose, who, in chapter 23 of Luke, as well as sermon 46 says: “I read the tears of Peter, but not satisfaction.”

I respond: In that passage satisfaction is called excuse. For we usually say in our common speech: I will satisfy him, that is, I will cleanse the criminal charge with words and I shall show that I was unjustly accused; consequently, in that passage Ambrose praises Peter because he did not excuse his sin in the way that Adam did, but instead confessed it with tears and accused himself. For he so adds: “Peter rightly wept and was silent, because what is usually wept over is not usually excused, and what cannot be defended, can be washed away... I find that he wept, I do not find what he said, because without a doubt Peter said nothing in purgation of himself.”

5) *Fifthly*, Calvin objects using Augustine who says, in tract. 49 *in Joannem*, “All souls have, when they depart this life, their different receptions, they have the joy of good and the torments of evil, but when the resurrection happens, the joy of the good will be increased and the torments of the wicked will be more grave, seeing that they will be tortured with their body... The rest, which is given immediately after death, if he is worthy of it, then each one receives it when he dies.”

I respond: Death brings joy and rest right away to all who die in charity, for in death all become certain of their eternal salvation, because it advances a great joy, but in different ways for the diversity of merits; for it is given to certain men without a mixture of suffering, for some, not without a mixture of temporal punishment; as St. Augustine often teaches the same thing.

6) *Sixthly*, they object the book *Hypognostici* of Augustine: “The faith of Catholics believes with divine authority that the first place is the kingdom of heaven, the second, hell, where all apostates or those foreign to the faith of Christ will experience eternal tortures; the third place we are altogether ignorant of, nay more, we also do not find it in the Scriptures. The same has Sermon 14, *de verbis Apostoli*, and lib. 1 c. 28 of *Peccatorum Meritis et remissione*.

I respond: He speaks about eternal places, for he writes against Pelagius, who found a third place for children that were not baptized, whom he would have it were blessed with a certain natural beatitude outside of hell and outside of the kingdom of heaven. But Augustine, or whoever was the author of *Hypognostici*, did not deny a third temporary place after this life; it can be understood from the fact that the Catholic faith teaches that apart from heaven and hell, there was before the passion of Christ the bosom of Abraham, where souls of the holy Fathers abided. Thus, Erasmus ineptly placed in the margin next to those words: “The third we altogether do not know is purgatory”, in other words, Purgatory would be this third place which the Catholic faith does not know.

7) *Seventhly*, Peter Martyr objects using the same Augustine, explaining that of Psalm 31 (32) *Blessed are they, whose sins have been covered*, says: “If he [God] covered sins, he refused to notice them; if he refused to notice, he refused to punish; he refused to acknowledge but, preferred to forgive.”

I respond: He speaks on *eternal* punishment, for on the temporal punishment which God requires, it is clear from the citations we made of Augustine above in tract. 124 in *Joann.* and on *Psalms* 50.

8) *Eighthly*, they advance Augustine from epistle 54 to Macedonius, where he says that after this life there will be no correction of morals.

I respond: This has no bearing on the matter at hand, for even if there were not, after this life, a place where the dissolute convert and correct their morals. Nevertheless, there will be a place where the light sins of the just (which cannot be called outrages), will be purged as well as temporal punishment suffered for crimes that were already forgiven.

9) *Ninthly*, they object again using Augustine from epistle 80 to Hesychius, where he says: “In whatever place someone will have found his last day, the last day of the world will seize him in this state, because in whatever state he was in on the day he died, so he will be judged in that state on that day.”

I respond: Augustine means after this life merits or demerits will not increase, and thus, everyone that is going to be judged for glory, or for hell, and to greater or lesser rewards or torments, will be judged exactly by the works he had done before his death.

10) *Tenthly*, they object from Theophylactus, who on chapter 8 of Matthew says: “After the soul has gone out it does not wander into the

world; for the souls of the just are in the hand of God, but the souls of sinners are lead hence, like the soul of the rich man.”

I respond: Theophylactus indicates that souls do not wander freely about the world, as demons do, but are closed in their shelters, and although he does not call to mind any besides those two places, nevertheless, he does not exclude another. Moreover, we can recall the souls which are lead to Purgatory, to whichever of those two places which he posits; for because they are just, they can rightly be said to be in the hand of God, although not in the kingdom of heaven, and similarly, they can be said to be in hell because Purgatory is part of hell, or certainly a neighboring area.

11) *In the eleventh place*, they object with St. Jerome, who says on c. 9 of Amos: “When a soul is released from the corporeal bonds from which it wills to fly, or from which it is compelled to go, it has freedom, or it is led to hell, on which it has been written, ‘Who will confess you in hell?’ or certainly it will be lifted up to heaven.”

I respond: Jerome does not speak on natural death, but on the freeing of the soul from the body by a speculation, for he disputes in that place on the impious soul, which, whenever it will turn itself in thought, there it will find God as an avenger. Therefore, when he said: “Or will certainly be lifted to heaven,” he adds, “Where there are spiritual things of wickedness in heaven, even if they mean to claim for themselves knowledge of circumcision, and having been conceived in humility, dwell in the mountains, and there it will be of no avail to avoid the probing hand of God, or try to avoid the eyes of the Lord, and to arrive in the last confines of salty waves, even if there the Lord will deliver to the torturous and ancient serpent, who is the enemy and avenger and he will bite the soul. Also, taken with vices and sins it will be struck by the sword of the Lord, that through tortures and punishments they be returned to the Lord.”

CHAPTER XIV: *Answer to Objections Raised from Reason*

ASTLY, they take up arguments from reason.

L 1) *The first* reason, is that after sin has been remitted no punishment remains, for remission of sin takes place by the merit of the Passion of Christ, which is infinite and sufficient to take away every sin and punishment, therefore nothing remains to be purged after justification.

I respond: First by turning the argument on its head, for if Christ satisfies for all of our sin and punishment, why do we still suffer so many things after our sins have been remitted, and at length also die? Should they say that they are paternal castigations to remedy future sin, we can ask why do infants get sick, who do not have the capacity for actual sin? Therefore, I say the merit of Christ suffices to take away all sin and punishment, but it must be applied to be efficacious, otherwise all men would be saved.

Furthermore, the application happens through our acts and the Sacraments. God willed that after Baptism the merit of Christ would be applied with contrition, and confession with the absolution of the priest to abolish sin, and further, be applied by satisfying works to take away temporal punishment, for eternal punishment is commuted to temporal when sin is remitted. This is because, when sin is remitted friendship is restored, and consequently the right to glory is given, and hence, he ought not be punished forever because in that mode, the soul would never attain to eternal glory and yet justice be exacted, since sin should be punished in some mode, thus eternal punishment is changed into temporal punishment. Something about the reason for it was said above, and more will be said in the disputation on satisfaction.

2) *The second* reason: In Baptism all sin and punishment is remitted, but Penance is a certain remembrance of Baptism, or rather, it is a certain type of Baptism; therefore, nothing remains to be cleansed after penance.

I respond: If the sacrament of Penance were received in an integral and Catholic manner, as embracing contrition, confession and satisfaction, full and now perfect, the whole argument can be admitted; but if it is received in

favor of absolution alone, in which the sacrament especially consists, the consequent is denied. For there is a great distinction between the sacrament of ablution and the sacrament of absolution, the ignorance of which is the reason for every error on satisfaction, the keys and indulgences, as well as on Purgatory.

Therefore, we say in the Sacrament of Baptism, God acts very generously, and applies the merit of Christ through that one action of ablution, to take away every sin and punishment of the next life, that is, both of hell and purgatory; but for the temporal punishments of this life, not even Baptism takes away, as is clear in sick and dying children that are baptized. But in the Sacrament of absolution God still holds back his hand, and applies the merit of Christ to take away sin and eternal punishment; nevertheless, it still requires works of penance, in which we make recompense for temporal punishments; this is clear from Hebrews 6, where the Apostle says: "It is impossible for those who are once illumined (*i.e.* the baptized) to again be renewed to penance", namely baptismal penance, because God only once uses that generosity. And in chapter 10 he says: "For if we sin wilfully after having the knowledge of the truth," *i.e.* after the illumination of baptism, "there is now left no sacrifice for sins," *i.e.* another suffering Christ and dying is not left behind, with whom we could again die by Baptism; for so all the Greek and Latin fathers explain these two places.

From that we have a notable argument for Purgatory. For the opposed particle is placed, "the terrible expectation of judgment and the blaze of fire, which is going to consume the adversaries". For if that would only mean the fire of hell, it would follow that all who sin after Baptism are necessarily going to be damned, or certainly that Paul speaks ineptly. Nor would we rightly say another Baptism does not remain for the sinner after Baptism but hell, if apart from Baptism there are other remedies, as there really are.

Therefore we must say that by fire, St. Paul understands fire in general, whether of hell or purgatory, so that this would be the sense: another Baptism does not remain for the sinner after Baptism, nor some equivalent remedy, *i.e.* just as easy which would free him from all fault on the spot; but fire necessary remains, either perpetual, if a man would not convert, or temporal, if he converts; nevertheless this temporal fire of purgatory will be in another life, unless the fire of affliction, taken up voluntarily, will purge a man in this life, and this is what we call satisfaction. The same thing is clear

from the Fathers, who on that account call the Baptism of water easy, and compare it to a ship easily passing over the waters, and penitence a laborious baptism of tears, fire and a second plank after the shipwreck. Thereupon, reason persuades the same thing; for after the first reconciliation, one sins so much more grievously the more ungrateful he is, as well as the greater the knowledge and assistance he possesses. See Gregory Nazianzen in his oration on *Holy Lights*, as well as Theodoret in the *Epitome of the divine decrees*, second to last chapter, as well as John Damascene, lib. 4 c. 10.

3) *The third* reason: The honor of Christ ought to remain spotless, for he alone is our liberator and redeemer. But if we make satisfaction, now we divide honor with Christ, for we become our own redeemers in some part, and we would owe not our whole salvation to Christ, but only part of it.

I respond: If it is a question of words, Scripture clearly says, “Redeem your sins with almsgiving,” and Philippians 2:12 says, “Work out your salvation with fear and trembling.” There, man is called his own redeemer and savior, but no injury is done to Christ on that account, the whole strength of our works and satisfaction depends upon the blood of Christ, and if we redeem sins, or work out our salvation, we do it by a gift of his spirit to us, or rather the very spirit of Christ works these things in us, just as nothing detracts from God which will be done through secondary causes. Nay more, it is added more to his glory because from that the efficacy of the power of God appears even more, seeing that he could not only do it, but even give to other things the force of operation.

4) *The fourth* reason: If satisfaction were applied to us by the works of Christ, either there would be two satisfactions joined together, one of Christ and the other ours, or only one. If two, then the same fault is punished by these and two punishments correspond to one sin; yet if one, either this is of Christ and then we do not make satisfaction, or ours and then Christ is excluded, or we truly divide the honor with Christ; for he will pay for the sin, we for the punishment.

I respond: There are three manners of speaking. *The first* is of those who assert that it is only one and that is of Christ, and we properly do not make satisfaction but only do something under the watchful eye of God who applies the satisfaction of Christ to us, which is to say our works are not without conditions, without which the satisfaction of Christ would not be applied to us, or in general, they are dispositions; So thinks Michael de

Bay (Bajus) in his book *de Indulgentiis*, in the last chapter, which seems to me to be an erroneous opinion, for Scripture and the fathers everywhere call our works satisfactions, and of sinners redemptions. Lastly if a just man can merit eternal life from his works *de condigno*, why can he not satisfy for temporal punishment, which is less?

The second manner of speaking is of others, that there are two but one depends on the other; this mode does not seem improbable to me; for even if one would suffice, still, for the greater glory of God, whom it satisfies, and the greater honor of the man making satisfaction, it pleased Christ to join our works to his, in the way in which one drop of his blood sufficed to redeem the world, and still he willed to pour forth all his blood that it would be a most copious redemption; in this way even a just adult man has the right by a two-fold title to the same glory, one by the merits of Christ communicated to him by grace, the other from his own merits.

The third manner of speaking seems more probable, that there is only one actual satisfaction, and this is ours. Christ is not excluded, or his satisfaction, because by his satisfaction we have the grace from where we make our satisfaction, and in this mode it is said that the satisfaction of Christ is applied to us; not that it makes immediate satisfaction to take away the temporal punishment due to us, but that it takes it away by a medium, insofar as we have grace from his satisfaction, without which our satisfaction would count for nothing.

Apart from these objections of the heretics we will also strike to other objections which theologians usually propose, to more clearly elucidate the truth of the matter.

5) *The fifth* objection from reason: In Purgatory there is no merit, therefore no satisfaction; for the same thing is required to merit and satisfy, and every satisfaction is meritorious.

I respond: The consequent must be denied, for certain common things are also required for merit and satisfaction, but also certain things of our own, from a defect of which something is merit without satisfaction, and vice versa. *Gratia inhabitans* is required for both, but this does not suffice. For it is required for satisfaction that a work, which is done, must be penitential, which is not required for merit. Freedom is required for merit, which praise follows; that which is not required for satisfaction, since when someone is compelled by a judge to pay a debt, he truly satisfies, even if compelled; on that account state of life is required to merit. For God, as the

agonotheta of our games, wills the present life to exist, in turn, souls which abide in Purgatory, because they are the medium from which to the state between wayfarers and the blessed, or the damned, for they are confirmed in good and yet are still held back from the attainment of the supreme good, and so they can make satisfaction, but not merit, although we can do both, the blessed and the damned, neither.

6) *The sixth reason*, Purgatory is constituted partly for the remission of venial sin, and partly to satisfy for punishment, but neither have place after this life; for it is of him to rise again from fault whose it is to fall into sin, but after this life souls cannot commit venial sins.

Besides, all sins are remitted by penance, but after this life there is no penance, for death is the same for man as the fall for the angels, as Damascene says (lib. 2 cap. 4). But angels through their fall became immovably fixed in evil. Next, in this life, as a just man can merit an increase of grace, so also remission of venial offenses. But after this life, there is no merit. Further, on punishment it is so proven: Punishment is on account of sin, and as sin increases, so also punishment, as sin decreases, so also the punishment, therefore, without sin, punishment is removed.

I respond: There are not lacking those who, on account of these arguments, deny that venial sin can be remitted after this life, as St. Thomas relates in his Commentary on the Sentences, (4 dist. 21 q. 1 art. 2). But they were saying all venial sins are remitted in death itself through the final grace. But they erred because Scripture and the Fathers clearly teach that after this life, light sins are remitted, nor is their foundation solid, for the final grace cannot remit sin which pleases in act, nay more, that which does not displease in some mode. But someone can die in the complacency of venial sin, or certainly without any act such as if he died straight away, or in madness, or sleeping.

Others, such as Scotus (4 dist. 21 quaest. 1) say that sin remains only in man after his acts pass, he is remanded to punishment and therefore venial sin is said to be remitted in Purgatory because there it is punished totally, but mortal sin cannot be said to be remitted after this life, because it is never punished there totally, unless in this world the guilt of eternal punishment were changed into the guilt of temporal punishment, and so here the remission would begin, he will not be able to be purged there. This opinion is false, both because without any doubt sin remains in man apart from the guilt of punishment, even a stain, or something similar, through

which a man is formally called a sinner and worthy of punishment, and also because in this mode venial sins really cannot be said to be remitted in Purgatory, for that which is totally punished is not remitted, for remission denotes the gift.

There is another opinion of the same Scotus (*ibid.*), that venial sins are remitted in the first instant of the separation of the soul from the body, but remitted by preceding merits. For he says that every good work which pleases God more than venial sins displease him, thereupon remit venial sins; moreover, while a man lives, not all venial sins are remitted by good works of this sort, because the very pleasure taken in sin is an impediment which, once it has been lifted (which happens in the first instant after death), then sin is remitted. I don't like this because it is not probable that every good work remits venial sin, unless there were at least a virtual displeasure for those sins. Then, because it would follow that after this life sin is never remitted except one sin, namely the one whose act is continued even to death, that which Scotus himself admits, but it is against the Scripture and the Fathers, as is clear from the aforesaid. Thirdly, it would not be necessary to pray for the dead so that they would be absolved of venial sins, as the Church prays and from the prayers of the Church wherein we ask that what was contracted by human frailty be forgiven. (Dionysius, *Eccles. Hierarch.*, last chapter).

Therefore, the opinion of St. Thomas in 4, dist. 21, q. 1, art. 2 is true, that venial sins are forgiven in Purgatory by an act of love and patience; for that welcoming of punishment inflicted by God, since it proceeds from charity, can be called a certain virtual penance, and although it is not properly meritorious, because there is no increase of glory or grace, nevertheless, it does remit penance.

Ad Primum: I deny the major proposition universally, for it has place only in mortal sin; what attains to venial sins, a soul can be freed from venial sins in Purgatory because it has appropriate means, *i.e.* an act of love contrary to sin, but it cannot fall into venial sin, because it lacks the *fomes peccati*, and besides, because it is confirmed in good.

Ad Secundum: I say after this life there is no penance for mortal sins, because the damned are fixed in evil, and Damascene holds this opinion, still in the souls of Purgatory there can rightly be displeasure at sin, and by that charity, and hence useful.

Ad Tertium: I say the souls of purgatory are not altogether on the road, and besides, they cannot merit an increase of grace; nevertheless, they are not altogether at the end, and therefore can do something which would pertain to the remission of venial sin.

I respond to the second part of the argument, the punishment depends upon the sin it happened in, not *in esse*, and therefore that phrase, “as the sin decreases so the punishment”, if something were understood in which a sin is lesser in that it generates a lesser punishment, is true, otherwise it is false, for punishment is also due on account of a past fault.

CHAPTER XV: *The Confession of Purgatory Pertains to the Catholic Faith*

NOW it remains that we bring to naught the opinion of Peter Martyr, who, in his commentary on chapter 3 of 1 Corinthians, contends that the existence of Purgatory cannot pertain to a dogma of faith in any way, which was the first opinion of Luther, or perhaps his first error. There are five reasons for this.

1) *The first* reason is because Scripture is silent on Purgatory in those passages where there was the best occasion for speaking about it. In Genesis 49 the funerals of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah and Rachel are very carefully described, and still not even a word is said about Purgatory. Likewise, in Leviticus, many kinds of sacrifices are instituted for different things, and there nothing is instituted for the dead. Next, Paul, in 1 Thessalonians 4, when he expressly argues about the dead, says nothing about Purgatory, but only asserts that they are going to rise and concludes: "Console each other with these words."

2) *The second* reason is because the Greek Church, which is the other part of the Church, resisted this doctrine for a long time in the Council of Florence, therefore, if even to our times half the Church does not believe Purgatory, how is it an article of faith?

3) *The third* reason is, because Dionysius, in the last chapter of *Ecclesiast. hierarchiae*, proposes this question: Why do Bishops in the burial of the faithful, pray for the dead and yet do not call purgatory to mind, and he labors anxiously to solve the question. But if Purgatory were a dogma of faith, he could have easily responded right away that he prays for the dead so they would be freed from Purgatory.

4) *The fourth* reason is that St. Augustine asserts with precise language, that he had only an uncertain rather than certain trust that Purgatory exists, in *Enchiridion*, cap. 69, where he says: "That such a thing as that happens after this life does not seem unbelievable. It is a matter that may be inquired into, and either ascertained or left hidden, whether some believers will pass through a sort of purgatorial fire, and in proportion as they have loved with more or less devotion transitory goods, be less or more quickly delivered

from it.” In his book on eight questions of Dulcitius, quaest. 1, he says: “Whether in this life only, men suffer such things, or whether some such judgments also follow after this life, the meaning that I have given of this sentence, as I suppose, does not abhor the truth.”

He says the same thing in *de fide et operibus*, cap. 16. Then, in book 21 of *City of God*, c. 26, he says: “But if it be said that in the interval of time between the death of this body and that last day of judgment and retribution which shall follow the resurrection, the bodies of the dead shall be exposed to a fire of such a nature that it shall not affect those who have not in this life indulged in such pleasures and pursuits as shall be consumed like wood, hay, stubble, but shall affect those others who have carried with them structures of that kind; if it be said that such worldliness, being venial, shall be consumed in the fire of tribulation either here only, or here and hereafter both, or here that it may not be hereafter — this I do not contradict, because possibly it is true.”

5) *The fifth* reason is because Scripture clearly disagrees with it, as John 5, Luke 13 and Apocalypse 14, as we advanced and refuted above.

These are the mainstay of it and they do not move us at all, so that we resolutely again assert that Purgatory is a dogma of faith, so much so that one who does not believe that Purgatory exists will never arrive there, rather he is going to be tortured in the fire of hell. Now it is customarily proven as a dogma of faith in four ways.

Firstly, from the express testimony of Scripture with a declaration of the Church, in the way we prove that Christ is *ὁμοούσιον* with the Father from that of John 10: “The Father and I are one,” with the addition of the Council of Nicaea; for otherwise the quarrel with the Arians could not have been ended, since that passage, and others which they usually advanced they would explain otherwise.

Secondly, by the evident deduction from those which are expressly held in Scripture; in the way we prove Christ has two wills, divine and human, because according to the Scriptures, he is God and man, with the addition of the decree of the Sixth Council.

Thirdly, from the word of God not written by the Apostles, but handed down, in the way we prove the Gospels and the Epistles of Paul are divine Scriptures.

Fourthly, by the evident deduction from the word of God handed down, how St. Augustine everywhere proves that it must be believed that infants have original sin, even if it is not contained in Scripture because it is evidently deduced from Apostolic Tradition on infant Baptism. From that it is clear the sufficiency of these four modes is clear, because that alone is of the faith which has been revealed by God mediately or immediately. Moreover, divine revelations are partly written, and partly unwritten. Consequently, the decrees of Councils, Popes and the consent of doctors and all others are reduced to these four, for only then do they make a matter *de fide*, when they explain the word of God or deduce something from it.

Indeed, Purgatory is proven from all of these modes. From the first mode it is clear from twenty passages of Scripture, which we have advanced, and some of which are explained by the whole Church to be on Purgatory, as is clear from the Councils and the Fathers whom we cited.

In regard to the second mode, it is clear from the first two reasons which we gave.

On the third mode it is evident from the fact that we do not find the beginning of this doctrine, but all the Greek and Latin Fathers from the time of the Apostles constantly taught that there is a Purgatory. For such things must be related to Apostolic tradition, as St. Augustine affirms (lib. 4 *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, cap. 24).

On the fourth mode it is clear from Clement, Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom cited above, because they assert that prayer for the dead is Apostolic tradition, and none of the Fathers ever said the contrary. From that, it is evidently gathered that there is a Purgatory. If tradition is Apostolic, that it is necessary to pray for the dead, who does not see that it follows thence that souls after this life need assistance and hence they will not suffer eternal, but only temporal punishments? Nor will it be difficult for us to answer the arguments of Peter Martyr.

1) Therefore, to the first I respond: *firstly* it is not necessary for Scripture to say all things everywhere.

I say *secondly*, to that of Genesis that it was not an occasion of placing the doctrine on Purgatory. Genesis is not a book of dogmas, but a certain history of the Patriarchs. Thus, doctrine in that time is not preserved in Scripture but in tradition. Otherwise, we will say that before the times of Abraham no one was ever justified because Scripture does not hand down how men were justified in the time of Adam, Enoch and Noah.

Lastly, I say that mention of Purgatory is at least implicitly made in Genesis, for when it is said in Genesis 23 “And Abraham rose from the office of the funeral,” what prevents that word, office (*officium*) from being taken to mean not only tears, but also prayer and fasting? And why, I ask, when Jacob and Joseph were dying in Egypt, they desired their bones to be brought into the promised land, except because there alone they knew sacrifices were going to be offered for the dead?

To that of Leviticus, I deny that sacrifices were not instituted for the dead in Leviticus, seeing that those which were instituted for sins were understood for the sins of both the living and the dead, which is clear from 2 Maccabees 12.

To that of Paul I say, that in that passage Paul only means to say one should not immoderately weep for the dead in the way the pagans do. Given his scope, however, it would not be of no benefit to his purpose, but even harm it to make mention of purgatory. For, to say the souls of our neighbors are severely tortured in Purgatory is not to advance matter for consolation, but greater mourning; Paul, however, meant to console them, as is clear, and therefore he mentioned the resurrection and glory and concludes: “Therefore, console one another with these words.” But in other places, as earlier in 1 Corinthians 3:15 as well as chapter 15, and Hebrews 10, Paul precisely places the fire of Purgatory and the laborious baptism received for the dead.

2) I say to the second that the Greek Church never doubted about Purgatory, as is clear from the Fathers we have cited, Dionysius the Areopagate, Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim, Chrysostom, Cyril, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylactus, Damascene, and the Council of Florence itself. For, what Peter Martyr says, that in that Council the Greek Fathers resisted for a long time, is a lie, accordingly in the first session, and again in the last, they affirmed that they always believed in Purgatory as well as prayers for the dead, but only called into question the nature of the punishment, whether it is fire or something else. So what he boasts about the Greeks is either absolutely false or must be understood to be about individuals.

3) I marvel at the third argument of Peter Martyr, for even if Dionysius does not say Purgatory by name, nevertheless he expressly says that prayer is made for the dead to free them from sins. “With prayers he directs, by divine goodness, that all sins which were committed from human frailty

would be forgiven to a man once he leaves this life.” Next, he asks why prayer is made for the dead, so that his sins would be remitted, since it was written that all are going to receive insofar as they acted in their body? He answers therefore, they are prayed for, because they are made worthy by the merits of this life for the prayers of the living to benefit them. Even if St. Dionysius opposed himself, he could not ignore Purgatory or deny it since he so clearly asserted prayer for the sins of the dead.

4) To the fourth, we oppose other citations of St. Augustine. In the same *Enchiridion*, c. 110, he asserts that prayers and sacrifices benefit souls and similarly in *quaest. 2 ad Dulcitium*, as well as *City of God* book 21, ch. 24, he says it is certain that souls are cleansed after this life, and in chapter 1 *de Cura pro mortuis*, he says: “There is no doubt that prayer benefitted the dead.”

Peter Martyr responds that these passages ought to be explained by those in which he doubts. But how, I ask, will we explain “it is certain,” and “there is no doubt,” by “It is not unbelievable” and “Perhaps it is true”? It is necessary to say that Augustine held something about Purgatory with certain faith, and doubted on some matter. What exactly he doubted we will easily explain. But Peter Martyr will not so easily be able to explain what it is on which Augustine did not doubt, for nothing less can be granted than that he had not doubts about purgatory in general, *i.e.* that there is some purgatory after this life. With some certain faith, doubt could exist on the type of punishment which is inflicted, on the nature of the sin which is punished in the place, the time, etc. Yet, no certain faith in regard to purgatory can correspond with uncertainty about Purgatory in general; nevertheless, Augustine says he has certain faith in regard to it.

Therefore, I say that Augustine, in those four citations, only doubts on the type of sin which is punished, namely, whether it is like immoderate love toward temporal things in this life which is purged by God through various afflictions, such as the death of a wife and children, etc. So also it would be believable, after this life, for certain other relics of such actual affections which ought to be cleansed by tribulations and troubles to still remain in the disembodied spirit. Even if disembodied spirits do not seem to be able to be touched by corporal affections of this sort, nevertheless, when they are forms of bodies and were in the body for a long time as well as desire to be reunited with the body, it is not unbelievable that they still remember the desire which they experienced through corporeal instruments

and thereby hold onto some desire. But because the matter is so difficult, Augustine rightly said it could be inquired after and perhaps the answer would never found.

5) The fifth has already been answered above.

END BOOK I

BOOK II: ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF PURGATORY

CHAPTER I: *On the Persons for whom Purgatory is Suited*

HERETO, it has been shown that Purgatory exists. Now we must treat the genus on the circumstances of Purgatory, *i.e.* on the persons, the place, time, punishments, prayers and other matters. *The first question* that arises is: “For which persons is purgation after this life suited?” There are many errors extant on the persons of this kind.

1) *The first* was that both the good and the bad need to be purged after this life, with the exception of Christ. This opinion is usually attributed to Alcuin, but it seems to be not only his, but of several Fathers. Origen (*hom. 14 in Lucam*) says: “I think that after the resurrection from the dead we will need the sacrament to wash and also cleanse us, for no man could rise again without spot, nor could any soul be found that would not have any vices.” And on Psalm 36 (37) he says: “It is necessary for all of us to come to that fire, even if someone were Paul or Peter.”

St. Ambrose, on Psalm 36 (37) says: “The sons of Levi will be cleansed in fire, Ezechiel and Daniel by fire.” And in Psalm 118 (119), *serm. 20*, adducing that of Genes. 4 “He placed before paradise a fiery sword,” says that the fiery sword is the purgatorial fire, through which whoever would pass into paradise necessarily must pass through the fire. “It is necessary for all to make passage through the flames, whether he was John or Peter, etc.” And further, “The one Christ of God, who is justice, could not feel that fire.”

Hilary seems to have supposed the same thing from the words of Psalm 118 (119) “My soul eagerly longs for the judgments of your justice.” There he even insinuates that the Blessed Virgin ought to pass through the fire. Lactantius held the same thing (*lib. 7 cap. 21 divin. Instit.*) and Jerome, in *ch. 7* of Amos, from those words: “Behold he will call the fire to judgment.” Next, Rupert (*lib. 3 in Genes. c. 32*) explaining the fire sword.

This opinion, taken as it sounds, contains a manifest error. For in the last session of the Council of Florence, it was defined that some souls are

received in hell, some in purgatory, some in heaven. Next, the Church believes those who die right after Baptism can never suffer the punishment of Purgatory, as Augustine firmly teaches (*de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, cap. 16) and likewise those who are Baptized in blood, as Cyprian says (lib. 4, epist. 2), for he affirms all sins are cleansed in martyrdom, therefore, martyrs immediately obtain their reward.

Additionally, what the Fathers adduced (with the exception of Origen, whose words in *hom. 14 in Lucam* do not suffer a suitable exposition) seem to be able to be understood in a sound mode: for some of them do not understand the fire to be a purgatorial fire, but the fire of divine judgment, in the way Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 3, when he says: "Fire will prove the value of the work of each and every man." And in this mode it must be affirmed that all the Saints, with the exception of Christ, made passage through the fire. It seems in this way that Hilary and Jerome spoke about the fire, and in the later passage Ambrose.

But some seem to understand the fire to be the true flame of Purgatory, through which they say the Saints pass through without any harm, so that they would pass through Purgatory materially, but not formally. This is the way it seems Lactantius, Ambrose and Rupert speak. Lactantius so says: "But also, when God judges the just and will have already examined them with fire, then for those whose sins prevail either by weight or number, they will be bound to the fire and burned; but those who are full of justice and whom the ripeness of virtue has smelted, they will not perceive the fire, for they have something in them of God which repels the force of the flame." So also Ambrose speaks in Psalm 36 (27), where he had said all are going to pass through the fire, he added that certain men are going to remain in the fire perpetually, certain men must be burned, but still it is not going to burn certain men, *i.e.* the saints, after the fashion of dew, just as it was for the three children in the furnace at Babylon.

The vision of St. Fursaeus conforms to this opinion, which St. Bede describes (lib. 3 *historiae*, cap. 19). He saw on the road to heaven great fires, through which one had to pass, but at the same time saw those who had nothing burnable, *i.e.* no sin or punishment to suffer and they passed unharmed, but others were more or less burned precisely as they carried burnable matter. Taken in this way, I do not dare to assert that the opinion teaching all are going to pass through the fire, although not all are harmed by it should be held as true, nor condemn it as an error.

2) *The second* error, is that all the wicked, and the demons, will at length escape hell and be altogether saved, and hence all punishments after this life are purgatorial. This error was of Origen, as Epiphanius relates and refutes in his epistle to John of Jerusalem, Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, cap. 17 & 23), Jerome (c. 3 *Jonae*), and Gregory (*moral.* lib. 9, cap. 45 & 45, and book 34, cap. 12 & 13). For in Matthew 25 it is said: “Go, ye accursed, into the eternal fire which has been prepared for the devil and his angels.” And lest someone would answer that the fire is eternal, but a dwelling does not remain in the fire, the Lord concludes: “These will go into eternal punishment, but the just into eternal life.” And in Apocalypse 20, “The devil, who seduced them, was sent into the lake of fire and sulfur, where the beast and the false-prophets will be tortured day and night in ages of ages.”

Ruffinus attributed the same error to St. Jerome (lib. 1 *invectio in Hieronymum*), but this was an injury, for St. Jerome was very bitterly opposed to this error, which is clear from the place we recently cited, and from *Apolog. 2 contra Ruffinum*, from book 1 *contra Pelagionos*, from the epistle to Pammachius, on the errors of John of Jerusalem, and from the commentary on the last words of Isaiah. The things that Ruffinus cites as an error from Jerome’s commentary on Ephesians were said in the person of Origen, as Jerome teaches on similar errors in *Apologia 1 contra Ruffinum*. It is related that a book of a certain Anabaptist named Stanislaus favors this error of Origen, which is titled *De Divina Philanthropia*; but I have not yet been able to see the book.

3) *The third* error is of those who hold that the punishments of all sinful men, though not the devil, will be purgatorial after this life, as Augustine relates and refutes in *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, c. 18 and 24.

4) *The fourth* error is of those who thought the number of those in Purgatory will be made up only of Christians, whether heretics or Catholics; Augustine relates this also (*Ibid.*, cap. 19 and 25).

5) *The fifth* error is of those who thought it was on only those and all those who at one time were Catholic. (Augustine, *ibid.* c. 20 and 25). This error is refuted not only from Matthew 25: “Go into the eternal fire,” and Apocalypse 20, “They will be tortured for ages of ages,” but even from the last of Isaiah: “Their fire will not be extinguished,” and Galatians 5: “Those who do such things will never possess the kingdom of God.” For in these passages it is said that not only will demons or pagans, or heretics be punished without end, but even dissolute Catholics.

There were four foundations for this error. The *first*, because Psalm 76 (77) says: “God will never forget to be merciful, nor will he hold back mercy in his wrath?” *Second*, because in Romans 11 it says: “God concealed all in infidelity so that he might have mercy on all.”

Third, because if the Saints prayed for their enemies, and were heard in this life, they will pray much more and be heard on the day of judgment. *Fourth*, because we see in the Scripture that God absolutely threatens punishments and still, later they are not imposed, as is clear from Jonah 3: “After forty days, and Niniveh will be destroyed.” For this reason, we understand, they say, when God threatens punishments, it does not mean they really are imposed, but only from those whom are threatened, those worthy are punished in this way.

St. Augustine responds to the *first* in *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, cap. 25, that these words are understood in respect to the good, or if they were extended to the damned, the sense is: the damned are indeed going to be punished forever, but not as much as they deserve. It could also be said that those words are understood in this life, on which it is said: “Behold, now is the acceptable time,” for on the coming judgment James speaks: “Judgment without mercy for the man that does not show mercy.”

Augustine responds to the second (*ibid.*), that the verse: “So that he would have mercy on all,” does not mean all men, but every nation, that is both of the Gentiles and of the Jews, so that some from the Gentiles and some from the Jews will be saved, while the verse, “He concealed all in infidelity,” means both the Gentiles and the Jews, that is, some from the Gentiles and some from the Jews, for before the arrival of Christ God permitted the Gentiles to go out on their path in infidelity and idolatry, so that later the confused would require a doctor, and would find him, just as it came to pass. Then after the Gentiles converted, he permitted infidelity to ruin the Jews, so that they will be confused and humbled until the end of the world, when they will be converted.

He responds to the *third*, that the saints in this world prayed because they knew in this life the time for fruitful penance is short, but in judgment they are not going to pray for the damned, just as now we do not pray for the devil and the other damned.

Augustine responds to the *fourth*, Nineveh was truly overturned as it has been predicted, for all the men changed from wicked to good, which is the best overturning, because it was understood conditionally, unless someone

would do penance, but after this life it is not penance, at least fruitful penance, but after this life there is no fruitful penance, for John 9 says: "Work while it is day; night is coming, in which no man can work." And in Ecclesiastes 9: "In hell there is no work, or reason, etc."

6) *The sixth* error is of others who would have it that all and only Catholics persevering in faith descend to Purgatory, even if otherwise they lived the worst possible life. Augustine relates and refutes this error (*de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, c. 25 and 26; *Enchirid.* c. 68; *de fide et operibus*, c. 15-16; *Quaest. 1 ad Dulcitium*). For in Matthew 3 it is said about the wicked faithful: "But he will burn the chaff with an inextinguishable fire." And in Matthew 25 it will be said to the pitiless: "Go into the eternal fire." And in 1 Corinthians 6, Paul writes, "Neither drunkards nor the greedy, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor those cursing will possess the kingdom of God." And we find similar things in Galatians 5 and Ephesians 5.

The foundation of this error was that passage of 1 Cor. 3:15, "But he will be saved, as if by fire," for they thought by foundation the Catholic faith was meant, by silver and gold all good works, by wood, grass and hay all sins, but this was sufficiently refuted in chapter 5 of the last book.

Moreover, we must observe that there are some who thought St. Jerome labored in this error, because in the last words of Isaiah he says: "Just as we believe the devil and all apostates and the impious who said in their heart, 'There is no God,' will go to eternal torments, so also we think the sentence of the merciful judge mixed and moderate that the works of sinners and also the pious, and still of Christians, must be proven and purged in the fire." Likewise in book 1 *contra Pelagianos*: "If Origen says all rational creatures do not perish what is there for us? Don't we say the devil and his angels and all the impious perish perpetually? But Christians, if they were first in sin, can be saved after punishment."

Nevertheless, it seems to some that Jerome held to this error, seeing that in chapter 25 of Matthew where it is manifestly a question of the eternal damnation of the faithful who are sinners, he so writes: "O prudent reader, attend, that the punishments are also eternal, and thus, eternal life does not have the fear of ruin." And in c. 4 to the Galatians, he remarks: "Do we think we obtain the kingdom of God if we are free from fornication, idolatry and sorcery? Look to enmity, contention, wrath, quarrelling, dissension, also drunkenness and the rest which we account as nothing, exclude us from the kingdom of God."

In the cited passages to the contrary, St. Jerome does not mean to say that all Christians are saved after penalties, but that none but Christians are saved after penalties. Wherefore, in the earlier passage he did say that impious Christians are saved, but he added a restrictive condition, when he says: “Whose works are going to be purged in fire, and have been purged,” *i.e.* only those impious Christians will be saved whose wicked works have already been purged, in regard to sin, will be cleansed insofar as they suffer punishments. In the later citation, he opposes Christians to the impious, who are found in deadly sin, since he indicates that he is only speaking about pious Christians.

7) *The seventh* error is of those who think everyone who gives alms will be saved by the fire of Purgatory, even if they otherwise persevered in sin even to death.

St. Augustine refutes this error (*Enchirid.* c. 75 and 76; *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, c. 22 and 27). He says that Scripture requires many things with the clearest words for the justification of the impious apart from almsgiving. In Luke 13:5, it says “If you will not have done penance, you will all perish likewise,” and 1 Corinthians 13:3, “If I will spend all my powers in giving food to the poor, but would not have charity, it is of no benefit to me.” Who, I ask, has the sort of charity that would not fear to offend God, or after offending him, would not seek reconciliation? But, they say, after examination is made on the day of judgment, we see only about almsgiving (Matthew 25), those who gave alms are sent into the kingdom, but those who did not are sent to hell. *I respond:* The Lord posited lesser things so that we would gather greater things from it. He threatens hell to those who did not give their own things, to punish them more than those who took the goods of others; and he promised the kingdom to those who gave alms from their own money, to crown much more those who lay down their life for the sake of faith. See, if you would, the many things in our disputation *On Almsgiving*. [9](#)

So, with these errors confuted, the last true and Catholic opinion remains: Purgatory is only for those who die with venial sins, which is the matter at hand in 1 Corinthians 3:12 *et seqq.* For they are those who build upon a foundation with wood and straw, and will be saved as if by fire. And again for those who fall deserving punishment, whose sins have already been forgiven, which is the subject of Luke 12:59: “You will not go out

from there until you have paid the last penny,” and in the other passages cited in the previous book.

CHAPTER II: In Purgatory, Souls can Neither Gain Merit nor Sin

ANOTHER question follows. Is there a place for merit and sin in Purgatory? Luther, when he confessed Purgatory, did so in this way: it is mixed partly with the state of this life and partly with hell. He said that the souls of Purgatory can merit, which is of this life, and again, that they can both sin on the spot and despair of salvation, which are proper to the damned. The root of these was that he thought the souls are sent to purgatory that were not perfected in charity; those having no charity are sent into hell, those with perfect charity, ascend into heaven. On the other hand, imperfect charity ought to be increased, and it cannot be increased without new merits, therefore, he placed a state of merit in Purgatory; again, because perfect charity sends fear out of doors, and hence imperfect charity is mixed with fear, and is clearly servile, and from here Luther thought fear is a sin; thence he deduces that souls sin because they fear, shudder and flee punishment, they seek what is their own, etc. See the book of Luther on Purgatory, which John Eck refuted. [10](#)

That this opinion of Luther is also manifestly heretical is proven by the testimonies of the Scriptures and of the Fathers. 1) From Sirach 9:5: “The dead knew nothing more, nor have any further reward.” Jerome says on this passage: “So long as they live, men can become just, but after death they no longer have an occasion for good works... Living with the fear of death they can carry out good works, but the dead do not have the power to add to that which they once had when they have died... Nor can they act justly, or sin, or add virtues and vices.”

2) In the same place, verse 10, Scripture says: “Whatever your hand can do, act urgently because neither work nor reason nor wisdom is in hell, where you hasten.” We cannot say in another life nothing is done or known, since in Luke 16:23 we read about the rich man, that he also saw Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham and implored the assistance of Abraham first for himself, then for his brethren; this is why he speaks about meritorious work, as St. Jerome explains, and he is not speaking about the lower hell, but on

hell *in genere*, as it embraces all places to which all men descended before the resurrection of Christ.

3) *The third* passage is Sirach 11:3, “If a tree will fall either to the north or to the south, wherever it will have fallen, there it shall lie.” Jerome as well as St. Bernard, commenting on this passage (*sermon*. 49), explain that this is said in regard to the immutability of the soul after this life, which cannot go from wicked to good or good to wicked.

4) *The fourth* passage is Sirach 14:17, “Before your death do justice, because in hell there is no food to find.”

5) *The fifth* passage is Sirach 18:22, “Do not fear to be justified even to death.” Why even to death? Except because after death there will be no more time.

6) *The sixth* passage is John 9:4, “Night comes, during which no man works.” Origen (Psalm 36), Chrysostom, Augustine, Euthymius, and Theophylactus (on this passage), as well as Jerome and Gregory (*Dialog*. lib. 4 c. 39), unanimously explain that “night” means the time of the next life; for “to work”, is meant to do meritorious works.

7) *The seventh* is 2 Corinthians 5:10, “We must all be made manifest before the tribunal of Christ so that each man might receive what is proper of the body, as he did, whether good or evil.” Augustine, explaining this place (*de praedest. Sanctorum*, c. 12) adverts that what is proper of the body is not called corporal works, as if spiritual things were not going to be judged, but rather means all works which are done while we are in the body, because after this life no time remains to work, rather, to receive reward or punishment.

8) *The eighth* passage is Galatians 6:8-10, “As a man will have sown, he will also reap... But let us not fail doing good, for unfailing we will reap in season, therefore, while we have time, let us do good.” Jerome teaches on this passage that the time to sow is not extended beyond this life, rather, to sow is to work well.

9) *The ninth* passage is Luke 16:2, “Give an account of your stewardship, for you cannot be a steward any longer.” St. Ambrose, Theophylactus, Jerome (q. 6 *ad Algasiam*), Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, c. 7) and all others understand death by the deposing from stewardship, and by the fact he can no longer be steward, that one can no longer merit and profit.

10) *the tenth* is Apocalypse 10:6. The Angel having one foot over the sea and the other over the land, swears by the living in ages of ages that there will be no more time, namely *to do good*. Then, Scripture everywhere witnesses this, and a syllable will never be found favoring the error of Luther.

Secondly, it is proven from the Fathers. Cyprian (*Sermon 4*, which is on mortality) says death is a great benefit for this purpose, that we might be delivered from the danger of sin. For, while we are in this life, we fight in the arena, death brings the end of the battle. Augustine, when adding that passage of Cyprian, adds: “By these and such like sentiments, that teacher sufficiently and plainly witnesses in the clearest light of the Catholic faith, that perils of sin as well as trials are to be feared even until this body has been laid aside, but that afterwards no one shall suffer any such things. And even if he did not testify thus, when could any manner of Christian be in doubt on this matter?” (*de praedest. Sanctorum*, c. 14).

Note that Luther cannot be called a Christian in any way based on Augustine’s opinion, rather, clearly a heathen, since he is uncertain on the matter which Augustine says no Christian can be uncertain of. Augustine says the same thing in the *Enchiridion* (cap. 110), “Therefore, here all merit is earned, which can relieve or aggravate... but no man then, may hope for himself when he has died that he shall obtain merit with God which he has neglected here.”

Chrysostom (hom. 2 *de Lazaro*) says many things on this opinion, and in hom. 37 in Matthew, he says: “This present life granted the power to you to live rightly and vice versa; but after your day you will die, and consequently undergo judgment and penalty.” Jerome (*In Eccles.* 9) says: “The dead cannot act justly or sin.” Damascene (*de fide Orthodoxa*, lib. 2 cap. 4) says: “What the fall was to the Angels, death is the same to men.”

Thirdly, it is proved from reason: Luther’s opinion opposes itself. For Luther says these souls may and must merit because they are imperfect in charity, namely that perfect charity is increased by new merits. He says the same thing, that those souls, because they are imperfect, fear punishment and sin in that fear, and because they are always afraid while they are imperfect, hence they also always sin while they are imperfect.

But these are interiorly opposed. For a man that sins, particularly a mortal sin, cannot merit while he sins. Yet, if these souls always sin while they are in Purgatory, because they are imperfect, consequently, they can

never merit while they are in Purgatory. Besides, in the second place, because it follows it is impossible to free souls from Purgatory, for they will always sin while they are afraid; they will always be imperfect until a new charity will be added to them; a new charity cannot be added to them except by merits; they cannot merit while they sin, therefore they will never be freed.

CHAPTER III: *Objections are Answered*

It remains now to answer arguments.

I 1) The *first argument*: The souls which abide in Purgatory are imperfect in charity, therefore they ought to effect and merit that they would be made perfect. *Firstly*, if these souls were perfect, certainly they would not be punished since, to what end would perfect spirits be punished? If one were to say to make satisfaction to God, it could be answered that they especially make satisfaction to God by charity, as “Charity covers a multitude of sins,” as St. Peter teaches (1 Peter 4:8).

Secondly, because if someone dies, if he still were to have a debt for ten days of fasting, and still supremely loved God, it is incredible that God would not forgive him those ten days since God customarily freely receives the will where he does not find the means; therefore, if his debt is not forgiven, it is a sign that he was not perfect in charity.

Thirdly, because if they were perfect, they would not fear punishments; for perfect charity sends fear out of doors. If they would not fear punishments, they will not be punished because a penalty is not that which is loved, and freely received; therefore they would not be in Purgatory unless they were imperfect.

Fourthly, because nothing can be perfect outside of God, according to that of 1 Corinthians 13:10, “When that which is perfect will have come, that which is but a part will be purged.” Therefore, the souls of Purgatory which are not blessed, are necessarily imperfect. Then, the consequents of the first argument are proven.

a) It is impossible to stand in the road, it is always necessary to go forward or back, as Bernard says, but the souls of Purgatory are on the road and have not yet arrived; *b)* “Virtue is perfected in infirmity,” (2 Corinthians 12:9), and gold is brightened in the furnace; *c)* it is impossible for some creature to be preserved except that he would always receive more and more until it would be absorbed in its source, just as happens in rivers which always receive new water until they enter the sea; for this reason, life is usually described as a type of continuous creation; *d)* charity after this

life will be greater, therefore it will be increased, therefore that happens by merits.

I respond to the preceding: The souls of Purgatory can be called imperfect in respect to those which are in glory, and even a soul in Purgatory can be called imperfect in respect to another, whether in Purgatory or existing in this world. Nevertheless, every soul existing absolutely in Purgatory is perfected in charity. For there is no charity that is simply imperfect: “He who keeps his word, truly in him the charity of God has been perfected” (1 John 2:5). Moreover, each degree of charity suffices that someone would keep the word, that is, the precepts of the Lord.

To the consequent I say that the souls of Purgatory, insofar as they are imperfect in respect to souls in heaven, ought to be perfected in charity; but that increase does not require new merits, for it will be the reward of all past merits. Charity is increased in two ways: in one mode, in a kind of grace, that a man would become more suitable to merit more, and this increase is not granted after this life; in the other mode, in a kind of glory, so that a reward is given for all past merits, and this will take place in beatitude itself. For a part of the reward will be such copious charity that a man could never be deprived of beatitude and justice, who will have been provided with this copious charity, as Augustine says (*de correptione et gratia*, lib. 2 cap. 10).

Now, let us respond to the objections in order. I say to the *first* that by charity satisfaction is not properly made, rather by the sorrow commanded by charity, and whatever can be done so that the sorrow intended were of such a kind, and proceeding from such a charity that it would fully make satisfaction for every crime. Nevertheless, it can also happen that the sorrow were not such and on that account something would remain to be cleansed in Purgatory; for, punishment that must be undergone to make satisfaction which takes place outside of the kingdom of heaven is not opposed to the perfection of charity. To the words of St. Peter, I say that charity covers a multitude of sins, but not in the same mode in regard to sin and punishment; for it blots out the whole sin by its act, but it does not always abolish the punishment by its whole act, rather by satisfactory works which charity itself demands.

To the second, I say likewise: if someone dies and he suffers for his sins with supreme love, he can in that mode make satisfaction for every sin; but if his sorrow is not very great, he ought to make satisfaction later in

Purgatory. Nor is it opposed that he might desire to fast, if he would remain alive. God does receive the will where he does not find the means, for in that the means of making satisfaction is found, if not in fasting, certainly by suffering in Purgatory.

To the third, I say that the soul in Purgatory does not fear, rather really suffers punishments. Fear is of future things, not the present. Besides, I say that fear of punishment is not opposed to perfect charity, otherwise Christ, who feared punishments, and from that fear sweated blood (Luke 22:44), was not perfected in charity. But what John says: “Perfect charity sends fear out of doors,” is not understood in regard to fear of punishment, but the fear of sin, especially on account of punishment, for one that perfectly loves, fears to offend God, especially on account of God himself, not on account of the punishment which follows those offending God; likewise, perfect charity is free from that servile fear with which someone would not dare sin lest he be damned, so that he will sin if he does not fear damnation.

To the fourth, I say that outside of God nothing so perfect that would not be said to be imperfect in respect to *the perfection of glory* could be found; nevertheless, the thing itself will be perfect simply. This is why Paul says in Philippians 3:12, “I am not yet perfected, but I follow, if I may by any means apprehend.” And further (verse 15): “Therefore, let us, as many have been made perfect.” There, he says he is perfected absolutely, and still is imperfect in comparison to the blessed.

Now, to the first confirmation of the consequent, I say the souls of Purgatory are not on the road, but at the end, inasmuch as we consider an increase of grace. For a man that aims for some city, and arrives at its gates in the middle of the night is said to have arrived and completed the whole way, although he finds the gates closed and cannot enter until the sun rises. Besides, what Bernard says: “To not move forward on the way of God is to go back,” ought not be received mathematically, but morally, for he does not mean to say in any work we merit an increase of grace or lose some grace, but they who do not pay attention to accomplish their purpose, can easily be impelled by the devil, and the world to fall., etc.

To the second confirmation, I say that in the first place Paul speaks about the virtue of God literally, which is said to be perfected in infirmity, because then the power of God appears the more that they resist it; for in Greek it is δύναμις μου, that is “my virtue.” I say besides, our virtue is also perfected in tribulations, but only in this life, in regard to the true increase of virtue,

because only in this life do we have the occasion to merit; but in the next it can be said to be perfected in Purgatory, not because something is added to him, but because the blight of sin is taken away; in the way that gold is made brighter in the furnace, not because something is added to it, but because it is separated from earth, lead and similar things.

I say to the third confirmation, that the principle of Luther in permanent matters is very false, and only has place *in successive* matter; otherwise permanent matters would never be the same and thus God would not now punish Judas in hell but one that sinned who was created after him. Nor would he have rewarded Peter who merited, but another man created later. But it is said that life is continual creation, which is true but what is understood to be created is that same thing, it does not increase or become something new.

The fourth has already been answered.

The *second argument* of Luther: Souls in Purgatory sin right away, therefore they are in a state of merit and demerit. He proves the antecedent: those souls abhor punishments, and they take refuge and seek rest; therefore, they sin. He proves the antecedent not only because otherwise they would not be punished (for a punishment ought to be involuntary and bitter), but also because we ought not to pray for their rest and liberation from Purgatory if they themselves love these punishments.

Thereupon he proves the consequent. 1) *Firstly*, all punishments become sweet to a man that loves them, therefore, those souls, while they flee punishments, do not perfectly love, hence they sin. 2) *Secondly*, because while they flee punishments, they seek their own honor, not God's. 3) *Thirdly*, because they love God with a love of concupiscence while they desire to be free from it. 4) *Fourthly*, because Christ says: "He that does not take up his cross is not worthy of me," *i.e.* a man that does not receive it freely and of his own will. But Purgatory is the cross of souls, so they sin while they flee that cross.

I respond: the souls in Purgatory abhor and flee punishments, and seek rest insofar as they consider these as evils and contrary to nature, and still at the same time they freely admit and tolerate them insofar as they consider them as instruments through which they are purged. In the same way, a sick man abhors bitter medicine, and still freely takes it because by it he hopes to be cured, nor can there ever be a sin in this. For the Lord, who could not sin, abhorred certain punishments, and said, "Father, take this chalice from

me.” (Matthew 26:39), and David declared: “Because I suffered tribulation, hear me speedily.” (Psalm 68/69:18). And on Peter, Christ said: “When you grow old another will bind you, and lead you, whither you do not wish to go.” (John 21:18).

Next, St. Cyprian says in his work on mortality: “Who doesn’t wish to be without sadness? Who does not hasten to embrace joy?” And St. Augustine, in book 10, chapter 28 of *Confessions*, says about punishments: “You ask us to endure them, not to love them, for no man loves that which he endures, although he loves to endure.”

So, *to the first*, in which the consequence is proven, I say that punishments are not made so sweet to a lover that he does not perceive them, but so that although they are bitter, he nevertheless endures them eagerly on account of what is loved, which is clear both from the aforesaid, and from the words of St. Eleazar: “O Lord, who hast the holy knowledge, you clearly know that, whereas I might be delivered from death, I suffer grievous pains in body. Yet in soul, I am well content to suffer these things because I fear you.” (2 Maccabees 6:30). And this was the common feeling of the martyrs who truly felt the most bitter sufferings and still gladly offered themselves, although God granted a privilege to certain men to remove the pain or some sense of it by abundance of consolation, as Ruffinus writes about St. Theodore (*histor. lib. 10 cap. 36*).

To the second, I say they do not seek what is their own, but the honor of God. For they desire to be liberated sooner so that they could praise God more and better.

To the third I say, they love God with the love of friendship because they refer their good to God.

To the fourth I say, they take up their cross because they freely suffer and do not desire to be freed except according to the will of God and by the means which God established. And certainly, if the things that Luther says were true, *i.e.* those souls seek that which are their own and that they love God with a love of concupiscence, they would neither take up their cross nor have even imperfect charity, rather they would have none and they should not be in Purgatory, but in hell.

Now, the *third* argument is of certain Catholics. The souls of Purgatory have everything necessary for merit, for they have grace, faith, hope, charity and free will, at least in regard to its exercise; so why don’t they merit? *Then*, the blessed can merit, as is clear from Christ who was always

blessed and still merited, consequently, how much more can the souls of Purgatory merit? *Likewise*, the rich man in hell prayed for himself and his own (Luke 16:24), therefore, even the souls of Purgatory could pray; but their prayer proceeds, without a doubt, from charity, so they merit to be heard. *Lastly*, they confirm the same with the authority of St. Thomas, who in 4, dist. 21, q. 1, a. 3 ad 4, says that after this life merit cannot be found in respect to essential reward, but only in respect to the accidental.

I respond to the argument: the *state of life* is lacking to the souls in purgatory in regard to merit; for God, as is clearly proven from the Scriptures, only constituted the period of this life to take up good works for merit or demerit. After this life good works will be the effect of glory and evil the effect of damnation.

To the first confirmation, I say that Christ was at the same time in possession of beatitude and a wayfarer, so on the side of a wayfarer he was able to merit, but after his death, since this state was lacking to him, he could merit no more.

To the second I say: If the souls of Purgatory would pray for themselves or us, (on which we will treat later in a question on suffrage), they do not merit, rather they only ask from past merits, in the way that now the Saints procure for us in prayer although they do not merit.

To the third confirmation, I say: St. Thomas changed his opinion; for in q. 7 of *de Malo*, article 11, he clearly teaches that in Purgatory there can be no merit, whether of essential or accidental reward. St. Bonaventure teaches the same thing, as do Scotus, Durandus and others. Perhaps even St. Thomas in the citation from the Sentences, meant to use the term “merit” not properly but *improperly*, for he called the act of delight in Purgatory meritorious for the remission of venial sin, because it is a remission, although not in the mode of merit properly so called, but by the mode of one thing abolishing its contrary.

CHAPTER IV: *The souls in Purgatory are Certain about their Eternal Salvation*

NOW, we must treat on the third question, whether souls in Purgatory are certain or not about their salvation?

Luther, in art. 38, teaches that they are not certain. Some Catholics teach the same thing, who think that there are different punishments in Purgatory, and one is the greatest of all, uncertainty of salvation, whereby they say certain souls are only punished, so although they really are certain of their salvation, still they do not know this. So it seems Dennis the Carthusian thought, on account of certain visions which he relates in his book on the four last things, art. 47. Bajus teaches the same thing (*de merit. operum*, lib. 2 c. 8), where, wishing to prove that venial sin by its nature merits eternal death, adduces into argument that otherwise it would follow the souls in Purgatory are certain about their salvation, which seemed to be absurd to him.

Next, it seems the same thing is deduced from the teaching of Gerson (*lectione 1 de vita spirituali*) and John Fisher (*contra art. 32 Lutheri*), both of whom admit there is no such a thing as venial sin except by the mercy of God and hence it can be justly punished forever if God wills. So, it follows that souls having venial sins cannot know for certain whether they will be punished forever, although Fisher, in art. 38 of Luther, contends that the souls of Purgatory are certain about their salvation; but I do not see how that is consistent with his first opinion.

But the common teaching of theologians is that all souls which are in Purgatory have certitude about their salvation. Moreover, that it would be understood to what extent they have certitude, we must know that there are three degrees of certitude.

1) *The first* is that which excludes every hope and all fear, and such is of the blessed for whom beatitude is not some future thing, but the present life.

2) *The second* is that which excludes all fear, but not all hope, and such is in Purgatory; for beatitude is the future life for them, not the present, and therefore it does not remove the expectation; and again it is arduous

because they attain it by punishments, and so their waiting can be called hope. Nevertheless, it is not contingent, but necessary, because they cannot lose anything more, and therefore it removes all fear.

3) *The third* is that which excludes neither hope nor fear and can be called a conjectural degree of certitude, and such is our lot. Beatitude is for us a future good and not a present; arduous and not easy, contingent and not necessary or impossible, and so we most properly hope and fear, as we are still in battle in the contest, in agony.

Now we shall show the matter to be so. If the souls [of Purgatory] do not have certitude of their salvation, necessarily it would happen on account of one of four reasons: either they could still merit and lose merit; they were not yet judged; they are ignorant of the sentence of the judge, even though it has been imposed; on account of the magnitude of their suffering they are so absorbed that their judgment is obscured to the extent that they cannot think of or see this certitude. But none of these have place. Not the first, as is clear; not the second, because although the universal judgment has not been made, still apart from it there is the particular judgment, in which souls are immediately judged from death, as the Theologians teach in 4 dist. 47, as well as St. Thomas in III pars, q. 59 art. 5.

They usually add for this purpose that the particular judgment is proven from two passages. One is that of John 5:22, “The father gave every judgment to the Son,” for when he says “every judgment” it seems to mean many judgments; clearly one is particular and the other universal. The other is from Hebrews 9:27, “It has been established for men to die once, and after this, judgment.” But those passages do not conclude the matter; both can be understood about universal judgment, for that “*omne*” of John 5 does not necessarily refer to two judgments, particular and general; but to judge different men and different works. The sense of the other passage from Hebrews 9:27 is: When all men are dead, then there will be judgment, as Oecumenius explains.

Nevertheless, the particular judgment is efficaciously proven from those words of Sirach 11:28, “It is easy to give back to each one in the presence of God on the day of death, according to his ways.” Likewise, in verse 29: “At the end of man his works are laid bare.”

Besides, the same is evidently gathered from another truth: It is *de fide* that soon after death the impious descend to eternal punishments, as is clear from Luke 16:22 about the rich man, and the just to eternal life; as is clear

from Luke 23:43 about the thief, “Today you will be with me in paradise.” But it is not in any way credible that God would distribute punishments and rewards before the judgment has been made.

Next, the Fathers teach the same thing. St. Cyprian, in his sermon on mortality, says: “We must rejoice and embrace the reward of time, since while we firmly display our faith, and while enduring the labor continue to Christ through the narrow road of Christ, we take the reward of life and faith at his judgment seat.” Chrysostom says in hom. 37 in Matth., “After your day you will die; judgment and punishment follow; for in hell, the Psalmist says, who will praise you?” There, even if the word *immediately* were not added, still it is necessarily understood to be between the lines. Chrysostom refuted the error of those who thought Christ will preach after death and will lead the dead to penance.

But he uses this argument: After death judgment follows, and after judgment the punishment of hell, in hell no man can confess the Lord; thus, after death there is no place for penance. But if Chrysostom did not mean to say, the impious are judged immediately from death and are driven into hell but delayed all these things until the last day, his argument would be to no avail. For it would be answered in this middle time the dead can be preached, to provided the universal judgment is delayed. St. Augustine, in his work on the origin of the soul (lib. 2 cap. 4) says: “Now he most rightly and wholesomely believes that souls, after quitting the body are judged before they come to the final judgment to which they must submit when their bodies are restored to them.”

To these we add the example of those who have witnessed that they were judged. St. Gregory writes (lib. 4 *Dialogorum*, cap. 36) on a certain Stephan, who, when he had died and was offered to judgment, heard the judge saying: “I did not command this one, but Stephan Ferrarius to be called,” and so he came back to life while at the same time Stephan Ferrarius, who lived in a nearby place, died. St. Augustine relates a similar event in *de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 12, on a certain Curma. But Gregory adds that this did not take place by a true error, but that through it, as if it were an error, the one who had been dead and came back to life would relate torments and judgment to the living which remain for the impious after this life. In the same book, cap. 38, he relates the example on a certain Chrisorius, who, being placed at the point of death, while he was still living saw the sentence of his own damnation.

St. Bede relates to similar events (*hist. lib. 5, cap. 14-15*), about two men who died in the throes of despair because they had seen their judgment carried out and the sentence imposed. John Climacus relates a similar thing in his *Scala*, 7th step, about a certain hermit that, while on the point of death, heard as if he were placed in trial to answer accusations, and once was heard to say “It is false, I did not do it; I did it, but I did penance; you speak the truth and I have nothing to answer.”

Next, a memorable example is extant in the life of St. Bruno, about a certain Parisian doctor, who in the very Church where the funeral rights were carried out, after his head was elevated on the bier, shouted: “By the just judgment of God I have been accused;” and on the following day, again shouted: “By the just judgment of God I have been judged”; and on the third day, “By the just judgment of God I have been damned”. We must also note in regard to these examples, both the judgment of those which was carried out before death, and even more that of the Parisian which was delayed for three days after his death, pertain to a certain particular and extraordinary providence of God which he uses to build us up or to terrify us. Otherwise, normally it must be believed that judgment takes place immediately from death; for ordinarily the useful time of penance endures even to the last breath; as St. Leo clearly teaches in epistle 90 *ad Rusticum*. Nor is there a reason why after death judgment should be delayed, since God does not need witnesses nor allegations, but can judge in an instant. It could also be said, and perhaps more probably, in the examples related by Bede that judgment was not carried out before death, but merely foreshown, while in the example of the Parisian doctor, the judgment was not delayed to another day, but only manifested on another day.

It must also be observed that it cannot be defined for certain whether their judgment is delayed; whether they are judged on the spot after they relinquish the body; and similarly whether they are judged immediately by Christ in human form imposing sentence; or whether only by divine power, which is present everywhere, or whether the sentence is manifested by angels. What Scripture everywhere says is that Christ the man is the judge of the living and the dead, it understands on the *last general judgment*, for even before the incarnation a particular judgment was exercised. This is why it is not only not certain, but still not probable, what Innocent III affirms (*de contemptu mundi*, lib. 2, last chapter) that Christ will appear in the crucified form to the dying, both the good and the bad.

In regard to the *third*, that the sentence of judgment is hidden to souls when they are judged is false and impertinent. False because the particular judgment is made particularly for this purpose, so that the sentence would be made known to the one judged; for on account of others there will be a general judgment. Judgment is not necessary on account of God, for he knows all things, therefore it is only done to make it known to that soul who is judged, and the same is gathered from the visions cited above. But it is also impertinent since even if the sentence of the judge were not made known to them, still they could easily recognize *per se* what sort it is from the effect, because they will see themselves right away in hell, or in heaven, or in purgatory.

But someone will say they could doubt whether they were in hell or in purgatory. But it is not so, since in hell God is blasphemed, in purgatory he is praised; in hell there is no infused faith, nor any hope or charity, while in Purgatory all these things are found; therefore, the soul, which will see itself hope in God, praise and love God, clearly sees that it is not in hell.

But he could, they say, fear lest he might be sent into hell, although he was still not there, but this can also not be said: for here he believed according to the clearest testimonies of the Scriptures, after death it cannot happen that anyone from the good becomes wicked, or from the wicked becomes good, and none other than the wicked will be sent into hell. So when he sees that he loves God and hence is good, he will not fear damnation.

But someone will insist: Here we see that we love God, and still we are not certain whether we are just, so also those souls will not gather for certain their justice from their love.

I respond: We do not see the infused habit of charity, whereby we are justified, but we gather from fallible conjectures that it is in us; but the souls separated from their bodies, just as they will clearly see themselves without dependence upon phantasms, so also they see all things which they have in themselves, and hence they see whether they have the true habit of charity or not; besides, they know the souls are immovable in good and in evil, therefore, even if they did not see their infused habit of charity, nevertheless they would know that they will never blaspheme God, nor have hatred for him, and hence are never going to be sent to hell. Then, from faith they know the souls of the impious are pushed into hell right after the death of the body, and their punishments are not delayed any further. All Catholics

believe this from Luke 16:22, therefore the souls which see themselves outside of hell, believe firmly that they are never going to be sent into it.

In regard to *the fourth*, is utterly false that the souls are impeded from the recognition of their state by excessive torments, and hence think they are in hell and live in a certain disturbance and despair, as Luther says. Firstly, the soul of the rich man in hell, in Luke 16, was not impeded from the knowledge of his state; how much less, therefore, will the souls that are in Purgatory be impeded.

Secondly, that in this world men are impeded from right judgment by the intensity of sufferings, comes into being from wounding of the corporeal organ; but in purgatory the mind is pure, spiritual, and incorruptible.

Thirdly, because the Church says in the canon of the Mass: “Be mindful, O Lord, of your servants and handmaids, who preceded us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace.” There the Church prays for the souls of Purgatory, for it adds: “For these, O Lord, and all those resting in Christ we ask that you grant a place of refuge, light and peace.” But certainly, those who are said to sleep in the sleep of peace, are not anxious, nor despair, but instead have a mixture with supreme tortures and incredible consolation on account of the certain hope of salvation.

Fourthly, because if they believed that they were damned, they would not pray for the living, nor would they say that they would be freed in short order if prayers were offered for them, as we see happened with St. Gregory (*dialog.* lib. 4, c. 40) and the other examples brought in the first question.

CHAPTER V: *Objections Made from the Prayers of the Church are Answered*

SOME object, *firstly*, with certain testimonies of the Scriptures which the Church uses in the office of the dead. She desires to pray for souls that abide in Purgatory from Psalm 6:3, “My soul is exceedingly disturbed.” And in the same place, verse 2: “Cleanse my soul, because my bones have been crushed.” And Psalm 114 (115):3, “The sorrows of death surrounded me, and the dangers of hell found me.” Certainly, things such as disturbance and anxiety cannot be born from punishments alone, but from uncertainty and fear of eternal damnation. If those souls were perfect in charity, and were certain of their salvation, they would not be so afraid, seeing that it is written: “The just man will not be sorrowful, whatever happens to him” (Proverbs 12:21).

I respond: It is foolish to understand what the Church uses from some Psalm in the office for the dead as being applied literally in all its parts to the dead; for how would we understand verses of the same Psalm 6:6 to be about the dead: “I will wash my bed every night, I will water my sheets with my tears”? Therefore, the Church usually reads the whole of some passage of Scripture on account of one or another teaching which bears on the present matter, even if the greater part of that passage does not bear on it. It is thus in the dedication of a Church, where the Gospel about Zacchaeus is read, only for the reason that the last words “Today salvation has entered this house”, are suited in some mode to the dedication and consecration of a Church. In like manner, in the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, the Church reads the Gospel of Martha and the Magdalene on account of these words: “Mary has chosen the best part, and it will not be taken from her.” And so (that I might omit many others) in the office of the dead on account of the words, “Have mercy on me O Lord, because I am weak.” (Psalm 6:2). And on account of that of Psalm 114 (115):9, “I will please the Lord in the land of the living.” These whole psalms are read.

Additionally, what is assumed in the argument is also false, namely that disturbance and sadness are not born from suffering but from uncertainty or despair of salvation; for the Lord himself (John 12:27) says in his regard: “Now my soul is troubled,” and in Matthew 26:37, he began to be sad and wept, and still neither uncertainty nor desperation could fall upon the Lord. But the passage of Proverbs ought not be received on any sadness you like, but on the sadness with dejection and despair, which causes death, which St. Paul calls the sadness of this age (2 Corinthians 7:10).

The second objection is taken from that prayer which is recited after the Gospel in the Mass for the dead: “O Lord, free the souls of all the faithful departed from the punishments of hell and from the deep lake; free them from the mouth of the lion lest the underworld would absorb them, lest they fall into obscurity, etc.”

Some respond that the Church prays for those who are in agony so that they will not be damned to hell. But this is opposed to the part that says: “Free the souls of all the faithful departed”, for they are not said to be in agony. Then, the use of the Church is that this prayer is said even on the anniversaries of the dead for those souls who had died many years ago. Others say this prayer is poured forth for those who are in hell, whom, it turns out, are freed later, as is related about Trajan. But that I might omit how improbable that history of Trajan is, those who are in hell have already fallen into obscurity and also were absorbed into the underworld. Therefore, what does the Church pray for when she asks that they not fall into darkness or be absorbed into the underworld? Next, the Church only prays for the faithful: “Free the souls of the faithful departed.” But they are not faithful who are damned to hell.

Consequently, there are two other answers that can be given. One is that the Church prays for the souls of those who abide in Purgatory so that they will not be condemned to the eternal punishment of hell, though not because it is uncertain that they are not going to be damned to those punishments, but because God wants us to pray also for those things which we will receive for certain.

But one can object against this response that even if the Church sometimes prays for those things which it is not going to receive for certain, nevertheless, it does not pray for those things which it has already received; hence it has already received that these souls will not be damned since they have a certain sentence and are most secure. Next, the mind of the faithful,

who pray for the dead, or desire they be prayed for, is certainly related by the fact that they help those souls and obtain for them relief from the present punishments of Purgatory.

But these objections are easily dealt with, for even if the souls of Purgatory had already received the first sentence in the particular judgment, and were freed from hell by that sentence, still the general judgment, wherein they are going to receive the second sentence, remains. In this regard, the Church, prays lest in the final judgment those souls would fall into obscurity or be absorbed into the underworld. It does not pray for that which the soul received but for that which it is going to receive.

Now, to that from the intention of the faithful, *I respond* that the intention would satisfy it, for in that prayer both things are asked, namely that the souls be freed from the punishments of hell, *i.e.* Purgatory, which are suffered at the present, and later that they would be freed from the sentence of damnation imposed in the last judgment.

There is another answer, that the Church truly prays insofar as to her intention, that souls be freed from the punishments of Purgatory, nevertheless she uses that mode of speaking as if the souls just left the body as if their eternal salvation were in danger, because it calls to mind and represents the day of deposition, or death, just like in the celebration of feasts of the Incarnation, Nativity, Apparition, of the Passion and Resurrection, and the Ascension of the Lord. There, the Church prays as if then Christ ought either to become incarnate or born, etc., because it represents these mysteries as present realities. Still, it does not intend to pray literally for this, say that the Word would become flesh, or born from a Virgin, etc., but so that the fruit of these mysteries would be applied to us; so also in the sacrifice for the dead, because the day of their death is commemorated, the Church so prays for them as if then they had died; and still intends to pray so that they would be freed from hell *in the mode in which they can be freed; i.e.*, that they would not be detained any longer in those punishments, or that some rest would be mixed with sorrows. Otherwise, how would it not be absurd that now after 1500 years to say for the Lord's arrival; "*Rorate caeli de super, et nubes pluant justum; aperiatur terra, et germinet Salvatorem,*" [11](#) and many other kinds of things; consequently, it is not absurd to say for the dead, "free them from the mouth of the lion, lest they fall into obscurity," etc.

CHAPTER VI: *On the Location of Purgatory*

THE *fourth question* follows: Where is Purgatory? The Church has defined nothing on such a question, although there are many opinions.

1) *First*, is of those who think that souls are cleansed in the very spot where they had sinned, *i.e.* in different places. And indeed that souls are cleansed in different places is gathered probably enough from St. Gregory (*Dialog.* lib. 4, cap. 40 and cap. 55), who relates the soul of Paschasius and of a certain other man cleansed in bath houses. Also, from an epistle of Peter Damian about the miracles of his time, where he describes a vision on the purgation of the soul of S. Severinus in a certain river. But that all are punished in the place where they sinned is not probable, for as it happens, some sinned in many places, it does not have the appearance of truth that they will be cleansed in all of them. Besides, the aforesaid visions show the contrary; for Paschasius the deacon sinned at Rome in the election of a Pope, but was cleansed in the baths of Puteoli, and St. Severinus sinned in the palace of the Emperor, and was cleansed in a river.

2) *The second* opinion, is that the habitations of souls are not corporeal, as Augustine thought (lib. 12 *de Gen.* cap. 33), but he retracted it in *Retractions*, lib. 2 cap. 24.

3) *The third*, is that penal places for souls are this world, in which the souls remain in body as if in jail. Irenaeus relates and refutes this at the end of book 5, for the Scripture says the souls after this life descend into hell, as is clear from Luke 16:22 and other places.

4) *The fourth*, hell, and the purgatory of the soul, is nothing apart from the accusing conscience punishing sins. So Philo in his book *de Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis Gratiâ*, and Origen, as Jerome relates in epist. ad Avitum. This is refuted, for if this opinion were true we would be in hell or purgatory no less now than after our death.

5) *The fifth* opinion is that hell, and hence Purgatory (for they are neighboring places), are in the valley of Josaphat. Chrysostom relates that

some fathers thought this (hom. *de praemiis beatorum*, tom. 3) and Gregory relates a similar opinion (lib. 4 *Dialog.* cap. 42). Perhaps their argument was that since Christ everywhere calls hell *Gehenna*, and *Gehenna* is a certain valley joined with the valley of Josaphat so that it seems to be a part of it; we will speak on that name below.

6) *The sixth* opinion is that hell is the state of the soul outside the body, for while it is in the body, it lives in the light, as is clear from its works; when it leaves the body, it can see no longer, unless it is blessed; and this is outward darkness. So Theophylactus relates on chapter 16 of Luke.

7) *The seventh* opinion is that it is a penal place of souls that is not earthly, but a foggy air where demons live. So Gregory of Nyssa thinks (*de Anima et resurrectione*) and Chrysostom (hom. *de praemiis beatorum*) as well as the author of the incomplete work on Matthew, hom. 53, whose opinion the history of St. Fursaeus favors that is found in Bede (*hist. Anglorum*, lib. 3, cap. 19), after he as died, when by Angels he is lead into heaven, they are shown the greatest fires above the air, which are preserved (as the angel says), for the conflagration of the world, and there the works of men will be examined.

8) *The eighth* is the common teaching of the Scholastics, that Purgatory is within the bowels of the earth, near to hell. The Scholastics, in a common consensus, constitute that within the four corners of the earth, or one divided into four parts there is one place for the damned; another for those to be purged; a third for the infants dying without baptism; a fourth for the just who died before the passion of Christ which now remains empty. The sufficiency of these is altogether taken from the kinds of punishments; for there are all these penal places, every punishment is either only of loss, or of sense; and again either eternal or temporal. For punishment only of eternal loss, there is the limbo of children; for punishment only of temporal loss, there was the limbo of the Fathers; for the punishment of eternal loss and sense, there is hell; for the punishment of temporal loss and sense, there is Purgatory.

Yet, because Calvin says these are all fables (*Instit.* lib. 2, cap. 15, §9) and likewise his disciple Beza (in cap. 2 Act), and his teacher Bucer (in cap. 27 Matth.) each one of these must be proved. *First*, that within the bowels of the earth there is some place for souls that is called in the general vocabulary hell (*infernus*) we proved in book 4 *On Christ*, ch. 9, let the reader look there if he wishes to clearly see what pertains to that place.

Next, to the arguments which we then advanced, are added various eruptions of fire which appear in the earth, which St. Gregory does not rashly think are certain tokens of hell, existing within the bowels of the earth (lib. 4 *Dialog.* cap. 35), for in the same book, (cap. 30) he writes that he knew from a certain relation that at the same hour in which the Arian King Theodoric died, his soul was seen thrown into the pit of Vulcan, which is in Sicily. Laurence Surius, in his history for the year 1537, writes in regard to mount Hecla, a mountain on Iceland, from which flames break out and certain things are heard like terrible lightening, and souls often appear which say they are sent to that mountain. This is about hell in general. [12](#)

Now on the individual places. *First*, that the hell of the damned is in the deepest parts of the earth is proven; firstly, although that hell is within the bounds of the earth is already shown, still, in Luke 16:22 the soul of the rich man is said to have been in hell, and not only in hell, but even in the deepest place; seeing that he saw Lazarus, who then was also in subterranean places, again he ought to be facing him. Besides, reason itself demands that if the place of the blessed is in the highest heaven, the place of the damned would be in the place furthest from heaven, for nothing is more remote than the center of the earth.

Then, that Purgatory is also under the earth and near hell, is proven from those words of Acts 2:24: “After he loosed the sorrows of hell,” which St. Augustine understood to be the punishments of Purgatory (epist. 99), “Free the souls of the dead from the punishments of hell and from the deep lake.” *Secondly*, it is confirmed from the vision which Bede relates (lib. 5, cap. 13 *historiae*), where Purgatory was clearly seen touching upon the hell of the damned. Next, nearly all theologians teach that the damned and the souls of Purgatory are in the same place and tortured by the same fire.

Now, that the limbo of children is in hell is proved: the Council of Florence, in its last session, clearly defined that both those who are dead with mortal sin and those who with only original sin, descend right away into hell, still to be punished with different punishments; St. Augustine, in *de Baptismo parvulorum*, lib. 4, cap. 28 and *Hypognostici*, lib. 4, says that the Catholic faith knows none other than two places, the heaven of the blessed and the hell of the damned. Nevertheless, it is the common opinion of the Scholastics, that the limbo of children is in a place in hell higher than Purgatory, so that the fire does not touch them. Innocent III followed this

opinion (cap. *Majores*, extra de Baptismo). But on this matter we will make a disputation in another place.

Lastly, the limbo of the Fathers is in hell, but in the highest part, and it is proved with sufficient accuracy in book 4 *de Christo*, cap. 10. We will repeat only one argument which in that place was treated too briefly. Therefore, 1 Kings 28:13, the soul of Samuel was seen to ascend from subterranean places: “I say,” the witch says, “the gods ascend from the earth.”

Our adversaries respond, that it was not truly Samuel but a devil in his form, as Tertullian teaches (*de anima*), as well as the author of the *Questions* cited by Justin Martyr (quaest. 52) and questions on the Old Testament (*quaest.* 27) cited by Augustine, and the author of the books on the miracles of Sacred Scripture, book 2 ch. 11, and Procopius and Eucherius on this passage of the book of kings, and Isidore, lib. 8 *etymologiar*: cap. 9, who is moved by these reasons.

Firstly, it is not believable that Samuel was subject to a witch, or would have come of his own will, because that would confirm her magic art. *Secondly*, because Samuel would not suffer himself to be worshiped, as that shadow did. *Thirdly*, because he would not have said to Saul in verse 19: “Tomorrow you and your son will be with me.” The soul of Saul was not going to the limbo of the Fathers, but to hell. *Fourthly*, because God denied the response to Saul through the prophets, through oracles and through dreams, as it is related in the chapter, therefore it is not believable that he would respond later through a witch.

But these notwithstanding, it must be held that what appeared was truly the soul of Samuel and hence a forceful confirmation of our teaching on the subterranean location of Purgatory. In the first place, all the cited authors are either uncertain or unclear; but those who teach the contrary are certain and of renown, such as Josephus (*antiq.* lib. 6, cap. 15), Justin Martyr (*Dialog with Trypho*), Basil (*epist.* 80 *ad Eustachius the doctor*); Ambrose (in cap. 1 of Luke), Jerome (in cap. 8 of Isaiah), and Augustine (*de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 15). Nor is it opposed that Augustine (*ad Simplicianum*, lib. 2, quaest. 3) was uncertain whether that was the soul [of Samuel] or not, for he wrote later in his work *de cura pro mortuis* after he had considered the matter more diligently. Besides these fathers, more recent authors teach the same thing, such as Lyranus, Abulenis, Dennis the Carthusian and Cajetan.

There are also the strongest reasons for this teaching: 1) That Scripture perpetually calls what appeared “Samuel”, in verse 12: “When the women saw Samuel;” and again in 15: “Samuel spoke to Saul,” verse 14: “So Saul understood that it was Samuel.” But certainly it would not have said that he understood it to be Samuel, but that he thought it was, if it were not really true.

2) Sirach 46:16-23 is placed in praise of Samuel because as a dead man he had prophesied and announced to the king what was about to come. But what praise is that which a devil of some species assumes and depicts? And this is an argument on account of what Augustine asserts in *de cura pro mortuis*, that truly it was Samuel that had appeared, whose testimony he had not recalled when he wrote to Simplicianus.

3) Because it foretold the future to Saul, which the devil cannot know, namely that he was going to die the next day with his sons, the army be destroyed and that David would rule after him, etc.

4) Lastly, because the contrary reasons conclude nothing.

So, I say to the *first*, Samuel did not come at the command of the witch, but at the command of God and he rather more impeded the magical art than confirmed it; for Samuel came before the spell would cause his arrival, and he ascended in a contrary mode to others who are roused by a spell, and the reason is because the witch was disturbed and said it was imposed on her. For if it is true, what the Rabbis write, that the shadows of the dead which are called upon by magical art, ascend upside down; but Samuel ascended standing upright, so that the head came first, then the breast, and lastly the feet were seen to emerge from the earth.

I say to the *second*, that adoration was not latria, but a reverence due to the soul of Samuel.

I say to the *third*, that “You will be with me,” does not mean he would be in the bosom of Abraham, but under the earth, *i.e.* you will be dead, for although Jonathan was just among the sons of Saul, they were not going to descend to the same place, and still Samuel said in general: “You will be with me.”

To the *fourth*, I say that God meant to show he was angry at Saul, and did this both by not responding when he was asked and by responding when he was not asked; for both are figures of anger. Add that when Saul asked God, if God would have responded, Saul could have turned away from war and punishment prepared for him by God; but when he asked the witch, all

things were already prepared, the army drawn up and placed in his sight, so that he could not withdraw from battle by any means; therefore, then God, so that he might punish Saul more, foretold to him through his prophet the ruin of his sons and whole army.

Therefore, we have Purgatory, Hell, and the limbos of the fathers and children are locations under the earth.

CHAPTER VII: *Whether after this Life, There is Some Place for Just Souls apart from Heaven and Purgatory*

ON the aforesaid subterranean receptacles for souls, theologians usually treat on two specific ones, which it is suitable to discuss here briefly for the purpose of treating the doctrine more fully. *Firstly*, they ask whether, apart from these places there might be some other place, where souls are retained before they arrive at the kingdom of heaven. *Secondly*, whether they can go out from these places.

In regard to the first, the difficulty is sufficiently great; because on the one hand, all theologians teach that there are no other receptacles apart from the four enumerated, and the Council of Florence defined in its last session that those having nothing to be purged are immediately received into heaven. On the other hand, Bede relates (*hist. lib. 5, cap. 13*) a very probable vision that he did not hesitate to trust. In it, it was shown to a certain soul which later returned to the body and said that apart from hell, purgatory and heaven, there a certain place like a most florid meadow, very bright, fragrant and pleasant, in which souls abided that suffered nothing but still remained there because they were not yet suitable for the beatific vision. Dennis the Carthusian adds many other things in conformity with that revelation in his dialog *de judicio particulari*, art. 31, and Louis Blosius in his *Monili Spirituali*, cap. 13.

It seems to me it must be said that it is not improbable that such a place is found and that it pertains to Purgatory; for even if there were no punishment of sense, still there is a punishment of loss; but punishment is not fitting except for a soul that has not yet been fully purged, and therefore it would be the mildest place of Purgatory, sort of like an aristocratic and honored prison.

Nevertheless, this must be added: the souls which tarry in that place not only lack beatitude, but are also afflicted and tortured by the delay of beatitude. Moreover, I said it seems to me that it is not *improbable* that such a place is found, because St. Thomas writes (4 dist. 21, quaest. 1, art.1) that in those matters in regard to purgatory that have not yet been determined by the Church, it favors those which are more in conformity to the aforesaid and the revelations of the Saints. The authority of Juan Torquemada also moves me, seeing that he was a most learned man and one of the best Cardinals, who in the prologue which is prefaced to the Revelations of St. Brigit, he eagerly expended much energy on these revelations and did not hesitate to affirm that it is fitting for St. Brigit what is said in Judith 8:28, “All the things which you spoke are true, and there is no fault in your speech.” St. Brigit writes (lib. 4 cap. 124) about a certain soul in Purgatory that had no other punishment but the sorrow from the longing for that happiness, so long delayed.

CHAPTER VIII: *Whether Souls of the Dead might Avail to Leave their Receptacles*

THE other question can have a threefold sense. *First*, whether souls that go out can never return because they are transferred from one receptacle to another; *second*, whether they can go out so that they might again return to their place; *third*, whether they can go out in such a way that they might live here again with us.

As far as the first sense, it is easy to respond: From the hell of the damned and the limbo of children one cannot go out again; from Purgatory and the limbo of the Fathers it is granted, for there are souls of the impious condemned to perpetual prisons and the fires of hell, and likewise the souls of children to perpetual exile and darkness. But the souls of the Holy Fathers were condemned to a temporal exile, and the souls of Purgatory to temporal prisons. The reason is the cause of the prison, or exile of the damned is actual mortal sin, or original sin, which is never remitted; the cause of the exile of the Fathers was temporal debt contracted from the sin of the first parents; by that sin heaven was closed, and it could not be opened except by the real shedding of the blood of Christ; but the cause of Purgatory is to undergo temporal punishment which necessarily has an end.

Nevertheless, the authority of John Damascene is against this, who, in an oration on the dead, says that by the prayers of St. Thecla the soul of Falconilla, a certain pagan woman, was delivered from hell, and by the prayers of St. Pope Gregory the Great the soul of Trajan was delivered from hell.

I respond: If these histories have to be defended, it would be fitting to say that Trajan was not absolutely damned to hell, but only punished in hell according to his present demerits, and his sentence suspended on account of the foreseen prayers of St. Gregory; and besides, he did not pass immediately from hell to heaven, but first united to the body, and then baptized, and did penance in this life; for this is the common answer of St. Thomas, Durandus, Richardus, and of others (in 4 dist. 45). Nevertheless, there is no witness that relates Trajan's resurrection, nor does any ancient

writer call it to mind, and it is opposed to the teaching of Damascene, who clearly enough teaches that Trajan passed from hell to heaven, but not that he returned to this life, and if he did penance he did it in hell; nevertheless, the cited authors only rest upon the authority of Damascene. Therefore, I propose in its place the teaching of Melchior Cano, who altogether disproves this history as made up (*de locis*, lib. 11 cap. 2), and Domingo de Soto who in 4 dist. 45, quaest. 2 art. 2, says this history was very hard for him to trust, notwithstanding the defense by Alonso Chacón, published three years ago. But the reasons, whereby I am moved, are four.

1) *First*, because whoever admits this history, they do it on account of the authority of Damascene, but that book is not of Damascene and it can easily be shown, for in that book the authority not only says Trajan and Falconilla passed from hell to heaven, but also that many others who had descended into hell because they lacked divine faith, were converted by Christ and saved when he descended to hell, which is erroneous in itself and contrary to the words of Damascene, (*de fide*, lib. 2, cap. 4) where he says that death is to men what the fall was to angels.

2) *The second* reason is that no Latin authority mentions this history, such as Paul the Deacon, Anasthasius the Librarian, Marians Scotus, Ado, and not even Bede himself, who was very devoted to St. Gregory, and not even in the Roman Church itself and its archives, since there exists no mention of this event. When John the Deacon wrote the life of St Gregory, he most diligently gathered records from the Roman archives, and still (lib. 2 cap. 44), he says this history on Trajan was found in a certain English Church; the Romans did not put certain faith in it.

3) *Third*, because St. Gregory (lib. 34, *Mor.*, cap. 13 et 16) clearly teaches that one cannot pray for dead unbelievers, and in the same way, not for the devil, seeing that they are in the same eternal and irrevocable damnation. So how is it believable that he did this? Abulensis responds (quaest. 57 and in 4 Kings) that Gregory sinned mortally in praying for Trajan. This is absolutely absurd and truly blasphemous, since it is a fact that Gregory was not only a holy man but also very prudent. Next, if he sinned mortally in so praying, how was it that he was heard? Is God pleased when he is offended? Chacón answers that Gregory did not sin in so praying, but rather merited the effect, even though normally it is not permitted to pray for the damned, still it is permitted from a peculiar divine instinct.

Against this, the same history relates that Gregory, on account of this sin, was punished with perpetual stomach and foot pain. He responds that this suffering was not given to Gregory as a penalty, but lest glorification would creep up on him; but against this, Peter the deacon, whom he cites from a certain book in the Vatican Library, says that Gregory was told by an angel that because he presumed to ask for this, he would labor even to death in pain, etc., therefore he was punished for sin, since presumption is a sin.

4) *The fourth* reason is that the arguments of Chacón do not conclude the matter; he rests especially upon these witnesses. *Firstly*, the testimony of Peter and John, the deacons of Gregory, which he says are extant in the Vatican library. *Secondly*, on the testimony of an unnamed author, who wrote the life of St. Gregory that is prefaced to his works printed at Basel in 1564. The author seems to have been someone that lived in the time of Gregory himself. *Thirdly*, on the testimony of Damascene. *Fourthly*, on the testimony of John the Deacon (lib. 2 cap. 44) on the life of St. Gregory. *Fifthly*, on the testimony of St. Thomas. *Sixthly*, on the testimony of St. Brigit. *Seventhly*, on the testimony of Mechtilidis.

The first testimony seems suspect to me; for if it were truly of Peter the Deacon, John the deacon would not have said this history is not extant in the Roman Church, but only among the English. *Besides*, this Peter says that Gregory sought from God that whoever was buried in the Church of St. Andrea on the Scaurus hill can not be damned, provided they held Christian faith. But certainly Gregory, a very prudent man, would never have prayed in this way, for he either understands informed faith or formed faith; first, if informed, then he meant dying men are saved without charity; but who would believe that? If formed, it was not necessary that they perish, for wherever they are buried who die with charity, they cannot be damned. Add that the whole fragment is redolent with novelty and thus seems suspicious; for it calls Gregory *divus*, a name that was not used at that time. Likewise, it places Cardinals ahead of bishops, which is opposed to John the Deacon's usage, who in the life of St. Gregory writes that many from among the Cardinals were usually promoted to the Episcopate by Gregory, as though to a higher degree. It also has several other signs of novelty.

The second testimony advances nothing new; but the author, without a name, did not live in the time of St. Gregory, rather in a later time. For he reduced into a compendium life of St. Gregory what John the deacon had written more profusely.

The third testimony has already been rejected.

The fourth testimony is against Chacón himself, for John the Deacon says the soul of Trajan was not freed from hell but only that it was obtained for him that he would not suffer the punishment of fire in hell; Chacón, however, would have it that he is among the blessed in heaven.

The fifth testimony is also against him, since St. Thomas, where he avowedly treats this, namely in 4, dist. 45, quaest. 2, thinks it very probable that the soul of Trajan was only freed from the punishments of hell even to the day of judgment, and thereafter, is going to be tortured with the rest.

The sixth is expressly against it, for Mechtildis says he asked from the Lord what he would do with the souls of Samson, Solomon, Origen and Trajan, and God answered that he meant for it to be unknown to all what he did from his generosity. So, if God wanted it to be unknown, then one must not put any trust in the authors that say Trajan is in heaven. Add that God, in this revelation, joins Trajan with Origen; but in the spiritual meadow cited by the seventh Council as well as by John the deacon in his life of St. Gregory (lib. 2 cap. 45), another revelation is related in which Origen was seen in the fires of hell with Arius and Nestorius, and in the fifth Council, cap. 11, it says anathema to Origen just as to Arius, Nestorius and other heretics.

In regard now to the second question, certain men think the souls cannot ever go out from their receptacles and all apparitions are of demons who pretend to be souls going out from Purgatory and asking for assistance. So thought Tertullian (*de anima*), and the author of questions to Antioch, quaest. 11 and 13. Chrysostom appears to say the same thing (homil. 29 in Matth. and hom. 1 & 4 on Lazarus) as well as Theophylactus in cap. 8 Matth. Although these two, if they are read correctly, do not say that souls can not go out to us in any manner, but simply not of their own will; nor do they become demons, nor wander among us after the fashion of demons. The heretics of this time mock all apparitions of souls as illusions of demons, especially the Centuriators.

Nevertheless, St. Augustine's teaching is the truest (*de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 15-16), that it is of the greatest impudence to deny that souls return to us either at God's command or with his permission; for we have the testimony of very serious authors on the return of souls from all receptacles, apart from the limbo of children. That the souls of the blessed in heaven should come to us at some point is certain from examples cited by Eusebius

(*histor. lib. 6, cap. 5*), Augustine (*de cura pro mortuis, cap. 16*) Sulpitius, in the life of Martin, Paulinus, in the life of Ambrose, Theodoret (*lib. 5, hist. cap. 24*), Gregory (*lib. 3 Dialog. cap. 24 & 25*) and in the seventh Council, act 4.

That souls appeared from the limbo of the Fathers, St. Augustine proves (*loc. cit.*) from 1 Kings 1:28, where the soul of Samuel appeared to Saul, and in Matthew 17 where Moses appeared with Elijah on mount Thabor. Although Hilary and Ambrose say on this passage that Moses still lives, nevertheless the contrary is expressly contained in Deuteronomy 34:5 and Joshua 1:1-2.

That souls have appeared from Purgatory, there are examples cited by Gregory (*Dialog. lib. 4, capl 40 & 55*) and other authors whom we cited above. Then from hell, the author of the books on the properties of bees relates many examples, and the same appear from that apparition of the Parisian Doctor in the life of St. Bruno, who, three days after his death, said that he was condemned. It is believable that a soul descended right away into hell, but still appeared and in the first place manifested its accusation; secondly its judgment; thirdly its damnation, so that it would be known to many by way of example.

In regard to the third part of the question, that some from Purgatory or the limbo of the Fathers were recalled to life, there cannot be a doubt for anyone. For the those whom Elijah, Elisha and our Lord Jesus Christ raised from the dead, as well as those raised by Peter and Paul when they were faithful, are believed to have been in Purgatory or in limbo; nor does anything unseemly follow, if from these places some rose again, accordingly, this is nothing other than to change exile, or prison for them.

But someone will object: They were certain of their salvation, and by resurrection they become uncertain. Abulensis responds well (q. 57 in 4 Regum), that all of those who are recalled to life from Purgatory or the limbo of the Fathers were, without a doubt, confirmed in grace so that in no way could they perish because otherwise it would be an injury for them.

Moreover, that from heaven or the hell of the damned they could be recalled to life seems unbelievable, unless there were examples that could not be denied. Now, St. Gregory writes about St. Fortunatus raising Marcellus, a certain holy man (*Dialog. lib. 1 c. 9*), who had been lead by the Angels into the best place, and in chapter 12 he writes about St. Severus who raised a certain very wicked man that had been lead down by demons

into hell. Egesippus writes (lib. 3 c. 2) that St. Peter raised a certain relation of Caesar, a heathen, from death. Nor can there be any doubt that the Apostles raised some pagans. Maximus (serm. 2 de S. Agnete) says that St. Agnete raised the son of a Prefect that had died in mortal sin. And Evodius (lib. 1 de miraculis S. Stephani), says that a child dead before baptism was brought to life by the relics of St. Stephen.

Therefore, I say those presently blessed cannot be recalled to life. Beatitude includes a certitude about not losing any happiness, as St. Augustine teaches (*de corrept. et gratia*, cap. 10), and the reason is clear, because beatitude is the state perfected by the joining of all goods; but someone who does not have certitude does not have all goods. Therefore, if some holy men are returned to the body, they were not blessed, but God, foreseeing their being raised, delayed their beatification and meanwhile detained them in some very good place, as happened to Marcellus, about whom Gregory speaks.

I will say the same thing about the damned. Someone that has been damned absolutely to eternal punishments cannot be recalled to life because otherwise, the damnation of the impious would be uncertain. St. Augustine correctly says that it is of great presumption to assert they are not going to remain perpetually in fire, to whom Truth says: "Go into the eternal fire;" but Truth says this to all whom it damns, both in the particular and in the universal judgment. *Besides*, there would be none of the damned who could hope for salvation and for whom we could not pray; but now we do not pray for damned infidels, because according to faith we believe they cannot be saved; but if they can at least be saved by privilege, certainly, we must pray for them just as in this world we pray for those who are obstinate in evil that God would grant to them efficacious grace, which certainly is not given except by a privilege.

But Abulenis objects in question 57, on the 4th book of Kings: For someone raised from the hell of the damned, neither sin nor punishment is remitted by the same raising, nor is there another miracle required here than a simple raising from the dead, rather an equivalent benefit is given, because he is placed in a state in which he will be able to be free from sin and punishment, from which all the aforesaid absurdities follow, which will not be certain for the impious in damnation; but if they could hope for them, it would be lawful to pray for them.

To these examples, which are advanced, de Soto responds (4 dist. 45, quaest. 2 art. 2) that all the heathen whom the Apostle raised labored in invincible ignorance of the faith, and hence were in Purgatory.

But what will de Soto answer to St. Ambrose (serm. 90) and to St. Maximus (in serm. 2), who say that St. Agnetis raised the son of the prefect, whom the devil had slain since he meant to deflower the holy maiden? I say they who are raised, when they merit eternal punishments, were not damned rather their judgment was suspended and in the mean time they were punished according to the present injustice, as St. Thomas teaches in 4 sent. dist. 45, q. 92, art. 2, just as Richardus, Durandus and others explain the same thing.

CHAPTER IX: *On the Time in which Purgatory Endures*

NOW on the time in which Purgatory will remain, there are two extreme errors. The first error is that of Origen, who extended the times of Purgatory beyond the day of the resurrection, so that he has in homily 14 in Luke: “I think that even after the resurrection from the dead we need the sacrament to wash and cleanse us, for no man can rise again with filth.” Nevertheless, this error has been explored, for St. Augustine (lib. 21 *de civitate Dei*, cap. 16) says: “We suppose that there will be no Purgatorial punishments except before that last and tremendous judgment.” And the reason is, because the Lord says that in the judgment there will be only two ranks of men, one of the blessed, the other of the damned (Matth. 25).

But someone will say: The soul alone did not sin, but once with the body, therefore it should be purged then with the body, hence, after the resurrection men will be purged. *I respond*: if that would conclude the argument, it would also prove that the soul cannot be separated to be punished in hell, nor enjoy the delights of heaven, which is against the Gospel, “I am tortured in this flame” (Luke 16:24), and “Today you will be with me in paradise” (Luke 23:43).

Therefore, I say the soul is duly punished even by itself, because it is the subject and efficient cause of sin; for there are certain human acts which cannot be done except from the whole composite, nor received except in the whole composite, such as all those which are done by organic potencies, *e.g.* to speak, see, hear, etc., and such things, after the dissolution of the composite, are no longer found. And if indeed such were a sin, it would clearly conclude the argument. But it is not so, for sin is an act of free will, and therefore properly said to come into being by the will alone and found formally in the will alone. Consequently, after the dissolution of man, the whole sin is only found in the will, and by that fact, in the soul, but not in

dead flesh; moreover, it ought to be punished or purged in that place where it is found.

Add also, that the flesh is punished in its mode; for as the separated soul is punished with the penalty of loss, because it lacks the vision of God, and the punishment of sense, because it is tortured in fire, so the flesh is punished by the fire of loss, because it lacks life and the punishment of sense, although improperly, because it rots little by little and is reduced to ash; nevertheless, the first answer is better, for even the bodies of the saints that do not need purgation suffer this.

The second error is of Luther, who on the contrary makes Purgatory too short. He would have it that anyone who dies in faith has the remainder of his sins purged by the sorrow of death, and so there is no further Purgatory than death itself. This error can be easily refuted. By the remaining sins, either the *fomes* [13](#) are understood, or bad habits that were contracted, or the undergoing of temporal punishments and venial sins. These alone, and all others can remain in a man that has been justified, which pertain to sin and hence can be said to be the remainder of one's sins. First, the *fomes* is certainly abolished in death, because then sensuality is extinguished, but we do not constitute Purgatory due to the *fomes*, otherwise even baptized infants that die would need to suffer the punishments of Purgatory, since Baptism does not wash away the *fomes*. But Augustine, in the cited passage of *City of God*, teaches precisely that children of this sort do not suffer any purgatorial punishments. Now in regard to bad habits, those which exist in the will are not necessarily extinguished by death, seeing that they are in the powers that are not bound to an organ. Nevertheless, on account of habits of this sort we constitute Purgatory since otherwise it would follow that adults who are baptized after they have contracted bad habits, and immediately die, or certainly are killed for Christ, could not be saved except by Purgatory because neither Baptism nor Martyrdom dissolves habits of this kind. We see the baptized still have these same wicked inclinations which they had before, and it is necessary for them to abolish habits of this sort little by little with contrary acts.

Therefore, it is believable that all these habits are abolished by the first contrary act of the separated soul, which it elicits immediately from the separation. For, even if this habit, contracted in one act, cannot be destroyed by many acts nevertheless, there it will be able to be because that act will be much more forceful, seeing that then the soul will be more powerful in

regard to spiritual acts and it will not have the contrary *fomites* and resistance as it has here.

Thus, it remains to speak of suffering punishment and venial sin, which can properly be called the remainder of sin, which is the reason why Purgatory exists. Moreover, it is certain that sometimes these remnants are purged in death, and at other times it is certain they are not, whereas, at other times there is a doubt as to whether this happened and it is very probable that it was partly purged and partly not.

I will prove these individually. For the first, a violent death received for Christ, which is called martyrdom, without a doubt cleanses all remnants of this sort. Cyprian clearly says that all sins are cleansed in passion (lib. 4 epist. 2); that he is not speaking about mortal sins is obvious because in the same place he says that without charity martyrdom is of no benefit whatsoever. St. Paul taught this before Cyprian in 1 Cor. 13. Therefore, the Church never prays for martyrs, because, as St. Augustine says on the words of the Apostle: "It is an injury to pray for a martyr, to whose prayers we ought to be commended."

I prove the second: Those who die against their will or without the use of reason, such as the insane, those who die in their sleep and those who die instantly cannot be purged by that death in any mode; for either death itself absolutely purges, or by reason of some voluntary concomitant act itself. Not the former because death is, according to what it is, natural, at least after the sin of our first parents. This is why it is common to both the good and the bad, nay more to men and beasts; but by natural things which necessarily must come about we do not merit or lose merit, nor can we dissolve debts contracted voluntarily, so if death purges, it happens by reason of a voluntary concomitant act. But we are speaking in this place about those men who die without any act of this sort. Besides, we often see the best men suffer a very hard death, and those that are not good suffer a very light one. But if in death the remnants of sin should be purged, then necessarily the contrary ought to happen.

I prove the third: There are many who bear death with equanimity, whose patience without a doubt helps to make satisfaction, but whether those sufferings are equivalent to the debts contracted from sin, nobody can know for certain.

Apart from these errors there was an opinion of Domingo de Soto that no one in Purgatory remains beyond ten years (4 Sent. dist. 19 quaest. 3, art.

2). His reasoning is that if here on earth we can be freed from all punishments in a short time by certain punishments, why not more quickly in Purgatory since those punishments are infinitely more serious punishments and more intense than the former? Besides, here punishments are extended because they cannot be very intense or they would destroy the subject; but after this life they can be as intense as possible, because the subject is incorruptible. Thus, it is believable that God purges those souls gasping for glory in the shortest time by the most intense punishments. But these reasons do not conclude the matter.

To the first it can be said that here is the time of mercy and there is the time of justice.

To the second I say, God can compensate extension with intension, but he refuses; otherwise it would follow that souls do not remain in Purgatory for one hour, because God can, by increasing the intensity, redirect the punishments of ten years to one hour.

Besides, his opinion is opposed to approved visions of the Saints. Bede writes that the punishments of Purgatory were shown to a certain man, and it was said to him that souls which abide in Purgatory are all going to be saved on the day of judgment, although some will be assisted with prayers and almsgiving of the living, and above all the sacrifice of the altar, so that they will be freed even before the day of judgment (lib. 5 hist. cap. 13). There, he clearly shows some men that already died will remain in Purgatory even to the day of judgment. We can advance many similar visions from Dennis the Carthusian and others.

The custom of the Church is also opposed to this opinion, which celebrates an anniversary Mass for the dead, even if it is certain they died a hundred or two-hundred years ago. Certainly the Church would not do that if she believed that souls are not punished beyond ten years. Consequently, the matter is still uncertain and cannot be defined without temerity.

CHAPTER X: *What Kind of Punishment is in Purgatory?*

ON the punishment of Purgatory there are some things that are certain and some that are in doubt. *Firstly*, it is certain that the punishment of Purgatory is not despair and fear of hell, as Luther's thinking which has already been refuted.

Secondly, it is also certain that one of the punishments of Purgatory is the loss of the divine vision; souls cannot not suffer since they see they are impeded from the enjoyment of the supreme good on account of their faults; this is called the punishment of loss [*pæna damni*].

Thirdly, it is certain that apart from this punishment there is also another punishment which theologians call the punishment of sense [*pæna sensus*], which consists in some sorrow arising from something other than the loss of the vision of God. One who sins turns himself away from the supreme good and turns inordinately to creatures, so later he ought to be punished not only with the loss of the supreme good, but even affliction inflicted by another created object.

Fourthly, it is certain that in Purgatory, just as also in hell, there is the punishment of fire, whether this fire is received properly or metaphorically, and whether it means the punishment of sense or of loss, as some men would have it. That there is some fire in Purgatory and hell is obvious both from the words of St. Paul "He will be saved as if by fire" (1 Cor. 3:15), and Matthew 25:41, "Go into the eternal fire," and from the testimonies of the Fathers cited in book 1, for all call the punishment of Purgatory fire.

With these being posited for certain, and all agreeing on them, there is a doubt: 1) Whether that fire is a fire properly so-called, or metaphorically? 2) If it is properly so-called, how could it affect disembodied spirits? 3) By whom are these punishments administered, by demons, angels, or do they happen themselves? 4) Whether these punishments are greater than the punishments of this life?

CHAPTER XI: *The Fire of Purgatory is Corporeal*

IN regard to the *first*, the common opinion of theologians is that it is a true and proper fire and of the same species with our element. Such an opinion is indeed not *de fide*, because it has never been defined by the Church; nay more, in the Council of Florence the Greeks professed that they do not posit a fire in Purgatory, and still in the last session a definition was made in which Purgatory was defined but with no mention of fire. Still, it is a very probable opinion.

Firstly, on account of the consensus of the Scholastics, who cannot be scorned except with temerity.

Secondly, on account of the authority of Gregory (*Dialogorum*, lib. 4 cap. 29) where he carefully asserts that the fire, in which souls are punished, is corporeal. Nor is it opposed that in book 15, cap. 14 of the *Morals* he says the fire of hell is incorporeal, since it is a mistake of copyists, who placed *incorporeum* for *corporeum*, as is clear from what follows, since he says it burns corporally.

Thirdly, on account of Augustine, who inclined to the same opinion (*de civitate Dei*, lib. 21 cap. 10).

Fourthly, because in Scripture everywhere punishment of the impious is called fire, and the rule of theologians is that the words of Scripture are received properly when nothing absurd follows.

Fifthly, because the bodies of the damned will be punished with fire after the resurrection, as is clear in Matthew 25:41, “Go into the eternal fire,” but bodies cannot be burned except by a corporeal fire. Further, the fire for the bodies of the damned is the same as for disembodied spirits, for it is said: “which was prepared for the devil and his angels.”

Sixthly, because in Wisdom 11:17, it is said, that the very things whereby a man sinned will torture him, but men often sin by desiring objects of sensible delight, therefore they are often punished by sensible objects; so the fire, whereby they are punished, is sensible.

Seventhly, it is confirmed from eruptions of fire on mount Aetna, and other places about which we spoke in chapter 6.

CHAPTER XII: *It Cannot be Known how Corporeal Fire Burns Souls*

ON the *second* doubt, the truest opinion is that it cannot be known in this life how a corporeal fire acts on the incorporeal soul; for Durandus nobly confesses (4 dist. 44 quaest. ult), and before him St. Augustine (*City of God*, lib. 21, cap. 10) that souls are tortured by a marvelous fire, but in true modes; and St. Gregory (lib. 4 *Dialog*. cap. 29) says that souls undergo invisible punishment from a visible fire in ways that are secret and unknown to us. But although we do not know how it happens, still, it can be so, as Augustine teaches from a similitude: We see the incorporeal soul united to the human body and give it life, and rejoices with it although the mode of this union is plainly ineffable. Who grasps how the spirit is the form of the body, when between body and soul there is no proportion? Therefore, just as a spirit can be united to the flesh to communicate life to it, so also can a spirit be united to fire for it to undergo punishment from it, although the mode of each union is properly unknown.

CHAPTER XIII: *Whether Souls in Purgatory are Tortured by Demons*

ON the third uncertainty, the matter is altogether unclear; for the Scholastics, such as St. Thomas, teach they are neither tortured by demons or angels, but the fire alone (4 dist. 20 art. 5) and they give the reason that all the souls of Purgatory conquered the devil in their last conflict, so it is not fitting for divine justice to permit them to be troubled by the enemy they overthrew. *Next*, here on earth the demons trouble the perfect, because they hope that they can cause them to sin; but they know that the souls of Purgatory are confirmed in grace, cannot yield and that vexation will hasten them to purgation sooner; so it is not believable that the souls are tortured by an act of the demons.

On the other hand, many revelations teach that the souls of Purgatory are tortured by demons, such as that of Blessed Fursaeus, cited by Bede (*hist. lib. 3, c. 19*) and Dennis the Carthusian in his work on the last things, not to mention in book 1 of the life of St. Bernard, ch. 12. Therefore, this remains among the secrets that will be made clear to us in its time.

CHAPTER XIV: *On the Gravity of Punishments*

ON the fourth, the punishments of Purgatory are very severe, and no punishments of this life can be compared with these, as the Fathers constantly teach. Augustine says, commenting on Psalm 37 (38): “Although he will be saved by fire, still that fire will be more severe than whatever a man can suffer in this life.” St. Gregory says, commenting on Psalm 3: “That transitory fire I think more unbearable than every tribulation of the present life.” St. Bede, commenting on the same Psalm, says that no punishments of martyrs or thieves can be compared with those purgatorial punishments. St. Anselm holds the same thing (commenting on 1 Cor. 3) and St. Bernard in his sermon *on the death of Humbert*.

All revelations which Bede cites (*Histor.* lib. 3 & 5) prove the same thing, as well as those cited by St. Brigit and Dennis the Carthusian and what is contained in the life of the miraculous Christina.

Reason proves the same thing, at least in regard to the *poena sensus*. Three things coincide with both sorrow and joy; potency, object and the union of one thing with another. Now, in regard to potency, without comparison the rational potency has more capacity for sorrow than the animal; in regard to apprehension, the intellect is like a font, sense like a small brook; in regard to the appetite, the will is like the font, the lower appetite is like a brook. Therefore, when the naked soul is tortured the greatest suffering it ought to be on the side of the one suffering; in this life it is not only the soul but also the body that is tortured and through the body some of the suffering is also transferred to the soul.

In regard to the object, if it is a true fire there, it will be altogether the most bitter, since it was only established for this purpose, that it would be an instrument of divine justice; if it is not a true fire, it will be something much more horrible, such that God could prepare, which he willed to show his power.

Inasmuch as it regards the union, it will be the greatest; here, where everything is corporal, there is no union except through contact with the extremities, and superficial; but there punishment will penetrate the soul itself.

However, all admit in some mode that the punishments of Purgatory are greater than those of this life, nevertheless, there is a doubt how this is understood. St. Thomas teaches two things in 4 dist. 30 quaest. 1, art. 2. 1) The *poena damni* is the greatest of punishments which can be found in Purgatory and in this life; 2) He says the least punishment of Purgatory is greater than the greatest punishment of this life.

He proves the first because, just as possession of a desired good begets joy, so the absence of a desired good begets sorrow. But the good which the souls of Purgatory long for is the supreme good and the desire is thus the greatest; for the intellect more clearly recognizes how great a good it is to see God and the appetite, and the strength of the appetite, as well as infused charity, will go out and is the most intense, nor is it impeded by a corporeal mass and sensible delectations. In this life examples can be given, say if someone were disturbed by a vehement hunger, or would burn with an unbearable thirst, and see before him a table laden with the best food and sweetest wine, but cannot touch anything, and still he would know all these things were otherwise prepared for himself.

Next, St. Thomas proves the second, because everyone who abides in purgatory is tortured at least by this *poena damni*, which is the greatest of all, therefore the least punishment of Purgatory is greater than the greatest punishment of this life.

But St. Bonaventure (in 4 dist. 20 art. 1 q. 2) teaches *firstly*, the punishment of loss in Purgatory is not greater than every punishment, whether of Purgatory or of this life. *Secondly*, he teaches that the punishments of purgatory are greater than the punishments of this life, only in this sense, because the greatest punishment of Purgatory is greater than the greatest punishment of this life, although some punishment of purgatory is found lesser than some punishment of this life. I find this opinion more pleasing. Although the absence of the supreme good of itself would beget supreme sorrow in the lover, nevertheless, in Purgatory this sadness is mitigated and lifted in a great degree on account of a certain hope of acquiring that good; for that certain hope brings an incredible joy and from there, the closer it comes to the end of that exile, the more joy increases.

Therefore, only in hell is the *poena damni* the greatest, because it is connected to certain desperation. Chrysostom speaks about this (hom. 24 in Matth) when he says a thousand hells are nothing if they are conferred with the loss of the divine sight, and Augustine, who in *Enchirid.* cap. 112, says the least *poena damni*, if it is eternal, is greater than all the punishments of this life.

Someone might say: But the damned do not love God, thus, they do not desire to see him. *I respond:* They do not love God on account of God, but still, *on account of themselves* they are compelled to ardently desire his sight because they understand their supreme good is constituted in the vision of God.

This argument is confirmed, *firstly*, because if the *poena damni* were the most terrible, even in Purgatory, it would follow that the Fathers in limbo suffered the most terrible punishment; but this is completely false, as we see in Luke 16:25 where Abraham says to the rich man about Lazarus: “You are tortured, but he is consoled.” And St. Augustine (epist. 99) denies that of Acts 2:24 can be understood about the Holy Fathers, “After the sorrows of hell were loosed,” because Christ found them not in exceeding suffering, but in rest. And St. Gregory (*Moral.* lib. 13, cap. 22), says the Fathers in hell had no torment, but rest.

It is confirmed *secondly* because Augustine, Gregory, Bede, Anselm, and Bernard, although they say the punishment of Purgatory is greater than every punishment of this life, they clearly speak about the punishment *of fire*, through which every punishment of *sense* is understood, not of loss.

Then, what was said by Bonaventure is proven *firstly*, because from certain revelations it is clear that the punishment of some men is so scanty that they seem to suffer nothing, such as those who are clothed in white vestments that were seen in pleasant and lucid places, cited by Bede (lib. 5 *hist.* c. 13).

What Bonaventure says is proved *secondly*, because it can happen that someone carries there bearing no debt with himself but one idle word; it seems absurd that on account of only one idle word someone ought to suffer graver punishments than all those of this life.

Thirdly, although there is the question as to whether the punishment of purgatory will always torture in an equally grave manner from the beginning even to the end of purgation, or whether it is diminished little by little until the end comes, still, the opinion is more probable that it is

remitted little by little. Hence it follows that not every punishment of Purgatory is greater than the greatest punishment of this life, for that punishment of Purgatory which is near the end ought to be nearly remitted, so that it can no longer be remitted, but here very intense punishments are found that could remit a great many.

Now we prove that the punishment of Purgatory is incrementally remitted: St. Bernard, in the life of St. Malachi, writes that while Malachi was praying for his dead sister, she appeared to him three times. 1) in a black garment and outside of a Church; 2) in a gray garment and standing at the threshold of a Church; 3) in a white garment and at the altar itself with the rest of the saints. From such he understood that the soul of his sister was little by little being remitted of its punishments as it came to the end of its purgation. Many similar visions could be advanced.

CHAPTER XV: *The Suffrage of the Church Benefits the Dead*

WE are going to explain four things in regard to the suffrage for the dead. *First*, whether the suffrage of the living benefits the dead; *second*, how many kinds of suffrage there are; *third*, by whom it can be made; *fourth*, whom they benefit.

First, all the heretics of this time as well as other older ones whom we cited in the beginning of this disputation, deny that suffrage of the living benefits the dead. Moreover, that it does benefit can be proven from the Scriptures, the Councils, the Fathers and apparitions of souls, all of which ought to be sought from the first question. To these, reason must be added, which then we did not advance, because it presupposes that Purgatory exists, but at that time we had not yet shown it.

The reasoning is of Peter the Cluniac (*contra Petrobusianos*): The whole Church is one body, the head is Christ; therefore it ought to have communication, both of the head with the members and of the members among themselves, as it is said in 1 Cor. 12:24, the members are anxious for one another, and if one member suffers something, all the members do likewise. But the just dead are members of this body, seeing that they are gathered with us and with God in faith, hope and charity. This is why St. Augustine (*de civitate Dei*, lib. 20 c. 9) says: "The souls of the faithful departed are not separated from the Church, which is the kingdom of Christ." Consequently, they may and must help the dead just as members of the same body.

Besides, Christ, because he is the head, benefitted the living while he was alive on earth, when dead he benefitted the dead, when living he benefitted the dead, and while he was dead he benefited the living. Therefore, it is also fitting that the members should so act among themselves so that just men who are alive would help the living, the dead would help the dead, the living the dead and the dead benefit the living. *First of all*, that Christ, while he was alive, benefitted the living is clear because he remitted the sins of the Magdalen (Luke 7:48), the Paralytic (Matthew 9:6), Zachaeus (Luke 19:9), Peter (Luke 22:61), of the thief:

(Luke 23:43) and he took care of a great many corporally, as it is said in Mark 1:34, Acts 10:38 and other passages. That when dead he benefited the dead is clear; for descending to hell, he freed a great many from the sorrows of hell, as it says in Acts 2:24 and at the same time opened the tombs and roused a great many bodies of the Saints (Matthew 27:52). It is also certain that as a living man he benefited the dead: for the girl in the house of Jairus, the youth on the road and Lazarus in the tomb, were all dead and he recalled them to life (Matthew 9:25; Luke 7:15; John 11:44). Lastly, as a dead man he helped the living, for in his death he brought eternal life to us and now always fights for us in heaven, and has made himself our advocate (Hebrews 7:25; 1 John 2:1).

Thirdly and lastly, it is proven from the four divisions of members; three are certainly manifest, so the fourth should have place. Nobody denies that the living are helped by the living, since we see that some men are taught, instructed and fed by the word and the Sacraments by others, and James 5:16 says: “Pray for each other that you might be saved.”

Now it is certain that the dead benefit the dead: for Elisha, when he was dead, raised another man from the dead (4 Kings 13:21), and Abraham, when he was dead, received Lazarus into his bosom (Luke 16:22). Nor should there be any doubt whether the souls of the dead saints reigning with Christ should pray for the souls of the saints laboring in Purgatory. Domingo de Soto asserts the contrary (lib. 4 sent., dist. 45, quaest. 3 art. 2), and rashly, for apart from Peter the Cluniac (*loc. cit.*) St. Augustine says for this purpose it benefits the dead to be buried in the basilica of a martyr, so that one will be mindful of the dead man and at the same time remember the Martyr and commend the soul of the dead man to his prayers. And the whole Church begs God in the prayer: *Deus veniae largitor*, [14](#) etc. that by the suffrage of the Blessed Virgin and all the saints, all the faithful departed might hasten to attain a share of perpetual beatitude.

Moreover, that the dead can benefit the living is clear, for in 2 Maccabees 15:12-14, we read that Onias and Jeremiah were already long dead and were seen to pray for the people of the Jews that were still alive. Furthermore, the benefits shown by dead saints to men living here are innumerable and most certain. See St. Augustine (lib. 22 *de civitate Dei*, cap. 8) and Theodoret (*de Martyribus*). It is not unbelievable that even the souls of Purgatory pray for us and obtain things for us, seeing that the soul of Paschasius and St. Severinus worked miracles, even though they abided

in Purgatory, as is clear from Gregory (*Dialog.* lib., 4, cap. 40) and Peter Damian in his epistle on the miracles of his time.

Although St. Thomas teaches the contrary (2.2. qu. 83, art. 11 ad 3), still his reason does not convict the matter, for if those souls do not pray for us, there is either a cause, because they do not see God, or because they are in the greatest torments, or because they are inferior to us, but none of these can be said. Not the first, because in the time of the Old Testament, dead saints prayed for the living, as is clear from 2 Maccabees 31:121-14, although they did not yet see God.

Not the second, because the rich man in hell prayed for his brothers (Luke 16:27) although still he was in greater torments than the souls in Purgatory. Besides, martyrs are constituted in this world amid torments, but they prayed for themselves and others as is clear from St. Stephen (Acts 7:59). Likewise, suffering does not disturb souls in any mode of rational judgment, nor impede the good affect of the will; this happens to us by reason of corporal organs, which they lack. Lastly, there does not seem to be any uncertainty whether they might pray for themselves, torments notwithstanding.

Not the third, because in this world we pray for Bishops and the Supreme Pontiffs who are our superiors and we also pray for those whom we do not doubt are holier than we are, just as Christians once prayed for the Apostle Paul when he sought their prayers (Romans 15:30).

Besides, even if the souls of Purgatory were inferior to us by reason of the punishments, still they are our superiors by reason of the grace and charity in which they are confirmed. But prayer which proceeds from charity. This is especially requires a superiority if it requires anything, therefore it is probable that they pray for us. But although these things are true, nevertheless it seems superfluous to beseech them to pray for us regularly because they cannot ordinarily recognize what we are doing in particular, rather they only know in general that we live in many dangers just as we only know in general that they are exceedingly tortured. St. Augustine shows that they are not concerned with our affairs, nor do they see our prayers in God, since they are not blessed, nor does it have the appearance of truth that what we are doing or ask is ordinarily revealed to them. So, if the living benefit the living, the dead benefit the dead, and the dead benefit the living, why couldn't the living benefit the dead?

Thus, it remains to answer the arguments which remain, apart from those we dealt with in the first and second question.

1) *The first argument.* Sirach 9:5, “Living they know they are going to die, but the dead know nothing more nor do they have anything beyond their reward, etc., nor a share in this life in the work which is done under the sun.”

I respond: Wisdom speaks about the goods of this life and means to say the dead do not know how the affairs which remain here pass, nor can they use their own action, such as eating, drinking, giving alms, etc. Thus, it follows: “Go and eat in joy.” Still, it is not concluded whether we can help them.

2) Calvin objects in the preface of the *Institutes*, first citing St. Ambrose: “We teach that we ought no longer to cling to the dead, rather it is enough to perform our duty and leave them” (*de Abraham*, lib. 1 cap. 7) and then he adds: “They burst through these limits when they maintain perpetual solicitude for the dead.”

I respond: Here Ambrose argues about the mourning and pomp of funerals which he rightly willed to be moderated, but he does not forbid the solicitude of prayer for the dead, as is clear from the prayer of Ambrose himself on the death of Valentinian the younger. In the end, addressing Gratianus and Valentinian who were dead, he says: “Be blessed together, if my prayers have any strength, no day will pass you by in silence, no night shall pass without some portion given to my prayers; I will celebrate you in all offerings.”

3) They object with St. Jerome, who while commenting in chapter 6 to the Galatians, explaining the verse: “Bear each other’s burdens”, says: “We are taught by this little sentence a new doctrine which was hidden; while we are in the present life, whether by prayer or council we can help each other; but when we come before the tribunal of Christ, not Job, not Daniel, not even Noah can pray for anyone, but each will bear his own burden.” But this sentence of Jerome seems to be approved by the Church, nay more it is in the decretal of Gratian can. *In praesenti*, 13, q. 2, as has already been related.

I respond: Jerome spoke about those who sin mortally and die without penance, as Gratian annotated. Or, it must be said that Jerome spoke on the *last judgment*, when Purgatory will cease and suffrage will also cease, and only the final sentence of the judge will be entrusted to execution. That

Jerome must be so understood is clear from that book against Vigilantius, where he accuses Vigilantius in earnest because he had said we can pray for each other while we live, but after death it is for no one to listen to a prayer of another.

4) From reason: It is better to make satisfaction by one's self than by another, since he will be less happy who makes satisfaction through another instead of himself, therefore, we ought not to pray for the dead lest we diminish their glory.

I respond: In this life it is better to make satisfaction by ourselves than through another, because while we make satisfaction we merit an increase of grace and glory at the same time; but in Purgatory, where souls cannot merit, it is not better to make satisfaction by one's self than through another.

5) We do not know, they say, where our dead are, and often while we think they are in Purgatory, they are in hell, or in heaven, therefore we pray in vain.

St. Augustine responds to this in *de cura*, that it is better that suffrage were superfluous for those who do not need it than that it should be lacking to those who need it, just as we do good to the unjust in this world lest the just be passed over. Additionally, a good work is never in vain, for it is meritorious to the one that does it, even if it confers no benefit on the one for whom it was done.

6) The justice of God renders evil for evil and good for good, but no man suffers for the sin of another, because a father will not carry the iniquity of the son (Ezechiel 18:20). Consequently, nobody ought to enjoy someone else's goods.

I respond: No man can be punished for the sin of another, *unless he becomes a partaker of the same sin*, either by consent or imitation. Exodus 20:5 speaks about such things when God punishes the sins of the Fathers in the sons to the third and fourth generation, which is understood when the sons imitate the parents, as the Church Fathers explain (Jerome, in cap. 18 of Ezechiel; Augustine, in Psalm 108; Chrysostom, homil. 29 in Gen., and Gregory, lib., 25 moral. cap. 22). As a result, it is not absurd that someone enjoys the goods of another, *if with the consent of both and it is done willingly*, as in this place. The souls of Purgatory desire to be assisted and we wish to help them. Besides, to punish one for another is an injustice, and to receive the goods of one for another is mercy and liberality.

CHAPTER XVI: *How many Kinds of Suffrage are there?*

NOW to the second, there are three types of suffrage: The Sacrifice of Mass, Prayer and any penitential works you like, and satisfactory works, such as almsgiving, fasting, pilgrimages and like things. Hence, we distinguish prayer from satisfactory works, although it might itself be satisfactory, because prayer helps the souls of the faithful departed in two ways; 1) as a certain punitive and laborious work, and in this mode it could be embraced under a satisfactory work; 2) in another mode it assists, as it is a mode of entreaty which is proper to prayer itself; in this way even the prayers of the Blessed benefit us and the souls in Purgatory, although they are not satisfactory.

For this purpose the dead are also assisted by indulgences, but these do not constitute a fourth kind of suffrage, because an indulgence is nothing other than the application of satisfactory or punitive works of Christ, and of the Saints to the dead. This is why it is said that an indulgence is “conceded” to the dead *by the mode of suffrage*, not by the mode of absolution; for the Pope cannot absolve the dead from penalties in the way he absolves the living because they are not subject to him. Nevertheless, he can, as supreme dispenser of the treasury of the Church, communicate to them good punitive works which are in the treasury, but we are going to speak on this matter elsewhere. In the meantime, see Cajetan in the first volume of the *opuscula*, tract. 16, q. 5 & 6.

That these are so is clear from the testimonies of the Fathers. St. Ambrose speaks about sacrifice and prayer for the dead in book 2, epist. 8 *ad Faustinum* on the death of his sister: “I think she is not to be wept over as much as to be pursued with prayers, nor mourned with your tears, rather, her soul must be commended to the Lord with prayers.” Moreover, he treats on almsgiving in book 2 *de fide resurrectionis* in regard to the excess of his brother Satyrus, he exhorts parents to transmit a portion of the inheritance, which pertains to dead sons, to their spirits by giving alms to the poor.

St. Augustine, in sermon 32, speaks about the words of the Apostle: “With the prayers of the holy Church and the salutary sacrifice, as well as almsgiving, there is no doubt the dead receive assistance.”

Chrysostom (hom. 69 *ad populum*), says: “The commemoration of the dead that is made in the awesome mysteries was not rashly ratified by the Apostles, for from it they obtain much fruit and profit.” He says the same thing in homily 41 on 1 Corinthians: “The dead man is not helped by tears but prayers, supplications and almsgiving.”

Add to these the testimony of the angel cited by Bede (*histor.* lib. 5, cap. 13), “The prayers of the living, almsgiving, fasting, and especially the celebration of the Mass brings assistance so that they might be freed before the day of judgment.”

Here there is only one doubt: Would restitution of someone else’s goods benefit the dead, and hence a fourth kind of suffrage? For souls are often said to appear and ask that restitution be made for them of those things which they either forgot about or could not restore. St. Brigit, in book 6 of her revelations, chapter 66, affirms that souls are tortured until something that was taken by them unjustly is restored.

Domingo de Soto responds (4 dist. 45 quaest. 2 art. 3) that restitution of this sort does not assist the dead if it is made and it does not hinder them if it is not. God does not punish except for someone’s own sin contracted in this life; so either the dead man sinned by failing to make restitution, or did not sin. If he did not sin, then he could have, or did, possess a thing in good faith, thus, he ought not also be punished; if he sinned, he will be punished for the sin of negligence for that matter in Purgatory, but after he has undergone due punishment, he will be saved whether the thing is restored or not. He has already been rendered powerless to make restitution, nor ought his salvation depend upon the will of another, otherwise the soul could remain in Purgatory for ever if an heir were never to make restitution; this is why, if restitution could be made and was not, by the negligence of the heir, the heir will indeed sin, but it will not harm that soul; if it is done it confers no benefit to that soul because the restitution is not satisfaction for sin, for satisfaction is a good penal work, but it is penal to give one’s own things, not to restore someone else’s.

I respond to those apparitions: Perhaps the souls did not ask for restitution *as restitution*, but *as almsgiving*, although it does not benefit the soul if one would restore someone else’s goods, which he is held to restore.

Nevertheless, it may rightly benefit if restitution of something else was made which one is not held to; for that is a certain almsgiving and hence satisfactory.

CHAPTER XVII: *Who can Assist Souls*

O the third: who can assist souls with their suffrage? A just man. An unjust man cannot make satisfaction for himself, let alone for others.

But someone will say: Isn't the Mass of a bad priest beneficial to the dead? Isn't also a just master that commands almsgiving to be made from his possessions for the dead, but then they are given by an unjust minister, still beneficial to the soul for whom they were given? *I respond*: it does benefit the soul, but in these cases it is not the unjust minister who causes the benefit, but rather the just master.

But again, someone will say: "What if a just prelate commands his spiritual sons to pray or fast for the dead, and these sons are unjust?"

Paludanus (4 sent. dist. 45, qu. 1) answers that all these benefit. But de Soto is more correct to deny it (*ibid.* q. 2 art. 2). For when a servant gives alms from his master's money, that work is properly of his master, not of the servant, and therefore, the malice of the minister does not spoil the work; but when the one in obedience prays or fasts, it is properly the work of that subject, for he acts with his own labor, not the labor of his master. For the same reason, St. Jerome says that it is better to give alms to a poor just man than an unjust poor man, because the former, praying for a benefactor, is heard while the other is not.

CHAPTER XVIII: *Who Benefits from Suffrage?*

TO the fourth, it is certain that the suffrage of the Church benefits neither the blessed nor the damned, but only those who abide in Purgatory. The first do not need it, the second cannot be helped by it, as all the Scholastics teach (4 dist. 45) following Augustine, who, in the *Enchiridion* (cap. 110) and *De cura pro mortuis* (cap. 1) says that the suffrage of the Church is a thanksgiving for the very good, propitiation for the very wicked, and for the very wicked it is of no assistance, but such as it is a consolation to the living.

But there are three difficulties to the contrary. *First*, on the blessed. It seems false that the suffrage does not benefit the blessed, for Epiphanius (*haer.* 75) and Cyril (*Catech.* 5 *Mystagogica*) as well as the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom say sacrifice is offered to God for the Apostles, Martyrs, Prophets, etc.

Secondly, the Church often reads in her prayers: “We have received the holy mysteries, O Lord, which, as they benefit thy saints in glory, so we ask that they may benefit us like a healing remedy.” And in ancient missals, as Innocent III relates (cap. *Cum Marthae, extra de Celebratione Missarum, in die 8 Leonis*, it is said: “We annually beseech thee, O Lord, that this sacrifice might benefit the soul of St. Leo.” And although this prayer was changed, still we say in the secret prayer for the same feast: “May the annual solemnity of St. Leo, thy confessor and Pontiff render us acceptable so that by these duties of pious reconciliation, a blessed reward might accompany it and acquire the gifts of thy grace for us.”

Besides, Chrysostom also says (hom. 33 in Matth.), exhorting men to give alms for their dead sons: “You think he is pure from sin? Give his possessions to others that he might cleanse himself of those stains; do you think he died in justice? Offer your own for him to increase the reward and payment.”

The response to the *first* is easy: That something is sacrificed for the saints is not so that we might ask something for them, but so that we might give thanks to God for the glory he has conferred on them; for it is what St. Augustine says, thanksgiving is made for the very good.

Pope Innocent responds to the rest, as above, in a two-fold manner: a) when the Church seeks glory for the saints who possess the kingdom of heaven, it does not ask that they would increase in glory, but that their glory would increase among us, *i.e.* that their glory would be made known to the whole world, and they would be glorified everywhere more and more; b) he says it does not seem absurd if we ask for an increase of something *accidental* to their glory; c) add thirdly, perhaps glory of the body is sought, which they will have on the day of the resurrection; for even if that glory were obtained for certain, which is due for their merits, still it is not absurd for them to desire this, and ask so that it would be due in many modes. So, when Augustine says (sermon. 17) from the words of the Apostle that it does a martyr injury to pray for him, it is understood on those who are prayed to as Martyrs for the remission of sin or essential glory, as if they lacked it.

The *second* difficulty is on the damned. For Augustine says, “But those who benefit from suffrage either do so for this purpose, so that a full remission is made, or the damnation itself becomes more tolerable” (*Enchir.* cap. 110). And in chapter 112, he so speaks: “Let them think the punishments of the damned are mitigated, little by little, for certain intervals of time, if it gives them pleasure to think so, provided it is understood that they remain in the wrath of God, this is, damnation itself.”

Chrysostom said the same thing (hom. 3 in *ep. ad Philipp.*), after he had said prayer must be made for the dead, he added: “That indeed is true what we have said, because they have departed in faith; but it seems catechumens are not worthy of this consolation, but are destitute of all help except one alone. But what? It is permitted to give alms on their behalf, from where they will obtain some rest.”

Besides, Damascene, in his prayer on the dead, not only relates that story about Trajan and Falconilla freed from hell by the prayer of Gregory and Thecla, which we related above, but he also adds from the history of Palladius ad Lausum, that St. Macharius at some time asked the dry skull of a certain idolater whether the prayers of the living were of any benefit to the

dead, the skull gave this response: “When you offer prayers for the dead, we perceive some alleviation.”

Besides, Prudentius says, in his hymn for the new light at the Easter Vigil:

*Sunt et spiritibus saepe nocentibus,
pœnarum celebres sub styge feriae, etc.* [15](#)

Then, Innocent III, cap. *Cum Marthae*, places a four-fold division; for he says from the dead there were some that were very good who do not need suffrage, certain ones men that were very bad, who cannot be helped, some men only somewhat good, whom suffrage benefits to expiation; and certain men only somewhat bad whom they benefit to propitiation—but certainly the last member does not seem to fit, except for the children in limbo. For, if the very good are in heaven, the very wicked are in the fires of hell; therefore, the somewhat good are in Purgatory, but wherever will the somewhat bad go, apart from limbo? Therefore, suffrage will benefit although they are still not in purgatory.

I respond to the first: Augustine understood by a more tolerable damnation, a mitigation of the punishments of Purgatory, as is clear from the preceding three-member division.

I say to the *second*, there Augustine does not argue on prayer for the dead, but only to say that it is not conceded to be erroneous that the damned would be punished short of what they ought; he teaches this more clearly in book 21, *de Civitate Dei*, cap. 24.

To the *third*: Chrysostom seems to only deny one must pray *publicly* or offer sacrifice for Catechumens, just as the Council of Braga defined at a different time (I. can. 35).

To the *fourth*, St. Thomas in 4 dist. 45, art. 2 q. 2, after refuting some inept answers of Praepositivus, Porretanus and others, answers that the souls of the damned do not perceive some true mitigation of their punishments by the prayers of the saints, but only some inane and fallacious joy, which seems to be in respect to their associates in punishments, such as the joy of demons, when they deceive someone. But perhaps it would be

better rejected as false and apocryphal, which is asserted about that skull, for such a thing is not found in the book of Palladius, nor does it have the appearance of truth that St. Macharius prayed for dead unbelievers.

To the *fifth*, I say it is nothing other than the poetic license of Prudentius.

To the *last*, which usually tortures many, I suspect Innocent III had a lapse of memory in the division, which is cited by Augustine three-fold, as four-fold, for with Augustine the moderately good and moderately bad are the same. Moreover, Innocent distinguishes this member into two, saying: "Some are moderately good, others moderately bad." Still, we can say the moderately good are said to be those who have no sin but still have to undergo punishment, while the moderately bad are said to be those who have some sin but it is only venial.

The *third* difficulty is on the souls of Purgatory. Theologians agree on two things, and do not on one. 1) They agree that all suffrage benefits everyone, at least *insofar as they convey a new joy*, as that is common to every good work, that all good men rejoice in it according to that of Psalm 118 (119): 63, "I am a partaker of all that fear you."

2) They agree that common suffrage which is made for all the dead, also benefits all the souls of Purgatory; not only by reason of joy, but also by reason of satisfaction, for there is no reason why someone would be excluded.

3) But they disagree in regard to particular suffrages. For Cajetan (tomus 1 *opusc.* tract. 16 q. 5) teaches that all souls may and must be assisted by common suffrage; yet, in regard to particular suffrage which is made for them, they do not help except for those which they merit personally so that such would benefit them. Moreover, he says these souls personally merit that had a special devotion to the keys of the Church here on earth and were solicitous for the souls of others, and he proves it from St. Augustine (*de cura pro mortuis*, c. 1; *Enchir.* cap. 109).

But others, whom St. Thomas cites in 4 dist. 45, q. 2 art. 4, say that the suffrage which is made for one, does not only benefit him alone, but also all others; no less others than him; just as a lamp enkindled for a master equally gives light to the servants who are in the same place.

The common opinion is in the mean, which is that one's own suffrage is beneficial to all and him individually by reason of satisfaction for which it is made. *To all*, against Cajetan, is clear, because the foundation of the communication of suffrage is not some peculiar merit, but the state of grace.

St. Augustine, when he says suffrage is beneficial only to those that merit so that they could benefit themselves, by the excluding adjective *alone*, does not exclude any soul of Purgatory, but only damned souls. Moreover, it must be noted carefully that Augustine, in the *Enchiridion*, does not say that suffrage only helps the dead who personally merited it for their benefit, but anyone who merited for it for their benefit.

This is why Cajetan, who says all souls can be assisted but *de facto* are not helped, does not follow Augustine as he supposed. That these particular suffrages are beneficial only to those for whom they are made is certain; for the application of goods of this sort depends upon the intention of the one applying it, nor ought these suffrages be compared to the light of a lamp, but rather to the money which is paid by one man for another.

I also highlight that passage of Augustine favoring this teaching from the *de cura pro mortuis*, c. 4, where he says that the Church prays for all the dead in general so that those who are destitute of parents or friends to pray for them and would otherwise be destitute of help shall at least have the help from their common mother, which is the Church.

CHAPTER XIX: *On Funerals*

WE have spoken hitherto on the spirits of the dead; now we must address the burial of their bodies. The heretics of this time do not rebuke the burial itself, rather the many things surrounding burial.

Firstly, that we bury them in sacred places, and also that we raise cemeteries for this purpose. Some of the heretics rebuke this, such as in Bohemia (as Aeneas Sylvius cites, *de origine Boemorum*, cap. 35). Furthermore, the argument can be made that the place of burial is of no benefit from the words of Luke 12:4, “Do not fear those who kill the body, and after this have no more power to do anything.” Likewise, from cap. *Sacris, extra de sepulturis*, where it is said that it is no judgment against a man if he is buried in a vile place, or in no place at all. Likewise, from St. Augustine (*de Civitate Dei* lib. 1, c. 12; *de cura mortuis*), where he says that burial and the pomp of a funeral is a comfort for the living but no assistance for the dead.

Secondly, they rebuke the use of candles. And because in the Council of Elibertinus, can. 34, it was stated that candles were not to be lit in the cemeteries on the day of death, as the fathers of that Council said: “The spirits of the dead must not be disturbed.”

Thirdly, they rebuke anniversaries and so many repetitions of the funeral on the third, seventh and thirtieth day because it is a sign that faith is wanting to repeat the same prayers to many times. In addition, because St. Ambrose (*de Abraham*, lib. 1 cap. 9), while speaking about Genesis 23:3, that Abraham rose from the office of the funeral, “We teach that we ought no longer cling to the dead, rather it is enough to perform our duty and leave them.” Calvin, explaining such a passage in the preface of the *Institutes*, says that those who do not cease praying for the dead are rebuked by that passage.

Fourthly, they rebuke the fact that we regard burial as a meritorious work as well as pleasing to God, since no such command as this is found

from God. In fact, while the Lord enumerated the works of mercy in Matthew 25, he did not mention burial.

These notwithstanding, we assert that burial is a good and useful thing, and all the rites of the Church for burying the dead are ancient as well as holy.

The fact that the matter is good and meritorious is proven from that of 2 Kings 2:5, “Ye blessed of the Lord, who have shown this mercy with your master, Saul, and buried him, and now the Lord will reward you.” In Tobit 12:12, among the works of Tobit, the angel extols that he buried the dead. In Matthew 26:10-12, “She has done good to me, ... for by this anointing she has prepared me for burial.”

That it is ancient and useful can easily be shown, for everything which we now preserve in the Church was always in her use. First, the bodies are now washed; that was also done as is clear from Acts 9:37 with Tabitha, and is cited by Gregory (*Dial.* lib. 3, cap. 17; lib. 4, cap. 16 & 27).

Secondly, bodies were buried with honor and brought to the tomb with many attendants. We read that this was so done in Genesis 50:7, Luke 7:12 as well as with Gregory Nazianzen (orat. 2 in *Julianum*), Sulpitius (*vita S. Martini*), Jerome (*vita S. Fabiolae, S. Paulae*) and others.

Thirdly, the bodies of the faithful are buried in churches and sacred places; so also Jacob and Joseph the Patriarchs who died in Egypt wished to be buried in the promised land, in which the temple was going to be built and Christ was going to be born (Genesis 49:29; 50:24). Then, in the times of Christians, many witness that the bodies of the faithful were buried in Churches (Ambrose, *de Abraham*, lib. 1, c. 9; Jerome, *vita Paulae, et Fabiolae*; Gregory *Dialog.* lib. 3, c. 13; Augustine, *de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 1).

Fourthly, the bodies of the faithful are buried with the chant of hymns and Psalms, and this is also witnessed by Gregory Nazianzen (*loc. cit.*), Chrysostom (hom. 4 in Hebr.) Jerome (*loc. cit.*) Sulpitius (*vita S. Martini*) and the most ancient of all, Dionysius the Aeropagite, *de Ecclesiastica hierarchia*, cap. 7). [16](#)

Fifthly, the use of lamps and lit candles at a funeral was done then as now. Gregory of Nyssa (epist. ad Olympia on the death of her sister), Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom (*ll.cc.*), Jerome (*loc. cit.*) and Theodoret (*hist.* lib. 5 cap. 36) as well as others.

Sixthly, the sacrifice of the altar is offered for them. So it was also done formerly as Tertullian witnesses (*de corona militis*) Cyprian (lib. 1, epistl. 9), Augustine (*Confessiones*, lib. 9 c. 12), Ambrose (*oratione de Valentiniani obitu*) and others.

Seventhly, Mass is offered and they are prayed for not only when they are buried, but also on the anniversary of their death, as is clear from Tertullian (*de Monogamia*), and Gregory Naianzen (*oratione in Caesarium fratrem*).

Eighth, not only on the anniversary, but also on the third, seventh and thirtieth day, as Ambrose shows in the beginning of his *oration for the death of Theodosius*, and this is preserved even today.

Ninth, tombstones are raised up; the same was once done in Genesis 35:20, Acts 2:29, 1 Maccabees 13:27).

Now, what the advantage of this might be is a little more obscure. In the first place two errors must be rejected, which St. Augustine rejects (*de cura pro mortuis*, c.2). 1) What the pagans thought, that burial was necessary for souls to be able to rest, according to the fables of Virgil (*Aeneidos*, lib. 6). 2) The other is of those who thought that some sense is still present in the bodies of the dead.

Now that these two errors have been rejected, we say that burial is useful both for the living and the dead. For the living in four ways. 1) *First*, to ward off the stench and horror of cadavers by burial, which would do no little harm to the living.

2) *Second*, for the living to witness their faith in the resurrection and the immortality of the soul by such zeal. We would not take such care of the bodies of the dead unless we thought they will rise again. Nor would we light candles unless we meant to show that souls live after the death of their bodies.

3) *Third*, for the living to be warned of their own death, this is why the tombs of the dead are called monuments. [17](#)

4) *Fourth*, by that office the living make satisfaction in some way for the affections they hold for the dead. If we carefully arrange the garments and rings of friends, certainly much more their bodies; and this is what St. Augustine means when he says that the pomp of burial is a comfort for the living.

Now we add the utility from burial for the dead, and this is also fourfold. 1) *First*, that the honor paid to them remains in the minds of the living, for

one cannot lack some ignominy when the foulness of our bodies is exposed to the sight of the living. Further, it is judged no small punishment when someone is deprived of burial by a judge and commanded to be hung from a gibbet or a wheel to be food for the birds.

2) *Second*, that it satisfies the desires they had while they were alive, for there is no one that hates his own flesh, as it is said in Ephesians 5:29, and thus while anyone lives, he desires also that after his death his body will be handled with integrity; nay more, it is believable that souls, once they have been freed from their bodies, even if they did not know what happened to their bodies, still would desire they be held with integrity, just as they also desire to go back to them as Augustine teaches (*de Genes. ad literam*, lib. 12, cap. 35) and hence we see the disobedient prophet was given as a punishment that he would not be buried with his fathers (3 Kings 13:24).

3) *The third utility* arises from the fact that many carry them to burial; hence it happens *per accidens* that many will also pray for them.

4) *The fourth* is taken from the fact that they are buried in the Churches of saints; from there it happens that when their friends remember them they will also remember the saint in whose Church they are buried at the same time and will frequently commend them to his patronage. St. Augustine posits this advantage in his work *de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 4 & 5, and St. Gregory (in *Dialog.* lib. 4 cap. 50).

From all these we make our responses to the arguments. I say *to the first*, with Augustine (*de Civitate Dei* lib. 1 cap. 12), that the Lord speaks on the pain with which bodies are afflicted while they live. Then in verse 4 he says: "After this they have no more to do," because the dead body, if it were cut or mutilated or burned clearly does not sense the pain. Nevertheless, it does not follow that some almsgiving should not be made to satisfy the desire that the man had while he lived, and perhaps still has to bury his body. I say *to the second*, the Pope speaks in that decretal on the advantage to *eternal salvation*, and teaches that burial does not benefit *per se*, nor does it cause any harm to attaining eternal salvation *per se*, as we said by reason of the prayers of friends. I say *to the third*, Augustine only teaches that burial *per se* offers no aid to the dead so they would attain eternal life, but comfort to the living; nevertheless, it benefits them *per accidens* as he himself teaches in the same book.

To that other citation from the Council of Elibertinus, I respond that in that Council ceremony is rebuked and forbidden because it was done from

the superstition of the gentiles who thought dead bodies sensed something; but after that error was put to rest the same ceremony was used for another end, namely to show that souls live and even the body was going to rise again in its time, and our dead are sons of light, not of darkness. Furthermore, what that Council says, that the spirits of the dead must not be disturbed does not mean those spirits are really restless, but to dispel the people of an error of this sort, just as Ambrose says in the aforementioned epistle (lib. 2 epist. 8) that his correspondent should not mourn his dead sister with tears, but prayers.

I say to the third that it is not a sign that faith is wanting, rather a sign of longing and fervor to repeat the same prayers, for Paul does the very thing in 2 Corinthians 12:8 when he “asked the Lord three times,” and the Lord himself repeated the same prayer three times in Matthew 26:44.

We respond to the citation from Ambrose as above in chapter 15, he is not talking about prayers but about weeping and sorrow; for he says the same thing in the oration on the death of Valentinian: “Blessed together, if my prayers have any strength, no day will pass by you in silence, no night composed without some portion given to my prayers; I will celebrate you in all offerings.”

To the *last*, I respond from chapter 25 of Matthew. Firstly, when Chrysostom says in homil. 84 on John that the Lord did not add “I was dead and you buried me,” because men usually not only give this alms of their own will, but also are given to too much excess in so doing; for just as in other good things, so also here a certain abuse mixed itself in, whereby rich men customarily are buried clothed in precious garments; it would be better and much more pleasing and useful for the dead, as Chrysostom says in the same place, for the precious garments to be given to the poor for the soul of the man that is buried. Thus the Lord, not only to correct an abuse, but even more, because it did not seem necessary to commend this duty too much, did not number this almsgiving with the rest.

Secondly, it can be said that the Lord did not call to mind this almsgiving because it was the least and most obscure of all, as St. Augustine teaches (*de cura pro mortuis*, cap. 3), for the Lord meant to show that he justly rewards the good and punishes the wicked, and therefore he only called to mind those works which evidently, and in the judgment of all, are works of mercy. And this will suffice for this whole disputation.

END OF THE THIRD GENERAL CONTROVERSY

LAUS DEO, VIRGINIQUE MATRI MARIE

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF ST. ROBERT BELLARMINE

The 'De Controversiis'

Published:

On the Roman Pontiff
On Councils
On the Church Militant
On the Marks of the Church
On Purgatory

Forthcoming:

On Clergy, Monks, Laity
On Beatification and Canonization of the Saints
On Relics and Images
On the Sacraments
On Grace, Justification and Free Will
On Good Works
On Indulgences
On the Word of God
On Christ

Alia:

Autobiography
Catechism

Footnotes

1

*Quin et supremo cum lumine vita reliquit,
Non tamen malum miseris, nec funditus omnes
Corporea excedunt pestes, penitusque necesse est
Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris,
Ergo exercentur poenis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt, etc. (lib. 6).*

2

*Sedet, aeternumque sedebit
Infelix Theseus Phlegiasque miserrimus, omnes
Admonet et magna testatur voce per umbras.
Discite iustitiam moniti, et non temnere divos.*

3

Translator's note: this is the translation from the text Bellarmine cites, "Tu autem in sanguine Testamenti tui eduxisti vinctos tuos de lacu, in quo non est aqua." The text of the Clementine Vulgate, revised and promulgated after this book was written, has: "Tu quoque in sanguine testamenti tui emisisti vinctos tuos de lacu in quo non est aqua," or as the revised Douay-Rheims has it: "Thou also, by the blood of thy testament, hath sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there is no water."

4

Translator's note: The Brabant Bellarmine is referring to is a province of Flanders (Belgium), and thus under the authority of Spain at the time of the book's writing.

5

Translator's note: The Vulgate Bellarmine uses reads: "*Fluvius igneus egredietur de ore ejus.*" However, the revised edition subsequent to Bellarmine's writing reads: "*Fluvius igneus rapidusque egrediebatur a facie ejus,*" or, "A swift fiery stream proceeded from his face."

6

Translator's note: The Vulgate Bellarmine uses *has*: "*Oportet illum coelum suscipere, donec omnia subjiciantur pedibus ejus.*" The subsequent revision has: "*Oportet autem illum regnare donec ponat omnes inimocos sub*

pedibus ejus,” “He must reign until he shall place all enemies under his feet.”

7

Ergo exercentur poenis veterumque malorum supplicia expendunt. –Aeneid, l. 6.739-40.

8

*Quos ubi per varios amnes, per mille figuras
Egit Lethæo purgatos flumine, etc.*

Translator’s note: *Lethæus* refers, at least in its use in Ovid, to a river in Hades where the dead would drink and forget.

9

Tomus III, *de Gratia, libero arbitrio et justificatione*, on good works in particular, book 3. This will be forthcoming from Mediatrix Press.

10

Translator’s note: It is not certain here which book “on Purgatory” that Bellarmine is referring to that was refuted by Eck. Luther’s early writings do profess belief in Purgatory as Bellarmine lays it out here, but in 1530 Luther clearly rejected it altogether in his tract *Revocation of Purgatory*.

11

“Drop down dew, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the just: let the earth be opened, and bud forth a saviour.” Isaiah 45:8

12

Translator’s note: While testimonies of this sort made an impression on men in the 16th century, today they are less impressive to most. Still, there is nothing to make such an explanation impossible.

13

Translator’s note: *The fomes* is a technical term from *fomes peccati*, meaning literally “tinder for sin” and refers to concupiscence.

14

Translator’s note: This is an ancient prayer from the Office of the Dead at Lauds. *Deus veniae largitor, et humanae salutis amator, quaesumus clementiam tuam: ut nostrae congregationis fratres, propinquos, et benefactores, qui ex hoc saeculo transierunt, beata Maria semper virgine intercedente cum omnibus Sanctis tuis, ad perpetuae beatitudinis consortium pervenire concedas.*

“O God the bestower of forgiveness, and lover of human salvation, we beseech your mercy that you would permit the brethren of our congregation, relations and benefactors that departed from this world to come to the consort of human beatitude by the intercession of the Blessed and ever Virgin Mary, with all your saints.”

15

Translator’s note: “There are also festivals for wicked spirits, famous for their crimes in the underworld, etc.” *Cathemer. Hymn v* (lin. 125).

16

Translator’s note: Although modern scholarship questions the attribution to Dionysius, the matter was not in doubt with Bellarmine or with the Protestants of his day.

17

Translator’s note: There is a symmetry in the Latin that is lost here; the word used here for warn is *admonere*, the participle for which is *admonitus*, from which *monimenta* (monument) comes.

ON CHURCH MILITANT

Contents

DE CONTROVERSIIS FIDEI CHRISTIANI

DEDICATIO

CHAPTER I: On the term “Church”

CHAPTER II: On the Definition of the Church

CHAPTER III: On the Unbaptized

CHAPTER IV: On Heretics and Apostates

CHAPTER V: On Schismatics

CHAPTER VI: On the Excommunicated

CHAPTER VII: On the Predestined

CHAPTER VIII: On Those who are not Perfect

CHAPTER IX: On Great Sinners

CHAPTER X: On Secret Infidels

CHAPTER XI: Another Controversy is Proposed: Whether the Church is
Always Visible, or Whether it can Err and Defect

CHAPTER XII: The Church is Visible

CHAPTER XIII: The Visible Church Cannot Defect

CHAPTER XIV: The Church Cannot Err

CHAPTER XV: The Arguments with Which they Set up an Invisible Church are Refuted

CHAPTER XVI: The Arguments Whereby our Adversaries try to Show the Church can Defect are Answered

CHAPTER XVII: The Arguments Whereby our Adversaries try to show that all Shepherds of the Church can Err at the Same Time.

DE CONTROVERSIIS FIDEI CHRISTIANI

DE ECCLESIA MILITANTE
DIFFUSA PER ORBEM TERRARIUM



ON THE CHURCH MILITANT
DIFFUSED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

by
ST. ROBERT BELLARMINE, S.J.
Doctor of the Church

CHAPTER I: On the term “Church”

THE CONTROVERSY on the Church Militant has many parts. In the first place, what the Church itself is must be argued, and then on the members, that is, clergy, monks and laity. Again, the Church Militant must be considered according to what it is, and this is what we now hasten to dispute. There are three particular controversies: 1) On the term “Church” and its definition; 2) On the quality or the visibility of the Church; 3) On the marks whereby it can be known for certain.

We now commence with the first, but before we get too far into it we ought to note those who have written about the Church, or rather, whose books we have read since we have not read everything. Therefore, these have written on this point about the Church: St. Augustine; [1](#) St. Cyprian; [2](#) Optatus; [3](#) and from more recent authors who have written on this matter we have Thomas Waldens; [4](#) John Turrecremata; [5](#) John Driedo; [6](#) Albert Pighius; [7](#) Cardinal Hosius in his confession, as well as in his explication of the Creed, and his *Contra prolegomena Brentii*, lib. 5; Pedro de Soto; [8](#) John of Daventria; [9](#) John Cochlaeus, [10](#) Johan Eck; [11](#) Alphonsus a Castro; [12](#) John of Louvain; [13](#) Francis Turrianus [14](#) and Melchior Cano. [15](#) After these, in the beginning of the year 1577, we disputed this very treatise (which we are now publishing) in the schools, and in that time Gregory of Valentia also wrote on the same issue [16](#) and others also wrote, but he was not free from explaining their books through other occupations.

I come now to the proposed disputation, which is on the first point, the term “Church”. The name is Greek and is deduced from the word *ekkaleō*, which means *I call out*. Therefore, Church is an evocation, or a body of those called out. Moreover, the people of God is a body of those called out, because no man joins himself to this people by himself and by his own instinct, but any whosoever that come have been preceded by the calling of God. For the calling is the first benefit, which the saints receive from God, as the Apostle says in Romans, “He called them and justified them, and glorified those whom he had justified.” [17](#) The Apostle says often enough that Christians are called, in fact in nearly every epistle.

Moreover, three things must be noted on this term. 1) The name of Church can be joined with another thing, and can be received on the side of

the good and the bad. For the Psalms speak of the “Church of the malignant,” [18](#) and “the Church of the Saints”. [19](#) Moreover, this term is placed absolutely, it is not understood unless it is about the Church of Christ, with the exception of one passage, that is Acts XIX where it says about the people of the heathen “For the Church was confused.”

2) Mark with St. Augustine, “God stood in the synagogue of the gods,” [20](#) although the Church of the Old Testament and the New are the same, nevertheless the state of the new Testament Church is by far more excellent, thus, the names are also distinct, for the people of the Old Testament are properly called the Synagogue, that is the congregation; but the people of the New Testament is never called the Synagogue, but always the Church, that is the evocation. To be gathered is common among both men and beasts, but to be called out is proper to men. It is not related that the people of the Jews in the Old Testament are also everywhere called the Church; for both the Synagogue and the Church are called in Hebrew by the word “congregation” (e-dah) which we translate into Synagogue, and is said to be from (*ya-ad*) “to assign or gather”. Likewise, *qa-hal*, that is “the Church,” is said to be from the same word meaning, “to gather”. Therefore there are two names, but they mean altogether the same thing.

3) It also must be noted that in the same way as the city on the one hand means a body of men, on the other the place in which that body lives, so also the Church in the Scriptures means the body of the faithful, as it says in Romans XVI: “All the Churches of Asia greet you.” Now, all the faithful are gathered in that very citation, just as in Judith VI: “every people prayed through the whole night within the Church,” although we now only mean the body of the faithful when we dispute on the Church.

CHAPTER II: On the Definition of the Church

THERE are five heretical opinions on the definition of the Church. The first is that the Church is the congregation of the predestined, so that only all those who have been predestined would constitute the Church. This is the opinion of John Wycliff [21](#) and John Huss whose position is contained in a condemnation by the Council of Constance: “A man foreknown, although he might be in grace for a time according to the present justice, is still never part of the Holy Church whereas a man predestined will always remain a member of the Church, although at some time he may fall from the grace he has attained thus far, still not from the grace of predestination. [22](#)

The second is that the Church would be a multitude of perfect men having no sin. Certain Pelgians taught this, as St. Augustine relates where he says: “They progress in it that they would say the life of the just in this age is altogether without any sin, and the Church of Christ is perfected by these in this mortal life.” [23](#) Calvin attributes the same teaching to the Anabaptists of this time. [24](#)

The third is that the Church might be a congregation of the just, or better still those who have never failed to make the confession of faith. This is distinguished from the second opinion in that it excluded each and every sinner, but this does not exclude anyone except notable sinners. Formerly, St. Cyprian thought Novation was the author of this opinion, [25](#) and Augustine the Donatists, [26](#) for I believe Calvin and others were deceived who thought that the followers of Novation and the Donatists excluded every kind of sinner. For, Cyprian and Epiphanius clearly say that they retained swindlers, adulterers and the like in the Church but only excluded those who had lapsed under persecution. [27](#) Moreover, what Ambrose [28](#) and Theodoret [29](#) say does not appear opposed to this, that the Novationists abolished the power of forgiving all sins, save for the lightest. For even if they did not absolve grave sinners they still retained them in their body unless they lapsed in the confession of faith. Augustine also teaches [30](#) that

the Donatists did not abhor all sins, but only certain greater crimes; one that they objected to is that they thought Catholics were traitors to the divine books.

The fourth is of the Confessionists, who, although they condemn the Pelagians, Novationists and Donatists by name, still their opinion is a composite of those heresies. For: 1) Not only the Confessionists, but all Lutherans and Calvinists teach that there is no sin that is venial by nature, rather, all are in and of themselves mortal, but venial by the mercy of God, who does not impute these to believers. Luther teaches this [31](#) as well as Melanchthon [32](#) and Calvin. [33](#)

2) The Augsburg Confession, in article 7, teaches that the Church is the congregation of the Saints who truly believe and obey God. And Melanchthon, in his defense of it, tries to show that sinners do not pertain to the Church except in name. John of Brentz teaches similar things in the Prolegomena against Pedro de Soto. Nor is it opposed that Melanchthon and Brenz both say that the wicked are mixed with the good, for they in effect create two Churches. One that is true, and to which the privileges related in the Scriptures pertain; this is the congregation of the Saints who truly believe and obey God, and this one is not visible but can only be seen with the eyes of faith. The other is external, which is a Church in name only, and this is the congregation of men coming together in the doctrine of faith, and the use of the sacraments; in this the good and bad are discovered. Consequently, they never mean that the wicked are parts of the true Church and so Melanchthon cautiously does not say the Church consists from the wicked as well as the good, but says the wicked are mixed into the Church. Moreover Brenz says that the wicked are in the Church in some manner, but they are not of the Church.

Luther in his work *de Conciliis et Ecclesia*, in the third part, says that the Church is the holy Christian people. That he might show himself to speak on the sanctity of each of the members, he tries to show the Pope and Cardinals are not of the Church because they are not holy. Therefore, if only the just are part of the true Church, and all sins, in so far as they are light, are mortal sins and make a man unjust; it follows that only the perfect and those lacking all sin are in the Church, which was the opinion of the Pelagians.

3) The Confessionists say, and in this they agree with all Lutherans, that all the works of man, even of the justified, are mortal sins. The *Augsburg*

Confession [34](#) indicates this, but Luther more clearly asserts it in his *Assertions*, [35](#) whereby it seems to follow that no man is in the Church. For, if only the just are in the Church, and there are altogether no just in the world, and naturally when the works of every man are sins, who, I ask, will constitute the Church? But they easily explain the whole matter when they say the works of the just are all mortal sins, but still they are not imputed to them if they have the faith, and hence he who has faith, at the same time is the most just and also sins by every work. In some manner the Confessionists agree with the Donatists and the Novationists. For, as they did not exclude all sinners from the Church, but only those who committed idolatry, so the former do not exclude all sinners, but only those who do not truly believe. For they think, as we said, that no crime is imputed to believers.

The fifth opinion seems to have been raked together from all these. For it teaches that the Church is constituted from the predestined. Thus Calvin taught three things in this regard. 1) Once someone has faith, he can never be damned, and furthermore all who have the faith are necessarily predestined. He holds this in the *Institutes*, [36](#) but the ancient heretic Jovinian expressly taught this same thing in the ancient Church, as we see from St. Jerome. [37](#) 2) He also teaches that the true Church can be recognized by God alone since its foundation is divine election, because it is constituted from the faithful, who are necessary from the number of the elect. [38](#) 3) he teaches besides a certain external Church, wherein the good and the bad dwell, as the Confessionists said above, he holds in the same book and chapter, in the subsequent sections. Martin Bucer seems to think the same thing and he defines the kingdom of Christ as the charge of salvation of the elect of God, whom God has gathered on earth. [39](#) Tilman Hesch teaches the same thing. [40](#)

The Catholic teaching is that the Church is only one, not two, and that the body of men of the same Christian profession and of the same Sacraments gathered in communion is one and true, under the rule of legitimate pastors and especially of the one Vicar of Christ on Earth, the Roman Pontiff. From such a definition it can be clearly understood which men pertain to the Church and which do not. For there are three parts of this definition; the profession of the true faith, the communion of the Sacraments, and subjection to the legitimate pastor, the Roman Pontiff. By the reasoning of the first all infidels and those who have never entered the

Church are excluded, such as Jews, Turks, and Pagans; then those who were in the Church but left, such as heretics and apostates. By the reasoning of the second part, all Catechumens and excommunicates are excluded, because they have not been admitted to the communion of the Sacraments, these are sent out; by reasoning of the third, all schismatics are excluded, that is those who have the faith and the Sacraments, but are not under the legitimate pastor, and therefore profess the faith and receive the Sacraments outside of the Church. Yet, all others, even the base, wicked and impious are included.

This is the difference between our teaching and all others, that all others require external virtues to constitute someone in the Church, and for that reason they make the Church invisible; but even though we believe all virtues (e.g. faith, hope and charity and the rest), are discovered in the Church, still that someone could absolutely be called part of the true Church, on which the Scriptures speak, we do not think any internal virtue is required, but only the external profession of faith, as well as the communion of the Sacraments which is taken up in that sense. For the Church is a body of men that is just as visible and palpable as the body of the Roman people, or the Kingdom of France, or the Republic of Venice.

Furthermore, it must be noted with Augustine, [41](#) that the Church is a living body in which there is a soul and body, and in the soul there are internal gifts of the Holy Spirit, namely Faith, Hope and Charity, etc. The body is the external profession of faith as well as the communication of the Sacraments. From there it happens that some men are in the soul and body of the Church and furthermore are united to Christ the head inwardly and outwardly, and such are perfectly in the Church, since they are as living members in the body, although among them are also some who participate more or less in the life of the Church, and some even who might hold only the beginning of life like a sense but not a motion, just as those who only have faith without charity. Again, some might be in the soul of the Church and not in the body, such as Catechumens or the excommunicated if they might have faith and charity, which can happen. Then, some may be in the body, but not the soul, such as those who have no internal virtue, and still by hope, or by some temporal fear profess the faith and communicate in the Sacraments under the rule of their pastors, and such are like hairs or nails, or bad humors in the human body.

Therefore, our definition holds true in this last manner of being in the Church, because this at least is required, that one can be said to be apart of the visible Church. Therefore, it must in the proper order be proved that the following do not pertain to the Church: the unbaptized, heretics, apostates, excommunicates and schismatics. Next, that those who are not predestined do in fact pertain to the Church, along with the imperfect and also manifest sinners; then lastly, secret heretics, if they would have the Sacraments as well as the profession of faith and subjection to the Church, etc.

CHAPTER III: On the Unbaptized

PAUL certainly speaks about the unbaptized infidels when he says, [42](#) “Why do you ask me to judge concerning those who are outside?” He says generally in that passage that they are outside who did not give their names for Christ through Baptism, but followed some other religions.

On Catechumens, there is a somewhat greater difficulty because they are faithful, and can be saved if they die in that state but still no man can be saved outside the Church, just as no one could outside of the ark of Noah, according to that which is held in the first chapter of the Lateran Council (III): “The universal Church of the faithful is one, outside of which altogether no one is saved.” But just the same it is certain that Catechumens are not in the Church properly and by act, but only in potency, just as in the way a man being conceived but not yet formed and born is not called a man, except in potency. For we read in Acts II: “Therefore those who received the word were baptized and on that day around three thousand were added.” Likewise, the Council of Florence in the instruction of the Armenians teaches that men become members of Christ and concern the body of the Church when they are baptized, and the Fathers teach likewise.

St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration on holy Baptism, says that Catechumens are in the vestibule of piety, but still they cannot be called faithful unless they enter in through Baptism. John Chrysostom says that Catechumens are foreign to the faithful and have nothing in common with them, not citizenship, nor table, etc. [43](#) Tertullian in the *Praescriptiones*, condemns among the heretics those that refused to distinguish the Catechumens from the faithful. Cyril teaches that Catechumens are with Christians just as the uncircumcised were among the Jews, who on that account could not feed on the Paschal lamb. [44](#) Augustine distinguished Catechumens from the faithful, which other Fathers also do. [45](#) Moreover, it is certain that the Church is the body of the faithful.

Therefore, Catechumens do not have the right to any sacraments, nor to other things which are common to the universal Church. Therefore Catechumens do not pertain to the Church properly or in act. Therefore, how, you will ask, are they saved, if they are outside the Church? The

author of the book on Ecclesiastical dogmas (cap. 74) clearly responds, that Catechumens are not saved. But this seems too harsh. Certainly St. Ambrose in his oration on the death of Valentinian affirms with eloquent words that Catechumens (in which Valentinian was numbered) can be saved when they have departed from this life.

Therefore, there is another solution. Melchior Cano says that Catechumens can be saved because even if they are not of the Church, which properly is called Christian, still they are part of the Church which embraces all the faithful from Abel even to the consummation of the world. But this does not seem to satisfy. For after the coming of Christ there is no true Church but that which is properly called Christian; consequently, if Catechumens are not in it, they are in nothing.

Consequently, I respond that it is said outside the Church no man is saved, and this ought to be understood on those who are neither in fact nor in desire within the Church, just as all the Theologians commonly teach on Baptism. Moreover, if the Catechumens are not in the Church *de facto*, at least they are in the Church in desire, therefore they can be saved. This is not opposed to the similitude of the Ark of Noah (outside of which no man was saved), even if he were in it by desire since similitudes do not agree in all things. For that reason, 1 Peter III compares Baptism to the ark of Noah and still it is certain that some are saved without Baptism in fact.

But, one might say, Augustine says that Catechumens are in the Church; [46](#) it is true, but in the same place he separates them from the faithful. Therefore, he meant that they are in the Church not by act, but by potency, which he explains in the beginning of the 2nd book on the Creed, where he compares Catechumens to men who are conceived but not yet born.

CHAPTER IV: On Heretics and Apostates

ALPHONSUS DE CASTRO teaches that heretics and baptized apostates are members and parts of the Church, even if they openly profess a false doctrine. [47](#) Such an opinion is clearly false, and it can easily be refuted. 1) Scripture shows this, since in 1 Timothy I:19 it says that certain men are shipwrecked in regard to the faith. In that passage, it understands heretics by means of a metaphor of a shipwreck, after being broken from one part of the boat of the Church, after which they sink into the sea, which also is meant by the Lord's parable of the net which is torn before the multitude. [48](#) Besides, to Titus he says, "after a heretic has been given one or two corrections, knowing that he is subversive, who is of this sort, he has been condemned by his own judgment." There the Apostle commands the Bishop that he should avoid heretics, because certainly he would not command it if they were within the Church. For a shepherd ought not avoid those whom he has care of when they pertain to his own flock. And he adds the reason that such a pertinacious heretic is condemned by his own judgment, that is (as Jerome explains it), he has not been thrown out of the Church by excommunication, as many other sinners, but he cast himself out of the Church. Likewise, 1 John II says, "They went out from us, but they were not from among us," in other words, they went out from us because they were with us in the same Church but they were not from us according to divine election, as St. Augustine explains. [49](#)

2) This is proved from the 18th and 19th chapter of the Council of Nicaea, where heretics are said to be able to be received in the Church if they wish to return to it, although under certain conditions. In like manner, from the chapter *Firmiter* of the Lateran Council, on the Supreme Trinity and the Catholic Faith, where the Church is called the congregation of the faithful. It is certain that heretics are not in any manner among the faithful.

3) From the Fathers, Irenaeus says that Polycarp converted many heretics to the Church, [50](#) whence it follows that beforehand they had gone out from the Church. Tertullian says that when Marcion wanted to rejoin the Church, he received the same condition as the others that he had perverted, that he

should be restored to the Church. [51](#) Cyprian says, in an epistle to Jubaianum, that heretics, although they are outside the Church, still claim the power of the Church for themselves after the fashion of apes who, although they are not men, nevertheless wish to appear as men.

Jerome says, in his Dialogue against the Luciferians, “If you will have heard anywhere some who are called “Christs”, not by the Lord Jesus Christ, but by some other name, as the Marcionists, Valentinians, Montanists, or Campenses, know that this is not the Church of Christ, but it is the Synagogue of Antichrist.”

St. Augustine says sometimes it may happen that a heretic who is outside the Church might not act against it, while a Catholic inside the Church might act against it. [52](#) And in his book on the Unity of the Church, chapter IV: “Those who do not believe that Christ came in the flesh from the Virgin Mary, from the seed of David or that he rose in his own body in which he was crucified and buried, indeed they are not in the Church.”

Lastly, it happens that when the Church was a united multitude (for a certain people are either a kingdom, or one body) and this particular union consists in the profession of the one faith, the observance of the same laws and rights; no reason permits that we might say they are of the body of the Church who have altogether no union with it.

On the other hand, some object firstly with what is said in Matthew on the parable of the cockle the three that are discovered in the same field, wheat, the husks and the chaff, which mean good Catholics, bad Catholics and heretics, as Augustine [53](#) and Jerome explain on this passage, as well as Chrysostom. Moreover, the Church would be sick, as Cyprian [54](#) and Augustine [55](#) teach.

I respond: Some understand through cockle not heretics but wicked men who are in the Church. Thus Cyprian (loc. cit.) and often Augustine, [56](#) speaking not so much from his own opinion as much as by the mind of Cyprian. Moreover, the fact is Cyprian does not understand heretics by cockle, thereupon it can be understood that in those citations, where he says the cockle is in the Church, he says that heretics are not in the Church. Besides, the fact is made plain from the intention of Cyprian who writes in those places against the Novatianists, who refused to admit the lapsed penitents into the Church, fearing lest they might communicate their sins with others. Cyprian showed them that by the Lord’s parable there are not

only strong men in the Church but also weak who fall at some point, just as the cockle is in the field at the same time as the grain.

But although such an exposition might not be condemned and is not contrary to our position, nevertheless it seems better to respond with what Augustine says, that the field does not mean the Church, but the whole world. [57](#) For the Lord, explaining the parable, says the field is the world. Hence, by the name of “cockle,” although heretics are rightly understood, still perhaps we might understand it more literally as all the wicked in general, whether they be heretics or not. The scope of the parable, therefore, is to show that there were always going to be some wicked men in the world, nor can any human diligence cleanse the world before the day of judgment. For that reason, the Lord says that the cockle are the wicked sons, and all those who at length will be cast into eternal fire.

Secondly, they object with the verse in 2 Timothy II:20, “In a great house there are vessels, some golden, some silver, some wooden, and some clay.” There by the name *house* it seems that Paul understands the Church and by the name of the wooden and clay vessels, heretics. Thus he said a little earlier: “Their word creeps like a crab, from which are Hymnaeus and Philetus who are cut off from the truth.” [58](#) Moreover, the house is understood as the Church which Cyprian, [59](#) Ambrose (in his commentary on this passage), and Augustine [60](#) teach.

I respond: This varies in the expositions of the Fathers. One is of the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom and Theophylactus who understand by the word house not the Church, but the world just as we said about the field in which there is cockle. The other is of the Latins, Cyprian, Ambrose and Augustine, who understand the house to be the Church. Although Augustine and Ambrose would have it that the wood and clay vessels represent heretics, nevertheless Augustine explains that same passage must be understood in the sense that they are in the Church, when he says they are in it before they are separated from it by obstinacy and pertinacity, and this is the time the Apostle considers, so that they are not heretics as much as they are said to be erring in the Church. [61](#) He also adds that it can be said they are in the Church after they have left it, on account of the administration of the Sacraments, because even they truly administer some sacraments. In other words, they are in the Church according to something, not on their own account. Ambrose receives it as the Church in a broad sense that is more common than proper, according to how it embraces all

who are named Christians in any manner, in the same way that the Pagans usually said that in the body of Christians there are many opposed opinions and sects.

But according to Cyprian (whose explanation I reckon is more true), through wooden and clay vessels heretics are not understood, but the weak and frail who are easily seduced. When the Apostle says that in a great house there are vessels of gold, silver, etc., he is not referring to “whose word lurks like a crab”, whereby Hymnaeus and Philetus are cut off from the truth, but to the part where he says: “And they overturn the faith of some men.” The Apostle means that if they overturn some, they are not a danger for this reason, lest all would be overturned. For in the Church there are the strong and the weak, etc.

But one might say that Augustine, who understands heretics by the wooden and clay vessels, says he is moved to think this by Cyprian’s words in his epistle to Antioninus, which is the second of book 4.

I respond: Augustine thought these words of the Apostle were related by Cyprian: “In a great house there are golden vessels, etc.,” referred to the verse “whose word creeps like a crab,” just as he says. Moreover, the words of Cyprian do not sound that way, and Cyprian correctly did not mean that heretics are in the Church, as is clear from the same epistle, where he clearly says that Novation is outside of the Church because he is a heretic.

Thirdly, the argument is made that the Church can judge and punish heretics, therefore they are within it, “For what is it to me to judge those who are on the outside?” [62](#) Besides, heretics retain the character of Baptism and priesthood, therefore they are Christians and priests.

I respond: Although heretics are not in the Church, nevertheless they ought to be; hence they pertain to her like sheep to the sheepfold when they roam outside the sheepfold. The Church can judge concerning those who are inside by that very fact, or who ought to be, just as a pastor really can judge and compel the sheep who wander outside of the sheepfold through the mountains to return to it. In the same way, a general can compel by force a deserter from the army who has fled across to the camp of the enemy to return or even to hang him. The Apostle, on the other hand, speaks on those who were never truly in the Church.

Now I speak to that which relates to the character. Heretics retain those indelible characters outside of the Church, just as lost sheep retain the branding in their back and deserters of the army military signs: but they are

not in the Church for that reason because those characters do not suffice to constitute someone in the Church; otherwise the Church would also be in hell. St. Thomas Aquinas says that the damned are not members of Christ in either act or potency. [63](#) Besides, the character does not properly unite a man with the head, rather it is a sign of the power of a certain union, and consequently, in hell they are recognized by that sign as men who were members of Christ. Nevertheless, that it does not unite them is clear since something that is invisible cannot unite outwardly, nor interiorly when it is not in act or when it is not an operative habit. For that reason St. Thomas places the first internal union in faith.

CHAPTER V: On Schismatics

SEVERAL Catholics deliberate whether schismatics are in the Church, on the other hand there are those who affirm that they are in the Church, such as Alphonsus de Castro in the place we cited. Yet it is easy to teach the contrary from the Scripture and from the tradition of the Fathers. In the first place, when it is said in Luke that the nets were torn, [64](#) schisms in the Church are understood through the tearing of the nets and the exit of the fish from it, and the exit of heretics and schismatics, as St. Augustine explains. [65](#)

Besides, Scripture calls the Church, “One sheepfold,” [66](#) “One body,” [67](#) “One spouse, friend and dove.” [68](#) Moreover, schism tears that which was one into parts, as is clear from its very name, as *schizein* is to tear, and *schismē* means a tear. Consequently, schismatics are not in the Church nor are they of the Church. For the part that is torn from the body is no longer a part of that body. For that reason Cyprian beautifully says that the Church is signified through the seamless garment of Christ which was not torn, that we might understand the Church can be torn, but not in that manner in which a garment is torn, so that some parts remain equally part of the garment, but how a branch is torn from a tree, which dies right away while the tree still lives. [69](#) In like manner, he adds it is similar to a river from its source which soon dries up while the source flows, and the ray from the sun, which fails right away while the sun remains as it was. Or, if one were to contend that the part torn from the Church is also a certain Church, then he would make many Churches; but that is against the Scriptures recently cited.

Secondly it is proved from the decrees of Pope Pelagius, who clearly proves that schismatics are not part of the Church. [70](#) Moreover, the testimony of the whole Church witnesses the fact, since on Good Friday it prays for heretics and schismatics that God would deign to recall them to the Catholic Church, which would not be the case if it believed they were in the Church. The testimony of the Roman Catechism also pertains to this, which is of no scanty authority in the Church of God. Thus the Catechism separates schismatics from the Church in its explanation of the Creed. [71](#)

Thirdly, it is proved from the Fathers. Irenaeus, after he had said earlier in his work that a spiritual man judges all heretics and schismatics and had enumerated them into many particular heresies, he also had added them under those properly called schismatic, and he concludes in the end: “He will judge all those who are outside the truth, that is outside the Church.” [72](#) St. Cyprian says, “The people has been joined to the priest even as the flock adheres to its shepherd, for that reason you ought to know that the Bishop is in the Church and the Church in the Bishop, and if there would be someone who is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church.” [73](#) But certainly schismatics are not with the Bishop; therefore they are not in the Church.

Chrysostom said, “The meaning of schism convicts them enough, or rather more its name is enough to strike them, since they had not become many parts, rather the one had perished. For they constituted these many into whole Churches.” [74](#) And in another homily he teaches that schismatics are like a hand that is cut from the body which soon ceases to be a member and he says in the same place that schismatics are in another Church even if they agree with the true Church of Christ in faith and doctrines. [75](#)

Jerome says, “Schismatics really separate a deceived multitude from the Church of God; still they do not do this from belief, as heretics do.” [76](#) And again, “We hold this is between heresy and schism, because a heresy holds a perverse doctrine, but schism equally separates from the Church by reason of Episcopal dissension.” [77](#) There note the word *equally*.

Augustine says: “We believe in the Holy *Catholic* Church, since even the heretics and schismatics call their congregations “Churches”, but the heretics violate faith in God by believing false things, while the schismatics leap from fraternal charity by wicked dissensions, even if they believe what we believe. For that very reason neither the heretic pertains to the Catholic Church because he loves God nor the schismatic because he loves his neighbor.” [78](#)

Optatus of Miletus, speaking of schismatics, says: “After deserting their Catholic mother, the wicked sons run about outside of her and separate themselves, as you have done, being cut off from the root of the hated mother Church by sickles, like rebels who recede by wandering away.” [79](#) In book 2 of that work he compares schismatics with branches, rivers and rays cut off from the tree, font and sun. Fulgentius says: “Hold most firmly and do not by any means doubt that not only Pagans but also Jews, heretics

and schismatics who end the present life outside the Catholic Church are going into the eternal fire.” [80](#) Next Thomas Waldens holds the same thing, [81](#) as well as John Driedo, [82](#) and other more recent writers.

Lastly, it is proven from reason. From the very notion of what the Church is, that it is one in regard to the union of members within her, and with her head, but schism abolishes this union since it separates itself from communion with the head and other members. Moreover the essential unity of the Church consists in that union of that joining of the members among and with the head is proven, since there is a manifold unity discovered in the Church. 1) The unity of the same beginning; that is the calling of God. “No one comes to me, etc.” [83](#) 2) The unity by reason of the same final end, which is signified in Matthew XX in that one denarius promised to all the workers. 3) By reason of the same means, that is the Faith, Sacraments, and laws according to what is said in Ephesians IV, “One faith, one baptism.” 4) By unity of the same Holy Spirit, by whom the Universal Church is steered as if by an external and separate Captain, “There are divisions of grace, but the same Spirit.” [84](#) 5) By reason of the same head, just as an internal and continuous Captain; for every Church obeys the same Christ and his vicar just like a head, “He gave the him as the head over the whole Church,” [85](#) and, “Simon Peter, feed my sheep.” [86](#) 6) By reason of the connection of the members among themselves and especially with the head as the principal member, “We are one body, each one members of another.” [87](#)

Moreover, among these unities we have enumerated that properly make one Church there are two ends. By the first, the Church is not one as much as it is from one. By the second, it is not as much one as to one. By the third it is not as much one as through one. By the fourth it is not as much one as under one. By the fifth and sixth, it is properly one, that is one body, one people and one society. Schism, however, is opposed to these last unities; consequently there is schism when one member refuses to be any longer a member of that body, nor under the head, this is the reason why it abolishes the essential unity and also the Church herself; therefore a schismatic is not of the Church.

Now they object: 1) The Church is a congregation of Catholics, as Pope Nicholas defined, [88](#) But schismatics are Catholics, therefore they are of the Church.

I respond: Firstly, even if schismatics have the Catholic faith, nevertheless, they cannot properly be called Catholics even if they profess

the faith in the Catholic Church, as is clear from the citations we provided from St. Augustine and Optatus. I say secondly, this is not the full definition of Pope Nicholas, nor did he mean to define the Church but only exclude heretics from the Church. Just as Innocent did when he said that the Church is the congregation of the faithful. [89](#)

They object 2) Even if schismatics refuse to submit to the Pope, nevertheless they mean to submit to Christ the Supreme Head, and although they refuse to communicate with this Church on earth, nevertheless, they mean to communicate with the Church that is in heaven, namely the better part of the Church, therefore they do not abolish the unity of the Church nor are they absolutely outside it. This argument is confirmed from like things. For if anyone would refuse to be under his particular Bishop nor communicate with that particular Church under that Bishop, and nevertheless he means to be under the Roman Pontiff and communicates with the universal Church, he cannot be said to be outside the Church.

I respond: No man can be under Christ and communicate with the Church who is not subject to the Pope and is not in communion with the Church militant—even if he wishes to be. For Christ said, “He who hears you, hears me,” [90](#) and besides, just as Christ is the supreme head in regard to the interior life (since he breaths sense and motion into his members, that is faith and charity), so the Pope is the supreme head over the Church militant, in regard to the exterior life of the doctrine and the sacraments. Furthermore, the Church triumphant is united, nay more, it is one with the Church militant, and hence no man can be separated from one without being separated from the other.

In a similar fashion I respond with a confirmation. One who separates himself from a particular Church and Bishop is necessarily separated from the Church and the universal Bishop (unless perhaps someone had done it because that particular Church and its bishop were heretics or schismatics). For Cyprian rightly says, “They deceive themselves in vain, who, not having peace with the priests of God, creep and believe that they secretly communicate with the Church, which is Catholic and one and that it would not be torn nor divided but really is the connection of those adhering to each other and joined with the glue of the priests. [91](#)

CHAPTER VI: On the Excommunicated

CONCERNING the Excommunicated, the Roman Catechism teaches they are not in the Church. [92](#) Furthermore, Thomas Waldens, [93](#) John de Turrecremata, [94](#) John Driedo [95](#) and several others teach the same thing. It is proven first from what we read in Matthew XVIII:17, “If they will not listen to the Church, let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-collector.” There the Lord speaks about the excommunicated according to the exposition of all. Heathens are not in the Church. Likewise we see in 1 Corinthinas, “Have you not rather not mourned that he is taken away from your midst, that did such a thing? . . . Do you not know that a little leaven corrupts the whole mass? . . . Put away the evil one from yourselves.” [96](#) With these words, the Apostle describes what it means to be excommunicated. For he bids anyone to be excommunicated who would have the wife of his father.

Secondly it is proved from Canon law, “It is canonically established, following the examples of the holy Fathers, that we eliminate violators of the Church of God from the lap of holy mother the Church and the consort with the whole Christian world by the authority of God and the judgment of the Holy Spirit.” [97](#)

Thirdly from the Fathers. Eusebius, relating the extent to which Pope Victor had excommunicated all the Galatians says, “He sent a letter in which he separated everyone at the same time without distinction from Ecclesiastical union. . . . Irenaeus argued with Victor because it was not right to cut so many and such Churches from the unity of the body.” [98](#) Epiphanius, speaking about Marcion (who had professed virginity prior to becoming a heretic and nevertheless violated a woman who also had professed virginity and consequently was excommunicated by his father), said, “He was ejected from the Church by his own father, for his father was famous due to the excellence of his piety and persevered living honestly in the ministry of the episcopate.” [99](#)

Hilary, commenting on that verse, “Let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-collector,” says that God did that very thing with the people of Israel as Christ advises must be done. Firstly, he corrected the people between him

and it alone, when he appeared to them with majesty on mount Sinai. Secondly, he applied two witnesses to himself, that is the Law and the Prophets. Third, he spoke to the Church, that is, he sent Christ as the Supreme Prelate of the Church who reproached the Jews. Lastly, when they did not listen to the prelate of the Church, he neglected them and left them behind, just as the heathen and the tax-collectors. With such words he showed that through excommunication a man becomes just as a heathen and a tax-collector, cast out from the people of God, and no longer governed by that peculiar providence whereby the Church is governed.

Chrysostom and Theophylactus explain on this citation that one is said to be cast out from the Church because he becomes as a heathen and a tax-collector. Jerome says that some sinners are pushed outside the Church through the excommunications of bishops and become heretics and schismatics by their very own will. Augustine says that those who are excommunicated are visibly cut from the body of the Church. [100](#) Likewise he says that through excommunication diseased sheep are separated from the healthy lest dangerous plagues creep through a great many of them. [101](#) This opinion is cited by Augustine: “Every Christian who is excommunicated by priests is handed over to Satan. How? Because obviously the devil is outside the Church, just as Christ is in the Church.” [102](#) Anselm subscribes to this when says that a man is handed over to Satan that is pushed out of the Church through excommunication. [103](#)

Lastly it is proven by reason. Firstly, by excommunication men are deprived from all the spiritual privileges that men in the Church have, as Tertullian teaches; [104](#) consequently they are no longer in the body of the Church. What is it for some citizen to be deprived of his city except to be deprived of all privileges that are due to men of that city? Secondly, excommunication has that place in the Church that the death penalty had in the Old Testament as well as in Republican times, but through death men are separated from the whole Republic. Augustine says, “Excommunication now does in the Church what death did formerly.” [105](#) There he compares what is said in Deuteronomy XXIV, “You will abolish the evil one from your midst,” with what Paul says, “Remove the wicked man from your presence.” [106](#) Thirdly, there is no penalty that the Church can inflict more severe than excommunication, as St. Augustine teaches, [107](#) therefore by excommunication a man is cast out from the Church. It is more serious to

be cast from the Church than any penalty you like that remains for the Church to take up.

Fourthly, excommunication can not be imposed except upon those who are contumacious and incorrigible, as St. Augustine teaches. [108](#) And indeed, even all Theologians deduce this from that passage of Matthew XVIII we have been citing. Consequently, excommunication is the ejection from the Church; for if excommunication were to be imposed for some penalty short of ejection, it would also be imposed in every degree whatsoever upon murderers, adulterers and other malefactors even if they are not contumacious. Add to this that when the excommunicates are absolved, it is said: “Now you have been restored to the unity of the Church and the participation of the members.” That is a clear sign that the excommunicates were separated from the unity of the Church.

But they object to the contrary. First, an excommunicated man remains baptized, retains the profession of faith and the subjection of the legitimate Prelate, and to the extent that he is a friend of God, if he will be unjustly excommunicated then the excommunicate can also justly do penance and have those three before he is absolved, therefore he will be in the Church, even while remaining excommunicated.

I respond, such a person is in the Church by mind, or by desire, which suffices to salvation, but still not in the body or the external communion which properly causes a man to be in this visible Church which is on Earth. Augustine says, “Often divine providence may permit that even good men may be expelled from the Christian congregation. If men will bear such contumely or injury very patiently for the peace of the Church, nor will have created any novelties, schisms or heresies then they will teach men how truly God must be served by good will and by such genuine charity. The Father who sees in secret will crown these in secret.” [109](#)

Secondly they object because Augustine says, “And we do not separate from the people of God those whom we reduce to a lower place by degradation or excommunication.” [110](#)

I respond: I suspect this passage has been corrupted and thus the phrase “And we do not separate from the people of God,” must be picked out, since what follows after that is, “And we are not allowed to do this for the sake of peace and tranquility of the Church, still we do not so neglect the Church, but we tolerate that which we refuse to arrive where we wish, using the precaution of the Lord’s precept, lest we might wish to gather the cockle

before its time and eradicate the wheat with it.” But if this passage has not been corrupted then the response can be made that through the words, “the people of God,” not only the Church militant is understood but the absolute number of those going to be saved, whether they might be in the Church or whether they can be; since by excommunication pastors do not intend to separate men from the number of those who can be saved, but rather more to help them to salvation by that correction.

They object thirdly that excommunication is a type of spiritual medicine established for the assistance of those who are excommunicated. For this reason the Apostle says, “But if any man does not obey our word by epistle, mark such a man lest you keep company with him so that he shall be ashamed.” [111](#)

I respond: Excommunication, even if it tears a man from the Church, nevertheless does not take away potency so that he cannot again be inserted into the Church when he is cut off from it if he should do penance. Therefore, the Church, through excommunication, separates certain men from its body, but for their sake because she desires them to be humbled by that shame, and once humbled then received again into the body of the Church.

CHAPTER VII: On the Predestined

MOREOVER, the fact that not only the predestined but even the reprobate can pertain to the Church (contrary to Wycliffe and Calvin) must be proved. 1) From the very clear parables of the Lord. In Matthew the Church is compared with a threshing floor, “He will clear his threshing floor and will gather the wheat into his barn, but he will burn the chaff in the inextinguishable fire.” [112](#) Certainly the term “threshing floor” cannot be understood except about the Church, in which the threshing floor is discovered, but the part about the inextinguishable fire cannot be understood about the elect. Later in Matthew he compares the net let down in the sea that gathers every kind of fish but at length some of them are sent into the furnace of fire, [113](#) but that certainly is not said about the predestined.

Later in Matthew’s Gospel the nuptial dinner is compared to that in which the good and the wicked enter and afterward the wicked do not have the nuptial garment and are cast into exterior darkness. Then the Lord concludes it saying, “Many are called but few are chosen,” [114](#) *i.e.*, many are in the Church, which is a certain evocation, or the body of those called who still are of the elect. Likewise he compares it to ten virgins, of whom the five prudent will enter the nuptials with the spouse on the day of judgment, but the five foolish will be excluded. [115](#) In the same place it is compared to a sheepfold in which there are sheep and goats and the former, as the Lord himself explains, are the elect while the latter are the reprobate. [116](#) Paul bids the incestuous to be expelled from the Church, [117](#) and still he could not cause him to be cast out from the predestined, nor did he will it, since he cast him out that, having been humbled, he would return and be saved on the day of the Lord, as he says in the same place. [118](#) Likewise in 2 Timothy II he says, “In a great house there are vessels, some gold and silver, some wooden and made of clay, some in glory and some in contumely.” There does not seem to be a doubt that the vessels in glory are the elect while the vessels in contumely are the reprobate even though they are in the same house.

St. Cyprian confirms the same thing [119](#) and he clearly teaches that in the Church there are wheat and cockle, as well as golden and wooden vessels,

since it is certain that the cockle is burned and the wooden vessels are in contumely. Moreover St. Augustine says, “According to foreknowledge and predestination how many sheep are outside and how many wolves inside?”

[120](#) There he says that many predestined are outside the Church and many reprobates are within it.

Besides, the examples of Paul and Judas agree with it. John Huss said that Paul was always in the Church but Judas was never in it. On the other hand, Paul himself says that he had persecuted the Church of God, just as Luke affirms. [121](#) Therefore I ask, was the Church which Paul persecuted the true Church, or it was not? If the true Church, then Paul was not a member of the true Church at some point. For how was he of the Church which he opposed with all his strength? If that was not the true Church, then Paul and Luke lie when they unreservedly call it the Church of God.

Hence, St. Augustine teaches that Paul, although he was predestined, was a wolf before the fact and a sheep afterward. [122](#) Chrysostom says that Paul was a clay vessel but turned into gold while Judas was gold but turned into clay. [123](#) Hence Judas became reprobate, as is clear from the Acts of the Apostles, [124](#) and nevertheless, was at some point in the true Church. It is said in the same passage of Acts that he was an Apostle from the twelve and was called a Bishop by David, [125](#) This could not be true unless he were in the Church at some point. For this reason Augustine says that Judas was a son of Christ and still persecuted his father just as Absalom did David. [126](#) He also says that Judas was in the Church in which the rest of the Apostles were. [127](#)

Reason also agrees for if predestination alone makes a man in the Church, it would follow that if the Turks, Jews, heretics or any impious men were predestined, then they are now in the Church and the living members of Christ; but on the other hand certain holy and pious baptized men, if they might not be predestined, are not in the Church or the body of Christ. But each is false and against what is expressed in the Scripture. For above we showed the fact that the unbaptized and heretics are not in the Church, and the impious are not living members as it says in Romans, “If anyone does not have the spirit of Christ, he is not of him,” [128](#) *i.e.* a living member. That the impious do not have the spirit of Christ, but the spirit of the devil is clear from their works. For they are not patient, chaste, etc., which are works of the spirit, rather they are adulterers, murderers, blasphemers, etc., which are works of the flesh. [129](#) On the contrary, we find that all pious

baptized men are members of the Church in Paul, “We are all baptized in one spirit into one body,” [130](#) and again, “You are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus, whoever you are that has been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ.” [131](#) And still it is not believable that all the Corinthians and Galatians were predestined.

Next, Augustine says, “In the bond of Christ, just as in a living building of the temple of God, which is the Church, men are born not from the works of justice that they do rather they are transferred by works of grace just as from the mass of a ruin to the solidity of a building.” [132](#) Again, showing that the impious do not pertain to the living members of Christ, he says, “God forbid that they could enter the confines of the enclosed garden that has such a guard as cannot be deceived, who nevertheless if they confess and are corrected, then enter, then are cleansed, then are enclosed among the trees of the garden, then are numbered in the members of the singular dove.” [133](#)

Lastly it is proven from what is disagreeable; for if only the predestined were in the Church, then everything would be uncertain. Then no man could recognize his brothers, nor would shepherds know their sheep or be recognized by them, since nobody would know who is predestined and besides nobody would know which would be the true Scripture, which would be the true Sacraments, or the true faith, etc., since all these depend upon the testimony of the true Church.

Yet they object to this with several arguments. 1) That verse in the Canticles, “An enclosed garden, a sealed font, a well of living water, etc.,” without a doubt means the Church, and still St. Augustine explains all of these about the elect alone. [134](#)

I respond: Firstly, Scripture often attributes one thing by a figure of speech to the whole which only agrees with a part. In Matthew it says that the thieves that were crucified with the Lord blasphemed against him, [135](#) when it is certain from Luke that only one of them blasphemed. [136](#) In Philippians it says “All seek what is their own,” [137](#) and yet there were not very many saints like this who lived then and especially the Philippians. Secondly I say that what is said about the spouse in the Canticles must not necessarily be understood on the Church. Some men understand this to be about the Church, and others about the Blessed Virgin, and others every perfect soul (which seems more probable), for it is said, “There are sixty queens and eighty concubines and the young women are beyond number.

One is my dove, my perfect, my mother is one chosen by her mother.” [138](#) In that passage, if you understand the Church through that one spouse, what will you understand by the queens, concubines and young women? Therefore the Church is understood by the mother while the souls of the more imperfect by the queens, concubines and young women and at length the faithful and good souls. For it is said, “For that reason the young women have loved you.” [139](#) But through the one perfect spouse and dove is understood a perfect soul. Thus it is also said in that very place, “Just as a lily among thorns, so my beloved among the daughters.” [140](#) If you understand the Church through the beloved, what will you understand for the other daughters? Would it be the congregation of the unfaithful? God forbid. Thus, it speaks on the perfect soul, which is called to mind amidst the multitude of sinners in the same garden of the Church. St. Augustine says, “The thorns are described on account of the malignity of morals, the daughters are described on account of the communion of the Sacraments.” [141](#)

2) They make the second objection that the ark of Noah was a figure of the Church, as Augustine teaches, [142](#) but there was nobody in the ark but those who were going to be saved from the waters, therefore only the predestined are in the Church.

I respond: Similitudes do not agree in all things, otherwise every baptized person would be predestined, since Peter compares Baptism to the ark of Noah, [143](#) thus not only the good but even the wicked would be saved because in the ark both the clean and unclean animals were saved. For that very reason the ark agrees with the Church; for just as outside the ark no man could be saved, so not outside the Church as Augustine remarks on that citation, as well as Cyprian and Jerome, [144](#) nor must any other similitude be sought out.

3) They make their third objection that Christ is not the head except of his Church which he will save, and which he will show to himself on the glorious day of judgment, not having spot or stain, as Paul says. [145](#) But only the predestined will be saved and glorious, therefore only the predestined pertain to the Church of Christ.

I respond: When it is said that Christ is not the head except of his Church which he will save, that, “of his Church,” can mean of his part of the Church which he will save, and then the proposition is false. For he is the head of his whole body although certain members are going to cease to be

members and will perish in eternity. It can also mean, “of his Church,” as in the whole Church, as is distinguished from other congregations of infidels and then the proposition is true but the consequent is bad. Although some members of this Church will not be saved, it does not follow on that account that Christ did not save his Church, of which he is the head.

4) They argue fourthly that the mystical body is like a true body, but the whole true body of Christ is safe and glorious with all its parts, therefore the mystical body in all of its members and parts ought to be saved.

I respond: Firstly, similitudes do not agree in all things. Secondly, just as the body of Christ is true, saved and glorious in regard to all its formal parts, still not in regard to all its material parts, for the material parts flowed out from and were changed in Christ as we see happens among us, so also the mystical body is going to be saved in regard to all the formal parts, which are Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, etc.; some will be saved from every race of men, but not in regard to all material parts, which are all men individually.

5) The Church is one sheepfold, [146](#) but there are no sheep except the predestined, [147](#) therefore, only the predestined are in the Church.

I respond: In some places of Scripture the word “sheep” means only the predestined as in Matthew XXV where the sheep are separated from the goats, and in John X, “My sheep hear my voice.” In other places it means everyone in general, both the good and the bad who are in the Church, as in the last chapter of John, “Feed my sheep,” and in the Psalms, “Your furor has been aroused over thy pasture,” [148](#) and in Ezechiel XXXIV, the sheep of God are described as some fat, some lean, some healthy and some sick, but according to this second meaning the argument does not have any force.

Still, we respond following the earlier meaning that in the sheepfold there are not only sheep but also goats, as is clear from Matthew XXV, where they are separated since beforehand they were present together in the same sheepfold. Moreover, the sheepfold is so called even if it does not only contain sheep from the greater part of them. Just the same, Rome is called a city although she embraces many who are not her citizens.

6) They argue from John, “I have other sheep who are not from this sheepfold,” [149](#) and also, “Jesus was going to die for the nation, but not only for the nation but even that the sons of God who were dispersed would be gathered into one.” [150](#) In such places the predestined are called sheep and sons of God, even when they lived amidst the errors of the Gentiles, for

this reason the predestined are always in the Church. Likewise we see in 2 Timothy, “The strong foundation of God stands having this seal, the Lord knew who were his own,” [151](#) and in 1 John, “They went out from us but they were not from us, for if they were from us they would certainly have remained with us.” [152](#) Therefore, even before they went out they were not from us but seemed to be. And it is confirmed by Augustine, “Some are sons of God because they received grace temporally, as when it says ‘from us,’ nevertheless they are not of God. . . . They went out from us, but they were not of us, *i.e.* even when they seemed to be among us they were not. Likewise, they were not sons even when they seemed to be in profession and in the name of sons. . . . because they did not have perseverance, just as they were not truly disciples of Christ so they were not truly sons of God, even when they seemed to be and were so called.” [153](#) Besides, in *Doctrina Christiana*, arguing with Ticonius who called the mystical body of the Lord, *i.e.* the Church, divided, he says, “It ought not be so called, for that part which will not be with him forever is not really the Lord’s body.” [154](#)

I respond: Two distinct things must be noted for the explanation of these passages. The first is that a man can be called a sheep of Christ, a son, a member in two ways; a) according to predestination; b) according to present justice. This distinction is contained with Paul, for when he says, “Whoever does not have the spirit of Christ is not of him,” [155](#) and nevertheless in 2 Timothy he says about the predestined, “The Lord knows who are his own.” [156](#) Therefore, a member and a non-member of Christ can be one and the same. For he will be his if he has been predestined, and he will not be his if meanwhile he does not have his spirit. Likewise Augustine teaches, “According to foreknowledge, many who are certainly outside, and even those who are called heretics, are better than many and good Catholics.” And again, “According to foreknowledge and predestination how many sheep are outside? But how many wolves are inside?” [157](#)

The difference between these is that those who are the sheep, sons, or members, are only so according to predestination, such as are by potency but not by act. For predestination places nothing in man, rather it is an act remaining in God himself. But those who are such according to present justice are simply such by act, because they really have this act in themselves, whence they are called such. Augustine clearly teaches this when he says, “Why is it that I said how many sheep are outside? How many that revel are going to be chaste? How many that blaspheme Christ

are going to believe in Christ? And these are sheep. Even so, they only hear a foreign voice, they follow strangers. Likewise how many praise God on the inside but are going to blaspheme? How many are chaste but will fornicate and who now stand but are going to fall? And we say they are not sheep from the predestined.” [158](#) There you can see how he speaks about the future, “they who revel are going to be chaste, etc.” For in the same way it can be said that those who are outside are going to be inside, and from this distinction it should be clear enough from the Scriptures we have brought forth. For there the sheep are spoken of, as well as the sons of God who still were not in the Church because they were such according to predestination and in potency, not however in act and simply.

For equal reasoning, it is said in 2 Timothy II, “The Lord knows who are his,” this phrase is about those who are his through predestination but not on the whole Church, since he adds in the same place, “In a great house there are many vessels, some of gold, some silver, some wooden and others of clay.” And the reprobate are similarly called those who went out from the Church and were not from us, because they were not from us according to predestination, although they were according to the communion of the Sacraments. In this way it ought also be understood what the author of the incomplete work says in homily 20 on Matthew, namely, that one who falls from the Church was never Christian; there he understands it according to predestination.

The second distinction is that one can truly be said to be a son of God or a member of the body of Christ in two ways, in one way by the truth of essence, or the form, and in the other way by the truth of the end, or as others say, from the truth of permanence. By the truth of essence it is the son of God who has charity. “Everyone who loves is born of God.” [159](#) And likewise by the truth of essence is the member of Christ who lives in the same spirit. “In one spirit you all were baptized into one body.” [160](#) But by the truth of the end one is called a son of God, who attains inheritance; and who will not attain it seemed to be a son but was not. For the purpose of descent is inheritance, “Such if a son and heir through God.” [161](#) thus even by the truth of the end one is a member who will be saved, for Christ united the Church to himself for this purpose, just as the body to the head that he would save her, as it is said in Ephesians IV. Therefore, who is in grace and still has not been predestined, is truly a son and member by the truth of essence and is not truly a son or a member by the truth of the end.

On the other hand, one who is not in grace, and still has been predestined, is not truly a son or a member by the truth of essence, and nevertheless is truly both by the truth of the end. The verse, “Who keeps his word, truly the charity of God has been perfected in him,” [162](#) is understood on the first truth; while the verse, “If you will have remained in my word, you will truly be my disciple,” [163](#) is on the second.

Since we have made such a notation, the passages of Augustine will be easily understood, where he says that the just who are not predestined are neither truly sons nor members. For he speaks on the truth of the end, not on the truth of the essence, as he explains himself in the same passage. Likewise in his book on *Rebuke and Grace*, after he had said the predestined—not the good—were truly sons, [164](#) he added, “Not because they feigned justice but because they did not remain in it.” and in *Doctrina Christiana*, [165](#) rendering an account as to why he had said that those who will not be with Christ in eternity do not truly pertain to his body he said, “Now they are in one, still they will not always be in one. He is indeed that servant called to mind in the Gospel, of whom when the Lord will have come he will divide him and place him in the lot of the hypocrites.”

CHAPTER VIII: On Those who are not Perfect

IT can easily be proven that there are imperfect men in the Church, against the opinion of the Pelagians and the Anabaptists. If those who had any imperfection were not in the Church, then there never would have been nor would be any Church on earth. For with the exception of Christ and the Blessed Virgin (who by themselves do not make the Church), there is no one, even if he were very holy in this life, who does not have some venial sins, even though they do not abolish justice nor make man an enemy of God, as the Pelagians thought. That is particularly taught in Scripture. “You forgave the impiety of my sin, for this every holy man will pray to you in due season.” [166](#) What is the “for this,” except for this remission of sin? Furthermore, the holy man is a man, and he still has something that he begs to be remitted him. In the Old Testament it says, “For there is no man who shall not sin,” [167](#) and again, “The just man falls seven times a day and rises again,” [168](#) and, “No man is so just on earth that he does good and does not sin.” [169](#) In Mathew all are bid to say, “Forgive us our sins.” James says, “We have all offended in many things.” [170](#) and “If we will have said that we do not have sin, we deceive ourselves and we do not have the truth.” [171](#) Such testimonies are certainly so clear that they hardly need any explanation.

Likewise the Council of Miletus defines in canons 7 and 8 that the just say “forgive our sins,” not just out of humility but also in truth—not just for others but even for themselves.

The Fathers witness the same thing. St. Cyprian said, “Whoever says he is without fault is either proud or stupid.” [172](#) St. Gregory Nazianzen said, “To be free from every sin altogether is something God constituted above the mode of human nature.” [173](#) St. Ambrose said, “The just man cannot deny this because no man is without sin.” [174](#) St. John Chrysostom says, “The Church is not constituted from the perfect but contains those given over both to industry and sluggishness.” [175](#) St. Jerome said, “I concede there are just men, but I do not agree they are without any sin.” [176](#) In book

3 of the same work, Jerome proves this same thing from the whole matter, when he at length admits that a man can go a very brief time without sin, but not long.

St. Augustine teaches that a man can live without any sin by a singular privilege from God, but really there is no one who lives or has lived thus but Christ. [177](#) He says the same thing in *de natura et gratia*, cap. 34, where he also exempts the Blessed Virgin, and in epist. 89, 95 and in the whole book on perfect justice, and finally in book 1 against the two Pelagian epistles, cap. 14. “There is no one in the Church that could rightly be ordained a minister, if the Apostle would have said if anyone is free from sin, where he said free from crime; or if he had said those having no sin when he said those having no crime. To be sure, there are many baptized faithful that are not guilty of a crime, but in this life I say there is no one without sin.” St. Gregory the Great said that in this life there are many not guilty of a crime, but no one that lives without sin. [178](#)

There are many arguments to the contrary, but they do not all need to be answered here. Those which are advanced to prove that any sin destroys justice, or that a man can live without any sin, do not lack an answer since a little later we will show that the best and the most wicked men are in the Church. There are only two arguments proper to this place. One is from the Canticles, “You are all beautiful, my beloved, and there is no stain in you,” [179](#) and the other, “That he might show the glorious Church to himself, having no stain or blemish, or anything of this kind.” [180](#) That passage must be understood about the Church, as the sixth Council of Toledo teaches in its first chapter, explaining the confession of faith.

I respond: To the first, it is either understood on the Church by reason of only one part, *i.e.* by reason of just souls or on the perfect soul, which I would prefer to argue. For the just soul is called all beautiful, either through hyperbole (which is familiar to lovers), or because the just and perfect soul lacks mortal sins, which properly leave behind a stain and avoids venial sins as much as it is permitted for human frailty to do so, and if it were to commit such it will soon labor to blot them out. Even if it is not immaculate simply, still it is immaculate for the state of this life, as Augustine explains in his book on the perfection of justice. In this way no one is perfect in this life absolutely, and nevertheless many in the Scriptures are said to be perfect because they were such for the state of this life. In Genesis it says, “Noah was a just man and also perfect,” [181](#) and, “Let all of us who are

perfect be of this mind.” [182](#) Nay more they are also called Immaculate who lack venial sins, “And I will be Immaculate with him.” [183](#) “Blessed are the immaculate on the road.” [184](#) “He chose us in himself, that we might be holy and immaculate in truth.” [185](#)

I say to the second argument that a) it can be understood about the Church, not as it now is but as it will be after the resurrection, as St. Jerome explains it, [186](#) as well as St. Augustine, [187](#) and St. Bernard. [188](#) The Council of Toledo is not opposed to this either, because even if the Council understood those words on the Church in this time, nevertheless it did not define it. Still, I say b) it is more probable that the Apostle spoke about the Church of this time but attributed it through a figure of speech to the whole Church, which agrees with one part of it. For those who are now the just in the Church, that are glorious through the beauty of grace which is an innate glory, who are the ones without stain, as it was expressed a little earlier, without blemish, because they have been renewed through baptism; they have laid aside the old man and put on the new, the blemishes are signs of the old man. So all understand this passage apart from the Council of Toledo that has already been cited, such as Chrysostom, Jerome and Theophylactus in their commentaries on those passages.

CHAPTER IX: On Great Sinners

MOREOVER, in the one true and Catholic Church of Christ there are not only imperfect men but even great sinners, and not only secret ones but even manifest ones. This is proved against the error of the Novationists, Donatists and Confessionists. First, it is proved from the parables of the Gospels on the chaff, on the net, on the nuptial dinner, the ten virgins and on the sheepfold that we cited above, with which Catholics once so refuted the Donatists that the latter found no way to escape them, as Augustine relates in his short work on the conference with the Donatists, explaining the conference of the third day.

Besides, there are other very clear passages. In Matthew it says, “If your brother might have sinned against you, go correct him, etc. If he will not hear you, speak to the Church, if he will not hear the Church, let him be to you just as a pagan and a publican.” [189](#) Here it cannot be denied that the discourse is on the true Church, for Christ speaks about his Church and in this Church it is certain that sinners are discovered, even such sinners who often are not mended by fraternal correction, nor by the application of two witnesses, and still they remain in the Church until they are thrown out of the Church by the judgment of a prelate. We also see in Matthew that the Lord commands in regard to wicked overseers that we should do what they say but not what they do. [190](#) Next the Lord describes a wicked overseer who strikes the converted, eats and drinks with the drunk and he says, “The Lord will come on a day which he hopes not and he will divide him and place his share with that of the hypocrites.” [191](#) Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom and others teach on that passage that it is on those in charge of the Church. Likewise Paul says that he writes to the Church of God, which is in Corinth, and soon he adds, “It has been shown to me that there are contentions among you.” [192](#) And in chapter V, “fornication is heard of among you and such fornication that is not known among the nations, so that a man has the wife of his father.” [193](#) What will they say here? That it is not the true Church? But the Apostle calls it the Church of God; that it was not a very great and manifest sinner? Yet the Apostle says it. That he was not in that Church? But the Apostle commands that they expel him through excommunication. “Let him be taken away from your midst, etc.”

Additionally, St. John writes in the book of the Apocalypse to the seven Churches of Asia, [194](#) and condemns individuals for no light matters. As Augustine remarks, John not only condemns the Churches, but even the Bishops, signified by the Angel of the Church of Sardis, “You have the name which you could live, but you are dead, be watchful, etc.” [195](#) Add that in the time of the Old Testament the people of God never lacked very serious sins, and still we never read that Moses or Samuel or other Prophets who lived in different times, or Mary, Anna, Elizabeth, Simeon, Zachariah, John the Baptist and the other just, whom the Lord discovered in the people of the Jews, separated themselves from the other very evil men in regard to the temple, altar, sacrifices and other things which are of religion, hence, the good and the bad remained in the same congregation. St. Augustine duly urges this very argument. [196](#)

Secondly it is proven from the testimony of the Catholic Church in St. Augustine’s time. For Augustine relates a famous conference held in Carthage among 306 Catholic Bishops (of which he himself was one), with 296 Donatist Bishops. Augustine indicates that there were that many on the first day, then in the conference on the third day the Donatists were compelled to admit that the good and the bad are in the Church, and the Catholics advanced the parables on the net gathering the good and bad fish, but the Donatists still said those who are secretly wicked are in the Church, just as in the net while it is in the sea the good fish are not known from the bad, but on the shore they will soon be separated. The Catholic Bishops responded to this that on that account the Church is compared to a seine, in which the chaff is discerned from the grain, nay more the chaff appears more than the grain. Further they argued that in the ark of Noah, after the exit of the raven (which signifies heretics), the clean and unclean animals still clearly remained in the ark.

Augustine also adds that when the Donatists misrepresented Catholics as making two Churches, one on earth which would have the good and evil but the other in heaven which had none but the good, then the Catholics responded they do not make two Churches but distinguish two periods of the Church, “They said that there is now one and the same holy Church, but later it will be otherwise, now it is mixed with the wicked, then it is not going to have them just as there are not two Christs because Christ was at one point mortal and then immortal.” Such things must also be noted against the Confessionists and the Calvinists who create two Churches.

Thirdly, it is proven from the testimonies of the Fathers. Cyprian said, “Neither faith nor our charity ought to be impeded just because we discern that cockle is in the Church, it is no reason to depart from the Church.” [197](#) St. Gregory Nazianzen compares the Church to a vast sea monster composed of many such creatures, that is from the great, the small, wild, meek, etc. to show that the greatest labor is that of Bishops who ought to rule so many kinds of men, the perfect and the imperfect, the good and the bad. [198](#) St. John Chrysostom says many similar things on the sins of those who are ruled by Bishops. [199](#) Commenting on Psalm 39 (40), on that verse, *They are multiplied over the hairs of my head*, he said: “The whole Church is certainly not constituted from the perfect, but it also has those who from laziness give themselves over to inaction, and embrace a soft and dissolute life, and gladly serve their desires, at length both the former and the latter announce that it is one body from one person.”

Jerome says, “The ark of Noah was a type of the Church, just as in it were all kinds of animals so also in the Church there are men of all kinds of nations and morals, just in the ark there were leopards, goats and wolves as well as sheep, so also in the Church there are the just and sinners, *i.e.*, vessels of gold and silver along with those of wood and clay.” [200](#) Augustine says, “We affirm that both the good and the wicked are in the Catholic Church, but just as the grain and the chaff.” [201](#) Fulgentius says, “Firmly hold and in nowise doubt the threshing floor of God is the Catholic Church and within it even to the end of the world it contains the chaff mixed with grain, that is, the wicked are mixed with the good in the communion of the Sacraments.” [202](#) St. Gregory also teaches the wicked are in the Church and proves it with many arguments. [203](#)

Lastly, it is proved from reason. For if only the good were in the Church then the Sacrament of Penance would be in vain since it is administered only to those who are in the Church. Besides no man would know for certain who was or was not in the Church, since it would be uncertain who was really good or not. Likewise, if some prelate were to sooner or later fall into sin then he would no longer be in the Church and hence no longer a prelate and therefore it would not be necessary to obey him any longer; just the same if his subjects sooner or later would sin, they would no longer be in the flock and therefore it would be lawful for the pastors to omit their care; but from such confusion great disturbance would arise.

Still they object; 1) from the Scripture: “He will not add beyond that he should pass over to the uncircumcised and the unclean. . . . Withdraw, withdraw, go out from there do not touch anyone polluted go out from their midst.” [204](#) The Apostle explains this passage thus, “I will receive you, says the Lord.” [205](#) Therefore, God does not receive anyone in his Church except those who separate themselves from the unclean and sinners. Paul gives the reason (*loc. cit.*) saying, “What participation does justice have with iniquity? What compact does Christ have with Belial?” In 1 Corinthinas he says, “One bread and one body we are many.” [206](#) But bread is only effected from grain, not chaff and grain. In Romans he says, “Whoever does not have the spirit of Christ is not of him,” [207](#) and, “In the one spirit we are all baptized into one body.” [208](#) Therefore, whoever does not have the spirit is a sinner, and not a member of Christ. If one were to say he is not a living member but still he is a member, on the other hand because he is a dead member he is not a member except by a figure of speech, therefore he is not a true member and thus not one at all.

St. Augustine responds to the first argument. [209](#) The Church triumphant is understood in that passage, “he will not add more that he should pass over to the uncircumcised and unclean.” What is added, “Recede, go out, etc.,” is understood on the separation which ought to happen in the soul and the dead but not in the corporal separation from the same temple and Sacraments, etc.

But Cyril of Jerusalem says it better when he comments on this passage of Isaiah (and it does not seem that Jerome disagrees). He teaches that it is according to the historic sense, and it is a question of the temporal persecution of the Jews that the sense might be when you return from captivity an addition should not be made, *i.e.* for a long time, some infidel persecutor shall pass through your lands, devastating them, but according to the mystical sense it is a question of the Church, and Isaiah foretold that the gates of hell would not prevail against it. For the uncircumcised and the unclean are principally the enemies of the Church, that is the demons. For equal reasoning it follows that, “recede, recede, etc.” according to the historic sense is understood about the Jews whom Isaiah exhorts go out from Babylon since the time of captivity was limited; but according to the mystical sense it is understood about Christians who ought, after Baptism, to be separated from the bodies, temples and sacrifices of unbelievers, along with their spouses and all the rest which also pertain to religion. And St.

Paul understands this passage in that manner when he says speaks not on the commerce with certain sinners, but only with the infidels, “Do not take up the yoke with infidels, what share do the faithful have with the unbeliever? What union is there with the temple of God and idols?”

To what was said on the one bread, which is from the wheat alone, I respond: the similitudes do not agree in everything. This similitude consists of the bread and of the Church, as Cyprian and Irenaeus explain, [210](#) just as one bread is made from many grains through water, so also from many men through the waters of Baptism, or through the Holy Spirit, who is also called water, [211](#) one people of God is made. No man is in the Church who has not been baptized and does not participate in either an internal or external gift of the Holy Spirit. Although it is also not true that bread consists of wheat alone. Meanwhile either from negligence or from their malice, were those who make bread to mix in even a grain of chaff, just as often in wine from the malice of the sellers it is mixed with water. Next, the same is shown from the very words of Paul when he says, “We are one bread and one body, we who participate in one bread.” But the good and the bad participated in the one bread, otherwise Paul would not have argued that some communicate unworthily. [212](#)

To the last point I say that the wicked are not living members of the body of Christ and the Scriptures themselves signify this. To that which is added, that they are members by a figure of speech, etc., it is usually conceded by many men that the wicked are not true members of the body of the Church, nor simply, but only according to something and by a figure of speech, such as John de Turrecremata [213](#), and he tries to show it from Alexander of Hales, Hugh and St. Thomas. Pedro de Soto, Melchior Cano and others that also teach the same thing; even if they say the wicked are not true members, just the same they say they are truly in the Church, or in the body of the Church and are faithful, that is Christians, simply. For not only are members in the body, but also the humors, the teeth, the hair and other things. And faithful or Christians are not called such from charity, but from faith or by the profession of faith. But if that is so, it follows that a bad Pope is not the head of the Church and other bishops, if they will be bad, are not the heads of their Churches. For the head is not a humor, or a hair, but a member and certainly a special one; but this is against the Council of Constance wherein the error of John Huss was condemned which asserted that a bad shepherd

is only a shepherd by a figure of speech. It also condemned his error which asserted that a bad prelate is not truly a prelate. [214](#)

Consequently, I respond that members can be considered in two ways: a) as there are certain matters according to themselves or according to their essence and substance; b) as they are operative instruments, *e.g.*, a man's eye and a cow's eye, as they are certain substances they are different in regard to species, by reason of different souls. But as operative instruments, they are species of the same thing because they have the same object.

Therefore I say, a bad Bishop, priest, teacher, etc., are dead members and so they are not true members of the body of Christ in so far as it attains to the purpose of the member, as it is a certain part of the living body, nevertheless they are truly members by reason of the instrument, *i.e.* the Pope and the Bishops are true heads, the Doctors true eyes, or a true tongue of this body, etc. and the reason is because they are constituted living members by charity, which the impious lack. But the operative instruments are constituted either by the power of order or of jurisdiction, which can also exist without grace. For even if in the natural body a dead member cannot be an instrument of operation, still it can in the mystical body. In a natural body the work depends upon the goodness of the instrument, because the soul cannot operate well unless it does through good instruments, nor can it exercise works of life except through living instruments. The soul of this body, *i.e.*, the Holy Spirit works equally well through good and bad instruments, as well as living and dead, etc.

The second objection. The Church is called "Holy" in the Creed, therefore it is constituted by none but the holy. Those who make this objection will say that the response that the Church is called holy because one part of the Church is holy does not suffice. For then the Church could also be called sinful because one part, nay more the greater part is sinful.

I respond: The Church is truly said to be holy because all the things that pertain to her constitution are holy. First baptism, which no man denies is holy. Secondly, Christian profession, that is the profession of faith, as well as of morals, doctrines and Christian precepts. It is certain that she is holy and that only she is holy by this profession since the profession of the Jews, Turks, Heathen and heretics is not holy; and only that of Christians is. Thirdly, the union of members among themselves and with the head, at least the external head, and in regard to those things which pertain to religion is also certainly holy. She is called holy on account of the saints that she has,

but she ought not be called sinful on that account since a denomination is made from its better part. Besides, it is proper for the Church to have saints because she alone truly has holy people, but to have wicked men is not proper to the Church, for that agrees with other bodies as well. Next, she is called holy because she is wholly consecrated to God and because Christ her head is the holy of holies.

The third objection. He who does not have the Church as a mother does not have God as a Father, as St. Cyprian teaches; likewise one who does not have the Church as a mother does not have God as a father. But none of the wicked have God as a father, “For those who are urged by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God,” [215](#) and it is said to the wicked, “You are from your father the devil.” [216](#) and again, “In this you are manifested as sons of God and sons of the devil, everyone who is not just is not from God.” Therefore only the good have the Church as a mother, therefore only the good are in the Church.

I respond with St. Augustine [217](#) that the name of son is received in three ways in the Scriptures. In one way sons are called according to production, whether that is properly by generation, or creation, or regeneration; thus Christ the Lord is properly called the Son of God because he was generated by God the Father, all men also are sons by reason of creation. “Is he not your father who made and created you?” [218](#) Still by reason of a new regeneration all sons are called just, and only just as in the places we have cited, Romans VIII and 1 John III. Secondly, some are called sons by reason of imitation, just as the Apostle calls the sons of Abraham those who imitate the faith of Abraham, [219](#) and again, “Love your enemies and do good to those who hate you that you might be sons of your father, etc.” [220](#) And in this way only the good are sons of God, for all the wicked are sons of the devil, as it says in John VIII and 1 John III. Thirdly, they are called sons by reason of doctrine, this is why the Apostle calls the Corinthians sons, [221](#) because he taught them the Gospel, and again he says, “My children, whom I give birth to a second time until Christ will have been formed in you.” [222](#) In this way all who are in the Church are sons of God and the Church, because they adhere to the true doctrine of God and the Church, but they can still be good and wicked. This is why Isaiah says, “I nurtured the children and raised them up, and they hoped in me,” [223](#) and the Canticles declare, “My beloved is among the daughters as a lily among thorns.” There, Christian souls are called daughters, but wicked.

With these being noted we respond to the argument. If it is a question of the sons of doctrine, the assumption is false, for it is not true that only the just are sons of God if only the reason of doctrine is considered; but if it is a question of the sons of God by regeneration or imitation, the last consequent is bad, therefore only the good are in the Church; for not only the sons but even the servants although these do not remain in the house for ever, the sons remain forever, [224](#) and this is the mind of St. Cyprian. He did not mean that in the Church there are none but the sons, but there are not any sons outside the Church, just as there are not any good men outside, although there might be evil ones within. He meant to terrify heretics and schismatics, and to warn them to not think they are able be either good or sons outside the Church.

The fourth objection is also from St. Cyprian, when he says, “Only the peaceful and harmonious dwell in the Church, as God who makes those in unity dwell in his home, says in the Psalms through the Holy Spirit.” [225](#) Therefore, sinners who fight and make contentions with others are not in the Church.”

I respond: Cyprian does not speak on every peace, but on that which is properly said to be opposed to schismatics. Besides, there can be other dissensions in the Church and in fact one often finds them, as Cyprian himself witnesses in his sermon *de Lapsis*, where among other sins, he also places among men in the Church who separated themselves from pertinacious hatred for each other.

The fifth argument is from St. John Chrysostom and Theophylactus commenting on 2 Timothy II, where they say, “In a great house there are golden vessels, etc.” They say that this cannot be understood about the Church but about the world, because in the Church there are no vases but gold and silver.

I respond: They do not deny that the wicked can be in the Church but they say it is not necessary that they be in the Church because when the Apostle says that in a great house there are golden, silver, clay and wooden vessels, it is known that all these are necessary lest someone might think the Church cannot exist without the wicked. So these Fathers say that by the term “house”, not the Church but the world should be understood since the Church does not need the wicked, nay more when it will be in its best state, *i.e.* in heaven, it will have no wicked members. Yet the world is furnished with the wicked, not *per se* but *per accidens*, if there were no wicked men

then the patience of the just would not be exercised in this world, nor the justice of God.

The sixth argument is taken from St. Jerome in his commentary on Ephesians V. He says on the subjection of the Church to Christ, “The Church of Christ is glorious, having no stain, no blemish, nor anything of this sort. A sinner or anyone stained with filth cannot be said to be of the Church nor subject to Christ.”

I respond: Jerome means that the wicked cannot be said to be in that part of the Church that contains only the perfect. He explains in his commentary on Galatians I on that verse, “Paul, an Apostle, ... to the Churches of Galatia,” he means to explain how the words of the Apostle embrace in themselves those who now seem to praise all the Churches, then reproach and rebuke them; he says the Church is received in a two-fold sense, *i.e.* not that there are two Churches, but on the one diverse-mode the Scriptures speak; sometimes Scripture attributes that which is proper to the perfect to the whole Church, namely, that it lacks stain or blemish, and sometimes that which is proper to the imperfect, such as to sin and the need for correction. When the Church is praised it must be taken in respect to that part which contains the perfect, when it is rebuked then to that which contains the imperfect.

The seventh argument is from Pacianus, who says, “In the Church there is no stain or blemish because sinners are not in the Church until they will have done penance for their prior life, and after that are cleansed.” [226](#)

I respond: He does not speak about all sinners, but only on sinners who fell into heresy, for before that he had said the Church lacks stain and blemish because she lacks heresy.

The eighth argument is taken from St. Augustine who says, “But by this, even without the knowledge of the Church, on account of the wicked and polluted conscience, those damned by Christ are not in the body of Christ, which is the Church, because Christ cannot have damned members.” [227](#) He holds similar things in other places. [228](#)

I respond, on account of these citations, not only Brenz and Calvin, but even some Catholics imagine that there are two Churches, but they really imagine it, for neither the Scriptures nor Augustine ever call to mind two Churches, but only one. Certainly in the brief conference with the Donatists, where they falsely asserted that Catholics make two Churches (one for the good and another which contains the good with the wicked),

the Catholic side responded that they never dreamed of two Churches, but only distinguish parts, or times of the Church. Parts, because on the one hand the good pertain to the Church, and on the other the wicked, since the good are the interior part, just like the soul of the Church, and the wicked are the exterior part, just like the body and they gave the example concerning the interior man and the exterior, which are not two men but one part of the same man.

With regard to times, they spoke distinguishing on the one hand the Church today, and on another the church after the resurrection; today it has good and wicked men, after the resurrection it will not have any but the good. They also placed the example of Christ, who is always the same but nevertheless was mortal and passible before his resurrection, but afterwards immortal and impassible. St. Augustine often confirms the same doctrine in other places and explains it with various similitudes. Against the Donatists he says that the good are in the house of God, which is the Church, so that the house of God might be built upon living stones, while the wicked are in the same house, but these, nevertheless are not the house. [229](#) In the last chapter of his book *On the Unity of the Church*, he says that the wicked are cut off from the Church in spirit but not in body; in other words they pertain to the Church as to the exterior man, but not to the interior. In *Doctrina Christiana*, while explaining the verse in the Canticles, “I am black but beautiful, just as a cedar tent, just as the skin of Solomon,” he notes that it was not said “I was black and I am beautiful,” but “I *am* black and beautiful,” because the Church now is one and the same, black just as a cedar tent, on account of the sinners which she has in her, and at the same time beautiful, just as the skin of Solomon, *i.e.*, just as the halls of a king, because of the good which she has in her. [230](#)

Augustine says the same thing on the epistle of John, where he teaches that the wicked are indeed in the body of the Church, not as members, but as corrupted humors which remain in the breast and really are in the body, and nevertheless are also truly separated from the members of the body. From the latter the response is made that when Augustine says the wicked are not in the Church, it ought to be understood to be in that way in which the good are, that is, they are not living members of the body.

But one might object that St. Augustine also teaches that only the saints are the Church, which is founded upon the rock, and to which was given the

keys of the kingdom, [231](#) and about which it was said if he will not hear the Church, let him be to you just as a heathen and a publican.

I respond: Augustine meant nothing other than that all privileges which were conceded to the universal Church by God were conceded on account of the saints alone for the advantage and benefit of those who obtain eternal salvation. Otherwise, Augustine frequently repeats the same thing; wicked Christians advantageously administer the Sacraments and hence rule men, loose them, bind them, etc. Consequently, [232](#) he compares evil ministers to a stony channel, through which water passes to the garden, and although it acquires no advantage for itself, nevertheless it is the cause for grass and flowers to be born and grow in the garden. [233](#)

The ninth argument is of the Lutheran Centuriators of Magdeburg. They try to show that there are two Churches, one of the good and one of the wicked. [234](#) They distinguish the justice of the disciples in Matthew V from the justice of the Pharisees, in Matthew VI of the pious from the hypocrites, in Matthew VII the body of wayfarers traveling on the narrow path from the body of those going through the broad road, and in the same place they distinguish the house founded upon the rock from the one founded upon sand. Moreover, they say it is certain that the Church of the wicked is not one holy Catholic Church, therefore the true Church of Christ only embraces the good.

I respond: Two Churches are not distinguished in any of those passages, but only different qualities of those who are in one and the same Church. Just the same, Matthew XIII distinguishes good fish from bad fish, and still they are in the same net, which signifies the Church, so they are also in the same Church who make the profession of the same faith and are in the communication of the same Sacraments, indeed they are those who walk on the broad road of vices, just as those who walk on the narrow path of virtue and just as those who are truly pious and those who are hypocrites, and those who follow the justice of the Pharisees as well as those who follow the justice of the Apostles. Lastly, there are some just as a house founded upon a rock, and those like a house founded upon sand. For in this passage it does not signify two Churches, as if we wanted to make as many Churches as there are men, for the Lord says, "Therefore, everyone who hears my words and does them, he will be compared to a wise man who built his house upon the rock, etc."

The tenth argument. If the body of Christ is the Church they cannot be parts and members of this body, among whom Christ works nothing. For he works nothing in the impious and the hypocrites; as a result, they are not of the same sort as those who can pertain to the Church of Christ. Likewise, it is altogether fitting to distinguish the kingdom of Christ from the kingdom of the devil, but all the impious pertain to the kingdom of the devil, therefore, only the pious pertain to the kingdom of Christ, which is the Church.

I respond: It is not necessary that Christ work something in all his members, for there are some dead members, some shriveled, which only adhere to the rest by an external connection. Moreover, if the kingdom of Christ is distinct from the kingdom of the devil, still the same men can pertain to each kingdom; those who are provided with bad morals persevere in the Catholic faith, and the union with the other faithful, pertain to the kingdom of Christ in so far as the profession of faith, but to the kingdom of the devil in respect to the perversity of morals. For this reason Augustine says the impious who are in the Church are sons and foreigners; sons on account of the form of piety, but foreigners on account of the loss of virtues.

CHAPTER X: On Secret Infidels

LASTLY, it remains to speak of secret infidels, *i.e.* those who have neither internal faith nor any Christian virtue, but nevertheless profess the Catholic faith due to some temporal advantage and mix with the true faithful by the communion of the Sacraments. Both the Confessionists and Calvinists teach that such men in no way pertain to the true Church, and even some Catholics, one of whom is John de Turrecremata, [236](#) although this author perhaps meant nothing other than that they require faith for someone can be said to be united by an internal union to the body of Christ, which is the Church, which would be very true.

Nevertheless, we follow the manner of speaking of a great many authors who teach that they who are joined with the remaining faithful only by an external profession are true parts and even members of the Church but withered and dead. [237](#)

1) This opinion can be demonstrated from those words of John: “And now many have become Antichrists, they went out from us, but they were not from us; for if they were from us they would have remained with us.” [238](#) John speaks in this place on heretics, whom he calls Antichrists, and he says that before they went out, they were not from us, *i.e.* they were not Catholics in spirit and will but heretics and Antichrists, and still they went out from us because if they were not from us, in spirit and will, nevertheless they were by external profession; but after they betrayed themselves and broke out into open schism, they already ceased to be from us in every manner.

And, although at some time St. Augustine explained those words, “They were not from us,” about predestination, still in his commentary on this passage, he explains they are about secret heretics. He speaks thus: “All heretics, all schismatics, went out from us, that is, they went out from the Church, but they would not have gone out if they were from us, *i.e.* they went out from the Church, but they would not have gone out if they were from us. Before they went out, therefore, they were not from us, if before they went out they were not from us, many are inside that did not go out, and yet they are Antichrists. . . . And those who are inside are certainly in the body of our Lord Jesus Christ since he still takes care of his own body;

and health will not be completed except in the resurrection of the dead; thus they are in the body of Christ in the same way as bad humors, when they are vomited then the body is relieved; thus even the wicked, when they go out, then the Church is relieved and when she vomits them out, and the body casts them out, she says these humors go out from me, but they were not from me. Why were they not from me? They were not cut from my flesh but pressed from my breast when they were present there.” [239](#) He explains it in the same way in other places, [240](#) which we will present below.

2) Next the same thing is proven from the testimonies of those Fathers who teach in a common consensus that those who are outside the Church have no authority or jurisdiction in the Church. [241](#)

Moreover, right reason manifestly teaches the same thing: By what arrangement can it be devised or imagined that one might have jurisdiction and hence be the head of the Church, who is not a member of the Church? Whoever heard of a head which was not a member? Moreover it is certain, whatever one or another might think, a secret heretic, if he might be a Bishop, or even the Supreme Pontiff, does not lose jurisdiction, nor dignity, or the name of the head in the Church, until either he separates himself publicly from the Church, or being convicted of heresy is separated against his will; for this reason, Celestine and Nicholas say (*loc. cit.*) that a heretical Bishop, to the extent that he began to preach heresy, could bind and loose no one although without a doubt if he had already conceived the error, were it before he began to preach publicly, he could still bind and loose. The fact is likewise confirmed from the canon *Audivimus*, 24, quaest. 1, where we read: “But if he will have devised a new heresy in their heart, to the extent that he begins to preach such things, he can condemn no man.” Besides, what if secret heretics could have no jurisdiction, every act that depends upon jurisdiction would be rendered uncertain, which would disturb the universal Church in no small measure. Therefore, now if he who is not in the Church cannot have authority in the Church and a secret heretic can have it, and at some point really has authority in the Church, certainly a secret heretic can be in the Church.

3) The same thing is proven from Origen, Augustine and Gregory. Origen says, “Even here in Jerusalem (*i.e.* in the Church), there are some Jebusites who are perverse in their faith and deeds.” [242](#) There is no doubt whether he spoke on secret heretics, for he adds: “Nor do we speak about

those who are manifestly and evidently guilty enough to be expelled from the Church.”

Augustine says, “The enemies of this fraternal charity are either clearly outside or seem to be inside, as pseudochristians and Antichrists, for after the opportunities have been discovered they go out. But even if they lack opportunities, although they seem to be inside, they have been separated by the invisible bond of charity.” [243](#) When Augustine says these things about secret heretics, that they seem to be in the Church, he does not mean they are not really in the Church, but that they are not in the mode in which they seem. They seem to be united by an internal and external bond with the other members but still they are not united except by an external bond. For if they were not really inside in any way but only seemed to be, for equal reasoning they would not truly go out when they clearly betray themselves, but would only seem to go out. Moreover, Augustine says they go out after the opportunities have been discovered, and he adds they were separated even before they went out, but from the invisible bond of charity, not from the external communion of the Church. What Augustine says later in the same work [244](#) ought to be understood in the same way. There he says that secret heretics are separated so that they may be judged, even if they do not go out. He speaks on the internal separation, not on the external, and this is not proper in Augustine to secret heretics but to all sinners, whom Augustine affirms are not in the body of the Church, as is clear from the chapters we cited above. Augustine continues in this place: “Wherefore, John said they went out from us but they were not from us, he did not say they became foreigners by going out, but that they were foreigners on account of this they declared they left.” The Apostle Paul also speaks on certain men who erred concerning faith, they were in one great house, I believe that they had not yet gone out.

Augustine continues, “Even if only the cockle must be spoken of, which even to the end endures in deadly error and much great is outside, and much cockle inside.” [245](#) The sense of such words seems to be that we understand outside the Church there are many manifest heretics who at length will be converted to the true faith, and inside in the Church herself there are many secret heretics who never converted. He has the same thing in *City of God*, where he says, “He rightly called to mind that those who were going to be citizens lurked among his very enemies, just as the city of God would hold itself from their number connected in communion of the Sacraments.” [246](#)

Here it must be observed on enemies, who are outside the Church, Augustine said they are future citizens because they are merely not citizens but will be in their time. But on enemies who lurk within the Church, he does not say they are going to be enemies, but they are presently, now they are in the Church itself although they nevertheless pertain to the number of enemies.

Again, when Augustine is treating on John XIII, where we read Christ was present while Judas was leaving, he says, “For us, the Lord deigned to signify with his disturbance that it is necessary to tolerate false brethren even as the cockle of the Lord’s field amidst the grain even to the time of the harvest, that when some pressing reason compels a separation from them before the harvest, this cannot be done without a disturbance to the Church. This disturbance of its saints by future schismatics and heretics in just the manner the Lord foretold prefigured in himself the wicked man made his exit, and the mixture of the grain in which it had been so long tolerated was clearly left behind in the separation; he was disturbed but not in the flesh, rather in the spirit.” [247](#) Further on in the same tract he declares that Judas was one of the Lord’s disciples and nevertheless bore the type of the heretic, “One from the number, but not rightly; one in species but not in virtue; by a corporal mixture but not by a spiritual bond, joined in a unity of the flesh but not a friend of the heart; . . . Both are true, both from us and not from us, according to one from us, according to another thing not from us, according to the communion of the Sacraments from us, according to the propriety of his crimes not from us.” He speaks likewise in another work, “Some men are still placed in heart on the side of the Donatists but show themselves to be with us corporally; in regard to the flesh they are inside, but in regard to the spirit outside.” [248](#)

Next, in his work *On Catechizing the Unlearned*, he distinguished three kinds of Christians, secret heretics, bad Catholics and good Catholics, “There are those who wish to be Christians, to either be brought into the view of men from whom they hope for agreeable temporal assistance or because they do not want to offend some that they fear. But if they are reprobate, the Church bears them, albeit for a time, just as the sand bears the chaff for a time. If they do not correct themselves and begin to be Christians on account of the coming eternal rest, then in the end they will be separated. They cannot flatter themselves that they can be in the sand with the grain of God, because they will not be in the barn with it, rather, they

will be destined for the fated fire. There are also others with better hope, but still not with lesser danger, who now fear God and do not mock the Christian name, nor enter the Church of God with a feigned heart, but hope for happiness in this life.” [249](#) You can clearly see there, from the discussion of these two kinds of men, the first is of those who do not fear God but mock the Christian name and enter the Church with a feigned heart, and still they are in it and remain and make up the number [of Christians] and will not be separated until that clear exodus.

St. Gregory the Great, while explaining the words of Job, “My wrinkles bear witness against me,” [250](#) says: “What, except the duplicitous are meant by ‘wrinkles’? The wrinkles are all those who live two-faced in this life, who shout the faith of the holy Church loudly but deny it with their works. Without a doubt, they lie that they are faithful in a time of peace because they see the same faith honored by the powers of the world; but when the holy Church is disturbed by the gales of sudden adversity, they show themselves on the spot to be soft in a treacherous mind. . . . But because the Church holds even many reprobates within the fold of faith, when a time of persecution rages, she suffers these enemies whom she seemed to nourish with the words of preaching. Let it be said, therefore, ‘my wrinkles bear testimony against me,’ *i.e.* they rebuke me in declaration who now place themselves in the body by their duplicity and do not amend their malice. ... Even in a time of peace the holy Church suffers false brethren while there are many in her who despair of the promise of eternity and still lie that they are faithful, but when the time of malice breaks out he who now lies lays aside what must be gainsaid, he comes before the face because he resisted the words of the true faith with a loud voice.”

4) It is proven from reason and the similitude of the human body argues for that which we seek. The Church is like the human body, as the Apostle teaches in Romans XII and 1 Cor. XII. Moreover, in the human body we see there are many different kinds of parts to the extent that some are live and feel, some are alive and do not feel, some are neither alive nor feel, which is obvious. Therefore, nothing prevents some men who have the faith and charity from being in the Church, as well as some who have only faith, and some who do not even have the faith at all but merely an external union.

Next, if those who lack internal faith are not, nor can be, in the Church, there will be no further question between us and the heretics on the visibility of the Church, hence (which I consider to be a great matter), so

many disputations of the most erudite men will be redundant, which to this point have been brought forth. All who have written to this point object to the Lutherans and Calvinists because they make the Church invisible. I will now prove it beyond question.

The Lutherans and Calvinists establish certain visible and external signs, namely, the preaching of the word of God and the administration of the Sacraments, and they constantly teach that wherever these signs are seen there is also the true Church of Christ. Nevertheless, because they mean only the just and the pious pertain to the true Church (and no man can say for certain who might be truly just and pious among so many that outwardly wear justice and piety before them, although it is certain that in every place there are many hypocrites and false brethren), then our writers correctly conclude that the former make the Church invisible. Since, for the Lutherans and Calvinists, justice consists only in faith and the same thing is said by those who say the Church is the body of the just and the pious and the body of true believers, then who does not see that we would plainly agree with them if we were to exclude all those from the Church who do not have true faith in their heart?

For this purpose, it is necessary that it should be constituted for us—with infallible certitude—what body of men make-up the true Church of Christ, since the traditions of Scripture and clearly all dogmas depend upon the testimony of the Church; unless we were absolutely certain what is the true Church, everything will be altogether uncertain. But one cannot constitute what the true Church might be with infallible certainty if internal faith in every member or part of the Church is required. Who knows for certain in whom there is such faith? Consequently, faith (whether it is something invisible or secret) is required for someone to pertain to the Church in some way.

Some respond to this argument in two ways. Firstly, it is certain enough that the body of faithful men can be recognized, so that it could be said if the effect of faith is discerned, then the type of protestation and confession of faith is of some sort; we even say that we truly and properly see a man even though we do not see the soul except in its effects. Secondly, they add that it is not necessary for it to be easy for us to see distinctly who these men are that make the Church, rather it is enough to assign a certain body of men within which we would know for certain or at least could believe that they all pertain to the Church. Accordingly, if the universal Roman

people were shown to someone in the forum or in the theatre, even though some outsiders might ultimately be mixed in, truly it would be said that he saw the Roman people even if he could not discern Romans from foreigners.

But neither answer seems to satisfy, and it was easily refuted earlier, the recognition that is not certain from the effects, but conjectural. Furthermore, the example of man does not convince, for in the first place, the effects of life in man are natural and necessary, but the effects of faith are free and voluntary, hence much less certain. We could never know for sure just by looking at someone that he whom we see is a man; accordingly it can happen that when we believe we see a man we might see an Angel or a demon in human form. Certainly, Abraham, Lot, Tobit and others in the Old Testament often believed some to be men who were angels. We, however, want to have infallible certitude concerning the Church, such as we have not from man himself, but from the form and exterior colors, as well as features of the human body, by which we cannot be deceived when we look upon it.

The second answer does not satisfy for many reasons. a) Because it can happen that the number of hypocrites would so increase that there might be more secret heretics than true and perfect Catholics and no one could truly say this body is the Church of Christ, when in that body that he shows a greater part does not pertain to the Church, nor would he himself know who might be those few who make the Church. Although it would have to be hoped that a greater part of those who profess the faith are sincere, still that is not certain.

b) Because the whole Church would not come together in one place so that we could say for certain that in this body is the Church; rather, it has been dispersed through various places, and we might be certain on no part, or that whole part might be without the true faith; wherever we go we will always be in doubt whether we communicate with the true Church of Christ. Now, this is not opposed to what we said elsewhere, that the particular Roman Church cannot defect from the true faith, [251](#) for the whole Roman Church itself comes together in some place at the same time, but is gathered while spread out in different churches, which are in the city of Rome, nor do we know for certain with infallible certitude in that body, to which we by chance have approached, that all are not without true faith in heart.

c) Because it can also happen that a whole general Council might be outside the Church; for how great would it be if, among so many thousands professing faith in Christ, three-hundred or four-hundred men, who come together in a Council, might lack the true faith? Evidently matters that are otherwise so well known, and which it is necessary that they be certain, will be called into doubt. Certainly Brenz, as we remarked in the disputation on Councils, elevates the authority of Councils for this reason, because we are not certain whether any of the Fathers had true faith in heart, and therefore were in the Church of God, for a false Church is not a column and firmament of truth, but only a true Church.

d) Because if we do not distinctly know who might constitute the Church, then we will be ignorant, not only as to what the Church is but where it is, or rather more where the Church hides, which is insufficient to save the visibility of the Church, which we will take up in the following chapter; but now let us see what some object.

Firstly, they object that faith is a foundation like the form of the Church, when we read, “Just as a good architect placed a foundation and no man can place another foundation apart from that which has been placed, which is Christ Jesus;” [252](#) and, “You are built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets in Christ Jesus the chief cornerstone.” [253](#) “One God, one faith, one baptism.” [254](#)

I respond: The form of the Church is not internal faith (unless we mean to have an invisible Church) but external faith, *i.e.* the confession of faith. St. Augustine teaches this very clearly, [255](#) and experience witnesses it. For they are admitted to the Church who profess the faith. Moreover, in those passages, faith is not said to be the form or the foundation of the Church, but the foundation of justice, or the doctrine which is in the Church. Add that the Scriptures, just as they place faith in the Church, so also do they place charity and every gift of the Holy Spirit, but no Catholic teaches that those who lack charity and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are not in the Church.

Secondly, they object that in the definition of the Lateran Council, which is contained in the chapter *Firmiter, de summa Trinitate et fide Catholica*, there is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no man is saved; to which there is a similar definition of Pope Nicholas which is contained in *de consecrat.* dist. 1, can. *Ecclesia*, the Church is a gathering of Catholics, but none are faithful and Catholic who do not have faith in their heart, even if they profess it in mouth.

I respond: These are not definitions of the Church. The Lateran Council only meant to assert that there is one Church, not to accurately describe what it might be. Moreover it addresses the Church of the faithful, because by this name the baptized Christians are distinguished both from those who are manifestly infidels and also from catechumens who are not called faithful, as we showed above. Therefore, it is the same as if the Council would have said the Church of Christians is one, not many. Secondly, the name of faithful can be received for one who publicly professes the faith, and we will speak soon in the same way about the name Catholic. Thirdly, it could truly be said that the Church of the faithful, *i.e.*, of those who have true faith in heart, is one; for the Church especially gathers faithful only from intention, but when some false men are mixed in who do not truly believe, that happens apart from the intention of the Church. For if she could refuse then she would never admit them, or immediately exclude those just admitted after their fall.

Thus we come to those words of Pope Nicholas, “The Church is a gathering of Catholics.” We are necessarily compelled to say that they are called Catholics who profess the Catholic faith, irrespective of their internal faith; for Nicholas bids that Churches not be made, *i.e.* as he explains it, gatherings of Catholics, without the nod of the Apostolic See. Moreover it is plain that gatherings of Catholics cannot otherwise happen than by calling into one place all of those that are said to be Catholic, *i.e.* those who publicly profess that they are Catholics.

Thirdly, they object with the testimony of the Fathers, who said that heretics are not truly Christians, such as Tertullian, [256](#) Cyprian, [257](#) Athanasius, [258](#) and Augustine, [259](#) but the Church of Christ cannot be made of any but Christians, therefore those who do not have true faith do not pertain to the Church.

I respond: Those fathers speak on manifest heretics who have the faith of Christ neither in their heart nor in their mouth. The Christian name is of profession, and they are called Christians who preserve and follow the law and faith of Christ publicly.

Fourthly, they object that before the coming of Christ, not only the Synagogue of the Jews pertained to the Church of God, but all the Gentiles as well who, though dispersed throughout the world, truly worshiped one God. From that it seems to follow that faith might be a bond of the Church and hence, he who does not have faith does not pertain to the Church.

I respond: all those, and only those, constituted the Church of God, in all ages, who had been gathered at the same time in confession and asservation of one faith in one God, the creator of heaven and earth, whether these were made by sacrifices, or in another mode.

The last objection. The principle reason why secret heretics are included among the members of the Church, is that it seems that it is constituted for us with infallible certitude what body of men might be the Church; but this certitude cannot be had, even if secret heretics pertain to the Church, which is confirmed by the following arguments.

a) Those who are not baptized are not members of the Church, but no man knows for certain who might be truly baptized, both because the character of Baptism is invisible, and because even when exterior Baptism is furnished, few are present to see, and consequently the rest ought to be content with human faith.

b) The Church cannot exist without Bishops and priests, as Jerome teaches. [260](#) But who knows for certain who might be true Bishops and priests since that depends upon the intention of the one ordaining and upon an invisible character.

c) The excommunicated are not in the Church, as we taught above, but many are secretly excommunicated, namely, excommunicated ipso facto by law, and not promulgated in the presence of the people, for that reason will we not be compelled to doubt when we see someone whether they may be in the Church or not?

d) It often happens, or certainly can happen in some places, that manifest heretics feign themselves to be Catholics, and also Jews, Turks and pagans mix themselves with the faithful, and still, either they will not be of the Church, or we will say that the Church is the body of heretics, pagans and hypocrites.

I respond to these arguments: *resp.* a) That someone might be in the body of the Church does not require the character of Baptism, but external Baptism; nor is external Baptism required to reckon someone might be in the Church, but only that he might be admitted since, if anyone asks to be admitted to the Church, it will not happen without Baptism. Nevertheless, if someone says he has been baptized, and the contrary is not certain, he shall be admitted to the other sacraments, and through this he will be of the body of the Church. Now, the sign of this that if afterward it were to become known that he was not baptized, then he will be expelled from the

congregation if he deceived them and not received again unless after penance he will be baptized. On the other hand, if it is not his fault, he would not be cast out, rather what he lacked will be perfected in him. It would not be judged that he was not in the Church, but will be judged to have entered through another way than the ordinary power. For this very reason, Innocent III, [261](#) judged that a priest who was not baptized was truly in the Church, and commanded sacrifice to be offered for his soul just as for the faithful. Dionysius of Alexandria, as we have it in church history, [262](#) judged that a certain man was truly in the Church whom it was certain was not truly baptized but only secured the other Sacraments as one of the baptized.

resp. b) Two things can be considered on Bishops: Firstly, that they hold the place of Christ so for that reason we owe obedience to them, and because they cannot deceive us in those things necessary for salvation. Secondly, that they might have the power of Order and Jurisdiction. If it is considered in the first mode, we are certain with an infallible certitude that these, whom we see, are our true Bishops and Pastors. For this, neither faith, nor the character of order, nor even legitimate election is required, but only that they be held for such by the Church. Since they are Bishops on account of the Church, they are not against it; God assists those who are held for such lest they would err in teaching the Church. Now, if this is considered in the second manner, we do not have any but a moral certitude that these will truly be Bishops, although it is certain, with infallible certitude, that at least some are true, otherwise God will have deserted the Church. For this purpose, to hold the Church is certain and clearly visible in so far as the heads and members, the first consideration suffices.

resp. c) The secret excommunicates are in the Church by number but not by merit, *de facto* not *de jure*.

resp. d) In the first place, I say the difficulty is that men of this sort are not detected on the spot, but nevertheless delude the Church for a long time, still nothing detrimental can happen from that. The Church does not number those among her own except by reason of external profession (they do not judge men regarding their internal life). Moreover, that external profession is very holy, although badly usurped by men such as these. Therefore, they are in the body of the Church while they are joined to the faithful in the bond of profession and obedience, because it binds the universal Church, and renders it into one body. Nevertheless, it does not follow that the

Church on that account is the body of heretics, pagans and hypocrites, since even if a few men such as these are in the Church, nevertheless, we are certain with the certitude of divine faith that in the same Church, there are truly many faithful, pious and elect; just as in the human body nail and hair are discovered which do not live, and still no man thence gathers that the human body is nothing but nails and hair.

CHAPTER XI: Another Controversy is Proposed: Whether the Church is Always Visible, or Whether it can Err and Defect

WE HAVE explained what the Church is. Now what kind of thing it is must be spoken of. There is a conflict between the heretics, and us on three matters. 1) They say the true Church is invisible and known only to God. Thus it is noted by Frederick Staphilus [263](#) that, in the beginning the Lutherans made the Church invisible, then at length, when they saw the absurdity which followed thence, by a secret counsel, they established that the Church may be said to be visible, but still by this name of visible they mean really invisible.

First of all, we take Luther in his work on *The Slave Will*. When Erasmus objected to him that it was not credible that God would desert the Church for so long a time, Luther responded that God never deserted the true Church, but that which is commonly called the Church is not the Church of Christ, *i.e.* the Pope, Bishops, clergy, monks and the remaining multitude of Catholics, rather it is a certain pious few whom, like a remnant, God preserves. And this was always in the world, that the Church that men said was the Church was not rather the certain pious and few. In another place he says the Church is spiritual and only perceptible by faith. [264](#) In another work he says the same thing, “Who will show us the Church since it is hidden in the spirit and only believed? In the same way as it is said, I believe in the holy Church?” [265](#)

Now the Centuriators of Magdeburg define the Church as a visible body, [266](#) nevertheless they distinguish two Churches, and say the true Church is for the most part scanty, while the false one is very numerous, [267](#) because only they pertain to the true Church who enter through the narrow gate, *i.e.* the truly pious, hence the true Church is invisible. They add that in the time of Christ, truly the Shepherds as well as the Magi, Zacharia, Simeon, Mary, and Anna, were in the Church but not the Priests and the Sadducees, because the former were pious, the latter were impious. [268](#)

Philip Melanchthon repeats as often as he can that the Church is visible. [269](#) Nevertheless, he says in the same place that the word of God must be followed in controversies according to the confession of the true Church; moreover, this true Church he says cannot be Bishops and priests, nor a greater part of a Council, but certain pious and elect illuminated by God. Moreover, he says in the time of Elijah, the true Church was Elijah, Elisha, and the others that adhered to them, but not the remaining multitude of the Jews. Lastly, that in the time of Christ, the Church was Zachariah, Simeon, Mary and the shepherds because they were pious.

John of Brenz says in the Württemberg Confession [270](#) that the Church of God has the promise, still one must not stand before the judgment of Councils because few of the elect are there, and because often the greater part conquers the better part. And in his prolegomena he says: “You see that he [Pedro de Soto] makes the Church visible and perceptible in its corporeal senses. Therefore that article of the Creed will have to be blotted out, ‘I believe in the holy Catholic Church,’ and must be replaced with, *I see and perceive the holy Catholic Church.*” In like manner, Calvin says, “Scripture speaks on the Church in two ways, on the one hand when it gives the name to the Church, it understands that which is really in the presence of God. ... It is necessary for us to believe the Church is invisible and conspicuous only to the eyes of God.” [271](#) and again, “Moreover, to embrace the unity of the Church in that way, there is no need to pick out the Church herself with the eyes, or to touch it with the hands.” [272](#)

2) They teach that the visible Church so erred in faith and morals that it defected inwardly. Calvin says this in his preface to *The Institutes*: “But it is no small thing that they erred from the truth, while they did not recognize the Church except that which they discerned with their physical eye. . . . They groan unless the Church is always shown with a finger. . . . Why don’t we rather more permit God that, since he alone knows who are his own, he will, now and again, take the exterior notice of his Church from the sight of men.”

3) They teach that the true Church, that is the invisible one, cannot indeed defect, nor err, in those matters which necessarily pertain to salvation; nevertheless it can err in other things. Calvin argues thus. [273](#) We assert the contrary and we will confirm each point with its own arguments.

CHAPTER XII: The Church is Visible

FIRST, therefore, that the true Church is visible can be proved from all the Scriptures where the term Church is discovered. A visible congregation is always meant by the term Church. Calvin could not, and did not, advance even one passage where the term is attributed to an invisible congregation. Certainly, when it is said in Numbers, “Why did you lead the Church of the Lord into the wilderness?” [274](#) the Church is called that people who had gone out from Egypt. Thus in Kings, Scripture manifestly speaks on the visible Church, when it says, “The king turned his face and blessed every Church of Israel; for every Church of Israel stood.” [275](#) In Matthew XVI, “Upon this rock I will build my Church,” by the name of rock one either understands Christ, or the confession of faith as the heretics do, or Peter as we believe, the foundation of the Church is always something perceptible, as is clear, and consequently, the Church herself is perceptible, or visible. Even if now we see neither Christ nor Peter, still both had been put forth to be seen by corporeal senses, and now both are seen not in themselves but in a vicar, or in their successor, just as the King of Naples is not invisible when the king is away since he is seen in his viceroy. “Speak to the Church, if he will not hear the Church, etc.” [276](#)

Certainly neither [foundation] can be saved if the Church were invisible, as Acts relates, “Attend to the whole flock over which the Holy Spirit has placed you as Bishops to rule the Church of God.” [277](#) How could they rule a Church that they did not know? “These being removed from the Church passed into Phoenicia,” [278](#) and in the same chapter, “When they came to Jerusalem, they were received by the Church.” “Paul went up and greeted the Church.” [279](#) How do these agree with an invisible Church? Paul says that he persecuted the Church of God; [280](#) but it is known whom he persecuted from Acts IX. Next, he says, “I write these things to you, son Timothy, that you know how you ought to live in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, etc.” [281](#) But rightly he could not live in it unless he know what it might be.

Secondly, it is proven from other Scriptures where the Church is not named, but is clearly described. “He placed his tent in the sun.” [282](#) St.

Augustine explains that he placed his Church in the open, just as the sun which cannot be completely hidden, so neither can the Church be hidden. [283](#) Likewise in Isaiah II, Daniel II, and Micah IV, the Church is compared to a great and conspicuous mountain which can be in no wise hidden, according to the common exposition of Jerome on these citations, as well as Augustine. [284](#) Likewise in Matthew, “A city placed on a mountain cannot be hidden.” [285](#) Augustine explains this on the Church. Therefore the gospel parables on the sand, the net and the sheepfold, the dinner party etc. all show that the true Church, which is the kingdom of heaven, is visible. [286](#)

Thirdly, it is proved from the very beginning and progress of the Church. So as to pass over the Old Testament we note that the Church was so visible that they carried the visible sign of circumcision in their flesh. In the New Testament the Christian Church was whole in the beginning in the Apostles and disciples of Christ, who were so visible that the Holy Spirit visibly descended over them on the day of Pentecost. Next, on one day three thousand men were added to them, and again five thousand by the confession of faith and Baptism, as is clear from Acts. [287](#) Thereafter, all these and only these were held to be in the Church of Christ, who had united themselves to those first through Baptism and Confession of faith, and thence they did not receive through heresy or schism, or were expelled through excommunication.

Fourthly, it is proven from the very plan of the Church. The Church is a certain society, not of Angels, nor of souls, but of men. For a society of men cannot be spoken of unless it consists of external and visible signs, for it is not a society unless the members of that society recognize each other, *i.e.*, unless the bonds of society are external and visible. It is also confirmed from the custom of all human societies, for in the army, in a city, in a kingdom, and like things, men are ascribed to them in no other manner than with visible signs. For this reason St. Augustine says, “In no name of religion, whether true or false, can men be gathered together except by some participation in signs or visible Sacraments.” [288](#)

Fifthly, in the time of Christ, as Melanchthon and Illyricus would have it, the Church was only in Zacharia, Simeon, Anne, Mary and a few other pious persons, but not in the priests and the remaining multitude of the Jews. But it is certain that Zacharias, Simeon and the others communicated with the Priests in the temple, the sacrifices, etc. Zacharias was sacrificing

in the same temple; Anna did not leave the temple; Mary went yearly to the temple; Christ himself sent lepers to the priests and said, “Do what they tell you.” Therefore, the Lutherans actually act wrongly by not communicating with us and by not obeying the Pope.

Sixthly, it is proven from necessity; for we are all held to unite ourselves to the true Church and persevere in it under the danger of eternal death, *i.e.* to obey its head and communicate with the other members, as is clear from St. Cyprian, [289](#) Jerome, [290](#) and Augustine. [291](#) But this cannot be done if the Church is invisible.

Seventhly, from the aforesaid in the previous question, if the Church is a gathering of men using the same Sacraments and professing the faith of Christ, under the rule of legitimate pastors, as it was proved there, it necessarily follows that it is visible.

Finally, by the testimony of the Fathers, such as Origen, “The Church is full of brilliance from East to West, etc.” [292](#) Cyprian, “The Church, imbued with the light of the Lord, sprinkles its rays throughout the whole world.” [293](#) Chrysostom says, “It is easier for the sun to be extinguished than the Church hidden.” [294](#) Augustine says, “There is no safety in unity except from the promises of God that were declared to the Church, that, being set up on a mountain (as it was said), cannot be hidden,” [295](#) and again, “Can we not show the Church with our finger, brethren? Is it not clear?” [296](#) “What more is there to say than that they who do not see so great a mountain are blind? Who close their eyes to the lamp placed upon a lamp stand?” [297](#)

CHAPTER XIII: The Visible Church Cannot Defect

NOW that this true and visible Church cannot defect can be easily proven. Moreover it must be observed that many waste their time when they try to show that the Church cannot defect absolutely, for Calvin and the other heretics concede that, but they say it ought to be understood about the invisible Church. Therefore, we mean to show the visible Church cannot defect, and by the name Church, we do not understand one thing or another, but the multitude gathered together, in which there are Prelates and subjects.

1) It is shown from the Scriptures where the Church is clearly named, “Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.” [298](#) What is said in 1 Timothy is similar to this, “That you might know how you ought to live in the house of God which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and firmament of truth.” [299](#) In both it is a question of the visible Church, as we see and still hear the very truth asserted that the gates of hell are not going to prevail against that Church.

2) The promise is clear from other passages without the name *Church*, such as in the last chapter of Matthew: “Behold I am with you even to the consummation of the age.” Such words were spoken to a visible Church, evidently to the Apostles and the remaining disciples, whom the Lord spoke to on the day of his ascension. And since these men were not going to remain in the body even to the end of the world, it was necessary to say this promise pertained to their successors. Therefore St. Leo I [300](#) and Leo II [301](#) understand this on the perpetual duration of the Church.

Moreover, in Ephesians we read, “And he gave some as Apostles, others Prophets, other Evangelists, others Pastors and Teachers to the consummation of the Saints in the work of ministry, in the building of the body of Christ until we all run in the unit of faith, and the recognition of the son of God, in the completion of strength and the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ. [302](#) There the Apostle teaches that the ministry of pastors and teachers is going to remain in that Church for the continual building of

the body of Christ, and hence the visible Church, even to the day of Judgment. Were only an invisible Church to be in the world, that ministry would not be able to be found which cannot be exercised unless shepherds and sheep recognize it. It must be noted that although the Fathers understand this passage on the spiritual measure of the mystical body, more recent authors understand it on the corporal measure of the body of the blessed which they say is going to be of such a magnitude, as things were or had been in its perfect state of age. Nevertheless, all understand this passage on the last days, when the number of the elect will be filled. [303](#)

Besides, the Psalmist says, “God founded her in eternity,” [304](#) *i.e.* his Church, which is his city, as Augustine explains, and the matter speaks for itself, for the whole Psalm is on the foundation of the Christian Church, just as of a new and visible city. It begins, “The Lord is great and exceedingly praiseworthy, in the city of our God on his holy mountain: the whole world is founded in exaltation, etc.” Likewise in Isaiah, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, ... and I will strike a perpetual covenant with them, and their seed will be known among the Nations, and their seed in the midst of the people. All who see them recognize them, because they are the seed which the Lord has blessed.” [305](#) That this chapter is understood on the Church of the New Testament, Christ taught in Luke IV when he recited it in the Synagogue and explained it on his coming. Certainly this passage is so clear that it does not require exposition. How will that body be invisible if it is said, “All who saw them knew them because they are the seed which the Lord has blessed.”

3) Next come the testimonies from parables in which the Church is meant by the consensus of all, for the sand in which there are grains and chaff; the net in which there are good fish and bad; the field in which there is the grain and cockle; the dinner party in which there are the good and evil reclining; the sheepfold in which there are sheep and goats mean the visible Church, as even the heretics affirm. For an invisible Church does not have wicked and good, but only the good, according to their opinion. But the same parables teach that the Church visible Church is never going to perish even to the Day of Judgment. In Matthew it is said, “He will cleans his field, and he will gather the wheat into his barn, but the chaff he will burn in the inextinguishable fire,” [306](#) which certainly will happen before the day of judgment. And again, “Permit each to rise even to the harvest. The harvest will be the end of the world ... Thus the angels will go out in the

consummation of the age, and will separate the wicked from the midst of the just, etc.” [307](#)

Fourthly, it is proven from the Scriptures, which speak on the reign of Christ. The Psalmist says, “His throne is as the sun in my sight, and just as the moon completed forever, and a faithful witness in the sky . . . and I will place his seed in age upon age and his throne as a day of heaven.” [308](#) “In the days of those kingdoms God will raise the kingdom of heaven which will never be destroyed: and his kingdom will be handed to another people.” [309](#) “And for his kingdom there will be no end.” [310](#) These passages cannot be understood except about the fact that the true and visible Church of Christ is not going to perish. For the Kingdom of Christ, without a doubt, is his true Church. One cannot call a few secret men dispersed and separated from each other a kingdom, where one does not know the other such as the invisible Church of the Lutherans. For the kingdom is a multitude of men gathered who know one another.

Besides, in Psalm 88 (89) where the eternal kingdom of Christ is spoken of, it also says that in it there will be the good and the evil, and hence that the Church is visible, “But if its sons forsake my law and do not keep my justice, ... I will visit their iniquity with the rod and their sins with beatings, but I will not dispense my mercy from it, etc.” St. Cyprian beautifully explains such a passage in *de Lapsis*. In the other verse in Daniel where it says the kingdom of Christ is perpetual, we also read that the kingdom is a great mountain filling all the earth, which Isaiah [311](#) and Micah [312](#) call a conspicuous mountain according to the Septuagint.

5) It is proven from the testimonies of the Fathers. Origen and Chrysostom affirm it in the places we cited, but Augustine and Bernard express it more clearly. St. Augustine, disputing on Psal. 101 against the Donatists, (who said the whole visible Church had perished and only remained among the just in Africa) said, “But that Church, which was of all nations, no longer exists, it perished, yet those who are not in it say this. O impudent voice, just because you are not in it does not make it so. See to it lest you might not exist, since it will, even if you may not.” [313](#) Further on, he introduces the Church speaking in this way: “How long will I be in this world? Tell me, on account of those who say the Church did exist but does so no longer, that it apostatized and perished from all nations; yea it announced and that voice was not empty. Who announced it to me, unless it was on the road? When did he announce it? Behold, I am with you even to

the end of the age.” He says similar things on Psalm 147 and in his work *On the Unity of the Church*, chapter 13, 20, and in other places.

The response cannot be made that Augustine speaks about the invisible Church since that does not perish nor is it going to, as the Donatists admitted, when they tried to apply the verse “I am with you even to the end of the age,” to themselves, as Augustine related above.

On that verse in the Canticles, “I held him, nor will I let him go until I lead him into the house of my mother,” St. Bernard explains, “Then and thereafter the Christian race is not going to defect, neither faith from the earth nor charity from the Church; the rivers came, the winds blew and dashed against her, and she did not fall, to the extent that she was founded upon the rock, and the rock was Christ. Therefore neither the verbosity of the philosophers nor the jeering of heretics nor the swords of persecutors could or will be able to separate her from the love of God.” [314](#) These cannot be understood on the invisible Church, for the swords of tyrants will not pursue her, nor the verbosity of Philosophers or the jeering of heretics; therefore, the visible Church does not defect. Vincent of Lérin agrees, who rebukes the opinion of Nestorius as a grave error that taught the whole Church erred in the mystery of the Incarnation, to the extent that it followed blind Doctors. [315](#)

Lastly, it is proved by natural reason. Firstly, if at some time only an invisible Church remained in the world, then at sometime salvation was impossible for those who are outside the Church, since they cannot be saved unless they enter the Church just as in the time of Noah they necessarily perished who were not added to the ark; but they could not enter a Church that they were ignorant of, therefore they have no remedy.

Besides that, it is also shown from the plan of the one true Church that it is visible, therefore if the visible Church were to perish then no true Church would remain.

Next, either those hidden men who constituted an invisible Church openly profess their faith and abstain from the worship of idols or not; if they profess it, therefore the Church is not invisible, but especially visible just as it was in the time of the Martyrs; if they do not profess it, therefore there is no Church since the Church is not the true Church if there are no good men in it who are saved; moreover they are neither good nor saved who do not confess the faith, but instead, after they restrain it in their heart, profess treachery and idolatry outwardly, since in Romans the Apostle says,

“For the man who believes in heart to justice, let confession be made by his mouth unto salvation,” [316](#) and again, “Everyone who denies me before men, I will deny him before my Father.” [317](#) Consequently, it involves a contradiction for there to be a Church that altogether lacks a visible form, unless one were to place it outside the world where it will never be necessary to confess the faith.

CHAPTER XIV: The Church Cannot Err

IT remains that we prove the Church cannot err in any way, not even by apostatizing from God. Still, first place must be given to a little more careful explanation of our adversaries teachings and our own.

Calvin says that the famous proposition, “The Church cannot err,” is true with a two-fold restriction. 1) If the Church does not propose doctrines outside of Scripture, *i.e.* if it rejects traditions not written and only faithfully proposes what is contained in the Scriptures. Moreover, if you ask whether we might be certain that the Church always faithfully proposes those things that are in the Scriptures, Calvin responds by applying a second restriction, the Church always proposes faithfully what is contained in the Scriptures in matters necessary to salvation, still not in other matters and consequently some blemishes of error always remain in the Church.

The second restriction is that “The Church cannot err,” is understood on the universal Church alone, it is not extended to the Bishops who are representatives of the Church, as it is said on the Catholic side. Every Bishop manages the person of his particular Church and therefore all Bishops manage the person of the whole Church. So Calvin holds of the greater institution, [318](#) while in the lesser institution, [319](#) he fraudulently and mendaciously explains our opinion, saying we advance that the Church cannot err whether it uses the Word of God or not, since still he does not know we do not speak on the word of God absolutely, but only on the written word, and to say the Church cannot err whether it proposes that which is contained in the Scriptures, or doctrines outside of the Scriptures.

Next, our opinion is that the Church absolutely cannot err, neither in matters absolutely necessary, nor in others which must be believed or proposed that we must do, whether they are expressly held in the Scriptures or not, and when we say the Church cannot err, we understand that both on the universality of the faithful and on the universality of the Bishops, so that the sense might be of this proposition that the Church cannot err, *i.e.* that which all faithful hold as *de fide* is necessarily true and *de fide*, and likewise that which all Bishops teach as pertaining to the faith necessarily is true and *de fide*.

Since these have been explained this truth must be proved. 1) From the universal Church as it contains all the faithful and especially from that we read in 1 Timothy: “The Church of God is a pillar and firmament of truth.” Calvin responds that the Church is called a pillar and firmament of truth because, like a most trusty guardian, it preserves the preaching of the written word of God, not because it cannot err in any matter.

On the other hand, in this manner the offices of copyists were the pillars of truth because they very carefully safeguard all Scriptures, then the Apostle mentions Scriptures here, but he simply says the Church is the pillar and firmament of truth. Besides, how much more is a pillar than a simple guard? For the house rests upon the pillar and without that it falls. Thus when the Apostle calls the Church the pillar of truth, he means the truth of faith, in regard to us, rests upon the authority of the Church and the Church sanctions whatever is true and rejects whatever is false. Add that the Church was a pillar when there were no Scriptures, from which it follows that it is not called a pillar on account of protection of the Scriptures. Next, if it were a question of protection, then it would be better if Paul had compared the Church to a strong-box than to a pillar, for strong-boxes preserve books.

2) Besides, the Church is governed by Christ just as a spouse by her head, and by the Holy Spirit just as by the soul, which is clear from Ephesians, “He gave it a head over every Church, which is his body,” [320](#) and, “One body, one Spirit,” [321](#) and “A man is the head of a woman just as Christ is the head of the Church.” [322](#) Therefore, if the Church could err in doctrines of faith or morals, error would be attributed to Christ and the Holy Spirit. For that reason, the Lord said, “The Spirit of truth will teach you all truth.” [323](#)

Calvin responds that Christ and the Holy Spirit teach the Church all the truth that is simply necessary, but still some blemish is always left behind. It doesn’t follow that error would be attributed to Christ or the Holy Spirit, just as ignorance, which is beyond doubt in the Church, is not attributed to them.

I respond: Just as a man who is head of a woman is not held to remove from his wife all ignorance, still he is held to remove all error from which some great evil might arise, although the wife may be excused by ignorance; so also Christ is held to remove all error from the Church, from which great evil arises, such is all error in regard to faith. For it is a great

evil because the Church would worship God with a false faith, since divine worship consists in Faith, Hope and Charity, as Augustine teaches. [324](#)

3) We are obliged under the penalty of anathema to believe the Church in everything, as is clear from Scripture, “But if he will not listen to the Church, let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-collector.” [325](#) Councils impose every anathema on those not assenting to the decrees of the Church, but it would be wicked to oblige under so grave a penalty to assent to uncertain and false matters.

Calvin responds: Christ commanded that we listen to the Church because he knew the Church was going to teach nothing outside of the written word of God. On the other hand, so as to omit a great many things which we said in the disputation on traditions, the true Church teaches that the epistle to the Romans is the word of God, but the epistle to the Laodiceans is not, and likewise the about the Gospel of Mark and that of Nicodemus and other things that can be said, which were never written, consequently, it is not true that the Church teaches nothing outside the written word of God.

4) The Apostles’ Creed teaches that the Church is holy and this holiness properly consists in the profession of doctrines, therefore, Christian profession contains nothing but what is holy, *i.e.* what is true in regard to a doctrine of faith and just in regard to precepts of morals, and in this it really excels all the professions of the Philosophers, Heathen, Jews and heretics. For all have some false doctrines mixed with true ones.

5) If Calvin’s opinion were true, then a great part of dogmas of faith could be called into doubt, for there are many *de fide* which are not absolutely necessary to salvation. Duly to believe in the histories of the Old Testament, or that the Gospels of Mark and Luke are canonical writings, nay more any of the Scriptures, is not altogether necessary for salvation, since without this faith many were saved before the Scriptures were read; afterward, in the time of the New Testament, many barbarian nations were saved without them, as Irenaeus writes. [326](#) But this is most absurd, nor would Calvin admit there can be any doubt about Scripture, therefore it is not true that the Church cannot err only in those matters necessary for salvation.

Lastly it is proven from the Fathers who, as we in the *Controversy on the Word of God*, in the question on the judge of controversies, all call upon the Church in whatever question of faith. Certainly they would not do this if they thought the Church could be deceived in some way. Tertullian says,

“Well then, all Churches erred and the Holy Spirit looks to no one.” [327](#) Augustine said, “We hold to the truth of the Scriptures since we do that which has already pleased the universal Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves commends, that because the Holy Scripture cannot be deceived, whoever fears to be deceived by the obscurity of this question, let him consult the Church about it, as Sacred Scripture points out without any ambiguity.” [328](#) And again, “He speaks of the most insolent madness to dispute against that which the universal Church senses.” [329](#)

Now that the Church also can not err representatively is proven first from the fact that if all Bishops would err, the whole Church would also err, because the people are held to follow their own pastors, by what the Lord says in Luke, “He who hears you, hears me,” [330](#) and “Whatsoever they say, do.” [331](#) Secondly, from the epistle of the Council of Ephesus to Nestorius, where Nestorius is compelled if he would satisfy the Church he could swear an oath to attest that he believes just as the Bishops of the East and West do. Likewise we see that St. Augustine calls the decree of a general Council the consensus of the universal Church, [332](#) and rightly so since the Church does not teach that it does not discern anything except through her pastors, just as any body you like through its head. For that reason, in Scripture a congregation of Priests and elders is called the assembly (*ecclesia*) of all Israel. [333](#) Chrysostom explains what verse of Matthew XVIII, “Speak to the Church,” that is, to a Prelate. But this has more to do with the tract on Councils.

CHAPTER XV: The Arguments with Which they Set up an Invisible Church are Refuted

IT remains that we rebut the arguments of our adversaries. And the first is where they try to show that the Church is invisible by these testimonies. 1) “I will give my law in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they will be my people.” [334](#) There, God distinguishes the Church of the New Testament from the Church of the Old Testament, which was an external body and for that reason had a written law on external tablets, e.g. stone; the Church of the New Testament, however is a people that has an interior law and for that reason it is written on their hearts. The same thing is contained in Luke, “The kingdom of God does not come with observation and they will not say, “look her, or look there. Behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” [335](#) And in John, “The hour comes and now is when true worshipers will adore the Father in spirit and truth.” [336](#) Therefore the Church of the New Testament does not consist in some exterior sign, nor is it bound to places and corporal ceremonies, just as we see in Hebrews, “For you have not come to an easy mountain or an accessible fire, but to Mount Zion, the city of the living God,” etc. [337](#) There he compares the Synagogue to Mount Sinai the visible and tangible Church to the spiritual Mountain of Zion. Likewise in first Peter, “And you yourselves are built just as living stones of a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices to God;” [338](#) But this house is the Church. At length that the Church exists is an article of faith, consequently the Church is not seen, but believed.”

I respond: In the first passage from Jeremiah, it does not compare the Church with the Synagogue but the New Testament with the Old, which is clear in that passage. And although the New testament is properly charity, which is the law written on our hearts, the Old Testament is properly external doctrine, or the law written on stones, still it does not follow that the Church of the New Testament is invisible; just as the body of any

animal you like is visible, still it has many internal parts which are not seen, such as the heart, the liver, the vitals of life, and like things; so also the visible Church has many invisible things, Faith, Hope and Charity, etc. and although these gifts are invisible, they are necessary in the Church and in the Church alone; still not in all its parts, just as a sense is necessarily in an animal and only in an animal, and nevertheless not in all its parts.

To the second I say the kingdom of God is understood in Luke by grace, through which God now reigns in the hearts of men, as Theophylactus explains it, or Christ himself as Bede explains it. For Christ speaks on both comings. The Pharisees asked, “When will the kingdom of God come,” *i.e.*, the kingdom of the Messiah? But the Lord responded that the Messiah came and is going to come again on the Day of Judgment. Therefore, on the first coming he said, “The kingdom of God will not come with observation, behold the kingdom of God is within you,” *i.e.* the Messiah has come and is present now. On the second he adds, “And they will say to you, behold he is here, or behold there, do not go out, just as lightening strikes under heaven, etc., so will be the coming of the son of man.”

To the third I say, it is taught in that passage that the particular worship of God in the Church is going to be internal, but for that reason it does not follow that the Church herself is invisible, as we said above, nor does it follow that all external worship must be rejected and external temples be destroyed. The Lord does not treat on the place of prayer in that verse, but on the manner and rite. For if he meant to say that true worshipers are no longer going to worship God in Jerusalem or on Mount Gerizim, what he said would have been false. It is certain that Peter and John, after they received the Holy Spirit went up to the temple in Jerusalem at the ninth hour for prayer. [339](#) It is also certain that afterward there always were in Palestine Christians who worshipped God in Jerusalem and on mount Gerizim, and everywhere that bordered those places. He speaks on the rite of worship, or of prayer, in other words, you will adore the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem, *i.e.* neither the rite of the Samaritans nor that of the Jews, but you will worship in the rite of Christians which is a rite worshiping in spirit and truth, but that is explained in two ways.

Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthymius oppose “in the spirit” in this passage to the ceremonies of the Jews, in so far as they were corporal, that “in truth”, to the same ceremonies in so far as they were a figure and shadow of things to come. Theophylactus, St. Thomas and Cajetan oppose “in the Spirit” to

the ritual of the Jews, which was especially external and corporal, but that, “In truth,” to the ritual of the Samaritans, which was false and erroneous, for these worshiped the true God as well as false gods. Consequently, the Lord says that the rite of the Christian people will be particularly spiritual and at the same time true and pure from all error, although the spiritual rite will not exclude corporal ceremonies, in so far as they promote spiritual worship.

I answer the fourth with Chrysostom and Theophylactus, St. Thomas and others. Through the spiritual mountain of Zion and the city of the living God the Apostle does not understand the Church militant, but the Church triumphant, which is constituted from blessed souls. Accordingly, he compares the Synagogue with the Church and says the men of the Old Testament came to a physical mount Zion that they would see God there in some manner through corporeal images, but the men of the new Testament came not in fact but in hope, to the spiritual mount Zion, *i.e.* to the glory of the blessed, where God is seen face to face, and it is added for this reason, “And the abundance of many thousands of Angels, and the spirits of the perfect just, etc.”

I respond to the fifth that something can be said to be spiritual in two ways. In one way, according to substance, which is why in Ephesians they are called, “Spiritual wickedness in the heavens.” [340](#) In the other way, according to the ordination to the Spirit, because something is ordered to the spirit or the spirit is dominated in it. This is why in 1 Corinthians II a man is called spiritual, and in 1 Cor. XV the spiritual body, and in 1 Peter II all good works are called spiritual offerings, such as almsgiving and fasting. Therefore, St. Peter, when he says the Church is a spiritual house, he understands this in the second way, for he means the Church is not a house made from wood and stones, but built from men consecrated to God.

To the sixth it can be said that in the Creed it is not merely I believe in the Church, but, I believe in the holy Church. Consequently the holiness of the Church is without any doubt invisible. But it is better to say that in the Church something is seen and something is believed. For we see that body of men which is the Church, yet we do not see the fact that this body is the true Church of Christ, rather we believe it. For the true Church is that which professes the faith of Christ. Who clearly knows our faith is of Christ? We indeed believe it is firm and certain, but it is one thing to believe and

another to see, nay more to believe is the very thing defined by the Apostle, the argument is not of appearances.

What must be noted so as to understand it better, is that every teaching that is *de fide* is born from two propositions on faith and then the whole conclusion is not apparent; or one is on faith and the other is from what is apparent and then the conclusion is partly apparent, partly not apparent. Such is this conclusion, these men who now profess the faith under the Roman Pontiff are in the Church of Christ; for it arises from a syllogism: the Church of Christ is a body of men professing the faith of Christ, under the rule of the legitimate pastors; but these who are under the Roman Pontiff today are of such a body; therefore they are the Church of Christ. In such a syllogism, the major is on faith, and consequently is not apparent whereas the minor is evident, for we place nothing in the minor that is not perceived with the eyes or the ears. Therefore the conclusion is properly advanced as partly evident and partly non-apparent.

Next, the very matter, or (that we might speak logically) that *incomplexity*, concerning which the plan and definition of the Church is preached, is a certain visible thing; whereas the *complexity*, or the connection of what has been preached with the subject is preserved only by faith. The examples whereby this is illustrated are not lacking. Accordingly, that man who is Christ the son of God, the Apostles saw and at length that he was Christ the son of God they did not see, but they believed. For this reason in John XX, it was said to Thomas, “You have believed Thomas because you have seen me.” And in the creed we say, “I believe in one Baptism,” although we might see and perceive Baptism, *i.e.* the aspersion of water and the conferral of the words. Therefore we do not see, but we believe that the sprinkling of the water and the conferral of the words is the Baptism of Christ, that is a specific sacrament.

CHAPTER XVI: The Arguments Whereby our Adversaries try to Show the Church can Defect are Answered

NOW, our adversaries attempt to show that the Church can defect and at some time did defect with these arguments. 1) In the beginning of the world Adam and Eve alone constituted the whole Church at least in power; but each lost the faith and apostatized from God, as is clear from Genesis III and from the Fathers. [341](#)

2) In the time of Moses the whole Church apostatized from God. For Aaron, the High priest, proposed to worship the calf, and the whole people shouted, “These are the gods of Israel.” [342](#)

3) In the time of Elijah the whole visible Church had defected. For in 3 Kings Elijah says, “I alone am left. And the Lord said to him, ‘I have reserved to myself seven thousand men in Israel who have not bent the knee to Baal’,” [343](#) but these were secret not doubtful, since not even Elijah knew them.

4) It is said in Isaiah, “The ox knows its owner and the ass the trough of its lord, but Israel does not know me. From the soul of the foot even to the crown of the head there is no health in it.” [344](#) And in Jeremiah, “The houses of Israel have been confounded and their kings and princes, even the priests and prophets speaking in the wood; you are my Father, why do you contend with me in judgment? All have forsaken me, says the Lord.” [345](#) And in Chronicles, “Many days will pass in Israel without the true God, without a priest or teacher, and without the law.” [346](#)

5) It was foretold that the Church would be in visible inactivity. “The hosts will cease, and the sacrifice.” [347](#) “When the son of man will come, do you think he will find faith on earth?” [348](#) “Unless the great dispersal will happen first, and the man of sin will have been revealed.” [349](#) Therefore, Calvin thinks that what we read in Jeremiah has been said to us, “Do not trust in the words of the a lie, saying the Temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord,” [350](#) namely these ancient Jews did not believe the prophets’ warnings about the desolation because they saw the had the

temple of the Lord, and external ceremonies; so Calvin thinks we boast that we have the ancient Churches, the successions of Bishops, the Apostolic See and meanwhile we do not attend to the Scriptures, which clearly foretell desolation to us.

6) The General Council of Basel deposed Eugene as a heretic and all those adhering to him and chose Felix, thereupon after the Council was concluded and dispersed, again Eugene crept into the See without any canonical election and from him were born as many as were Popes, Cardinal and Bishops afterward, therefore at least from that time the Church adhering to the Roman Pontiff was not the true Church and since there was no other visible body, the visible Church perished. Calvin places this argument in the preface of his *Institutes* and again in the last place as though it were his strongest argument, adding, “This is discovered that it is necessary for them to adhere or to define the Church otherwise, or else we hold all to be schismatics.”

7) They advance the testimony of the Fathers and first of all Hilary. “The love of walls gave you a beginning; you venerate the Church of God badly in buildings, you badly heaped under them the name of peace; to me mountains, lakes, prisons and deep holes are safer.” [351](#) There he says the true Church was so obscured in his time that it could only be found in catacombs and caverns. Then Jerome, speaking in the same time, says, “The whole world groaned and marveled that it was Arian.” [352](#) St. Basil says the same thing, [353](#) and St. Bernard, [354](#) so deplore the vices of the prelates of their times that they sufficiently show everyone had gone their own way and there was no visible Church. Then, Chrysostom teaches that sometimes there is no visible sign by which the true Church could be recognized, and therefore the only recourse is to return to the Scriptures. [355](#)

I respond, *ad* 1) If that our first parents sinned was for the Church to defect then not only the visible but even the invisible Church defected which is against our adversaries’ point. Secondly I say there was no Church then, nor only two human beings in the Church, rather it was only the beginning of the Church and the beginning was both material and formal. Adam was the material beginning of the Church because he was the first of all in the Church; he was also the formal principle because he was the head or teacher and ruler of the people of God so long as he lived. Consequently the head of the Church cannot err by teaching false doctrine, nevertheless he can err by living badly and even by thinking badly as a private man. We

see this happened in Adam since at one time he lived badly and perhaps even thought badly about God, nevertheless he did not teach badly.

ad 2) In regard to Aaron and the people that worshiped the golden calf, I say in that time there was neither a head nor a body of the Church to have defected since only Moses was the head whom it is certain did not err. Accordingly, Aaron was not yet the high priest since that happened later, as is clear from Exodus XL. Moreover the body did not fail, for all the Levites were immune from that sin, which is clear from the same chapter, where Moses said, “‘If anyone is of the Lord let him join with me,’ and all the sons of Levi gathered around him.” [356](#)

ad 3) Concerning the time of Elijah, both the consequent and the antecedent of this argument are denied. The consequent because the plan for the Jewish people and the Christian people are not the same. The people of the Jews were not a universal Church as the Christian people are, but a particular one and on that account faithful and just men were found outside of that people, such as Melchisedech, Job and later Cornelius, the Centurion and the Eunuch of Queen Candice, as well as several others. Therefore, even if the whole Synagogue of the Jews defected all the Church of God on earth would not have defected on the spot. But the antecedent is also denied since it cannot be shown that the Synagogue of the Jews altogether defected even to the coming of Christ. After that it did not as much defect as it was changed into something better.

Now to that about Elijah I say that he did not speak on every people of the Jews, but only about the part that had been subjected to the king of Samaria. It is certain from the same book of Kings that in the time of Elijah Asa ruled in Jerusalem and after him Josaphat, the best kings, and under them the people and the priests very clearly persisted in true religion. Next, when the Lord said, “I have reserved to myself seven thousand men,” he added, “in Israel.” Then those who were under the king of Samaria were said to be of Israel, while those who were under the king of Jerusalem were said to be of Judah. Thus Philip Melanchthon was evidently deceived, since in his work he says that in the time of Elijah the Church was only in Elijah, Elisha and a few priests. [357](#) Calvin followed him in this error in the preface of his *Institutes*, which especially rests upon this argument on Elijah.

ad 4) Augustine responds to this when he taught that Prophets and Apostles sometimes rebuke the whole people as though not one of them

were good, although there still might be many good and on the contrary sometimes they console all as if all were good when it is certain there are many wicked. Ezekiel says, “All the house of Israel is contrite on their forehead, and hard of heart.” [358](#) Yet he also says, “The sign of the Thau is upon the foreheads of all that groan and weep, over all abominations that are done in its midst.” [359](#) In Galatians the Apostle says, “O irrational Galatians, who bewitched you to not obey the truth?” [360](#) Yet he says later, “Brethren, and if a man be overtaken in any fault, you, who are spiritual, instruct such a one in the spirit of meekness.” [361](#)

To the verse from Chronicles I respond that in the first place it is only understood on the kingdom of Israel, not the kingdom of Judah. Next, perhaps the Scripture speaks on the time that was going to be after the coming of the Messiah, for now many days have passed in Israel without God, without Priest and without the Law.

ad 5) I say that we do not boast in temples and the succession of Bishops and the Apostolic See in themselves, but on account of the promise of Christ who said, “You are Peter and upon this rock, ... and the gates of hell will not prevail.” The Jews never had such a promise. Nor is it true that the ruin of the Church was foretold in the Scriptures, rather they oppose is true everywhere. Hence, to that passage of Daniel, even if Hilary, as well as even Hyppolitus and Apollinarius who are cited by Jerome [362](#) understand that prophecy on the time of Antichrist, still it is beyond doubt that they were deceived. For Daniel speaks on the overturning of Jerusalem and the end of the sacrifice of the Jews. This is how Chrysostom and Theophylactus, and Jerome, [363](#) Augustine, [364](#) as well as Eusebius, [365](#) Clement of Alexandria, [366](#) Tertullian, [367](#) and the common opinion of the Jews as we also see cited by Jerome in his commentary on Daniel IX.

And the heretics are compelled to admit this answer; for they say that now is the times of Antichrist and has been for many centuries, and nevertheless the sacrifices and the sacrifice has not ceased, therefore they ought to understand this passage of Daniel not on the time of Antichrist but on the overturning of Jerusalem, which is evidently gathered from the Gospel. “When you will see the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by the Prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place, he who reads shall understand, then those who are in Judea should flee to the mountains. [368](#) Likewise he explained the same thing in Luke, “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by an army, then know that its destruction

approaches, then those who are in Judea, let them flee to the mountains.”
[369](#)

Now, to that which we find later in Luke, “Do you think he will find faith on earth?” [370](#) I say that the Lord does not speak on faith simply, but on the outstanding faith that is found in only a few, and in the last days among very few. This is how Jerome explains it, [371](#) and Augustine, [372](#) or we could say with Theophylactus that the Lord speaks on faith absolutely and means few faithful are going to be left in the time of Antichrist, but still not be none, nor so few that they could not make the Church.

Now to that of Paul I say that by the name of dispersal either Antichrist himself is understood, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylactus and Augustine [373](#) explain. They argue it should be called a dispersal as a metonym, because it will cause many to leave Christ; or it means the defection from the Roman Empire, as Ambrose, Sedulius and Primasius explain, which is a very probable opinion, or at length it will mean a going out from the Church that is not general but particular, *i.e.* not of all but of many, or at least of all secret heretics, as some of the Fathers beautifully explain it. [374](#) in the same way that many who were in the Church for a long time with a feigned spirit, at length clearly leave through the profession of manifest heresy, so when Antichrist comes nearly every secret heretic who then will be discovered in the Church will leave it, and join themselves to Antichrist.

ad 6) I say that the Council of Basel was at first legitimate, for even the legate of the Roman Pontiff was present, as well as a great number of Bishops, but in the time that it “deposed” Eugene and elected Felix, it was not a Council of the Church but a schismatic Council, seditious and of altogether no authority. Thus it is called in the last Lateran Council, sess. 11, and hence Eugene was always a true Pope and this clearly another lie of Calvin when he says that this Council preserved its authority and dignity even to the end.

In the first place, at the time the Council dared to pronounce sentence, there was no legate of the Pope present and all the Bishops had left, but a certain Cardinal from Arles usurped the office of president and because the Bishops were very few, they introduced into the Council a multitude of priests so that it became against the form of ancient Councils, being composed not of Bishops but of priests.

Next, in the same time another Council was held in Florence in which the Supreme Pontiff presided and since the Latin and Greek Bishops who sat there without comparison many more than were at Basel, and together with the Bishops the Greek Emperor and the legate of the Latin Emperor were present, so that it could not be doubted which of the two was a true general Council of the Church.

Thirdly, God willed to show what he thought by afflicting Basel with a plague so horrible that a greater part of the Fathers who were there either were killed or were compelled to withdraw. Aeneas Sylvius (the future Pius II) related all of this in his history of the Council of Basel as well as what the heretics there had recently published as if favoring them on account of the condemnation of Eugene, when really he did them a great deal of harm. Add that the Council of Basel was continued at Lausanne and it subjected itself to Pope Nicholas V, as is clear from his epistle.

ad 7) Now we come to the citations of the Fathers. To the one from Hilary, firstly I respond in the way Augustine once did to the Donatists, [375](#) who objected with the same testimony, that the Church was at one time obscured by a multitude of scandals, still it stood out in its most loyal members, just as it did in the time which Hilary spoke. The Church stood out in Pope Julius I, Athanasius, Hilary, Eusebius Vercellensis, and then in Pope Damasus, Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nazanzien and many others who were steadfast pillars of the Church.

Secondly, I say that Hilary spoke in that citation on the Church at Milan, in which many simple people venerated Auxentius as a Catholic even though he was still an Arian, since Auxentius behaved with such a wonderful subtlety the Arians knew them as one of their own yet he was believed to be Catholic by many simple men. Hilary meant that no trust should be put in Auxentius even if he seemed to be a Bishop and preached in the Church and that it would be better to remain in prisons and caves with right faith than to be in the Church of God with heretics.

Nevertheless, what he said about one city, one Church and one Bishop cannot be applied to the universal Church. It can happen that one Bishop in one city and in one temple should teach heresy but still that all the Bishops in other cities and churches of the whole world would not do the same thing.

To that passage of Jerome I respond, there are two figures in his words, one of understanding, when he says, "The world groaned," for he calls the

world a great part of the world, but not the whole world, the second of abuse, when he says, “and marveled to find itself Arian,” for he calls the Arians improperly those who subscribe to heresy through ignorance. He speaks on that multitude of Bishops who throughout the world agreed with Ariminus and being deceived by the Arians decreed that the term *o`moousioj* (*homoousios*, *i.e.* consubstantial) must be abolished, even though they did not know what it meant. Certainly they were not heretics, nor did they err at least materially, just as if some Catholic might advance a blasphemous opinion externally with the tongue thinking it is a pious prayer, such a man would not properly be a blasphemer. For that reason the same Bishops, as they were admonished and recognized the fallacy, immediately corrected their error and with tears did penance for the blasphemy, even though it was only advanced by the tongue, and it seemed the whole world marveled and groaned to find itself Arian.

To Basil I say that in those epistles he did not deplore the vices of Catholics but the misery of the Church on account of the infestation of heretics. What was said in that citation are against Bishops, not against Catholic Bishops as Brenz though, but against Arian Bishops.

It is perfectly credible that Brenz erred from malice rather than ignorance. In the same place that he teaches that Catholic Bishops are not the true Church he relates from the history of Ruffinus about the holy monk Moses, who refused in any way to be ordained by the Bishop of Alexandria, who was the primary Patriarch of Alexandria after the Roman Pontiff. [376](#)

But in the same book and chapter, Ruffinus says that the Bishop of Alexandria was an Arian and savagely persecuted Catholics and for this reason Moses refused to be ordained by him in preference to a Catholic Bishop, thus there is no reason with which one could excuse or cover-up the fraud and impudence of Brenz.

To the quote from Bernard I say that he rebukes the vices of morals, but not of doctrine, and for that reason believed that those wicked Bishops were not truly Bishops. He himself refuted the heretics who said that bad Bishops were not really Bishops from the Apostolic Institution. [377](#)

To the quote from Chrysostom the response is above, those words were taken from an incomplete work which either has an Arian heretic for an author or was corrupted by heretics.

CHAPTER XVII: The Arguments

Whereby our Adversaries try to show that all Shepherds of the Church can Err at the Same Time.

OUR adversaries try to show that the Church, or at least all the shepherds of the Church could err at the same time. 1) Because in the time of the prophet Micah, all the Prophets (about 400 with the exception of him) erred, as is clear from the Kings, [378](#) hence the Church, which they followed as they ought, was deceived. Secondly, in Isaiah it says, “His watchmen are all blind, they know nothing.” [379](#) Thirdly, in the Lord’s passion the High priest along with all the priests and elders of the people condemned Christ to the penalty of death. In Mark XIV the whole people, seduced by the priests, cried out to Pilate, “Crucify him!” In Mark XV we see that at the same time all the Apostles lost the faith, since the Lord, “Reproached them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, etc.” [380](#) And in Matthew, “You will all be scandalized on my account.” [381](#)

Add that there are also Catholics that say during in the Lord’s passion the true faith only remained in the Blessed Virgin Mary, consequently they believe this is signified by the one candle that is kept alight in the Night Office [382](#) during the Triduum such as Alexander Alensis, [383](#) and John Turrecremata. [384](#) But these are light enough and will be refuted with little labor.

To the first I say, those four hundred prophets clearly were pseudoprophets, and it is not unknown that they were even counseled by Achab himself. For in the same book when King Josaphat said, “Is there not any prophet of the Lord by whom we might ask the Lord?” Achab responded, “One remains, but I hate him because he prophecies nothing but evil.” Certainly if anyone now in the midst of Saxony would counsel four hundred Lutheran ministers about justifying faith, and afterwards one

Catholic, it would be no wonder if the greater part would err. Still, besides the Lutheran ministers, because apart from Saxony and neighboring places, there are many others where the true faith is preached, so it does not follow that all the Jewish teachers in the time of Achab erred, even if the four hundred erred. The Prophets who were in Samaria erred, but besides these there were in Judaea many other Prophets and (what is foremost) there were priests in Jerusalem, by whom they duly apply to respond to consult from the law of the Lord.

To the second I say the those words of the Prophets are figurative, and directed to all, but really they ought to be understood not on all, but on many, as we said above.

To the third I say the priests and the High Priests did not have the privilege to not err when teaching the people, even to the times of Christ, but with Christ present and teaching us their error was a little nuisance. Nay more, this seems to have been foretold by Jeremiah when he said, “The law will perish from the priest, the word from the profit and counsel from the wise.” [385](#) However, on account of the honor of the priesthood God provided that the judgment of the high priest Caiaphas in some sense (though not from his intent) was true and just. It is said in John XI that he was the priest for that year and he prophesized.

What attains to the people, who cried out, “Crucify him,” I say that people was not all of the Jews, but only some and perhaps a lesser part, for in the city of Jerusalem there was also Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, and many others who disapproved of this, and outside of Jerusalem in the rest of all Judaea, and there were many Jews dispersed throughout the world who knew nothing about the death of Christ, hence they remained in the true faith and religion.

Now I will speak to what the what was said to the Apostles: First, it is clear the Apostles were not Bishops except by designation, rather they were only material parts of the Church which could err, nor did the Church consist in them alone, for the status of the Christian Church with the obligation to enter it began on the day of Pentecost, when after all the mysteries of the redemption were carried out the Apostles began to publically promulgate faith in Christ as well as Baptism in Jerusalem. Therefore, even if all the Apostles erred in the time of Christ’s passion in regard to faith, their error caused no harm to the universal Church.

Secondly I say, it is not probable that the Apostles lost the faith, since we do not read that they were rebuked except on the faith of the resurrection, but they could not lose that when they did not have it, unless after the Lord rose, were Christ often to have preached to them beforehand that he was going to rise; nevertheless they thought he spoke figuratively and did not understand, nor did they believe. Accordingly, when he said in Luke, "They will kill him and he will rise on the third day," Luke adds, "and they understood none of this, and the word was hidden from them and they did not understand what was said." [386](#) We also read in John XX that Peter and John, after they heard from Mary Magdalene that the Lord's body was taken from the tomb, right away they ran to the tomb and after they saw the garments and the shroud they believed that the body of Christ was taken by someone, "For they did not yet know the Scriptures that it was fitting or him to rise again from the dead," *i.e.* they believed he was taken by someone because they did not know he ought to rise again. Besides, in Luke it was said to Peter, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith shall not fail." [387](#) How believable will it be that on the same night the faith of Peter failed so that it would not remain in faith, since what did not remain in his mouth is certain. Next, Mary Magdalene burned with the greatest charity in that three day period, as is clear from John XIX and XX, but without faith there can be no charity, therefore the Magdalene did not lose faith in Christ, which she had beforehand, therefore it is not the case that faith only remained in the Blessed Virgin.

Now, to what is said in the last chapter in Mark, "He rebuked their unbelief," this does not mean they lost the faith that they had, but they were late to believe what they did not yet believe, which at least would have been some kind of sin, but not properly infidelity. Moreover, that of Matthew XXVI, "You will all suffer scandal on my account this night," means the sin the Apostles would commit in flight, fear and staggering, even in regard to the faith, due to the fact of the Lord's passion; still not every staggering is infidelity, but only deliberate staggering.

But I marvel at John de Turrecremata, who, on account of this very weak argument based on the candle, says it is against the faith of the universal Church to assert that faith did not remain only in the Blessed Virgin on the day of the Lord's passion. Rupert says, [388](#) that the last candle is also customarily extinguished at that time, and he adds that on those three nights after all the lights are extinguished, a new fire is customarily lit from a

stone, and through it all the lights which beforehand were extinguished are lit, which signifies the Prophets whom the Jews killed in different centuries, and brought darkness to the minds of those killing them. Through the last Christ is signified, whom they killed, giving birth to the worst darkness in themselves, but through the new light, which is struck from the stone after those three days the new light of Christians is signified, which arose from Christ the stone struck by the Jews in our minds.

But if custom were neglected, the ancient Churches shall bring the force in that use which we have now, the last candle is not extinguished; then the response can be made with Abulensis [389](#) that through that candle the Blessed Virgin is meant, in whom alone, it is piously believed, there was explicit faith in the resurrection in those three days. Still, it does not follow that there was error in others or infidelity, because they were not held to explicitly believe in the resurrection until after its legitimate promulgation and approval, and especially for those who were out of Jerusalem and had heard nothing about Christ, and there it seems dangerous to say that true faith only remained in the Blessed Virgin; both because if the Church would have perished then not one person could be said to be the Church, since the Church is the people and the kingdom of God; and because then they who were away from Jerusalem even to that time that they had the true faith, would soon have lost it without fault.

FINIS

Footnotes

[1](#)

De Unitate Ecclesiae.

[2](#)

De Unitate Ecclesiae.

[3](#)

Contra Parmenianum, in six books.

[4](#)

lib. 2. *doctrin. fid.* cap. 8.9.10, etc.

[5](#)

Summam de Ecclesia.

[6](#)

in lib. 4 de dogm. Ecclesiast., cap. 2.

[7](#)

Controversia, 3.

[8](#)

1 parte defensionis suae contra Brentium.

[9](#)

in confut. 7 artic. Confessionis Augustanae.

[10](#)

Philippica 4, et in lib. de Scripturae et Ecclesiae Auctoritate.

[11](#)

Enchiridium.

[12](#)

lib. 6 contra haeres.

[13](#)

In explicat. Symboli and all others who have written on the Creed.

[14](#)

In two books de Ecclesia et ordinat. Ministr.

[15](#)

de Locis, lib. 4.

[16](#)

In his *Analysis fidei Catholicae*, parte 6.

[17](#)

Romans VIII:30.

[18](#)

Psal. 25(26)

[19](#)

Psal. 88 (89)

[20](#)

In Psal. 81 (82)

[21](#)

Quoted in Waldens, tom. 1, lib. 2, cap. 8.

[22](#)

Artic. 1,2, 3, 5, 6 as is contained in the Council of Constance, sess. 15.

[23](#)

De haeresibus, ca. 88.

[24](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 1, §13.

[25](#)

Lib. 1, epist. 2

[26](#)

lib. *De Haeres.* cap. 69.

[27](#)

Cyprian lib. 4, epist. 2; Epiphanius *in haeres. Catharorum*.

[28](#)

lib. 1 *de poenitentia*, cap. 1-2.

[29](#)

lib. 3 *de fabulis haereticorum*.

[30](#)

Contra Parmenianum, lib. 3, cap. 2.

[31](#)

in assert. art. 32.

[32](#)

In locis cap. de discrimine peccati mortalis et venialis.

[33](#)

Instit. lib. 2, cap. 8, §58 et 59.

[34](#)

Articl. 6 & 20.

[35](#)

artc. 32.

[36](#)

lib. 3, ca. 2, §8-11.

[37](#)

Contra Iovinianum, lib. 2.

[38](#)

Instit., lib. 3, cap. 1, §2 and to a lesser degree in cap. 8, §4 et sequentibus.

[39](#)

De regno Christi, lib. 1, cap. 5.

[40](#)

De erroribus Pontificorum, locus 12; *de Ecclesia*, lib. 1, cap. 3.

[41](#)

Breviculus collation., collat. 3.

[42](#)

1 Cor. V:12.

[43](#)

hom. 24 in Ioannem.

[44](#)

Lib. 12 in Ioan., cap. 50.

[45](#)

Tract 4 in Ioannem and elsewhere,

[46](#)

Tract. 4 in Ioannem.

[47](#)

De Justa haereticorum punitione, lib. 2, cap. 2.

[48](#)

Luke V.

[49](#)

de bono persever., cap. 8.

[50](#)

Lib. 3, cap. 3.

[51](#)

De Praescriptionibus.

[52](#)

Contra Donatistas, lib. 4, cap. 10.

[53](#)

Quaest. 11 super Matthaeum.

[54](#)

Lib. 3, epist. 3.

[55](#)

Lib. 2, *Contra Cresconium*, cap. 34.

[56](#)

Lib. 4, ep. 2.

[57](#)

Quest. 11 super Matthaeum.

[58](#)

2 Tim. II:17.

[59](#)

Lib. 3, epist 3; lib. 4 epist. 2.

[60](#)

Lib. 4 de Baptismo, cap. 12.

[61](#)

De Baptismo, lib. 3, cap. 19.

[62](#)

1 Cor. V:12.

[63](#)

III, Q. 8, art. 3.

[64](#)

Luke V.

[65](#)

Tract. 122 in Ioannem.

[66](#)

John X:16.

[67](#)

Rom. XII:5.

[68](#)

Cant. VI:8.

[69](#)

De Unitate Ecclesiae.

[70](#)

24.q.1, can. *Pudenda*, et can. *Schisma*.

[71](#)

Catechism of the Council of Trent, Part I: The Creed, Article IX.

[72](#)

Lib. 4, cap. 62.

[73](#)

Lib. 4, epist. 9 ad Florentium Papianum.

[74](#)

Hom. 3 in 1 Cor.

[75](#)

Hom. 11 in epistolam ad Ephesios.

[76](#)

In Caput Primum Amos.

[77](#)

in cap. 3 ad Titum.

[78](#)

De Fide et Symbolo, cap. 10.

[79](#)

Contra Parmenianum, lib. 1.

[80](#)

De fide ad Petrum, cap. 38 et 39.

[81](#)

1 lib. 2, cap. 9 doctrinalis fidei antiquae.

[82](#)

Lib. 4 de Scripturis et dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, cap. 2, part. 2.

[83](#)

John VI.

[84](#)

1 Cor. XII:4.

[85](#)

Ephesians I:22.

[86](#)

John XXI.

[87](#)

Romans XII:5.

[88](#)

De Consecrat., distinctione prima, can. Ecclesia.

[89](#)

cap. *Firmiter, de Summa Trinitate et fide Catholica.*

[90](#)

Luke X:16.

[91](#)

Lib. 4, ep. 9.

[92](#)

Part I, *In explication of the Creed*, Article IX.

[93](#)

Doctr. fid. antiquae, tom. 1, lib. 2, cap. 9.

[94](#)

Summae de Ecclesia, lib. 1, cap. 3.

[95](#)

De Script. et dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, lib. 4, cap. 2, part. 2

[96](#)

1 Cor. V:2, 6, 13.

[97](#)

11, q. 3, can. *Canonica*.

[98](#)

Historiae, lib. 5, cap. 24.

[99](#)

Haeres. 42, which is of Marcion.

[100](#)

Lib. de unitate Ecclesiae, last chapter.

[101](#)

De Corrept. et Gratia, cap. 15.

[102](#)

11, quaest. 11, 3 can. Omnis.

[103](#)

In 1 Cor. V.

[104](#)

Apologeticus, cap. 39.

[105](#)

Quaest. 39 in Deuteron.

[106](#)

1 Cor. V:13.

[107](#)

De Correptione et Gratia, cap. 15.

[108](#)

De Vera Religione, cap. 6.

[109](#)

De Vera Religione, cap. 6.

[110](#)

Contra Donatistas, cap. 20.

[111](#)

2 Thess. III:14.

[112](#)

Matthew III:12.

[113](#)

Matthew XIII:47-50.

[114](#)

Matthew XXII:14.

[115](#)

Matthew XXV:1-12.

[116](#)

Matthew XXV:33.

[117](#)

1 Cor. V:1-3.

[118](#)

1 Cor. V:5.

[119](#)

Lib. 3, epist. 3; lib. 4, epist. 2.

[120](#)

Tract. 45 in Ioannem. He repeats the same thing in *Contra Cresconium*, lib. 2, cap. 34.

[121](#)

1 Timothy I; Galat. I; Cor. XV; Acts IX.

[122](#)

Serm 1, de conversione Sancti Pauli.

[123](#)

Hom. 6 in II Tim.

[124](#)

Acts I.

[125](#)

Psalm 108 (109).

[126](#)

in Psalm 3.

[127](#)

De Unitate Ecclesiae, cap. 13.

[128](#)

Romans VIII:9.

[129](#)

Gal. VI:8.

[130](#)

1 Cor. XII:13.

[131](#)

Gal. III:27.

[132](#)

Epist. ad Dardanum.

[133](#)

Contra Cresconium, lib. 2, cap. 21.

[134](#)

De Baptismo, lib. 5, cap. 27.

[135](#)

Matt. XXVII:39.

[136](#)

Luke XXIII:40.

[137](#)

Philippians II:21.

[138](#)

Canticle of Canticles VI:8.

[139](#)

cap.1.

[140](#)

cap.2.

[141](#)

Epist. 48.

[142](#)

de Baptismo, lib. 5, cap. ult.

[143](#)

1 Peter III:20.

[144](#)

Cyprian, *De unitate Ecclesiae*.; Jerome, epist. ad Damasum, de tribus Hypostatibus.

[145](#)

Ephes. V.

[146](#)

John X.

[147](#)

Augustine, Tractatu in Ioannem 45.

[148](#)

Psal. 73 (74).

[149](#)

John X:16.

[150](#)

John XI:52.

[151](#)

2 Timothy II:19.

[152](#)

1 John II.:19.

[153](#)

De Corrept. et Gratia, cap. 9.

[154](#)

loc. cit., lib. 3, ca. 32.

[155](#)

Romans VIII.

[156](#)

2 Timoth. II.

[157](#)

Tract. 45 in Ioan.; he says similar things in *de bono persever.*, cap. 8; *de corrept. et gratia*, cap. 9.

[158](#)

Tract. 45 in Ioan.

[159](#)

1 John IV:7.

[160](#)

1 Cor. XII:13.

[161](#)

Galat. IV:7.

[162](#)

1 John II:5.

[163](#)

John VIII:31.

[164](#)

De Corrept. et Gratia, cap. 9.

[165](#)

lib. 3 cap. 32.

[166](#)

Ps. 31(32).

[167](#)

3 Kings (1 Kings) VIII:46.

[168](#)

Proverbs XXIV:16.

[169](#)

Eccles. VII:21.

[170](#)

James III:2.

[171](#)

1 John I:6.

[172](#)

de Eleemosyna.

[173](#)

Orat. 2, in Iulian.

[174](#)

Serm. 16 in Psal. 16.

[175](#)

in Psal. 39.

[176](#)

Contra Pelagionaos, lib. 2.

[177](#)

De Spiritu et litera, cap. ult.

[178](#)

Moral., lib. 21, cap. 9.

[179](#)

Cantic. IV:7.

[180](#)

Ephes. V:27.

[181](#)

Gen. V9.

[182](#)

Philipp. III:15.

[183](#)

Psal. 17(18).

[184](#)

Psal. 118 (119).

[185](#)

Ephesians I:4.

[186](#)

in Hieremiae, cap. 31.

[187](#)

de Perfect. Iustit., et other places.

[188](#)

Serm. 3, *de festo omnium Sanctorum*.

[189](#)

Matthew XVIII:17.

[190](#)

Matthew XXIII.

[191](#)

Matthew XXIV:50.

[192](#)

1 Cor. I:11.

[193](#)

1 Cor. V:1.

[194](#)

Apocalypse II et III.

[195](#)

lib. 2, contra Parmenianum, cap. 10.

[196](#)

Breviculo, *loc. cit.*

[197](#)

lib. 3, epist. 3 ad Maximum.

[198](#)

Orat. 1, Apologetica.

[199](#)

lib. 3 de sacerdotio.

[200](#)

Dialogus contra Luciferianos.

[201](#)

Tract. 6 in Ioannem. cf. Retract., lib. 2, cap. 18; liber post collationem, cap. 7 et 20; de Unitate Ecclesiae, cap. 13; De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, cap. 4, 9, and other places.

[202](#)

de fide ad Petrum, cap. 43.

[203](#)

Hom. 11 et 38 in Evangelia.

[204](#)

Isaiah LII:11.

[205](#)

2 Cor. VI:18.

[206](#)

1 Cor. X:17.

[207](#)

Romans VIII:9.

[208](#)

1 Cor. XII.

[209](#)

lib. contra Donatistas post collationem, cap. 8 et 20, et in Breviculo Collationis tertia diei.

[210](#)

epist. 6, lib. 1 ad Magnum, Irenaeus, lib. 3 cap. 19.

[211](#)

Ezechiel XXXVI.

[212](#)

1 Cor. 11:27.

[213](#)

lib. 1, cap. 57.

[214](#)

In quo sess. 15 damnatur error XXII; XXX error.

[215](#)

Romans VIII.

[216](#)

John VIII.

[217](#)

contra Adimantum, cap. 5.

[218](#)

Deut. XXXII.

[219](#)

Gal. IV; Rom. IV.

[220](#)

Matthew V.

[221](#)

1 Cor. IV.

[222](#)

Galatians IV.

[223](#)

Isaiah I.

[224](#)

John VIII.

[225](#)

lib. 1, epist. 6 ad Magnum.

[226](#)

Epist. 3 ad Sympronianum.

[227](#)

Contra Cresconium, lib.2, cap. 21.

[228](#)

Contra Petilianum, lib. 2, cap. ult.; de Baptismo, lib. 4, cap. 3, lib. 6, cap. 3, lib. 7, cap. 49, 50, 51; de Unitate Ecclesiae, cap. ult.; doctrinae Christianae, lib. 3, cap. 32.

[229](#)

Contra Donatistas, lib. 7, cap. 51.

[230](#)

lib. 3, cap. 32.

[231](#)

de Baptismo, lib. 3, cap. 18, lib. 1, cap. 21 et 22, lib. 6, cap. 3, lib. 7 cap. 51.

[232](#)

tract. 5 in Ioannem.

[233](#)

C.f. *Contra Parmenianum*, lib. 2, cap. 10 et 11.

[234](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 1, cap. 4, col. 171.

[235](#)

In Psal. 47(48).

[236](#)

lib. 4, de Ecclesia, par. 2, cap. 20.

[237](#)

Thomas Waldens, tomus I, lib. 2 cap. 9, nu. 10, et cap. 11, num. 5; John Driedo, *de Ecclesiasticis Scripturis et dogmatibus*, lib. 4, cap. 2, par. 2; Pedro de Soto *Confessio Catholica*, (which was opposed to the Augsburg Confession), cap. de Ecclesia, et cap. de Conciliis, et in Apologia pro eadem Confessione par. 1, cap. 11; Cardinal Hosius, *contra Prolegomena Brentii*, lib. 3; Melchior Cano, lib. 4 de Locis Theologicis, cap. ult. ad argumentum XII.

[238](#)

1 John II:19.

[239](#)

Tract. 3, *in epistolam Ioannis*.

[240](#)

De Baptismo lib. 3, cap. 18, Tract. 61 in Ioannem.

[241](#)

Cyprian, lib. 1, epist. 6, lib. 2 epist. 1; Optatus, *contra Parmenianum*, lib. 1; Ambrose *de poenitentia*, lib. 1, cap. 2; Jerome *dialogus contra Luciferianos*; Augustine, *in Enchiridio*, cap. 65; Pope Celestine *epistola ad Clerum Constantinopolitanum, epistola ad Ioannem Antiochenum*, c.f. 1 Tomo Concilii Ephesini, cap. 18 et 19, cited by Nicholas I in his epistle to the Emperor Michael.

[242](#)

homil. 21 in Iosue.

[243](#)

de Baptismo, lib. 3, cap. 18.

[244](#)

lib.4, cap.16

[245](#)

lib. 4, cap. 10.

[246](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 1, cap. 35.

[247](#)

Tract. 61 in Ioan.

[248](#)

de gestis cum Emerito, cap.1.

[249](#)

de Catechizandis Rudibus, cap. 17.

[250](#)

Job XVI:9

[251](#)

On the Roman Pontiff, book IV, ch. 6.

[252](#)

1 Corinth. III.

[253](#)

Ephes. II.

[254](#)

Ephesians IV.

[255](#)

contra Faustum, lib. 19, cap. 11.

[256](#)

lib. *de Pudicitia*.

[257](#)

lib. 4, epist. 2.

[258](#)

serm. 2 *contra Arianos*.

[259](#)

lib. *de gratia Christi*, cap. 11.

[260](#)

Contra Luciferianos.

[261](#)

cap. Apostolicam, de Presbytero non Baptizato.

[262](#)

Hist. Eccles., lib. 7, cap. 8.

[263](#)

Prima Apologia, part. 3.

[264](#)

lib. *contra Catharinum*.

[265](#)

De abroganda Missa privata, pars 1.

[266](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 1, ca. 4, col. 170.

[267](#)

Ibid., col. 178.

[268](#)

Ibid., col. 181.

[269](#)

in locis, locus 12.

[270](#)

cap. *de Conciliis*.

[271](#)

Institut. lib. 4, cap. 1, §7.

[272](#)

Ibid., §3.

[273](#)

Instit. lib. 4, cap. 8, §13, and other places.

[274](#)

Numbers XX.

[275](#)

3 Kings (1 Kings) VIII.

[276](#)

Matth. XVIII.

[277](#)

Acts XX.

[278](#)

Acts XV.

[279](#)

Acts XVIII.

[280](#)

1 Corin. XV, Galat. I, Philip. III.

[281](#)

1 Tim. III.

[282](#)

Psalm 18.

[283](#)

tract. 2 in epistola Ioannis.

[284](#)

Tract 1 in epist. Ioannis.

[285](#)

Matt. 5.

[286](#)

de Unitate Ecclesiae, cap. 14, and other places.

[287](#)

Acts I-IV.

[288](#)

Contra Faustum, lib. 19, cap. 11.

[289](#)

de Simplicitate Praelatorum.

[290](#)

in epist. 1 ad Damasum de nomine Hypostasis.

[291](#)

de Baptismo, lib. 4, cap. 1.

[292](#)

Homil. 30 in Matthaëum.

[293](#)

de Unitate Ecclesiae.

[294](#)

Homil. IV, in cap. 6 Isaiae.

[295](#)

Contra epist. Parmeniani, lib. 3, cap. 5.

[296](#)

Tract. 1 epistola Ioannis.

[297](#)

Ibid., Tract. 2.

[298](#)

Matt. XVI.

[299](#)

I Tim. III.

300

in epist. 31 ad Pulcheriam Augustam.

301

in epistola ad Constantinum Augustum.

302

Eph. IV.

303

See Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 22, cap. 15, 17 et 18 where he touches on each explanation.

304

Psal. 47.

305

Isaiah LXI.

306

Matt. III.

307

Matt. XIII.

308

Psal. 88.

309

Daniel II.

310

Luke I.

311

~Oti e;stai evn tai/j evsca,tais h`me,raij evmfane.j to. o;roj Kuri,ou(kai. o` oi=koj tou/ Qeou/ evp va;krou tw/n ovrewn(kai. u`ywqh,setai u`pera,nw tw/n Bounw/n(kai. h[xousin evp v auvto. pa,nta ta, e;qnh) Isaiah II:2

312

Micah IV.

313

In Psal. 101, sermon 2.

314

Serm. 79 in Cant.

315

Commonitorium.

316

Romans X.

[317](#)

Matthew X.

[318](#)

Instit. lib. 4, cap. 8, §11, 12, 14, 15.

[319](#)

ibid., cap.8, §146, 148, 149 et 150.

[320](#)

Ephes. I.

[321](#)

Ephes. IV.

[322](#)

Ephes.V.

[323](#)

John XVI.

[324](#)

Enchiridium, cap. 3.

[325](#)

Matt. XVIII.

[326](#)

lib. 3, cap. 4.

[327](#)

de Praescript.

[328](#)

Contra Cresconium, lib. 1, cap. 33.

[329](#)

Epist. 118.

[330](#)

Luke X.

[331](#)

Matth. XXIII.

[332](#)

de Baptismo, lib. 1, cap. 18.

[333](#)

3 Kings VIII.

[334](#)

Jeremiah XXXI.

[335](#)

Luke XVII.

[336](#)

John IV.

[337](#)

Hebrews XII.

[338](#)

1 Peter II.

[339](#)

Acts III.

[340](#)

Ephes. VI.

[341](#)

Ambrose, lib. de Paradiso, cap. 6; Augustine, *Echirid.*, cap. 45 and Prosper, *lib. de gratia Dei*, contra collatorem.

[342](#)

Exodus XXXII.

[343](#)

3 Kings XIX.

[344](#)

Isaiah I.

[345](#)

Jeremiah II.

[346](#)

Paral. XV.

[347](#)

Daniel II.

[348](#)

Luke XVIII.

[349](#)

2 Thess. II.

[350](#)

Jeremiah VII.

[351](#)

Contra Auxentium.

[352](#)

Contra Luciferianos.

[353](#)

epist. 69 et 70.

[354](#)

Serm.33 *in Cantica*.

[355](#)

Hom. 49.

[356](#)

Exodus XXXII.

[357](#)

in Locis communibus, cap. de Ecclesia.

[358](#)

Ezek. III.

[359](#)

ibid., IX.

[360](#)

Galat. III:1.

[361](#)

Galat. VI:1.

[362](#)

in cap. 9 Danielis.

[363](#)

in cap. 24, Matth.

[364](#)

epist. 80 ad Esichium

[365](#)

lib. 8 Evangel. demonstr. cap. 2.

[366](#)

Stromata, lib. 2.

[367](#)

Contra Judaeos, cap. 5.

[368](#)

Matt. XXIV.

[369](#)

Luke XXI.

[370](#)

Luke XXVIII.

[371](#)

contra Luciferianos

[372](#)

de Unitate Ecclesiae, cap. 13.

[373](#)

de Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[374](#)

with Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[375](#)

Epist. 48.

[376](#)

Ruffinus, *hist. Ecclesiast.* cap. 6.

[377](#)

Serm. 66.

[378](#)

3 Kings XXII.

[379](#)

Isaiah LVI:10.

[380](#)

Mark XVI:14.

[381](#)

Matthew XXVI:31.

[382](#)

This refers to *Tenebrae*, which was celebrated with mostly the same ceremonies from ancient times until 1962, and today in all Churches attached to the liturgical books of that year. In that office there are 15 candles, which are extinguished as the Psalms are changed until there is one left. –Translator’s note.

[383](#)

3 parte q. ult. artic. 2.

[384](#)

lib. 1 de Ecclesia, cap. 30, et lib. 3, cap. 61.

[385](#)

Jeremiah XVIII.

[386](#)

Luke XVIII.

[387](#)

Luke XXII.

[388](#)

lib. 5 de divin. offic., cap. 26.

[389](#)

quest. 14 prologi in Matthaeum.