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OLD TESTAMENT: *Genesis,* 17:9-14

**9**Again God said to Abraham: And thou therefore shalt keep my covenant, and thy seed after thee in their generations.

**10**This is my covenant which you shall observe, between me and you, and thy seed after thee: All the male kind of you shall be circumcised:

**11**And you shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, that it may be for a sign of the covenant between me and you.

**12**An infant of eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations: he that is born in the house, as well as the bought servant shall be circumcised, and whosoever is not of your stock:

**13**And my covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant.

**14**The male, whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, that soul shall be destroyed out of his people: because he hath broken my covenant.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Exodus, 12:1-*13:16

**12**And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt:

**2**This month shall be to you the beginning of months: it shall be the first in the months of the year.

**3**Speak ye to the whole assembly of the children of Israel, and say to them: On the tenth day of this month let every man take a lamb by their families and houses.

**4**But if the number be less than may suffice to eat the lamb, he shall take unto him his neighbour that joineth to his house, according to the number of souls which may be enough to eat the lamb.

**5**And it shall be a lamb without blemish, a male, of one year: according to which rite also you shall take a kid.

**6**And you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month: and the whole multitude of the children of Israel shall sacrifice it in the evening.

**7**And they shall take of the blood thereof, and put it upon both the side posts, and on the upper door posts of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

**8**And they shall eat the flesh that night roasted at the fire, and unleavened bread with wild lettuce.

**9**You shall not eat thereof any thing raw, nor boiled in water, but only roasted at the fire: you shall eat the head with the feet and entrails thereof.

**10**Neither shall there remain any thing of it until morning. If there be any thing left, you shall burn it with fire.

**11**And thus you shall eat it: you shall gird your reins, and you shall have shoes on your feet, holding staves in your hands, and you shall eat in haste: for it is the Phase (that is the Passage) of the Lord.

**12**And I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and will kill every firstborn in the land of Egypt both man and beast: and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the Lord.

**13**And the blood shall be unto you for a sign in the houses where you shall be: and I shall see the blood, and shall pass over you: and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I shall strike the land of Egypt.

**14**And this day shall be for a memorial to you: and you shall keep it a feast to the Lord in your generations with an everlasting observance.

**15**Seven days shall you eat unleavened bread: in the first day there shall be no leaven in your houses: whosoever shall eat any thing leavened, from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall perish out of Israel.

**16**The first day shall be holy and solemn, and the seventh day shall be kept with the like solemnity: you shall do no work in them, except those things that belong to eating.

**17**And you shall observe the feast of the unleavened bread: for in this same day I will bring forth your army out of the land of Egypt, and you shall keep this day in your generations by a perpetual observance.

**18**The first month, the fourteenth day of the month in the evening, you shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the same month in the evening.

**19**Seven days there shall not be found any leaven in your houses: he that shall eat leavened bread, his soul shall perish out of the assembly of Israel, whether he be a stranger or born in the land.

**20**You shall not eat any thing leavened: in all your habitations you shall eat unleavened bread.

**21**And Moses called all the ancients of the children of Israel, and said to them: Go take a lamb by your families, and sacrifice the Phase.

**22**And dip a bunch of hyssop in the blood that is at the door, and sprinkle the transom of the door therewith, and both the door cheeks: let none of you go out of the door of his house till morning.

**23**For the Lord will pass through striking the Egyptians: and when he shall see the blood on the transom, and on both the posts, he will pass over the door of the house, and not suffer the destroyer to come into your houses and to hurt you.

**24**Thou shalt keep this thing as a law for thee and thy children for ever.

**25**And when you have entered into the land which the Lord will give you as he hath promised, you shall observe these ceremonies.

**26**And when your children shall say to you: What is the meaning of this service?

**27**You shall say to them: It is the victim of the passage of the Lord, when he passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, striking the Egyptians, and saving our houses. And the people bowing themselves, adored.

**28**And the children of Israel going forth did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron.

**29**And it came to pass at midnight, the Lord slew every firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharao, who sat on his throne, unto the firstborn of the captive woman that was in the prison, and all the firstborn of cattle.

**30**And Pharao arose in the night, and all his servants, and all Egypt: for there was not a house wherein there lay not one dead.

**31**And Pharao calling Moses and Aaron, in the night, said: Arise and go forth from among my people, you and the children of Israel: go, sacrifice to the Lord as you say.

**32**Your sheep and herds take along with you, as you demanded, and departing, bless me.

**33**And the Egyptians pressed the people to go forth out of the land speedily, saying: We shall all die.

**34**The people therefore took dough before it was leavened: and tying it in their cloaks, put it on their shoulders.

**35**And the children of Israel did as Moses had commanded: and they asked of the Egyptians vessels of silver and gold, and very much raiment.

**36**And the Lord gave favour to the people in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them: and they stripped the Egyptians.

**37**And the children of Israel set forward from Ramesse to Socoth, being about six hundred thousand men on foot, beside children.

**38**And a mixed multitude without number went up also with them, sheep and herds and beasts of divers kinds, exceeding many.

**39**And they baked the meal, which a little before they had brought out of Egypt, in dough: and they made earth cakes unleavened: for it could not be leavened, the Egyptians pressing them to depart, and not suffering them to make any stay: neither did they think of preparing any meat.

**40**And the abode of the children of Israel that they made in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.

**41**Which being expired, the same day all the army of the Lord went forth out of the land of Egypt.

**42**This is the observable night of the Lord, when he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt: this night all the children of Israel must observe in their generations.

**43**And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron: This is the service of the Phase: No foreigner shall eat of it.

**44**But every bought servant shall be circumcised, and so shall eat.

**45**The stranger and the hireling shall not eat thereof.

**46**In one house shall it be eaten, neither shall you carry forth of the flesh thereof out of the house, neither shall you break a bone thereof.

**47**All the assembly of the children of Israel shall keep it.

**48**And if any stranger be willing to dwell among you, and to keep the Phase of the Lord, all his males shall first be circumcised, and then shall he celebrate it according to the manner: and he shall be as he that is born in the land: but if any man be uncircumcised, he shall not eat thereof.

**49**The same law shall be to him that is born in the land, and to the proselyte that sojourneth with you.

**50**And all the children of Israel did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron.

**51**And the same day the Lord brought forth the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt by their companies.

**13**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**2**Sanctify unto me every firstborn that openeth the womb among the children of Israel, as well of men as of beasts: for they are all mine.

**3**And Moses said to the people: Remember this day in which you came forth out of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage, for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought you forth out of this place: that you eat no leavened bread.

**4**This day you go forth in the month of new corn.

**5**And when the Lord shall have brought thee into the land of the Chanaanite, and the Hethite, and the Amorrhite, and the Hevite, and the Jebusite, which he swore to thy fathers that he would give thee, a land that floweth with milk and honey, thou shalt celebrate this manner of sacred rites in this month.

**6**Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread: and on the seventh day shall be the solemnity of the Lord.

**7**Unleavened bread shall you eat seven days: there shall not be seen any thing leavened with thee, nor in all thy coasts.

**8**And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying: This is what the Lord did to me when I came forth out of Egypt.

**9**And it shall be as a sign in thy hand, and as a memorial before thy eyes: and that the law of the Lord be always in thy mouth, for with a strong hand the Lord hath brought thee out of the land of Egypt.

**10**Thou shalt keep this observance at the set time from days to days.

**11**And when the Lord shall have brought thee into the land of the Chanaanite, as he swore to thee and thy fathers, and shall give it thee:

**12**Thou shalt set apart all that openeth the womb for the Lord, and all that is first brought forth of thy cattle: whatsoever thou shalt have of the male sex, thou shalt consecrate to the Lord.

**13**The firstborn of an ass thou shalt change for a sheep: and if thou do not redeem it, thou shalt kill it. And every firstborn of men thou shalt redeem with a price.

**14**And when thy son shall ask thee to morrow, saying: What is this? thou shalt answer him: With a strong hand did the Lord bring us forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

**15**For when Pharao was hardened, and would not let us go, the Lord slew every firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of man to the firstborn of beasts: therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the womb of the male sex, and all the firstborn of my sons I redeem.

**16**And it shall be as a sign in thy hand, and as a thing hung between thy eyes, for a remembrance: because the Lord hath brought us forth out of Egypt by a strong hand.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Exodus,* 20:8-11

**8**Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day.

**9**Six days shalt thou labour, and shalt do all thy works.

**10**But on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no work on it, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.

**11**For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day: therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Exodus,* 24:5-8

**5**And he sent young men of the children of Israel, and they offered holocausts, and sacrificed pacific victims of calves to the Lord.

**6**Then Moses took half of the blood, and put it into bowls: and the rest he poured upon the altar.

**7**And taking the book of the covenant, he read it in the hearing of the people: and they said: All things that the Lord hath spoken we will do, we will be obedient.

**8**And he took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people, and he said: This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Exodus,* 31:13-17

**13**Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say to them: See that thou keep my sabbath: because it is a sign between me and you in your generations: that you may know that I am the Lord, who sanctify you.

**14**Keep you my sabbath: for it is holy unto you: he that shall profane it, shall be put to death: he that shall do my work in it, his soul shall perish out of the midst of his people.

**15**Six days shall you do work: in the seventh day is the sabbath, the rest holy to the Lord. Every one that shall do any work on this day, shall die.

**16**Let the children of Israel keep the sabbath, and celebrate it in their generations. It is an everlasting covenant

**17**Between me and the children of Israel, and a perpetual sign. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and in the seventh he ceased from work.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Leviticus* passim, esp 16

**16**And the Lord spoke to Moses, after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they were slain upon their offering strange fire:

**2**And he commanded him, saying, Speak to Aaron thy brother, that he enter not at all into the sanctuary, which is within the veil before the propitiatory, with which the ark is covered, lest he die, (for I will appear in a cloud over the oracle,)

**3**Unless he first do these things: He shall offer a calf for sin, and a ram for a holocaust.

**4**He shall be vested with a linen tunick, he shall cover his nakedness with linen breeches: he shall be girded with a linen girdle, and he shall put a linen mitre upon his head: for these are holy vestments: all which he shall put on, after he is washed.

**5**And he shall receive from the whole multitude of the children of Israel two buck goats for sin, and one ram for a holocaust.

**6**And when he hath offered the calf and prayed for himself, and for his own house,

**7**He shall make the two buck goats to stand before the Lord in the door of the tabernacle of the testimony:

**8**And casting lots upon them both, one to be offered to the Lord, and the other to be the emissary goat:

**9**That whose lot fell to be offered to the Lord, he shall offer for sin:

**10**But that whose lot was to be the emissary goat, he shall present alive before the Lord, that he may pour out prayers upon him, and let him go into the wilderness.

**11**After these things are duly celebrated, he shall offer the calf, and praying for himself and for his own house, he shall immolate it:

**12**And taking the censer, which he hath filled with the burning coals of the altar, and taking up with his hand the compounded perfume for incense, he shall go in within the veil into the holy place:

**13**That when the perfumes are put upon the fire, the cloud and vapour thereof may cover the oracle, which is over the testimony, and he may not die.

**14**He shall take also of the blood of the calf, and sprinkle with his finger seven times towards the propitiatory to the east.

**15**And when he hath killed the buck goat for the sin of the people, he shall carry in the blood thereof within the veil, as he was commanded to do with the blood of the calf, that he may sprinkle it over against the oracle,

**16**And may expiate the sanctuary from the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and from their transgressions, and all their sins. According to this rite shall he do to the tabernacle of the testimony, which is fixed among them in the midst of the filth of their habitation.

**17**Let no man be in the tabernacle when the high priest goeth into the sanctuary, to pray for himself and his house, and for the whole congregation of Israel, until he come out.

**18**And when he is come out to the altar that is before the Lord, let him pray for himself, and taking the blood of the calf, and of the buck goat, let him pour it upon the horns thereof round about:

**19**And sprinkling with his finger seven times, let him expiate, and sanctify it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.

**20**After he hath cleansed the sanctuary, and the tabernacle, and the altar, then let him offer the living goat:

**21**And putting both hands upon his head, let him confess all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their offences and sins: and praying that they may light on his head, he shall turn him out by a man ready for it, into the desert.

**22**And when the goat hath carried all their iniquities into an uninhabited land, and shall be let go into the desert,

**23**Aaron shall return into the tabernacle of the testimony, and putting off the vestments, which he had on him before when he entered into the sanctuary, and leaving them there,

**24**He shall wash his flesh in the holy place, and shall put on his own garments. And after that he has come out and hath offered his own holocaust, and that of the people, he shall pray both for himself, and for the people:

**25**And the fat that is offered for sins, he shall burn upon the altar.

**26**But he that hath let go the emissary goat, shall wash his clothes, and his body with water, and so shall enter into the camp.

**27**But the calf and the buck goat, that were sacrificed for sin, and whose blood was carried into the sanctuary, to accomplish the atonement, they shall carry forth without the camp, and shall burn with fire, their skins and their flesh, and their dung:

**28**And whosoever burneth them shall wash his clothes, and flesh with water, and so shall enter into the camp.

**29**And this shall be to you an everlasting ordinance: The seventh month, the tenth day of the month, you shall afflict your souls, and shall do no work, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you.

**30**Upon this day shall be the expiation for you, and the cleansing from all your sins: you shall be cleansed before the Lord.

**31**For it is a sabbath of rest, and you shall afflict your souls by a perpetual religion.

**32**And the priest that is anointed, and whose hands are consecrated to do the office of the priesthood in his father's stead, shall make atonement; and he shall be vested with the linen robe and the holy vestments,

**33**And he shall expiate the sanctuary and the tabernacle of the testimony and the altar, the priest also and all the people.

**34**And this shall be an ordinance for ever, that you pray for the children of Israel, and for all their sins once in a year. He did therefore as the Lord had commanded Moses.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Leviticus* passim, esp 23

**23**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**2**Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say to them: These are the feasts of the Lord, which you shall call holy.

**3**Six days shall ye do work: the seventh day, because it is the rest of the sabbath, shall be called holy. You shall do no work on that day: it is the sabbath of the Lord in all your habitations.

**4**These also are the holy days of the Lord, which you must celebrate in their seasons.

**5**The first month, the fourteenth day of the month at evening, is the phase of the Lord:

**6**And the fifteenth day of the same month is the solemnity of the unleavened bread of the Lord. Seven days shall you eat unleavened bread.

**7**The first day shall be most solemn unto you, and holy: you shall do no servile work therein:

**8**But you shall offer sacrifice in fire to the Lord seven days. And the seventh day shall be more solemn, and more holy: and you shall do no servile work therein.

**9**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**10**Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say to them: When you shall have entered into the land which I will give you, and shall reap your corn, you shall bring sheaves of ears, the firstfruits of your harvest to the priest:

**11**Who shall lift up the shed before the Lord, the next day after the sabbath, that it may be acceptable for you, and shall sanctify it.

**12**And on the same day that the sheaf is consecrated, a lamb without blemish of the first year shall be killed for a holocaust of the Lord.

**13**And the libations shall be offered with it, two tenths of flour tempered with oil for a burnt offering of the Lord, and a most sweet odour: libations also of wine, the fourth part of a hin.

**14**You shall not eat either bread, or parched corn, or frumenty of the harvest, until the day that you shall offer thereof to your God. It is a precept for ever throughout your generations, and all your dwellings.

**15**You shall count therefore from the morrow after the sabbath, wherein you offered the sheaf of the firstfruits, seven full weeks.

**16**Even unto the marrow after the seventh week be expired, that is to say, fifty days, and so you shall offer a new sacrifice to the Lord.

**17**Out of all your dwellings, two leaves of the firstfruits, of two tenths of flour leavened, which you shall bake for the firstfruits of the Lord.

**18**And you shall offer with the leaves seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one calf from the herd, and two rams, and they shall be for a holocaust with their libations far a most sweet odour to the Lord.

**19**You shall offer also a buck goat for sin, and two lambs of the first year for sacrifices of peace offerings.

**20**And when the priest hath lifted them up with the leaves of the firstfruits before the Lord, they shall fall to his use.

**21**And you shall call this day most solemn, and most holy. You shall do no servile work therein. It shall be an everlasting ordinance in all your dwellings and generations.

**22**And when you reap the corn of your land, you shall not cut it to the very ground: neither shall you gather the ears that remain; but you shall leave them for the poor and for the strangers. I am the Lord your God.

**23**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**24**Say to the children of Israel: The seventh month, on the first day of the month, you shall keep a sabbath, a memorial, with she sound of trumpets, and it shall be called holy.

**25**You shall do no servile work therein, and you shall offer a holocaust to the Lord.

**26**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**27**Upon the tenth day of this seventh month shall be the day of atonement, it shall be most solemn, and shall be called holy: and you shall afflict your souls on that day, and shall offer a holocaust to the Lord.

**28**You shall do no servile work in the time of this day: because it is a day of propitiation, that the Lord your God may be merciful unto you.

**29**Every soul that is not afflicted on this day, shall perish from among his people:

**30**And every soul that shall do any work, the same will I destroy from among his people.

**31**You shall do no work therefore on that day: it shall be an everlasting ordinance unto you in all your generations, and dwellings.

**32**It is a sabbath of rest, and you shall afflict your souls beginning on the ninth day of the month: from evening until evening you shall celebrate your sabbaths.

**33**And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying:

**34**Say to the children of Israel: From the fifteenth day of this same seventh month, shall be kept the feast of tabernacles seven days to the Lord.

**35**The first day shall be called most solemn and most holy: you shall do no servile work therein. And seven days you shall offer holocausts to the Lord.

**36**The eighth day also shall be most solemn and most holy, and you shall offer holocausts to the Lord: for it is the day of assembly and congregation: you shall do no servile work therein.

**37**These are the feasts of the Lord, which you shall call most solemn and most holy, and shall offer on them oblations to the Lord, holocausts and libations according to the rite of every day,

**38**Besides the sabbaths of the Lord, and your gifts, and those things that you offer by vow, or which you shall give to the Lord voluntarily.

**39**So from the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you shall have gathered in all the fruits of your land, you shall celebrate the feast of the Lord seven days: on the first day and the eighth shall be a sabbath, that is a day of rest.

**40**And you shall take to you on the first day the fruits of the fairest tree, and branches of palm trees, and boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook, and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God.

**41**And you shall keep the solemnity thereof seven days in the year. It shall be an everlasting ordinance in your generations. In the seventh month shall you celebrate this feast.

**42**And you shall dwell in bowers seven days: every one that is of the race of Israel, shall dwell in tabernacles:

**43**That your posterity may know, that I made the children of Israel to dwell in tabernacles, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God.

**44**And Moses spoke concerning the feasts of the Lord to the children of Israel.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Numbers,* 15:37-41

**37**The Lord also said to Moses:

**38**Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt tell them I to make to themselves fringes in the corners of their garments, putting in them ribands of blue:

**39**That when they shall see them, they may remember all the commandments of the Lord, and not follow their own thoughts and eyes going astray after divers things,

**40**But rather being mindful of the precepts of the Lord, may do them and be holy to their God.

**41**I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that I might be your God.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Numbers,* 16:37- 40

**37**Command Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest to take up the censers that lie in the burning, and to scatter the fire of one side and the other: because they are sanctified

**38**In the deaths of the sinners: and let him beat them into plates, and fasten them to the altar, because incense hath been offered in them to the Lord, and they are sanctified, that the children of Israel may see them for a sign and a memorial.

**39**Then Eleazar the priest took the brazen censers, wherein they had offered, whom the burning fire had devoured, and beat them into plates, fastening them to the altar:

**40**That the children of Israel might have for the time to come wherewith they should be admonished, that no stranger or any one that is not of seed of Aaron should come near to offer incense to the Lord, lest he should suffer as Core suffered, and all his congregation, according as the Lord spoke to Moses.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Deuteronomy,* 5:12-15

**12**Observe the day of the sabbath, to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.

**13**Six days shalt thou labour, and shalt do all thy works.

**14**The seventh is the day of the sabbath, that is, the rest of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not do any work therein, thou nor thy son nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant nor thy maidservant, nor thy ox, nor thy ass, nor any of thy beasts, nor the stranger that is within thy gates: that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest, even as thyself.

**15**Remember that thou also didst serve in Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out from thence with a strong hand, and a stretched out arm. Therefore hath he commanded thee that thou shouldst observe the sabbath day.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Deuteronomy,* 6:5-9

**5**Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength.

**6**And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart:

**7**And thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising.

**8**And thou shalt bind them as a sign on thy hand, and they shall be and shall move between thy eyes.

**9**And thou shalt write them in the entry, and on the doors of thy house.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Deuteronomy,* 11:18-21

**18**Lay up these my words in your hearts and minds, and hang them for a sign on your hands, and place them between your eyes.

**19**Teach your children that they meditate on them, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest on the way, and when thou liest down and risest up.

**20**Thou shalt write them upon the posts and the doors of thy house:

**21**That thy days may be multiplied, and the days of thy children in the land which the Lord swore to thy fathers, that he would give them as long as the heaven hangeth over the earth.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Deuteronomy,* 16:1-17

**16**Observe the month of new corn, which is the first of the spring, that thou mayst celebrate the phase to the Lord thy God: because in this month the Lord thy God brought thee out of Egypt by night.

**2**And thou shalt sacrifice the phase to the Lord thy God, of sheep, and of oxen, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, that his name may dwell there.

**3**Thou shalt not eat with it leavened bread: seven days shalt thou eat without leaven, the bread of affliction, because thou camest out of Egypt in fear: that thou mayst remember the day of thy coming out of Egypt, all the days of thy life.

**4**No leaven shall be seen in all thy coasts for seven days, neither shall any of the flesh of that which was sacrificed the first day in the evening remain until morning.

**5**Thou mayst not immolate the phase in any one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God will give thee:

**6**But in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, that his name may dwell there: thou shalt immolate the phase in the evening, at the going down of the sun, at which time thou camest out of Egypt.

**7**And thou shalt dress, and eat it in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, and in the morning rising up thou shalt go into thy dwellings.

**8**Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread: and on the seventh day, because it is the assembly of the Lord thy God, thou shalt do no work.

**9**Thou shalt number unto thee seven weeks from that day, wherein thou didst put the sickle to the corn.

**10**And thou shalt celebrate the festival of weeks to the Lord thy God, a voluntary oblation of thy hand, which thou shalt offer according to the blessing of the Lord thy God.

**11**And thou shalt feast before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger and the fatherless, and the widow, who abide with you: in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, that his name may dwell there:

**12**And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in Egypt: and thou shalt keep and do the things that are commanded.

**13**Thou shalt celebrate the solemnity also of tabernacles seven days, when thou hast gathered in thy fruit of the barnfloor and of the winepress.

**14**And thou shalt make merry in thy festival time, thou, thy son, and thy daughter, thy manservant, and thy maidservant, the Levite also and the stranger, and the fatherless and the widow that are within thy gates.

**15**Seven days shalt thou celebrate feasts to the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord shall choose: and the Lord thy God will bless thee in all thy fruits, and in every work of thy hands, and thou shalt be in joy.

**16**Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose: in the feast of unleavened bread, in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles. No one shall appear with his hands empty before the Lord:

**17**But every one shall offer according to what he hath, according to the blessing of the Lord his God, which he shall give him.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Joshua,* 4:1-9-(D) *Josue,* 4:1-9

**4**And when they were passed over, the Lord said to Josue:

**2**Choose twelve men, one of every tribe:

**3**And command them to take out of the midst of the Jordan, where the feet of the priests stood, twelve very hard stones, which you shall set in the place of the camp, where you shall pitch your tents this night.

**4**And Josue called twelve men, whom he had chosen out of the children of Israel, one out of every tribe,

**5**And he said to them: Go before the ark of the Lord your God to the midst of the Jordan, and carry from thence every man a stone on your shoulders, according to the number of the children of Israel,

**6**That it may be a sign among you and when your children shall ask you to morrow, saying: What mean these stones?

**7**You shall answer them: The waters of the Jordan ran off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, when it passed over the same: therefore were these atones set for a monument of the children of Israel for ever.

**8**The children of Israel therefore did as Josue commanded them, carrying out of the channel of the Jordan twelve stones, as the Lord had commanded him, according to the number of the children of Israel, unto the place wherein they camped, and there they set them.

**9**And Josue put other twelve stones in the midst of the channel of the Jordan, where the priests stood that carried the ark of the covenant: and they are there until this present day.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Esther,* 9:20-32

**20**And Mardochai wrote all these things, and sent them comprised in letters to the Jews that abode in all the king's provinces, both those that lay near and those afar off,

**21**That they should receive the fourteenth and fifteenth day of the month Adar for holy days, and always at the return of the year should celebrate them with solemn honour:

**22**Because on those days the Jews revenged themselves of their enemies, and their mourning and sorrow were turned into mirth and joy, and that these should be days of feasting and gladness, in which they should send one to another portions of meats; and should give gifts to the poor.

**23**And the Jews undertook to observe with solemnity all they had begun to do at that time, which Mardochai by letters had commanded to be done.

**24**For Aman, the son of Amadathi of the race of Agag, the enemy and adversary of the Jews, had devised evil against them, to kill them and destroy them: and had cast Phur, that is, the lot.

**25**And afterwards Esther went in to the king, beseeching him that his endeavours might be made void by the king's letters: and the evil that he had intended against the Jews, might return upon his own head. And so both he and his sons were hanged upon gibbets.

**26**And since that time these days are called Phurim, that is, of lots: because Phur, that is, the lot, was cast into the urn. And all things that were done, are contained in the volume of this epistle, that is, of this book:

**27**And the things that they suffered, and that were afterwards changed, the Jews took upon themselves and their seed, and upon all that had a mind to be joined to their religion, so that it should be lawful for none to pass these days without solemnity: which the writing testifieth, and certain times require, as the years continually succeed one another.

**28**These are the days which shall never be forgot: and which all provinces in the whole world shall celebrate throughout all generations: neither is there any city wherein the days of Phurim, that is, of lots, must not be observed by the Jews, and by their posterity, which is bound to these ceremonies.

**29**And Esther the queen, the daughter of Abihail, and Mardochai the Jew, wrote also a second epistle, that with all diligence this day should be established a festival for the time to come.

**30**And they sent to all the Jews that were in the hundred and twenty-seven provinces of king Assuerus, that they should have peace, and receive truth,

**31**And observe the days of lots, and celebrate them with joy in their proper time: as Mardochai and Esther had appointed, and they undertook them to be observed by themselves and by their seed, fasts, and cries, and the days of lots,

**32**And all things which are contained in the history of this book, which is called Esther.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Ezekiel,* 20:12

**12**Moreover I gave them also my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them: and that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.

OLD TESTAMENT: *Ezekiel,* 20:20

**20**And sanctify my sabbaths, that they may be a sign between me and you: and that you may know that I am the Lord your God.

**APOCRYPHA: *Rest of Esther,* 16:20-22-(D) OT, *Esther,* 16:20-22/ *II Maccabees,* 1:18-22-(D) OT, *II Machabees,* 1:18-22**

APOCRYPHA: *Rest of Esther,* 16:20-22-(D) OT, *Esther,* 16:20-22

²⁰And ye shall aid them, that even the same day, being the thirteenth day of the twelfth month Adar, they may be avenged on them, who in the time of their affliction shall set upon them.

²¹For Almighty God hath turned to joy unto them the day, wherein the chosen people should have perished.

²²Ye shall therefore among your solemn feasts keep it an high day with all feasting:

APOCRYPHA: *II Maccabees,* 1:18-22-(D) OT, *II Machabees,* 1:18-22

**18**Therefore whereas we purpose to keep the purification of the temple on the five and twentieth day of the month of Casleu, we thought it necessary to signify it to you: that you also may keep the day of Scenopegia, and the day of the fire, that was given when Nehemias offered sacrifice, after the temple and the altar was built.

**19**For when our fathers were led into Persia, the priests that then were worshippers of God took privately the fire from the altar, and hid it in a valley where there was a deep pit without water, and there they kept it safe, so that the place was unknown to all men.

**20**But when many years had passed, and it pleased God that Nehemias should be sent by the king of Persia, he sent some of the posterity of those priests that had hid it, to seek for the fire: and as they told us, they found no fire, but thick water.

**21**Then he bade them draw it up, and bring it to him: and the priest Nehemias commanded the sacrifices that were laid on, to be sprinkled with the same water, both the wood, and the things that were laid upon it.

**22**And when this was done, and the time came that the sun shone out, which before was in a cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered.

**NEW TESTAMENT: *Matthew,* 26:26-28 / *Mark, 14:22-24/ Luke,* 22:19-20/ *John,* 3:3-7; 6:30- *59/ Acts,* 2:38-39; 22:16/ *Romans, 6:3-4/ 1 Corinthians,* 10:16-17; II :23-27**

NEW TESTAMENT: *Matthew,* 26:26-28

**26**And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat. This is my body.

**27**And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this.

**28**For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.

NEW TESTAMENT: *Mark, 14:22-24*

**22**And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said: Take ye. This is my body.

**23**And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them. And they all drank of it.

**24**And he said to them: This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many.

NEW TESTAMENT: *Luke,* 22:19-20

**19**And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake; and gave to them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me.

**20**In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.

NEW TESTAMENT: *John,* 3:3-7

**3**Jesus answered, and said to him: Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

**4**Nicodemus saith to him: How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born again?

**5**Jesus answered: Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

**6**That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.

**7**Wonder not, that I said to thee, you must be born again.

NEW TESTAMENT: *John,* 6:30- *59*

**30**They said therefore to him: What sign therefore dost thou shew, that we may see, and may believe thee? What dost thou work?

**31**Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written: He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

**32**Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say to you; Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

**33**For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world.

**34**They said therefore unto him: Lord, give us always this bread.

**35**And Jesus said to them: I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.

**36**But I said unto you, that you also have seen me, and you believe not.

**37**All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will not cast out.

**38**Because I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.

**39**Now this is the will of the Father who sent me: that of all that he hath given me, I should lose nothing; but should raise it up again in the last day.

**40**And this is the will of my Father that sent me: that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth in him, may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day.

**41**The Jews therefore murmured at him, because he had said: I am the living bread which came down from heaven.

**42**And they said: Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then saith he, I came down from heaven?

**43**Jesus therefore answered, and said to them: Murmur not among yourselves.

**44**No man can come to me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up in the last day.

**45**It is written in the prophets: And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh to me.

**46**Not that any man hath seen the Father; but he who is of God, he hath seen the Father.

**47**Amen, amen I say unto you: He that believeth in me, hath everlasting life.

**48**I am the bread of life.

**49**Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead.

**50**This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die.

**51**I am the living bread which came down from heaven.

**52**If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.

**53**The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

**54**Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.

**55**He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day.

**56**For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed.

**57**He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.

**58**As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.

**59**This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever.

NEW TESTAMENT: *Acts,* 2:38-39

**38**But Peter said to them: Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins: and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

**39**For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are far off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call.

NEW TESTAMENT: *Acts,* 22:16

**16**And now why tarriest thou? Rise up, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, invoking his name.

NEW TESTAMENT: *Romans, 6:3-4*

**3**Know you not that all we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in his death?

**4**For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life.

NEW TESTAMENT: *1 Corinthians,* 10:16-17

**16**The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?

**17**For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.

NEW TESTAMENT: *1 Corinthians,* 11:23-27

**23**For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread.

**24**And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me.

**25**In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me.

**26**For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come.

**27**Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

**18 AUGUSTINE: *City of God, BK X, CH 5-6 301b-302d; CH 19-20 310d-311c; BK XVI, CH 26 438c-439a; BK XXI, CH 20 575c-d; CH 25 579d-581a / Christian Doctrine, BK II, CH 3 637c-d; BK III, CH 5-9 659d-661c; BK IV, CH 21,690d-691b***

18 AUGUSTINE: *City of God, BK X, CH 5-6 301b-302d*

Chap. 5. *Of the sacrifices which God does not require, but wished to be observed for the exhibition of those things which he does require*

And who is so foolish as to suppose that the things offered to God are needed by Him for some uses of His own? Divine Scripture in many places explodes this idea. Not to be wearisome, suffice it to quote this brief saying from a psalm: "I have said to the Lord, Thou art my God: for Thou needest not my goodness."² We must believe, then, that God has no need, not only of cattle, or any other earthly and material thing, but even of man's righteousness, and that whatever right worship is paid to God profits not Him but man. For no man would say he did a benefit to a fountain by drinking, or to the light by seeing. And the fact that the ancient church offered animal sacrifices, which the people of God nowadays read of without imitating, proves nothing else than this, that those sacrifices signified the things which we do for the purpose of drawing near to God, and inducing our neighbour to do the same. A sacrifice, therefore, is the visible sacrament or sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice. Hence that penitent in the psalm, or it may be the Psalmist himself, entreating God to be merciful to his sins, says, "If Thou desiredst sacrifice, I would give it: Thou delightest not in whole burnt-offerings. The sacrifice of God is a broken heart: a heart contrite and humble God

²Ps. 16. 2.

will not despise."³ Observe how, in the very words in which he is expressing God's refusal of sacrifice, he shows that God requires sacrifice. He does not desire the sacrifice of a slaughtered beast, but He desires the sacrifice of a contrite heart. Thus, that sacrifice which he says God does not wish is the symbol of the sacrifice which God does wish. God does not wish sacrifices in the sense in which foolish people think He wishes them, viz., to gratify His own pleassure. For if He had not wished that the sacrifices He requires, as, e.g., a heart contrite and humbled by penitent sorrow, should be symbolized by those sacrifices which He was thought to desire because pleasant to Himself, the old law would never have enjoined their presentation; and they were destined to be merged when the fit opportunity arrived, in order that men might not suppose that the sacrifices themselves, rather than the things symbolized by them, were pleasing to God or acceptable in us. Hence, in another passage from another psalm, he says, "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is mine and the fullness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?"⁴ as if He should say, Supposing such things were necessary to me, I would never ask thee for what I have in my own hand. Then he goes on to mention what these signify: "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High. And call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me."⁵ So in another prophet : "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the High God? Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? Hath He showed thee, man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"⁶ In the words of this prophet, these two things are distinguished and set forth with sufficient explicitness, that God does not require these sacrifices for their own sakes and that He does require the sacrifices which they symbolize. In the epistle entitled "To the Hebrews" it is said, "To do good and to communicate, forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."⁷ And so, when it is written, "I desire mercy rather than sacrifice,"⁸ nothing else is meant than that one sacrifice is preferred to an-

³Ps. 51. 16, 17. ⁴Ps. 50. 12, 13. ⁵Ps. 50. 14, 15.

⁶Micah, 6. 6-8. ⁷Heb. 13. 16. ⁸Hos. 6. 6.

other; for that which in common speech is called sacrifice is only the symbol of the true sacrifice. Now mercy is the true sacrifice, and therefore it is said, as I have just quoted, "with such sacrifices God is well pleased." All the divine ordinances, therefore, which we read concerning the sacrifices in the service of the tabernacle or the temple, we are to refer to the love of God and our neighbour. For "on these two commandments," as it is written, "hang all the law and the prophets."¹

¹Matt. 22. 40.

Chap. 6. *Of the true and perfect sacrifice*

Thus a true sacrifice is every work which is done that we may be united to God in holy fellowship, and which has a reference to that supreme good and end in which alone we can be truly blessed. And therefore even the mercy we show to men, if it is not shown for God's sake, is not a sacrifice. For, though made or offered by man. sacrifice is a divine thing, as those who called it sacrifice² meant to indicate. Thus man himself, consecrated in the name of God and vowed to God, is a sacrifice in so far as he dies to the world that he may live to God. For this is a part of that mercy which each man shows to himself; as it is written, "Have mercy on thy soul by pleasing God."³ Our body, too, is a sacrifice when we chasten it by temperance, if we do so as we ought, for God's sake, that we may not yield our members instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but instruments of righteousness unto God.⁴ Exhorting to this sacrifice, the apostle says, "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercy of God. that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service."⁵ If, then, the body, which, being inferior, the soul uses as a servant or instrument, is a sacrifice when it is used rightly and with reference to God, how much more does the soul itself become a sacrifice when it offers itself to God, in order that, being inflamed by the fire of His love, it may receive of His beauty and become pleasing to Him, losing the shape of earthly desire and being remoulded in the image of permanent loveliness? And this, indeed, the apostle subjoins, saying, "And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed in the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."⁶ Since, therefore, true sacrifices are works of mercy to ourselves or others, done with a reference to God,

²literally, a sacred action. ³Ecclus. 30. 24.

⁴Rom. 6. 13. ⁵Rom. 12. 1. ⁶Rom. 12. 2.

and since works of mercy have no other object than the relief of distress or the conferring of happiness, and since there is no happiness apart from that good of which it is said, "It is good for me to be very near to God,"⁷ it follows that the whole redeemed city, that is to say, the congregation or community of the saints, is offered to God as our sacrifice through the great High Priest, who offered Himself to God in His passion for us, that we might be members of this glorious head, according to the form of a servant. For it was this form He offered, in this He was offered, because it is according to it He is Mediator, in this He is our Priest, in this the Sacrifice. Accordingly, when the apostle had exhorted us to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, our reasonable service, and not to be conformed to the world, but to be transformed in the renewing of our mind, that we might prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God, that is to say, the true sacrifice of ourselves, he says, "For I say, through the grace of God which is given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For, as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us."⁸ This is the sacrifice of Christians: we, being many, are one body in Christ. And this also is the sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, in which she teaches that she herself is offered in the offering she makes to God.

⁷Ps. 73. 28. ⁸Rom. 12. 3-6.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK X, CH 19-20 310d-311c*

Chap. 19. *On the reasonableness of offering, as the true religion teaches, a visible sacrifice to the one true and invisible God*

As to those who think that these visible sacrifices are suitably offered to other gods, but that invisible sacrifices, the graces of purity of mind and holiness of will, should be offered, as greater and better, to the invisible God. Himself greater and better than all others, they must be oblivious that these visible sacrifices are signs of the invisible, as the words we utter are the signs of things. And therefore, as in prayer or praise we direct intelligible words to Him to Whom in our heart we offer the very feelings we are expressing, so we are to understand that in sacrifice we offer visible sacrifice only to Him to Whom in our heart we ought to present ourselves an invisible sacrifice. It is then that the angels, and all those superior powers who are mighty by their goodness and piety, regard us with pleasure, and rejoice with us and assist us to the utmost of their power. But if we offer such worship to them, they decline it ; and when on any mission to men they become visible to the senses, they positively forbid it. Examples of this occur in holy writ. Some fancied they should, by adoration or sacrifice, pay the same honour to angels as is due to God, and were prevented from doing so by the angels themselves and ordered to render it to Him to Whom alone they know it to be due. And the holy angels have in this been imitated by holy men of God. For Paul and Barnabas, when they had wrought a miracle of healing in Lycaonia. were thought to be gods, and the Lycaonians desired to sacrifice to them, and they humbly and piously declined this honour, and announced to them the God in Whom they should believe. And those deceitful and proud spirits, who exact worship do so simply because they know it to be due to the true God. For that which they take pleasure in is not. as Porphyry says and some fancy, the smell of the victims, but divine honours. They have, in fact, plenty of odours on all hands, and, if they wished more, they could provide them for themselves. But the spirits who arrogate to themselves divinity are delighted not with the smoke of carcasses, but with the suppliant spirit which they deceive and hold in subjection, and hinder from drawing near to God, preventing him from offering himself in sacrifice to God by inducing him to sacrifice to others.

Chap. 20. *Of the supreme and true sacrifice which was effected by the Mediator between God' and men*

And hence that true Mediator, in so far as, by assuming the form of a servant, He became the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, though in the form of God He received sacrifice together with the Father, with whom He is one God, yet in the form of a servant He chose rather to be than to receive a sacrifice, that not even by this instance any one might have occasion to suppose that sacrifice should be rendered to any creature. Thus He is both the Priest who offers and the Sacrifice offered. And He designed that there should be a daily sign of this in the sacrifice of the Church, which, being His body, learns to offer herself through Him. Of this true Sacrifice the ancient sacrifices of the saints were the various and numerous signs ; and it was thus variously figured, just as one thing is signified by a variety of words, that there may be less weariness when we speak of it much. To this supreme and true sacrifice all false sacrifices have given place.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK XVI, CH 26 438c-439a*

Chap. 26. *Of God's attestation to Abraham, by which He assures him, when now old, of a son by the barren Sarah, and appoints him the father of the nations, and seals his faith in the promise by the sacrament of circumcision*

After these things Ishmael was born of Hagar; and Abraham might think that in him was fulfilled what God had promised him. saying, when he wished to adopt his home-born servant, "This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth of thee, he shall be thine heir."³ Therefore, lest he should think that what was promised was fulfilled in the handmaid's son, "when Abram was ninety years old and nine, God appeared to him, and said unto him. I am God; be well-pleasing in my sight, and be without complaint, and I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will fill thee exceedingly."⁴

Here there are more distinct promises about the calling of the nations in Isaac, that is, in the son of the promise, by which grace is signified, and not nature; for the son is promised from an old man and a barren old woman. For although God effects even the natural course of procreation, yet where the agency of God is manifest, through the decay or failure of nature, grace is more plainly discerned. And because this was to be brought about, not by generation, but by regeneration, circumcision was enjoined now, when a son was promised of Sarah. And by ordering all, not only sons, but also home-born and purchased servants to be circumcised, he testifies that this grace pertains to all. For what else does circumcision signify than a nature renewed on the putting off of the old? And what else does the eighth day mean than Christ. Who rose again when the week was completed, that is. after the Sabbath? The very names of the parents are changed: all things proclaim newness, and the new covenant is shadowed forth in the old. For what does the term old covenant imply but the concealing of the new? And what does the term new covenant imply but the revealing of the old? The laughter of Abraham is the exultation of one who rejoices, not the scornful laughter of one who mistrusts. And those words of his in his heart, "Shall a son be born to me that am an hundred years old? And shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?" are not the words of doubt, but of wonder. And when it is said. "And I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land in which thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." if it troubles any one whether this is to be held as fulfilled, or whether its fulfilment may still be looked for. since no kind of earthly possession can be everlasting for any nation whatever, let him know that the word translated "everlasting" by our writers is what the Greeks term αἰὼιον, which is derived from αἰὼν, the Greek for saculum, an age. But the Latins have not ventured to translate this by secular, lest they should change the meaning into something widely different. For many things are called secular which so happen in this world as to pass away even in a short time ; but what is termed αἰὼιον either has no end, or lasts to the very end of this world.

³Gen. 15. 4. ⁴Gen. 17. 1-22.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK XXI, CH 20 575c-d*

Chap. 20. *Of those who promise this indulgence not to all, but only to those who have been baptized as Catholics, though afterwards they have broken out into many crimes and heresies*

There are others still who make this promise not even to all who have received the sacraments of the baptism of Christ and of His body, but only to the Catholics, however badly they have lived. For these have eaten the body of Christ, not only sacramentally but really, being incorporated in His body, as the apostle says, "We, being many, are one bread, one body";⁴ so that, though they have afterwards lapsed into some heresy, or even into heathenism and idolatry, yet by virtue of this one thing, that they have received the baptism of Christ and eaten the body of Christ, in the body of Christ, that is to say, in the Catholic Church, they shall not die eternally, but at one time or other obtain eternal life ; and all that wickedness of theirs shall not avail to make their punishment eternal, but only proportionately long and severe.

⁴I Cor. 10. 17.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK XXI, CH 25 579d-581a*

Chap. 25. *Whether those who received heretical baptism, and have afterwards fallen away to wickedness of life; or those who have received Catholic baptism, but have afterwards passed over to heresy and schism; or those who have remained in the Catholic Church in which they were baptized, but have continued to live immorally—may hope through the virtue of the sacraments for the remission of eternal punishment*

But let us now reply to those who promise deliverance from eternal fire, not to the devil and his angels (as neither do they of whom we have been speaking), nor even to all men whatever, but only to those who have been washed by the baptism of Christ, and have become partakers of His body and blood, no matter how they have lived, no matter what heresy or impiety they have fallen into. But they are contradicted by the apostle, where he says, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variances, emulations, wrath, strife, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings, and the like : of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, for they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."¹ Certainly this sentence of the apostle is false, if such persons shall be delivered after any lapse of time, and shall then inherit the kingdom of God. But as it is not false, they shall certainly never inherit the kingdom of God. And if they shall never enter that kingdom, then they shall always be retained in eternal punishment; for there is no middle place where he may live unpunished who has not been admitted into that kingdom.

And therefore we may reasonably inquire how we are to understand these words of the Lord Jesus: "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever."² And those, indeed, whom we are now answering, are refuted in their interpretation of this passage by those whom we are shortly to answer, and who do not promise this deliverance to all who have received the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's body, but only to the Catholics, however wickedly they live; for these, say they, have eaten the Lord's body not only sacramentally, but really, being constituted members of His body, of which the apostle says, "We being many are one bread, one body."³ He then who is in the unity of Christ's body (that is to say, in the Christian membership), of which body the faithful have been wont to receive the sacrament at the altar, that man is truly said to eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. And consequently heretics and schismatics being separate from the unity of this body, are able to receive the same sacrament, but with no profit to themselves—nay, rather to their own hurt, so that they are rather more severely judged than liberated after some time. For they are not in that bond of peace which is symbolized by that sacrament.

¹Gal. 5. 19-21. ²John, 6. 50, 51. ³I Cor. 10. 17.

But again, even those who sufficiently understand that he who is not in the body of Christ cannot be said to eat the body of Christ, are in error when they promise liberation from the fire of eternal punishment to persons who fall away from the unity of that body into heresy, or even into heathenish superstition. For, in the first place, they ought to consider how intolerable it is, and how discordant with sound doctrine, to suppose that many, indeed, or almost all, who have forsaken the Church Catholic, and have originated impious heresies and become heresiarchs, should enjoy a destiny superior to those who never were Catholics, but have fallen into the snares of these others ; that is to say, if the fact of their Catholic baptism and original reception of the sacrament of the body of Christ in the true body of Christ is sufficient to deliver these heresiarchs from eternal punishment. For certainly he who deserts the faith, and from a deserter becomes an assailant, is worse than he who has not deserted the faith he never held. And, in the second place, they are contradicted by the apostle, who, after enumerating the works of the flesh, says with reference to heresies, "They who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

And therefore neither ought such persons as lead an abandoned and damnable life to be confident of salvation, though they persevere to the end in the communion of the Church Catholic and comfort themselves with the words, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." By the iniquity of their life they abandon that very righteousness of life which Christ is to them, whether it be by fornication, or by perpetrating in their body the other uncleannesses which the apostle would not so much as mention, or by a dissolute luxury, or by doing any one of those things of which he says, "They who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Consequently, they who do such things shall not exist anywhere but in eternal punishment, since they cannot be in the kingdom of God. For, while they continue in such things to the very end of life, they cannot be said to abide in Christ to the end; for to abide in Him is to abide in the faith of Christ. And this faith, according to the apostle's definition of it, "worketh by love."⁴ And "love," as he elsewhere says, "worketh no evil."⁵ Neither can these persons be said to eat the body of Christ, for they cannot even be reckoned among His members. For, not to mention other reasons, they cannot be at once the members of Christ and the members of a harlot. In fine. He Himself, when He says. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him," l shows what it is in reality, and not sacramentally, to eat His body and drink His blood; for this is to dwell in Christ, that He also may dwell in us. So that it is as if He said. He that dwelleth not in me. and in whom I do not dwell, let him not say or think that he eateth my body or drinketh my blood. Accordingly, they who are not Christ's members do not dwell in Him. And they who make themselves members of a harlot, are not members of Christ unless they have penitently abandoned that evil, and have returned to this good to be reconciled to it.

⁴Gal. 5. 6. ⁵Rom. 13. 10.

18 AUGUSTINE: *Christian Doctrine, BK II, CH 3 637c-d*

Chap. 3. *Among signs, words hold the chief place*

4. Of the signs, then, by which men communicate their thoughts to one another, some relate to the sense of sight, some to that of hearing, a very few to the other senses. For, when we nod, we give no sign except to the eyes of the man to whom we wish by this sign to impart our desire. And some convey a great deal by the motion of the hands: and actors by movements of all their limbs give certain signs to the initiated, and, so to speak, address their conversation to the eyes : and the military standards and flags convey through the eyes the will of the commanders. And all these signs are as it were a kind of visible words. The signs that address themselves to the ear are, as I have said, more numerous, and for the most part consist of words. For though the bugle and the flute and the lyre frequently give not only a sweet but a significant sound, yet all these signs are very few in number compared with words. For among men words have obtained far and away the chief place as a means of indicating the thoughts of the mind. Our Lord, it is true, gave a sign through the odour of the ointment which was poured out upon His feet;¹ and in the sacrament of His body and blood He signified His will through the sense of taste; and when by touching the hem of His garment the woman was made whole, the act was not wanting in significance.² But the countless multitude of the signs through which men express their thoughts consist of words. For I have been able to put into words all those signs, the various classes of which I have briefly touched upon, but I could by no effort express words in terms of those signs.

¹John, 12. 3-7; Mark, 14. 8. ²Matt. 9. 20.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK III, CH 5-9 659d-661c*

Chap. 5. *It is a wretched slavery which takes the figurative expressions of Scripture in a literal sense*

9. But the ambiguities of metaphorical words, about which I am next to speak, demand no ordinary care and diligence. In the first place, we must beware of taking a figurative expression literally. For the saying of the apostle applies in this case too: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."¹ For when what is said figuratively is taken as if it were said literally, it is understood in a carnal manner. And nothing is more fittingly called the death of the soul than when that in it which raises it above the brutes, the intelligence namely, is put in subjection to the flesh by a blind adherence to the letter. For he who follows the letter takes figurative words as if they were proper, and does not carry out what is indicated by a proper word into its secondary signification; but, if he hears of the Sabbath, for example, thinks of nothing but the one day out of seven which recurs in constant succession; and when he hears of a sacrifice, does not carry his thoughts beyond the customary offerings of victims from the flock, and of the fruits of the earth. Now it is surely a miserable slavery of the soul to take signs for things, and to be unable to lift the eye of the mind above what is corporeal and created, that it may drink in eternal light.

Chap. 6. *Utility of the bondage of the Jews*

10. This bondage, however, in the case of the Jewish people, differed widely from what it was in the case of the other nations ; because, though the former were in bondage to temporal things, it was in such a way that in all these the One God was put before their minds. And although they paid attention to the signs of spiritual realities in place of the realities themselves, not knowing to what the signs referred, still they had this conviction rooted in their minds, that in subjecting themselves to such a bondage they were doing the pleasure of the one invisible God of all. And the apostle describes this bondage as being like to that of boys under the guidance of a schoolmaster.² And those who clung obstinately to such signs could not endure our Lord's neglect of them when the time for their revelation had come; and hence their leaders brought it as a charge against Him that He healed on the Sabbath, and the people, clinging to these signs as if they were realities, could not believe that one who refused to observe them in the way the Jews did was God, or came from God. But those who did believe, from among whom the first Church at Jerusalem was formed, showed clearly how great an advantage it had been to be so guided by the schoolmaster that signs, which had been for a season imposed on the obedient, fixed the thoughts of those who observed them on the worship of the One God Who made heaven and earth. These men, because they had been very near to spiritual things (for even in the

¹II Cor. 3. 6. ²Gal. 3. 24.

temporal and carnal offerings and types, though they did not clearly apprehend their spiritual meaning, they had learnt to adore the One Eternal God), were filled with such a measure of the Holy Spirit that they sold all their goods, and laid their price at the apostles' feet to be distributed among the needy,³ and consecrated themselves wholly to God as a new temple, of which the old temple they were serving was but the earthly type.

11. Now it is not recorded that any of the Gentile churches did this, because men who had for their gods idols made with hands had not been so near to spiritual things.

Chap. 7. *The useless bondage of the Gentiles*

And if ever any of them endeavoured to make it out that their idols were only signs, yet still they used them in reference to the worship and adoration of the creature. What difference does it make to me, for instance, that the image of Neptune is not itself to be considered a god, but only as representing the wide ocean, and all the other waters besides that spring out of fountains? As it is described by a poet of theirs,⁴ who says, if I recollect aright, "Thou, Father Neptune, whose hoary temples are wreathed with the resounding sea, whose beard is the mighty ocean flowing forth unceasingly, and whose hair is the winding rivers." This husk shakes its rattling stones within a sweet covering, and yet it is not food for men, but for swine. He who knows the gospel knows what I mean.⁵ What profit is it to me, then, that the image of Neptune is used with a reference to this explanation of it, unless indeed the result be that I worship neither? For any statue you like to take is as much god to me as the wide ocean. I grant, however, that they who make gods of the works of man have sunk lower than they who make gods of the works of God. But the command is that we should love and serve the One God, who is the Maker of all those things, the images of which are worshipped by the heathen either as gods, or as signs and representations of gods. If, then, to take a sign which has been established for a useful end instead of the thing itself which it was designed to signify, is bondage to the flesh, how much more so is it to take signs intended to represent useless things for the things themselves! For even if you go back to the very things signified by such signs, and engage your mind in the worship of these, you will not be anything the more free from the burden and the livery of bondage to the flesh.

³Acts, 4. 34, 35. ⁴Claudian. ⁵Luke, 15. 16.

Chap. 8. *The Jews liberated from their bondage in one way, the Gentiles in another*

12. Accordingly the liberty that comes by Christ took those whom it found under bondage to useful signs, and who were (so to speak) near to it, and, interpreting the signs to which they were in bondage, set them free by raising them to the realities of which these were signs. And out of such were formed the churches of the saints of Israel. Those, on the other hand, whom it found in bondage to useless signs, it not only freed from their slavery to such signs, but brought to nothing and cleared out of the way all these signs themselves, so that the Gentiles were turned from the corruption of a multitude of false gods, which Scripture frequently and justly speaks of as fornication, to the worship of the One God: not that they might now fall into bondage to signs of a useful kind, but rather that they might exercise their minds in the spiritual understanding of such.

Chap. 9. *Who is in bondage to signs, and who not*

13. Now he is in bondage to a sign who uses, or pays homage to, any significant object without knowing what it signifies : he, on the other hand, who either uses or honours a useful sign divinely appointed, whose force and significance he understands, does not honour the sign which is seen and temporal, but that to which all such signs refer. Now such a man is spiritual and free even at the time of his bondage, when it is not yet expedient to reveal to carnal minds those signs by subjection to which their carnality is to be overcome. To this class of spiritual persons belonged the patriarchs and the prophets, and all those among the people of Israel through whose instrumentality the Holy Spirit ministered unto us the aids and consolations of the Scriptures. But at the present time, after that the proof of our liberty has shone forth so clearly in the resurrection of our Lord, we are not oppressed with the heavy burden of attending even to those signs which we now understand, but our Lord Himself and apostolic practice have handed down to us a few rites in place of many, and these at once very easy to perform, most majestic in their significance, and most sacred in the observance; such, for example, as the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord. And as soon as any one looks upon these observances he knows to what they refer, and so reveres them not in carnal bondage, but in spiritual freedom. Now, as to follow the letter, and to take signs for the things that are signified by them, is a mark of weakness and bondage; so to interpret signs wrongly is the result of being misled by error. He, however, who does not understand what a sign signifies, but yet knows that it is a sign, is not in bondage. And it is better even to be in bondage to unknown but useful signs than, by interpreting them wrongly, to draw the neck from under the yoke of bondage only to insert it in the coils of error.

18 AUGUSTINE: *BK IV, CH 21,690d-691b*

Chap. 21. *Examples of the various styles, drawn from the teachers of the Church, especially Ambrose and Cyprian*

45. But these writings of the apostles, though clear, are yet profound, and are so written that one who is not content with a superficial acquaintance, but desires to know them thoroughly, must not only read and hear them, but must have an expositor. Let us, then, study these various modes of speech as they are exemplified in the writings of men who, by reading the Scriptures, have attained to the knowledge of divine and saving truth, and have ministered it to the Church. Cyprian of blessed memory writes in the subdued style in his treatise on the sacrament of the cup. In this book he resolves the question, whether the cup of the Lord ought to contain water only, or water mingled with wine. But we must quote a passage by way of illustration. After the customary introduction, he proceeds to the discussion of the point in question. "Observe." he says, "that we are instructed, in presenting the cup, to maintain the custom handed down to us from the Lord, and to do nothing that our Lord has not first done for us : so that the cup which is offered in remembrance of Him should be mixed with wine. For, as Christ says, 'I am the true vine,'¹ it follows that the blood of Christ is wine, not water; and the cup cannot appear to contain His blood by which we are redeemed and quickened, if the wine be absent ; for by the wine is the blood of Christ typified, that blood which is foreshadowed and proclaimed in all the types and declarations of Scripture. For we find that in the book of Genesis this very circumstance in regard to the sacrament is foreshadowed, and our Lord's sufferings typically set forth, in the case of Noah, when he drank wine, and was drunken, and was uncovered within his tent, and his nakedness was exposed by his second son. and was carefully hidden by his elder and his younger sons.² It is not necessary to mention the other circumstances in detail, as it is only necessary to observe this point, that Noah, foreshadowing the future reality, drank, not water, but wine, and thus showed forth our Lord's passion. In the same way we see the sacrament of the Lord's supper prefigured in the case of Melchizedek the priest, according to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, where it says : 'And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most h:gh God. And he blessed Abraham.'³ Now, that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, the Holy Spirit declares in the Psalms, where the Father addressing the Son says. "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.'⁴ " In this passage, and in all of the letter that follows, the subdued style is maintained, as the reader may easily satisfy himself.

¹John, 15. 1. ²Gen. 9. 20-24.

³Gen. 14. 18, 19. ⁴Ps. 110.4.

**19 AQUINAS: *Summa Theologica, PART I, Q 92, A 3, ANS 490c-491 b***

Article 3. *Whether the Woman Was Fittingly Made from the Rib of Man?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It would seem that the woman should not have been formed from the rib of man.

Objection 1. For the rib was much smaller than the woman's body. Now from a smaller thing a larger thing can only be made either by addition (and then the woman ought to have been described as made out of that which was added, rather than out of the rib itself), or by rarefaction, because, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. x) :² "A body cannot increase in bulk except by rarefaction." But the woman's body is not more rarefied than man's—at least, not in the proportion of a rib to Eve's body. Therefore Eve was not formed from a rib of Adam.

Obj. 2. Further, in those things which were first created there was nothing superfluous. Therefore a rib of Adam belonged to the integrity of his body. So, if a rib was removed, his body remained imperfect, which is unreasonable to suppose.

Obj. 3. Further, a rib cannot be removed from man without pain. But there was no pain before sin. Therefore it was not right for a rib to be taken from the man, that Eve might be made from it.

*On the contrary, It is written (Gen. 2. 22): God built the rib, which He took from Adam, into a woman.*

I answer that, It was right for the woman to be made from a rib of man. First, to signify the social union of man and woman, for the woman should neither use authority over man, and so she was not made from his head; nor was it right for her to be subject to man's contempt as his slave, and so she was not made from his feet. Secondly, for the sacramental signification ; for from the side of Christ sleeping on the Cross the Sacraments flowed—namely, blood and water—on which the Church was established.

Reply Obj. 1. Some say that the woman's body was formed by a material increase, without anything being added, in the same way as

²Chap. 26 (PL 34, 428).

our Lord multiplied the five loaves.¹ But this is quite impossible. For such an increase of matter would either be by a change of the very substance of matter itself, or by a change of its dimensions. Not by change of the substance of the matter, both because matter, considered in itself, is altogether unchangeable, since it has a potential existence, and has nothing but the character of being a subject, and because multiplication and size are extraneous to the essence of matter itself. Therefore multiplication of matter is quite unintelligible, as long as the matter itself remains the same without anything added to it, unless it receives greater dimensions. This implies rarefaction, which is for the same matter to receive greater dimensions, as the Philosopher says.² To say, therefore, that matter is multiplied, without being rarefied, is to combine contradictories—namely, the definition with the absence of the thing defined.

Therefore, as no rarefaction is apparent in such multiplication of matter, we must admit an addition of matter, either by creation or, which is more probable, by conversion. Hence Augustine says (Tract, xxiv, in Joan.)³ that "Christ filled five thousand men with five loaves in the same way as from a few seeds He produces the harvest of corn"—that is, by conversion of the nourishment. Nevertheless, we say that the crowds were fed with five loaves, or that woman was made from the rib, because an addition was made to the already existing matter of the loaves and of the rib.

Reply Obj. 2. The rib belonged to the integral perfection of Adam, not as an individual, but as the principle of the human race; just as the semen belongs to the perfection of the begetter, and is released by a natural and pleasurable operation. Much more, therefore, was it possible that by the Divine power the body of the woman should be produced from the man's rib without pain.

From this it is clear how to answer the *third objection.*

¹Hugh of St. Victor, De Sacram., I, VI, 36 (PL 176, 284);

Peter Lombard, Sent., II, d. 18, chap. 4 (QR 1, 389).

²Physics, IV, 9 (217ᵃ25).

³PL 35, 1593.

**20 AQUINAS: *Summa Theologica, PART I-II, QQ 101-103 265d-304a; PART III, QQ 60-65 847a- 884a,c***

20 AQUINAS: *Summa Theologica, PART I-II, QQ 101-103 265d-304a*

QUESTION CI

OF THE CEREMONIAL PRECEPTS IN THEMSELVES

(*In Four Articles*)

We must now consider the ceremonial precepts. And first we must consider them in themselves secondly, their cause (Q. CII); thirdly, their duration (Q. CII). Under the first head there are four points of inquiry: (1) The nature of the ceremonial precepts; (2) Whether they are figurative? (3) Whether there should have been many of them? (4) Of their various kinds.

Article I. *Whether the Nature of the Ceremonial Precepts Consists in Their Pertaining to the Worship of God?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It would seem that the nature of the ceremonial precepts does not consist in their pertaining to the worship of God.¹

Objection I. Because, in the Old Law, the Jews were given certain precepts about abstinence from food (Levit. ii.) and about refraining from certain kinds of clothes, for example (Levit. 19. 19): Thou shall not wear a garment that is woven of two sorts; and again (Num. 15. 38): To make to themselves fringes in the corners of their garments. But these are not moral precepts, since they do not remain in the New Law. Nor are they judicial precepts, since they do not pertain to the pronouncing of judgment between man and man. Therefore they are ceremonial precepts. Yet they seem in no way to pertain to the worship of God. Therefore the nature of the ceremonial precepts does not consist in their pertaining to Divine Worship.

Obj. 2. Further, some state that the ceremonial precepts are those which pertain to solemnities, as though they were so called from the cerei (candles) which are lit up on those occasions.² But many other things besides solemnities pertain to the worship of God. Therefore it does not seem that the ceremonial precepts are so called from their pertaining to the Divine worship.

Obj. 3. Further, some say that the ceremonial precepts are norms, that is, rules, of salvation, because the Greek xaipe is the same as the Latin salve. But all the precepts of the Law are rules of salvation, and not only those that pertain to the worship of God. Therefore not only those precepts which pertain to the Divine worship are called ceremonial.

Obj. 4. Further, Rabbi Moses says (Doct. Perplex, III)³ that "the ceremonial precepts are those for which there is no evident reason." But there is evident reason for many things pertaining to the worship of God, such as the observance of the Sabbath, the feasts of the Passover and of the Tabernacles, and many other things, the reason for which is set down in the Law. Therefore the ceremonial precepts are not those which pertain to the worship of God. On the contrary, It is written (Exod. 18. 19, 20) : Be thou to the people in those things that pertain to God . . . and . . . shew the people the ceremonies and the manner of worshipping. I answer that, As stated above (q. xcix, a. 4), the ceremonial precepts are determinations of the moral precepts by which man is directed to God, just as the judicial precepts are determinations of the moral precepts by which he is directed to his neighbour. Now man is directed to God by the worship due to Him. Therefore those precepts are properly called ceremonial which pertain to the Divine worship. The reason for their being called so was given above (ibid., A. 3), when we established the distinction between the ceremonial and the other precepts.

Reply Obj. 1. The Divine worship includes not only sacrifices and the like, which seem to be directed to God immediately, but also those things by which His worshippers are duly prepared to worship Him; thus too in other matters, whatever is preparatory to the end comes under the science whose object is the end. Accordingly those precepts of the Law which regard the clothing and food of God's worshippers, and other such matters, pertain to a certain preparation of the ministers, with the view of fitting them for the Divine worship, just as those who administer to a king make use of certain special observances. Consequently such are contained under the ceremonial precepts.

Reply Obj. 2. The alleged explanation of the name does not seem very probable, especially as the Law does not contain many instances of the lighting of candles in solemnities, since even the lamps of the Candlestick were furnished with oil of olives, as stated in Levit. 24. 2. Nevertheless we may say that all things pertaining to the Divine worship were more carefully observed on solemn festivals, so that all ceremonial precepts may be included under the observance of solemnities.

Reply Obj. 3. Neither does this explanation of the name appear to be very much to the point, since the word "ceremony" is not Greek but Latin. We may say, however, that, since man's salvation is from God those precepts above all seem to be rules of salvation which direct man to God. And accordingly those which refer to Divine worship are called ceremonial precepts.

Reply Obj. 4. This explanation of the ceremonial precepts has a certain amount of prob

¹Cf. Albert the Great. In Sent., iv, d. i, a. 7 (BO xxix. 19); Cicero, De Nat. Deor., 11, 28 (DD iv, 124); De Invent., ii, 53(DD I, 165).

²Albert, In .Sent., iv, d. i, A. 7 (BO xxix, 18).

³Chap. 28 (FR 314).

ability; not that they are called ceremonial precisely because there is no evident reason for them, bat rather this is a kind of consequence. For since the precepts referring to the Divine worship must be figurative, as we shall state further on (a. 2), the consequence is that the reason for them is not so very evident.

Article 2. *Whether the Ceremonial Precepts Are Figurative?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It would seem that the ceremonial precepts are not figurative.

Objection 1. For it is the duty of every teacher to express himself in such a way as to be easily understood, as Augustine states,¹ and this seems very necessary in the framing of a law because precepts of law are proposed to the populace, for which reason "a law should be manifest," as Isidore declares (Etym. v, 21).² If therefore the precepts of the Law were given as figures of something, it seems unfitting that Moses should have delivered these precepts without explaining what they signified.

Obj. 2. Further, whatever is done for the worship of God, should be entirely free from unfittingness. But the performance of actions in representation of others seems to savour of the theatre or of poetry, because formerly the actions performed in theatres were done to represent the actions of others. Therefore it seems that such things should not be done for the worship of God. But the ceremonial precepts are ordained to the Divine worship, as stated above (a. i). Therefore they should not be figurative.

Obj. 3. Further, Augustine says (Enchirid. iii, iv)³ that "God is worshipped chiefly by faith, hope, and charity." But the precepts of faith, hope and charity are not figurative. Therefore the ceremonial precepts should not be figurative.

Obj. 4. Further, Our Lord said (John 4. 24) : God is a spirit, and they that adore Him, must adore Him in spirit and in truth. But a figure is not the very truth: in fact one is divided against the other. Therefore the ceremonial precepts, which refer to the Divine worship, should not be figurative.

On the contrary. The Apostle says (Coloss. 2, 16, 17) : *Let no man . . . judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or*
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*of the new moon^ or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come.*

I answer that. As stated above (a. i; q. xcix, AA. 3, 4), the ceremonial precepts are those which refer to the worship of God. Now the Divine worship is twofold: interior, and external. For since man is composed of soul and body, each of these should be applied to the worship of God, the soul by an interior worship, the body by an outward worship ; hence it is written (Ps. 83. 3) : My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God. And as the body is ordered to God through the soul so the outward worship is ordered to the internal worship. Now interior worship consists in the soul being united to God by the intellect and affections. Therefore according to the various ways in which the intellect and affections of the man who worships God are rightly united to God, his external actions are applied in various ways to the Divine worship.

For in the state of future happiness, the human intellect will gaze on the Divine Truth in Itself. Therefore the external worship will not consist in anything figurative, but solely in the praise of God, proceeding from the inward knowledge and affection, according to Isa. 51. 3: Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of praise.

But in the present state of life we are unable to gaze upon the Divine Truth in Itself, and we need the ray of Divine light to shine upon us under the form of certain sensible figures, as Dionysius states; in various ways, however, according to the various states of human knowledge. For under the Old Law, neither was the Divine Truth manifest in Itself, nor was the way leading to that manifestation as yet opened out, as the Apostle declares (Heb. 9. 8). Hence the external worship of the Old Law needed to be figurative not only of the future truth to be manifested in our heavenly country, but also of Christ, Who is the way leading to that heavenly truth. But under the New Law this way is already revealed, and therefore it needs no longer to be foreshadowed as something future, but to be brought to our minds as something past or present; and the truth of the glory to come, which is not yet revealed, alone needs to be foreshadowed. This is what the Apostle says (Heb. 10. i) : The Law has (Vulg., —having) a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, for a shadow is less than an image, so that the image belongs to the New Law, but the shadow to the Old.

Reply Obj 1. The things of God are not to be revealed to man except in proportion to his capacity, otherwise he would be in danger of downfall were he to despise what he cannot grasp. Hence it was more beneficial that the Divine mysteries should be revealed to primitive people under a veil of figures that thus they might know them at least implicitly by using those figures to the honour of God.

Reply Obj. 2. Just as human reason fails to grasp poetical expressions because they are lacking in truth, so does it fail to grasp Divine things perfectly on account of the sublimity of the truth they contain. And therefore in both cases there is need of signs by means of sensible figures.

Reply Obj. 3. Augustine is speaking there of internal worship, to which, however, external worship should be ordered, as stated above. The same answer applies to the Fourth Objection, because men were taught by Christ to practise more perfectly the spiritual worship of God.

Article 3. *Whether There Should Have Been Many Ceremonial Precepts?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It would seem that there should not have been many ceremonial precepts.

Objection 1. For those things which lead to an end should be proportionate to that end. But the ceremonial precepts, as stated above (aa. I, 2), are ordered to the worship of God, and to the foreshadowing of Christ. Now there is but one God, of Whom are all things, . . . and one Lord Jesus Christy by Whom are all things (I Cor. 8. 6). Therefore there should not have been many ceremonial precepts.

Obj. 2. Further, the great number of the ceremonial precepts was an occasion of transgression, according to the words of Peter (Acts 15. 10): Why tempt you God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? Now the transgression of the Divine precepts is an obstacle to man's salvation. Since, therefore, every law should conduce to man's salvation, as Isidore says {Etym. v, 3),¹ it seems that the ceremonial precepts should not have been given in great number.

Obj. 3. Further, the ceremonial precepts referred to the outward and bodily worship of God, as stated above (a. 2). But the Law should have lessened this bodily worship: since it directed men to Christ, Who taught them to
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worship God in spirit and in truth, as stated in John 4. 23. Therefore there should not have

been many ceremonial precepts.

On the contrary, It is written (Osee 8. 12): I shall write to them (Vulg.,—him) My manifold laws; and (Job 11. 6): That He might show thee the secrets of His wisdom, and that His Law is manifold.

I answer that. As stated above (q. xcvi., a. i) every law is given to a people. Now a people contains two kinds of men. Some are prone to evil, and have to be coerced by the precepts of the law, as stated above (q. xcv, a. i) ; some are inclined to good, either from nature or from custom, or rather from grace, and these have to be taught and improved by means of the precepts of the law. Accordingly, with regard to both kinds of men it was expedient that the Old Law should contain many ceremonial precepts. For in that people there were many prone to idolatry, and therefore it was necessary to recall them by means of ceremonial precepts from the worship of idols to the worship of God.

And since men served idols in many ways, it was necessary on the other hand to devise many means of repressing every single one ; and again, to lay many obligations on such men in order that being burdened, as it were, by their duties to the Divine worship, they might have no time for the service of idols. As to those who were inclined to good, it was again necessary that there should be many ceremonial precepts; both because thus their mind was turned to God in many ways, and more diligently, and because the mystery of Christ, which was foreshadowed by these ceremonial precepts, brought many benefits to the world, and afforded men many considerations, which needed to be signified by various ceremonies.

Reply Obj. 1. When that which is ordered to an end is sufficient to lead to it, then one such thing suffices for one end; thus one remedy, if it be efficacious, suffices sometimes to restore man to health, and then the remedy needs not to be repeated. But when that which conduces to an end is weak and imperfect, it needs to be multiplied : thus many remedies are given to a sick man when one is not enough to heal him. Now the ceremonies of the Old Law were weak and imperfect, both for representing the mystery of Christ, on account of its surpassing excellence, and for subjugating men's minds to God. Hence the Apostle says (Heb. 7. 18, 19): *There is a setting aside of the former commandment because of the weakness and unprofitableness thereof, for the law brought nothing to* *perfection*. Consequently these ceremonies needed to be in great number.

Reply Obj. 2. A wise lawgiver should suffer lesser transgressions that the greater may be avoided. And therefore, in order to avoid the sin of idolatry, and the pride which would arise in the hearts of the Jews were they to fulfil all the precepts of the Law, the fact that they would in consequence find many occasions of disobedience did not prevent God from giving them many ceremonial precepts.

Reply Obj. 3. The Old Law lessened bodily worship in many ways. Thus it forbade sacrifices to be offered in every place and by any person. Many such things did it enact for the lessening of bodily worship, as Rabbi Moses, the Egyptian testifies (Doct. Perplex, iii).¹ Nevertheless it was necessary not to attenuate the bodily worship of God so much as to allow men to fall away into the worship of idols.

Article 4. *Whether the Ceremonies of the Old Law Are Suitably Divided into Sacrifices, Sacred Things, Sacraments, and Observances?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It would seem that the ceremonies of the Old Law are unsuitably divided into sacrifices, sacred things, sacraments and observances.²

Objection 1. For the ceremonies of the Old Law foreshadowed Christ. But this was done only by the sacrifices, which foreshadowed the sacrifice in which Christ delivered Himself an oblation and a sacrifice to God (Eph. 5. 2). Therefore none but the sacrifices were ceremonies.

Obj. 2. Further, the Old Law was ordered to the New. But in the New Law the sacrifice is the Sacrament of the Altar. Therefore in the Old Law there should be no distinction between sacrifices and sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, a sacred thing is something dedicated to God, in which sense the tabernacle and its vessels were said to be consecrated. But all the ceremonial precepts were ordained to the worship of God, as stated above (a. i). Therefore all ceremonies were sacred things. Therefore sacred things should not be taken as a part of the ceremonies.

Obj. 4. Further, Observances are so called from having to be observed. But all the precepts of the Law had to be observed, for it is written (Deut. 8. 11): Observe (Douay,— Take heed) and beware lest at any time thou forget the Lord thy God, and neglect His commandments
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and judgments and ceremonies. Therefore the observances should not be considered as a part of the ceremonies.

Obj. 5. Further, the solemn festivals are reckoned as part of the ceremonial, since they were a shadow of things to come (Coloss. 2. 16, 17) : and the same may be said of the oblations and gifts, as appears from the words of the Apostle (Heb. 9. 9) ; and yet these do not seem to be included in any of those mentioned above. Therefore the above division of ceremonies is unsuitable.

On the contrary, In the Old Law each of the above is called a ceremony. For the sacrifices are called ceremonies (Num. 15. 24): They shall offer a calf . . . and the sacrifices and libations thereof, as the ceremonies require. Of the sacrament of Order it is written (Levit. 7. 35) : This is the anointing of Aaron and his sons in the ceremonies. Of sacred things also it is written (Exod. 38. 21) : These are the instruments of the tabernacle of the testimony . . . in the ceremonies of the Levites. And again of the observances it is written (III Kings 9. 6) : If you . . . shall turn away from following Me, and will not observe (Douay, — keep) My . . . ceremonies which I have set before you.

I answer that, As stated above (aa. 1,2), the ceremonial precepts are ordered to the Divine worship. Now in this worship we may consider the worship itself, the worshippers, and the instruments of worship. The worship consists specially in sacrifices, which are offered up in honour of God. The instruments of worship refer to the sacred things, such as the tabernacle, the vessels and so forth. With regard to the worshippers two points may be considered. The first point is their preparation for Divine worship, which is effected by a sort of consecration either of the people or of the ministers; and to this the sacraments refer. The second point is their particular mode of life, whereby they are distinguished from those who do not worship God, and to this pertain the observances; for instance, in matters of food, clothing, and so forth.

Reply Obj. 1. It was necessary for the sacrifices to be offered both in some certain place and by some certain men, and all this pertained to the worship of God. Therefore just as their sacrifices signified Christ the victim, so too their sacraments and sacred things foreshadowed the sacraments and sacred things of the New Law, while their observances foreshadowed the mode of life of the people under the New Law—all of which things pertain to Christ.

Reply Obj. 2. The sacrifice of the New Law, namely, the Eucharist, contains Christ Himself, the Author of our Sanctification; for He sanctified the people by His own blood (Heb. 13. 12). Hence this Sacrifice is also a sacrament. But the sacrifices of the Old Law did not contain Christ, but foreshadowed Him; hence they are not called sacraments. In order to signify this there were certain sacraments apart from the sacrifices of the Old Law, which sacraments were figures of the sanctification to come. Nevertheless to certain consecrations certain sacrifices were united.

Reply Obj. 3. The sacrifices and sacraments were of course sacred things. But certain things were sacred through being dedicated to the Divine worship, and yet were not sacrifices or sacraments. Therefore they retained the common designation of sacred things.

Reply Obj. 4. Those things which pertained to the mode of life of the people who worshipped God retained the common designation of observances, in so far as they fell short of the above. For they were not called sacred things because they had no immediate connection with the worship of God, such as the tabernacle and its vessels had. But by a sort of consequence they were matters of ceremony, in so far as they affected the fitness of the people who worshipped God.

Reply Obj. 5. Just as the sacrifices were offered in a fixed place, so were they offered at fixed times, for which reason the solemn festivals seem lo be reckoned among the sacred things. The oblations and gifts are counted together with the sacrifices; hence the Apostle says (Heb. 5. i) : Every high-priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices.

QUESTION CXI

OF THE CAUSES OF THE CEREMONIAL PRECEPTS

(*In Six Articles*)

We must now consider the causes of the ceremonial precepts, under which head there are six points of inquiry: (1) Whether there was any cause for the ceremonial precepts? (2) Whether the cause of the ceremonial precepts was literal or figurative? (3) The causes of the sacrifices. (4) The causes of the sacraments. (5) The causes of the sacred things. (6) The causes of the observances.

Article I . *Whether There Was Any Cause for the Ceremonial Precepts?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It would seem that there was no cause for the ceremonial precepts.

Objection 1. Because on Ephes. 2. 15, Making void the law of the commandments, the gloss says,¹ "that is, making void the Old Law as to the carnal observances, by substituting decrees, that is, evangelical precepts, which are based on reason." But if the observances of the Old Law were based on reason, it would have been useless to void them by the reasonable decrees of the New Law. Therefore there was no reason for the ceremonial observances of the Old Law.

Obj. 2. Further, the Old Law succeeded the law of nature. But in the law of nature there was a precept for which there was no reason save that man's obedience might be tested, as Augustine says {Gen. ad lit. viii, 6, 13),² concerning the prohibition about the tree of life. Therefore in the Old Law there should have been some precepts for the purpose of testing man's obedience, having no reason in themselves.

Obj. 3. Further, man's works are called moral according as they proceed from reason. If therefore there is any reason for the ceremonial precepts, they would not differ from the moral precepts. It seems therefore that there was no cause for the ceremonial precepts, for the reason of a precept is taken from some cause.

On the contrary. It is written (Ps. 18. 9): The commandment of the Lord is lightsome, enlightening the eyes. But the ceremonial precepts are commandments of God. Therefore they are lightsome, and yet they would not be so, if they had no reasonable cause. Therefore the ceremonial precepts have a reasonable cause.

I answer that, Since, according to the Philosopher,³ it is the function of a wise man to set things in order, those things which proceed from the Divine wisdom must be well ordered, as the Apostle states (Rom. 13. i). Now there are two conditions required for things to be well ordered. First, that they be ordered to their due end, which is the principle of the whole order in matters of action, since those things that happen by chance outside the intention of the end, or which are not done seriously but for
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fun, are said to be lacking in order. Secondly, that which is done in view of the end should be proportionate to the end. From this it follows that the reason for whatever leads to the end is taken from the end; thus the reason for the disposition of a saw is taken from cutting, which is its end, as stated in the Physics.¹ Now it is evident that the ceremonial precepts, like all the other precepts of the Law, were institutions of Divine wisdom; hence it is written (Deut. 4. 6) : This is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of nations. Consequently we must say that the ceremonial precepts were ordered to a certain end, from which their reasonable causes can be gathered.

Reply Obj. 1. It may be said that there was no reason for the observances of the Old Law, in the sense that there was no reason in the very nature of the thing done; for instance that a garment should not be made of wool and linen. But there could be a reason for them in their relation to something else, namely, in so far as something was signified or excluded thereby. On the other hand, the decrees of the New Law, which refer chiefly to faith and the love of God, are reasonable from the very nature of the act.

Reply Obj. 2. The reason for the prohibition concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was not that this tree was naturally evil. And yet this prohibition was reasonable in its relation to something else, since it signified something. And so also the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law were reasonable on account of their relation to something else.

Reply Obj. 3. The moral precepts in their very nature have reasonable causes, as for instance, Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. But the ceremonial precepts have a reasonable cause in their relation to something else, as stated above.

Article 2. *Whether the Ceremonial Precepts Have a Literal Cause or Merely a Figurative Cause?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It would seem that the ceremonial precepts have not a literal but merely a figurative cause.

Objection 1. For among the ceremonial precepts the chief were circumcision and the sacrifice of the paschal lamb. But neither of these had any but a figurative cause, because each was given as a sign. For it is written (Gen. 17. 11): You shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, that it may be for a sign of the covenant between Me and you; and of the celebration of

¹Aristotle, 11, 9 (200ᵃ10).

the Passover it is written (Exod. 13. 9) : It shall be as a sign in thy hand, and as a memorial before thy eyes. Therefore much more did the other ceremonial precepts have none but a figurative reason.

Obj. 2. Further, an effect is proportionate to its cause. But all the ceremonial precepts are figurative, as stated above (q. ci, a. 2). Therefore they have no other than a figurative cause.

Obj. 3. Further, if it be a matter of indifference whether a certain thing, considered in itself, be done in a particular way or not, it seems that it has not a literal cause. Now there are certain points in the ceremonial precepts which appear to be a matter of indifference as to whether they be done in one way or in another for instance, the number of animals to be offered, and other such particular circumstances. Therefore there is no literal cause for the precepts of the Old Law.

On the contrary, Just as the ceremonial precepts foreshadowed Christ, so did the stories of the Old Testament: for it is written (I Cor. 10. 11) that all (these things) happened to them in figure. Now in the stories of the Old Testament, besides the mystical or figurative, there is the literal sense. Therefore the ceremonial precepts had also literal, besides their figurative causes.

I answer that, As stated above (a. i), the reason for whatever leads to an end must be taken from that end. Now the end of the ceremonial precepts was twofold, for they were ordered to the Divine worship, for that particular time, and to the foreshadowing of Christ, just as the words of the prophets regarded the time being in such a way as to be utterances figurative of the time to come, as Jerome says on Osee i. 3.² Accordingly the reasons for the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law can be taken in two ways. First, in respect of the Divine worship which was to be observed for that particular time. And these reasons are literal, whether they refer to the shunning of idolatry, or recall certain Divine benefits, or remind men of the Divine excellence, or point out the disposition of mind which was then required in those who worshipped God. Secondly, their reasons can be gathered from the point of view of their being ordained to foreshadow Christ. And thus their reasons are figurative and mystical, whether they be taken from Christ Himself and the Church, which pertains to the allegorical sense, or to the morals of the Christian people, which pertains to the moral sense, or to the state of fu-
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ture glory, according as we are brought there by Christ, which refers to the anagogical sense.

Reply Obj. 1. Just as the use of metaphorical expressions in Scripture belongs to the literal sense because the words are employed in order to convey that particular meaning, so also the meaning of those legal ceremonies which commemorated certain Divine benefits, on account of which they were instituted, and of others similar which belonged to that time, does not go beyond the order of literal causes. Consequently when we assert that the cause of the celebration of the Passover was its signification of the delivery from Egypt, or that circumcision was a sign of God's covenant with Abraham, we assign the literal cause.

Reply Obj. 2. This argument would avail if the ceremonial precepts had been given merely as figures of things to come, and not for the purpose of worshipping God then and there.

Reply Obj. 3. As we stated when speaking of human laws (q. xcvi, aa. i, 6), there is a reason for them in a universal way, but not in regard to particular conditions, which depend on the judgment of those who frame them; so also many particular determinations in the ceremonies of the Old Law have no literal cause, but only a figurative cause. But taken in general they have a literal cause.

Article 3. *Whether a Suitable Cause Can Be Assigned for the Ceremonies Which Pertained to Sacrifices?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It would seem that no suitable cause can be assigned for the ceremonies pertaining to sacrifices.

Objection 1. For those things which were offered in sacrifice are those which are necessary for sustaining human life, such as certain animals and certain loaves. But God needs no such sustenance, according to Ps. 49. 13: Shall I eat the flesh of bullocks? Or shall I drink the blood of goats? Therefore such sacrifices were unfittingly offered to God.

Obj. 2. Further, only three kinds of quadrupeds were offered in sacrifice to God, namely, oxen, sheep and goats; of birds, generally the turtledove and the dove; but specially, in the cleansing of a leper, an offering was made of sparrows. Now many other animals are more noble than these. Since therefore whatever is best should be offered to God, it seems that not only of these three should sacrifices have been offered to Him.

Obj. 3. Further, just as man has received from God the dominion over birds and beasts, so also has he received dominion over fishes. Consequently it was unfitting for fishes to be excluded from the divine sacrifices.

Obj. 4. Further, turtledoves and doves indifferently are commanded to be offered up. Since then the young of the dove are commanded to be offered, so also should the young of the turtledove.

Obj. 5. Further, God is the Author of life, not only of men, but also of animals, as is clear from Gen. i. 20, seq. Now death is opposed to life. Therefore it was fitting that living animals rather than slain animals should be offered to God; especially as the Apostle admonishes us (Rom. 12. i), to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God.

Obj. 6. Further, if none but slain animals were offered in sacrifice to God, it seems that it mattered not how they were slain. Therefore it was unfitting that the manner of immolation should be determined, especially as regards birds (Levit. I. 15, seq.).

Obj. 7. Further, every defect in an animal is a step towards corruption and death. If therefore slain animals were offered to God, it was unreasonable to forbid the offering of an imperfect animal, for example, a lame, or a blind, or otherwise defective animal.

Obj. 8. Further, those who offer victims to God should partake of them, according to the words of the Apostle (I Cor. 10. 18) : Are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? It was therefore unfitting for the offerers to be denied certain parts of the victims, namely, the blood, the fat, the breast-bone and the right shoulder.

Obj. 9. Further, just as holocausts were offered up in honour of God, so also were the peace-offerings and sin-offerings. But no female animal was offered up to God as a holocaust, although holocausts were offered of both quadrupeds and birds. Therefore it was inconsistent that female animals should be offered up in peace-offerings and sin-offerings, and that nevertheless birds should not be offered up in peace offerings.

Obj. 10. Further, all the peace-offerings seem to be of one kind. Therefore it was unfitting to make a distinction among them, so that it was forbidden to eat the flesh of certain peace offerings on the following day, while it was allowed to eat the flesh of other peace-offerings, as laid down in Levit. 7. 15, seq.

Obj. 11. Further, all sins agree in turning us from God. Therefore, in order to reconcile us to God, one kind of sacrifice should have been offered up for all sins.

Obj. 12. Further, all animals that were offered up in sacrifice, were offered up in one way, namely, slain. Therefore it does not seem to be suitable that products of the soil should be offered up in various ways ; for sometimes an offering was made of ears of com, sometimes of flour, sometimes of bread, this being baked sometimes in an oven, sometimes in a pan, sometimes on a gridiron.

Obj. 13. Further, whatever things are serviceable to us should be recognized as coming from God. It was therefore unfitting that besides animals, nothing but bread, wine, oil, incense, and salt should be offered to God.

Obj. 14. Further, bodily sacrifices denote the inward sacrifice of the heart, by which man offers his soul to God. But in the inward sacrifice, the sweetness, which is denoted by honey, surpasses the pungency which salt represents ; for it is written (Ecclus 24. 27) : My spirit is sweet above honey. Therefore it was unfitting that the use of honey, and of leaven which makes bread savoury, should be forbidden in a sacrifice, while the use was prescribed, of salt which is pungent, and of incense which has a bitter taste. Consequently it seems that things pertaining to the ceremonies of the sacrifices have no reasonable cause.

On the contrary, It is written (Levit. i. 13) : The priest shall offer it all and burn it all upon the altar, for a holocaust, and most sweet savour to the Lord. Now according to Wisd. 7. 28, God loveth none but him that dwelleth with wisdom. From this it seems to follow that whatever is acceptable to God is wisely done. Therefore these ceremonies of the sacrifices were wisely done, as having reasonable causes.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 2), the ceremonies of the Old Law had a twofold cause, namely, a literal cause, according as they were intended for Divine worship, and a figurative or mystical cause, according as they were intended to foreshadow Christ; and on either hand the ceremonies pertaining to the sacrifices can be assigned to a fitting cause.

For, according as the ceremonies of the sacrifices were intended for the divine worship, the causes of the sacrifices can be taken in two ways. First, in so far as the sacrifice represented the directing of the mind to God, to which the offerer of the sacrifice was stimulated. Now in order to direct his mind to God rightly, man must recognize that whatever he has is from God as from its first principle, and direct it to God as its last end. This was denoted in the offerings and sacrifices by the fact that man offered some of his own belongings in honour of God, as though in recognition of his having received them from God, according to the saying of David (i Paral. 29. 14) : All things are Thine: and we have given Thee what we received of Thy hand. Therefore in offering up sacrifices man made protestation that God is the first principle of the creation of all things, and their last end, to which all things must be ordered.

And since for the human mind to be directed to God rightly it must recognize no first author of things other than God, nor place its end in any other, for this reason it was forbidden in the Law to offer sacrifice to any other but God, according to Exod. 22. 20: He that sacrificeth to gods, shall be put to death, save only to the Lord. Therefore another reasonable cause may be assigned to the ceremonies of the sacrifices, from the fact that thereby men were withdrawn from offering sacrifices to idols. Hence too it is that the precepts about the sacrifices were not given to the Jewish people until after they had fallen into idolatry, by worshipping the molten calf, as though those sacrifices were instituted, that the people, being ready to offer sacrifices, might offer those sacrifices to God rather than to idols. Thus it is written (Jer. 7. 22) : I spake not to your fathers and I commanded them not, in the day that I brought them, out of the land of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt-offerings and sacrifices.

Now of all the gifts which God vouchsafed to mankind after they had fallen away by sin, the chief is that He gave His Son ; and so it is written (John 3. 16) : God so loved the world, as to give His only-begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in Him, may not perish, but may have life everlasting. Consequently the chief sacrifice is that by which Christ Himself delivered Himself . . . to God for an odour of sweetness (Eph. 5. 2). And for this reason all the other sacrifices of the Old Law were offered up in order to foreshadow this one individual and paramount sacrifice—the imperfect forecasting the perfect. Hence the Apostle says (Heb. 10. 11) that the priest of the Old Law often offered the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but Christ offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever. And since the reason of the figure is taken from that which the figure represents, therefore the reasons of the figurative sacrifices of the Old Law should be taken from the true sacrifice of Christ.

Reply Obj. 1. God did not wish these sacrifices to be offered to Him on account of the things themselves that were offered, as though He stood in need of them ; hence it is written (Isa. i. ii) : I desire not holocausts of rams, and fat of failings, and blood of calves and lambs and buckgoats. But, as stated above, He wished them to be offered to Him in order to prevent idolatry; in order to signify the right ordering of man's mind to God; and in order to represent the mystery of the Redemption of man by Christ.

Reply Obj. 2. In all the respects mentioned above (Reply i), there was a suitable reason for these animals, rather than others, being offered up in sacrifice to God. First, in order to prevent idolatry. Because idolaters offered all other animals to their gods, or made use of them in their sorceries, while the Egyptians (among whom the people had been dwelling) considered it abominable to slay these animals, and so they used not to offer them in sacrifice to their gods. Hence it is written (Exod. 8. 26) : We shall sacrifice the abominations of the Egyptians to the Lord our God. For they worshipped the sheep, they reverenced the ram (because demons appeared under their form), while they employed oxen for agriculture, which was held by them as something sacred.

Secondly, this was suitable for the previously mentioned right ordering of man's mind to God, and in two ways. First, because it is chiefly by means of these animals that human life is sustained, and moreover they are most clean, and partake of a most clean food. But other animals are either wild, and not appointed to ordinary use among men ; or, if they be tame, they have unclean food, as pigs and geese, and nothing but what is clean should be offered to God. These birds especially were offered in sacrifice because there were plenty of them in the land of promise. Secondly, because the sacrificing of these animals represented purity of heart. Because as the gloss says on Levit. i.,¹ "We offer a calf when we overcome the pride of the flesh ; a lamb when we restrain our unreasonable motions; a goat when we conquer our wantonness ; a turtledove when we keep chaste; unleavened bread when we feast on the unleavened bread of sincerity." And it is evident that the dove denotes charity and simplicity of heart.

Thirdly, it was fitting that these animals should be offered that they might foreshadow Christ. Because, as the same gloss observes,²

¹Glossa ordin., Prol. (i, 214B); Isidore, Quaest. in Vet. Test., In Lev. 1 (PL 83, 321).

²Ibid.

"Christ is offered in the calf to denote the strength of the cross; in the lamb to signify His innocence; in the ram to foreshadow His headship; in the goat to signify the likeness of 'sinful flesh.' The turtledove and dove denoted the union of the two natures" ; or else the turtledove signified chastity, while the dove was a figure of charity. "The wheat-flour foreshadowed the sprinkling of believers with the water of Baptism."

Reply Obj. 3. Fish through living in water are further removed from man than other animals, which, like man, live in the air. Again, fish die as soon as they are taken out of water; hence they could not be offered in the temple like other animals.

Reply Obj. 4. Among turtledoves the older ones are better than the young, while with doves the case is the reverse. Therefore, as Rabbi Moses observes (Doct. Perplex, iii),³ "turtledoves and young doves are commanded to be offered because nothing should be offered to God but what is best."

Reply Obj. 5. The animals which were offered in sacrifice were slain because it is by being killed that they become useful to man, since God gave them to man for food. Therefore also they were burnt with fire, because it is by being cooked that they are made fit for human consumption. Moreover the slaying of the animals signified the destruction of sins, and also that man deserved death on account of his sins, as though those animals were slain in man's stead, in order to betoken the expiation of sins. Again the slaying of these animals signified the slaying of Christ.

Reply Obj. 6. The Law fixed the special manner of slaying the sacrificial animals in order to exclude other ways of killing, by which idolaters sacrificed animals to idols. Or again, as Rabbi Moses says (loc. cit.),⁴ "the Law chose that manner of slaying which was least painful to the slain animal." This excluded cruelty on the part of the offerers, and any mangling of the animals slain.

Reply Obj. 7. It is because unclean animals are accustomed to be held in contempt among men that it was forbidden to offer them in sacrifice to God; and for this reason too they were forbidden (Deut 23. 18) to offer the hire of a strumpet or the price of a dog in the house of . . . God. For the same reason they did not offer animals before the seventh day, because such were abortive as it were, the flesh being not yet firm on account of its exceeding softness.

³Chap. 40 (FR 360). ⁴Chap. .18 (FR 371).

Reply Obj. 8. There were three kinds of sacrifices. There was one in which the victim was entirely consumed by fire, and this was called a holocaust, that is, all burnt. For this kind of sacrifice was offered to God specially to show reverence to His majesty, and love of His goodness, and typified the state of perfection as regards the fulfilment of the counsels. Therefore the whole was burnt up, so that as the whole animal by being dissolved into vapour soared aloft, so it might denote that the whole man, and whatever belongs to him, are subject to the authority of God, and should be offered to Him.

Another sacrifice was the sin-offering, which was offered to God on account of man's need for the forgiveness of sin, and this typifies the state of penitents in satisfying for sins. It v/as divided into two parts; for one part was burnt, while the other was granted to the use of the priests to signify that remission of sins is granted by God through the ministry of His priests. When, however, this sacrifice was offered for the sins of the whole people, or specially for the sin of the priest, the whole victim was burnt up. For it was not fitting that the priests should have the use of that which was offered for their own sins, to signify that nothing sinful should remain in them. Moreover, this would not be satisfaction for sin, for if the offering were granted to the use of those for whose sins it was offered, it would seem to be the same as if it had not been offered.

The third kind of sacrifice was called the peace-offering, which was offered to God, either in thanksgiving, or for the welfare and prosperity of the offerers, in acknowledgment of benefits already received or yet to be received; and this typifies the state of those who are proficient in the observance of the commandments. These sacrifices were divided into three parts ; for one part was burnt in honour of God, another part was allotted to the use of the priests, and the third part to the use of the offerers, in order to signify that man's salvation is from God, by the direction of God's ministers, and through the co-operation of those who are saved.

But it was the universal rule that the blood and fat were not allotted to the use either of the priests or of the offerers, the blood being poured out at the foot of the altar, in honour of God, while the fat was burnt upon the altar (Levit. 9. 9, 10). The reason for this was, first, in order to prevent idolatry, because idolaters used to drink the blood and eat the fat of the victims, according to Deut. 32. 38: Of whose victims they eat the fat, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings. Secondly, in order to form them to a right way of living. For they were forbidden the use of the blood that they might abhor the shedding of human blood; hence it is written (Gen. 9. 4, 5) : Flesh with blood you shall not eat: for I will require the blood of your lives. And they were forbidden to eat the fat in order to withdraw them from lasciviousness ; hence it it written (Ezech. 34. 3): You have killed that which was fat. Thirdly, on account of the reverence due to God, because blood is most necessary for life, for which reason life is said to be in the blood (Levit. 17. 11, 14), while fat is a sign of abundant nourishment. Therefore, in order to show that to God we owe both life and a sufficiency of all good things, the blood was poured out, and the fat burnt up in His honour. Fourthly, in order to foreshadow the shedding of Christ's blood, and the abundance of His charity, whereby He offered Himself to God for us.

In the peace-offerings, the breast-bone and the right shoulder were allotted to the use of the priest in order to prevent a certain kind of divination which is known as spatulamantia, so called because it was customary in divining to use the shoulder-blade {spatula) and the breastbone of the animals offered in sacrifice; therefore these things were taken away from the offerers. This also denoted the priest's need of wisdom in the heart, to instruct the people (this was signified by the breast-bone, which covers the heart), and his need of fortitude in order to bear with human frailty—and this was signified by the right shoulder.

Reply Obj. 9. Because the holocaust was the most perfect kind of sacrifice, therefore none but a male was offered for a holocaust, because the female is an imperfect animal. The offering of turtledoves and doves was on account of the poverty of the offerers, who were unable to offer bigger animals. And since peace-victims were offered freely, and no one was bound to offer them against his will, hence these birds were offered not among the peace-victims, but among the holocausts and victims for sin, which man was obliged to offer at times. Moreover these birds, on account of their lofty flight, were befitting the perfection of the holocausts, and were suitable for sin-offerings, because their song is doleful.

Reply Obj. 10. The holocaust was the chief of all the sacrifices because the whole was burnt in honour of God, and nothing of it was eaten. The second place in holiness belongs to the sacrifice for sins, which was eaten by the priests in the court only, and on the very day of the sacrifice (Lev. 7. 6, 15). The third place must be given to the peace-offerings of thanksgiving, which were eaten on the same day, but anywhere in Jerusalem. Fourth in order were the ex-voto peace-offerings, the flesh of which could be eaten even on the morrow. The reason for this order is that man is bound to God chiefly on account of His majesty; secondly, on account of the sins he has committed; thirdly, because of the benefits he has already received from Him; fourthly, by reason of the benefits he hopes to receive from Him.

Reply Obj. 11. Sins are more grievous by reason of the state of the sinner, as stated above (q. lxxiii, a. 10). Therefore different victims are commanded to be offered for the sin of a priest, or of a prince, or of some other private individual. "But," as Rabbi Moses says (loc. cit.),¹ "we must take note that the more grievous the sin, the lower the species of animal offered for it. Therefore the goat, which is a very base animal, was offered for idolatry, which is the most grievous sin, while a calf was offered for a priest's ignorance, and a ram for the negligence of a prince."

Reply Obj. 12. In the matter of sacrifices the Law had in view the poverty of the offerers, so that those who could not have a four-footed animal at their disposal might at least offer a bird; and that he who could not have a bird might at least offer bread; and that if a man had not even bread he might offer flour or ears of corn.

The figurative cause is that the bread signifies Christ Who is the living bread (John 6. 41, 51). He was indeeed an ear of corn, as it were, during the state of the law of nature, in the faith of the patriarchs ; He was like flour in the doctrine of the Law of the prophets; and He was like perfect bread after He had taken human nature; baked in the fire, that is, formed by the Holy Ghost in the oven of the virginal womb ; baked again in a pan by the toils which He suffered in the world; and consumed by fire on the cross as on a gridiron.

Reply Obj. 13. The products of the soil are useful to man, either as food, and of these bread was offered; or as drink, and of these wine was offered; or as seasoning, and of these oil and salt were offered; or as healing, and of these they offered incense, which both smells sweetly and binds easily together.

Now the bread foreshadowed the flesh of Christ; and the wine. His blood, by which we

¹Chap. 46 (FR 363).

were redeemed ; oil signifies the grace of Christ; salt, His knowledge; incense. His prayer.

Reply Obj. 14. Honey was not offered in the sacrifices to God, both because it was accustomed to be offered in the sacrifices to idols, and in order to denote the absence of all carnal sweetness and pleasure from those who intend to sacrifice to God. Leaven was not offered to denote the exclusion of corruption. Perhaps too, it was accustomed to be offered in the sacrifices to idols.

Salt, however, was offered, because it wards off the corruption of putrefaction, for sacrifices offered to God should be incorrupt. Moreover, salt signifies the discretion of wisdom, or again, mortification of the flesh.

Incense was offered to denote devotion of the heart, which is necessary in the offerer; and again, to signify the odour of a good name, for incense is composed of matter both rich and fragrant. And since the sacrifice of jealousy did not proceed from devotion, but rather from suspicion, therefore incense was not offered there (Num. 5. 15).

Article 4. *Whether Sufficient Reason Can Be Assig7ied for the Ceremonies Pertaining to Holy Things?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It would seem that no sufficient reason can be assigned for the ceremonies of the Old Law that pertain to holy things.

Objection 1. For Paul said (Acts 17. 24): God Who made the world and all things therein; He being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made by hands. It was therefore unfitting that in the Old Law a tabernacle or temple should be set up for the worship of God.

Obj. 2. Further, the state of the Old Law was not changed except by Christ. But the tabernacle denoted the state of the Old Law. Therefore it should not have been changed by the building of a temple.

Obj. 3. Further, the Divine law, more than any other indeed, should lead man to the worship of God. But an increase of divine worship requires multiplication of altars and temples, as is evident in regard to the New Law. Therefore it seems that also under the Old Law there should have been not only one tabernacle or temple, but many.

Obj. 4. Further, the tabernacle or temple was ordained to the worship of God. But in God we should worship above all His unity and simplicity. Therefore it seems unbecoming for the tabernacle or temple to be divided by means of veils.

Obj. 5. Further, the power of the First Mover, that is, God, appears first of all in the east, for it is in that quarter that the first movement begins. But the tabernacle was set up for the worship of God. Therefore it should have been built so as to point to the east rather than the west.

Obj. 6. Further, the Lord commanded (Exod. 20. 4) that they should not make . . . a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything. It was therefore unfitting for graven images of the cherubim to be set up in the tabernacle or temple. In like manner the ark, the propitiatory, the candlestick, the table, the two altars, seem to have been placed there without reasonable cause.

Obj. 7. Further, the Lord commanded (Exod. 20. 24) : You shall make an altar of earth unto Me: and again (ibid., 26): Thou shalt not go up by steps unto My altar. It was therefore unfitting that subsequently they should be commanded to make an altar of wood laid over with gold or brass, and of such a height that it was impossible to go up to it except by steps. For it is written (Exod. 27. i, 2) : Thou shalt make also an altar of setim wood, which shall be five cubits long, and as many broad, . . . and three cubits high . . . and thou shalt cover it with brass; and (Exod. 30. i, 3): Thou shalt make . . an altar to burn incense, of setim wood . . . and thou shalt overlay it with the purest gold.

Obj. 8. Further, in God's works nothing should be superfluous ; for not even in the works of nature is anything superfluous to be found. But one cover suffices for one tabernacle or house. Therefore it was unfitting to furnish the tabernacle with many coverings, namely, curtains, curtains of goats' hair, rams' skins dyed red, and violet-coloured skins (Exod. 26).

Obj. 9. Further, exterior consecration signifies interior holiness, the subject of which is the soul. It was therefore unsuitable for the tabernacle and its vessels to be consecrated, since they were inanimate bodies.

Obj. 10. Further, it is written (Ps. 33. 2): I will bless the Lord at all times. His praise shall always be in my mouth. But the solemn festivals were instituted for the praise of God. Therefore it was not fitting that certain days should be fixed for keeping solemn festivals, so that it seems that there was no suitable cause for the ceremonies relating to holy things.

On the contrary. The Apostle says (Heb. 8. 4) that those who offer gifts according to the law, . . . serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things. As it was answered to Moses, when he was to finish the tabernacle: See, says He, that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shown thee on the mount. But that is most reasonable, which presents a likeness to heavenly things. Therefore the ceremonies relating to holy things had a reasonable cause.

I answer that. The chief purpose of the whole external worship is that man may give worship to God. Now man's tendency is to reverence less those things which are common and indistinct from other things; but he admires and reveres those things which are distinct from others in some point of excellence. Hence too it is customary among men for kings and princes, who ought to be reverenced by their subjects, to be clothed in more precious garments, and to possess vaster and more beautiful abodes. And for this reason special times, a special abode, special vessels, and special ministers had to be appointed for the divine worship, so that thereby the soul of man might be brought to greater reverence for God.¹

In like manner the state of the Old Law, as observed above (a. 2; q. c, a. 12; q. ci, a. 2), was instituted that it might foreshadow the mystery of Christ, Now that which foreshadows something should be determinate, so that it may present some likeness to it. Consequently, certain special points had to be observed in matters pertaining to the worship of God.

Reply Obj. 1. The divine worship regards two things: namely, God Who is worshipped; and men, who worship Him. Accordingly God, Who is worshipped, is confined to no bodily place. Therefore there was no need, on His part, for a tabernacle or temple to be set up. But men, who worship Him, are corporeal beings, and for their sake there was need for a special tabernacle or temple to be set up for the worship of God, for two reasons. First, that through coming together with the thought that the place was set aside for the worship of God, they might approach there with greater reverence. Secondly, that certain things relating to the excellence of Christ's Divine or human nature might be signified by the arrangement of various details in such temple or tabernacle.

To this Solomon refers (III Kings 8. 27) when he says : If heaven and the heavens of heavens cannot contain Thee, how much less this house, which I have built for Thee? And further on {ibid. 29, 30) he adds: That Thy eyes may be open upon this house . . . of which Thou hast said: My name shall be there; . . . that Thou

¹Cf. Maimonides, Guide, ni, 45 (FR 357).

mayest hearken to the supplication of Thy servant and of Thy people Israel. From this it is evident that the house of the sanctuary was set up, not in order to contain God, as abiding there locally, but that God's name might dwell there, that is, that God might be made known there by means of things done and said there; and that those who prayed there might, through reverence for the place, pray more devoutly, so as to be heard more readily.

Reply Obj. 2. Before the coming of Christ, the state of the Old Law was not changed as regards the fulfilment of the Law, which was effected in Christ alone; but it was changed as regards the condition of the people that were under the Law. Because, at first, the people were in the desert, having no fixed abode; afterwards they were engaged in various wars with the neighbouring nations; and lastly, at the time of David and Solomon, the state of that people was one of great peace. And then for the first time the temple was built in the place which Abraham, instructed by God, had chosen for the purpose of sacrifice. For it is written (Gen. 22. 2) that the Lord commanded Abraham to offer his son for a holocaust upon one of the mountains which I will show thee; and it is related further on {ibid. 14) that he called the name of that place, The Lord seeth, as though, according to the Divine prevision, that place were chosen for the worship of God. Hence it is written (Deut. 12. 5, 6) : You shall come to the place which the Lord your God shall choose . . . and you shall offer . . . your holocausts and victims.

Now it was not right for that place to be pointed out by the building of the temple before the aforesaid time, for three reasons assigned by Rabbi Moses.¹ First, lest the Gentiles might seize hold of that place. Secondly, lest the Gentiles might destroy it. The third reason is lest each tribe might wish that place to fall to their lot, and strifes and quarrels be the result. Hence the temple was not built until they had a king who would be able to quell such quarrels. Until that time a portable tabernacle was employed for divine worship, no place being as yet fixed for the worship of God. This is the literal reason for the distinction between the tabernacle and the temple.

The figurative reason may be assigned to the fact that they signify a twofold state. For the tabernacle, which was changeable, signifies the state of the present changeable life. But the temple, which was fixed and stable, signifies the

¹Guide. Ill, 45 {FR 355).

state of future life which is altogether unchangeable. For this reason it is said that in the building of the temple no sound was heard of hammer or saw, to signify that all movements of disturbance will be far removed from the future state. Or else the tabernacle signifies the state of the Old Law, while the temple built by Solomon signifies the state of the New Law. Hence the Jews alone worked at the building of the tabernacle, but the temple was built with the co-operation of the Gentiles, namely, the Tyrians and Sidonians.

Reply Obj. 3. The reason for the unity of the temple or tabernacle may be either literal or figurative. The literal reason was the exclusion of idolatry. For the Gentiles put up various temples to various gods, and so, to strengthen in the minds of men their belief in the unity of the Godhead, God wished sacrifices to be offered to Him in one place only. Another reason was in order to show that bodily worship is not acceptable of itself, and so they were restrained from offering sacrifices anywhere and everywhere. But the worship of the New Law, in whose sacrifice spiritual grace is contained, is of itself acceptable to God; and consequently the multiplication of altars and temples is permitted in the New Law.

As to those matters that regarded the spiritual worship of God, consisting in the teaching of the Law and the Prophets, there were, even under the Old Law, various places, called synagogues, appointed for the people to gather together for the praise of God, just as now there are places called churches in which the Christian people gather together for the divine worship. Thus our church takes the place of both temple and synagogue, since the very sacrifice of the Church is spiritual, and so with us the place of sacrifice is not distinct from the place of teaching. The figurative reason may be that the unity of the Church, whether militant or triumphant, is signified by this.

Reply Obj. 4. Just as the unity of the temple or tabernacle represented the unity of God, or the unity of the Church, so also the division of the tabernacle or temple signified the distinction of those things that are subject to God, and from which we rise to the worship of God. Now the tabernacle was divided into two parts. One was called the "Holy of Holies," and was placed to the west. The other was called the "Holy Place," which was situated to the east. Moreover there was a court facing the tabernacle. Accordingly there are two reasons for this distinction. One is in respect of the tabernacle being ordained to the worship of God. Because the different parts of the world are thus betokened by the division of the tabernacle. For that part which was called the Holy of Holies signified the higher world, which is that of spiritual substances, while that part which is called the Holy Place signified the corporeal world. Hence the Holy Place was separated from the Holy of Holies by a veil, which v/as of four different colours (denoting the four elements), namely, of linen, signifying earth, because linen, that is, flax, grows out of the earth; purple, signifying water, because the purple tint was made from certain shells found in the sea; violet, signifying air, because it has the colour of the air; and scarlet twice dyed, signifying fire. And this because matter composed of the four elements is a veil between us and incorporeal substances. Hence the high-priest alone, and that once a year, entered into the inner tabernacle, that is, the Holy of Holies, by which we are taught that man's final perfection consists in his entering into that world. But into the outward tabernacle, that is, the Holy Place, the priests entered every day, though the people were only admitted to the court; because the people are able to perceive material things, the inner nature of which only wise men by dint of study are able to discover.

But with regard to the figurative reason, the outward tabernacle, which was called the Holy Place, signified the state of the Old Law, as the Apostle says (Heb. 9. 6, seq.), because into that tabernacle the priests always entered accomplishing the offices of sacrifices. But the inner tabernacle, which was called the Holy of Holies, signified either the glory of heaven or the spiritual state of the New Law, which is a kind of beginning of the glory to come. To the latter state Christ brought us; and this was signified by the high-priest entering alone, once a year, into the Holy of Holies. The veil betokened the concealing of the spiritual sacrifices under the sacrifices of old. This veil was adorned with four colours: namely, that of linen, to designate purity of the flesh; purple, to denote the sufferings which the saints underwent for God ; scarlet twice dyed, signifying the twofold love of God and our neighbour; and violet, in token of heavenly contemplation. With regard to the state of the Old Law the people and the priests were situated differently from one another. For the people saw the corporeal sacrifices themselves which were offered in the court ; but the priests were intent on the inner meaning of the sacrifices, because their faith in the mysteries of Christ v/as more explicit. Hence they entered into the outer tabernacle. This outer tabernacle was divided from the court by a veil, because some matters relating to the mystery of Christ were hidden from the people, while they were known to the priests, though they were not fully revealed to them, as they were subsequently in the New Testament (cf. Ephes. 3.5). Reply Obj. 5. Worship towards the west was introduced in the Law to the exclusion of idolatry because all the Gentiles, in reverence to the sun, worshipped towards the east; hence it is written (Ezech. 8. 16) that certain men had their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces to the east, and they adored towards the rising of the sun. Accordingly, in order to prevent this, the tabernacle had the Holy of Holies to westward, that they might adore toward the west. A figurative reason may also be found in the fact that the whole state of the first tabernacle was ordained to foreshadow the death of Christ, which is signified by the west, according to Ps. 67. 5: Who ascendeth unto the west; the Lord is His name.

Reply Obj. 6. Both literal and figurative reasons may be assigned for the things contained in the tabernacle. The literal reason is in connection with the divine worship. And because, as already observed (Reply 4), the inner tabernacle, called the Holy of Holies, signified the higher world of spiritual substances, hence that tabernacle contained three things, namely, the ark of the testament in which was a golden pot that had manna, and the rod of Aaron that had blossomed, and the tables (Heb. 9. 4) on which were written the ten commandments of the Law. Now the ark stood between two cherubim that looked one towards the other; and over the ark was a table, called the propitiatory, raised above the wings of the cherubim, as though it were held up by them, and appearing, to the imagination, to be the very seat of God. For this reason it was called the propitiatory, as though the people received propitiation thence at the prayers of the high-priest. And so it was held up, so to speak, by the cherubim, in obedience, as it were, to God, while the ark of the testament was like the foot-stool to Him that sat on the propitiatory. These three things denote three things in that higher world. First, God Who is above all, and incomprehensible to any creature. Hence no likeness of Him was set up, in order to denote His invisibility. But there was something to represent His seat, since, that is, the creature, which is beneath God, as the seat is under the one sitting on it, is comprehensible. Again in that higher world there are spiritual substances called angels. These are signified by the two cherubim, looking one towards the other, to show that they are at peace with one another, according to Job 25:2: Who maketh peace in . .. high places. For this reason, too, there was more than one cherub, to betoken the multitude of heavenly spirits, to prevent their receiving worship from those who had been commanded to worship but one God. Moreover there are, enclosed as it were in that spiritual world, the intelligible types of whatsoever takes place in this world, just as in every cause are enclosed the types of its effects, and in the craftsman the types of the works of his craft. This was signified by the ark. which represented, by means of the three things it contained, the three things of greatest import in human affairs. These are wisdom, signified by the tables of the testament; the power of governing, represented by the rod of Aaron; and life, denoted by the manna which was the means of sustenance. Or else these three signified the three Divine attributes, namely, wisdom, in the tables; power, in the rod, goodness, in the manna—both by reason of its sweetness, and because it was through the goodness of God that it was granted to man, so that therefore it was preserved as a memorial of the Divine mercy. Again, these three things were represented in Isaias' vision. For he saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated; and the seraphim standing by; and that the house was filled with the glory of the Lord; and so the seraphim cried out: All the earth is full of His glory (Isa. 6. i, 3). And thus the images of the seraphim were set up, not to be worshipped, for this was forbidden by the first commandment, but as a sign of their function, as stated above.

The outer tabernacle, which denotes this present world, also contained three things, namely, the altar of incense, which was directly opposite the ark; the table of proposition, with the twelve loaves of proposition on it, which stood on the northern side; and the candlestick, which was placed towards the south. These three things seem to correspond to the three which were enclosed in the ark; and they represented the same things as the latter, but more clearly, because, in order that wise men, denoted by the priests entering the temple, might grasp the meaning of these types, it was necessary to express them more manifestly than they are in the Divine or angelic mind. Accordingly the candlestick signified, as its sensible sign, the wisdom which was expressed on the tables in intelligible words. The altar of incense signified the office of the priest, whose duty it was to bring the people to God. And this was signified also by the rod, because on that altar the sweet smelling incense was burnt, signifying the holiness of the people acceptable to God; for it is written (Apoc. 8. 3) that the smoke of the sweet-smelling spices signifies the justifications of the saints (cf. ibid. 19. 8). Moreover it was fitting that the dignity of the priesthood should be denoted, in the ark, by the rod, and, in the outer tabernacle, by the altar of incense, because the priest is the mediator between God and the people, governing the people by Divine power, denoted by the rod, and offering to God the fruit of His government, that is, the holiness of the people, on the altar of incense, so to speak. The table signified the sustenance of life, just as the manna did; but the former, a more general and a coarser kind of nourishment, the latter, a sweeter and more delicate. Again, the candlestick was fittingly placed on the southern side, while the table was placed to the north, because the south is the right-hand side of the world, while the north is the lefthand side, as stated in the book on the Heavens;¹ and wisdom, like other spiritual goods, belongs to the right hand, while temporal nourishment belongs to the left, according to Prov. 3. 16: In her left hand (are) riches and glory. And the priestly power is midway between temporal goods and spiritual wisdom, because thereby both spiritual wisdom and temporal goods are dispensed.

Another literal signification may be assigned. For the ark contained the tables of the Law in order to prevent forgetfulness of the Law, and so it is written (Exod. 24. 12) : I will give thee two tables of stone, and the Law, and the commandments which I have written: that thou mayest teach them to the children of Israel. The rod of Aaron was placed there to restrain the people from insubordination to the priesthood of Aaron; hence it is written (Num. 17. 10): Carry back the rod of Aaron into the tabernacle of the testimony, that it may be kept there for a token of the rebellious children of Israel. The manna was kept in the ark to remind them of the benefit conferred by God on the children of Israel in the desert; therefore it is written (Exod. 16. 32) : Fill a gomor of it, and let it be kept unto generations to come hereafter, that they may know the bread wherewith I fed you ill the wilderness. The candlestick was set up to enhance the beauty of the temple, for the magnificence of a house depends on its being well lighted. Now the candlestick had seven branches,

¹Aristotle, 11, 2 (285ᵇ16).

as Josephus observes (Antiquit. iii, 7),¹ to signify the seven planets with which the whole world is illuminated. Hence the candlestick was placed towards the south, because for us the course of the planets is from that quarter. The altar of incense was instituted that there might always be in the tabernacle a sweet-smelling smoke, both through respect for the tabernacle, and as a remedy for the stenches arising from the shedding of blood and the slaying of animals. For men despise evil-smelling things as being vile, but sweet-smelling things are much appreciated. The table was placed there to signify that the priests who served the temple should take their food in the temple ; therefore, as stated in Matt. 12. 4, it was lawful for none but the priests to eat the twelve loaves which were put on the table in memory of the twelve tribes. And the table was not placed in the middle directly in front of the propritiatory, in order to exclude an idolatrous rite; for the Gentiles, on the feasts of the moon, set up a table in front of the idol of the moon, and so it is written (Jerem. 7. 18) : The women knead the dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven.

In the court outside the tabernacle was the altar of holocausts, on which sacrifices of those things which the people possessed were offered to God. And therefore the people who offered these sacrifices to God by the hands of the priest could be present in the court. But the priests alone, whose function it was to offer the people to God, could approach the inner altar, on which the very devotion and holiness of the people was offered to God. And this altar was put up outside the tabernacle and in the court, to the exclusion of idolatrous worship; for the Gentiles placed altars inside the temples to offer up sacrifices on them to idols.

The figurative reason for all these things may be taken from the relation of the tabernacle to Christ, Who was foreshadowed therein. Now it must be observed that to show the imperfection of the figures of the Law, various figures were instituted in the temple to signify Christ. For He was foreshadowed by the propitiatory, since He is a propitiation for our sins (I John 2. 2). This propitiatory was fittingly carried by cherubim, since of Him it is written (Heb. 1.6) : Let all the angels of God adore Him. He is also signified by the ark, because just as the ark was made of setim-wood, so was Christ's body composed of most pure members. Moreover it was gilded; for Christ was full of wisdom and charity, which are signified by gold. And in
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the ark was a golden pot, that is. His holy soul, having manna, that is, all the fulness of the Godhead (Coloss. 2. 9). Also there was a rod in the ark, that is. His priestly power; for He was made a . . . priest for ever (Heb. 6. 20). And therein were the tables of the Testament, to denote that Christ Himself is a lawgiver. Again, Christ was signified by the candlestick, for He said Himself (John 8. 12): I am the Light of the world; while the seven lamps denoted the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. He is also signified in the table, because He is our spiritual food, according to John 6. 41, 51: I am the living bread; and the twelve loaves signified the twelve apostles, or their teaching. Or again, the candlestick and table may signify the Church's teaching, and faith, which also enlightens and refreshes. Again, Christ is signified by the two altars of holocausts and incense. Because all works of virtue must be offered by us to God through Him ; both those by which we afflict the body, which are offered, as it were, on the altar of holocausts, and those which, with greater perfection of mind, are offered to God in Christ by the spiritual desires of the perfect, on the altar of incense, as it were, according to Heb. 13 15: By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise always to God.

Reply Obj. 7. The Lord commanded an altar to be made for the offering of sacrifices and gifts in honour of God, and for the upkeep of the ministers who served the tabernacle. Now concerning the construction of the altar the Lord issued a twofold precept. One was at the beginning of the Law (Exod. 20. 24, seq.) when the Lord commanded them to make an altar of earth, or at least not of hewn stones; and again^ not to make the altar high, so as to make it necessary to go up to it by steps. This was in detestation of idolatrous worship, for the Gentiles made their altars ornate and high, thinking that there was something holy and divine in such things. For this reason, too, the Lord commanded (Deut. 16. 21): Thou shall plant no grove^ nor any tree near the altar of the Lord thy God, since idolaters were accustomed to offer sacrifices beneath trees, on account of the pleasantness and shade afforded by them. There was also a figurative reason for these precepts. Because we must confess that in Christ, Who is our altar, there is the true nature of flesh, as regards His humanity—and this is to make an altar of earth; and again, in regard to His Godhead, we must confess His equality with the Father,—and this is not to go up to the altar by steps. Moreover we should not couple the doctrine of Christ to that of the Gentiles, which provokes men to lewdness. But when once the tabernacle had been constructed to the honour of God, there was no longer reason to fear these occasions of idolatry. Therefore the Lord commanded the altar of holocausts to be made of brass, and to be conspicuous to all the people; and the altar of incense, which was visible to none but the priests. Nor was brass so precious as to give the people an occasion for idolatry.

Since, however, the reason for the precept, Thou shalt not go up by steps unto My altar (Exod. 20. 26) is stated to have been lest thy nakedness be discovered, it should be observed that this too was instituted with the purpose of preventing idolatry, for in the feasts of Priapus the Gentiles uncovered their nakedness before the people.¹ But later on the priests were prescribed the use of loin-cloths for the sake of decency, so that without any danger the altar could be placed so high that the priests when offering sacrifices would go up by steps of wood, not fixed but moveable.

Reply Obj. 8. The body of the tabernacle consisted of boards placed on end, and covered on the inside with curtains of four different colours, namely, twisted linen, violet, purple, and scarlet twice dyed. These curtains, however, covered the sides only of the tabernacle; and the roof of the tabernacle was covered with violet-coloured skins; and over this there was another covering of rams' skins dyed red; and over this there was a third curtain made of goats' hair, which covered not only the roof of the tabernacle, but also reached to the ground and covered the boards of the tabernacle on the outside. The literal reason of these coverings taken altogether was the adornment and protection of the tabernacle, that it might be an object of respect. Taken singly, according to some,² "the curtains denoted the starry heaven, which is adorned with various stars; the curtain (of goats' skin) signified the waters which are above the firmament; the skins dyed red denoted the empyrean heaven, where the angels are; the violet skins, the heaven of the Blessed Trinity."

The figurative meaning of these things is that the boards of which the tabernacle was constructed signify the faithful of Christ, who compose the Church. The boards were covered on the inner side by curtains of four colours, be-
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²Peter the Eater, Ilist. Schol, Lib. Exod., chap. 58 (PL 198, 1179).

cause the faithful are inwardly adorned with the four virtues ; for "the twisted linen," as the gloss observes,³ "signifies the flesh refulgent with purity; violet signifies the mind desirous of heavenly things ; purple denotes the flesh subject to passions; the twice dyed scarlet betokens the mind in the midst of the passions enlightened by the love of God and our neighbour." The coverings of the building designate prelates and doctors, who ought to be conspicuous for their heavenly manner of life, signified by the violet coloured skins; and who should also be ready to suffer martyrdom, denoted by the skins dyed red; and austere of life and patient in adversity, signified by the curtains of goats' hair, which were exposed to wind and rain, as the gloss observes.⁴

Reply Obj. 9. The literal reason for the sanctification of the tabernacle and vessels was that they might be treated with greater reverence, being assigned, as it were, to the divine worship by this consecration. The figurative reason is that this sanctification signified the sanctification of the living tabernacle, that is, the faithful of whom the Church of Christ is composed.

Reply Obj. 10. Under the Old Law there were seven temporal solemnities, and one continual solemnity, as may be gathered from Num. 28, 29. There was a continual feast, since the lamb was sacrificed every day, morning and evening; and this continual feast of an abiding sacrifice signified the perpetuity of Divine happiness. Of the temporal feasts the first was that which was repeated every week. This was the solemnity of the Sabbath, celebrated in memory of the work of the creation of the universe. Another solemnity, namely, the New Moon, was repeated every month, and was observed in memory of the work of the Divine government. For the things of this lower world owe their variety chiefly to the movement of the moon; therefore this feast was kept at the new moon, and not at the full moon, to avoid the worship of idolaters who used to offer sacrifices to the moon at that particular time. These two blessings are bestowed in common on the whole human race, and hence they were repeated more frequently.

The other five feasts were celebrated once a year, and they commemorated the benefits which had been conferred especially on that people. For there was the feast of the Passover
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in the first month to commemorate the blessing of being delivered out of Egypt. The feast of Pentecost was celebrated fifty days later, to recall the blessing of the giving of the Law. The other three feasts were kept in the seventh month, nearly the whole of which was solemnized by them, just as the seventh day. For on the first of the seventh month was the feast of Trumpets, in memory of the delivery of Isaac, when Abraham found the ram caught by its horns, which they represented by the horns which they blew. The feast of Trumpets was a kind of invitation whereby they prepared themselves to keep the following feast which was kept on the tenth day. This was the feast of Expiation, in memory of the blessing whereby, at the prayer of Moses, God forgave the people's sin of worshipping the calf. After this was the feast of Scenopegia or of Tents, which was kept for seven days, to commemorate the blessing of being protected and led by God through the desert, where they lived in tents. Hence during this feast they had to take the fruits of the fairest tree, that is, the citron, and trees of dense foliage, that is, the myrtle, which is fragrant, and branches of palm-trees, and willows of the brook, which retain their greenness a long time. And these are to be found in the Land of promise, to signify that God had brought them through the arid land of the wilderness to a land of delights. On the eighth day another feast was observed, of Assembly and Congregation, on which the people collected the expenses necessary for the divine worship, and it signified the uniting of the people and the peace granted to them in the Land of promise.

The figurative reason for these feasts was that the continual sacrifice of the lamb foreshadowed the perpetuity of Christ, Who is the Lamb of God, according to Heb. 13. 8: Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day, and the same for ever. The Sabbath signified the spiritual rest bestowed by Christ, as stated in Heb. 4. The Neomenia, which is the beginning of the new moon, signified the enlightening of the primitive Church by Christ's preaching and miracles. The feast of Pentecost signified the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles. The feast of Trumpets signified the preaching of the apostles. The feast of Expiation signified the cleansing of the Christian people from sins. And the feast of Tabernacles signified their pilgrimage in this world, where they walk by advancing in virtue. The feast of Assembly or Congregation foreshadowed the assembly of the faithful in the kingdom of heaven, and therefore this feast is described as most holy (Levit. 23. 36). These three feasts followed immediately on one another, because those who expiate their vices should advance in virtue, until they come to see God, as stated in Ps. 83. 8.

Article 5. *Whether There Can Be Any Suitable Cause for the Sacraments of the Old Law?*

*We proceed thus to the Fifth Article*: It would seem that there can be no suitable cause for the sacraments of the Old Law.

Objection 1. For those things that are done for the purpose of divine worship should not be like the observances of idolaters, since it is written (Deut. 12. 31): Thou shalt not do in like manner to the Lord thy God; for they have done to their gods all the abominations which the Lord abhorreth. Now worshippers of idols used to cut themselves even to the shedding of blood; for it is related (III Kings 18. 28) that they cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till they were all covered with blood. For this reason the Lord commanded (Deut. 14. i): You shall not cut yourselves nor make any baldness for the dead. Therefore it was unfitting for circumcision to be prescribed by the Law (Levit. 12. 3).

Obj. 2. Further, those things which are done for the worship of God should be marked with decorum and gravity, according to Ps. 34. 18: I will praise Thee in a grave (Douay, — strong) people. But it seems to savour of levity for a man to eat with haste. Therefore it was unfittingly commanded (Exod. 12. 11) that they should eat the Paschal lamb in haste. Other things too relative to the eating of the lamb were prescribed, which seem altogether unreasonable.

Obj. 3. Further, the sacraments of the Old Law were figures of the sacraments of the New Law. Now the Paschal lamb signified the sacrament of the Eucharist, according to I Cor. 5.7: Christ our Pasch is sacrificed. Therefore there should also have been some sacraments in the Old Law to foreshadow the other sacraments of the New Law, such as Confirmation, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, and so forth.

Obj. 4. Further, purification can scarcely be done except by removing something impure. But as far as God is concerned, no bodily thing is accounted impure, because all bodies are God's creatures; and every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving (I Tim. 4. 4). It was therefore unfitting for them to be purified after contact with a corpse, or any similar corporeal infection.

Obj. 5. Further, it is written (Ecclus. 34. 4): What can be made clean by the unclean? But the ashes of the red heifer which was burnt were unclean, since they made a man unclean; for it is stated (Num. 19. 7, seq.) that the priest who immolated her was rendered unclean until the evening; likewise he that burnt her, and he that gathered up her ashes. Therefore it was unfittingly prescribed there that the unclean should be purified by being sprinkled with those ashes.

Obj. 6. Further, sins are not something corporeal that can be carried from one place to another, nor can man be cleansed from sin by means of something unclean. It was therefore unfitting for the purpose of expiating the sins of the people that the priest should confess the sins of the children of Israel on one of the buckgoats, that it might carry them away into the wilderness ; but they were rendered unclean by the other, which they used for the purpose of purification, by burning it together with the calf outside the camp, so that they had to wash their clothes and their bodies with water (Levit. 16.).

Obj. 7. Further, what is already cleansed should not be cleansed again. It was therefore unfitting to apply a second purification to a man cleansed from leprosy, or to a house; as laid down in Levit. 14.

Obj. 8. Further, spiritual uncleanness cannot be cleansed by material water or by shaving the hair. Therefore it seems unreasonable that the Lord ordered (Exod. 30. 18, seq.) the making of a brazen laver with its pedestal, that the priests might wash their hands and feet before entering the temple; and that He commanded (Num. 8. 7) the Levites to be sprinkled with the water of purification, and to shave all the hairs of their flesh.

Obj. 9. Further, that which is greater cannot be cleansed by that which is less. Therefore it was unfitting that, in the Law, the higher and lower priests, as stated in Levit. 8., and the Levites, according to Num. 8., should be consecrated with any bodily anointing, bodily sacrifices, and bodily oblations.

Obj. 10. Further, as stated in I Kings 16, 7, Man seeth those things that appear, but the Lord beholdeth the heart. But those things that appear outwardly in man are the disposition of his body and his clothes.¹ Therefore it was unfitting for certain special garments to be appointed to the higher and lower priests, as re-
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lated in Exod. 28. It seems, moreover, unreasonable that anyone should be debarred from the priesthood on account of defects in the body, as stated in Levit. 21. 17. seq.: Whosoever of thy seed throughout their families, hath a blemish, he shall not offer bread to his God . . . if he be blind, if he be lame, etc. It seems therefore, that the sacraments of the Old Law were unreasonable.

On the contrary, It is written (Levit. 20. 8): I am the Lord that sanctify you. But nothing unreasonable is done by God, for it is written (Ps. 103. 24) : Thou hast made all things in wisdom. Therefore there was nothing without a reasonable cause in the sacraments of the Old Law, which were ordained to the sanctification of man.

I answer that. As stated above (q. ci, a. 4), the sacraments are, properly speaking, things applied to the worshippers of God for their consecration so as, in some way, to appoint them to the worship of God. Now the worship of God belonged in a general way to the whole people; but in a special way, it belonged to the priests and Levites, who were the ministers of divine worship. Consequently, in these sacraments of the Old Law, certain things concerned the whole people in general, while others belonged to the ministers.

In regard to both, three things were necessary. The first was to be established in the state of worshipping God; and this institution was brought about for all in general by circumcision, without which no one was admitted to any of the legal observances, and for the priests by their consecration. The second thing required was the use of those things that pertain to divine worship. And thus, as to the people, there was the partaking of the paschal banquet, to which no uncircumcised man was admitted, as is clear from Exod. 12. 43, seq.; and, as to the priests, the offering of the victims, and the eating of the loaves of proposition and of other things that were allotted to the use of the priests. The third thing required was the removal of all impediments to divine worship, namely, of uncleannesses. And so, as to the people, certain purifications were instituted for the removal of certain external uncleannesses, and also expiations from sins; while as to the priests and Levites, the washing of hands and feet and the shaving of the hair were instituted. And all these things had reasonable causes, both literal, in so far as they were ordained to the worship of God for the time being, and figurative, in so far as they were ordained to foreshadow Christ, as we shall see by taking them one by one.

Reply Obj. 1. The chief literal reason for circumcision was in order that man might profess his belief in one God. And because Abraham was the first to sever himself from the infidels, by going out from his house and kindred, for this reason he was the first to receive circumcision. This reason is set forth by the Apostle (Rom. 4. 9, seq.) thus: He received the sign of circumcision^ a seal of the justice of the faith which he had, being uncircumcised; because, that is, we are told that unto Abraham faith was reputed to justice, for the reason that against hope he believed in hope, that is, against the hope that is of nature he believed in the hope that is of grace, that he might be made the father of many nations, when he was an old man, and his wife an old and barren woman. And in order that this declaration and imitation of Abraham's faith might be fixed firmly in the hearts of the Jews, they received in their flesh such a sign as they could not forget, and so it is written (Gen. 17. 13) : My covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant. This was done on the eighth day, because until then a child is very tender, and so might be seriously injured, and is considered as something not yet consolidated ; therefore neither are animals offered before the eighth day. And it was not delayed after that time, lest some might refuse the sign of circumcision on account of the pain, and also lest the parents, whose love for their children increases as they become used to their presence and as they grow older, should withdraw their children from circumcision. A second reason may have been the weakening of concupiscence in that member. A third motive may have been to revile the worship of Venus and Priapus, which gave honour to that part of the body. The Lord's prohibition extended only to the cutting of oneself in honour of idols, and such was not the circumcision of which we have been speaking.

The figurative reason for circumcision was that it foreshadowed the removal of corruption, which was to be brought about by Christ, and will be perfectly fulfilled in the eighth age, which is the age of those who rise from the dead. And since all corruption of guilt and punishment comes to us through our carnal origin, from the sin of our first parent, therefore circumcision was applied to the generative member. Hence the Apostle says (Coloss. 2. 11): You are circumcised in Christ with circumcision not made by hand in despoiling of the body of the flesh, but in the circumcision of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Reply Obj. 2. The literal reason of the paschal banquet was to commemorate the blessing of being led by God out of Egypt. Hence by celebrating this banquet they declared that they belonged to that people which God had taken to Himself out of Egypt. For when they were delivered from Egypt, they were commanded to sprinkle the lamb's blood on the upper doorposts of their houses; as though declaring that they were averse to the rites of the Egyptians who worshipped the ram. Therefore they were delivered by the sprinkling or rubbing of the blood of the lamb on the door-posts from the danger of extermination which threatened the Egyptians.

Now two things are to be observed in their departure from Egypt: namely, their haste in going, for the Egyptians pressed them to go forth speedily, as related in Exod. 12. 33; and there was the danger that anyone who did not hasten to go with the crowd might be slain by the Egyptians. Their haste was shown in two ways. First by what they ate. For they were commanded to eat unleavened bread, as a sign that it could not be leavened, the Egyptians pressing them to depart; and to eat roast meat, for this took less time to prepare ; and that they should not break a bone thereof, because in their haste there was no time to break bones. Secondly, as to the manner of eating. For it is written: You shall gird your reins, and you shall have shoes on your feet, holding staves in your hands, and you shall eat in haste, which clearly designates men at the point of starting on a journey. To this also is to be referred the command : In one house shall it be eaten, neither shall you carry forth of the flesh thereof out of the house; because, that is, on account of their haste, they could not send any gifts of it. The stress they suffered while in Egypt was denoted by the wild lettuces.

The figurative reason is evident, because the sacrifice of the paschal lamb signified the sacrifice of Christ according to I Cor. 5. 7 : Christ our pasch is sacrificed. The blood of the lamb, which ensured deliverance from the destroyer by being sprinkled on the upper door-posts signified faith in Christ's Passion, in the hearts and on the lips of the faithful, by which same Passion we are delivered from sin and death, according to I Pet. I. 18 : You were . . . redeemed . . . with the precious blood . . . of a lamb unspotted. The partaking of its flesh signified the eating of Christ's body in the Sacrament; and the flesh was roasted at the fire to signify

Christ's Passion or charity. And it was eaten with unleavened bread to signify the blameless life of the faithful who partake of Christ's body, according to I Cor. 5. 8: Let us feast . . . with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. The wild lettuces were added to denote repentance for sins, which is required of those who receive the body of Christ. Their loins were girt in sign of chastity and the shoes of their feet are the examples of our dead ancestors. The staves they were to hold in their hands denoted pastoral authority, and it was commanded that the paschal lamb should be eaten in one house, that is, in a catholic church, and not in the conventicles of heretics.

Reply Obj. 3. Some of the sacraments of the New Law had corresponding figurative sacraments in the Old Law. For Baptism, which is the sacrament of Faith, corresponds to circumcision. Hence it is written (Col. 2. 11, 12): You are circumcised . . . in the circumcision of Our Lord Jesus Christ; buried with Him in Baptism. In the New Law the sacrament of the Eucharist corresponds to the banquet of the paschal lamb. The sacrament of Penance in the New Law corresponds to all the purifications of the Old Law. The sacrament of Orders corresponds to the consecration of the pontiff and of the priests. To the sacrament of Confirmation, which is the sacrament of the fulness of grace, there would be no corresponding sacrament of the Old Law, because the time of fulness had not yet come, since the Law brought no man (Vulg., — nothing) to perfection (Heb. 7. 19). The same applies to the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which is an immediate preparation for entrance into glory, to which the way was not yet opened out in the Old Law, since the price had not yet been paid. Matrimony did indeed exist under the Old Law, as a function of nature, but not as the sacrament of the union of Christ with the Church, for that union was not as yet brought about. Hence under the Old Law it was allowable to give a bill of divorce, which is contrary to the nature of a sacrament.

Reply Obj. 4. As already stated, the purifications of the Old Law were ordained for the removal of impediments to the divine worship, which worship is twofold; namely, spiritual, consisting in devotion of the mind to God, and corporal, consisting in sacrifices, oblations, and so forth. Now men are hindered in the spiritual worship by sins, by which men were said to be polluted, for instance, by idolatry, murder, adultery, or incest. From such pollutions men were purified by certain sacrifices, offered either for the whole community in general, or also for the sins of individuals; not that those carnal sacrifices had of themselves the power of expiating sin, but that they signified that expiation of sins which was to be effected by Christ, and of which those of old became partakers by protesting their faith in the Redeemer, while taking part in the figurative sacrifices.

The impediments to external worship consisted in certain bodily uncleannesses, which were considered in the first place as existing in man, and consequently in other animals also, and in man's clothes, dwelling-place, and vessels. In man himself uncleanness was considered as arising partly from himself and partly from contact with unclean things. Anything proceeding from man was accounted unclean that was already subject to corruption, or exposed to it; and consequently since death is a kind of corruption, the human corpse was considered unclean. In like manner, since leprosy arises from corruption of the humours, which break out externally and infect other persons, therefore were lepers also considered unclean; and, again, women suffering from a flow of blood, whether from weakness, or from nature (either at the monthly course or at the time of conception) ; and, for the same reason, men were reputed unclean if they suffered from a flow of seed, whether due to weakness, to nocturnal pollution, or to sexual intercourse. Because every humour issuing from man in the above ways involves some unclean infection. Again, man contracted uncleanness by touching any unclean thing whatever.

Now there was both a literal and a figurative reason for these uncleannesses. The literal reason was taken from the reverence due to those things that belong to the divine worship; both because men are not accustomed, when unclean, to touch precious things, and in order that by rarely approaching sacred things they might have greater respect for them. For since man could seldom avoid all these uncleannesses, the result was that men could seldom approach to touch things belonging to the worship of God, so that when they did approach, they did so with greater reverence and humbleness of mind.¹ Moreover, in some of these the literal reason was that men should not be kept away from worshipping God through fear of coming in contact with lepers and others similarly afflicted with loathsome and contagious diseases. In
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others, again, the reason was to avoid idolatrous worship, because in their sacrificial rites the Gentiles sometimes employed human blood and seed. All these bodily uncleannesses were purified either by the mere sprinkhng of water, or, in the case of those which were more grievous, by some sacrifice of expiation for the sin which was the occasion of the uncleanness in question.

The figurative reason for these uncleannesses was that they were figures of various sins. For the uncleanness of any corpse signifies the uncleanness of sin, which is the death of the soul. The uncleanness of leprosy signified the uncleanness of heretical doctrine; both because heretical doctrine is contagious just as leprosy is, and because no doctrine is so false as not to have some truth mingled with error, just as on the surface of a leprous body one may distinguish the healthy parts from those that are infected. The uncleanness of a woman suffering from a flow of blood denotes the uncleanness of idolatry, on account of the blood which is offered up. The uncleanness of the man who has suffered seminal loss signifies the uncleanness of empty words, for the seed is the word of God. (Luke 8, ii) The uncleanness of sexual intercourse and of the woman in child-birth signifies the uncleanness of original sin. The uncleanness of the woman in her periods signifies the uncleanness of a mind that is sensualized by pleasure. Speaking generally, the uncleanness contracted by touching an unclean thing denotes the uncleanness arising from consent in another's sin, according to II Cor. 6. 17 : Go out from among them, and be ye separate . . . and touch not the unclean thing.

Moreover, this uncleanness arising from the touch was contracted even by inanimate objects; for whatever was touched in any way by an unclean man, became itself unclean. In this the Law attenuated the superstition of the Gentiles, who held that uncleanness was contracted not only by touch, but also by speech or looks, as Rabbi Moses states (Doct. Perplex, iii)¹ of a woman in her periods. The mystical sense of this was that to God the wicked and his wickedness are hateful alike (Wisd. 14. 9).

There was also an uncleanness of inanimate things considered in themselves, such as the uncleanness of leprosy in a house or in clothes. For just as leprosy occurs in men through a corrupt humour causing putrefaction and corruption in the flesh, so, too, through some corruption and excess of humidity or dryness,

¹Chap. 47 (FR 368).

there arises sometimes a kind of corruption in the stones with which a house is built, or in clothes. Hence the Law called this corruption by the name of leprosy, whereby a house or a garment was deemed to be unclean; both because all corruption savoured of uncleanness, as stated above, and because the Gentiles worshipped their household gods as a preservative against this corruption. Hence the Law prescribed such houses, where this kind of corruption was of a lasting nature, to be destroyed, and such garments to be burnt, in order to avoid all occasion of idolatry. There was also an uncleanness of vessels, of which it is written (Num. 19. 15) : The vessel that hath no cover, and binding over it, shall be unclean. The cause of this uncleanness was that anything unclean might easily drop into such vessels, so as to render them unclean. Moreover, this command aimed at the prevention of idolatry. For idolaters beheved that if mice, lizards, or the like, which they used to sacrifice to the idols, fell into the vessels or into the water, these became more pleasing to the gods. Even now some women let down uncovered vessels in honour of the nocturnal deities which they call “Janae”.

The figurative reason of these uncleannesses is that the leprosy of a house signified the uncleanness of the assembly of heretics; the leprosy of a linen garment signified an evil life arising from bitterness of mind ; the leprosy of a woollen garment denoted the wickedness of flatterers ; leprosy in the warp signified the vices of the soul; leprosy on the woof denoted sins of the flesh, for as the warp is in the woof, so is the soul in the body. The vessel that has neither cover nor binding, betokens a man who lacks the veil of taciturnity, and who is unrestrained by any severity of discipline.

Reply Obj. 5. As stated above (Reply 4), there was a twofold uncleanness in the Law: one by way of corruption in the mind or in the body, and this was the graver uncleanness ; the other was by mere contact with an unclean thing, and this was less grave, and was more easily expiated. For the former uncleanness was expiated by sacrifices for sins, since all corruption is due to sin, and signifies sin; but the latter uncleanness was expiated by the mere sprinkling of a certain water, of which water we read in Num. 19. For there God commanded them to take a red cow in memory of the sin they had committed in worshipping a calf. And a cow is mentioned rather than a calf, because it was thus that the Lord was accustomed to designate the synagogue, according to Osee 4. 16 : Israel hath gone astray like a wanton heifer; and this was, perhaps, because they worshipped heifers after the custom of Egypt, according to Osee 10. 5 : (They) have worshipped the kine of Bethaven. And in detestation of the sin of idolatry it was sacrificed outside the camp; in fact, whenever sacrifice was offered up in expiation of the multitude of sins, it was all burnt outside the camp. Moreover, in order to show that this sacrifice cleansed the people from all their sins, the priest dipped his finger in her blood, and sprinkled it over against the door of the tabernacle seven times; for the number seven signifies universality. Further, the very sprinkling of blood pertained to the detestation of idolatry, in which the blood that was offered up was not poured out, but was collected together, and men gathered round it to eat in honour of the idols. Likewise it was burnt by fire, either because God appeared to Moses in a fire, and the Law was given from the midst of fire, or to denote that idolatry, together with all that was connected therewith, was to be extirpated altogether; just as the cow was burnt with her skin and her flesh, her blood and dung being delivered to the flames. To this burning were added cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet twice dyed, to signify that just as cedar-wood is not liable to putrefaction, and scarlet twice dyed does not easily lose its colour, and hyssop retains its odour after it has been dried, so also was this sacrifice for the preservation of the whole people, and for their good behaviour and devotion. Hence it is said of the ashes of the cow: That they may be reserved for the multitude of the children of Israel. Or, according to Josephus,¹ the four elements are indicated here, for cedar-wood was added to the fire to signify the earth, on account of its earthiness; hyssop to signify the air, on account of its smell; scarlet twice dyed to signify water, for the same reason as purple, on account of the dyes which are taken out of the water,—thus denoting the fact that this sacrifice was offered to the Creator of the four elements. And since this sacrifice was offered for the sin of idolatry, both he that burned her, and he that gathered up the ashes, and he that sprinkled the water in which the ashes were placed, were accounted unclean in detestation of that sin, in order to show that whatever was in any way connected with idolatry should be cast aside as being unclean. From this unclean-

¹The reference is uncertain; possibly De Bella Judaico, V,v,4(TK III,265).

ness they were purified by the mere washing of their clothes; nor did they need to be sprinkled with the water on account of this kind of uncleanness, because otherwise the process would have been unending, since he that sprinkled the water became unclean, so that if he were to sprinkle himself he would remain unclean ; and if another were to sprinkle him, that one would have become unclean, and in like manner, whoever might sprinkle him, and so on indefinitely. The figurative reason of this sacrifice was that the red cow signified Christ in respect of his assumed weakness, denoted by the female sex; while the colour of the cow designated the blood of His Passion. And the red cow was of full age, because all Christ's works are perfect, in which there was no blemish; and which had not carried the yoke, because Christ was innocent, nor did He carry the yoke of sin. It was commanded to be taken to Moses, because they blamed Him for transgressing the law of Moses by breaking the Sabbath. And it was commanded to be delivered to Eleazar the priest, because Christ was delivered into the hands of the priests to be slain. It was immolated without the camp, because Christ suffered outside the gate (Heb. 13. 12). And the priest dipped his finger in her blood, because the mystery of Christ's Passion should be considered and imitated.

It was sprinkled over against . . . the tabernacle, which denotes the synagogue, to signify either the condemnation of the unbelieving Jews, or the purification of believers; and this seven times, in token either of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, or of the seven days wherein all time is comprised. Again, all things that pertain to the Incarnation of Christ should be burnt with fire, that is, they should be understood spiritually; for the skin and flesh signified Christ's outward works; the blood denoted the subtle inward force which quickened His external deeds; the dung signified His weariness. His thirst, and all such things pertaining to His weakness. Three things were added, namely, cedar-wood, which denotes the height of hope or contemplation ; hyssop, in token of humility or faith; scarlet twice dyed, which denotes twofold charity; for it is by these three that we should cling to Christ suffering. The ashes of this burning were gathered by a man that is clean, because the relics of the Passion came into the possession of the Gentiles, who were not guilty of Christ's death. The ashes were put into water for the purpose of expiation, because Baptism receives from Christ's Passion the power of washing away sins. The priest who immolated and burned the cow, and he who burned, and he who gathered together the :ashes, were unclean, as also he that sprinkled the water; either because the Jews became unclean through putting Christ to death, whereby 'Our sins are expiated, and this, until the evening, that is, until the end of the world, when the remnants of Israel will be converted; or else because they who handle sacred things with a view to the cleansing of others contract certain uncleannesses, as Gregory says (Pastor. 2, 5) ;¹ and this until evening, that is, until the end of this life.

Reply Obj. 6. As stated above (Reply 5), an uncleanness which was caused by corruption either of mind or of body was expiated by sinofferings. Now special sacrifices used to be offered for the sins of individuals. But since some were neglectful about expiating such sins and uncleannesses, or, through ignorance, failed to offer this expiation, it was laid down that once a year, on the tenth day of the seventh month, a sacrifice of expiation should be offered for the whole people. And because, as the Apostle says (Heb. 7. 28), the Law maketh men priests, who have infirmity, the priest first of all had to offer a calf for his own sins, in memory of Aaron's sin in fashioning the molten calf, and besides, to offer a ram for a holocaust, which signified that the priestly sovereignty denoted by the ram, who is the head of the flock, was to be ordained to the glory of God. Then he offered two he-goats for the people, one of which was offered in expiation of the sins of the multitude. For the he-goat is an evil-smelling animal, and from its skin clothes are made having a pungent odour; thus is signified the stench, uncleanness and the sting of sin. After this he-goat had been immolated, its blood was taken, together with the blood of the calf, into the Holy of Holies, and the entire sanctuary was sprinkled with it, to signify that the tabernacle was cleansed from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel. But the corpses of the he-goat and calf which had been offered up for sin had to be burnt, to denote the destruction of sins. They were not, however, burnt on the altar, since none but holocausts were burnt thereon ; but it was prescribed that they should be burnt without the camp, in detestation of sin, for this was done whenever sacrifice was offered for a grievous sin, or for the multitude of sins. The other goat was let loose into the wilderness ; not indeed to offer it to the demons, whom the Gentiles worshipped in desert places, because it was unlawful to offer

¹PL 77. 34.

anything to them, but in order to point out the effect of the sacrifice which had been offered up. Hence the priest put his hand on its head while confessing the sins of the children of Israel, as though that goat were to carry them away into the wilderness, where it would be devoured by wild beasts, because it bore the punishment of the people's sins. And it was said to bear the sins of the people either because the forgiveness of the people's sins was signified by its being let loose, or because on its head written lists of sins were fastened.

The figurative reason of these things was that Christ was foreshadowed both by the calf, on account of His power, and by the ram, because He is the Head of the faithful, and by the hegoat, on account of the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8. 3). Moreover, Christ was sacrificed for the sins of both priests and people, since both those of high and those of low degree are cleansed from sin by His Passion. The blood of the calf and of the goat was brought into the Holies by the priest, because the entrance to the kingdom of heaven was opened to us by the blood of Christ's Passion, Their bodies were burnt without the camp, because Christ suffered without the gate, as the Apostle declares (Heb. 13. 12). The scape-goat may denote either Christ's divinity, Which went away into solitude when the Man Christ suffered, not by going to another place, but by restraining His power or it may signify the base concupiscence which we ought to cast away from ourselves, while we offer up to Our Lord acts of virtue.

With regard to the uncleanness contracted by those who burnt these sacrifices, the reason is the same as that which we assigned (Reply 5) to the sacrifice of the red heifer.

Reply Obj. 7. The legal rite did not cleanse the leper of his deformity, but declared him to be cleansed. This is shown by the words of Lev. 14. 3, seq., where it is said that the priest, when he shall find that the leprosy is cleansed, shall command him that is to be purified; consequently, the leper was already healed. But he was said to be purified in so far as the verdict of the priest restored him to the society of men and to the worship of God. It happened sometimes, however, that bodily leprosy was miraculously cured by the legal rite, when the priest erred in his judgment.

Now this purification of a leper was twofold. For, in the first place, he was declared to be clean ; and, secondly, he was restored, as clean, to the society of men and to the worship of God, namely, after seven days. At the first purification the leper who sought to be cleansed offered for himself two living sparrows, . . . cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, in such wise that a sparrow and the hyssop should be tied to the cedarwood with a scarlet thread, so that the cedarwood was like the handle of an aspersory, while the hyssop and sparrow were that part of the aspersory which was dipped into the blood of the other sparrow which was immolated . . . over living waters. These things he offered as an antidote to the four defects of leprosy: for cedarwood, which is not subject to putrefaction, was offered against the putrefaction; hyssop, which is a sweet-smelling herb, was offered up against the stench; a living sparrow was offered up against numbness ; and scarlet, which has a vivid colour, was offered up against the repulsive colour of leprosy. The living sparrow was let loose to fly away into the plain, because the leper was restored to his former liberty.

On the eighth day he was admitted to divine worship, and was restored to the society of men; but only after having shaved all the hair of his body, and washed his clothes, because leprosy rots the hair, infects the clothes, and gives them an evil smell. Afterwards a sacrifice was offered for his sin, since leprosy was frequently a result of sin, and some of the blood of the sacrifice was put on the tip of the ear of the man that was to be cleansed, and on the thumb of his right hand, and the great toe of his right foot; because it is in these parts that leprosy is first diagnosed and felt. In this rite, moreover, three liquids were employed: namely, blood, against the corruption of the blood; oil, to denote the healing of the disease; and living waters, to wash away the filth.

The figurative reason was that the Divine and human natures in Christ were denoted by the two sparrows, one of which, in likeness of His human nature, was offered up in an earthen vessel over living waters, because the waters of Baptism are sanctified by Christ's Passion. The other sparrow, in token of His impassible divinity, remained living, because divinity cannot die; hence it flew away, for divinity could not be encompassed by the Passion. Now this living sparrow, together with the cedar-wood and scarlet or cochineal, and hyssop, that is, faith, hope, and charity, as stated above (Reply 5), was put into the water for the purpose of sprinkling, because we are baptized in the faith of the God- Man. By the waters of Baptism or of his tears man washes his clothes, that is, his works, and all his hair, that is, his thoughts. The tip of the right ear of the man to be cleansed is moistened with some of the blood and oil in order to strengthen his hearing against harmful words, and the thumb and toe of his right hand and foot are moistened that his deeds may be holy. Other matters pertaining to this purification, or to that also of any other uncleannesses, call for no special remark, beyond what apphes to other sacrifices, whether for sins or for trespasses.

Reply Obj. 8 and 9. Just as the people were initiated by circumcision to the divine worship, so were the ministers by some special purification or consecration. Therefore they are commanded to be separated from other men, as being specially appointed, rather than others, to the ministry of the divine worship. And all that was done touching them in their consecration or institution was with a view to show that they were in possession of a prerogative of purity, power, and dignity. Hence three things were done in the institution of ministers. For first, they were purified; secondly, they were adorned¹ and consecrated; thirdly, they were employed in the ministry. All in general used to be purified by washing in water, and by certain sacrifices; but the Levites in particular shaved all the hair of their bodies, as stated in Lev. 8. (cf. Num. 8.).

With regard to the high-priests and priests the consecration was performed as follows. First, when they had been washed, they were clothed with certain special garments in designation of their dignity. In particular, the high priest was anointed on the head with the oil of unction, to denote that the power of consecration was poured forth by him on to others, just as oil flows from the head on to the lower parts of the body; according to Ps. 132. 2: Like the precious ointment on the head that ran down upon the beard, the beard of Aaron. But the Levites received no other consecration besides being offered to the Lord by the children of Israel through the hands of the high-priest, who prayed for them. The lesser priests were consecrated on the hands only, which were to be employed in the sacrifices. The tip of their right ear and the thumb of their right hand, and the great toe of their right foot were tinged with the blood of the sacrificial animal, to denote that they should be obedient to God's law in offering the sacrifices (this is denoted by touching their right ear) ; and that they should be careful and ready in performing the sacrifices (this is signified by the moistening of the right foot and hand). They themselves and their garments were sprinkled with the blood of the ani-

¹Cf. Lev. 8. 7-9.

mal that had been sacrificed, in memory of the blood of the lamb by which they had been delivered in Egypt. At their consecration the following sacrifices were offered: a calf, for sin, in memory of Aaron's sin in fashioning the molten calf; a ram, for a holocaust, in memory of the sacrifice of Abraham, whose obedience the high-priest was obliged to imitate; again, a ram of consecration, which was as a peace offering, in memory of the delivery from Egypt through the blood of the lamb; and a basket of bread, in memory of the manna vouchsafed to the people.

In reference to their being destined to the ministry, the fat of the ram, one roll of bread, and the right shoulder were placed on their hands, to show that they received the power of offering these things to the Lord, while the Levites were initiated to the ministry by being brought into the tabernacle of the covenant, as being destined to the ministry touching the vessels of the sanctuary.

The figurative reason of these things was that those who are to be consecrated to the spiritual ministry of Christ should be first of all purified by the waters of Baptism, and by the waters of tears, in their faith in Christ's Passion, which is a sacrifice both of expiation and of purification. They have also to shave all the hair of their body, that is, all evil thoughts. They should, moreover, be decked with virtues, and be consecrated with the oil of the Holy Ghost, and with the sprinkling of Christ's blood. And thus they should be intent on the fulfilment of their spiritual ministry.

Reply Obj. 10. As already stated (a. 4), the purpose of the Law was to induce men to have reverence for the divine worship, and this in two ways. First, by excluding from the worship of God whatever might be an object of contempt ; secondly, by introducing into the divine worship all that seemed to savour of reverence. And, indeed, if this was observed in regard to the tabernacle and its vessels, and in the animals to be sacrificed, much more was it to be observed in the very ministers. Therefore, in order to obviate contempt for the ministers, it was prescribed that they should have no bodily stain or defect, since men so deformed are accustomed to be despised by others. For the same reason it was also commanded that the choice of those who were to be destined to the service of God was not to be made in a broadcast manner from any family, but according to their descent from one particular stock, thus giving them distinction and nobility.

In order that they might be revered, special ornate vestments were appointed for their use, and a special form of consecration. This indeed is the general reason of ornate garments. But the high-priest in particular had eight vestments. First, he had a linen tunic. Secondly, he had a purple tunic, round the bottom of which were placed little bells and pomegranates of violet, and purple, and scarlet twice dyed. Thirdly, he had the ephod, which covered his shoulders and his breast down to the girdle; and it was made of gold, and violet and purple, and scarlet twice dyed and twisted linen, and on his shoulders he bore two onyx stones, on which were graven the names of the children of Israel. Fourthly, he had the rational, made of the same material; it was square in shape, and was worn on the breast, and was fastened to the ephod. On this rational there were twelve precious stones set in four rows, on which also were graven the names of the children of Israel, in token that the priest bore the burden of the whole people, since he bore their names on his shoulders ; and that it was his duty ever to think of their welfare, since he wore them on his breast, bearing them in his heart, so to speak. And the Lord commanded the Doctrine and Truth to be put in the rational, for certain matters regarding moral and dogmatic truth were written on it. The Jews indeed pretend that on the rational was placed a stone which changed colour according to the various things which were about to happen to the children of Israel, and this they call the Truth and Doctrine. Fifthly, he wore a belt or girdle made of the four colours mentioned above. Sixthly, there was the tiara or mitre which was made of linen. Seventhly, there was the golden plate which hung over his forehead; on it was inscribed the Lord's name. Eighthly, there were the linen breeches to cover the flesh of their nakedness, when they went up to the sanctuary or altar. Of these eight vestments the lesser priests had four, namely, the linen tunic and breeches, the belt and the tiara.

According to some,¹ the literal reason for these vestments was that they denoted the disposition of the terrestrial globe, as though the high-priest confessed himself to be the minister of the Creator of the world; thus it is written (Wisd. 18. 24): In the robe of Aaron was the whole world described. For the linen breeches signified the earth out of which the flax grows. The surrounding belt signified the ocean which

¹Glossa ordin. (in, 385E); Rabanus Maurus, In Sap., 3.17 (PL 109, 758); cf. Josephus, Antiqu., III, VII, 7 (TK iv, 405).

surrounds the earth. The violet tunic denoted the air by its colour; its little bells betoken the thunder; the pomegranates, the lightning. The ephod, by its many colours, signified the starry heaven; the two onyx stones denoted the two hemispheres, or the sun and moon. The twelve precious stones on the breast are the twelve signs of the zodiac, and they are said to have been placed on the rational, because in heaven are the types (ratio7tes) of earthly things, according to Job 38. S3'- Dost thou know the order of heaven, and canst thou set down the reason (rationem) thereof on the earth? The turban or tiara signified the empyrean ; the golden plate was a token of God, the governor of the universe.

The figurative reason is evident. Because bodily stains or defects from which the priests had to be immune signify the various vices and sins from which they should be free. Thus it is forbidden that he should be blind, that is, he ought not to be ignorant ; he must not be lame, that is, vacillating and uncertain of purpose; that he must not have a little, or a great, or a crooked nose, that is, that he should not, from lack of discretion, exceed in one direction or in another, or even exercise some base occupation, for the nose signifies discretion, because it discerns odours. It is forbidden that he should have a broken foot or ha7td, that is, he should not lose the power of doing good works or of advancing in virtue. He is rejected, too, if he have a swelling either in front or behind (Vulg., —if he be crookbacked) , by which is signified too much love of earthly things; if he be bleareyed, that is, if his mind is darkened by carnal affections, for running of the eyes is caused by a flow of matter. He is also rejected if he have a pearl in his eye, that is, if he presumes in his own estimation that he is clothed in the white robe of justice. Again, he is rejected if he have a continued scab, that is, lustfulness of the flesh; also, if he have a dry scurf, which covers the body without giving pain, and is a blemish on the comeliness of the members, which denotes avarice. Lastly, he is rejected if he have a rupture or hernia, through baseness rending his heart, though it appear not in his deeds.

The vestments denote the virtues of God's ministers. Now there are four things that are necessary to all His ministers, namely, chastity denoted by the breeches; a pure life, signified by the linen tunic; the moderation of discretion, signified by the girdle; and rectitude of purpose, denoted by the mitre covering the head. But the high-priests needed four other things in addition to these. First, a continual recollection of God in their thoughts ; and this was signified by the golden plate worn over the forehead, with the name of God engraved thereon. Secondly, they had to bear with the shortcomings of the people: this was denoted by the ephod which they bore on their shoulders. Thirdly, they had to carry the people in their mind and heart by the solicitude of charity, in token of which they wore the rational. Fourthly, they had to lead a godly life by performing works of perfection, and this was signified by the violet tunic. Hence little golden bells were fixed to the bottom of the violet tunic, which bells signified the teaching of divine things united in the high-priest to his godly mode of life. In addition to these were the pomegranates, signifying unity of faith and concord in good morals, because his doctrine should hold together in such a way that it should not rend asunder the unity of faith and peace.

Article 6. *Whether There Was Any Reasonable Cause for the Ceremonial Observances?*

*We proceed thus to the Sixth Article*: It would seem that there was no reasonable cause for the ceremonial observances.

Objection 1. For as the Apostle says (I Tim. 4. 4), every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving. It was therefore unfitting that they should be forbidden to eat certain foods, as being unclean according to Lev. 11.

Obj. 2. Further, just as animals are given to man for food, so also are herbs; hence it is written (Gen. 9. 3) : As the green herbs have I delivered all flesh to you. But the Law did not distinguish any herbs from the rest as being unclean, although some are most harmful, for instance, those that are poisonous. Therefore it seems that neither should any animals have been prohibited as being unclean.

Obj. 3. Further, if the matter from which a thing is generated be unclean, it seems that likewise the thing generated from it is unclean. But flesh is generated from blood. Since therefore all flesh was not prohibited as unclean, it seems that in like manner neither should blood have been forbidden as unclean, nor the fat which is engendered from blood.

Obj. 4. Further, Our Lord said (Matt. 10. 28; cf. Luke 12. 4), that those should not be feared that kill the body, since after death they have no more that they can do, which would not be true if after death harm might come to man through anything done with his body. Much less therefore does it matter to an

animal already dead how its flesh be cooked.

Consequently there seems to be no reason in

what is said, Exod. 23. 19: Thou shalt not boil

a kid in the milk of its dam.

Obj. 5. Further, all that is first brought forth of man and beast, as being most perfect, is commanded to be offered to the Lord (Exod. 13.). Therefore it is an unfitting command that is set forth in Lev. 19. 23: when you shall be come into the land, and shall have planted in it fruit trees, you shall take away the uncircumcision (Douay, — first fruits) of them, that is, the first crops, and they shall be unclean to you, neither shall you eat of them.

Obj. 6. Further, clothing is something extraneous to man's body. Therefore certain kinds of garments should not have been forbidden to the Jews; for instance (Lev. 19. 19): Thou shalt not wear a garment that is woven of two sorts; and (Deut. 22. 5): A woman shall not be clothed with man's apparel, neither shall a man use woman's apparel; and further on (verse 11): Thou shalt not wear a garment that is woven of woollen and linen together.

Obj. 7. Further, to be mindful of God's commandments concerns not the body but the heart. Therefore it is unsuitably prescribed (Deut. 6. 8, seq.) that they should bind the commandments of God as a sign on their hands and that they should write them in the entry; and (Num 15. 38, seq.) that they should make to themselves fringes in the corners of their garments, putting in them ribands of blue, that . . . they may remember . . . the commandments of the Lord.

Obj. 8. Further, the Apostle says (I Cor. 9. 9) that God doth not take care for oxen, and, therefore, neither of other irrational animals. Therefore without reason is it commanded (Deut. 22. 6) : If thou find, as thou walkest by the way, a bird's nest in a tree . . . thou shalt not take the dam with her young; and (Deut. 25. 4) : Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out thy corn; and (Lev. 19. 19): Thou shalt not make thy cattle to gender with beasts of any other kind.

Obj. 9. Further, no distinction was made between clean and unclean plants. Much less therefore should any distinction have been made about the cultivation of plants. Therefore it was unfittingly prescribed (Lev. 19. 19): Thou shalt not sow thy field with different seeds; and (Deut. 22. 9, seq.): Thou shalt sow thy vineyard with divers seeds; and: Thou shalt not plough with an ox and an ass together.

Obj. 10. Further, it is apparent that inanimate things are most of all subject to the power of man. Therefore it was unfitting to debar man from taking the silver and gold of which idols were made, or anything they found in the houses of idols, as expressed in the commandment of the Law (Deut. 7. 25, seq.). It also seems an absurd commandment set forth in Deut. 23. 13, that they should dig round about and . . . cover with earth that which they were eased of.

Obj. 11. Further, piety is required especially in priests. But it seems to be an act of piety to assist at the burial of one's friends ; hence, too, Tobias is commended for so doing (Tob. i. 20. seqq.). In like manner it is sometimes an act of piety to marry a loose woman, because she is thus delivered from sin and infamy. Therefore it seems inconsistent for these things to be forbidden to priests (Lev. 21.).

On the contrary. It is written (Deut. 18. 14) : But thou art otherwise instructed by the Lord thy God, from which words we may gather that these observances were instituted by God to be a special prerogative of that people. Therefore they are not without reason or cause.

I answer that, The Jewish people, as stated above (a. 5), were specially chosen for the worship of God, and among them the priests themselves were specially set apart for that purpose. And just as other things that are applied to the divine worship need to be marked in some particular way so that they be worthy of the worship of God, so too in that people's, and specially the priests', mode of life, there needed to be certain special things befitting the divine worship, whether spiritual or corporal. Now the worship prescribed by the Law foreshadowed the mystery of Christ, so that whatever they did was a figure of things pertaining to Christ, according to I Cor. 10. 11: All these things happened to them in figures. Consequently the reasons for these observances may be taken in two ways, first according to their fittingness to the worship of God; secondly, according as they foreshadow something touching the Christian mode of life.

Reply Obj. 1. As stated above (a. 5, Reply 4, 5), the Law distinguished a twofold pollution or uncleanness: one, that of sin, whereby the soul was defiled; and another consisting in some kind of corruption, whereby the body was in some way infected. Speaking then of the first-mentioned uncleanness, no kind of food is unclean, or can defile a man, by reason of its nature; hence we read (Matt. 15. 11): Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but what cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man, which words are explained (verse 17) as referring to sins. Yet certain foods can defile the soul accidentally in so far as man partakes of them against obedience or a vow, or from excessive concupiscence, or through their being an incentive to lust, for which reason some refrain from wine and flesh-meat.

If, however, we speak of bodily uncleanness, consisting in some kind of corruption, the flesh of certain animals is unclean, either because like the pig they feed on unclean things, or because their life is among unclean surroundings; thus certain animals, Hke moles and mice and the like, live underground, from which they contract a certain unpleasant smell; or because their flesh, through being too moist or too dry, engenders corrupt humours in the human body.¹ Hence they were forbidden to eat the flesh of flat-footed animals, that is, animals having an uncloven hoof, on account of their earthiness; and in like manner they were forbidden to eat the flesh of animals that have many clefts in their feet, because such are very fierce and their flesh is very dry, such as the flesh of Hons and the like. For the same reason they were forbidden to eat certain birds of prey the flesh of which is very dry, and certain water-fowl on account of their exceeding humidity. In like manner certain fish lacking fins and scales were prohibited on account of their excessive moisture, such as eels and the like. They were, however, aflowed to eat ruminants and animals with a divided hoof, because in such animals the humours are well absorbed, and their nature well balanced; for neither are they too moist, as is indicated by the hoof, nor are they too earthy, which is shown by their having not a flat but a cloven hoof. Of fishes they were allowed to partake of the drier kinds, of which the fins and scales are an indication, because thereby the moist nature of the fish is tempered. Of birds they were allowed to eat the tamer kinds, such as hens, partridges, and the like. Another reason was detestation of idolatry: because the Gentiles, and especially the Egyptians, among whom they had grown up, offered up these forbidden animals to their idols, or employed them for the purpose of sorcery-; but they did not eat those animals which the Jews were allowed to eat, but worshipped them as gods, or abstained, for some other motive, from eating them, as stated above (a. 3, Reply 2). The third reason was to prevent excessive care about food; hence they were allowed to eat

¹Maimonides, Guide, in, 48 (FR 370).

those animals which could be procured easily and promptly.

With regard to blood and fat, they were forbidden to partake of those of any animal whatever without exception. Blood was forbidden both in order to avoid cruelty, that they might abhor the shedding of human blood, as stated above (a. 3, Reply 8) ; and in order to shun the idolatrous rite whereby it was customary for men to collect the blood and to gather together around it for a banquet in honour of the idols, to whom they held the blood to be most acceptable. Hence the Lord commanded the blood to be poured out and to be covered with earth (Lev. 17. 13). For the same reason they were forbidden to eat animals that had been suffocated or strangled, because the blood of these animals would not be separated from the body or because this form of death is very painful to the victim; and the Lord wished to withdraw them from cruelty even in regard to irrational animals, so as to be less inclined to be cruel to other men, through being used to be kind to beasts. They were forbidden to eat the fat, both because idolaters ate it in honour of their gods and because it used to be burnt in honour of God; and, again, because blood and fat are not nutritious, which is the cause assigned by Rabbi Moses (Doct. Perplex, iii).² The reason why they were forbidden to eat the sinews is given in Gen. 32. 32, where it is stated that the children of Israel . . . eat not the sinew ... because he touched the sinew of Jacob's thigh and it shrank.

The figurative reason for these things is that all these animals signified certain sins, in token of which those animals were prohibited. Hence Augustine says {Contra Faust, vi, 7):³ "If the swine and lamb be called in question, both are clean by nature, because all God's creatures are good; yet the lamb is clean, and the pig is unclean in a certain signification. Thus if you speak of a foolish, and of a wise man, each of these expressions is clean considered in the nature of the sound, letters and syllables of which it is composed; but in signification the one is clean, the other unclean." The animal that chews the cud and has a divided hoof is clean in signification. Because division of the hoof is a figure of the two Testaments; or of the Father and Son; or of the two natures in Christ; of the distinction of good and evil. But chewing the cud signifies meditation on the Scriptures and a sound understanding of them, and who-

²Chap. 48 (FR 371).

³PL 42, 233.

ever lacks either of these is spiritually unclean. In like manner those fish that have scales and fins are clean in signification. Because fins signify the heavenly or contemplative life, while scales signify a life of trials, each of which is required for spiritual cleanness.

Of birds certain special kinds were forbidden.¹ In the eagle which flies at a great height, pride is forbidden : in the griffon which is hostile to horses and men, cruelty of powerful men is prohibited. The osprey, which feeds on very small birds, signifies those who oppress the poor. The kite, which is full of cunning, denotes those who are fraudulent in their dealings. The vulture, which follows an army, expecting to feed on the carcases of the slain, signifies those who like others to die or to fight among themselves that they may gain thereby. Birds of the raven kind signify those who are blackened by their lusts; or those who lack kindly feelings, for the raven did not return when once it had been let loose from the ark. The ostrich which, though a bird, cannot fly, and is always on the ground, signifies those who fight for God's cause, and at the same time are taken up with worldly business. The owl, which sees clearly at night, but cannot see in daytime, denotes those who are clever in temporal affairs, but dull in spiritual matters. The gull, which both flies in the air and swims in the water, signifies those who are partial both to Circumcision and to Baptism; or else it denotes those who would fly by contemplation, yet dwell in the waters of sensual delights. The hawk, which helps men to seize the prey, is a figure of those who assist the strong to prey on the poor.² The screech-owl, which seeks its food by night but hides by day, signifies the lustful man who seeks to He hidden in his deeds of darkness.³ The cormorant, so constituted that it can stay a long time under water, denotes the glutton who plunges into the waters of pleasure. The ibis is an African bird with a long beak, and feeds on snakes ; and perhaps it is the same as the stork.⁴ It signifies the envious man, who refreshes himself with the ills of others, as with snakes. The swan is bright in colour, and by the aid of its long neck extracts its food from deep places on land or water: it may denote those who seek earthly profit through an external brightness of virtue. The bittern is a bird of the East. It has

¹Cf. Rabanus Maurus, De Univ., VIII, I (PL III, 222A); chap. 6 (PL III, 240-255); Isidore, Etym., XII, 2, 7 (PL 82, 436,459).

²Albert, In De An., XXIII, I, 22 (BO XII, 482).

³Op. cit., chap. 24 (BO XII, 493).

⁴Op. cit., VIII, I, 2 (BO XI, 427),

a long beak, and its jaws are furnished with follicuies, in which it stores its food at first, after a time proceeding to digest it;'' it is a figure of the miser, who is excessively careful in hoarding up the necessities of life. The coot (Douay, —porphyrion) has this peculiarity apart from other birds, that it has a webbed foot for swimming, and a cloven foot for walking, for it swims like a duck in the water, and walks like a partridge on land. It drinks only when it bites, since it dips all its food in water^; it is a figure of the man who will not take advice, and does nothing but what is soaked in the water of his own will. The heron, commonly called a falcon, signifies those whose jeet are swift to shed blood (Ps. 13. 3). The plover, which is a garrulous bird, signifies the gossip. The hoopoe, which builds its nest on dung, feeds on foetid ordure, and whose song is like a groan, denotes worldly grief which works death in those who are unclean. The bat, which flies near the ground, signifies those who being gifted with worldly knowledge, seek none but earthly things. Of fowls and quadrupeds those alone were permitted which have the hind-legs longer than the fore-legs, so that they can leap ; but those were forbidden which cling rather to the earth, because those who abuse the doctrine of the four Evangelists, so that they are not lifted up thereby, are reputed unclean. By the prohibition of blood, fat and nerves, we are to understand the forbidding of cruelty, lust, and bravery in committing sin.

Reply Obj. 2. Men were accustomed to eat plants and other products of the soil even before the deluge, but the eating of flesh seems to have been introduced after the deluge ; for it is written (Gen. 9. 3) : Even as the green herbs have I delivered . . . all flesh to you. The reason for this was that the eating of the products of the soil savours rather of a simple life, while the eating of flesh savours of delicate and overcareful living. For the soil gives birth to the herb of its own accord, and such products of the earth may be had in great quantities with very little effort, while no small trouble is necessary either to rear or to catch an animal. Consequently God being wishful to bring His people back to a more simple way of living, forbade them to eat many kinds of animals, but not those things that are produced by the soil. Another reason may be that animals were offered to idols, while the products of the soil were not.

⁵Op. cit., XXIII, I, 24 (BO XII, 497).

⁶Ibid. (BO XII, 501).

The Reply to the Third Objection is clear from what has been said (Reply i).

Reply Obj. 4. Although the kid that is slain has no perception of the manner in which its flesh is cooked, yet it would seem to savour of heartlessness if the dam's milk, which was intended for the nourishment of her offspring, were served up on the same dish. It might also be said that the Gentiles in celebrating the feasts of their idols prepared the flesh of kids in this manner for the purpose of sacrifice or banquet; hence (Exod. 23.) after the solemnities to be celebrated under the Law had been foretold, it is added : Thou shalt not boil a kid in the milk of its dam. The figurative reason for this prohibition is this: the kid, signifying Christ, on account of the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8. 3), was not to be seethed, that is, slain, by the Jews, in the milk of its dam, that is, during His infancy. Or else it signifies that the kid, that is, the sinner, should not be boiled in the milk of its dam, that is, should not be cajoled by flattery.

Reply Obj. 5. The Gentiles offered their gods the first-fruits, which they held to bring them good luck ; or they burnt them for the purpose of sorcery.¹ Consequently (the Israelites) were commanded to look upon the fruits of the first three years as unclean. For in that country nearly all trees bear fruit in three years' time ; those trees, namely, that are cultivated either from seed, or from a graft or from a cutting; but it seldom happens that the fruit-stones or seeds encased in a pod are sown, since it would take a longer time for these to bear fruit, and the Law considered what happened most frequently. The fruits, however, of the fourth year, as being the firstlings of clean fruits, were offered to God, and from the fifth year onward they were eaten.

The figurative reason was that this foreshadowed the fact that after the three states of the Law (the first lasting from Abraham to David, the second until they were carried away to Babylon, the third until the time of Christ), the Fruit of the Law, that is, Christ, was to be offered to God. Or again, that we should mistrust our first efforts, on account of their imperfection.

Reply Obj. 6. It is said of a man in Ecclus. 19. 27, that the attire of the body . . . shows what he is. Hence the Lord wished His people to be distinguished from other nations, not only by the sign of circumcision, which was in the flesh, but also by a certain difference of attire.

¹Cf. Maimonides, Guide, in, 37 (FR 334).

Therefore they were forbidden to wear garments woven of woollen and linen together, and for a woman to be clothed with man's apparel, or vice versa, for two reasons. First, to avoid idolatrous worship. Because the Gentiles, in their religious rites, used garments of this sort, made of various materials. Moreover in the worship of Mars, women put on men's armour, while, conversely, in the worship of Venus men donned women's attire.² The second reason was to preserve them from lust, because the employment of various materials in the making of garments signified inordinate union of sexes, while the use of male attire by a woman, or vice versa, has an incentive to evil desires, and offers an occasion of lust. The figurative reason is that the prohibition of wearing a garment woven of woollen and linen signified that it was forbidden to unite the simplicity of innocence, denoted by wool, with the duplicity of malice, signified by linen. It also signifies that woman is forbidden to presume to teach, or perform other duties of men, or that man should not adopt the effeminate manners of a woman.

Reply Obj. 7. As Jerome says on Matt. 23. 6, "the Lord commanded them to make violet coloured fringes in the four corners of their garments so that the Israelites might be distinguished from other nations.'"³ Hence, in this way, they professed to be Jews, and consequently the very sight of this sign reminded them of their Law.

When we read : Thou shalt bind them on thy hand, and they shall be ever before thy eyes (Vulg.,— they shall be and shall move between thy eyes), "the Pharisees gave a false interpretation to these words, and wrote the decalogue of Moses on a parchment, and tied it on their foreheads like a wreath, so that it moved in front of their eyes⁴; but the intention of the Lord in giving this commandment was that they should be bound in their hands, that is, in their works and that they should be before their eyes, that is, in their thoughts. The violet coloured fillets which were inserted in their cloaks signify the heavenly intention which should accompany our every deed. It may, however, be said that, because they were a carnal minded and stiff-necked people, it was necessary for them to be stirred by these sensible things to the observance of the Law.

Reply Obj. 8. Affection in man is twofold: it may be an affection of reason, or it may be an

²Cf. Maimonides, Guide, in, 37 (FR 335).
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affection of passion. If a man's affection be one of reason, it matters not how man behaves to animals, because God has subjected all things to man's power, according to Ps. 8. 8: Thou hast subjected all things under his feet; and it is in this sense that the Apostle says that God has no care for oxen, because God does not ask of man what he does with oxen or other animals.

But if man's affection be one of passion, then it is moved also in regard to other animals, for since the passion of pity is caused by the afflictions of others, and since it happens that even irrational animals are sensible to pain, it is possible for the affection of pity to arise in a man with regard to the sufferings of animals. Now it is evident that if a man practise a pitiful affection for animals, he is all the more disposed to take pity on his fellow-men; therefore it is written (Prov. 12. 10): The just regardeth the lives of his beasts: but the bowels of the wicked are cruel. Consequently the Lord, in order to inculcate pity to the Jewish people, who were prone to cruelty, wished them to practice pity even with regard to dumb animals, and forbade them to do certain things savouring of cruelty to animals. Hence He prohibited them to boil a kid in the milk of its dam; and to muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and to slay the dam with her young. It may, nevertheless, be also said that these prohibitions were made in hatred of idolatry. For the Egyptians held it to be wicked to allow the ox to eat of the grain while threshing the corn. Moreover certain sorcerers were accustomed to ensnare the mother bird with her young during incubation, and to employ them for the purpose of securing fruitfulness and good luck in bringing up children; and also because it was held to be a good omen to find the mother sitting on her young.

As to the mingling of animals of various species, the literal reason may have been threefold. The first was to show detestation for the idolatry of the Egyptians, who employed various mixtures in worshipping the planets, which produce various effects, and on various kinds of things according to their various conjunctions.¹ The second reason was in condemnation of unnatural sins. The third reason was the entire removal of all occasions of concupiscence. Because animals of different species do not easily breed, unless this be brought about by man, and movements of lust are aroused by seeing such things. Therefore in the Jewish traditions we

¹Cf. Maimonides, Guide, III, 37 (FR 337).

find it prescribed, as stated by Rabbi Moses, that men shall turn away their eyes from such sights.²

The figurative reason for these things is that the necessities of life should not be withdrawn from the ox that treadeth the corn, that is, from the preacher bearing the sheaves of doctrine, as the Apostle states (I Cor. 9. 4, seqq.). Again, we should not take the dam with her young, because in certain things we have to keep the spiritual senses, that is, the offspring and set aside the observance of the letter, that is, the mother, for instance in all the ceremonies of the Law. It is also forbidden that beasts of burden, that is, any of the common people, should be allowed to engender, that is, to have any connection, with animals of another kind, that is, with Gentiles or Jews.

Reply Obj. 9. All these minglings were forbidden in agriculture; literally, in detestation of idolatry. For the Egyptians in worshipping the stars employed various combinations of seeds, animals and garments, in order to represent the various conjunctions of the stars.³ Or else all these minglings were forbidden in detestation of the unnatural vice.

They have, however, a figurative reason. For the prohibition: Thou shalt not sow thy field with different seeds, is to be understood, in the spiritual sense, of the prohibition to sow strange doctrine in the Church, which is a spiritual vineyard. Likewise the field, that is, the Church, must not be sown with different seeds, that is, with Catholic and heretical doctrines. Neither is it allowed to plough with an ox and an ass together; thus a fool should not accompany a wise man in preaching, for one would hinder the other.

[The reply to Obj. 10 is missing from the manuscripts.]

Reply Obj. 11. Sorcerers and idolatrous priests made use, in their rites, of the bones and flesh of dead men. Therefore, in order to extirpate the customs of idolatrous worship, the Lord commanded that the priests of inferior degree, who at fixed times served in the temple, should not incur an uncleanness at the death of anyone except of those who were closely related to them, namely, their father or mother, and others thus near of kin to them. But the high priest had always to be ready for the service of the sanctuary ; therefore he was absolutely forbidden to approach the dead, however nearly related to him. They were also forbidden to

²Op.cit.,III, 49 (FR 377).

³Cf. Maimonides, Guide, III, 37 (FR 337).

marry a harlot or one that has been put away, or any other than a virgin ; both on account of the reverence due to the priesthood, the honour of which would seem to be tarnished by such a marriage, and for the sake of the children who would be disgraced by the mother's shame, which was most of all to be avoided when the priestly dignity was passed on from father to son. Again, they were commanded to shave neither head nor beard, and not to make incisions in their flesh, in order to exclude the rites of idolatry. For the priests of the Gentiles shaved both head and beard, and so it is written (Baruch 6. 30) : Priests sit in their temples having their garments rent, and their heads and beards shaven. Moreover, in worshipping their idols they cut themselves with knives and lancets (III Kings 18. 28). For this reason the priests of the Old Law were commanded to do the contrary.

The spiritual reason for these things is that priests should be entirely free from dead works, that is, sins. And they should not shave their heads, that is, set wisdom aside; nor should they shave their beards, that is, set aside the perfection of wisdom; nor rend their garments or cut their flesh, that is, they should not incur the sin of schism.

QUESTION CII

OF THE DURATION OF THE CEREMONIAL

PRECEPTS

(In Four Articles)

We must now consider the duration of the ceremonial precepts, under which head there are four points of inquiry: (1) Whether the ceremonial precepts were in existence before the Law? (2) Whether at the time of the Law the ceremonies of the Old Law had any power of justification? (3) Whether they ceased at the coming of Christ? (4) Whether it is a mortal sin to observe them after the coming of Christ?

Article I. *Whether the Ceremonies of the Law Were in Existence Before the Law?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It would seem that the ceremonies of the Law were in existence before the Law.

Objection 1. For sacrifices and holocausts were ceremonies of the Old Law, as stated above (q. ci, a. 4). But sacrifices and holocausts preceded the Law, for it is written (Gen. 4. 3, 4) that Cain offered, of the fruits of the earth, gifts to the Lord, and that Abel offered of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat.

Noe also offered holocatists to the Lord (Gen. 18. 20), and Abraham did in like manner (Gen. 22. 13). Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law preceded the Law.

Obj. 2. Further, the erecting and consecrating of the altar were part of the ceremonies relating to holy things. But these preceded the Law. For we read (Gen. 13. 18) that Abraham . . . built . . . an altar to the Lord; and (Gen. 28. 18) that Jacob . . . took the stone . . . and set it up for a title, pouring oil upon the top of it. Therefore the legal ceremonies preceded the Law.

Obj. 3. Further, the first of the legal sacraments seems to have been circumcision. But circumcision preceded the Law, as appears from Gen. 17. In like manner the priesthood preceded the Law; for it is written (Gen. 14. 18) that Melchisedech . . . was the priest of the most high God. Therefore the sacramental ceremonies preceded the Law.

Obj. 4. Further, the distinction of clean from unclean animals belongs to the ceremonies oi observances, as stated above (q. cii, a. 6, Reply i). But this distinction preceded the Law; for it is written (Gen. 7. 2, 3): Of all clean beasts take seven and seven . . . but of the beasts that are unclean, two and two. Therefore the legal ceremonies preceded the Law.

On the contrary, It is written (Deut. 6. I): These are the precepts, and ceremonies . . . which the Lord your God commanded that I should teach you. But they would not have needed to be taught about these things, if the above mentioned ceremonies had been already in existence. Therefore the legal ceremonies did not precede the Law.

I answer that, As is clear from what has been said (q. ci, q. 2; q. cii, a. 2), the legal ceremonies were ordained for a double purpose, the worship of God, and the foreshadowing of Christ. Now whoever worships God must worship Him by means of certain fixed things pertaining to external worship. But the fixing of the divine worship belongs to the ceremonies, just as the determining of our relations with our neighbour is a matter determined by the judicial precepts, as stated above (q. xcix, a. 4). Consequently, as among men in general there were certain judicial precepts, not indeed established by Divine authority, but ordained by human reason, so also there were some ceremonies fixed, not by the authority of any law, but according to the will and devotion of those that worship God. Since, however, even before the Law some of the leading men were gifted with the spirit of prophecy, it is to be believed that a heavenly instinct, like a private law, prompted them to worship God in a certain definite way, which would be both in keeping with the interior worship, and a suitable token of Christ's mysteries, which were foreshadowed also by other things that they did, according to I Cor. 10. II : All . . . things happened to them in figure. Therefore there were some ceremonies before the Law, but they were not legal ceremonies, because they were not as yet established by legislation.

Reply Obj. 1. The patriarchs offered up these oblations, sacrifices and holocausts previously to the Law out of a certain devotion of their own will, according as it seemed proper to them to offer up in honour of God those things which they had received from Him, and thus to testify that they worshipped God Who is the beginning and end of all.

Reply Obj. 2. They also established certain sacred things, because they thought that the honour due to God demanded that certain places should be set apart from others for the purpose of divine worship.

Reply Obj. 3. The sacrament of circumcision was established by command of God before the Law. Hence it cannot be called a sacrament of the Law as though it were an institution of the Law, but only as an observance included in the Law. Hence Our Lord said (John 7. 22) that circumcision was not of Moses, but of his fathers. Again, among those who worshipped God, the priesthood was in existence before the Law by human appointment, for the Law allotted the priestly dignity to the firstborn.

Reply Obj. 4. The distinction of clean from unclean animals was in vogue before the Law, not with regard to eating them, since it is written (Gen. 9. 3): Everything that moveth and liveth shall be meat for you, but only as to the offering of sacrifices, because they used only certain animals for that purpose. If, however, they did make any distinction in regard to eating, it was not that it was considered illegal to eat such animals, since this was not forbidden by any law, but from dislike or custom; thus even now we see that certain foods are looked upon with disgust in some countries, while people partake of them in others.

Article 2. *Whether, at the Time of the Law, the Ceremonies of the Old Law Had Any Power of Justification?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It would seem that the ceremonies of the Old Law had the power of justification at the time

of the Law.

Objection 1. Because expiation from sin and consecration pertains to justification. But it is written (Exod. 29. 21) that the priests and their apparel were consecrated by the sprinkling of blood and the anointing of oil; and (Levit. 16. 16) that, by sprinkling the blood of the calf, the priest expiated the sanctuary from the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and from their transgressions and . . . their sins. Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law had the power of justification.

Obj. 2. Further, that by which man pleases God pertains to justification, according to Ps. 10. 8: The Lord is just and hath loved justice. But some pleased God by means of ceremonies, according to Levit. 10. 19: How could I . . . please the Lord in the ceremonies, having a sorrowful heart? Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law had the power of justification.

Obj. 3. Further, things relating to the divine worship regard the soul rather than the body, according to Ps. 18. 8: The Law of the Lord is unspotted, converting souls. But the leper was cleansed by means of the ceremonies of the Old Law, as stated in Lev. 14. Much more therefore could the ceremonies of the Old Law cleanse the soul by justifying it.

On the contrary, The Apostle says (Gal. 2) :¹ If there had been a law given which could justify (Vulg.,— give life), Christ died in vain, that is, without cause. But this is inadmissible. Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law did not confer justice.

In answer that, As stated above (q. cii, a. 5, Reply 4), a twofold uncleanness was distinguished in the Old Law. One was spiritual and is the uncleanness of sin. The other was corporal, which rendered a man unfit for divine worship thus a leper, or anyone that touched carrion, was said to be unclean. And thus uncleanness was nothing but a kind of irregularity. From this uncleanness, then, the ceremonies of the Old Law had the power to cleanse, because they were ordered by the Law to be employed as remedies for the removal of these uncleannesses which were contracted in consequence of the prescription of the Law. Hence the Apostle says (Heb. 9. 13) that the blood of goats and of oxen, and the ashes of a heifer, being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled, to the cleansing of the flesh. And just as this uncleanness which was washed away by such ceremonies affected the flesh rather than the soul, so also the ceremonies

¹Cf. Gal. 3.21.

themselves are called by the Apostle shortly before (verse lo) justices of the flesh: justices of the flesh, says he, being laid on them until the time of correction.

On the other hand, they had no power of cleansing from uncleanness of the soul, that is, from the uncleanness of sin. The reason of this was that at no time could there be expiation from sin, except through Christ, Who taketh away the sins (Vulg., — sin) of the world (John I. 29). And since the mystery of Christ's Incarnation and Passion had not yet really taken place, those ceremonies of the Old Law could not really contain in themselves a power flowing from Christ already incarnate and crucified, such as the sacraments of the New Law contain. Consequently they could not cleanse from sin; thus the Apostle says (Heb. 10. 4) that it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away. And for this reason he calls them (Gal. 4. 9) weak and needy elements, weak indeed, because they cannot take away sin; but this weakness results from their being needy, that is, from the fact that they do not contain grace within themselves.

However, it was possible at the time of the Law for the minds of the faithful to be united by faith to Christ incarnate and crucified, so that they were justified by faith in Christ, of which faith the observance of these ceremonies was a sort of profession, in so far as they foreshadowed Christ. Hence in the Old Law certain sacrifices were offered up for sins, not as though the sacrifices themselves washed sins away, but because they were professions of faith which cleansed from sin. In fact, the Law itself implies this in the terms employed, for it is written (Lev. 4. 26; 5. 16) that in offering the sacrifice for sin the priest shall pray for him . . . and it shell be forgiven him, as though the sin were forgiven not in virtue of the sacrifices but through the faith and devotion of those who offered them. It must be observed, however, that the very fact that the ceremonies of the Old Law washed away uncleanness of the body was a figure of that expiation from sins which was effected by Christ.

It is therefore evident that under the state of the Old Law the ceremonies had no power of justification.

Reply Obj. 1. That sanctification of priests and their sons, and of their apparel or of anything else belonging to them, by sprinkling them with blood, had no other effect but to appoint them to the divine worship, and to remove impediments from them, to the cleansing of the flesh, as the Apostle states (Heb. 9. 13), in token of that sanctification whereby Jesus sanctified the people by His own blood (ibid. 13. 12). Moreover, the expiation must be understood as referring to the removal of these bodily uncleannesses, not to the forgiveness of sin. Hence even the sanctuary which could not be the subject of sin is stated to be expiated.

Reply Obj. 2. The priests pleased God in the ceremonies by their obedience and devotion, and by their faith in the reality foreshadowed, not by reason of the things considered in themselves.

Reply Obj. 3. Those ceremonies which were prescribed in the cleansing of a leper were not ordained for the purpose of taking away the defilement of leprosy. This is clear from the fact that these ceremonies were not applied to a man until he was already healed ; hence it is written (Lev. 14. 3, 4) that the priest, going out of the camp, when he shall find that the leprosy is cleansed, shall command him that is to be purified to offer, etc. ; from this it is evident that the priest was appointed the judge of leprosy not before, but after cleansing. But these ceremonies were employed for the purpose of taking away the uncleanness of irregularity. They say, however, that if a priest were to err in his judgment, the leper would be cleansed miraculously by the power of God, but not in virtue of the sacrifice. Thus also it was by miracle that the thigh of the adulterous woman rotted when she had drunk the water on which the priest had heaped curses, as stated in Num. 5. 19-27.

Article 3. *Whether the Ceremonies of the Old Law Ceased at the Coming of Christ?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It would seem that the ceremonies of the Old Law did not cease at the coming of Christ.

Objection 1. For it is written (Baruch 4. i) : This is the book of the commandments of God, and the law that is for ever. But the legal ceremonies were part of the Law. Therefore the legal ceremonies were to last for ever.

Obj. 2. Further, the offering made by a leper after being cleansed was a ceremony of the Law. But the Gospel commands the leper, who has been cleansed, to make this offering (Matt. 8. 4). Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law did not cease at Christ's coming.

Obj. 3. Further, as long as the cause remains, the effect remains. But the ceremonies of the Old Law had certain reasonable causes, since they were ordained to the worship of God, besides the fact that they were intended to be figures of Christ. Therefore the ceremonies of the Old Law should not have ceased.

Obj. 4. Further, circumcision was instituted as a sign of Abraham's faith, the observance of the sabbath to recall the blessing of creation, and other solemnities in memory of other Divine favours, as stated above (q. cii, a. 4, Reply 10; A. 5, Reply i). But Abraham's faith is ever to be imitated even by us, and the blessing of creation and other Divine favours should never be forgotten. Therefore at least circumcision and the other legal solemnities should not have ceased.

On the contrary, The Apostle says (Coloss. 2. 16, 17): Let no man . . . judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come; and (Heb. 8. 13) : In saying a new {testament)^ he hath made the former old: and that which decayeth and growth old, is near its end.

I answer that. All the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law were ordained to the worship of God, as stated above (q. ci, aa. i, 2). Now external worship should be in proportion to the internal worship, which consists in faith, hope, and charity. Consequently exterior worship had to be subject to variations according to the variations in the internal worship, in which a threefold state may be distinguished. One state was in respect of faith and hope, both in heavenly goods, and in the means of obtaining them—in both of these considered as things to come. Such was the state of faith and hope in the Old Law. Another state of the interior worship is that in which we have faith and hope in heavenly goods as things to come, but in the means of obtaining heavenly goods as in things present or past. Such is the state of the New Law. The third state is that in which both are possessed as present, in which nothing is believed in as lacking, nothing hoped for as being yet to come. Such is the state of the Blessed.

In this state of the Blessed, then, nothing in regard to the worship of God will be figurative there will be only thanksgiving and voice of praise (Isa. 51. 3). Hence it is written concerning the city of the Blessed (Apoc. 21. 22) : I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty is the temple thereof, and the Lamb. Proportionately, therefore, the ceremonies of the first mentioned state which foreshadowed the second and third states, had need to cease at the advent of the second state; and other ceremonies had to be introduced which would be in keeping with the state of divine worship for that particular time, in which heavenly goods are a thing of the

future, but the Divine favours by which we obtain the heavenly boons are a thing of the present.

Reply Obj. 1. The Old Law is said to be "forever" simply and absolutely, as regards its moral precepts; but as regards the ceremonial precepts it lasts for ever in respect of the reality which those ceremonies foreshadowed.

Reply Obj. 2. The mystery of the redemption of the human race was fulfilled in Christ's Passion ; hence Our Lord said then : It is consummated (John 19. 30). Consequently the prescriptions of the Law must have ceased then altogether, through their reality being fulfilled. As a sign of this, we read that at the Passion of Christ the veil of the temple was rent (Matt. 27. 51). Hence, before Christ's Passion, while Christ was preaching and working miracles, the Law and the Gospel were concurrent, since the mystery of Christ had already begun, but was not as yet consummated. And for this reason Our Lord, before His Passion, commanded the leper to observe the legal ceremonies.

Reply Obj. 3. The literal reasons already given (q. cii) for the ceremonies refer to the divine worship, which was founded on faith in that which was to come. Hence, at the advent of Him Who was to come, both that worship ceased, and all the reasons referring to it.

Reply Obj. 4. The faith of Abraham was commended in that he believed in God's promise concerning his seed to come, in which all nations were to be blessed. Therefore, as long as this seed was yet to come, it was necessary to make profession of Abraham's faith by means of circumcision. But now that it is consummated, the same thing needs to be declared by means of another sign, namely. Baptism, which, in this respect, took the place of circumcision, according to the saying of the Apostle (Coloss. 2. 11, 12) : You are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand, in despoiling of the body of the flesh, but in the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in Baptism.

As to the sabbath, which was a sign recalling the first creation, its place is taken by the Lord's Day, which recalls the beginning of the new creature in the Resurrection of Christ. In like manner other solemnities of the Old Law are supplanted by new solemnities, because the blessings vouchsafed to that people foreshadowed the favours granted us by Christ. Hence the feast of the Passover gave place to the feast of Christ's Passion and Resurrection; the feast of Pentecost when the Old Law was given, to the feast of Pentecost on which was given the Law of the living spirit; the feast of the New Moon, to the feast of the Blessed Virgin, when appeared the first rays of the sun, that is, Christ, by the fulness of grace; the feast of Trumpets, to the feasts of the Apostles; the feast of Expiation, to the feasts of Martyrs and Confessors; the feast of Tabernacles, to the feast of the Church Dedication ; the feast of the Assembly and Collection, to feast of the Angels, or else to the feast of All Saints.

Article 4. *Whether since Christ's Passion the Legal Ceremonies Can Be Observed Without Committing Mortal Sin?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It would seem that since Christ's Passion the legal ceremonies can be observed without committing mortal sin.

Objection 1. For we must not believe that the apostles committed mortal sin after receiving the Holy Ghost, since by His fulness they were endued with power from on high (Luke 24. 49). But the apostles observed the legal ceremonies after the coming of the Holy Ghost; for it is stated (Acts 16. 3) that Paul circumcised Timothy, and (Acts 21. 26) that Paul, at the advice of James, took the men, and . . . being purified with them, entered into the temple, giving notice of the accomplishment of the days of purification, until an oblation should be offered for every one of them. Therefore the legal ceremonies can be observed since the Passion of Christ without committing mortal sin.

Obj. 2. Further, one of the legal ceremonies consisted in shunning the fellowship of Gentiles. But the first Pastor of the Church complied with this observance; for it is stated (Gal. 2. 12) that, when certain men had come to Antioch, Peter withdrew and separated himself from the Gentiles. Therefore the legal ceremonies can be observed since Christ's Passion without committing mortal sin.

Obj. 3. Further, the commands of the apostles did not lead men into sin. But it was commanded by apostolic decree that the Gentiles should observe certain ceremonies of the Law: for it is written (Acts 15. 28, 29): It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things: that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication. Therefore the legal ceremonies can be observed since Christ's Passion without committing mortal sin.

On the contrary. The Apostle says (Gal. 5. 2); If you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. But nothing save mortal sin hinders us from receiving Christ's fruit. Therefore since Christ's Passion it is a mortal sin to be circumcised, or to observe the other legal ceremonies.

I answer that. All ceremonies are professions of faith, in which the interior worship of God consists. Now man can make profession of his inward faith, by deeds as well as by words, and in either profession if he makes a false declaration, he sins mortally. Now though our faith in Christ is the same as that of the fathers of old yet, since they came before Christ, while we come after Him, the same faith is expressed in different words by us and by them. For by them was it said (Isa. 7. 14) : Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, where the verbs are in the future tense; but we express the same by means of verbs in the past tense, and say that she conceived and bore. In like manner the ceremonies of the Old Law signified Christ as having yet to be born and to suffer, but our sacraments signify Him as already born and having suffered. Consequently, just as it would be a mortal sin now for anyone, in making a profession of faith, to say that Christ is yet to be born, which the fathers of old said devoutly and truthfully, so too it would be a mortal sin now to observe those ceremonies which the fathers of old fulfilled with devotion and fidelity. Such is the teaching of Augustine (Contra Faust, xix, 16),¹ who says: "It is no longer promised that He shall be born, shall suffer and rise again, truths of which their sacraments were a kind of image; but it is declared that He is already born, has suffered and risen again, of which our sacraments, in which Christians share, are the actual representation."

Reply Obj. 1. On this point there seems to have been a difference of opinion between Jerome and Augustine. For Jerome (Super Galat. ii, II, seq.)² distinguished two periods of time. One was the time previous to Christ's Passion, during which the legal ceremonies were neither dead, since they were obligatory, and did expiate in their own fashion, nor deadly, because it was not sinful to observe them. But immediately after Christ's Passion they began to be not only dead, so as no longer to be either effectual or binding, but also deadly, so that whoever observed them was guilty of mortal sin. Hence he maintained that after the Passion the apostles

¹PL 42, 357.

²PL 26, 364; Episi., CXII (PL 22, 921); see Hugh of St. Victor, De Sacram., II, VI, 4 (PL 176, 449); Bonaventure, In Sent., IV, d. 3, Pt. 3, Q- 2 (QR IV, 87).

never observed the legal ceremonies in real earnest, but only by a kind of pious pretence, lest, that is, they should scandalize the Jews and hinder their conversion. This pretence, however, is to be understood, not as though they did not in reahty perform those actions, but in the sense that they performed them without the mind to observe the ceremonies of the Law; thus a man might cut away his foreskin for health's sake, not with the intention of observing legal circumcision.

But since it seems unfitting that the apostles, in order to avoid scandal, should have hidden things pertaining to the truth of life and doctrine, and that they should have made use of pretence in things pertaining to the salvation of the faithful, therefore Augustine (Epist. Ixxxii)¹ more fittingly distinguished three periods of time. One was the time that preceded the Passion of Christ, during which the legal ceremonies were neither deadly nor dead; another period was after the publication of the Gospel, during which the legal ceremonies are both dead and deadly. The third is a middle period, namely, from the Passion of Christ until the publication of the Gospel, during which the legal ceremonies were dead indeed, because they had neither effect nor binding force, but were not deadly, because it was lawful for the Jewish converts to Christianity to observe them, provided they did not put their trust in them so as to hold them to be necessary unto salvation, as though faith in Christ could not justify without the legal observances. On the other hand, there was no reason why those who were converted from heathendom to Christianity should observe them. Hence Paul circumcised Timothy, who was born of a Jewish mother, but was unwilling to circumcise Titus, who was born of Gentiles.

The reason why the Holy Ghost did not wish the converted Jews to be debarred at once from observing the legal ceremonies, while converted heathens were forbidden to observe the rites of heathendom, was in order to show that there is a difference between these rites. For heathenish ceremonial was rejected as absolutely unlawful, and as prohibited by God for all time; but the legal ceremonial ceased as being fulfilled through Christ's Passion, since it had been instituted by God as a figure of Christ.

Reply Obj. 2. According to Jerome,² Peter withdrew himself from the Gentiles by pretence, in order to avoid giving scandal to the Jews, of whom he was the Apostle. Hence he did not sin

¹PL 33, 281. ²In Gal. i. super 2.14 (PL 26, 367).

at all in acting thus. On the other hand, Paul in like manner made a pretence of blaming him, in order to avoid scandalizing the Gentiles, whose Apostle he was. But Augustine disapproves of this solution,⁵ because in the canonical Scripture (viz., Gal. 2. 11), wherein we must not hold anything to be false, Paul says that Peter was to he blamed. Consequently it is true that Peter sinned, and Paul blamed him in very truth and not with pretence. Peter, however, did not sin by observing the legal ceremonial for the time being, because this was lawful for him who was a converted Jew. But he did sin by excessive minuteness in the observance of the legal rites lest he should scandalize the Jews, the result being that he gave scandal to the Gentiles.

Reply Obj. 3. Some have held⁴ that this prohibition of the apostles is not to be taken literally, but spiritually : namely, that the prohibition of blood signifies the prohibition of murder; the prohibition of things strangled, that of violence and rapine; the prohibition of things offered to idols, that of idolatry ; while fornication is forbidden as being evil in itself. This opinion they gathered from certain glosses, which expound these prohibitions in a mystical sense. Since, however, murder and rapine were held to be unlawful even by the Gentiles, there would have been no need to give this special commandment to those who were converted to Christ from heathendom. Hence others maintain that those foods were forbidden literally not to prevent the observance of legal ceremonies, but in order to prevent gluttony.⁵ Thus Jerome says on Ezech. 44. 31⁶ (The priest shall not eat of anything that is dead) : "He condemns those priests who from gluttony did not keep these precepts." But since certain foods are more delicate than these and more conducive to gluttony, there seems no reason why these should have been forbidden more than the others.

We must therefore follow a third opinion, and hold that these foods were forbidden literally, not with the purpose of enforcing compliance with the legal ceremonies, but in order to further the union of Gentiles and Jews living side by side. Because blood and things strangled were loathsome to the Jews by ancient custom, while the Jews might have suspected the Gentiles of relapse into idolatry if the latter had partaken of things offered to idols. Hence these things

³Augustine, Epist., lxxxii, 2 (PL 33, 280).
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⁶Bk. xiii (PL 25, 464).

were prohibited for the time being, during which the Gentiles and Jews were to become united together. But as time went on, with the lapse of the cause, the effect lapsed also, when the truth of the Gospel teaching was divulged, wherein Our Lord taught that not that which entereth into the mouth defileth a man (Matt. 15. 11), and that nothing is to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving (I Tim. 4. 4). With regard to fornication a special prohibition was made, because the Gentiles did not hold it to be sinful.

20 AQUINAS: *Summa Theologica, PART III, QQ 60-65 847a- 884a,c*

QUESTION LX

OF THE SACRAMENTS

(In Eight Articles)

After considering those things that concern the mystery of the incarnate Word, we must consider the sacraments of the Church which derive their efficacy from the Word incarnate Himself. First we shall consider the sacraments in general ; secondly, we shall consider specially each sacrament (q. lxvi).

Concerning the first our consideration will be fivefold: (1) What is a sacrament? (2) Of the necessity of the sacraments (q. lxi). (3) Of the effects of the sacraments (q. lxii). (4) Of their cause (q. lxiv). (5) Of their number (q. lxv).

Under the first heading there are eight points of inquiry: (1) Whether a sacrament is a kind of sign? (2) Whether every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament? (3) Whether a sacrament is a sign of one thing only, or of several? (4) Whether a sacrament is a sign that is a sensible thing? (5) Whether a determinate sensible thing is required for a sacrament? (6) Whether signification expressed by words is necessary for a sacrament? (7) Whether determinate words are required? (8) Whether anything may be added to or subtracted from these words?

Article I . *Whether a Sacrament Is a Kind of Sign?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that a sacrament is not a kind of sign.

Objection 1. For sacrament appears to be derived from making holy (sacrando), just as medicament, from healing (medicando). But this seems to be of the nature of a cause rather than to the nature of a sign. Therefore a sacrament is in the genus of cause rather than in the genus of sign.

Obj. 2. Further, sacrament seems to signify something hidden, according to Tob. 12. 7: It is good to hide the secret (sacramentum) of a king; and Ephes. 3. 9: What is the dispensation of the mystery (sacramenti) which hath been hidden from eternity in God. But that which is hidden, seems to be against the nature of a sign for, "a sign is that which conveys something else to the mind besides the species which it puts into the senses," as Augustine explains.¹ Therefore it seems that a sacrament is not in the genus of sign.

Obj. 3. Further, an oath is sometimes called a sacrament, for it is written in the Decretals:² "Children who have not attained the use of reason must not be obliged to swear, and whoever has foresworn himself once, must no more be a witness, nor be allowed to take a sacrament"— that is, an oath. But an oath is not a kind of sign, and therefore it seems that a sacrament is not a kind of sign.

On the contrary, Augustine says:³ "The visible sacrifice is the sacrament, that is, the sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice."

I answer that, All things that are ordered to one, even in different ways, can be denominated from it; thus, from health which is in an animal, not only is the animal said to be healthy through being the subject of health, but medicine also is said to be healthy through producing health, diet through preserving it, and urine, through being a sign of health. Consequently, a thing may be called a sacrament either from having a certain hidden sanctity, and in this sense a sacrament is the same as a sacred secret; or from having some relationship to this sanctity, which relationship may be that of a cause, or of a sign or of any other relation. But now we are speaking of sacraments in a special sense, as implying the relationship of sign, and in this way a sacrament is a kind of sign.

Reply Obj. 1. Because medicine is an efficient cause of health, consequently whatever things are denominated from medicine are called so in relation to one first agent, so that a medicament implies a certain causality. But sanctity from which a sacrament is denominated is not there taken as an efficient cause, but rather as a formal or a final cause. Therefore it does not follow that a sacrament need always imply causality.

¹Christian Doctrine, 11, I (PL 34, 35).

²Gratian, Decretum, 11, causa xxii, Q. 5, can. 14 (RF I, 886).
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Reply Obj. 2. This argument considers sacrament in the sense of a sacred secret. Now not only God's, but also the king's, secret, is said to be sacred and to be a sacrament, because according to the ancients, whatever it was unlawful to lay violent hands on was said to be holy or sacrosanct,¹ such as the city walls,² and persons of high rank. Consequently those secrets, whether Divine or human, which it is unlawful to violate by making them known to anybody whatever, are called sacred secrets or sacraments.

Reply Obj. 3. Even an oath has a certain relation to sacred things, in so far as it consists in calling a sacred thing to witness. And in this sense it is called a sacrament, not in the sense in which we speak of sacraments now, the word sacrament being thus used not equivocally but analogically—that is, by reason of a different relation to the one thing—namely, something sacred.

Article 2. *Whether Every Sign of a Holy Thing Is a Sacrament?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that not every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament.

Objection 1. For all sensible creatures are signs of sacred things, according to Rom. i. 20: The invisible things of God are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made. And yet all sensible things cannot be called sacraments. Therefore not every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament.

Obj. 2. Further, whatever was done under the Old Law was a figure of Christ Who is the Holy of Holies (Dan. 9. 24), according to I Cor. 10. II : All {these) things happened to them in figure; and Col. 2. 17: Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's. And yet not all that was done by the Fathers of the old Testament, not even all the ceremonies of the Law, were sacraments, but only in certain special cases, as stated in the Second Part (I-II, Q. CI, A. 4). Therefore it seems that not every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament.

Obj. 3. Further, even in the New Testament many things are done in sign of some sacred thing, yet they are not called sacraments; such as sprinkling with holy water, the consecration of an altar, and the like. Therefore not every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament.

On the contrary, A definition is convertible

¹Cf. Digest, I, tit. viii, leg. 8 (KR I, 40A).

²Ibid., leg. 1 (KR I, 39a).

with the thing defined. Now some³ define a sacrament as being "the sign of a sacred thing"; moreover, this is clear from the passage quoted above (a. i) from Augustine. Therefore it seems that every sign of a sacred thing is a sacrament.

I answer that, Signs are given to men, to whom it is proper to come to the unknown by means of the known. Consequently a sacrament properly so called is that which is the sign of some sacred thing pertaining to man, so that properly speaking a sacrament, as considered by us now, is defined as being the sign of a holy thing so far as it makes men holy.

Reply Obj. 1. Sensible creatures signify something holy—namely. Divine wisdom and goodness in so far as these are holy in themselves, but not in so far as we are made holy by them. Therefore they cannot be called sacraments as we understand sacraments now.

Reply Obj. 2. Some things pertaining to the Old Testament signified the holiness of Christ considered as holy in Himself. Others signified His holiness considered as the cause of our holiness; thus the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb signified Christ's Sacrifice whereby we are made holy, and such things are properly styled sacraments of the Old Law.

Reply Obj. 3. Names are given to things considered in reference to their end and state of completeness. Now a disposition is not an end, whereas perfection is. Consequently things that signify disposition to holiness are not called sacraments, and with regard to these the objection is verified: only those are called sacraments which signify the perfection of holiness in man.

Article 3. *Whether a Sacrament Is a Sign of One Thing Only?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that a sacrament is a sign of one thing only.

Objection 1. For that which signifies many things is an ambiguous sign, and consequently occasions deception; this is clearly seen in equivocal words. But all deception should be removed from the Christian religion, according to Col. 2. 8: Beware lest any man cheat you by

³Cf. Lanfranc, Dc Corp. et Sang. Dom., xii (PL 150, 422); Hugh of St. Victor, De Sacr., i, ix, 2 (PL 176, 317); Peter Lombard, Sent., iv, d. i, chap. 2 (QR ii, 745); Albert the Great, In Sent., iv, dist. i. A. i, Q. 2 (QR iv, 14); Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol., iv, Q. i, m. i (iv, 2ra); Bonaventure, In Sent., iv, d. i, A. i, Q. 2 (QR iv, 14).

philosophy and vain deceit. Therefore it seems that a sacrament is not a sign of several things.

Obj. 2. Further, as stated above (a. 2), a sacrament signifies a holy thing in so far as it is a cause of man's holiness. But there is only one cause of man's holiness, namely, the blood of Christ, according to Heb. 13. 12: Jesus, that He might sanctify the people by His own blood, suffered without the gate. Therefore it seems that a sacrament does not signify several things.

Obj. 3. Further, it has been said above (a. 2, Reply 3) that a sacrament signifies properly the very end of sanctification. Now the end of sanctification is eternal life, according to Rom. 6. 22: You have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end life everlasting. Therefore it seems that the sacraments signify one thing only—namely, eternal life. On the contrary, In the Sacrament of the Altar, two things are signified, namely, Christ's true body, and Christ's mystical body, as Augustine says (Liber Sent. Prosper.).¹

I answer that. As stated above (a. 2) a sacrament properly speaking is that which is ordained to signify our sanctification. In which three things may be considered; namely, the very cause of our sanctification, which is Christ's passion, the form of our sanctification, which is grace and the virtues, and the ultimate end of our sanctification, which is eternal life. And all these are signified by the sacraments. Consequently a sacrament is a sign that is both a reminder of the past, that is, the passion of Christ; and an indication of that which is effected in us by Christ's passion, that is, grace; and a prognostic, that is, a foretelling of future glory.

Reply Obj. 1. A sign is ambiguous and the occasion of deception when it signifies many things not ordered to one another. But when it signifies many things according as through being mutually ordered they form one thing, then the sign is not ambiguous but certain ; thus this word "man" signifies the soul and body according as together they form the human nature. In this way a sacrament signifies the three things aforesaid, according as by being in a certain order they are one thing.

Reply Obj. 2. Since a sacrament signifies that which sanctifies, it must signify the effect, which is understood in the sanctifying cause itself according as it is sanctifying.

Reply Obj. 3. It is enough for the nature of a sacrament that it signify that perfection

¹Cf. Lanfranc, De Corp. et Sang. Dom., xiv (PL 150, 424); Gratian, Decreium, III, d. 2, can. 48 (RF i, 1331).

which consists in the form, nor is it necessary that it should signify only that perfection which is the end.

Article 4. *Whether a Sacrament Is Always Something Sensible?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that a sacrament is not always something sensible.

Objection i. Because, according to the Philosopher,² every effect is a sign of its cause. But just as there are certain sensible effects, so are there certain intelligible effects; thus science is the effect of a demonstration. Therefore not every sign is sensible. Now it is enough for the nature of a sacrament that it be a sign of some sacred thing, in so far as by it man is sanctified, as stated above (a. 2). Therefore it is not required for a sacrament that it be some sensible thing.

Obj. 2. Further, sacraments belong to the kingdom of God or the Divine worship. But sensible things do not seem to belong to the Divine worship; for we are told (John 4. 24) that God is a spirit; and they that adore Him, must adore Him in spirit and in truth, and (Rom. 14. 17) that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink. Therefore sensible things are not required for the sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, Augustine says {De Lib. Arb. ii, 19)³ that "sensible things are goods of least account, since without them man can live rightly." But the sacraments are necessary for man's salvation, as we shall show farther on (q. lxi, a. i), so that man cannot live rightly without them. Therefore sensible things are not required for the sacraments.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx, sup. Joann. xv, 3) :⁴ "The word is added to the element and this becomes a sacrament," and he is speaking there of water which is a sensible element. Therefore sensible things are required for the sacraments.

I answer that. Divine wisdom provides for each thing according to its mode; hence it is written (Wis. 8. i) that she . . . ordereth all things sweetly, and therefore also we are told (Matt. 25. 15) that she gave to everyone according to his proper ability. Now it is natural to man to acquire knowledge of the intelligible from the sensible. But a sign is that by means of which one attains to the knowledge of something else. Consequently, since the sacred things which are signified by the sacraments

²Prior Analytics, 11, 27 (70ᵃ7).
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are the spiritual and intelligible goods by means of which man is sanctified, it follows that the sacramental signs consist in sensible things, just as in the Divine Scriptures spiritual things are set before us under the likeness of things sensible. And hence it is that sensible things are required for the sacraments, as Dionysius also proves in his book on the heavenly hierarchy (Cal. Hicr. i).¹

Reply Obj. 1. The name and definition of a thing is taken principally from that which belongs to a thing primarily and through itself, and not from that which belongs to it through something else. Now a sensible effect being the primary and direct object of man's knowledge (since all our knowledge springs from the senses) by its very nature leads to the knowledge of something else, whereas intelligible effects are not such as to be able to lead us to the knowledge of something else, except in so far as they are manifested by some other thing, that is, by certain sensibles. It is for this reason that the name sign is given primarily and principally to things which are offered to the senses; hence Augustine says² that a sign "is that which brings something else to the mind besides the species which it impresses on the senses." But intelligible effects do not have the nature of a sign except in so far as they are pointed out by certain signs. And in this way, too, certain things which are not sensible are termed sacraments as it were, in so far as they are signified by certain sensible things, of which we shall treat further on (q. lxiii, a. I, Reply 2; a. 3, Reply 2; q. Lxxiii, A. 6; Q. lxxxiv, a. i, Reply 3).

Reply Obj. 2. Sensible things considered in their own nature do not belong to the worship or kingdom of God, but considered only as signs of spiritual things in which the kingdom of God consists.

Reply Obj. 3. Augustine speaks there of sensible things considered in their own nature but not as employed to signify spiritual things, which are the highest goods.

Article 5. *Whether Determinate Things Are Required for a Sacrament?*

*We proceed thus to the Fifth Article*: It seems that determinate things are not required for a sacrament.

Objection, 1. For sensible things are required in sacraments for the purpose of signification, as stated above (a. 4). But nothing hinders the

¹Sect. I (PG 3, 121); cf. De Eccl. Hicr., chap. 2, sect 2 (PG 3,417).

²Christian Doctrine, 11, i (PL 34, 35).

same thing being signified by various sensible things; thus in Holy Scripture God is signified metaphorically, sometimes by a stone (II Kings 22. 2; Zach. 3. 9; I Cor. 10. 4; Apoc. 4. 3), sometimes by a lion (Isa. 31. 4; Apoc. 5. 5), sometimes by the sun (Isa. 60. 19, 20; Malach. 4. 2), or by something similar. Therefore it seems that various things can be suitable to the same sacrament. Therefore determinate things are not required for the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, the health of the soul is more necessary than that of the body. But in bodily medicines, which are ordered to the health of the body, one thing can be substituted for another which happens to be wanting. Therefore much more in the sacraments, which are spiritual remedies ordered to the health of the soul, can one thing be substituted for another when this happens to be lacking.

Obj. 3. Further, it is not fitting that the salvation of men be restricted by the Divine Law, still less by the Law of Christ, Who came to save all. But in the state of the Law of nature determinate things were not required in the sacraments, but were put to that use through a vow, as appears from Gen. 28. 20, where Jacob vowed that he would offer to God tithes and peace-offerings. Therefore it seems that man should not have been restricted, especially under the New Law, to the use of any determinate thing in the sacraments.

On the contrary, Our Lord said (John 3. 5); Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

I answer that, In the use of the sacraments two things may be considered, namely, the worship of God, and the sanctification of man, the former of which pertains to man in relation to God, and the latter pertains to God in relation to man. Now it is not for anyone to determine that which is in the power of another but only that which is in his own power. Since, therefore, the sanctification of man is in the power of God Who sanctifies, it is not for man to decide what things should be used for his sanctification, but this should be determined by Divine institution. Therefore in the sacraments of the New Law, by which man is sanctified according to I Cor. 6. II, You are washed, you are sanctified, we must use those things which are determined by Divine institution.

Reply Obj. 1. Though the same thing can be signified by various signs, yet to determine which sign must be used belongs to the signifier. Now it is God Who signifies spiritual things to us by means of the sensible things in the sacraments, and of similitudes in the Scriptures. And consequently, just as the Holy Ghost decides by what similitudes spiritual things are to be signified in certain passages of Scripture, so also must it be determined by Divine institution what things are to be employed for the purpose of signification in this or that sacrament.

Reply Obj. 2. Sensible things are endowed with natural powers conducive to the health of the body, and therefore if two of them have the same power it does not matter which we use. Yet they are ordained to sanctification not through any power that they possess naturally, but only in virtue of the Divine institution. And therefore it was necessary that God should determine the sensible things to be employed in the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 3. As Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 16),¹ various sacraments suit different times, just as different times are signified by different parts of the verb, namely, present, past, and future. Consequently, just as under the state of the Law of nature man was moved by inward instinct and without any outward law, to worship God, so also the sensible things to be employed in the worship of God were determined by inward instinct. But later on it became necessary for a law to be given from without; both because the Law of nature had become obscured by man's sins, and in order to signify more expressly the grace of Christ, by which the human race is sanctified. And hence the need for those things to be determinate, of which men have to make use in the sacraments. Nor is the way of salvation narrowed thereby, because the things which need to be used in the sacraments are either in everyone's possession or can be had with little trouble.

Article 6. *Whether Words Are Required for the Significance of the Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Sixth Article*: It seems that words are not required for the signification of the sacraments.

Objection 1. For Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 16):² "What else is a corporal sacrament but a kind of visible word?" Therefore to add words to the sensible things in the sacraments seems to be the same as to add words to words. But this is superfluous. Therefore words are not required besides the sensible things in the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, a sacrament is some one

¹PL 42, 356. ²PL 42, 356.

thing. But it does not seem possible to make one thing of those that belong to different genera. Since, therefore, sensible things and words are of different genera, for sensible things are the product of nature, but words of reason, it seems that in the sacraments words are not required besides sensible things.

Obj. 3. Further, the sacraments of the New Law succeed those of the Old Law, since "the former were instituted when the latter were abolished," as Augustine says (Contra Faust. xix, 13).³ But no form of words was required in the sacraments of the Old Law. Therefore neither is it required in those of the New Law. On the contrary, The Apostle says (Eph. 5. 25, 26) : Christ loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. And Augustine says {Tract, xxx in Joann.):⁴ "The word is added to the element, and this becomes a sacrament."

I answer that, The sacraments, as stated above (aa. 2, 3), are employed as signs for man's sanctification. Consequently they can be considered in three ways, and in each way it is fitting for words to be added to the sensible signs. For in the first place they can be considered in regard to the cause of sanctification, which is the Word incarnate, to Whom the sacraments have a certain conformity in that the word is joined to the sensible sign, just as in the mystery of the Incarnation the Word of God is united to sensible flesh.

Secondly, sacraments may be considered on the part of man who is sanctified, and who is composed of soul and body, to whom the sacramental remedy is proportioned, since it touches the body through the visible thing, and the soul through faith in the words. Hence Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx in Joann.)⁵ on John 15. 3, Now you are clean by reason of the word, etc.: "Whence hath water this so great virtue, to touch the body and wash the heart, but by the word doing it, not because it is spoken, but because it is believed?"

Thirdly, a sacrament may be considered on the part of the sacramental signification. Now Augustine says⁶ that "words are the principal signs used by men," because words can be formed in various ways for the purpose of signifying various mental concepts, so that we are able to express what we conceive by the mind with greater distinctness by means of words. And

³PL 42, 355.
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therefore in order to insure the perfection of sacramental signification it was necessary to determine the signification of the sensible things by means of certain words. For water may signify both a cleansing by reason of its wetness, and refreshment by reason of its being cool; but when we say, "I baptize thee," it is clear that we use water in baptism in order to signify a spiritual cleansing.

Reply Obj. 1. The sensible things of the sacraments are called words by way of a certain likeness, in so far as they partake of a certain significative power, which resides principally in the very words, as stated above. Consequently it is not a superfluous repetition to add words to the visible element in the sacraments, because one determines the other, as stated above.

Reply Obj. 2. Although words and other sensible things are not in the same genus, considered in their natures, yet have they something in common as to the things signified by them, which is more perfect in words than in other things. Therefore in the sacraments, words and things, like form and matter, combine in the formation of one thing, in so far as the signification of things is completed by means of words, as above stated. And under words are comprised also sensible actions, such as cleansing and anointing and the like, because they have a like signification with the things.

Reply Obj. 3. As Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 16),¹ the sacraments of things present should be different from sacraments of things to come. Now the sacraments of the Old Law foretold the coming of Christ. Consequently they did not signify Christ so clearly as the sacraments of the New Law, which flow from Christ Himself, and have a certain likeness to Him, as stated above. Nevertheless in the Old Law, certain words were used in things pertaining to the worship of God, both by the priests, who were the ministers of those sacraments, according to Num. 6. 23, 24: Thus shall you bless the children of Israel, and you shall say to them: The Lord bless thee, etc.; and by those who made use of those sacraments, according to Deut. 26. 3 : I profess this day before the Lord thy God, etc.

Article 7. *Whether Determinate Words Are Required in the Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Seventh Article*: It seems that determinate words are not required in the sacraments.

¹PL 42, 356.

Objection 1. For as the Philosopher says,² "words are not the same for all." But salvation, which is sought through the sacraments, is the same for all. Therefore determinate words are not required in the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, words are required in the sacraments since they are the principal means of signification, as stated above (a. 6). But it happens that various words mean the same. Therefore determinate words are not required in the sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, corruption of anything changes its species. But some corrupt the pronunciation of words, and yet it is not credible that the sacramental effect is hindered thereby, for otherwise unlettered men and stammerers, in conferring sacraments, would frequently do so invalidly. Therefore it seems that determinate words are not required in the sacraments.

On the contrary, Our Lord used determinate words in consecrating the sacrament of the Eucharist, when He said (Matt. 26. 26) : This is My Body. Likewise He commanded His disciples to baptize under a form of determinate words, saying (Matt. 28. 19): Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 6, Reply 2), in the sacraments the words are as the form, and sensible things are as the matter. Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is on the part of the form, which is as it were the end and term of the matter. Consequently for the being of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter, for determinate matter is needed that it may be proportioned to the determinate form. Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required, which are as the sacramental matter, much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words.

Reply Obj. 1. As Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx sup. Joann.),³ the word operates in the sacraments "not because it is spoken," that is, not by the outward sound of the voice, "but because it is believed," that is, in accordance with the sense of the words which is held by faith. And this sense is indeed the same for all, though the same words as to their sound be not used by all. Consequently no matter in what language this sense is expressed, the sacrament is complete.

²Interpretation, i (16ᵃ5). ³PL 35, 1840.

Reply Obj. 2. Although it happens in every language that various words signify the same thing, yet one of those words is that which those who speak that language use principally and more commonly to signify that particular thing, and this is the word which should be used for the sacramental signification. So also among sensible things, that one is used for the sacramental signification which is most commonly employed for the action by which the sacramental effect is signified; thus water is most commonly used by men for bodily cleansing, by which the spiritual cleansing is signified, and therefore water is employed as the matter of baptism.

Reply Obj. 3. If he who corrupts the pronunciation of the sacramental words does so on purpose, he does not seem to intend to do what the Church intends, and thus the sacrament seems to be defective.

But if he do this through error or a slip of the tongue, and if he so far mispronounce the words as to deprive them of sense, the sacrament seems to be defective. This would be the case especially if the mispronunciation be in the beginning of a word, for instance, if one were to say in nomine matris instead of in nomine Patris. If, however, the sense of the words be not entirely lost by this mispronunciation, the sacrament is complete. This would be the case principally if the end of a word be mispronounced; for instance, if one were to say in nomine patrias et filias. For although the words thus mispronounced have no appointed meaning, yet we allow them an accommodated meaning corresponding to the usual forms of speech. And so, although the sensible sound is changed, yet the sense remains the same.

What has been said about the various mispronunciations of words, either at the beginning or at the end, holds because with us a change at the beginning of a word changes the meaning, whereas a change at the end generally speaking does not effect such a change; but with the Greeks the sense is changed also in the beginning of words in the conjugation of verbs.

Nevertheless the principle point to observe is the extent of the corruption entailed by mispronunciation, for in either case it may be so little that it does not alter the sense of the words, or so great that it destroys it. But it is easier for the one to happen on the part of the beginning of the words and the other at the end.

Article 8. *Whether It Is Lawful to Add Anything to the Words in Which the Sacramental Form Consists?*

*We proceed thus to the Eighth Article*: It seems that it is not lawful to add anything to the words in which the sacramental form consists.

Objection 1. For these sacramental words are not less necessary than are the words of Holy Scripture. But it is not lawful to add anything to, or to take anything from, the words of Holy Scripture; for it is written (Deut. 4. 2) : You shall not add to the word that I speak to you, neither shall you take away from it; and (Apoc. 22. 18, 19) : I testify to everyone that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book : if any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away . . . God shall take away his part out of the book of life. Therefore it seems that neither is it lawful to add anything to, or to take anything from, the sacramental forms.

Obj. 2. Further, in the sacraments words are by way of form, as stated above (a. 6, Reply 2; A. 7). But any addition or subtraction informs changes the species, as also in numbers.¹ Therefore it seems that if anything be added to or subtracted from a sacramental form, it will not be the same sacrament.

Obj. 3. Further, just as the sacramental form demands a certain number of words, so does it require that these words should be pronounced in a certain order and without interruption. If therefore, the sacrament is not rendered invalid by addition or subtraction of words, in like manner it seems that neither is it rendered invalid if the words be pronounced in a different order or with interruptions.

On the contrary, Certain words are inserted by some in the sacramental forms which are not inserted by others; thus the Latins baptize under this form: I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, whereas the Greeks use the following form: The servant of God, N ... is baptized in the name of the Father, etc. Yet both confer the sacrament validly. Therefore it is lawful to add something to, or to take something from, the sacramental forms.

I answer that. With regard to all the variations that may occur in the sacramental forms, two points seem to call for our attention. One is on the part of the person who says the words,

¹Aristotle, Metaphysics, VIII, 3 (1043ᵇ36).

and whose intention is essential to the sacrament, as will be explained further on (q. lxiv, A. 8). Therefore if he intends by such addition or suppression to perform a rite other from that which is recognized by the Church, it seems that the sacrament is invalid, because he seems not to intend to do what the Church does.

The other point to be considered is the meaning of the words. For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above (a. 7, Reply i), we must see whether the change of words destroys the due sense of the words, because then, the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid. Now it is clear that if any of those things which are of the substance of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the due sense of the words is destroyed, and consequently the sacrament is invalid. Therefore Didymus says {De Spir. Sanct. ii):¹ "If anyone attempt to baptize in such a way as to omit one of the aforesaid names," that is, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "his baptism will be invalid." But if that which is omitted be not a substantial part of the form, such an omission does not destroy the due sense of the words, nor consequently the validity of the sacrament. Thus in the form of the Eucharist, —For this is My Body, the omission of the word "for" does not destroy the due sense of the words, nor consequently cause the sacrament to be invalid; although perhaps he who makes the omission may sin from negligence or contempt.

Again, it is possible to add something that destroys the due sense of the words; for instance, if one were to say: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father Who is greater, and of the Son Who is less," with which form the Arians baptized;² and consequently such an addition makes the sacrament invalid. But if the addition be such as not to destroy the due sense, the sacrament is not rendered invalid. Nor does it matter whether this addition be made at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end. For instance, if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father Almighty, and of the Only Begotten Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete," the baptism would be valid; and in like manner if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and may

¹Translation of Jerome (PG 39, 1054); cf. PL 23, 130.
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the Blessed Virgin succour thee," the baptism would be valid.

Perhaps, however, if one were to say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary," the baptism would be void, because it is written (I Cor. i. 13): Was Paul crucified for you or were you baptized in the name of Paul? But this is true if the intention be to baptize in the name of the Blessed Virgin as in the name of the Trinity, by which baptism is consecrated, for such a sense would be contrary to true faith, and would therefore render the sacrament invalid; but if the addition, "and in the name of the Blessed Virgin" be understood not as if the name of the Blessed Virgin effected anything in baptism, but as intimating that her intercession may help the person baptized to preserve the baptismal grace, then the sacrament is not rendered void.

Reply Obj. 1. It is not lawful to add anything to the words of Holy Scripture as regards the sense, but many words are added by Doctors by way of explanation of the Holy Scriptures. Nevertheless, it is not lawful to add even words to Holy Scripture as though such words were a part thereof, for this would amount to forgery. It would amount to the same if anyone were to pretend that something is necessary to a sacramental form which is not so.

Reply Obj. 2. Words belong to a sacramental form by reason of the sense signified by them. Consequently any addition or suppression of words which does not add to or take from the due sense does not destroy the species of the sacrament.

Reply Obj. 3. If the words are interrupted to such an extent that the intention of the speaker is interrupted, the sacramental sense is destroyed, and consequently, the validity of the sacrament. But this is not the case if the interruption is so slight, that the intention of the speaker and the sense of the words is not interrupted.

The same is to be said of a change in the order of the words. Because if this destroys the sense of the phrase, the sacrament is invalidated, as happens when a negation is made to precede or follow a word. But if the order is so changed that the sense of the phrase does not vary, the sacrament is not invalidated, according to the Philosopher's dictum: "Nouns and verbs mean the same though they be transposed."³

³Interpretation, 10 (20ᵇ1).

QUESTION LXI

OF THE NECESSITY OF THE SACRAMENTS

(*In Four Articles*)

We must now consider the necessity of the sacraments, concerning which there are four points of inquiry: (1) Whether sacraments are necessary for man's salvation? (2) Whether they were necessary in the state that preceded sin? (3) Whether they were necessary in the state after sin and before Christ? (4) Whether they were necessary after Christ's coming?

Article 1. *Whether Sacraments Are Necessary for Man's Salvation?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that sacraments are not necessary for man's salvation.

Objection 2. For the Apostle says (I Tim. 4. 8) : Bodily exercise is profitable to little. But the use of sacraments pertains to bodily exercise, because sacraments are perfected in the signification of sensible things and words, as stated above (q. lx, a. 6). Therefore sacraments are not necessary for the salvation of man.

Obj. 2. Further, the Apostle was told (II Cor. 12, 9): My grace is sufficient for thee. But it would not suffice if sacraments were necessary for salvation. Therefore sacraments are not necessary for man's salvation.

Obj. 3. Further, given a sufficient cause, nothing more seems to be required for the effect. But Christ's Passion is the sufficient cause of our salvation, for the Apostle says (Rom. 5. 10) : If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son: much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life. Therefore sacraments are not necessary for man's salvation.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 11) :¹ "It is impossible to keep men together in one religious denomination, whether true or false, except they be united by means of visible signs or sacraments." But it is necessary for salvation that men be united together in the name of the one true religion. Therefore sacraments are necessary for man's salvation.

I answer that, Sacraments are necessary to man's salvation for three reasons. The first is taken from the condition of human nature to which it is proper to be led by things corporeal

¹PL 42, 355.

and sensible to things spiritual and intelligible. Now it belongs to Divine providence to provide for each thing according as its condition requires. Divine wisdom, therefore, fittingly provides man with means of salvation, in the shape of corporeal and sensible signs that are called sacraments.

The second reason is taken from the state of man who in sinning subjected himself by his affections to corporeal things. Now the healing remedy should be given to a man so as to reach the part affected by disease. Consequently it was fitting that God should provide man with a spiritual medicine by means of certain corporeal signs; for if man were offered spiritual things without a veil, his mind being taken up with the material world would be unable to apply itself to them.

The third reason is taken from the fact that man is prone to direct his activity chiefly towards material things. Lest, therefore, it should be too hard for man to be drawn away entirely from bodily actions, bodily exercise was offered to him in the sacraments, by which he might be trained to avoid superstitious practices, consisting in the worship of demons, and all manner of harmful action, consisting in sinful deeds.

It follows, therefore, that through the institution of the sacraments man, consistently with his nature, is instructed through sensible things he is humbled, through knowing that he is subject to corporeal things, seeing that he receives assistance through them; and he is even preserved from harmful actions, by the healthy exercise of the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 1. Bodily exercise, as such, is not very profitable, but exercise taken in the use of the sacraments is not merely bodily, but to a certain extent spiritual, namely, in its signification and in its causality.

Reply Obj. 2. God's grace is a sufficient cause of man's salvation. But God gives grace to man in a way which is suitable to him. Hence it is that man needs the sacraments that he may obtain grace.

Reply Obj. 3. Christ's Passion is a sufficient cause of man's salvation. But it does not follow that the sacraments are not also necessary for that purpose, because they obtain their effect through the power of Christ's Passion; and Christ's Passion is, so to say, applied to man through the sacraments according to the Apostle (Rom. 6. 3): All we who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in His death.

Article 2. *Whether Before Sin Sacraments Were Necessary to Man?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that before sin sacraments were necessary to man.

Objection 1. For, as stated above (a. i, Reply 2) man needs sacraments that he may obtain grace. But man needed grace even in the state of innocence, as we stated in the First Part (q. xcv, a. 4; cf. MI, Q. cix, A. 2; Q. cxiv, A. 2). Therefore sacraments were necessary in that state also.

Obj. 2. Further, sacraments are fitting to man by reason of the conditions of human nature, as stated above (a. i). But man's nature is the same before and after sin. Therefore it seems that before sin man needed the sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, matrimony is a sacrament, according to Eph. 5. 32: This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church. But matrimony was instituted before sin, as may be seen in Gen. 2. Therefore sacraments were necessary to man before sin.

On the contrary, None but the sick need remedies, according to Matt. 9. 12: They that are in health need not a physician. Now the sacraments are spiritual remedies for the healing of wounds inflicted by sin. Therefore they were not necessary before sin.

I answer that, Sacraments were not necessary in the state of innocence before sin. This can be proved from the rectitude of that state, in which the higher ruled the lower, and in no way depended on them; for just as the mind was subject to God, so were the lower powers of the soul subject to the mind, and the body to the soul. And it would be contrary to this order if the soul were perfected either in knowledge or in grace by anything corporeal, which happens in the sacraments. Therefore in the state of innocence man needed no sacraments, whether as remedies against sin or as means of perfecting the soul.

Reply Obj. 1. In the state of innocence man needed grace; not so that he needed to obtain grace by means of sensible signs, but in a spiritual and invisible manner.

Reply Obj. 2. Man's nature is the same before and after sin, but the state of his nature is not the same. Because after sin, the soul, even in its higher part, needs to receive something from corporeal things in order that it may be perfected, whereas man had no need of this in that state.

Reply Obj. 3. Matrimony was instituted in the state of innocence not as a sacrament, but as a function of nature. Consequently, however, it foreshadowed something in relation to Christ and the Church, just as everything else foreshadowed Christ.

Article 3. *Whether There Should Have Been Sacraments After Sin, Before Christ?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that there should have been no sacraments after sin, before Christ.

Objection 1. For it has been stated (a. i, Reply 3) that the Passion of Christ is applied to men through the sacraments, so that Christ's Passion is compared to the sacraments as cause to effect. But effect does not precede cause. Therefore there should have been no sacraments before Christ's coming.

Obj. 2. Further, sacraments should be suitable to the state of the human race, as Augustine declares (Contra Faust, xix, 16, 17).¹ But the state of the human race underwent no change after sin until it was repaired by Christ. Neither, therefore, should the sacraments have been changed, so that besides the sacraments of the natural law others should be instituted in the law of Moses.

Obj. 3. Further, the nearer a thing approaches to that which is perfect, the more like it should it be. Now the perfection of human salvation was accomplished by Christ, to Whom the sacraments of the Old Law were nearer than those that preceded the Law. Therefore they should have borne a greater likeness to the sacraments of Christ. And yet it appears the contrary is the case, since it was foretold that the priesthood of Christ would be according to the order of Melchisedech, and not . . . according to the order of Aaron (Heb. 7. 11). Therefore sacraments were unsuitably instituted before Christ.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 13)² that "the first sacraments which the Law commanded to be solemnized and observed were announcements of Christ's future coming. But it was necessary for man's salvation that Christ's coming should be announced beforehand. Therefore it was necessary that some sacraments should be instituted before Christ.

I answer that. Sacraments are necessary for man's salvation in so far as they are sensible signs of invisible things whereby man is made holy. Now after sin no man can be made holy save through Christ, Whom God hath pro-
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posed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to the showing of His justice . . . that He Himself may be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ (Rom. 3. 25, 26). Therefore before Christ's coming there was need for some visible signs whereby man might testify to his faith in the future coming of a Saviour. And these signs are called sacraments. It is therefore clear that some sacraments were necessary before Christ's coming.

Reply Obj. 1. Christ's Passion is the final cause of the old sacraments, for they were instituted in order to foreshadow it. Now the final cause precedes not in time, but in the intention of the agent. Consequently, it is not unfitting that there should be sacraments before Christ's Passion.

Reply Obj. 2. The state of the human race after sin and before Christ can be considered from two points of view. First, from the nature of faith, and thus it was always one and the same, since men were made righteous through faith in the future coming of Christ. Secondly, according as sin was more or less intense, and knowledge concerning Christ more or less explicit. For as time went on sin began to gain a greater hold on man, so much so that with the clouding of man's reason, the precepts of the natural law were insufficient to make man live rightly, and it became necessary to have a written code of fixed laws, and together with these certain sacraments of faith. For it was necessary, as time went on, that the knowledge of faith should be more and more unfolded, since, as Gregory says (Hom. vi in Ezech.);¹ "With the advance of time there was an advance in the knowledge of Divine things." Consequently in the Old Law there was also a need for certain fixed sacraments significative of man's faith in the future coming of Christ, which sacraments are compared to those that preceded the Law as something determinate to that which is indeterminate, since before the Law it was not laid down precisely of what sacraments men were to make use, whereas this was prescribed by the Law; and this was necessary both on account of the overclouding of the natural law, and for the clearer signification of faith.

Reply Obj. 3. The sacrament of Melchisedech which preceded the Law is more like the Sacrament of the New Law in its matter, in so far as he offered bread and mine (Gen. 14. 18), just as bread and wine are offered in the

¹PL 76, 980.

sacrifice of the New Testament. Nevertheless, the sacraments of the Mosaic Law are more like the thing signified by the sacrament, that is, the Passion of Christ, as clearly appears in the Paschal Lamb and the like. The reason of this was for fear that if the sacraments retained the same appearance, it might seem, where there was no interruption of time, to be the continuation of one and the same sacrament.

Article 4. *Whether There Was Need for Any Sacraments After Christ Came?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that there was no need for any sacraments after Christ came.

Objection 1. For the figure should cease with the advent of the truth. But grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John i. 17). Since, therefore, the sacraments are signs or figures of the truth, it seems that there was no need for any sacraments after Christ's Passion.

Obj. 2. Further, the sacraments consist in certain elements, as stated above (q. lx, a. 4). But the Apostle says (Gal. 4. 3, 4) that when we were children we were serving under the elements of the world, but that now when the fulness of time has come, we are no longer children. Therefore it seems that we should not serve God under the elements of this world by making use of corporeal sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, according to James i. 17, with God there is no change, nor shadow of alteration. But it seems to argue some change in the Divine will that God should give man certain sacraments for his sanctification now during the time of grace, and other sacraments before Christ's coming. Therefore it seems that other sacraments should not have been instituted after Christ.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 13)² that the sacraments of the Old Law "were abolished because they were fulfilled; and others were instituted, fewer in number, but more efficacious, more profitable, and of easier accomplishment."

I answer that, As the ancient Fathers were saved through faith in Christ's future coming, so are we saved through faith in Christ's past birth and Passion. Now the sacraments are signs in affirmation of the faith whereby man is justified, and signs should vary according as they signify the future, the past, or the present; for as Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 16),³ "the same thing is variously pronounced

²PL 42, 3SS. ³PL 42, 356.

as to be done and as having been done; for instance the word 'passurus' (going to suffer) differs from 'passus' (having suffered)." Therefore there must be other sacraments of the New Law, that signify Christ in relation to the past, besides those of the Old Law, that foreshadowed the future.

Reply Obj. 1. As Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. v),¹ the state of the New Law is between the state of the Old Law, whose figures are fulfilled in the New, and the state of glory, in which all truth will be openly and perfectly revealed. Therefore then there will be no sacraments. But now, so long as we know through a glass in a dark manner, (I Cor. 13. 12) we need sensible signs in order to reach spiritual things, and this pertains to the nature of the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 2. The Apostle calls the sacraments of the Old Law weak and needy elements (Gal. 4. 9) because they neither contained nor caused grace. Hence the Apostle says that those who used these sacraments served God under the elements of this world, for the very reason that these sacraments were nothing else than the elements of this world. But our sacraments both contain and cause grace. Consequently the comparison does not hold.

Reply Obj. 3. Just as the head of the house is not proved to have a changeable will through issuing various commands to his household at various seasons, ordering things differently in winter and summer, so it does not follow that there is any change in God because He instituted sacraments of one kind after Christ's coming and of another kind at the time of the Law; because the latter were suitable as foreshadowing grace, the former as signifying the presence of grace.

QUESTION LXII

OF THE SACRAMENTS' PRINCIPAL EFFECT, WHICH IS GRACE

(In Six Articles)

We have now to consider the effect of the sacraments. First of their principal effect, which is grace; secondly, of their secondary effect, which is a character (q. lxiii). Concerning the first there are six points of inquiry: (1) Whether the sacraments of the New Law are the cause of grace? (2) Whether sacramental grace confers anything in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts? (3) Whether the sac-

¹Sect. 2 (PG 3, 501).

raments contain grace? (4) Whether there is any power in them for the causing of grace? (5) Whether the sacraments derive this power from Christ's Passion? (6) Whether the sacraments of the Old Law caused grace?

Article 1. *Whether the Sacraments Are the Cause of Grace?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that the sacraments are not the cause of grace.

Objection 1. For it seems that the same thing is not both sign and cause, since the nature of sign appears to be more in keeping with an effect. But a sacrament is a sign of grace. Therefore it is not its cause.

Obj. 2. Further, nothing corporeal can act on a spiritual thing, since the agent is more excellent than the patient, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. xii, 16).² But the subject of grace is the human mind, which is a spiritual thing. Therefore the sacraments cannot cause grace.

Obj. 3. Further, what is proper to God should not be ascribed to a creature. But it is proper to God to cause grace, according to Ps. 83. 12: The Lord will give grace and glory. Since, therefore, the sacraments consist in certain words and created things, it seems that they cannot cause grace.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx in Joann.)³ that the baptismal water "touches the body and cleanses the heart." But the heart is not cleansed save through grace. Therefore it causes grace, and for like reason so do the other sacraments of the Church.

I answer that, We must say that in some way the sacraments of the New Law cause grace. For it is evident that through the sacraments of the New Law man is incorporated with Christ; thus the Apostle says of Baptism (Gal. 3. 27): As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ. And man is made a member of Christ through grace alone.

Some, however, say⁴ that they are the cause of grace not by their own operation, but in so far as God causes grace in the soul when the sacraments are employed. And they give as an example a man who on presenting a leaden coin, receives, by the king's command, a hundred pounds; not as though the leaden coin, by any
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⁴Richard Fishacre, In Sent., iv, dist. i, and Robert Kilwardby, In Sent., iv, d. I. (In Simonin and Meersseman, De Sacram. Efficientia, pp. 16, 27); cf. Bonaventure, In Sent., IV, d. I, art. I, Q. I (QR iv, 23).

operation of its own, caused him to be given that sum of money, but this being the effect of the mere will of the king. Hence Bernard says in a sermon on the Lord's Supper:¹ "Just as a canon is invested by means of a book, an abbot by means of a crozier, a bishop by means of a ring, so by the various sacraments various kinds of grace are conferred." But if we examine the question properly, we shall see that according to the above mode the sacraments are mere signs. For the leaden coin is nothing but a sign of the king's command that this man should receive money. In like manner the book is a sign of the conferring of a canonry. Hence, according to this opinion the sacraments of the New Law would be mere signs of grace, whereas we have it on the authority of many saints that the sacraments of the New Law not only signify, but also cause grace.

We must therefore say otherwise, that an agent cause is twofold, principal and instrumental. The principal cause works by the power of its form, to which form the effect is likened; just as fire by its own heat makes something hot. In this way none but God can cause grace, since grace is nothing else than a participated likeness of the Divine Nature, according to II Pet. 1.4: He hath given us most great and precious promises; that we may be (Vulg., — you may be made) partakers of the Divine Nature.—But the instrumental cause works not by the power of its form, but only by the motion whereby it is moved by the principal agent, so that the effect is not likened to the instrument but to the principal agent; for instance, the couch is not like the axe, but like the art which is in the craftsman's mind. And it is thus that the sacraments of the New Law cause grace, for they are instituted by God to be employed for the purpose of conferring grace. Hence. Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 16):² "All these things," namely, pertaining to the sacraments, "are done and pass away, but the power," namely, of God, "which works by them, remains ever." Now that is, properly speaking, an instrument by which someone works, and so it is written (Tit. 3. 5): He saved us by the laver of regeneration.

Reply Obj. 1. The principal cause cannot properly be called a sign of its effect, even though the latter be hidden and the cause itself sensible and manifest. But an instrumental cause, if manifest, can be called a sign of a hidden effect, for this reason that it is not

¹PL 183, 272. ²PL 42, 357.

merely a cause but also in a measure an effect in so far as it is moved by the principal agent. And in this sense the sacraments of the New Law are both cause and signs. Hence, too, is it that, to use the common expression, they effect what they signify. From this it is clear that they have perfectly the nature of a sacrament, being ordered to something sacred not only as a sign, but also as a cause.

Reply Obj. 2. An instrument has a twofold action. One is instrumental, in respect of which it works not by its own power but by the power of the principal agent. The other is its proper action, which belongs to it in respect of its own form; thus it belongs to an axe to cut asunder by reason of its sharpness, but to make a couch in so far as it is the instrument of an art. But it does not accomplish the instrumental action save by exercising its proper action, for it is by cutting that it makes a couch. In like manner the corporeal sacraments by their proper operation, which they exercise on the body that they touch, accomplish through the Divine institution an instrumental operation on the soul ; for example, the water of baptism, in respect of its proper power, cleanses the body, and thereby, since it is the instrument of the Divine power, cleanses the soul, since from soul and body one thing is made. And thus it is that Augustine says³ that it "touches the body and cleanses the heart."

Reply Obj. 3. This argument considers that which causes grace as principal agent; for this belongs to God alone, as stated above.

Article 2. *Whether Sacramental Grace Confers Anything in Addition to the Grace of the Virtues and Gifts?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that sacramental grace confers nothing in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts.

Objection 1. For the grace of the virtues and gifts perfects the soul sufficiently, both in the essence of the soul and in its powers, as is clear from what was said in the Second Part(I-II, Q. ex, AA. 3, 4). But grace is ordered to the perfecting of the soul. Therefore sacramental grace cannot confer anything in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts.

Obj. 2. Further, the soul's defects are caused by sin. But all sins are sufficiently removed by the grace of the virtues and gifts, because there is no sin that is not contrary to some virtue. Since, therefore, sacramental grace is ordered to the removal of the soul's defects, it cannot

³In Joann., tract. Lxxx (PL 35, 1840).

confer anything in addition to the grace of the

virtues and gifts.

Obj. 3. Further, every- addition or subtraction of form varies the species.¹ If, therefore, sacramental grace confers anything in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts, it follows that it is called grace equivocally, and so we are none the wiser when it is said that the sacraments cause grace.

On the contrary, If sacramental grace confers nothing in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts, it is useless to confer the sacraments on those who have the virtues and gifts. But there is nothing useless in God's works. Therefore it seems that sacramental grace confers something in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts.

I answer that, As stated in the Second Part (I-II, Q. ex, AA. 3, 4), grace, considered in itself, perfects the essence of the soul, in so far as it is a certain participated likeness of the Divine Being. And just as the soul's powers flow from its essence, so from grace there flow certain perfections into the powers of the soul, which are called virtues and gifts, whereby the powers are perfected in reference to their actions. Now the sacraments are ordered to certain special effects which are necessary in the Christian life; thus Baptism is ordered to a certain spiritual regeneration, by which man dies to vice and becomes a member of Christ, which effect is something special in addition to the actions of the soul's powers; and the same holds true of the other sacraments. Consequently just as the virtues and gifts confer, in addition to grace commonly so called, a certain special perfection ordered to the powers’ proper actions, so does sacramental grace confer, over and above grace commonly so called, and in addition to the virtues and gifts, a certain Divine assistance in obtaining the end of the sacrament. It is thus that sacramental grace confers something in addition to the grace of the virtues and gifts.

Reply Obj. 1. The grace of the virtues and gifts perfects the essence and powers of the soul sufficiently as regards the general ordering of the soul's actions; but as regards certain special effects which are necessary in a Christian life, sacramental grace is needed.

Reply Obj. 2. Vices and sins are sufficiently removed by virtues and gifts as to present and future time, in so far as they prevent man from sinning. But in regard to past sins, the acts of which are transitory whereas their guilt remains,

¹Aristotle, Metaphysics, viii, 3 (1043ᵇ36).

man is provided with a special remedy in the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 3. The notion of Sacramental grace is compared to grace commonly so called, as the notion of species to genus. Therefore just as it is not equivocal to use the term "animal" in its common sense and as applied to a man, so neither is it equivocal to speak of grace commonly so called and of sacramental grace.

Article 3. *Whether the Sacraments' of the New Law Contain Grace?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain grace.

Objection 1. For it seems that what is contained is in the container. But grace is not in the sacraments; neither as in a subject, because the subject of grace is not a body but a spirit, nor as in a vessel, for according to the Physics,² "a vessel is a movable place," and an accident cannot be in a place. Therefore it seems that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain grace.

Obj. 2. Further, sacraments are instituted as means whereby men may obtain grace. But since grace is an accident it cannot pass from one subject to another. Therefore it would be of no account if grace were in the sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, a spiritual thing is not contained by a corporeal, even if it be therein; for the soul is not contained by the body, rather does it contain the body. Since, therefore, grace is something spiritual, it seems that it cannot be contained in a corporeal sacrament.

On the contrary, Hugh of S. Victor says {De Sacram. I)³ that "a sacrament through its being sanctified, contains an invisible grace."

I answer that, A thing is said to be in another in many ways; in two of which grace is said to be in the sacraments. First, as in its sign, for a sacrament is a sign of grace. Secondly, as in its cause, for, as stated above (a, i) a sacrament of the New Law is an instrumental cause of grace. Therefore grace is in a sacrament of the New Law, not as to the likeness, of species as an effect in its univocal cause, nor as to some proper and permanent form proportioned to such an effect, as effects in non-univocal causes, for instance, as things generated are in the sun, but as to a certain instrumental power transient and incomplete in its natural being, as will be explained later on (a. 4).

²Aristotle, iv, 4 (212ᵃ14).

³ix, 2 (PL 176, 317).

Reply Obj. 1. Grace is said to be in a sacrament not as in its subject, nor as in a vessel considered as a place, but according as a vessel is understood as the instrument of some work to be done, according to Ezech. 9. i : Everyone hath a destroying vessel (Douay — weapon) in his hand.

Reply Obj. 2. Although an accident does not pass from one subject to another, nevertheless in a fashion it does pass from its cause into its subject through the instrument; not so that it be in each of these in the same way, but in each according to its proper nature.

Reply Obj. 3. If a spiritual thing exist perfectly in something, it contains it and is not contained by it. But, in a sacrament, grace has a passing and incomplete mode of being, and consequently it is not unfitting to say that the sacraments contain grace.

Article 4. *Whether There Be in the Sacraments a Power of Causing Grace?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that there is not in the sacraments a power of causing grace.

Objection 1. For the power of causing grace is a spiritual power. But a spiritual power is not in a body; neither as proper to it, because power flows from a thing's essence and consequently cannot transcend it; nor as derived from something else, because that which is received into anything follows the mode of the recipient. Therefore in the sacraments there is no power of causing grace.

Obj. 2. Further, whatever exists is reducible to some genus of being and some degree of good. But there is no assignable genus of being to which such a power can belong, as anyone may see by running through them all. Nor is it reducible to some degree of good; for neither is it one of the goods of least account, since sacraments are necessary for salvation, nor is it an intermediate good, such as are the powers of the soul, which are natural powers, nor is it one of the greater goods, for it is neither grace nor a power of the mind. Therefore it seems that in the sacraments there is no power of causing grace.

Obj. 3. Further, if there be such a power in the sacraments, it is caused there by nothing less than a creative act of God. But it seems unbecoming that so excellent a being should cease to exist as soon as the sacrament is complete. Therefore it seems that in the sacraments there is no power for causing grace.

Obj. 4. Further, the same thing cannot be in several. But several things concur in the completion of a sacrament, namely, words and things, while in one sacrament there can be but one power. Therefore it seems that there is no power of causing grace in the sacraments.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx in Joann.):¹ "Whence hath water so great power, that it touches the body and cleanses the heart?" And Bede says² that "Our Lord conferred a power of regeneration on the waters by the contact of His most pure body."

I answer that, Those who hold that the sacraments do not cause grace save by a certain concomitance,³ deny the sacraments any power that is itself productive of the sacramental effect, and hold that the Divine power assists the sacraments and produces their effect. But if we hold that a sacrament is an instrumental cause of grace, we must allow that there is in the sacraments a certain instrumental power of bringing about the sacramental effects. Now such power is proportionate to the instrument, and consequently it stands in comparison to the complete and perfect power of anything as the instrument to the principal agent. For an instrument, as stated above (a. i), does not work save as moved by the principal agent, which works of itself. And therefore the power of the principal agent exists in nature completely and perfectly, whereas the instrumental power has a being that passes from one thing into another, and is incomplete ; just as motion is an imperfect act passing from agent to the thing acted upon.

Reply Obj. 1. A spiritual power cannot be in a corporeal thing after the manner of a permanent and complete power; as the argument proves. But there is nothing to hinder an instrumental spiritual power from being in a body, in so far as a body can be moved by a particular spiritual substance so as to produce a particular spiritual effect; thus in the very voice which is perceived by the senses there is a certain spiritual power, in so far as it proceeds from a mental concept, of arousing the mind of man. It is in this way that a spiritual power is in the sacraments, since they are ordained by God to the production of a spiritual effect.

Reply Obj. 2. Just as motion, through being an imperfect act, is not properly in a genus, but is reducible to a genus of perfect act, for instance, alteration to the genus of quality,
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so, instrumental power, properly speaking, is not in any genus, but is reducible to a genus and species of perfect power.

Reply Obj. 3. Just as an instrumental power accrues to an instrument through its being moved by the principal agent, so does a sacrament receive spiritual power from Christ's blessing and from the action of the minister in applying it to a sacramental use. Hence Augustine says in a sermon on the Epiphany (S. Maximus of Turin, Serm. xii):¹ "Nor should you marvel if we say that water, a corporeal substance, achieves the cleansing of the soul. It does indeed, and penetrates every secret hiding place of the conscience. For subtle and clear as it is, the blessing of Christ makes it yet more subtle, so that it permeates into the very principles of life and searches the innermost recesses of the heart."

Reply Obj. 4. Just as the one same power of the principal agent is instrumentally in all the instruments that are ordered to the production of an effect, because they are one as being so ordered, so also the one same sacramental power is in both words and things, since words and things combine to form one sacrament.

Article 5. *Whether the Sacraments of the New Law Derive Their Power from Christ's Passion?*

*We proceed thus to the Fifth Article*: It seems that the sacraments of the New Law do not derive their power from Christ's Passion.

Objection 1. For the power of the sacraments is in the causing of grace which is the principle of spiritual life in the soul. But as Augustine says (Tract, xix in Joann.);² "The Word, as He was in the beginning with God, quickens souls; as He was made flesh, quickens bodies." Since, therefore, Christ's Passion pertains to the Word as made flesh, it seems that it cannot cause the power of the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, the power of the sacraments seems to depend on faith; for as Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx in Joann.),³ the Divine word perfects the sacrament "not because it is spoken, but because it is believed." But our faith regards not only Christ's Passion but also the other mysteries of His humanity, and in a yet higher measure, His divinity. Therefore it seems that the power of the sacraments is not due specially to Christ's Passion.

Obj. 3. Further, the sacraments are ordered to man's justification, according to I Cor. 6. 11: You are washed . . , you are justified. Now jus-
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tification is ascribed to the Resurrection, according to Rom. 4. 25: (Who) rose again for our justification. Therefore it seems that the sacraments derive their power from Christ's Resurrection rather than from His Passion.

On the contrary, On Rom. 5. 14: After the similitude of the transgression of Adam, etc., the gloss says:⁴ "From the side of Christ asleep on the Cross flowed the sacraments which brought salvation to the Church." Consequently, it seems that the sacraments derive their power from Christ's Passion.

I answer that, As stated above (a. i) a sacrament in causing grace works after the manner of an instrument. Now an instrument is twofold: the one, separate, as a stick, for instance; the other, joined, as a hand. Moreover, the separate instrument is moved by means of the joined instrument, as a stick by the hand. Now the principal efficient cause of grace is God Himself, in comparison with Whom Christ's humanity is as a united instrument, whereas the sacrament is as a separate instrument. Consequently, the saving power must be derived by the sacraments from Christ's Godhead through His humanity.

Now sacramental grace seems to be ordained principally to two things : namely, to take away the defects consequent on past sins, in so far as they are transitory in act, but endure in guilt; and, further, to perfect the soul in things pertaining to Divine Worship in regard to the religion of the Christian life. But it is manifest from what has been stated above (q. XLviii, AA. I, 2, 6; Q. XLix, AA. I, 3) that Christ delivered us from our sins principally through His Passion, not only by way of efficiency and merit, but also by way of satisfaction. Likewise by His Passion He inaugurated the Rites of the Christian Religion by offering Himself—an oblation and a sacrifice to God (Eph. 5. 2). Therefore it is manifest that the sacraments of the Church derive their power specially from Christ's Passion, the Power of which is in a manner united to us by our receiving the sacraments. It was in sign of this that from the side of Christ hanging on the Cross there flowed water and blood, the former of which belongs to Baptism, the latter to the Eucharist, which are the most powerful sacraments.

Reply Obj. 1. The Word, since He was in the beginning with God, quickens souls as principal agent; but His flesh, and the mysteries accomplished therein, are as instrumental causes in

⁴Glossa ordin. (vi, 13B); Glossa Lombardi (PL 191, 1392).

the process of giving life to the soul; while in giving life to the body they act not only as instrumental causes, but also to a certain extent as exemplars, as we stated above (q. lvi, a. I Reply 3).

Reply Obj. 2. Christ dwells in us by faith (Eph. 3. 17). Consequently, by faith Christ's power is united to us. Now the power of blotting out sin belongs in a special way to His Passion. And therefore men are delivered from sin especially by faith in His Passion, according to Rom. 3. 25: Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood. Therefore the power of the sacraments which is ordered to the remission of sins is derived especially from faith in Christ's Passion.

Reply Obj. 3. Justification is ascribed to the Resurrection by reason of the term to which, which is newness of life through grace. But it is ascribed to the Passion by reason of the term from which, namely, in regard to the forgiveness of sin.

Article 6. *Whether the Sacraments of the Old Law Caused Grace?*

*We proceed thus to the Sixth Article*: It seems that the sacraments of the Old Law also caused grace.

Objection 1. For, as stated above (a. 5, Reply 2) the sacraments of the New Law derive their efficacy from faith in Christ's Passion. But there was faith in Christ's Passion under the Old Law, as well as under the New, since we have the same spirit of faith (II Cor. 4. 13). Therefore just as the sacraments of the New Law confer grace, so did the sacraments of the Old Law.

Obj. 2. Further, there is no sanctification save by grace. But men were sanctified by the sacraments of the Old Law: for it is written (Lev. 8. 31) : And when he, that is, Moses, had sanctified them, that is, Aaron and his sons, in their vestments, etc. Therefore it seems that the sacraments of the Old Law conferred grace.

Obj. 3. Further, Bede says in a homily on the Circumcision:¹ "Under the Law circumcision provided the same health-giving balm against the wound of original sin as baptism in the time of revealed grace." But Baptism confers grace now. Therefore circumcision conferred grace, and in like manner, the other sacraments of the Law; for just as Baptism is the door of the sacraments of the New Law, so was circumcision

¹Homilies, Bk. 11, horn, x, On the Feast of the Circumcision (PL 94, 54).

the door of the sacraments of the Old Law; hence the Apostle says (Gal. 5. 3) : I testify to every man circumcising himself, that he is a debtor to the whole law.

On the contrary, it is written (Gal. 4. 9) Turn you again to the weak and needy elements? i.e., to the Law, the gloss says,² "which is called weak, because it does not justify perfectly." But grace justifies perfectly. Therefore the sacraments of the Old Law did not confer grace.

I answer that, It cannot be said that the sacraments of the Old Law conferred justifying grace of themselves, that is, by their own power, since thus Christ's Passion would not have been necessary, according to Gal. 2. 21: If justice be by the Law, then Christ died in vain.

But neither can it be said that they derived the power of conferring justifying grace from Christ's Passion. For as it was stated above (a. 5),³ the power of Christ's Passion is united to us by faith and the sacraments, but in different ways; because the link that comes from faith is produced by an act of the soul, whereas the link that comes from the sacraments is produced by making use of exterior things. Now nothing hinders that which is subsequent in point of time from causing movement, even before it exists in reality, in so far as it preexists in an act of the soul ; thus the end, which is subsequent in point of time, moves the agent in so far as it is apprehended and desired by him. On the other hand, what does not yet actually exist does not cause movement if we consider the use of exterior things. Consequently, the efficient cause cannot in point of time come into being after causing movement, as does the final cause. It is therefore clear that the sacraments of the New Law do reasonably derive the power of justification from Christ's Passion, which is the cause of man's justification, whereas the sacraments of the Old Law did not.

Nevertheless the Fathers of old were justified by faith in Christ's Passion, just as we are. And the sacraments of the Old Law were a kind of protestation of that faith, in so far as they signified Christ's Passion and its effects. It is therefore manifest that the sacraments of the Old Law were not endowed with any power by which they conduced to the bestowal of justify-
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ing grace, and they merely signified faith by which men were justified.

Reply Obj. 1. The Fathers of old had faith in the future Passion of Christ, which, according as it was apprehended by the soul, was able to justify them. But we have faith in the past Passion of Christ, which is able to justify, also by the real use of sacramental things as stated above.

Reply Obj. 2. That sanctification was a figure, for they were said to be sanctified because they gave themselves up to the Divine worship according to the rite of the Old Law, which was wholly ordered to the foreshadowing of Christ's Passion.

Reply Obj. 3. There have been many opinions about Circumcision. For, according to some/ Circumcision conferred no grace, but only remitted sin. But this is impossible, because man is not justified from sin save by grace, according to Rom. 3. 24: Being justified freely by His grace.

Therefore others said² that by Circumcision grace is conferred, as to the privative effects of sin, but not as to its positive effects. But this also appears to be false, because by Circumcision children received the power of obtaining glory, which is the ultimate positive effect of grace. Moreover, as regards the order of the formal cause, positive effects are naturally prior to privative effects, though according to the order of the material cause, the reverse is the case, for a form does not exclude privation save by informing the subject.

Hence others³ say that Circumcision conferred grace also as regards a certain positive effect, that is, by making man worthy of eternal life, but not so as to repress concupiscence which makes man prone to sin. And so at one time it seemed to me.⁴ But if the matter be considered carefully, this too appears to be untrue, because the very least grace is sufficient to resist any degree of concupiscence, and to merit eternal life.

And therefore it seems better to say that Circumcision, just as also the other sacraments of the Old Law, was merely a sign of justifying faith; and therefore the Apostle says (Rom. 4. 11 ) that Abraham received the sign of Circum-

¹Hugh of St. Victor, De Sacram., 11, vi, 3 (PL 176, 448); Glossa ordin., on Rom. 4, ii (vi, iiB); Glossa Lombardi on Rom. 4. 11 (PL 191, 1372).

²William of Auxerre, Sumnta A urea, iv (246ra).

³Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol., Pt. iv, q. 7, m. 7, A. 5, sect. 2 (iv, 3gvb); Bonaventure, In Sent., iv, d. i, Pt. II, A. 2, Q. 3 (QR IV, 44).

⁴In Sent., iv, d. i, q. 2, a. 4, q. 3.

cision, a seal of the justice of faith. Consequently grace was conferred in Circumcision in so far as it was a sign of Christ's future Passion, as will be made clear further on (q. LXX, A. 4),

QUESTION LXIII

OF THE OTHER EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS WHICH IS A CHARACTER

(*In Six Articles*)

We have now to consider the other effect of the sacraments, which is a character, and concerning this there are six points of inquiry: (1) Whether by the sacraments a character is produced in the soul? (2) What is this character? (3) Of whom is this character? (4) What is its subject? (5) Is it indelible? (6) Whether every sacrament imprints a character?

Article 1. *Whether a Sacrament Imprints a Character on the Soul?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that a sacrament does not imprint a character on the soul.

Objection 1. For the word "character" seems to signify some kind of distinctive sign. But Christ's members are distinguished from others by eternal predestination, which does not imply anything in the predestined, but only in God predestining, as we have stated in the First Part (q. XXIII, A. 2). For it is written (II Tim. 2. 19) : The sure foundation of God standeth firm, having this seal: The Lord knoweth who are His. Therefore the sacraments do not imprint a character on the soul.

Obj. 2 . Further, a character is a distinctive sign. Now a sign, as Augustine says,⁵ "is that which conveys something else to the mind besides the species which it impresses on the senses." But nothing in the soul can impress a species on the senses. Therefore it seems that no character is imprinted on the soul by the sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, just as the believer is distinguished from the unbeliever by the sacraments of the New Law, so was it under the Old Law. But the sacraments of the Old Law did not imprint a character; hence they are called justices of the flesh (Heb. 9. 10) by the Apostle. Therefore neither it seems do the sacraments of the New Law.

On the contrary, The Apostle says (II Cor. i, 21, 22) : He . . . that hath anointed us is God; Who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the spirit in our hearts. But a character

⁵Christian Doctrine, 11, 1 (PL 34, 35).

means nothing else than a kind of sealing. Therefore it seems that by the sacraments God imprints His character on us.

I answer that, As is clear from what has been already stated (q. lxii, a. 5) the sacraments of the New Law are ordained for a twofold purpose: namely, for a remedy against sins, and for the perfecting of the soul in things pertaining to the Divine worship according to the rite of the Christian life. Now whenever anyone is allotted to some definite purpose he is accustomed to receive some outward sign of it; thus in olden times soldiers who enlisted in the ranks used to be marked with certain characters on the body, because they were allotted to a bodily service. Since, therefore, by the sacraments men are allotted to a spiritual service pertaining to the worship of God, it follows that by their means the faithful receive a certain spiritual character. Therefore Augustine says (Contra Parmen. ii, 13):¹ "If a deserter from the battle, through dread of the mark of enlistment on his body, throws himself on the emperor's clemency, and having besought and received mercy, return to the fight, is that character renewed, when the man has been set free and reprimanded? is it not rather acknowledged and approved? Are the Christian sacraments, by any chance, of a nature less lasting than this bodily mark?"

Reply Obj. 1. The faithful of Christ are destined to the reward of the glory that is to come, by the seal of Divine Predestination. But they are allotted to acts becoming the Church that is now, by a certain spiritual seal that is set on them, and is called a character.

Reply Obj. 2. The character imprinted on the soul has the nature of a sign in so far as it is imprinted by a sensible sacrament, since we know that a certain one has received the baptismal character through his being cleansed by the sensible water. Nevertheless from a kind of likeness, anything that fashions one thing to another, or discriminates one thing from another, even though it be not sensible, can be called a character or a seal; thus the Apostle calls Christ the figure or Χαρακτἠρ of the substance of the Father (Heb. i. 3).

Reply Obj. 3. As stated above (q. lxii, a. 6) the sacraments of the Old Law had not in themselves any spiritual power of producing a spiritual effect. Consequently in those sacraments there was no need of a spiritual character, and bodily circumcision sufficed, which the Apostle calls a seal (Rom. 4. 11).

Article 2. *Whether a Character Is a Spiritual Power?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that a character is not a spiritual power.

Objection 1. For character seems to be the same thing as figure; hence (Heb. i. 3), where we read figure of His substance, for figure the Greek has Χαρακτἠρ. Now figure is in the fourth species of quality, and thus differs from power which is in the second species of quality. Therefore character is not a spiritual power. Obj. 2. Further, Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. ii):² "The Divine Beatitude admits him that seeks happiness to a share in Itself, and grants this share to him by conferring on him Its own light as a kind of seal." Consequently, it seems that a character is a kind of light. Now light belongs rather to the third species of quality. Therefore a character is not a power, since this seems to belong to the second species.

Obj. 3. Further, character is defined by some³ thus: "A character is a holy sign of the communion of faith and of the holy ordination, conferred by a hierarch." Now a sign is in the genus of relation, not of power. Therefore a character is not a spiritual power.

Obj. 4. Further, a power has the nature of a cause and principle.⁴ But a sign which is placed in the definition of a character is rather in the nature of an effect. Therefore a character is not a spiritual power.

On the contrary, The Philosopher says:⁵ "There are three things in the soul, power, habit, and passion." Now a character is not a passion, since a passion passes quickly, whereas a character is indelible, as will be made clear further on (a. 5). In like manner it is not a habit, because no habit is indifferent to acting well or ill, whereas a character is indifferent to either, since some use it well, some ill. Now this cannot occur with a habit, because no one abuses a habit of virtue, or uses well an evil habit. It remains, therefore, that a character is a power.

I answer that, As stated above (a. i), the sacraments of the New Law produce a character, in so far as by them we are appointed to

²Part III, sect. 4 (PG 3, 400).

³Dionysius, according to Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol., Pt. IV, Q. 19, m. I, A. I (iv, 86vb) and Bonaventure, In Sent., iv, d. vi, pt. i, a. i, q. i (QR iv, 137); see also Albert, In Sent., iv, d. vi, A. 4 (BO xxix, 123); also Thomas, In Sent., iv, d. iv, Q. i, A. 2; of. Dionysius the Areopagite, De Eccl. Hier., 2, Pt. iii, 4 (PG 3, 400).

⁴Aristotle, Metaphysics, v, 12 (1019ᵃ15).

⁵Ethics, II, 5 (1105ᵇ20).

the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion. Therefore Dionysius (Eccl. Hier. ii),¹ after saying that God "by a kind of sigh grants a share of Himself to those that approach Him through baptism," adds "by making them Godlike and communicators of Divine things." Now the worship of God consists either in receiving Divine things or in bestowing them on others. And for both these purposes some power is needed; for to bestow something on others, active power is necessary, and in order to receive, we need a passive power. Consequently, a character signifies a certain spiritual power ordered to things pertaining to the Divine worship.

But it must be observed that this spiritual power is instrumental, as we have stated above (q. lxti, a. 4) of the power which is in the sacraments. For to have a sacramental character belongs to God's ministers, and a minister is a kind of instrument, as the Philosopher says.² Consequently, just as the virtue which is in the sacraments is not of itself in a genus, but is reducible to a genus, for the reason that it is of a transitory and incomplete nature, so also a character is not properly in a genus or species, but is reducible to the second species of quality.

Reply Obj. 1. Figure is a certain boundary of quantity. Therefore, properly speaking, it is only in corporeal things, and of spiritual things is said metaphorically. But a thing is not put in a genus or species except by that which is properly predicated of it. Consequently, a character cannot be in the fourth species of quality, although some have held this to be the case.³

Reply Obj. 2. The third species of quality contains only sensible passions or sensible qualities. Now a character is not a sensible light. Consequently, it is not in the third species of quality as some have maintained.⁴

Reply Obj. 3. The relation signified by the word "sign" must be founded on something. Now the relation of this sign which is a character cannot be founded immediately on the essence of the soul, because then it would belong to every soul naturally. Consequently, there must be something in the soul on which such a relation is founded. And this is the essence of

¹III, 4 (PG 3, 400). ²Politics, I, 4 (1253ᵇ130).

³Referred to by Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol.,
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A character. Therefore it need not be in the genus relation as some have held.⁵

Reply Obj. 4. A character is in the nature of a sign in comparison to the sensible sacrament by which it is imprinted. But considered in itself, it is in the nature of a principle, in the way already explained.

Article 3. *Whether the Sacramental Character Is the Character of Christ?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that the sacramental character is not the character of Christ.

Objection 1. For it is written (Eph. 4. 30): Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby you are sealed. But something that seals is implied in the nature of character. Therefore the sacramental character should be attributed to the Holy Ghost rather than to Christ.

Obj. 2. Further, a character has the nature of a sign. And it is a sign of the grace that is conferred by the sacrament. Now grace is poured forth into the soul by the whole Trinity; hence it is written (Ps. 83. 12): The Lord mil give grace and glory. Therefore it seems that the sacramental character should not be attributed specially to Christ.

Obj. 3. Further, a man is marked with a character that he may be distinguishable from others. But the saints are distinguishable from others by charity, which, as Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 18),⁶ "alone separates the children of the kingdom from the children of perdition." Therefore also the children of perdition are said to have the character of the beast (Apoc. 13. 16, 17). But charity is not attributed to Christ, but rather to the Holy Ghost according to Rom. 5. 5: The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, Who is given to us; or even to the Father, according to II Cor. 13. 13 : The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the charity of God. Therefore it seems that the sacramental character should not be attributed to Christ.

On the contrary, Some⁷ define character thus: "A character is a distinctive mark printed on the rational soul by the eternal Character, whereby the created trinity is sealed with the likeness of the creating and re-creating Trinity, and distinguishing him from those who are not so enlikened. according to the state of faith." But the eternal Character is Christ Himself,

⁵Cf. note 3. ⁶PL 42, 1082.
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according to Heb. i. 3: Who being the brightness of His glory and the figure, or character, of His substance. It seems, therefore, that the character should properly be attributed to Christ.

I answer that, As has been made clear above (a. i), a character is properly a kind of seal, whereby something is marked, as being ordered to some end; thus a coin is marked with a character for use. in exchange of goods, and soldiers are marked with a character as being assigned to military service. Now the faithful are assigned to a twofold end. First and principally to the enjoyment of glory. And for this purpose they are marked with the seal of grace according to Ezech. 9. 4 : Mark Thou upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and mourn; and Apoc. 7.3: Hurt not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, till we sign the servants of our God in their foreheads.

Secondly, each of the faithful is appointed to receive, or to bestow on others, things pertaining to the worship of God. And to this end, properly speaking, the sacramental character is allotted. Now the whole rite of the Christian religion is derived from Christ's priesthood. Consequently, it is clear that the sacramental character is specially the character of Christ, to Whose priesthood the faithful are made like by reason of the sacramental characters, which are nothing else than certain participations of Christ's Priesthood, flowing from Christ Himself.

Reply Obj. 1. The Apostle speaks there of that sealing by which a man is assigned to future glory, and which is effected by grace, which is attributed to the Holy Ghost, since it is through love that God gives us something freely, which pertains to the nature of grace; for the Holy Ghost is love. Therefore it is written (I Cor. 12. 4): There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit.

Reply Obj. 2. The sacramental character is a thing as regards the exterior sacrament, and a sacrament in regard to the ultimate effect. Consequently, something can be attributed to a character in two ways. First, according to the nature of sacrament, and thus it is a sign of the invisible grace which is conferred in the sacrament. Secondly, according to the proper nature of character. And thus it is a sign conferring on a man a likeness to some principal person in whom is vested the authority over that to which he is assigned ; thus soldiers who are assigned to military service are marked with their leader's sign, by which they are, in a fashion, likened to him. And in this way those who are appointed to the Christian worship, of which Christ is the author, receive a character by which they are likened to Christ. Consequently, properly speaking, this is Christ's character.

Reply Obj. 3. A character distinguishes one from another in relation to some particular end, to which he who receives the character is ordered, as has been stated concerning the military character (a. i) by which a soldier of the king is distinguished from the enemy's soldier in relation to the battle. In like manner the character of the faithful is that by which the faithful of Christ are distinguished from the servants of the devil, either in relation to eternal life, or in relation to the worship of the Church that now is. Of these the former is the result of charity and grace, as the objection runs, while the latter results from the sacramental character. Therefore the character of the beast may be understood by opposition, to mean either the obstinate malice for which some are assigned to eternal punishment, or the profession of an unlawful form of worship.

Article 4. *Whether the Character Is in the Powers of the Soul As in a Subject?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that the character is not in the powers of of the soul as in a subject.

Objection 1. For a character is said to be a disposition to grace. But grace is in the essence of the soul as in a subject as we have stated in the Second Part (I-II, Q. ex, a. 4). Therefore it seems that the character is in the essence of the soul and not in the powers.

Obj. 2. Further, a power of the soul does not seem to be the subject of anything save habit and disposition. But a character as stated above (a. 2), is neither habit nor disposition, but rather a power, the subject of which is nothing else than the essence of the soul. Therefore it seems that the character is not in a power of the soul as in a subject, but rather in its essence.

Obj. 3. Further, the powers of the rational soul are divided into those of knowledge and those of appetite. But it cannot be said that a character is only in a knowing power, nor, again, only in an appetitive power, since it is neither ordered to knowledge only, nor to desire only. Likewise, neither can it be said to be in both, because the same accident cannot be in different subjects. Therefore it seems that a character is not in a power of the soul as in a subject, but rather in the essence.

On the contrary, A character, according to its definition given above (a. 3), is imprinted in the rational soul by way of an image. But the image of the Trinity in the soul is seen in the powers. Therefore a character is in the powers of the soul.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 3), a character is a kind of seal by which the soul is marked, so that it may receive, or bestow on others, things pertaining to Divine worship. Now the Divine worship consists in certain actions, and the powers of the soul are properly ordered to actions, just as the essence is ordered to being. Therefore a character is not in the essence of the soul as in a subject, but in its power.

Reply Obj. 1. The subject is ascribed to an accident in respect of that to which the accident disposes it proximately, but not in respect of that to which it disposes it remotely or indirectly. Now a character disposes the soul directly and proximately to the fulfilling of things pertaining to Divine worship, and because such cannot be accomplished suitably without the help of grace, since, according to John 4. 24, they that adore God must adore Him in spirit and in truth, consequently the Divine bounty bestows grace on those who receive the character, so that they may accomplish worthily the service to which they are appointed. Therefore the subject should be ascribed to a character in respect of those actions that pertain to the Divine worship rather than in respect of grace.

Reply Obj. 2, The essence of the soul is the subject of the natural power, which flows from the principles of the essence. Now a character is not a power of this kind, but a spiritual power coming from without. Therefore, just as the essence of the soul, from which man has his natural life, is perfected by grace by which the soul lives spiritually, so the natural power of the soul is perfected by a spiritual power, which is a character. For habit and disposition belong to a power of the soul, since they are ordered to actions of which the powers are the principles. And in like manner whatever is ordered to action should be attributed to a power.

Reply Obj. 3. As stated above, a character is ordered to things pertaining to the Divine worship, which is a protestation of faith expressed by exterior signs. Consequently, a character needs to be in the soul's knowing power, where also is faith.

Article 5. *Whether a Character Can Be Blotted Out from the Soul?*

*We proceed thus to the Fifth Article*: It seems that a character can be blotted out from the soul.

Objection 1. Because the more perfect an accident is, the more firmly does it adhere to its subject. But grace is more perfect than a character, because a character is ordered to grace as to a further end. Now grace is lost through sin. Much more, therefore, is a character so lost.

Obj. 2. Further, by a character a man is assigned to the Divine worship, as stated above (aa. 3, 4). But some pass from the worship of God to a contrary worship by apostasy from the faith. It seems, therefore, that such lose the sacramental character.

Obj. 3. Further, when the end ceases, the means to the end should cease also for otherwise it would remain uselessly; thus after the resurrection there will be no marriage, because begetting will cease, to which marriage is ordered. Now the exterior worship to which a character is ordered will not endure in heaven, where nothing is done in figure, but all will be truth without a veil. Therefore the sacramental character does not last in the soul for ever, and consequently it can be blotted out.

On the contrary, Augustine says ( Contra Parmen, ii, 13):¹ "The Christian sacraments are not less lasting than the bodily mark" of military service. But the character of military service is not repeated, but is "recognized and approved" in the man who obtains the emperor's forgiveness after offending him. Therefore neither can the sacramental character be blotted out.

I answer that, As stated above (a. 3), in a sacramental character Christ's faithful have a share in His Priesthood, in the sense that as Christ has the full power of a spiritual priesthood, so His faithful are likened to Him by sharing a certain spiritual power with regard to the sacraments and to things pertaining to the Divine worship. For this reason it is unbecoming that Christ should have a character; but His priestly power is compared to a character as that which is complete and perfect is compared to some participation of itself. Now Christ's Priesthood is eternal, according to Ps. 109. 4: Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech. Consequently, every sanctification wrought by His Priesthood, is perpetual, enduring as long as the thing sancti-

¹PL 43. 72.

fied endures. This is clear even in inanimate things, for the consecration of a church or an altar lasts for ever unless they be destroyed. Since, therefore, the subject of a character is the soul as to its intellectual part, where faith resides, as stated above (a. 4, Reply 3), it is clear that, the intellect being perpetual and incorruptible, a character cannot be blotted out from the soul.

Reply Obj. 1. Grace and character are in the soul in different ways. For grace is in the soul as a form having complete being therein, whereas a character is in the soul as an instrumental power, as stated above (a. 2). Now a complete form is in its subject according to the condition of the subject. And since the soul as long as it is a wayfarer is changeable in respect of free choice, it results that grace is in the soul in a changeable manner. But an instrumental power follows rather the condition of the principal agent, and consequently a character exists in the soul in an indelible manner, not from any perfection of its own, but from the perfection of Christ's Priesthood, from which the character flows like an instrumental power.

Reply Obj. 2. As Augustine says {ibid.), "even apostates are not deprived of their baptism, for when they repent and return to the fold they do not receive it again ; from which we conclude that it cannot be lost." The reason of this is that a character is an instrumental power, as stated above (Reply i), and the nature of an instrument as such is to be moved by another, but not to move itself ; this belongs to the will. Consequently, however much the will be moved in the contrary direction, the character is not removed, by reason of the immobility of the principal mover.

Reply Obj. 3. Although external worship does not last after this life, yet its end remains. Consequently, after this life the character remains, both in the good as adding to their glory, and in the wicked as increasing their shame; just as the character of the military service remains in the soldiers after the victory, as the boast of the conquerors, and the disgrace of the conquered.

Article 6. *Whether a Character Is Imprinted By Each Sacrament of the New Law?*

*We proceed thus to the Sixth Article*: It seems that a character is imprinted by all the sacraments of the New Law.

Objection 1. For each sacrament of the New Law makes man a participator in Christ's Priesthood. But the sacramental character is nothing but a participation in Christ's Priesthood, as already stated (aa. 3, 5). Therefore it seems that a character is imprinted by each sacrament of the New Law.

Obj. 2. Further, a character is to the soul in which it exists as a consecration to the thing consecrated. But by each sacrament of the New Law man receives sanctifying grace, as stated above (q. lxii, a. i). Therefore it seems that a character is imprinted by each sacrament of the New Law.

Obj. 3. Further, a character is a thing and a sacrament. But in each sacrament of the New Law there is something which is only a thing, and something which is only a sacrament, and something which is both thing and sacrament. Therefore a character is imprinted by each sacrament of the New Law.

On the contrary, Those sacraments in which a character is imprinted are not repeated, because a character is indelible, as stated above (a. 5), whereas some sacraments are repeated, for instance, penance and matrimony. Therefore not all the sacraments imprint a character.

I answer that, As stated above (q. lxii, aa. I, 5), the sacraments of the New Law are ordained for a twofold purpose, namely, as a remedy for sin, and for the Divine worship. Now all the sacraments, from the fact that they confer grace, have this in common, that they afford a remedy against sin, whereas not all the sacraments are directly ordered to the Divine worship. Thus it is clear that penance, whereby man is delivered from sin, does not afford man any advance in the Divine worship, but restores him to his former state.

Now a sacrament may belong to the Divine worship in three ways: first in regard to the thing done; secondly, in regard to the agent; thirdly, in regard to the recipient. In regard to the thing done, the Eucharist belongs to the Divine worship, for the Divine worship consists principally therein, so far as it is the sacrifice of the Church. And by this same sacrament a character is not imprinted on man, because it does not order man to any further sacramental action or benefit received, since rather is it "the end and consummation of all the sacraments," as Dionysius says {Eccl. Hier. iii, i).¹ But it contains within itself Christ, in Whom there is not the character, but the very plentitude of the Priesthood.

But it is the sacrament of Order that pertains to the sacramental agents, for it is by this sacrament that men are assigned to confer sacra-
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ments on others, while the sacrament of Baptism pertains to the recipients, since it confers on man the power to receive the other sacraments of the Church; hence it is called the door of the sacraments. In a way Confirmation also is ordained for the same purpose, as we shall explain in its proper place (q. lxv, A. 3). Consequently, these three sacraments imprint a character, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order.

Reply Obj. 1. Every sacrament makes man a participator in Christ's Priesthood, from the fact that it confers on him some effect thereof. But every sacrament does not allot a man to do or receive something pertaining to the worship of the priesthood of Christ, while it is just this that is required for a sacrament to imprint a character.

Reply Obj. 2. Man is sanctified by each of the sacraments, according as sanctity means cleansing from sin, which is the effect of grace. But in a special way some sacraments, which imprint a character, sanctify man by a certain consecration, thus assigning him to the Divine worship ; just as inanimate things are said to be consecrated because they are assigned to Divine worship.

Reply Obj. 3. Although a character is a thing and a sacrament, it does not follow that everything that is a thing and a sacrament is a character. With regard to the other sacraments we shall explain further on what is the thing and what is the sacrament, (q. lxxiii, a. i, Reply 3; Q. Lxxxiv, A. I, Reply 3).

QUESTION LXIV

OF THE CAUSES OF THE SACRAMENTS

(*In Ten Articles*)

In the next place we have to consider the causes of the sacraments, both as to authorship and as to ministration. Concerning which there are ten points of inquiry: (1) Whether God alone works inwardly in the sacraments? (2) Whether the institution of the sacraments is from God alone? (3) Of the power which Christ exercised over the sacraments. (4) Whether He could communicate that power to others? (5) Whether the wicked can have the power of administering the sacraments? (6) Whether the wicked sin in administering the sacraments? (7) Whether the angels can be ministers of the sacraments? (8) Whether the minister's intention is necessary in the sacraments? (9) Whether right faith is required therein, so that it be impossible for an unbeliever to confer a sacrament? (10) Whether a right intention is required therein?

Article I. *Whether God Alone Works Inwardly Sacramental Effect?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that not God alone, but also the minister, works inwardly sacramental effect.

Objection 1. For the inward sacramental effect is to cleanse man from sin and enlighten him by grace. But it belongs to the ministers of the Church "to cleanse, enlighten and perfect," as Dionysius explains (Cal. Hier. v).¹ Therefore it seems that the sacramental effect is the work not only of God, but also of the ministers of the Church.

Obj. 2. Further, certain prayers are offered up in conferring the sacraments. But the prayers of the just are more acceptable to God than those of any other, according to John 9. 31: If a man be a server of God, and doth His will, him He heareth. Therefore it seems that a man obtains a greater sacramental effect if he receive it from a good minister. Consequently, the interior effect is partly the work of the minister and not of God alone.

Obj. 3. Further, man is of greater account than an inanimate thing. But an inanimate thing contributes something to the interior effect, since "water touches the body and cleanses the heart," as Augustine says (Tract. Ixxx in Joann.).² Therefore the interior sacramental effect is partly the work of man and not of God alone.

On the contrary, It is written (Rom. 8. 33): God that justifieth. Since, then, the inward effect of all the sacraments is justification, it seems that God alone works the interior sacramental effect.

I answer that. There are two ways of producing an effect: first, as a principal agent; secondly, as an instrument. In the former way the interior sacramental effect is the work of God alone. First, because God alone can enter the soul wherein the sacramental effect takes place, and no agent can operate immediately where it is not. Secondly, because grace which is an interior sacramental effect is from God alone, as we have established in the Second Part (I-II, Q. cxii, A. i), while the character which is the interior effect of certain sacraments is an instrumental power which flows from the principal agent, which is God.

In the second way, however, the interior sacramental effect can be the work of man, in
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so far as he works as a minister. For a minister is of the nature of an instrument, since the action of both is applied to something extrinsic, while the interior effect is produced through the power of the principal agent, which is God.

Reply Obj. 1. Cleansing, in so far as it is attributed to the ministers of the Church, is not a washing from sin ; deacons are said to cleanse in so far as they remove the unclean from the body of the faithful, or prepare them by their pious admonitions for the reception of the sacraments. In like manner also priests are said to enlighten God's people, not indeed by giving them grace, but by conferring on them the sacraments of grace, as Dionysius explains (ibid.).

Reply Obj. 2. The prayers which are said in giving the sacraments are offered to God not on the part of the individual, but on the part of the whole Church, whose prayers are acceptable to God, according to Matt. 18 .19: If two of you shall consent upon earth, concerning anything whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by My Father. Nor is there any reason why the devotion of a just man should not contribute to this effect.

But that which is the sacramental effect is not sought through the prayer of the Church or of the minister, but through the merit of Christ's Passion, the power of which operates in the sacraments, as stated above (q. lxii, a. 5). Therefore the sacramental effect is made no better by a better minister. And yet something in addition may be asked for for the receiver of the sacrament through the devotion of the minister; but this is not the work of the minister, but the work of God Who hears the minister's prayer.

Reply Obj. 3. Inanimate things do not produce anything towards the inward sacramental effect, except instrumentally, as stated above. In like manner neither do men produce the sacramental effect, except ministerially, as also stated above.

Article 2. *Whether the Sacraments Are Instituted By God Alone?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that the sacraments are not instituted by God alone.

Objection 1. For those things which God has instituted are delivered to us in Koly Scripture. But in the sacraments certain things are done which are nowhere mentioned in Holy Scripture; for instance, the chrism with which men are confirmed, the oil with which priests are anointed, and many others, both words and actions, which we employ in the sacraments. Therefore the sacraments were not instituted by God alone.

Obj. 2. Further, a sacrament is a kind of sign. Now sensible things have their own natural signification. Nor can it be said that God takes pleasure in certain significations and not in others, because He approves of all that He made. Moreover, it seems to be peculiar to the demons to be enticed to something by means of signs; for Augustine says:¹ "The demons are enticed ... by means of creatures, which were created not by them but by God, by various means of attraction according to their various natures, not as an animal is enticed by food, but as a spirit is drawn by a sign." It seems, therefore, that there is no need for the sacraments to be instituted by God.

Obj. 3. Further, the apostles were God's vicegerents on earth; hence the Apostle says (II Cor. 2. 10): For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ, that is, as though Christ Himself had pardoned. Therefore it seems that the apostles and their successors can institute new sacraments.

On the contrary, The institutor of anything is he who gives it strength and power, as in the case of those who institute laws. But the power of a sacrament is from God alone, as we have shown above (a. i; q. lxii, a. i). Therefore God alone can institute a sacrament.

I answer that. As appears from what has been said above {ibid.), the sacraments are instrumental causes of spiritual effects. Now an instrument has its power from the principal agent. But an agent in respect of a sacrament is twofold; namely, he who institutes the sacraments, and he who makes use of the sacrament instituted, by applying it for the production of the effect. Now the power of a sacrament cannot be from him who makes use of the sacrament, because he works but as a minister. Consequently, it remains that the power of the sacrament is from the institutor of the sacrament. Since, therefore, the power of the sacrament is from God alone, it follows that God alone can institute the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 1. Human institutions observed in the sacraments are not essential to the sacrament, but belong to the solemnity which is added to the sacraments in order to arouse devotion and reverence in the recipients. But those things that are essential to the sacrament are
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instituted by Christ Himself. Who is God and man. And though they are not all handed down by the Scriptures, yet the Church holds them from the intimate tradition of the apostles, according to the saying of the Apostle (I Cor. II. 34): The rest I will set in order when I come.

Reply Obj. 2. From their very nature sensible things have a certain aptitude for the signifying of spiritual effects, but this aptitude is fixed by the Divine institution to some special signification. This is what Hugh of S. Victor means by saying {De Sacram. I)¹ that "a sacrament owes its signification to its institution." Yet God chooses certain things rather than others for sacramental signification, not as though His operation were restricted to them, but in order that their signification be more suitable to them.

Reply Obj. 3. The apostles and their successors are God's vicars in governing the Church which is built on faith and the sacraments of faith. Therefore, just as they may not institute another Church, so neither may they deliver another faith, nor institute other sacraments; on the contrary, the Church is said to be built up with the sacraments which flowed from the side of Christ while hanging on the Cross.²

Article 3. *Whether Christ As Man Had the Power of Producing the Inward Sacramental Effect?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that Christ as man had the power of producing the interior sacramental effect.

Objection 1. For John the Baptist said (John I. 33): He, Who sent me to baptize in water, said to me: He upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon Him, He it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. But to baptize with the Holy Ghost is to confer inwardly the grace of the Holy Ghost. And the Holy Ghost descended upon Christ as man, not as God, for thus He Himself gives the Holy Ghost. Therefore it seems that Christ as man had the power of producing the inward sacramental effect.

Obj. 2. Further, our Lord said (Matt. 9. 6): That you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins. But forgiveness of sins is an inward sacramental effect. Therefore it seems that Christ as man produces the inward sacramental effect.
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Obj. 3. Further, the institution of the sacraments belongs to him who acts as principal agent in producing the inward sacramental effect. Now it is clear that Christ instituted the sacraments. Therefore it is He Who produces the inward sacramental effect.

Obj. 4. Further, no one can confer the sacramental effect without conferring the sacrament unless he produces the sacramental effect by his own power. But Christ conferred the sacramental effect without conferring the sacrament, as in the case of Magdalen to whom He said; Thy sins are forgiven Thee (Luke 7. 48). Therefore it seems that Christ, as man, produces the inward sacramental effect.

Obj. 5. Further, the principal agent in causing the inward effect is that in virtue of which the sacrament operates. But the sacraments derive their power from Christ's Passion and through the invocation of His Name, according to I Cor. I. 13: Was Paul then crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul? Therefore Christ, as man, produces the inward sacramental effect.

On the contrary, Augustine (Isidore, Etymol. vi, 19)³ says: "The Divine power in the sacraments works in a hidden way in producing their salutary effect." Now the Divine power is Christ's as God, not as man. Therefore Christ produces the inward sacramental effect not as man but as God.

I answer that, Christ produces the inward sacramental effect both as God and as man, but not in the same way. For, as God, He works in the sacraments by authority, but as man His operation conduces to the inward sacramental effects meritoriously and efficiently, but instrumentally. For it has been stated (q. XLViii, AA. I, 6; Q. XLix, A. i) that Christ's Passion which belongs to Him in respect of His human nature, is the cause of our justification, both meritoriously and efficiently, not as the principal agent thereof, or by authority, but as an instrument, in so far as His humanity is the instrument of His Godhead, as stated above (q. xiii, aa. 2, 3; q. xix, a i).

Nevertheless, since it is an instrument united to the Godhead in unity of Person, it has a certain headship and causality in regard to extrinsic instruments, which are the ministers of the Church and the sacraments themselves, as has been explained above (a. i). Consequently, just as Christ, as God, has the power of authority over the sacraments, so, as man, He has the power of ministry in chief, or power
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of excellence. And this consists in four things. First in this, that the merit and power of His Passion operates in the sacraments, as stated above (q. lxii, a. 5). And because the power of the Passion is joined to us by faith, according to Rom, 3. 25: Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, which faith we proclaim by calling on the name of Christ, therefore, secondly, Christ's power of excellence over the sacraments consists in this, that they are sanctified by the invocation of His name. And because the sacraments derive their power from His institution, hence, thirdly, the excellence of Christ's power consists in this, that He, Who gave them their power, could institute the sacraments. And since cause does not depend on effect, but rather conversely, it belongs to the excellence of Christ's power that He could bestow the sacramental effect without conferring the exterior sacrament. Thus it is clear how to solve the objections, for the arguments on either side are true to a certain extent, as explained above.

Article 4. *Whether Christ Could Communicate to Ministers the Power Which He Had in the Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that Christ could not communicate to ministers the power which He had in the sacraments.

Objection 1. For as Augustine argues against Maximin,¹ "if He could, but would not, He was jealous of His power." But jealousy was far from Christ Who had the fulness of charity. Since, therefore, Christ did not communicate His power to ministers, it seems that He could not.

Obj. 2. Further, on John 14. 12: Greater than these shall he do, Augustine says (Tract. Ixxii):² "I affirm this to be altogether greater," namely, for a man from being ungodly to be made righteous, "than to create heaven and earth." But Christ could not communicate to His disciples the power of creating heaven and earth; neither, therefore, could He give them the power of justifying the wicked. Since, therefore, the justification of the wicked is effected by the power that Christ has in the sacraments, it seems that He could not communicate that power to ministers.

Obj. 3. Further, it belongs to Christ as Head of the Church that grace should flow from Him to others, according to John i. 16:
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Of His fulness we all have received. But this could not be communicated to others, since then the Church would be deformed, having many heads. Therefore it seems that Christ could not communicate His power to ministers.

On the contrary, On John i. 31 : I knew Him not, Augustine says (Tract. V)³ that "he did not know that Our Lord having the authority of baptizing . . . would keep it to Himself." But John would not have been in ignorance of this if such a power were incommunicable. Therefore Christ could communicate His power to ministers.

I answer that. As stated above (a. 3), Christ had a twofold power in the sacraments. One was the power of authority, which belongs to Him as God, and this power He could not communicate to any creature, just as neither could He communicate the Divine Essence. The other was the power of excellence, which belongs to Him as man. This power He could communicate to ministers; namely, by giving them such a fulness of grace that their merits would conduce to the sacramental effect, and that by the invocation of their names, the sacraments would be sanctified, and that they themselves might institute sacraments, and by their mere will confer the sacramental effect without observing the sacramental rite. For an instrument, that is joined, the more powerful it is, the more able is it to lend its power to the separated instrument, as the hand can to a stick.

Reply Obj. 1. It was not through jealousy that Christ refrained from communicating to ministers of the Church His power of excellence, but for the good of the faithful, lest they should put their trust in men, and lest there should be various kinds of sacraments, giving rise to division in the Church, as may be seen in those who said : I am of Paul, I am of Apollo, and I of Cephas (I Cor. i. 12).

Reply Obj. 2. This objection is true of the power of authority, which belongs to Christ as God. At the same time the power of excellence can be called authority in comparison to other ministers. Hence on I Cor. i. 13: Is Christ divided? the gloss says⁴ that "He could give power of authority in baptizing to those to whom He gave the power of administering it."

Reply Obj. 3. It was in order to avoid the incongruity of many heads in the Church that Christ was unwilling to communicate to ministers His power of excellence. If, however, He
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had done so, He would have been Head chief, the others secondary to Him. in

Article 5. *Whether the Sacraments Can Be Conferred By Evil Ministers?*

*We proceed thus to the Fifth Article*: It seems that the sacraments cannot be conferred by evil ministers.

Objection 1. For the sacraments of the New Law are ordained for the purpose of cleansing from sin and for the bestowal of grace. Now evil men, being themselves unclean, cannot cleanse others from sin, according to Ecclus. 34. 4: Who (Vulg., What) can be made clean by the unclean? Moreover, since they have not grace, it seems that they cannot give grace, for no one gives what he has not. It seems, therefore, that the sacraments cannot be conferred by wicked men.

Obj. 2. Further, all the power of the sacraments is derived from Christ, as stated above (a. 3; Q. LXii, A. 5). But evil men are cut off from Christ, because they have not charity, by which the members are united to their Head, according to I John 4. 16: He that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him. Therefore it seems that the sacraments cannot be conferred by evil men.

Obj. 3. Further, if anything is wanting that is required for the sacraments, the sacrament is invalid; for instance, if the required matter or required form be wanting. But the minister required for a sacrament is one who is without the stain of sin, according to Lev. 21. 17, 18: Whosoever of thy seed throughout their families, hath a blemish, he shall not offer bread to his God, neither shall he approach to minister to Him. Therefore it seems that if the minister be wicked, the sacrament has no effect.

On the contrary, Augustine says on John i. 33: He upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit, etc. (Tract, v in Joann.),¹ that "John did not know that Our Lord, having the authority of baptizing, would keep it to Himself, but that the ministry would certainly pass to both good and evil men. . . . What is a bad minister to thee, where the Lord is good?"

I answer that, As stated above (a. i), the ministers of the Church work instrumentally in the sacraments, because, in a way, a minister is of the nature of an instrument. But. as stated above (q. lxii, aa. i, 4), an instrument acts not by reason of its own form, or power, but by the power of the one who moves it. Consequently, whatever form or power an instru-
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ment has in addition to that which it has as an instrument, is suitable to it, for instance, that a physician's body, which is the instrument of his soul, in which is his medical art, be healthy or sickly; or that a pipe through which water passes be of silver or lead. Therefore the ministers of the Church can confer the sacraments, even though they be wicked.

Reply Obj. 1. The ministers of the Church do not by their own power cleanse from sin those who approach the sacraments, nor do they confer grace on them; it is Christ Who does this by His own power while He employs them as instruments. Consequently, those who approach the sacraments receive an effect by which they are likened not to the ministers but to Christ.

Reply Obj. 2. Christ's members are united to their Head by charity, so that they may receive life from Him ; for as it is written (I John 3. 14) : He that loveth not abideth in death. Now it is possible for a man to work with a lifeless instrument, and separated from him as to bodily union, provided it be united to him by some sort of motion; for a workman works in one way with his hand, in another with his axe. Consequently, it is thus that Christ works in the sacraments, both by wicked men as lifeless instruments, and by good men as living instruments.

Reply Obj. 3. A thing is required in a sacrament in two ways. First, as being essential to it, and if this be wanting, the sacrament is invalid; for instance, if the due form or matter be wanting. Secondly, a thing is required for a sacrament by reason of a certain fitness. And in this way good ministers are required for a sacrament.

Article 6. *Whether Wicked Men Sin in Administering the Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Sixth Article*: It seems that wicked men do not sin in administering the sacraments.

Objection 1. For just as men serve God in the sacraments, so do they serve Him in works of charity; hence it is written (Heb. 13. 16): Do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such sacrifices God's favour is obtained. But the wicked do not sin in serving God by works of charity: indeed, they should be persuaded to do so, according to Dan. 4. 24: Let my counsel be acceptable to the king; Redeem thou thy sins with alms. Therefore it seems that wicked men do not sin in administering the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, whoever co-operates with another in his sin is also guilty of sin, according to Rom. I. 3²: He is (Vulg., They are) worthy of death ; not only he that commits the sin, but also he who consents to them that do them. But if wicked ministers sin in administering sacraments, those who receive sacraments from them co-operate in their sin. Therefore they would sin also, which seems unreasonable.

Obj. 3. Further, it seems that no one should act when in doubt, for thus man would be driven to despair, as being unable to avoid sin. But if the wicked were to sin in administering sacraments, they would be in a state of perplexity, since sometimes they would sin also if they did not administer sacraments; for instance, when by reason of their office it is their bounden duty to do so, for it is written (I Cor. 9. 16) : For a necessity lieth upon me: Woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel. Sometimes also on account of some danger; for instance, if a child in danger of death be brought to a sinner for baptism. Therefore it seems that the wicked do not sin in administering the sacraments.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. i)¹ that "it is wrong for the wicked even to touch the symbols," that is, the sacramental signs. And he says in the epistle to Demophilus:² "It seems presumptuous for such a man," that is, a sinner, "to lay hands on priestly things; he is neither afraid nor ashamed, all unworthy that he is, to take part in Divine things, with the thought that God does not see what he sees in himself: he thinks, by false pretences, to cheat Him Whom he calls his Father; he dares to utter, in the person of Christ, words polluted by his infamy, I will not call them prayers, over the Divine symbols."

I answer that, A sinful action consists in this, that a man fails to act as he ought to, as the Philosopher explains.³ Now it has been said (a. 5, Reply 3) that it is fitting for the ministers of sacraments to be just, because ministers should be like their Lord, according to Lev. 19. 2: Be ye holy, because I ... am holy, and Ecclus. 10. 2 : As the judge of the people is himself, so also are his ministers. Consequently, there can be no doubt that the wicked sin by exercising the ministry of God and the Church, by conferring the sacraments. And
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since this sin pertains to irreverence towards God and the defiling of holy things, as far as the man who sins is concerned, although holy things in themselves cannot be defiled, it follows that such a sin is mortal in its genus.

Reply Obj. 1. Works of charity are not made holy by some process of consecration, but they pertain to the holiness of justice, as being in a way parts of justice. Consequently, when a man shows himself as a minister of God, by doing works of charity, if he is just, he will be made yet holier; but if he is a sinner, he is thereby disposed to holiness. On the other hand, the sacraments are holy in themselves owing to their mystical consecration. Therefore the holiness of justice is required in the minister, that he may be suitable for his ministry, for which reason he acts unbecomingly and sins if while in a state of sin he attempts to fulfil that ministry.

Reply Obj. 2. He who approaches a sacrament, receives it from a minister of the Church not because he is such and such a man, but because he is a minister of the Church. Consequently, as long as the latter is tolerated in the ministry, he that receives a sacrament from him does not communicate in his sin, but communicates with the Church from whom he has his ministry. But if the Church, by degrading, excommunicating, or suspending him, does not tolerate him in the ministry, he that receives a sacrament from him sins, because he communicates in his sin.

Reply Obj. 3. A man who is in mortal sin is not perplexed absolutely, if by reason of his office it is his duty to minister sacraments, because he can repent of his sin and so minister lawfully. But there is nothing unreasonable in his being perplexed if we suppose that he wishes to remain in sin.

However, in a case of necessity when even a lay person might baptize, he would not sin in baptizing. For it is clear that then he does not exercise the ministry of the Church, but comes to the aid of one who is in need of his services. It is not so with the other sacraments, which are not so necessary as baptism, as we shall show further on (q. lxv, aa. 3, 4; q. LXVII, A. 3).

Article 7. *Whether Angels Can Administer Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Seventh Article*: It seems that angels can administer sacraments. Objection i. Because a higher minister can do whatever the lower can; thus a priest can do whatever a deacon can, but not conversely. But angels are higher ministers in the hierarchical order than any men whatsoever, as Dionysius says (CaI. Hier. ix).¹ Therefore, since men can be ministers of sacraments, it seems that much more can angels be.

Obj. 2. Further, in heaven holy men are likened to the angels (Matt. 22. 30). But some holy men, when in heaven, can be ministers of the sacraments, since the sacramental character is indelible, as stated above (q. lxiii, a. 5). Therefore it seems that angels too can be ministers of sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, as stated above (q. viii, a. 7), the devil is head of the wicked, and the wicked are his members. But sacraments can be administered by the wicked. Therefore it seems that they can be administered even by demons.

On the contrary, It is written (Heb. 5. i): Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God. But angels whether good or bad are not taken from among men. Therefore they are not ordained ministers in the things that pertain to God, that is, in the sacraments.

I answer that. As stated above (a. 3; q. Lxii, a. 5), the whole power of the sacraments flows from Christ's Passion, which belongs to Him as man. And men, not angels, resemble Him in their very nature; indeed, in respect of His Passion, He is described as being a little lower than the angels (Heb. 2. 9). Consequently, it belongs to men, but not to angels, to dispense the sacraments and to take part in their administration.

But it must be observed that as God did not bind His power to the sacraments, so as to be unable to bestow the sacramental effect without conferring the sacrament, so neither did He bind His power to the ministers of the Church so as to be unable to give angels power to administer the sacraments. And since good angels are messengers of truth, if any sacramental rite were performed by good angels, it should be considered valid, because it ought to be evident that this is being done by the will of God; for instance, certain churches are said to have been consecrated by the ministry of the angels. But if demons, who are "lying spirits," were to perform a sacramental rite, it should be pronounced as invalid.

Reply Obj. 1. What men do in a less perfect manner, that is, by sensible sacraments, which are proportionate to their nature, angels also
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do, as ministers of a higher degree, in a more perfect manner, that is, invisibly,—by cleansing, enlightening, and perfecting.

Reply Obj. 2. The saints in heaven resemble the angels as to their share of glory, but not as to the conditions of their nature, and consequently not in regard to the sacraments.

Reply Obj. 3. Wicked men do not owe their power of conferring sacraments to their being through wickedness members of the devil. Consequently, it does not follow that a fortiori the devil, their head, can do so.

Article 8. *Whether the Minister's Intention Is Required for the Validity of a Sacrament?*

*We proceed thus to the Eighth Article*: It seems that the minister's intention is not required for the validity of a sacrament.

Objection 1. For the minister of a sacrament works instrumentally. But the perfection of an action does not depend on the intention of the instrument but on that of the principal agent. Therefore the minister's intention is not necessary for the perfecting of a sacrament.

Obj. 2. Further, one man's intention cannot be known to another. Therefore if the minister's intention were required for the validity of a sacrament, he who approaches a sacrament could not know whether he has received the sacrament. Consequently he could have no certainty in regard to salvation ; the more that some sacraments are necessary for salvation, as we shall state further on (q. lxv, a. 4).

Obj. 3. Further, a man's intention cannot bear on that to which he does not attend. But sometimes ministers of sacraments do not attend to what they say or do, through thinking of something else. Therefore in this respect the sacrament would be invalid through want of intention.

On the contrary, What is unintentional happens by chance. But this cannot be said of the sacramental operation. Therefore the sacraments require the intention of the minister.

I answer that, When a thing is indifferent to many uses, it must be determined to one if that one has to be effected. Now those things which are done in the sacraments can be done with various intent; for instance, washing with water, which is done in baptism, may be ordered to bodily cleanliness, to the health of the body, to amusement, and many other similar things. Consequently, it needs to be determined to one purpose, that is, the sacramental effect, by the intention of him who washes. And this intention is expressed by the words which are pronounced in the sacraments; for instance the words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, etc.

Reply Obj. 1. An inanimate instrument has no intention regarding the effect, but instead of the intention there is the motion whereby it is moved by the principal agent. But an animate instrument, such as a minister, is not only moved, but in a sense moves itself, in so far as by his will he moves his members to act. Consequently, his intention is required, whereby he subjects himself to the principal agent ; that is, it is necessary that he intend to do that which Christ and the Church do.

Reply Obj. 2. On this point there are two opinions. For some¹ hold that the mental intention of the minister is necessary, in the absence of which the sacrament is invalid, and that this defect in the case of children who have not the intention of approaching the sacrament is made good by Christ, Who baptizes inwardly; but in adults, because they have the intention of receiving the sacrament, this defect is made good by their faith and devotion. This might be true enough of the ultimate effect, that is, justification from sins, but as to that effect which is both real and sacramental, namely, the character, it does not appear possible for it to be made good by the devotion of the recipient, since a character is never imprinted save by a sacrament.

Consequently, others² with better reason hold that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is, while in the words uttered by him, the intention of the Church is expressed, and that this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, unless the contrary be outwardly expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the sacrament.

Reply Obj. 3. Although he who thinks of something else has no actual intention, yet he has habitual intention, which suffices for the validity of the sacrament; for instance if, when a priest goes to baptize someone, he intends to do to him what the Church does. Therefore if subsequently during the exercise of the act his mind be distracted by other matters, the sacrament is valid in virtue of his original intention. Nevertheless, the minister of a sacrament should take great care to have actual intention. But this is not entirely in man's power,
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because when a man wishes to be very intent on something, he begins unintentionally to think of other things, according to Ps. 39. 13: My heart hath forsaken me.

Article 9. *Whether Faith Is Required of Necessity in the Minister of a Sacrament?*

*We proceed thus to the Ninth Article*: It seems that faith is required of necessity in the minister of a sacrament.

Objection 1. For, as stated above (a. 8), the intention of the minister is necessary for the validity of a sacrament. But "faith directs the intention," as Augustine says against Julian (In Psalm 31. 2, cf. Contra Julian, iv, 3).³ Therefore, if the minister is without the true faith, the sacrament is invalid.

Obj. 2. Further, if a minister of the Church has not the true faith, it seems that he is a heretic. But heretics, it seems, cannot confer sacraments. For Cyprian says in an epistle against heretics:⁴ "Everything whatsoever heretics do is carnal, void and counterfeit, so that nothing that they do should receive our approval." And Pope Leo says in his epistle to Leo Augustus (clvi):⁵ "It is a matter of notoriety that the light of all the heavenly sacraments is extinguished in the see of Alexandria, by an act of dire and senseless cruelty. The sacrifice is no longer offered, the chrism is no longer consecrated, all the mysteries of religion have fled at the touch of the parricide hands of ungodly men." Therefore a sacrament requires of necessity that the minister should have the true faith.

Obj. 3. Further, those who have not the true faith seem to be separated from the Church by excommunication: for it is written in the second canonical epistle of John (10): If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him: God speed you; and (Tit. 3. 10): A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition avoid. But it seems that an excommunicate cannot confer a sacrament of the Church: since he is separated from the Church, to whose ministry the dispensation of the sacraments belongs. Therefore a sacrament requires of necessity that the minister should have the true faith.

On the contrary, Augustine says against the Donatist Petilian:⁶ "Remember that the evil

³PL 36, 259; PL 44, 754.

⁴Epist., Lxx (PL 3, 1081); cf. PL 4, 421); Cone of Carthage i, anno 255 (MA i, 924).

⁵Chap. 5 (PL 54, 1 131).

⁶Bk. II, Chap. 47 (PL 43, 298).

lives of wicked men are not prejudicial to God's sacraments, by rendering them either invalid or less holy."

I answer that, As stated above (a. 5), since the minister works instrumentally in the sacraments, he acts not by his own but by Christ's power. Now just as charity belongs to a man's own power so also does faith. Therefore, just as the validity of a sacrament does not require that the minister should have charity, and even sinners can confer sacraments, as stated above (ibid.), so neither is it necessary that he should have faith, and even an unbeliever can confer a true sacrament, provided that the other essentials be there.

Reply Obj. 1. It may happen that a man's faith is defective in regard to something else, and not in regard to the reality of the sacrament which he confers; for instance, he may believe that it is unlawful to swear in any case whatever, and yet he may believe that baptism is an efficient cause of salvation. And thus such unbelief does not hinder the intention of conferring the sacrament. But if his faith is defective in regard to the very sacrament that he confers, although he believes that no inward effect is caused by the thing done outwardly, yet he does know that the Catholic Church intends to confer a sacrament by that which is outwardly done. Therefore, his unbelief notwithstanding, he can intend to do what the Church does, although he esteems it to be nothing. And such an intention suffices for a sacrament, because as stated above (a. 8, Reply 2) the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the Church by whose faith any defect in the minister's faith is made good.

Reply Obj. 2. Some heretics¹ in conferring sacraments do not observe the form prescribed by the Church, and these confer neither the sacrament nor the reality of the sacrament. But some² do observe the form prescribed by the Church, and these confer indeed the sacra-

¹The Marcosians: Cf. Irenaeus, Contra Ilaeres, i, 21 (PG 7, 657); Epiphanius, Adv. Ilaeres, i, 3, haeres 34 (PG 41, 621); the Sabellians: Cf. Epiphanius, Adv. Haeres., II, I, haeres. 62; the Eunomians: Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunom., xi (PG 45, 881); the Pauhnists: Cf. Innocent I, Epist., XVII, chap. 5 (PL 20, 533); the Montanists: Cf. Gregory the Great, Registrum, Bk. xi, indict, in, epist. Lxvii (PL 77, 1206); for many others, see Gennadius, De Eccl. Dogm., chap. 52 (PL 58, 993)- See Pt. in, Q. Lxvi, A. 9, reply 3.

²The Arians: Cf. Athanasius, Contra Arianos, orat. I (PG 26, 236); Ambrose, De Spir. Sancto, i, 3 (PL 16, 337); the Novatians: Cf. Innocent I, Epist., xvii, chap. 5 (PL 20, 533); the Monophysites and Nestorians: Cf. Gregory the Great, Registrum, Bk. xi, indict, iv, epist. LXVii (PL 77, 1206, 1207).

ment but not the reality. I say this if they are clearly cut off from the Church, because from the very fact that anyone receives the sacraments from them, he sins, and consequently is hindered from receiving the effect of the sacrament. Therefore Augustine (Fulgentius,— De Fide ad Pet.)³ says: "Be well assured and have no doubt whatever that those who are baptized outside the Church, unless they come back to the Church, will reap disaster from their Baptism." In this sense Pope Leo says⁴ that "the light of the sacraments was extinguished in the See of Alexandria"; namely, in regard to the reality of the sacrament, not as to the sacrament itself.

Cyprian, however, thought that heretics do not confer even the sacrament, but in this respect we do not follow his opinion. Hence Augustine says (De unico Baptismo, xiii):⁵ "Though the martyr Cyprian refused to recognize Baptism conferred by heretics or schismatics, yet so great are his merits, culminating in the crown of martyrdom, that the light of his charity dispels the darkness of his fault, and if anything needed pruning, the sickle of his suffering cut it off."

Reply Obj. 3. The power of administering the sacraments belongs to the spiritual character which is indelible, as explained above (q. LXiii, A. 3). Consequently, if a man be suspended by the Church, or excommunicated or degraded, he does not lose the power of conferring sacraments, but the permission to use this power. Therefore he does indeed confer the sacrament, but he sins in so doing. He also sins that receives a sacrament from such a man, so that he does not receive the reality of the sacrament, unless ignorance excuses him.

Article 10. *Whether the Validity of a Sacrament Requires a Good Intention in the Minister?*

*We proceed thus to the Tenth Article*: It seems that the validity of a sacrament requires a good intention in the minister.

Objection 1. For the minister's intention should be in conformity with the Church's intention, as explained above (a. 8, Reply i). But the intention of the Church is always good. Therefore the validity of a sacrament requires of necessity a good intention in the minister.

Obj. 2. Further, a perverse intention seems worse than a playful one. But a playful inten-

³Fulgentius, 36 (PL 65, 703).

⁴Epist. CLVI, 5 (PL 54, 1131). ⁵PL 43, 606.

tion destroys a sacrament; for instance, if someone were to baptize anybody not seriously but in fun. Much more, therefore, does a perverse intention destroy a sacrament; for instance, if somebody were to baptize a man in order to kill him afterwards.

Obj. 3. Further, a perverse intention vitiates the whole work, according to Luke 11. 34: If thy eye be evil, thy whole body will be darksome. But the sacraments of Christ cannot be contaminated by evil men, as Augustine says against Petilian (Cont. Litt. Petil. ii, 39).¹ Therefore it seems that, if the minister's intention is perverse, the sacrament is invalid. On the contrary, A perverse intention belongs to the wickedness of the minister. But the wickedness of the minister does not annul the sacrament ; neither, therefore, does his perverse intention.

I answer that, The minister's intention may be perverted in two ways. First in regard to the sacrament ; for instance, when a man does not intend to confer a sacrament, but to make a mockery of it. Such a perverse intention takes away the truth of the sacrament, especially if it be manifested outwardly. Secondly, the minister's intention may be perverted as to something that follows the sacrament; for instance, a priest may intend to baptize a woman so as to be able to abuse her, or to consecrate the Body of Christ, so as to use it for sorcery. And because that which comes first does not depend on that which follows, consequently such a perverse intention does not annul the sacrament ; but the minister himself sins grievously in having such an intention.

Reply Obj. 1. The Church has a good intention both as to the validity of the sacrament and as to its use, but it is the former intention that perfects the sacrament, while the latter conduces to the meritorious effect. Consequently, the minister who conforms his intention to the Church as to the former rectitude, but not as to the latter, perfects the sacrament indeed, but gains no merit for himself.

Reply Obj. 2. The intention of mimicry or fun excludes the first kind of right intention necessary for the validity of a sacrament. Consequently, there is no comparison.

Reply Obj. 3. A perverse intention perverts the action of the one who has such an intention, not the action of another. Consequently, the perverse intention of the minister perverts the sacrament in so far as it is his action, not in so

¹PL 43, 293.

far as it is the action of Christ, Whose minister he is. It is just as if the servant of some man were to carry alms to the poor with a wicked intention, although his master had commanded him with a good intention to do so.

QUESTION LXV

OF THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS

(*In Four Articles*)

We have now to consider the number of the sacraments, and concerning this there are four points of inquiry: (1) Whether there are seven sacraments? (2) The order of the sacraments among themselves. (3) Their mutual comparison. (4) Whether all the sacraments are necessary for salvation?

Article 1. *Whether There Should Be Seven Sacraments of the Church?*

*We proceed thus to the First Article*: It seems that there ought not to be seven sacraments.

Objection 1. For the sacraments derive their efficacy from the Divine power and the power of Christ's Passion. But the Divine power is one, and Christ's Passion is one, since by one oblation He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified (Heb. 10. 14). Therefore there should be but one sacrament.

Obj. 2. Further, a sacrament is intended as a remedy for the defect caused by sin. Now this is twofold, punishment and guilt. Therefore two sacraments would be enough.

Obj. 3. Further, sacraments belong to the actions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as Dionysius explains (Eccl. Hier. v),² But, as he says, there are three actions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, namely, "to cleanse, to enlighten, to perfect." Therefore there should be no more than three sacraments.

Obj. 4. Further, Augustine says (Contra Faust, xix, 13)³ that the sacraments of the New Law are "less numerous" than those of the Old Law. But in the Old Law there was no sacrament corresponding to Confirmation and Extreme Unction. Therefore these should not be counted among the sacraments of the New Law.

Obj. 5. Further, lust is not more grievous than other sins, as we have made clear in the Second Part (I-II, Q. lxxiv, a. 5; II-II, q. CLiv, A. 3). But there is no sacrament instituted as a remedy for other sins. Therefore neither should matrimony be instituted as a remedy for lust.

²Sect. 2 (PG 3, 501). ³PL 42, 355.

Obj. 6. On the other hand, It seems that

there are more than seven sacraments. For sacraments

are a kind of sacred sign. But in the

Church there are many sanctifications by sensible

signs, such as Holy Water, the Consecration

of Altars, and the like. Therefore there

are more than seven sacraments.

Obj. 7. Further, Hugh of S. Victor (De Sacram, i)¹ says that the sacraments of the Old Law were oblations, tithes and sacrifices. But the Sacrifice of the Church is one sacrament, called the Eucharist. Therefore oblations also and tithes should be called sacraments.

Obj. 8. Further, there are three kinds of sin, original, mortal and venial. Now Baptism is intended as a remedy against original sin, and Penance against mortal sin. Therefore besides the seven sacraments, there should be another against venial sin.

I answer that, As stated above (q. lxii, a. 5; Q. LXiii, A. i), the sacraments of the Church were instituted for a twofold purpose : namely, in order to perfect man in things pertaining to the worship of God according to the religion of Christian life, and to be a remedy against the defects caused by sin. And in either way it is fitting that there should be seven sacraments.

For spiritual life has a certain conformity with the life of the body, just as other corporeal things have a certain likeness to things spiritual. Now a man attains perfection in the corporeal life in two ways: first, in regard to his own person; secondly, in regard to the whole community of the society in which he lives, for man is naturally a social animal. With regard to himself man is perfected in the life of the body, in two ways; first, through himself (per se), that is, by acquiring some vital perfection; secondly, accidentally (per accidens), that is, by the removal of hindrances to life, such as ailments, or the like. Now the life of the body is perfected per se, in three ways. First, by generation, whereby a man begins to be and to live; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Baptism, which is a spiritual regeneration, according to Tit. 3. 5:. By the laver of regeneration, etc. Secondly, by growth, whereby a man is brought to perfect size and strength; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Confirmation, in which the Holy Ghost is given to strengthen us. Therefore the disciples who were already baptized were bidden thus : Stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high (Luke 24, 49). Thirdly, by nourishment, whereby life

¹Part XI, chap. 2 (PL 176, 344); xii, 4 (PL 176, 351).

and strength are preserved to man; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is the Eucharist. Therefore it is said (John 6. 54) : Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you.

And this would be enough for man if he had an impassible life, both corporally and spiritually; but since man is liable at times to both corporal and spiritual infirmity, that is, sin, hence man needs a cure from his infirmity. This cure is twofold. One is the healing, that restores health, and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Penance, according to Ps. 40. 5: Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee. The other is the restoration of former vigour by means of suitable diet and exercise; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is Extreme Unction, which removes the remainders of sin, and prepares man for final glory. Therefore it is written (Jas. 5. 15) : And if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him.

In regard to the whole community, man is perfected in two ways. First, by receiving power to rule the community and to exercise public acts; and corresponding to this in the spiritual life there is the sacrament of Order, according to the saying of Heb. 7. 27, that priests offer sacrifices not for themselves only, but also for the people. Secondly in regard to natural propagation. This is accomplished by Matrimony both in the corporal and in the spiritual life, since it is not only a sacrament but also a function of nature.

We may likewise gather the number of the sacraments from their being instituted as a remedy against the defect caused by sin. For Baptism is intended as a remedy against the lack of spiritual life; Confirmation, against the infirmity of soul found in those of recent birth; the Eucharist, against the soul's proneness to sin; Penance, against actual sin committed after baptism; Extreme Unction against the remainders of sins,—of those sins, namely, which are not sufficiently removed by Penance, whether through negligence or through ignorance; Order, against divisions in the community; Matrimony, as a remedy against concupiscence in the individual, and against the decrease in numbers that results from death.

Some,² again, gather the number of sacra-

²Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol., iv, Q. 8, iii. 7, A. 2 (iv, 52rb); Bonaventure, In Sent., iv, d. ii, a. 3, Q. 3 (QR IV, S3); Albert, In Sent., iv, d. ii, A. i (BO xxix, 43); See Hugh of St. Victor, De Sacram., i, DC, 3 (PL 176, 320).

ments from a certain adaptation to the virtues and to the defects and penal effects resulting from sin. They say that Baptism corresponds to Faith, and is ordained as a remedy against original sin; Extreme Unction, to Hope, being ordained against venial sin; the Eucharist, to Charity, being ordained against the penal effect of malice; Order, to Prudence, being ordained against ignorance; Penance, to Justice, bring ordained against mortal sin; Matrimony, to Temperance, being ordained against concupiscence; Confirmation, to Fortitude, being ordained against infirmity.

Reply Obj. 1. The same principal agent uses various instruments for various effects, in accordance with the thing to be done. In the same way the Divine power and the Passion of Christ work in us through the various sacraments as through various instruments.

Reply Obj. 2. Guilt and punishment are diversified both according to species, since there are various species of guilt and punishment, and according to men's various states and dispositions. And in this respect it was necessary to have a number of sacraments, as explained above.

Reply Obj. 3. In hierarchical actions we must consider the agents, the recipients and the actions. The agents are the ministers of the Church, and to these the sacrament of Order belongs. The recipients are those who approach the sacraments, and these are brought into being by Matrimony. The actions are cleansing, enlightening, and perfecting. Mere cleansing, however, cannot be a sacrament of the New Law, which confers grace; yet it belongs to certain sacramentals, that is. catechism and exorcism. But cleansing coupled with enlightening, according to Dionysius,¹ belongs to Baptism; and, for him who falls back into sin, they belong secondarily to Penance and Extreme Unction. And perfecting, as regards power, which is, as it were, a formal perfection, belongs to Confirmation, while, as regards the attainment of the end, it belongs to the Eucharist.

Reply Obj. 4. In the sacrament of Confirmation we receive the fulness of the Holy Ghost in order to be strengthened, while in Extreme Unction man is prepared for the immediate attainment of glory; and neither of these two purposes was appropriate to the Old Testament. Consequently, nothing in the Old Law could correspond to these sacraments. Nevertheless, the sacraments of the Old Law were more numerous on account of the various kinds of sacrifices and ceremonies.

¹Eccl Hier., v, 3 (PG 3, 504).

Reply Obj. 5. There was need for a special sacrament to be applied as a remedy against the concupiscence of sex: first because by this concupiscence not only the person but also the nature is defiled; secondly, by reason of its vehemence which clouds the reason.

Reply Obj. 6. Holy Water and other consecrated things are not called sacraments because they do not produce the sacramental effect, which is the receiving of grace. They are, however, a kind of disposition to the sacraments: either by removing obstacles, as for example Holy Water is ordained against the snares of the demons, and against venial sins; or by making things suitable for the perfection and conferring of a sacrament, as for example the altar and vessels are consecrated through reverence for the Eucharist.

Reply Obj. 7. Oblations and tithes, both in the Law of nature and in the Law of Moses, were ordained not only for the sustenance of the ministers and the poor, but also figuratively; and consequently they were sacraments. But now they remain no longer as figures, and therefore they are not sacraments.

Reply Obj. 8. The infusion of grace is not necessary for the blotting out of venial sin. Therefore, since grace is infused in each of the sacraments of the New Law, none of them was instituted directly against venial sin. This is taken away by certain sacramentals, for instance, Holy Water and the like.—Some,² however, hold that Extreme Unction is ordained against venial sin. But of this we shall speak in its proper place (Suppl. xxx, a. i).

Article 2. *Whether the Order of the Sacraments, As Given Above, Is Becoming?*

*We proceed thus to the Second Article*: It seems that the order of the sacraments as given above (a. i) is unbecoming.

Objection 1. For according to the Apostle (I Cor. 15. 46), that was . . . first . . . which is natural, afterwards that which is spiritual. But man is begotten through Matrimony by a first and natural generation, while in Baptism he is regenerated as by a second and spiritual generation. Therefore Matrimony should precede Baptism.

Obj. 2. Further, through the sacrament of Order man receives the power of performing sacramental actions. But the agent precedes his action. Therefore Order should precede

²Alexander of Hales, Summa Theol, iv, q. 8, iii. 7, A. 2 (iv, 52rb); Bonaventure, In Sent., iv, d. 11, a. i, q. 3 (QR IV, 53).

Baptism and the other sacraments.

Obj. 3. Further, the Eucharist is a spiritual food, while Confirmation is compared to growth. But food causes, and consequently precedes, growth. Therefore the Eucharist precedes Confirmation.

Obj. 4. Further, Penance prepares man for the Eucharist. But a disposition precedes perfection. Therefore Penance should precede the Eucharist.

Obj. 5. Further, that which is nearer the last end comes after other things. But, of all the sacraments, Extreme Unction is nearest to the last end. which is Happiness. Therefore it should be placed last among the sacraments.

0n the contrary, The order of the sacraments, as given above (a. i), is commonly adopted by all.

I answer that, The reason of the order among the sacraments appears from what has been said above (a. i). For just as unity precedes multitude, so those sacraments which are intended for the perfection of the individual, naturally precede those which are intended for the perfection of the multitude; and consequently the last place among the sacraments is given to Order and Matrimony, which are intended for the perfection of the multitude, while Matrimony is placed after Order, because it has less participation in the nature of the spiritual life, to which the sacraments are ordered. Moreover, among things ordered to the perfection of the individual those naturally come first which are ordered directly (per se) to the perfection of the spiritual life, and afterwards, those which are ordered to it indirectly (per accidens), namely, by removing some supervening accidental cause of harm ; such are Penance and Extreme Unction, while of these Extreme Unction is naturally placed last, for it preserves the healing which was begun by Penance.

Of the remaining three, it is clear that Baptism which is a spiritual regeneration, comes first; then Confirmation, which is ordered to the formal perfection of power; and after these the Eucharist which is ordered to final perfection.

Reply Obj. 1. Matrimony according as it is ordered to animal life, is a function of nature. But in so far as it has something spiritual it is a sacrament. And because it has the least amount of spirituality it is placed last.

Reply Obj. 2. For a thing to be an agent it must first of all be perfect in itself. Therefore those sacraments by which a man is perfected in himself are placed before the sacrament of Order, in which a man is made a perfecter of others.

Reply Obj. 3. Nourishment both precedes growth, as its cause, and follows it, as maintaining the perfection of size and power in man. Consequently, the Eucharist can be placed before Confirmation, as Dionysius places it {Eccl. Hier. iii, iv),¹ and can be placed after it, as the Master does.²

Reply Obj. 4. This argument would hold if Penance were required of necessity as a preparation to the Eucharist. But this is not true, for if anyone is without mortal sin he does not need Penance in order to receive the Eucharist. Thus it is clear that Penance is an accidental preparation to the Eucharist, that is to say, sin being supposed. Therefore it is written in the last chapter of the second Book of Paralipomenon (cf. 2 Paral. 33. 18):³ "Thou, Lord of the just, didst not impose penance on just men."

Reply Obj. 5. Extreme Unction, for this very reason, is given the last place among those sacraments which are ordained to the perfection of the individual.

Article 3. *Whether the Eucharist Is the Greatest of the Sacraments?*

*We proceed thus to the Third Article*: It seems that the Eucharist is not the greatest of the sacraments.

Objection 1. For the common good is of more account than the good of the individual."⁴ But Matrimony is ordered to the common good of the human race by means of generation, whereas the sacrament of the Eucharist is ordered to the private good of the recipient. Therefore it is not the greatest of the sacraments.

Obj. 2. Further, it seems that those sacraments are greater which are conferred by a greater minister. But the sacraments of Confirmation and Order are conferred by a bishop only, who is a greater minister than a simple priest, by whom the sacrament of the Eucharist is conferred. Therefore those sacraments are greater.

Obj. 3. Further, those sacraments are greater that have the greater power. But some of the sacraments imprint a character—namely. Baptism, Confirmation and Order whereas the Eu-

¹PG 3, 424; 472.

²Sent., IV, dist. viii, chap, i (QR 11, 787).

³The words quoted are from the apocryphal Prayer of Manasses, which, before the Council of Trent, was to be found inserted in some Latin copies of the Bible.

⁴Aristotle, Ethics, i, 2 (1094ᵇ8).

charist does not. Therefore those sacraments are greater.

Obj. 4. Further, that seems to be greater on which others depend without its depending on them. But the Eucharist depends on Baptism, since no one can receive the Eucharist except he has been baptized. Therefore Baptism is greater than the Eucharist.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii, i)¹ that "No one receives hierarchical perfection save by the most Godlike Eucharist." Therefore this sacrament is greater than all the others and perfects them.

I answer that, Absolutely speaking, the sacrament of the Eucharist is the greatest of all the sacraments, and this may be shown in three ways. First from what is contained in the sacrament, for in the sacrament of the Eucharist Christ Himself is contained substantially, whereas the other sacraments contain a certain instrumental power which is a share of Christ's power, as we have shown above (q. lxii, a. 4 Reply 3, A. 5). Now, that which is essentially such is always of more account than that which is such by participation.

Secondly, this is made clear by considering the relation of the sacraments to one another. For all the other sacraments seem to be ordered to this one as to their end. For it is manifest that the sacrament of Order is ordered to the consecration of the Eucharist, and the sacrament of Baptism to the reception of the Eucharist, while a man is perfected by Confirmation, so as not to fear to abstain from this sacrament. By Penance and Extreme Unction man is prepared to receive the Body of Christ worthily. And Matrimony, at least in its signification, touches this sacrament, in so far as it signifies the union of Christ with the Church, of which union the Eucharist is a figure ; hence the Apostle says (Eph. 5. 32) : This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the Church.

Thirdly, this is made clear by considering the rites of the sacraments. For nearly all the sacraments terminate in the Eucharist, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. iii, i);² thus those who have been ordained receive Holy Communion, as also do those who have been baptized, if they be adults.

The remaining sacraments may be compared to one another in several ways. For on the ground of necessity, Baptism is the greatest of the sacraments, while from the point of view of perfection. Order comes first, and Confirma-

¹PG 3, 425. ²PG 3, 424.

tion holds a middle place. The sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction are on a degree inferior to those mentioned above, because, as stated above (a. 2), they are ordered to the Christian life, not directly {per se), but accidentally, as it were, that is to say, as remedies against supervening defects. And among these, Extreme Unction is compared to Penance, as Confirmation to Baptism, in such a way that Penance is more necessary, whereas Extreme Unction is more perfect.

Reply Obj. 1. Matrimony is ordered to the common good as regards the body. But the common spiritual good of the whole Church is contained substantially in the sacrament itself of the Eucharist.

Reply Obj. 2. By Order and Confirmation the faithful of Christ are allotted to certain special duties, and this can be done by the prince alone. Consequently the conferring of these sacraments belongs exclusively to a bishop, who is, as it were, a prince in the Church. But a man is not allotted to any duty by the sacrament of the Eucharist; rather is this sacrament the end of all duties, as stated above.

Reply Obj. 3. The sacramental character, as stated above (q. lxiii, a. 3), is a kind of participation in Christ's priesthood. Therefore the sacrament that unites man to Christ Himself is greater than a sacrament that imprints Christ's character.

Reply Obj. 4. This argument holds good on the ground of necessity. For thus Baptism, being of the greatest necessity, is the greatest of the sacraments, just as Order and Confirmation have a certain excellence considered in their administration, and Matrimony by reason of its signification. For there is no reason why a thing should not be greater from a certain point of view which is not greater absolutely speaking.

Article 4. *Whether All the Sacraments Are Necessary for Salvation?*

*We proceed thus to the Fourth Article*: It seems that all the sacraments are necessary for salvation.

Objection 1. For what is not necessary seems to be superfluous. But no sacrament is superfluous, because God does nothing without a purpose. Therefore all the sacraments are necessary for salvation.

Obj. 2. Further, just as it is said of Baptism (John 3. 5): Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, so of the Eucharist is it said (John 6. 54) : Except yon eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink of His blood, you shall not have life in you. Therefore, just as Baptism is a necessary sacrament, so is the Eucharist.

Obj. 3. Further, a man can be saved without the sacrament of Baptism, provided that some unavoidable obstacle, and not his contempt for religion, debar him from the sacrament, as we shall state further on (q. lxviii, a. 2). But contempt of religion in any sacrament is a hindrance to salvation. Therefore, in like manner, all the sacraments are necessary for salvation.

On the contrary, Children are saved by Baptism alone without the other sacraments.

I answer that, Necessity with respect to end, of which we speak now, is twofold. First, a thing may be necessary so that without it the end cannot be attained; thus food is necessary for human life. And this is absolute necessity with respect to end. Secondly, a thing is said to be necessary, if, without it, the end cannot be attained so suitably ; thus a horse is necessary for a journey. But this is not absolute necessity with respect to end.

In the first way, three sacraments are necessary for salvation. Two of them are necessary to the individual: Baptism, simply and absolutely; Penance, in the case of mortal sin committed after Baptism. But the sacrament of Order is necessary to the Church, since where there is no governor the people shall fall (Prov. II. 14).

But in the second way the other sacraments are necessary. For in a sense Confirmation perfects Baptism, Extreme Unction perfects Penance, while Matrimony, by multiplying them, preserves the numbers in the Church.

Reply Obj. 1. For a thing not to be superfluous it is enough if it be necessary either in the first or the second way. It is thus that the sacraments are necessary, as stated above.

Reply Obj. 2. These words of Our Lord are to be understood of spiritual, and not of merely sacramental, eating, as Augustine explains.¹

Reply Obj. 3. Although contempt of any of the sacraments is a hindrance to salvation, yet it does not amount to contempt of the sacrament if anyone does not trouble to receive a sacrament that is not necessary for salvation. Otherwise those who do not receive Orders, and those who do not contract Matrimony, would be guilty of contempt of those sacraments.

¹Tract., XXVI, super Joann. (PL 35, 1614).

**22 CHAUCER: *Parson's Tale,* par 1-22 495a-510b esp par 22, 510b**

22 CHAUCER: *Parson's Tale,* par 1-22 495a-510b

1. Our swete lord god of hevene, that no man wol perisse, but wole that we comen alle to the knoweleche of him, and to the blisful lyf that is perdurable, amonesteth us by the prophete Jeremie, that seith in this wyse: "stondeth upon the weyes, and seeth and axeth of olde pathes (that is to seyn, of olde sentences) which is the goode wey; and walketh in that wey, and ye shul finde refresshinge for your soules," &c. Manye been the weyes espirituels that leden folk to oure Lord Jesu Crist, and to the regne of glorie. Of whiche weyes, ther is a ful noble wey and a ful covenable, which may nat faile to man ne to womman, that thurgh sinne lhath misgoon fro the righte wey of Jerusalem celestial; and this wey is cleped Penitence, of which man sholde gladly herknen and enquere with al his herte; to witen what is Penitence, and whennes it is cleped Penitence, and in how manye maneres been the accions of werkinges of Penitence, and how manye spyces ther been of Penitence, and whiche thinges apertenen and bihoven to Penitence, and whiche thinges destourben Penitence.

2. Seint Ambrose seith, that "Penitence is the pleyninge of man for the gilt that he hath doon, and na-more to do any thing for which him oghte to pleyne." And som doctour seith: "Penitence is the waymentinge of man, that sorweth for his sinne and pyneth himself for he hath misdoon." Penitence, with certeyne circumstances, is verray repentance of a man that halt him-self in sorwe and other peyne for hise giltes. And for he shal be verray penitent, he shal first biwailen the sinnes that he hath doon, and stidefastly purposen in his herte to have shrift of mouthe, and to doon satisfaccioun, and never to doon thing for which him oghte more to biwayle or to compleyne, and to continue in goode werkes: or elles his repentance may nat availle. For as seith seint Isidre: "he is a japer and a gabber, and no verray repentant, that eftsoone dooth thing, for which him oghte repente." Wepinge, and nat for to stinte to doon sinne, may nat avaylle. But nathelees, men shal hope that every tyme that man falleth, be it never so ofte, that he may arise thurgh Penitence, if he have grace: but certeinly it is greet doute. For as seith Seint Gregorie: "unnethe aryseth he out of sinne, that is charged with the charge of yvel usage." And there-

Our sweet Lord God of Heaven, Who will destroy no man, but would have all come unto the knowledge of Him and to the blessed life that is everlasting, admonishes us by the Prophet Jeremiah, who says thus: "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths (that is to say, the old wisdom) where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls," etc. Many are the spiritual ways that lead folk unto Our Lord Jesus Christ and to the Kingdom of Glory. Of which ways there is a right noble way and a proper one, which will not fail either man or woman who through sin has gone astray from the right way to the Heavenly Jerusalem; and this way is called penitence, as to which man should gladly hear and inquire with all his heart, in order that he may learn what penitence is, and why it is called penitence, and in how many ways penitence functions, and how many kinds of penitence there are, and what things appertain and are necessary to penitence, and what things hinder it.

Saint Ambrose says that "penitence is the mourning of man for the sin that he has done, and the resolve to do no more anything for which he ought to mourn." And another doctor says: "Penitence is the lamenting of man, who sorrows for his sin and punishes himself because he has done amiss." Penitence, under certain circumstances, is the true repentance of a man that goes in sorrow and other pain for his misdeeds. And that he shall be truly penitent, he shall first regret the sins that he has done, and steadfastly purpose in his heart to make oral confession, and to do penance, and nevermore to do anything for which he ought to feel regret or to mourn, and to continue on good works; or else his repentance will avail him nothing. For, as says Saint Isidore: "He is a mocker and a liar and no true penitent who does again a thing for which he ought to repent." Weeping, when not accompanied by a refusal to sin, shall not avail. But, nevertheless, men should hope that every time a man falls, be it never so often, he may arise through penitence, if he have grace; but certainly there is great doubt of this. For, as Saint Gregory says: "With difficulty shall he arise out of sin who is burdened with the burden of evil habit." And therefore repentant folk, who keep from

Sin and abandon sin ere sin abandon them, Holy Church holds them to be sure oi their salvation. And he that must and verily repents in his last moments, Holy Church vet hopes tor his salvation, what of the great mercy of Our Lord Jesus Christ, because of his repentance; but take you the certain way.

And now, since I have declared unto you what penitence is, now shall you understand that there are three deeds required by penitence. The first deed is that a man be baptized after he has sinned. Saint Augustine says: "Save he be repentant for his former sinful life, he shall not begin to lead the new clean life." For truly, if he be baptized without repentance for his old offence, he receives the sign of baptism but not the grace nor the remission of his sins, until he have true repentance. Another defect is this, that men do deadly sin after they have received baptism. The third defect is that men fall into venial sins after their baptism, and from day to day. Thereof Saint Augustine says that "penitence of good and humble folk is the penitence of every day."

The kinds of penitence are three. One of them is public, another is general, and the third is private. That form of penitence which is public is of two kinds: as to be expelled from Holy Church in Lent, for the slaughter of children and such-like things. Another is, when a man has sinned openly, of which sin the shame is openly spoken of in the community; and then Holy Church, by judgment rendered, constrains him to do open penance. Common or general penitence is when priests enjoin men collectively in certain cases, as, peradventure, to go naked on pilgrimages, or barefoot. Private penitence is that which men do continually for their sins, whereof we confess privately and receive a private penance.

Now shall you understand what is necessary to a true and perfect penitence. And this stands upon three things: contrition of heart, confession by word of mouth, and restitution. As to which Saint John Chrysostom says: "Penitence constrains a man to accept cheerfully every pain that is put upon him, with contrition of heart and oral confession, with restitution; and in doing all of acts of humility." And this is a fruitful penitence for three things wherein we anger Our Lord Jesus Christ; that is to say, by delight in thinking, by recklessness in speaking, and by wicked sinful works. And over against these wicked offences is penitence, which may be likened unto a tree.

The root of this tree is contrition, which hides itself away in the heart of him who is truly repentant, just as the root of another tree hides within the earth. Prom the root contrition springs a trunk that bears branches and leaves of confession and the fruit of penance, as to which Christ says in His gospel: "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance." For by this fruit may men know this tree, and not by the root that is hidden in the heart of man, nor

fore repentant folk, that stinte for to sinne, and forlete sinne er that sinne forlcte hem, holy chirche holdeth hem siker of hir savacioun. And he that sinneth, and verraily repenteth him in his laste ende, holy chirche yet hopeth his savacioun, by the grete mercy of oure lord Jesu Crist, for his repentaunce; but tak the siker wey.

3. And now, sith I have declared yow what thing is Penitence, now shul ye understonde that ther been three accions of Penitence. The firste accion of Penitence is, that a man be baptized after that he hath sinned. Seint Augustin seith: "but he be penitent for his olde sinful lyf, he may nat biginne the newe clene lif." For certes, if he be baptized withouten penitence of his olde gilt, he rcceivcth the mark of baptisme, but nat the grace ne the remission of his sinnes, til he have repentance verray. Another defaute is this, that men doon deedly sinne after that they han received baptisme. The thridde defaute is, that men fallen in venial sinnes after hir baptisme, fro day to day. Ther-of seith Seint Augustin, that "penitence of goode and humble folk is the penitence of every day."

4. The spyces of Penitence been three. That oon of hem is solempne, another is commune, and the thridde is privee. Thilke penance that is solempne, is in two maneres; as to be put out of holy chirche in lente, for slaughtre of children, and swich maner thing. Another is, whan a man hath sinned openly, of which sinne the fame is openly spoken in the contree; and thanne holy chirche by jugement destreineth him for to do open penaunce. Commune penaunce is that preestes enjoinen men comunly in certeyn caas; as for to goon, peraventure, naked in pilgrimages, or bare-foot. Privee penaunce is thilke that men doon alday for privee sinnes, of whiche we shryve us prively and receive privee penaunce.

5. Now shaltow understande what is behovely and necessarie to verray parfit Penitence. And this stant on three thinges; Contricioun of herte, Confessioun of Mouth, and Satisfaccioun. For which seith Seint John Crisostom: "Penitence destreyneth a man to accepte benignely every peyne that him is enjoyned, with contricion of herte, and shrift of mouth, with satisfaccion; and in werkinge of alle maner humilitee." And this is fruitful Penitence agayn three thinges in whiche we wratthe oure lord Jesu Crist: this is to seyn, by delyt in thinkinge, by recchelesnesse in spekinge, and by wikked sinful werkinge. And agayns thise wikkede giltes is Penitence, that may be lykned un-to a tree.

6. The rote of this tree is Contricion, that hydeth him in the herte of him that is verray repentant, right as the rote of a tree hydeth him in the erthe. Of the rote of Contricion springeth a stalke, that bereth braunches and leves of Confession, and fruit of Satisfaccion. For which Crist seith in his gospel: "dooth digne fruit of Penitence"; for by this fruit may men knowe this tree, and nat by the rote that is hid in the herte of man, ne by the

braunches ne by the leves of Confession. And therefore oure Lord Jesu Crist seith thus: "by the fruit of hem ye shul knowen hem." Of this rote eek springeth a seed of grace, the which seed is moder of sikernesse, and this seed is egre and hoot. The grace of this seed springeth of god, thurgh remembrance of the day of dome and on the peynes of helle. Of this matere seith Salomon, that "in the drede of god man forleteth his sinne." The hete of this seed is the love of god, and the desiring of the joye perdurable. This hete draweth the herte of a man to god, and dooth him haten his sinne. For soothly, ther is no-thing that savoureth so wel to a child as the milk of his norice, ne no-thing is to him more abhominable than thilke milk whan it is medled with other mete. Right so the sinful man that loveth his sinne, him semeth that it is to him most swete of any-thing; but fro that tyme that he loveth sadly our lord Jesu Crist, and desireth the lif perdurable, ther nis to him no-thing more abhominable. For soothly, the lawe of god is the love of god; for which David the prophete seith: "I have loved thy lawe and hated wikkednesse and hate"; he that loveth god kepeth his lawe and his word. This tree saugh the prophete Daniel in spirit, up-on the avision of the king Nabugodonosor, whan he conseiled him to do penitence. Penaunce is the tree of lyf to hem that it re- . ceiven, and he that holdeth him in verray penitence is blessed; after the sentence of Salomon.

7. In this Penitence or Contricion man shal understonde foure thinges, that is to seyn, what is Contricion: and whiche been the causes that moeven a man to Contricion: and how he sholde be contrit: and what Contricion availleth to the soule. Thanne is it thus: that Contricion is the verray sorwe that a man receiveth in his herte for his sinnes, with sad purpos to shryve him, and to do penaunce, and nevermore to do sinne. And this sorwe shal been in this manere, as seith seint Bernard: "it shal been hevy and grevous, and ful sharpe and poinant in herte." First, for man hath agilt his lord and his creatour; and more sharpe and poinant, for he hath agilt his fader celestial; and yet more sharpe and poinant, for he hath wrathed and agilt him that boghte him; which with his precious blood hath delivered us fro the bondes of sinne, and fro the crueltee of the devel and fro the peynes of helle.

8. The causes that oghte moeve a man to Contricion been six. First, a man shal remembre him of hise sinnes; but loke he that thilke remembrance ne be to him no delyt by no wey, but greet shame and sorwe for his gilt. For Job seith: "sinful men doon werkes worthy of Confession." And therefore seith Ezechie: "I wol remembre me alle the yeres of my lyf, in bitternesse of myn herte." And god seith in the Apocalips: "remembreth yow fro whennes that ye been falle"; for biforn that tyme that ye sinned, ye were the children of god, and limes of the regne of god; but for your sinne ye been woxen thral and foul, and membres of the

by the branches, nor by the leaves of confession. And therefore Our Lord Jesus Christ says thus: "By their fruits ye shall know them." From this root, too, springs a seed of grace, the which seed is the mother of security, and this seed is eager and hot. The grace of this seed springs from God, through remembrance of the day of doom and the pains of Hell. Of this matter says Solomon: "Fear the Lord, and depart from evil." The heat of this seed is the love of God and the desiring of the joy everlasting. This heat draws the heart of man unto God and causes him to hate his sin. For truly there is nothing that tastes so well to a child as the milk of its nurse, nor is there anything more abhorrent to it than this same milk when it is mingled with other food. Just so, to the sinful man who loves his sin, it seems that it is sweeter than anything else; but from the time that he begins to love devoutly Our Lord Jesus Christ, and desires the life everlasting, there is to him nothing more abominable. For truly the law of God is the love of God; whereof David the prophet says: "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." He that loves God keeps His law and His word. The Prophet Daniel saw this tree in spirit following upon the vision of King Nebuchadnezzar, when he counselled him to do penance. Penance is the tree of life to those who receive it, and he that holds himself in true penitence is blessed, according to the opinion of Solomon.

In this penitence or contrition man shall understand four things, that is to say, what contrition is, and what the causes are that move a man to contrition, and how he should be contrite, and what contrition avails the soul. Then it is thus: that contrition is the real sorrow that a man receives within his heart for his sins, with firm purpose to confess them and to do penance and nevermore to do sin. And this sorrow shall be in this manner, as says Saint Bernard: "It shall be heavy and grievous and sharp and poignant in the heart." First, because man has offended his Lord and his Creator; and more sharp and poignant because he has offended his Heavenlv Father; and yet more sharp and poignant because he has angered and offended Him Who redeemed him, Who with His precious blood has delivered us from the bonds of sin and from the cruelty of the Devil and from the pains of Hell.

The causes that ought to move a man to contrition are six. First, a man should remember his sins, vet see to it that this same remembrance be not to him in any wise a delight, but only great shame and sorrow or his guilt. For Job says: that sinful men do things that ought to be confessed. And therefore Hezekiah says: "I will remember all the years of mv life, in bitterness of heart." And God says in the Apocalypse: "Remember from whence thou art fallen." For before that time when first you sinned, you were the children of God and members of the Kingdom of God; but because of your sin you are become slavish and vile, and the children of the Fiend,

hated of the angels, the slander of Holy Church, and food of the false serpent. You are perpetual fuel for the fire of Hell. And yet more vile and abominable, for you offend often and often, like the dog that returns to his vomit. And you are even yet more vile, for your long continuation in sin and your sinful habits, for which you are as filthy in your sin as a beast in its dung. Such thoughts cause a man to take shame to himself for his sinning, and not delight, as God says by the Prophet Ezekiel: "Thou shalt remember thy ways and be ashamed." Truly, sins are the ways that lead folk unto Hell.

The second reason why a man ought to have contempt for sin is this: that, as Saint Peter says, "He that sinneth is the slave of sin." And sin puts a man into deep thralldom. And thereupon the Prophet Ezekiel says: "I went sorrowfully, in abhorrence of myself." And truly, well ought a man to abhor sin and to release himself from that thralldom and degradation. And see what Seneca says about this matter. He says thus: "Though I knew that neither God nor man should ever be cognizant of it, yet would I disdain to commit a sin." And the same Seneca also says: "I am born to greater things than to be thrall to mv body, or than to make of my body a thrall." Nor a viler thrall may man or woman make of his or her body than by giving that body over to sin. And were it the lowest churl, or the lowest woman, that lives, and the least worth, yet is he or she then more vile and more in servitude. Ever from the higher degree than man falls, the more is he enthralled, and by so much the more to God and to the world is he vile and abominable. O good God! Well ought a man to have disdain of sin; since, because of sin, whereas he was once free, now is he in bondage. And thereupon Saint Augustine says: "If thou have disdain for thy servant, if he offend or sin, have thou then disdain that thou shouldest do any sin." Have regard of your worth, that you be not foul unto yourself. Alas! Well ought they then to disdain to be servants and thralls to sin, and to be sorely ashamed of themselves, when God of His endless goodness has set them in high place, or given them understanding, bodily strength, health, beauty, prosperity, and redeemed them with His heart's blood, who now so unnaturally, in face of His nobleness, requite Him so vilely as to slaughter their own souls. O good God! You women, who are of so great beauty, remember the proverb of Solomon, who says: "A fair woman who is the fool of her body is like a gold ring in the snout of a sow." For just as a sow roots deep into every ordure, so does she root her beauty into the stinking filth of sin.

The third cause that ought to move a man to contrition is fear of the day of doom and of the horrible pains of Hell. For as Saint Jerome says: "Every time that I remember the day of doom I quake; for when I eat or drink or do whatever thing, ever it seems to me that the trump sounds in my ear, bidding the

feend, hate of aungels, sclaundre of holy chirche, and fode of the false serpent; perpetuel matere of the fyr of helle. And yet more foul and abhominable, for ye trespassen so ofte tyme, as doth the hound that retourneth to eten his spewing. And yet be ye fouler for your longe continuing in sinne and your sinful usage, for which ye be roten in your sinne, as a becst in his dong. Swiche manere of thoghtes maken a man to have shame of his sinne, and no delyt, as god seith by the prophete Ezechiel: "ye shal remembre yow of youre weyes, and they shuln displese yow." Sothly, sinnes been the weyes that leden folk to helle.

9. The seconde cause that oghte make a man to have desdeyn of sinne is this: that, as seith seint Peter, "who-so that doth sinne is thral of sinne"; and sinne put a man in greet thraldom. And therefore seith the prophete Ezechiel: "I wente sorweful in desdayn of my-self." And certes, wel oghte a man have desdayn of sinne, and withdrawe him from that thraldom and vileinye. And lo, what seith Seneca in this matere. He seith thus: "though I wiste that neither god ne man ne sholde nevere knowe it, yet wolde I have desdayn for to do sinne." And the same Seneca also seith: "I am born to gretter thinges than to be thral to my body, or than for to maken of my body a thral." Ne a fouler thral may no man ne womman maken of his body, than for to yeven his body to sinne. AJ were it the fouleste cherl, or the fouleste womman that liveth, and leest of value, yet is he thanne more foule and more in servitute. Evere fro the hyer degree that man falleth, the more is he thral, and more to god and to the world vile and abhominable. O gode god, wel oghte man have desdayn of sinne; sith that, thurgh sinne, ther he was free, now is he maked bonde. And therfore seyth Seint Augustin: "if thou hast desdayn of thy servant, if he agilte or sinne, have thou thanne desdayn that thou thyself sholdest do sinne." Take reward of thy value, that thou ne be to foul to thy-self. Alias! wel oghten they thanne have desdayn to been servauntz and thralles to sinne, and sore been ashamed of hem-self, that god of his endelees goodnesse hath set hem in heigh estaat, or yeven hem wit, strengthe of body, hele, beautee, prosperitee, and boghte hem fro the deeth with his herte blood, that they so unkindely, agayns his gentilesse, quyten him so vileinsly, to slaughtre of hir owene soules. O gode god, ye wommen that been of so greet beautee, remembreth yow of the proverbe of Salomon, that seith: "he lykneth a fair womman, that is a fool of hir body, lyk to a ring of gold that were in the groyn of a sowe." For right as a sowe wroteth in everich ordure, so wroteth she hir beautee in the stinkinge ordure of sinne.

10. The thridde cause that oghte moeve a man to Contricion, is drede of the day of dome, and of the horrible peynes of helle. For as seint Jerome seith: "at every tyme that me remembreth of the day of dome, I quake; for whan I ete or drinke, or what-so that I do, evere semeth me that the trompe

sowneth in myn ere: riseth up, ye that been dede, and cometh to the jugement." O gode god, muchel oghte a man to drede swich a jugement, "ther-as we shullen been alle," as seint Poul seith, "biforn the sete of oure lord Jesu Crist"; wher-as he shal make a general congregacion, wher-as no man may been absent. For certes, there availleth noon essoyne ne excusacion. And nat only that oure defautes shullen be juged , but eek that alle oure werkes shullen openly be knowe. And as seith Seint Bernard: "ther ne shal no pledinge availle, ne no sleighte; we shullen yeven rekeninge of everich ydel word." Ther shul we han a juge that may nat been deceived ne corrupt. And why? For, certes, alle our thoghtes been discovered as to him; ne for preyere ne for mede he shal nat been corrupt. And therefore seith Salomon: "the wratthe ofgod ne wol nat spare no wight, for preyere ne for yifte"; and therfore, at the day of doom, ther nis noon hope to escape. Wherfore, as seith Seint Anselm: "ful greet angwissh shul the sinful folk have at that tyme; ther shal the sterne and wrothe juge sitte above, and under him the horrible put of helle open to destroyen him that moot biknowen hise sinnes, whiche sinnes openly been shewed bifom god and biforn every creature. And on the left syde, mo develes than herte may bithinke, for to harie and drawe the sinful soules to the pyne of helle. And with-inne the hertes of folk shal be the bytinge conscience, and with-oute-forth shal be the world al brenninge. ^Thider shal thanne the wrecched sinful man flee to hyden him? Certes, he may nat hyden him; he moste come forth and shewen him." For certes, as seith seint Jerome: "the erthe shal casten him out of him, and the see also; and the eyr also, that shal be ful of thonder-clappes and lightninges." Now sothly, who-so wel remembreth him ofthise thinges, I gesse that his sinne shal nat turne him in-to delyt, but to greet sorwe, for drede of the peyne of helle. And therfore seith Job to god: "suffre, lord, that I may a whyle biwaille and wepe, er I go with-oute returning to the derke lond, covered with the derknesse of deeth; to the lond of misese and of derknesse, where-as is the shadwe of deeth; where-as ther is noon ordre or ordinance, but grisly drede that evere shal laste." Lo, here may ye seen that Job preyde respyt a whyle, to biwepe and waille his trespas; for soothly oon day of respyt is bettre than al the tresor of the world. And for-as-muche as a man may acquiten him-self biforn god by penitence in this world, and nat by tresor, therefore sholde he preye to god to yeve him respyt a whyle, to biwepe and biwaillen his trespas. For certes, al the sorwe that a man mighte make fro the beginning of the world, nis but a litel thing at regard of the sorwe of helle. The cause why that Job clepeth helle "the lond of derknesse"; understondeth that he clepeth it "londe" or erthe, for it is stable, and nevere shal faille; "derk," for he that is in helle hath defaute of light material. For certes, the derke light, that shal come out of the fyr that evere shal brenne, shal turne him al to peyne that is in helle;

dead arise and come to judgment." O good God! Greatly ought a man to fear such a judgment, "Where we shall be all." as Saint Paul says, "before the throne of Our Lord Jesus Christ." And there we shall compose a general congregation, whence no man shall absent himself. For truly there shall avail neither essoin nor excuse. And not only shall our faults be judged, but all our deeds shall openly be made known. As Saint Bernard says: "There shall no pleading avail, and no trickery; we shall give reckoning for every idle word." There shall we have a Judge that cannot be corrupted or deceived. And why? Because, in truth, all our thoughts are known unto Him; nor for prayer nor for bribing shall He be corrupted. And therefore says Solomon: "The wrath of God will spare no one, either for prayer or gifts." Therefore, at the day of doom, there shall be no hope of escape. Wherefore, as says Saint Anselm: "Great anguish shall all sinful folk have at that time; there shall the stern and angry Judge sit above, and under Him the horrible pit of Hell, open to destroy him who must acknowledge his sins, which sins shall be openly showed before God and before all creatures. And on the left side more devils than any heart can think, to harry and to draw the sinful souls to the punishment of Hell. And within the hearts of folk shall be the tearing of conscience and without shall be the world all burning. Whither then shall the wretched sinful man flee to hide himself? Certainly he shall not hide; he must come forth and show himself." For truly, as says Saint Jerome: "The earth shall cast him forth and the sea also; aye, and the air, which shall be filled with thunders and with lightnings." Now, indeed, whoso well thinks of these things, I suppose that his sin shall not be a delight within him, but a great sorrow, for fear of the pain of Hell. And therefore said Job to God: "Let me take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness as darkness itself Land of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Lo, here may it be seen that Job prayed for respite to weep and to bewail his trespass; for indeed one day of respite is better than all the treasure of the world. And for as much as man may acquit himself before God by penitence in this world, and not by treasure, therefore should he pray to God to grant him respite for a while to weep and to bewail his sins. For truly, all the sorrow that a man might feel from the beginning of the world is but a little thing in comparison with the sorrows of Hell. As to the reason why Job called Hell the "land of darkness," it is to be understood that he called it "land" or "earth" because it is stable and never shall fail; "dark" because he that is in Hell lacks the materials for light. For truly the dark light that shall come out of the fire that burns for ever shall turn him all to pain who is in Hell; for it shall show unto him the horrible devils that torment him. "Covered with the darkness of death:" that is to say, that he who is in Hell shall lack the sight of God; for truly, to see God is life everlasting. "The dark.

ness of death" is the sin which the wretched man has done, which hinders his seeing the face of God; just as does a cloud that comes between us and the sun. "Land of ill ease:" because there are three kinds of pains against three things that folk of the world have in this present life, that is to say, honours, delights, and riches. Over against honours they have in Hell shame and contusion. For well you know that men call "honour" the reverence that man gives to man; but in Hell is no honour or reverence. For indeed no more reverence shall «be done there to a king than to a knave. As to which God says, by the Prophet Jeremiah: "They that scorn me shall be scorned." "Honour" is also called great lordship; but there no man shall serve another save to his harm and torment. "Honour," again, subsists in great dignity and rank; but in Hell all they shall be trodden upon by devils. And God says: "The horrible devils shall go and come upon the heads of the damned." And this is because the higher they were in this life, the lower shall they lie and be defiled in Hell. Against the riches of this world shall they have the misery of poverty; and this poverty shall be of four kinds: lack of treasure, whereof David says: "They that trust in their wealth, boast themselves in the multitude of their riches, they shall sleep in the darkness of death, and nothing shall they find in their hands of all their treasure." And, moreover, the misery of Hell shall consist of lack of food and drink. For God says thus, through Moses: "They shall be wasted with hunger, and the birds of Hell shall devour them with bitter death, and the gall of the dragon shall be their drink, and the venom of the dragon their morsels." And, furthermore, their misery shall be for lack of clothing, for they shall be naked of body save for the fire wherein they burn, and for other filth; and naked shall they be of soul, devoid of all virtues, which are the clothing of the soul. Where shall be then the gay robes and the soft sheets and the soft shirts? Behold what God says by the prophet Isaiah: "Under them shall be strewed moths and their covering shall be of the worms of Hell." And still further, their misery shall lie in lack of friends; for he is not poor who has good friends; but there there is no friend; for neither God nor any other shall be friend to them, and each of them shall hate all others with a deadly hatred. "The sons and the daughters shall rebel against father and mother, and kindred against kindred, and each of them shall curse and despise the others," both day and night, as says God through the Prophet Micah. And the loving people that once loved each other so passionately, each of them would eat the other if he might. For how should they love in the torments of Hell who hated each other in the prosperity of this life? For trust it well, their carnal love was deadly hate; as says the Prophet David: "Whoso loveth wickedness hateth his own soul." And whoso hates his own soul, truly he may love no other, in any wise. And therefore, in Hell is no solace nor any friendship, but ever the more fleshly relationships there are in Hell, the more cursings and

for it sheweth him to the horrible develes that him tormenten. "Covered with the derknesse of deeth": that is to seyn, that he that is in helle shal have defaute of the sighte of god; for certcs, the sighte of god is the lyf perdurable. "The derknesse of deeth" been the sinnes that the wrecched man hath doon, whiche that destourben him to see the face of god; right as doth a derk cloude bitwixe us and the sonne. "Lond of misese": by-cause that ther been three maneres of defautes, agayn three thinges that folk of this world han in this present lyf, that is to seyn, honours, delyces, and richesses. Agayns honour, have they in helle shame and confusion. For wel ye woot that men clepen "honour" the reverence that man doth to man; but in helle is noon honour ne reverence. For certes, na-more reverence shal be doon there to a king than to a knave. For which god seith by the prophete Jeremye: "thilke folk that me despysen shul been in despyt." "Honour" is eek cleped greet lordshipe; ther shal no man serven other but of harm and torment. "Honour" is eek cleped greet dignitee and heighnesse; but in helle shul they been al fortroden of develes. And god seith: "the horrible develes shulle goon and comen up-on the hevedes of the dampned folk." And this is for-as-muche as, the hyer that they were in this present lyf, the more shulle they been abated and defouled in helle. Agayns the richesses of this world, shul they han misese of poverte; and this poverte shal been in foure thinges: in defaute of tresor, of which that David seith; "the riche folk, that embraceden and oneden al hir herte to tresor of this world, shul slepe in the slepinge of deeth; and no-thing ne shul they finden in hir handes of al hir tresor." And more-over, the miseise of helle shal been in defaute of mete and drinke. For god seith thus by Moyses; "they shul been wasted with hunger, and the briddes of helle shul devouren hem with bitter deeth, and the galle of the dragon shal been hir drinke, and the venim of the dragon hir morsels." And forther-over, hir miseise shal been in defaute of clothing: for they shulle be naked in body as of clothing, save the fyr in which they brenne and othere filthes; and naked shul they been of soule, of alle manere vertues, which that is the clothing of the soule. Where been thanne the gaye robes and the softe shetes and the smale shertes? Lo, what seith god of hem by the prophete Isaye: "that under hem shul been strawed motthes, and hir covertures shulle been of wormes of helle." And forther-over, hir miseise shal been in defaute of freendes; for he nis nat povre that hath goode freendes, but there is no freend; for neither god ne no creature shal been freend to hem, and everich of hem shal haten other with deedly hate. "The sones and the doghtren shullen rebellen agayns fader and mooder, and kinrede agayns kinredc, and chyden and despysen everich of hem other," bothe day and night, as god seith by the prophete Michias. And the lovinge children, that whylom loveden so fleshly everich other, wolden everich of hem eten other if they mighte. For how

sholden they love hem togidre in the peyne of helle, whan they hated ech of hem other in the prosperitee of this lyf? For truste wel, hir fleshly love was deedly hate; as seith the prophete David: "who-so that loveth wikkednesse he hateth his soule." And who-so hateth his owene soule, certes, he may love noon other wight in no manere. And therfore, in helle is no solas ne no frendshipe, but evere the more fleshly kinredes that been in helle, the more cursinges, the more chydinges, and the more deedly hate ther is among hem. And forther-over, they shul have defaute of alle manere delyces; for certes, delyces been after the appetytes of the fyve wittes, as sighte, heringe, smellinge, savoringe, and touchinge. But in helle hir sighte shal be ful of derknesse and of smoke, and therfore ful of teres; and hir heringe, ful of waymentinge and of grintinge of teeth, as seith Jesu Crist; hir nosethirles shullen be ful of stinkinge stink. And as seith Isaye the prophete: "hir savoring shal be ful of bitter galle." And touching of al hir body, y-covered with "fyr that nevere shal quenche, and with wormes that nevere shul dyen," as god seith by the mouth of Isaye. And for-as-muche as they shul nat wene that they may dyen for peyne, and by hir deeth flee fro peyne, that may they understonden by the word of Job, that seith: "ther-as is the shadwe of deeth." Certes, a shadwe hath the lyknesse of the thing of which it is shadwe, but shadwe is nat the same thing of which it is shadwe. Right so fareth the payne of helle; it is lyk deeth for the horrible anguissh, and why? For it peyneth hem evere, as though they feholde dye anon; but certes they shal nat dye. For as seith Seint Gregorie: "to wrecche caytives shal bedeethwith-outedeeth,andendewith-outenende, and defaute with-oute failinge. For hir deeth shal alwey liven, and hir ende shal everemo biginne, and hir defaute shal nat faille." And therfore seith Seint John the Evangelist: "they shullen folwe deeth, and they shul nat finde him; and they shul desyren to dye, and deeth shal flee fro hem." And eek Job seith: that "in helle is noon ordre of rule." And al-be-it so that god hath creat alle thinges in right ordre, and no-thing with-outen ordre, but alle thinges been ordeyned and nombred; yet nathelees they that been dampned been no-thing in ordre, ne holden noon ordre. For the erthe ne shal bere hem no fruit. For, as the prophete David seith: "god shal destroye the fruit of the erthe as fro hem"; ne water ne shal yeve hem no moisture; ne the eyr no refresshing, ne fyr no light. For as seith seint Basilie: "the brenninge of the fyr of this world shal god yeven in helle to hem that been dampned; but the light and the cleernesse shal be yeven in hevene to hise children"; right as the gode man yeveth flesh to hise children, and bones to his houndes. And for they shullen have noon hope to escape, seith seint Job atte laste: that "ther shal horrour and grisly drede dwellen with-outen ende." Horrour is alwey drede of harm that is to come, and this drede shal evere dwelle in the hertes of hem that been dampned. And therfore nan they lorn

the more deadly hates there are among them. And, again, they shall lack every kind of pleasure; for truly, pleasures are according to the appetites of the five senses, sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. But in Hell their sight shall be full of darkness and of smoke, and therefore full of tears; and their hearing lull of wailing and the gnashing of teeth, as says Jesus Christ; their nostrils shall be full of a stinking smell. And, as the Prophet Isaiah says, "their savouring shall be of bitter gall." And as for touch, all the body shall be covered with "fire that never shall be quenched and with worms that never shall die,” as God says by the mouth of Isaiah. And for as much as they shall not think that they may die of pain, and by death thus flee from pain, then may they understand the words of Job, who said, "There is the shadow of death." Certainly a shadow has the likeness of that whereof it is the shadow, but the shadow is not the substance. Just so it is with the pain of Hell; it is like unto death because of the horrible anguish. And why ? Because it pains for ever, and as if they should die at every moment; but indeed they shall not die. For as Saint Gregory says: "To these wretched captives shall be given death without death, and end without end, and want without ceasing." And thereupon says Saint John the Evangelist: "They shall seek for death and they shall not find it; and they shall desire to die and death shall flee from them." And Job, also, says: "Death, without any order." And though it be that God has created all things in right order, and nothing at all without order, but all things are ordered and numbered; yet, nevertheless, they that are damned have no order, nor hold to any order. For the earth shall bear them no fruit. For, as the Prophet David says: "God shall destroy the fruits of the earth from them." No water shall give them moisture, nor the air refreshment, nor the fire a light. For, as Saint Basil says: "The burning of the fire of this world shall God send into Hell unto the damned souls there, but the light and the radiance thereof shall be given in Heaven unto His children"—just as the good man gives flesh to his children and bones to his dogs. And since they shall have no hope of escape, Saint Job says at the last that horror and grisly fear shall dwell there without end. Horror is always the fear of evil that is to come, and this fear shall dwell for ever in the hearts of the damned. And therefore have they lost all their hope, and for seven causes. First, because God their Judge shall be without mercy to them; they may not please Him, nor may they please any of His saints; they can give nothing for their ransom; they shall have no voice wherewith to speak to Him; they cannot flee from pain; and they have no goodness within themselves which they might show to deliver them out of pain. And therefore says Solomon: "The wicked man dieth; and when he is dead he shall have no hope of escaping from pain." Whosoever, then, will well understand these pains, and bethink him well that he has deserved these very pains for his sins, certainly he shall have more longing to sigh and weep than ever

to sing and play. For, as Solomon says: "Whoso shall have the wisdom to know the pains th.it have been established and ordained for the punishment of pain, he will feel sorrow." "This same knowledge," says Saint Augustine, "maketh a man to bewail within his heart."

The fourth point that ought to cause a man to feel contrition is the unhappy memory of the good that he has left here on earth; also the good that he has lost. Truly, the good deeds that he has left are either those that he wrought before he fell into mortal sin, or the good deeds he did while he lived in sin. Indeed the good deeds he did before he fell into sin have been all deadened and stultified and rendered null and void by the repeated sinning. The other good deeds, which he wrought while he lay in mortal sin, they are utterly dead as to the effect they might have had on his life everlasting in Heaven. And then the same good deeds that have been rendered null by repeated sinning, which good works he wrought while he stood in a state of grace, shall never quicken again without an utter penitence. And thereof God says, by the mouth of Ezekiel: "If the righteous man shall turn again from his righteousness, and do wickedness, shall he live?" Nay, for all the good works that he has wrought shall never be held in memory, for he shall die in his sin. And thereupon, as to that same chapter, Saint Gregory says thus: "That we shall understand this principally: that when we do mortal sin it is for naught that we tell of or draw from memory the good works that we have wrought before." For, certainly, in the doing of mortal sin there is no trusting to the help of good that we have wrought before; that is to say, as it affects the everlasting life in Heaven. But notwithstanding this, the good deeds quicken again and return again, and help and are of avail in attaining the everlasting life in Heaven, when we have contrition. But indeed the good deeds that men do while they are in deadly sin, because they are done in deadly sin, shall never quicken again. For truly, that thing which never had life may never quicken; nevertheless, albeit these deeds avail nothing as to the perdurable life, yet they help to lighten the pains of Hell, or else to acquire temporal riches, or else, because of them, God will enlighten and illumine the heart of the sinful man to be repentant; and also they avail in accustoming a man to the doing of good deeds, to the end that the Fiend has less

al hir hope, for sevene causes. First, for god that is hir juge shal be with-outen mercy to hem; ne they may nat plese him, ne noon of hise halwes; ne they ne may yeve no-thing for hir raunson; ne they have no vois to speke to him; ne they may nat flee fro peyne; ne they have no goodnesse in hem, that they mowe shewe to delivere hem fro peyne. And therfore seith Salomon: "the wikked man dyeth; and whan he is deed, he shal have noon hope to escape fro peyne." Who-so thanne wolde wel understande these peynes, and bithinke him weel that he hath deserved thilke peynes for his sinnes, certes, he sholde have more talent to syken and to wepe than for to singen and to pleye. For as that seith Salomon: "who-so that hadde the science to knowe the peynes that been establissed and ordeyned for sinne, he wolde make sorwe." "Thilke science," as seith seint Augustin, "maketh a man to waymenten in hisherte."

11. The fourthe point, that oghte maken a man to have contricion, is the sorweful remembrance of the good that he hath left to doon here in erthe; and eek the good that he hath lorn. Soothly, the gode werkes that he hath left, outher they been the gode werkes that he wroghte er he fel in- to deedly sinne, or elles the gode werkes that he wroghte while he lay in sinne. Soothly, the gode werkes, that he dide biforn that he fil in sinne, been al mortified and astoned and dulled by the ofte sinning. The othere gode werkes, that he wroghte whyl he lay in deedly sinne, they been outrely dede as to the lyf perdurable in hevene. Thanne thilke gode werkes that been mortified by ofte sinning, whiche gode werkes he dide whyl he was in charitee, ne mowe nevere quiken agayn with-outen verray penitence. And therof seith god, by the mouth of Ezechiel: that, "if the rightful man returne again from his rightwisnesse and werke wikkednesse, shal he five?" Nay; for alle the gode werkes that he hath wroght ne shul nevere been in remembrance; for he shal dyen in his sinne. And up-on thilke chapiter seith seint Gregorie thus: "that we shull understonde this principally; that whan we doon deedly sinne, it is for noght thanne to rehercen or drawen in-to memorie the gode werkes that we nan wroght biforn." For certes, in the werkinge of the deedly sinne, ther is no trust to no good werk that we han doon biforn; that is to seyn, as for to have thereby the lyf perdurable in hevene. But nathelees, the gode werkes quiken agayn, and comen agayn, and helpen, and availlen to have the lyf perdurable in hevene, whan we han contricion. But soothly, the gode werkes that men doon whyl they been in deedly sinne, for-as-muche as they were doon in deedly sinne, they may nevere quiken agayn. For certes, thing that nevere hadde lyf may nevere quikene; and nathelees, al-be-it that they ne availle night to han the lyf perdurable, yet availlen they to abregge of the peyne of helle, or elles to geten temporal richesse, or elles that god wole the rather enlumine and lightne the herte of the sinful man to have repentance; and eek they availlen for to usen

a man to doon gode werkes, that the feend have the lasse power of his soule. And thus the curteis lord Jesu Crist wole that no good werk be lost; for in somwhat it shal availle. But for-as-muche as the gode werkes that men doon whyl they been in good lyf, been al mortified by sinne folwinge; and eek, sith that alle the gode werkes that men doon whyl they been in deedly synne, been outrely dede as for to have the lyf perdurable; wel may that man, that no good werke ne dooth, singe thilke newe Frenshe song: "Jay tout perdu mon temps et mon labour." For certes, sinne bireveth a man bothe goodnesse of nature and eek the goodnesse of grace. For soothly, the grace of the holy goost fareth lyk fyr, that may nat been ydel; for fyr faileth anoon as it forleteth his wirkinge, and right so grace fayleth anoon as it forleteth his werkinge. Than leseth the sinful man the goodnesse of glorie, that only is bihight to gode men that labouren and werken. Wel may he be sory thanne, that oweth al his lif to god as longe as he hath lived, and eek as longe as he shal live, that no goodnesse ne hath to paye with his dette to god, to whom he oweth al his lyf. For trust wel, "he shal yeven acountes," as seith seint Bernard, "of alle the godes that nan be yeven him in this present lyf, and how he hath hem despended; in so muche that ther shal nat perisse an heer of his heed, ne a moment of an houre ne shal nat perisse of his tyme, that he ne shal yeve of it a rekening."

12. The fifthe thing that oghte moeve a man to contricion, is remembrance of the passion that oure lord Jesu Crist suffred for oure sinnes. For, as seith seint Bernard: "whyl that I live, I shal have remembrance of the travailles that oure lord Crist suffred in preening; his werinesse in travailling, hise temptacions whan he fasted, hise longe wakinges whan he preyde, hise teres whan that he weep for pitee of good peple; the wo and the shame and the filthe that men seyden to him; of the foule spitting that men spitte in his face, of the buffettes that men yaven him, of the foule mowes, and of the repreves that men to him seyden; of the nayles with whiche he was nailed to the croys, and of al the remenant ofhis passion that he suffred formy sinnes, and no-thing for his gilt." And ye shul understonde, that in mannes sinne is every manere of ordre or ordinance turned up-so-doun. For it is sooth, that god, and reson, and sensualitee, and the body of man been so ordeyned, that everich of thise foure thinges sholde have lordshipe over that other; as thus: god sholde have lordshipe over reson, and reason over sensualitee, and sensualitee over the body of man. But sothly, whan men sinneth, al this ordre or ordinance is turned up-so-doun. And therefore thanne, for-as-muche as the reson of man ne wol nat be subget ne obeisant to god, that is his lord by right, therfore leseth it the lordshipe that it sholde have over sensualitee, and eek over the body of man. And why? For sensualitee rebelleth thanne agayns reson; and by that wey leseth reason the lordshipe over sensualitee and over the body.

power over his soul. And thus the compassionate Lord Jesus Christ wills that no good work be utterly lost; for in somewhat it shall avail. But for as much as the good deeds that men do while they are in a state of grace are all stultified by sin ensuing; and, also, since all the good works that men do while they are in mortal sin are utterly dead, in so far as the life everlasting is concerned, well may that man who does no good work sing that new French song, J'ai tout perdu mon temps et mon labeur. For certainly, ^n bereaves a man of both goodness of nature and the goodness of grace. For indeed the grace of the Holy Ghost is like fire, which cannot be idle; for fire fails anon as it forgoes its working, and even so does grace fail immediately it forsakes its work. Then loses the sinful man the goodness of glory, which is promised only to good men who suffer and toil. Well then may he sorrow, who owes all his life to God, as long as he has lived and as long as he shall live, and who vet has no goodness wherewith to repay his debt to God. For trust well, "he shall give account," as Saint Bernard says, "of all the good things that have been given him in this present life, and of how he has used them; in so much that there shall not perish a hair of his head, nor shall a moment of an hour perish of all his time, that he shall not be called upon to give a reckoning for."

The fifth thing that ought to move a man to contrition is remembrance of the passion that Our Lord Jesus Christ suffered for our sins. For, as Saint Bernard says: "While I live I will keep in remembrance the travail that Our Lord Christ suffered in preaching; His weariness in travail; His temptations when He fasted; His long watchings when He prayed; His tears when He wept for pity of good people; the grievous and the shameful and the filthy things that men said of Him; the foul sputum that men spat into His face; the foul buffets that men gave Him; the foul grimaces and the chidings that men said; the nails wherewith He was nailed to the cross; and all the rest of His passion, which he suffered for my sins and not for his own guilt." And you shall understand that in man's sin is every order or ordinance turned upside-down. For it is true that God and reason and sensuality and the body of man have been so ordained and established that, of these four things, the next higher shall have lordship over the lower; as thus: God shall have lordship over reason, and reason over sensuality, and sensuality over the body of man. But indeed, when man sins, all of this order or ordinance is turned upside-down. Therefore, then, for as much as the reason of man will not be subject to nor obedient to God, Who is man's Lord by right, therefore it loses the lordship that it should hold over sensuality and also over the body of man? And why? Because sensuality rebels then against reason; and in that way reason loses the lordship over sensuality and over the body. For just as reason is rebel to God, just so is sensuality rebel to

reason, and the body also. And truly, this confusion and this rebellion Our Lord Jesus Christ suffered upon His precious body, and paid full dearly thus, and hear you now in what wise. Por as much, then, as reason is rebel to God, therefore is man worthy to have sorrow and to die. This Our Lord Jesus Christ suffered for mankind after He had been betrayed by His disciple, and secured and bound "so that the blood burst out at every nail of His hands," as says Saint Augustine. Moreover, for as much as reason of man will not subdue sensuality when it may, therefore man is worthy of shame; and this suffered Our Lord Jesus Christ for man when they spat in His face. Furthermore, for as much, then, as the wretched body of man is rebel both to reason and to sensuality, therefore is it worthy of death. And this Our Lord Jesus Christ suffered for man upon the cross, where there was no part of His body free from great pain and bitter passion. And all this Jesus Christ suffered. Who never did any wrong. And therefore it may be reasonably said of Jesus thus: "Too much am I tortured for things the punishment of which I do not deserve, and too much disgraced for shame that belongs to man." And therefore may the sinful man well say, as says Saint Bernard: "Accursed be the bitterness of my sin, for which there must be suffered so much bitterness." For truly, according to the diverse discordances of our wickedness, was the passion of Jesus Christ ordained in divers ways, as thus. Certainly sinful man's soul is betrayed unto the Devil by covetousness of temporal prosperity, and scorned by deceit when he chooses carnal delights; and it is tormented by impatience under adversity, and spat upon by servitude and subjection to sin; and at the last it is slain for ever. For this confusion by sinful man was Jesus Christ first betrayed and afterwards bound, Who came to loose us from sin and pain. Then was He scorned, Who should have been only honoured in all things. Then was His face, which all mankind ought to have desired to look upon, since into that face angels desire to look, villainously spat upon. Then was He scourged, Who had done nothing wrong; and finally, then was He crucified and slain. So was accomplished the word of Isaiah: "He was wounded for our misdeeds and defiled for our felonies." Now, since Jesus Christ took upon Himself the punishment for all our wickedness, much ought sinful man to weep and to bewail that for his sins the Son of God in Heaven should endure all this pain.

The sixth thing that ought to move a man to contrition is the hope of three things; that is to say, forgiveness of sin, and the gift of grace to do well, and the glory of Heaven, u herewith God shall reward man for his good deeds. And for as much as Jesus Christ gives us these gifts of His largess and of His sovereign bounty, therefore is He called Jesus Nazarenus rex Judeorum. Jesus means "saviour" or "salvation," in whom men shall hope to have for-

For right as reson is rebel to god, right so is bothe sensualitee rebel to reson and the body also. And certes, this diaordmance and this rebellion oure lord Jesu Crist aboghte up-on his precious body fuldcrc.andhcrkneth in which wyse. For-as-muche thanne as reson is rebel to god, therfore is man worthy to have sorwe and to be deed. This suffred oure lord Jesu Crist for man, after that he hadde be bitraysed of his disciple, and distreyned and bounde, "so that his blood brast out at every nail of hise handes," as seith seint Augustin. And forther- over, for-as-muchel as reson of man ne wol nat daunte sensualitee whan it may, therfore is man worthy to have shame; and this suffred oure lord Jesu Crist for man, whan they spetten in his visage. And forther-over, for-as-muchel thane as the caitif body of man is rebel bothe to reason and to sensualitee, therfore is it worthy the deeth. And this suffred oure lord Jesu Crist for man upon the croys, where-as ther was no part of his body free, with-outen greet peyne and bitter passion. And al this suffred Jesu Crist, that nevere forfeted. And therfore resonably may be seyd of Jesu in this manere: "to muchel am I peyned for the things that I nevere deserved, and to muche defouled for shendshipe that man is worthy to have." And therefore may the sinful man wel seye, as seith seint Bernard: "acursed by the bitternesse of my sinne, for which ther moste be suffred so muchel bitternesse." For certes, after the diverse discordances of oure wikkednesses, was the passion of Jesu Crist ordeyned in diverse thinges, as thus. Certes, sinful marines soule is bitraysed of the devel by coveitise of temporel prosperitee, and scorned by deceite whan he cheseth fleshly delyces; and yet is it tormented by inpacience of adversitee, and bispet by servage and subjeccion of sinne; and atte laste it is slayn fynally. For this disordinaunce of sinful man was Jesu Crist first bitraysed, and after that was he bounde, that cam for to unbynden us of sinne and peyne. Thanne was he biscorned, that only sholde han been honoured in alle thinges and of alle thinges. Thanne was his visage, that oghte be desired to be seyn of al man-kinde, in which visage aungels desyren to looke, vileynsly bispet. Thanne was he scourged that no-thing hadde agilt; and fynally, thanne was he crucified and slayn. Thanne was acompliced the word of Isaye: "he was wounded for oure misdedes, and defouled for oure felonies." Now sith that Jesu Crist took up-on him-self the peyne of alle oure wikkednesses, muchel oghte sinful man wepen and biwayle, that for hise sinnes goddes sone of hevene sholde al this peyne endure.

13. The sixte thing that oghte moeve a man to contricion, is the hope of three thynges; that is to seyn, foryifnesse of sinne, and the yifte of grace wel for to do, and the glorie of hevene, with which god shal guerdone a man for hise gode dedes. And foras- muche as Jesu Crist yeveth us thise yiftes of his largesse and of his sovereyn bountee, therfore is he cleped Jesus Nazarenus rex Judeorum. Jesus is to seyn "saveour" or "salvacion," on whom men shul

hope to have foryifnesse of sinnes, which that is proprely salvacion of sinnes. And therfore seyde the aungel to Joseph: "thou shalt clepen his name Jesus, that shal saven his peple of hir sinnes." And heer-of seith seint Peter: "ther is noon other name under hevene that is yeve to any man, by which a man may be saved, but only Jesus." Nazarenus is as muche for to seye as "florisshinge," in which a man shal hope, that he that yeveth him remission of sinnes shal yeve him eek grace wel for to do. For in the flour is hope of fruit in tyme cominge; and in foryifnesse of sinnes hope of grace wel for to do. "I was atte dore of thyn hertc." seith Jesus, "and cleped for to entre; he that openeth to me shal have foryifnesse of sinne. I wol entre in-to him by my grace, and soupe with him," by the goode werkes that he shal doon; whiche werkes been the foode of god; "and he shal soupe with me," by the grete joye that I shal yeven him. Thus shal man hope, for hise werkes of penaunce, that god shall yeven him his regne; as he bihoteth him in the gospel.

14. Now shal a man understonde, in which manere shal been his contricion. I seye, that it shal been universal and total; this is to seyn, a man shal be verray repentant for alle hise sinnes that he hath doon in delyt of his thoght; for delyt is ful perilous. For ther been two manere of consentinges; that oon of hem is cleped consentinge of affeccion, whan a man is moeved to do sinne, and delyteth him longe for to thinke on that sinne; and his reson aperceyveth it wel, that it is sinne agayns the lawe of god, and yet his reson refreyneth nat his foul delyt or talent, though he see wel apertly that it is agayns I the reverence of god; al-though his reson ne consente noght to doon that sinne in dede, yet seyn somme doctours that swich delyt that dwelleth longe, it is ful perilous, al be it nevere so lite. And also a man sholde sorwe, namely, for al that evere he hath desired agayn the lawe of god with perfit consentinge of his reson; for ther-of is no doute, that it is deedly sinne in consentinge. For certes, ther is no deedly sinne, that it nas first in mannes thought, and after that in his delyt; and so forth in-to consentinge and in-to dede. Wherefore I seye, that many men ne repenten hem nevere of swiche thoghtes and delytes, ne nevere shriven hem of it, but only of the dede of grete sinnes outward. Wherfore I seye, that swiche wikked delytes and wikked thoghtes been subtile bigyleres of hem that shullen be dampned. Moreover, man oghte to sorwe for hise wikkede wordes as wel as for hise wikkede dedes; for certes, the repentance of a singular sinne, and nat repente of alle hise othere sinnes, or elles repenten him of alle hise othere sinnes, and nat of a singuler sinne, may nat availle. For certes, god almighty is al good; and ther-fore he foryeveth al, or elles right noght. And heer-of seith seint Augustin: "I woot certeinly that god is enemy to everich sinnere"; and how thanne? He that observeth o sinne, shal he have foryifnesse of the remenaunt of hise othere sinnes? Nay. And forther-over, contricion sholde be wonder sorwe-

giveness of sins, which is, properly, salvation from sins. And therefore said the angel to Joseph: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, Who skill s.ne His people from their sins." And thereof says Saint Peter: "There is no other name under Heaven given to any man, whereby a man may be saved, save only Jesus." Nazarenus is as much as to sav "flourishing," wherein a man may hope that He Who gives linn remission of sins shall give him also the grace to do well. For in the flower is hope of fruit in lime to come; and in forgiveness of sins is hope of grace to do well. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock." says Jesus: "if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him. and he with Me." That is to say, by the good works that he shall do, which good works are the food of God; "and he shall sup with Me"—by the great joy that I shall give him. Thus may man hope, lor his deeds of penitence, that God shall allow him to enter His Kingdom, as is promised unto him in the gospel.

Now shall a man understand in what manner shall be his contrition. I say, that it shall be universal and total; that is to say, a man shall be truly repentant for all the sins that he has done in delight of his thought; for delight is very dangerous. For there are two ways of acquiescence; one called acquiescence of the affections, when a man is moved to do sin, and delights in long thinking thereon; and his reason well perceives that it is sin against the law of God, and yet his reason restrains not his foul delight or appetite, though he see well that it is opposed to the reverence that is due to God; although his reason consent not to do that sin in very deed, yet some doctors say that dwelling long on such delight is full dangerous, be it ever so little. And also a man should sorrow for all that he has ever desired against the law of God with perfect acquiescence of his reason; for there is no doubt of it, there is mortal sin in acquiescence. For truly, there is no mortal sin that was not first in man's thought, and after that in his delight, and so on unto acquiescence and unto deed. Wherefore I say, that many men never repent for such thoughts and delights, and never confess them, but only the actual performance of great sins. Wherefore I say that such wicked delights and wicked thoughts are subtle beguilers of those that shall be damned. Moreover, a man ought to sorrow for his wicked words as well as for his wicked deeds; for truly, the repentance for a single sin, unaccompanied by repentance for all other sins, or else repentance for all other sins and not for a single sin. shall not avail. For certainly God Almighty is all good; and therefore He forgives all or nothing. And thereupon says Saint Augustine: "I know certainly that God is the enemy of every sinner." And how then? He that continues to do one sin, shall be have forgiveness for the rest of his sins ? No. Furthermore, contrition should be wondrous sorrowful and full of suffering; and for that God gives fully His mercy; and therefore, when my soul was suffering within me, I had remembrance of God, that my prayer

might come unto Him. Moreover, contrition must be continual, and a man must keep and hold a Stead last purpose to slime himself and to amend his way of lite. For truly, while contrition lasts, man may continue to have hope of forgiveness; and of this comes hatred of sin, which destroys sin within himself and also in other tolls, according to his ability. lor which David says: "Ye that lose Cod hate wickedness." For trust this well, to love God is to love what He loves and to hate what He hates.

The last thing that man shall understand about contrition is this: What does contrition avail him? I say, that at times contrition delivers a man from sin; as to which David says: "I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." And just as contrition nothing avails without firm purpose of shrift, if man have opportunity, just so shrift itself is of little worth without contrition. Moreover, contrition destroys the prison of Hell and makes weak and feeble all the strength of all the devils, and restores the gifts of the Holy Ghost and of all good virtues; and it cleanses the soul of sin, and delivers the soul from the pain of Hell and from the company of the Devil, and from the servitude of sin, and restores it unto all spiritual good and to the company and communion of Holy Church. And furthermore, it makes of him who was formerly the son of anger to be the son of grace; and all these things are proved by holy writ. And therefore he that would set his understanding to these things, he were full wise; for truly, he should not then, in all his life, have desire to sin, but should give his body and all his heart to the service of Jesus Christ, and do Him homage. For truly, Our sweet Lord Jesus Christ has spared us so graciously in our follies that, if He had not pity on man's soul, a sorry song indeed might all of us sing.

ful and anguissous, and therfore yeveth him god pleynly his mercy; and therfore, whan my soule was anguissous with-inne me, I hadde remembrance of god that my preyere mighte come to him. Forther-over, contricion moste be continucl, and that man have stedefast purpos to shriven him, and for to amenden him of his lyf. For soothly, whyl contricion lasteth, man may evere have hope of foryifnesse; and of this comth hate of sinne, that destroyeth sinne bothe in himself, and eek in other folk, at his power. For which seith David: "ye that loven god hateth wikkednesse." For trusteth wel, to love god is for to love that he loveth, and hate that he hateth.

15. The laste thing that man shal understonde in contricion is this; wherof avayleth contricion. I seye, that som tyme contricion delivereth a man fro sinne; of which that David seith: "I seye," quod David, that is to seyn, "I purposed fermely to shryve me; and thow, Lord, relesedest my sinne." And right so as contricion availleth noght, withouten sad purpos of shrifte, if man have oportunitee, right so litel worth is shrifte or satisfaccion with-outen contricion. And more-over, contricion destroyeth the prison of helle, and maketh wayk and feble alle the strengthes of the develes, and restoreth the yiftes of the holy goost and of alle gode vertues; and it clenseth the soule of sinne, and delivereth the soule fro the peyne of helle, and fro the companye of the devel, and fro the servage of sinne, and restoreth it to alle godes espirituels, and to the companye and communion of holy chirche. And forther-over, it maketh him that whylom was sone of ire to be sone of grace; and alle thise things been preved by holy writ. And therfore, he that wolde sette his entente to thise thinges, he were ful wys; for soothly, he ne sholde nat thanne in al his lyf have corage to sinne, but yeven his body and al his herte to the service of Jesu Crist, and ther-of doon him hommage. For soothly, oure swete lord Jesu Crist hath spared us so debonairly in our folies, that if he ne hadde pitee of mannes soule, a sory song we mighten alle singe.

*HERE ENDETH THE FIRST PART OF PENITENCE*

*HERE FOLLOWETH THE SECOND PART*

The second part of penitence is confession, which is the sign of contrition. Now shall you understand what confession is, and whether it ought to be used or not, and which things are necessary to true confession.

First, you shall understand that confession is the true discovery of sins to the priest; I say "true," for a man must confess all the circumstances and conditions of his sin, in so far as he can. All must be told, and nothing excused or hidden, or covered up, and he must not vaunt his good deeds. And furthermore, it is necessary to understand whence his sins come, and how they increase, and what they are.

Of the birth of sins, Saint Paul says thus: that “as

16. The seconde partie of Penitence is Confession, that is signe of contricion. Now shul ye understonde what is Confession, and whether it oghte nedes be doon or noon, and whiche thinges been covenable to verray Confession.

17. First shaltow understonde that Confession is verray shewinge of sinnes to the preest; this is to seyn "verray," for he moste confessen him of alle the condiciouns that bilongen to his sinne, as ferforth as he can. Al moot be seyd, and no thing excused ne hid ne forwrapped, and noght avaunte him of his gode werkes. And forther over, it is necessarie to understonde whennes that sinnes springen, and how they encresen, and whiche they been.

18. Of the springinge of sinnes seith seint Paul

in this wise: that "right as by a man sinne entered first in-to this world, and thurgh that sinne deeth, right so thilke deeth entred in-to alle men that sinneden." And this man was Adam, by whom sinne entred in-to this world whan he brak the comaundement of god. And therfore, he that first was so mighty that he sholde not have dyed, bicam swich oon that he moste nedes dye, whether he wolde or noon; and all his progenie in this world that in thilke man sinneden. Loke that in th'estaat of innocence, when Adam and Eve naked weren in paradys, and no-thing ne hadden shame of hir nakednesse, how that the serpent, that was most wyly of alle othere bestes that god hadde maked, seyde to the womman: "why comaunded god to yow, ye sholde nat eten of every tree in paradys?" The womman answerde: "of the fruit," quod she, "of the trees in paradys we feden us; but soothly, of the fruit of the tree that is in the middel of paradys, god forbad us for to ete, ne nat touchen it, lest per-aventure we should dyen." The serpent seyde to the womman: "nay, nay, ye shul nat dyen of deeth; for sothe, god woot, that what day that ye eten ther-of, youre eyen shul opene, and ye shul been as goddes, knowinge good and harm." The womman thanne saugh that the tree was good to feding, and fair to the eyen, and delytable to the sighte; she tok of the fruit of the tree, and eet it, and yaf to hir housbonde, and he eet; and anoon the eyen of hem bothe openeden. And whan that they knewe that they were naked, they sowed of fige-leves a manere of breches to hiden hir membres. There may ye seen that deedly sinne hath first suggestion of the feend, as sheweth here by the naddre; and afterward, the delyt of the flesh, as sheweth here by Eve; and after that, the consenting of resoun, as sheweth here by Adam. For trust wel, thogh so were that the feend tempted Eve, that is to seyn the flesh, and the flesh hadde delyt in the beautee of the fruit defended, yet certes, til that resoun, that is to seyn, Adam, consented to the etinge of the fruit, yet stood he in th'estaat of innocence. Of thilke Adam toke we thilke sinne original; for of him fleshly descended be we alle, and engendred of vile and corrupt matere. And whan the soule is put in our body, right anon is contract original sinne; and that, that was erst but only peyne of concupiscence, is afterward bothe peyne and sinne. And therfore be we alle born sones of wratthe and of dampnacion perdurable, if it nere baptesme that we receyven, which binimeth us the culpe; but for sothe, the peyne dwelleth with us, as to temptacion, which peyne highte concupiscence. Whan it is wrongfully disposed or ordeyned in man, it maketh him coveite, by coveitise of flesh, fleshly sinne, by sighte of hise eyen as to erthely thinges, and coveitise of hynesse by pryde of herte.

19. Now as for to speken of the firste coveitise, that is, concupiscence after the lawe of oure membres, that weren lawefulliche y-maked and by rightful jugement of god; I seye, for-as-muche as

by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; . . . so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And this man was Adam. by whom sin entered into the world when he broke the commandment of God. And therefore, he that at first was so mighty that he should never have died became such a one as must needs die, whether he would or no; and all his progeny in this world, since they, in that man, sinned. Behold, in the state of innocence, when Adam and Eve were naked in Paradise, and had no shame for their nakedness, how that the serpent, which was the wiliest of all the beasts that God had made, said to the woman: "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" And the woman said unto the serpent: "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, 'Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.' " And the serpent said unto the woman: "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and delectable in the sight, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat; and gave also unto her husband, and he did eat. And the eves of them both were opened. And when they knew that they were naked, they sewed fig-leaves together into a kind of breeches to hide their members. There may you see that mortal sin had first suggestion from the Fiend, who is here figured by the serpent; and afterward the delight of the flesh, as shown here by Eve; and after that the acquiescence of reason, as is shown by Adam. For trust this well, though it were that the Fiend tempted Eve, that is to say, the flesh, and the flesh delighted in the beauty of the forbidden fruit, certainly until reason, that is, Adam, consented to the eating of the fruit, yet stood he in the state of innocence. From that same Adam caught we all that original sin; for we are all descended from him in the flesh, engendered of vile and corrupt matter. And when the soul is put into a body, immediately is contracted original sin; and that which was at first merely the penalty of concupiscence becomes afterwards both penalty and sin. And therefore are we all born the sons of wrath and of everlasting damnation, were it not for the baptism we receive, which washes away the culpability; but, forsooth, the penalty remains within us, as temptation, and that penalty is called concupiscence. When it is wrongly disposed or established in man, it makes him desire, by the lust of the flesh, fleshly sin; desire, by the sight of his eyes, earthly things; and desire high place, what of the pride of his heart.

Now, to speak of the first desire, that is, concupiscence, according to the law for our sexual parts, which were lawfully made and by rightful word of God; I say, for as much as man is not obedient to

God, Who is his Lord, therefore is the flesh disobedient to Him. through concupiscence, which is also called the nourishing of and the reason tor sin. Therefore all the while that a man has within himself the penalty of concupiscence, it is impossible but that he will be sometimes tempted and moved in his flesh to do sin. And this shall not fail so long as he lives; it may well grow feeble and remote by virtue of baptism and by the grace of God through penitence; but it shall never be fully quenched so that he shall never be moved within himself, unless he be cooled by sickness or by maleficence of sorcery or by opiates. For behold what Saint Paul says: "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary, the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." The same Saint Paul, after his great penance on water and on land (on water by night and by day, in great peril and in great pain; on land in famine, in thirst, in cold, and naked, and once stoned almost unto death), yet said he: "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?" And Saint Jerome, when he had long lived in the desert, where he had no company but that of wild beasts, where he had no food but herbs, with only water to drink, and no bed but the naked earth, for which his flesh was black as an Ethiopian's with heat and well-nigh destroyed with cold, vet said he that the heat of lechery boiled through all his body. Wherefore I know well and surely that they are deceived who say that they are never tempted in the flesh. Witness Saint James the apostle, who says that everyone is tempted in his own concupiscence. That is to say, each of us has cause and occasion to be tempted by sin that is nourished in the body. And thereupon says Saint John the Evangelist: "It we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."

Now shall you understand in what manner sin waxes or increases in man. The first thing to be considered is this same nurturing of sin, whereof I spoke before, this same fleshly concupiscence. And after that comes the subjection to the Devil, that is to say, the Devil's bellows, wherewith he blows into man the fire of concupiscence. And after that a man bethinks himself whether he will do, or not, the thing to which he is tempted. And then, if a man withstand and put aside the first enticement of his flesh and the Fiend, then it is no sin; and if it be that he do not, he feels anon a flame of delight. And then it is well to be wary, and to guard himself, else he will fall anon into acquiescence to sin; and then he will do it, if he have time and place. And of this matter Moses says that the Devil says thus: "I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them." For certainly, just as a sword may part a thing in two pieces, just so acquiescence separates God from man. "And then will I slay him in his sinful deed." Thus says the

man is nat obeisaunt to god, that is his lord, therefore is the flesh to him disobeisaunt thurgh concupiscence, which yet is cleped norissinge of sinnc and occasion of sinne. Therfore, al the whyle that a man hath in him the peyne of concupiscence, it is impossible but he be tempted somtyme, and moeved in his flesh to sinne. And this thing may nat faille as longe as he liveth; it may wel wcxe feble and faille, by vertu of baptcsme and by the grace of god thurgh penitence; but fully ne shal it nevere quenche, that he ne shal som tyme be moeved in him-self, but-if he were al refreyded by siknesse, or by malefice of sorcerie or colde drinkes. For lo, what seith seint Paul: "the flesh coveiteth agayn the spirit, and the spirit agayn the flesh; they been so contrarie and so stryven that a man may nat alwey doon as he wolde." The same seint Paul, after his grete penaunce in water and in lond (in water by night and by day, in greet peril and in greet peyne, in lond, in famine, in thurst, in cold and clothlees, and ones stoned almost to the deeth) yet seyde he: "alias! I, caytif man, who shal delivere me fro the prisoun of my caytif body?" And seint Jerome, whan he longe tyme hadde woned in desert, where-as he hadde no companye but of wilde bestes, where-as he ne hadde no mete but herbes and water to his drinke, ne no bed but the naked erthe, for which his flesh was blak as an Ethiopen for hete and ny destroyed for cold, yet seyde he: that "the brenninge of lecherie boiled in al his body." Wherfore I woot wel sikerly, that they been deceyved that seyn, that they ne be nat tempted in hir body. Witnesse on Seint Jame the Apostel, that seith: that "every wight is tempted in his owen concupiscence"; that is to seyn, that everich of us hath matere and occasion to be tempted of the norissinge of sinne that is in his body. And therfore seith Seint John the Evaungelist: "if that we seyn that we beth with-oute sinne, we deceyve us-selve, and trouthe is nat in us."

20. Now shal ye understonde in what manere that sinne wexeth or encreseth in man. The firste thing is thilke norissinge of sinne, of which I spak biforn, thilke fleshly concupiscence. And after that comth the subjeccion of the devel, this is to seyn, the develes bely, with which he bloweth in man the fyr of fleshly concupiscence. And after that, a man bithinketh him whether he wol doon, or no, thilke thing to which he is tempted. And thanne, if that a man withstonde and weyve the firste entysinge of his flesh and of the feend, thanne is it no sinne; and if it so be that he do nat so, thanne feleth he anon a flambe of delyt. And thanne is it good to be war, and kepen him wel, or elles he wol falle anon in-to consentinge of sinne; and thane wol he do it, if he may have tyme and place. And of this matere seith Moyses by the devel in this manere: "the feend seith, I wole chace and pursue the man by wikked suggestion, and I wole hente him by moevynge or stiringe of sinne. I wol departe my pryse or my praye by deliberacion, and my lust shal been accompliced in delyt; I wol

drawe my swerd in consentinge": for certes, right as a swerd departeth a thing in two peces, right so consentinge departeth god fro man: "and thane wol I sleen him with myn hand in dede of sinne"; thus seith the feend. For certes, thanne is a man al deed in soule. And thus is sinne accompliced by temptacion, by delyt, and by consentinge; and thanne is the sin cleped actuel.

21. For sothe, sinne is in two maneres; outher it is venial, or deedly sinne. Soothly, whan man loveth any creature more than Jesu Crist oure creatour, thanne is it deedly sinne. And venial synne is it, if man love Jesu Crist lasse than him oghte. For sothe, the dede of this venial sinne is ful perilous; for it amenuseth the love that men sholde han to god more and more. And therfore, if a man charge him-self with manye swiche venial sinnes, certes, but-if so be that he som tyme discharge him of hem by shrifte, they mowe ful lightly amenuse in him al the love that he hath to Jesu Crist; and in this wise skippeth venial in-to deedly sinne. For certes, the more that a man chargeth his soule with venial sinnes, the more is he enclyned to fallen in-to deedly sinne. And therfore, lat us nat be necligent to deschargen us of venial sinnes. For the proverbe seith: that manye smale maken a greet. And herkne this ensample. A greet wawe of the see comth som-tyme with so greet a violence that it drencheth the ship. And the same harm doth som-tyme the smale dropes of water, that entren thurgh a litel crevace in-to the thurrok, and in-to the botme of the ship, if men be so t necligent that they ne descharge hem nat by tyme. And therfore, althogh ther be a difference bitwixe thise two causes of drenchinge, algates the ship is dreynt. Right so fareth it somtyme of deedly sinne, and of anoyouse veniale sinnes, whan they multiplye in a man so greetly, that thilke worldly things that he loveth, thurgh whiche he sinneth venially, is as greet in his herte as the love of god, or more. And therfore, the love of every thing, that is nat biset in god ne doon principally for goddes sake, al-though that a man love it lasse than god, yet is it venial sinne; and deedly sinne, whan the love of any thing weyeth in the herte of man as muchel as the love of god, or more. "Deedly sinne," as seith seint Augustin, "is, whan a man turneth his herte fro god, which that is verray sovereyn bountee, that may nat chaunge, and yeveth his herte to thing that may chaunge and flitte"; and certes, that is every thing, save god of hevene. For sooth is, that if a man yeve his love, the which that he oweth al to god with al his herte, un-to a creature, certes, as muche of his love as he yeveth to thilke creature, so muche he bireveth fro god; and therefore doth he sinne. For he, that is dettour to god, ne yeldeth nat to god al his dette, that is to seyn, al the love of his herte.

22. Now sith man understondeth generally, which is venial sinne, thanne is it covenable to tellen specially of sinnes whiche that many a man per-aventure ne demeth hem nat sinnes, and ne

Fiend. For truly, then is a man dead in soul. And thus is sin accomplished by temptation and by acquiescence; and then is the sin called actual.

Forsooth, sin is of two kinds; it is either venial or mortal sin. Verily, when man loves any creature more than he loves Jesus Christ our Creator, then is it mortal sin. And venial sin it is if a man love Jesus Christ less than he ought. Forsooth the effect of this venial sin is very dangerous; for it diminishes more and more the love that man should have for God. And therefore, if a man charge himself with many such venial sins, then certainly, unless he discharge them occasionally by shriving, they may easily lessen in him all the love that he has for Jesus Christ; and in this wise venial sin passes over into mortal sin. Therefore let us not be negligent in ridding ourselves of venial sins. For the proverb has it: "Mony a mickle mak's a muckle." And hear this example. A huge wave of the sea comes sometimes with so great violence that it sinks a ship. And the same harm is caused sometimes by the small drops of water that enter through the little opening in the seam into the bilge of the ship, if men be so negligent that they do not discharge it in time. And therefore, though there be a difference between these two ways of sinking, nevertheless the ship is sunk. Just so it is sometimes with mortal sin, and with vexatious venial sins when they multiply in a man so greatly that the worldly things he loves, for which he venially sins, have grown as great in his heart as the love for God, or greater. And therefore, the love for everything that is not fixed or rooted in God. or done principally for God's sake, though a man love it less than he love God, yet it is venial sin; and it is mortal sin when the love for anything weighs in the heart of man as much as the love for God, or more. "Mortal sin," as Saint Augustine says, "is when a man turns his heart from God, Who is the truly sovereign goodness and may not change, and gives his heart unto things that may change and pass away." And true it is that if a man give his love, the which he owes all to God, with all his heart, unto a creature, then certainly so much of his love as he gives unto the said creature he takes away from God; and thereby does he sin. For he, who is debtor to God, yields not unto God all of his debt, which is to sav, all the love of his heart.

Now since man understands generally what venial sin is, it is fitting to tell especially of sins which many a man perhaps holds not to be sins at all, and for which he shrives not himself; yet, nevertheless, they

are sins. Truly, as clerics write, every time a man cats or drinks more than suffices for the sustenance of his body, it is certain that he thereby sins. And, too, when he speaks more than it is necessary it is sin. Also, when he hears not benignly the complaint of the poor. Also, when he is in health of body and will not fast when other folk fast, and that without a reasonable excuse. Also, when he sleeps more than he needs, or when he comes, for that reason, too late to church, or toother places where works of charity are done. Also, when he enjoys his. wife without. A sovereign desire to procreate children to the honour of God, or when he does it without intention to Yield to his wife the duty of his body. Also, when he will not visit the sick and the imprisoned, if he may do so. Also, if he love wife or child or any other worldly thing more than reason requires. Also, if he flatter or blandish more than, of necessity, he ought. Also, if he diminish or withdraw his alms to the poor. Also, if he prepare his food more delicately than is needful, or eat it too hastily or too greedily. Also, if he talk about vain and trifling matters in a church or at God's service, or if he be a user of idle words of folly or of obscenity; for he shall yield up an accounting of it at the day of doom. Also, when he promises or assures one that he will do what he cannot perform. Also, when he, through thoughtlessness or folk, slanders or scorns his neighbour. Also, when he suspects a thing to be evil when he has no certain knowledge of it. These things, and more without number, are sins, as Saint Augustine says.

Now shall men understand that while no earthly man may avoid all venial sins, yet may he keep them down by the burning love that he has to Our Lord Jesus Christ, and by prayer and confession, and by other good deeds. For, as Saint Augustine says: "If a man love God in such manner that all that he ever does is done in the love of God, and truly for the love of God, because he burns with the love of God: behold, then, how much a drop of water falling in a furnace harms or proves troublesome; and just so much vexes the venial sin a man who is perfect in the love of Christ." Men may also keep down venial sins by receiving deservingly the precious body of Jesus Christ; also by receiving holy water; by almsgiving; by general confession of Confiteor of mass and at compline; and by the blessings of bishops and of priests, and by other good works.

shryveth him nat of the same thinges; and yet nathelees they been sinnes. Soothly, as thise clerics wryten, this is to seyn, that at every tyme that a man eteth or drinketh more than sufTyseth to the sustenaunce of his body, in certein he dooth sinne. And eek whan he speketh more than nedeth, it is sinne. Eke whan he herkneth nat benignely the compleint of the povre. Eke whan he is in hele of body and wol nat faste, whan othere folk faste, with-outen cause resonable. Eke whan he slepeth more than nedeth, or whan he comth by thilke enchesoun to late to chirche, or to othere werkes of charite. Eke whan he useth his wyf, with-outen sovereyn desyr of engendrure, to the honour of god, or for the entente to yelde to his wyf the dette of his body. Eke whan he wol nat visite the sike and the prisoner, if he may. Eke if he love wyf or child, or other worldly thing, more than resoun requyreth. Eke if he flatere or blandishe more than him oghte for any necessitee. Eke if he amenuse or withdrawe the almesse of the povre. Eke if he apparailleth his mete more deliciously than nede is, or ete it to hastily by likerousnesse. Eke if he tale vanitees at chirche or at goddes service, or that he be a talker of ydel wordes of folye or of vileinye; for he shal yelden acountes of it at the day of dome. Eke whan he biheteth or assureth to do things that he may nat perfourne. Eke whan that he, by lightnesse or folie, misseyeth or scorneth his neighebore. Eke whan he hath any wikked suspicion of thing, ther he ne woot of it no soothfastnesse. Thise thinges and mo with-oute nombre been sinnes, as seith seint Augustin.

Now shal men understonde, that al-be-it so that noon erthely man may eschue alle venial sinnes, yet may he refreyne him by the brenninge love that he hath to oure lord Jesu Crist, and by preyeres and confession and othere gode werkes, so that it shal but litel greve. For, as seith seint Augustin: "if a man love god in swiche manere, that al that evere he doth is in the love of god, and for the love of god verraily, for he brenneth in the love of god: loke, how muche that a drope of water that falleth in a fourneys ful of fyr anoyeth or greveth, so muche anoyeth a venial sinne un-to a man that is parfit in the love of Jesu Crist." Men may also refreyne venial sinne by receyvinge worthily of the precious body of Jesu Crist; by receyving eek of holy water; by almesdede; by general confession of Confiteor at masse and at complin; and by blessinge of bisshopes and of preestes, and by othere gode werkes.

22 CHAUCER: *Parson's Tale,* esp par 22, 510b

22. Now sith man understondeth generally, which is venial sinne, thanne is it covenable to tellen specially of sinnes whiche that many a man per-aventure ne demeth hem nat sinnes, and ne

Now since man understands generally what venial sin is, it is fitting to tell especially of sins which many a man perhaps holds not to be sins at all, and for which he shrives not himself; yet, nevertheless, they

are sins. Truly, as clerics write, every time a man cats or drinks more than suffices for the sustenance of his body, it is certain that he thereby sins. And, too, when he speaks more than it is necessary it is sin. Also, when he hears not benignly the complaint of the poor. Also, when he is in health of body and will not fast when other folk fast, and that without a reasonable excuse. Also, when he sleeps more than he needs, or when he comes, for that reason, too late to church, or toother places where works of charity are done. Also, when he enjoys his. wife without. A sovereign desire to procreate children to the honour of God, or when he does it without intention to Yield to his wife the duty of his body. Also, when he will not visit the sick and the imprisoned, if he may do so. Also, if he love wife or child or any other worldly thing more than reason requires. Also, if he flatter or blandish more than, of necessity, he ought. Also, if he diminish or withdraw his alms to the poor. Also, if he prepare his food more delicately than is needful, or eat it too hastily or too greedily. Also, if he talk about vain and trifling matters in a church or at God's service, or if he be a user of idle words of folly or of obscenity; for he shall yield up an accounting of it at the day of doom. Also, when he promises or assures one that he will do what he cannot perform. Also, when he, through thoughtlessness or folk, slanders or scorns his neighbour. Also, when he suspects a thing to be evil when he has no certain knowledge of it. These things, and more without number, are sins, as Saint Augustine says.

Now shall men understand that while no earthly man may avoid all venial sins, yet may he keep them down by the burning love that he has to Our Lord Jesus Christ, and by prayer and confession, and by other good deeds. For, as Saint Augustine says: "If a man love God in such manner that all that he ever does is done in the love of God, and truly for the love of God, because he burns with the love of God: behold, then, how much a drop of water falling in a furnace harms or proves troublesome; and just so much vexes the venial sin a man who is perfect in the love of Christ." Men may also keep down venial sins by receiving deservingly the precious body of Jesus Christ; also by receiving holy water; by almsgiving; by general confession of Confiteor of mass and at compline; and by the blessings of bishops and of priests, and by other good works.

shryveth him nat of the same thinges; and yet nathelees they been sinnes. Soothly, as thise clerics wryten, this is to seyn, that at every tyme that a man eteth or drinketh more than sufTyseth to the sustenaunce of his body, in certein he dooth sinne. And eek whan he speketh more than nedeth, it is sinne. Eke whan he herkneth nat benignely the compleint of the povre. Eke whan he is in hele of body and wol nat faste, whan othere folk faste, with-outen cause resonable. Eke whan he slepeth more than nedeth, or whan he comth by thilke enchesoun to late to chirche, or to othere werkes of charite. Eke whan he useth his wyf, with-outen sovereyn desyr of engendrure, to the honour of god, or for the entente to yelde to his wyf the dette of his body. Eke whan he wol nat visite the sike and the prisoner, if he may. Eke if he love wyf or child, or other worldly thing, more than resoun requyreth. Eke if he flatere or blandishe more than him oghte for any necessitee. Eke if he amenuse or withdrawe the almesse of the povre. Eke if he apparailleth his mete more deliciously than nede is, or ete it to hastily by likerousnesse. Eke if he tale vanitees at chirche or at goddes service, or that he be a talker of ydel wordes of folye or of vileinye; for he shal yelden acountes of it at the day of dome. Eke whan he biheteth or assureth to do things that he may nat perfourne. Eke whan that he, by lightnesse or folie, misseyeth or scorneth his neighebore. Eke whan he hath any wikked suspicion of thing, ther he ne woot of it no soothfastnesse. Thise thinges and mo with-oute nombre been sinnes, as seith seint Augustin.

Now shal men understonde, that al-be-it so that noon erthely man may eschue alle venial sinnes, yet may he refreyne him by the brenninge love that he hath to oure lord Jesu Crist, and by preyeres and confession and othere gode werkes, so that it shal but litel greve. For, as seith seint Augustin: "if a man love god in swiche manere, that al that evere he doth is in the love of god, and for the love of god verraily, for he brenneth in the love of god: loke, how muche that a drope of water that falleth in a fourneys ful of fyr anoyeth or greveth, so muche anoyeth a venial sinne un-to a man that is parfit in the love of Jesu Crist." Men may also refreyne venial sinne by receyvinge worthily of the precious body of Jesu Crist; by receyving eek of holy water; by almesdede; by general confession of Confiteor at masse and at complin; and by blessinge of bisshopes and of preestes, and by othere gode werkes.

**23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART III, 177d-178a; 180c-d; 206c-207a; 211c-212a; PART IV, 249b- 250c; 263d-264a**

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART III, 177d-178a

After this, it pleased God to speak to Abraham, and to make a covenant with him in these words, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee; And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession."¹

In this covenant Abraham promiseth for himself and his posterity to obey, as God, the Lord that spake to him; and God on his part promiseth to Abraham the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. And for a memorial and a token of this covenant, he ordaineth the sacrament of circumcision.² This is it which is called the Old Covenant, or Testament, and containeth a contract between God and Abraham, by which Abraham obligeth himself and his posterity in a peculiar manner to be subject to God's positive law; for to the law moral he was obliged before, as by an oath of allegiance. And though the name of King be not yet given to God, nor of kjngdom to Abraham and his seed, yet the thing is the same; namely, an institution by pact of God's peculiar sovereignty over the seed of Abraham, which in the renewing of the same covenant by Moses at Mount Sinai is expressly called a peculiar kingdom of God over the Jews: and it is of Abraham, not of Moses, St. Paul saith that he is the father of the faithful;³ that is, of those that are loyal and do not violate their allegiance sworn to God, then by circumcision, and afterwards in the New Covenant by baptism.

¹Genesis, 17. 7, 8.

²Ibid.,16.ii.

³Romans 4. 11.

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART III, 180c-d

Of holiness there be degrees: for of those things that are set apart for the service of God, there may be some set apart again for a nearer and more especial service. The whole nation of the Israelites were a people holy to God; yet the tribe of Levi was amongst the Israelites a holy tribe; and amongst the Levites the priests were yet more holy; and amongst the priests the high priest was the most holy. So the land of Judea was the Holy Land, but the Holy City wherein God was to be worshipped was more holy; and again, the Temple more holy than the city, and the sanctum sanctorum more holy than the rest of the Temple.

A sacrament is a separation of some visible thing from common use; and a consecration of it to God's service, for a sign either of our admission into the kingdom of God, to be of the number of his peculiar people, or for a commemoration of the same. In the Old Testament the sign of admission was circumcision; in the New Testament, baptism. The commemoration of it in the Old Testament was the eating (at a certain time, which was anniversary) of the Paschal Lamb, by which they were put in mind of the night wherein they were delivered out of their bondage in Egypt; and in the New Testament, the celebrating of the Lord's Supper, by which we are put in mind of our deliverance from the bondage of sin by our blessed Saviour's death upon the cross. The sacraments of admission are but once to be used, because there needs but one admission; but because we have need of being often put in mind of our deliverance and of our allegiance, the sacraments of commemoration have need to be reiterated. And these are the principal sacraments and, as it were, the solemn oaths we make of our allegiance. There be also other consecrations that may be called sacraments, as the word implieth only consecration to God's service; but as it implies an oath or promise of allegiance to God, there were no other in the Old Testament but circumcision and the Passover; nor are there any other in the New Testament but baptism and the Lord's Supper.

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART III, 206c-207a

Again, our Saviour resembled Moses in the institution of sacraments, both of admission into the kingdom of God and of commemoration of his deliverance of his elect from their miserable condition. As the children of Israel had for sacrament of their reception into the kingdom of God, before the time of Moses, the rite of circumcision, which rite, having been omitted in the wilderness, was again restored as soon as they came into the Land of Promise; so also the Jews, before the coming of our Saviour, had a rite of baptizing, that is, of washing with water all those that, being Gentiles, embraced the God of Israel. This rite St. John the Baptist used in the reception of all them that gave their names to the Christ, whom he preached to be already come into the world; and our Saviour instituted the same for a sacrament to be taken by all that believed in him. For what cause the rite of baptism first proceeded is not expressed formally in the Scripture, but it maybe probably thought to be an imitation of the law of Moses concerning leprosy; wherein the leprous man was commanded to be kept out of the camp of Israel for a certain time; after which time, being judged by the priest to be clean, he was admitted into the camp after a solemn washing. And this may therefore be a type of the washing in baptism, wherein such men as are cleansed of the leprosy of sin by faith are received into the Church with the solemnity of baptism. There is another conjecture drawn from the ceremonies of the Gentiles, in a certain case that rarely happens: and that is, when a man that was thought dead chanced to recover, other men made scruple to converse with him, as they would do to converse with a ghost, unless he were received again into the number of men by washing, as children new born were washed from the uncleanness of their nativity, which was a kind of new birth. This ceremony of the Greeks, in the time that Judaea was under the dominion of Alexander and the Greeks his successors, may probably enough have crept into

the religion of the Jews. But seeing it is not likely our Saviour would countenance a heathen rite, it is most likely it proceeded from the legal ceremony of washing after leprosy. And for the other sacrament, of eating the Paschal Lamb, it is manifestly imitated in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; in which the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine do keep in memory our deliverance from the misery of sin by Christ's Passion, as the eating of the Paschal Lamb kept in memory the deliverance of the Jews out of the bondage of Egypt. Seeing therefore the authority of Moses was but subordinate, and he but a lieutenant to God, it followeth that Christ, whose authority, as man, was to be like that of Moses, was no more but subordinate to the authority of his Father. The same is more expressly signified by that that he teacheth us to pray, "Our Father, let thy kingdom come"; and, "For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory"; and by that it is said that "He shall come in the glory of his Father"; and by that which St. Paul saith, "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father"; ¹ and by many other most express places.

Our Saviour therefore, both in teaching and reigning, representeth, as Moses did, the person of God; which God from that time forward, but not before, is called the Father; and, being still one and the same substance, is one person as represented by Moses, and another person as represented by His Son the Christ. For person being a relative to a representer, it is consequent to plurality of representers that there be a plurality of persons, though of one and the same substance.

¹I Corinthians, 15. 24.

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART III, 211c-212a

Another point of their commission is to "baptize, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." What is baptism? Dipping into water. But what is it to dip a man into the water in the name of anything? The meaning of these words of baptism is this. He that is baptized is dipped or washed as a sign of becoming a new man and a loyal subject to that God whose person was represented in old time by Moses, and the high priests, when He reigned over the Jews; and to Jesus Christ, His Son, God and Man, that hath redeemed us, and shall in his human nature represent his Father's person in his eternal kingdom after the resurrection; and to acknowledge the doctrine of the Apostles, who, assisted by the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, were left for guides to bring us into that kingdom, to be the only and assured way thereunto. This being our promise in baptism; and the authority of earthly sovereigns being not to be put down till the day of judgement; for that is expressly affirmed by St. Paul, where he saith, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be made alive. But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming; then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power."⁹ It is manifest that we do not in baptism constitute over us another authority by which our external actions are to be governed in this life, but promise to take the doctrine of the Apostles for our direction in the way to life eternal.

The power of remission and retention of sins, called also the power of loosing and binding, and sometimes the keys of the kingdom of heav-

⁹I Corinthians, 15. 22, 23, 24.

en, is a consequence of the authority to baptize or refuse to baptize. For baptism is the sacrament of allegiance of them that are to be received into the kingdom of God; that is to say, into eternal life; that is to say, to remission of sin: for as eternal life was lost by the committing, so it is recovered by the remitting of men's sins. The end of baptism is remission of sins: and therefore St. Peter, when they that were converted by his sermon on the day of Pentecost asked what they were to do, advised them to "repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins."¹ And therefore, seeing to baptize is to declare the reception of men into God's kingdom, and to refuse to baptize is to declare their exclusion, it followeth that the power to declare them cast out, or retained in it, was given to the same Apostles, and their substitutes and successors. And therefore after our Saviour had breathed upon them, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost,"² he addeth in the next verse, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." By which words is not granted an authority to forgive or retain sins, simply and absolutely, as God forgiveth or retaineth them. Who knoweth the heart of man and truth of his penitence and conversion; but conditionally, to the penitent: and this forgiveness, or absolution, in case the absolved have but a feigned repentance, is thereby, without other act or sentence of the absolved, made void, and hath no effect at all to salvation, but, on the contrary, to the aggravation of his sin. Therefore the Apostles and their successors are to follow but the outward marks of repentance; which appearing, they have no authority to deny absolution; and if they appear not, they have no authority to absolve. The same also is to be observed in baptism: for to a converted Jew or Gentile, the Apostles had not the power to deny baptism, nor to grant it to the unpenitent. But seeing no man is able to discern the truth of another man's repentance, further than by external marks taken from his words and actions, which are subject to hypocrisy, another question will arise: who is it that is constituted judge of those marks.? And this question is decided by our Saviour himself: "If thy brother," saith he, "shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more. And if he shall neglect to hear

¹Acts, 2. 38.

²John, 20. 22.

them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."³ By which it is manifest that the judgement concerning the truth of repentance belonged not to any one man, but to the Church, that is, to the assembly of the faithful, or to them that have authority to be their representant. But besides the judgement, there is necessary also the pronouncing of sentence: and this belonged always to the Apostle, or some pastor of the Church, as prolocutor; and of this our Saviour speaketh [Matthew, 18] in the eighteenth verse, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." And conformable hereunto was the practice of St. Paul where he saith, "For I verily, as absent in body, but present inspirit, have determined already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed; in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one to Satan";⁴ that is to say, to cast him out of the Church, as a man whose sins are not forgiven. Paul here pronounceth the sentence, but the assembly was first to hear the cause (for St. Paul was absent), and by consequence to condemn him. But in the same chapter the judgement in such a case is more expressly attributed to the assembly: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator," etc., "with such a one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within?''⁵ The sentence therefore by which a man was put out of the Church was pronounced by the Apostle or pastor; but the judgement concerning the merit of the cause was in the Church; that is to say, as the times were before the conversion of kings, and men that had sovereign authority in the Commonwealth, the assembly of the Christians dwelling in the same city; as in Corinth, in the assembly of the Christians of Corinth.

This part of the power of the keys by which men were thrust out from the kingdom of God is that which is called excommunication; and to excommunicate is, in the original, ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιείν, to cast out of the synagogue; that is, out of the place of divine service; a word drawn from the custom of the Jews, to cast out of their synagogues such as they thought in manners or doctrine contagious, as lepers were by the law of Moses separated from the congregation of Israel till such time as they should be by the priest pronounced clean.

³Matthew, 18. 15, 16, 17.

⁴I Corinthians, 5. 3, 4, 5.

⁵Ibid., 5. II, 12.

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART IV, 249b- 250c

From hence it is that in all dominions where the Pope's ecclesiastical power is entirely received, Jews, Turks, and Gentiles are in the Roman Church tolerated in their religion as far forth as in the exercise and profession thereof they offend not against the civil power: whereas in a Christian, though a stranger, not to be of the Roman religion is capital, because the Pope pretendeth that all Christians are his subjects. For otherwise it were as much against the law of nations to persecute a Christian stranger for professing the religion of his own country, as an infidel; or rather more, inasmuch as they that are not against Christ are with him.

From the same it is that in every Christian state there are certain men that are exempt, by ecclesiastical liberty, from the tributes and from the tribunals of the civil state; for so are the secular clergy, besides monks and friars, which in many places bear so great a proportion to the common people as, if need were, there might be raised out of them alone an army sufficient for any war the Church militant should employ them in against their own or other princes.

A second general abuse of Scripture is the turning of consecration into conjuration, or enchantment. To consecrate is, in Scripture, to offer, give, or dedicate, in pious and decent language and gesture, a man or any other thing to God, by separating of it from common use; that is to say, to sanctify, or make it God's, and to be used only by those whom God hath appointed to be His public ministers (as I have already proved at large in the thirty-fifth Chapter), and thereby to change, not the thing consecrated, but only the use of it, from being profane and common, to be holy, and peculiar to God's service. But when by such words the nature or quality of the thing itself is pretended to be changed, it is not consecration, but either an extraordinary work of God, or a vain and impious conjuration. But seeing, for the frequency of pretending the change of nature in their consecrations, it cannot be esteemed a work extraordinary, it is no other than a conjuration or incantation, whereby they would have men to believe an alteration of nature that is not, contrary to the testimony of man's sight and of all the rest of his senses. As for example, when the priest, instead of consecrating bread and wine to God's peculiar service in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (which is but a separation of it from the common use to signify, that is, to put men in mind of, their redemption by the Passion of Christ, whose body was broken and blood shed upon the cross for our transgressions), pretends that by saying of the words of our Saviour, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," the nature of bread is no more there, but his very body; notwithstanding there appeareth not to the sight or other sense of the receiver anything that appeared not before the consecration. The Egyptian conjurers, that are said to have turned their rods to serpents, and the water into blood, are thought but to have deluded the senses of the spectators by a false show of things, yet are esteemed enchanters. But what should we have thought of them if there had appeared in their rods nothing like a serpent, and in the water enchanted nothing like blood, nor like anything else but water, but that they had faced down the king, that they were serpents that looked like rods, and that it was blood that seemed water? That had been both enchantment and lying. And yet in this daily act of the priest, they do the very same, by turning the holy words into the manner of a charm, which produceth nothing new to the sense; but they face us down, that it hath turned the bread into a man; nay, more, into a God; and require men to worship it as if it were our Saviour himself present, God and Man, and thereby to commit most gross idolatry. For if it be enough to excuse it of idolatry to say it is no more bread, but God; why should not the same excuse serve the Egyptians, in case they had the faces to say the leeks and onions they worshipped were not very leeks and onions, but a divinity under their species or likeness? The words, "This is my body," are equivalent to these, "This signifies, or represents, my body"; and it is an ordinary figure of speech: but to take it literally is an abuse; nor, though so taken, can it extend any further than to the bread which Christ himself with his own hands consecrated. For he never said that of what bread soever any priest whatsoever should say, "This is my body," or "This is Christ's body," the same should presently be transubstantiated. Nor did the Church of Rome ever establish this transubstantiation, till the time of Innocent the Third; which was not above five hundred years ago, when the power of Popes was at the highest, and the darkness of the time grown so great, as men discerned not the bread that was given them to eat, especially when it was stamped with the figure of Christ upon the cross, as if they would have men believe it were transubstantiated, not only into the body of Christ, but also into the wood of his cross, and that they did eat both together in the sacrament.

The like incantation, instead of consecration, is used also in the sacrament of baptism: where the abuse of God's name in each several person, and in the whole Trinity, with the sign of the cross at each name, maketh up the charm. As first, when they make the holy water, the priest saith, "I conjure thee, thou creature of water, in the name of God the Father Almighty, and in the name of Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, and in virtue of the Holy Ghost, that thou become conjured water, to drive away all the powers of the enemy, and to eradicate, and supplant the enemy," etc. And the same in the benediction of the salt to be mingled with it, "That thou become conjured salt, that all phantasms and knavery of the Devil's fraud may fly and depart from the place wherein thou art sprinkled; and every unclean spirit be conjured by him that shall come to judge the quick and the dead." The same in the benediction of the oil, "That all the power of the enemy, all the host of the Devil, all assaults and phantasms of Satan, may be driven away by this creature of oil." And for the infant that is to be baptized, he is subject to many charms: first, at the church door the priest blows thrice in the child's face, and says, "Go out of him, unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost the Comforter." As if all children, till blown on by the priest, were demoniacs. Again, before his entrance into the church, he saith as before,"! conjure thee, etc., to go out, and depart from this servant of God"; and again the same exorcism is repeated once more before he be baptized. These and some other incantations are those that are used instead of benedictions and consecrations in administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper; wherein everything that serveth to those holy uses, except the unhallowed spittle of the priest, hath some set form of exorcism.

Nor are the other rites, as of marriage, of extreme unction, of visitation of the sick, of consecrating churches, and churchyards, and the like, exempt from charms; inasmuch as there is in them the use of enchanted oil and water, with the abuse of the cross, and of the holy word of David, asperges me Domine hyssopo, as things of efficacy to drive away phantasms and imaginary spirits.

Another general error is from the misinterpretation of the words eternal life, everlasting death, and the second death. For though we read plainly in Holy Scripture that God created Adam in an estate of living for ever, which was conditional, that is to say, if he disobeyed not His commandment; which was not essential to human nature, but consequent to the virtue of the tree of life, whereof he had liberty to eat, as long as he had not sinned; and that he was thrust out of Paradise after he had sinned, lest he should eat thereof, and live for ever; and that Christ's Passion is a discharge of sin to all that believe on Him, and by consequence, a restitution of eternal life to all the faithful, and to them only: yet the doctrine is now and hath been a long time far otherwise; namely, that every man hath eternity of life by nature, inasmuch as his soul is immortal. So that the flaming sword at the entrance of Paradise, though it hinder a man from coming to the tree of life, hinders him not from the immortality which God took from him for his sin, nor makes him to need the sacrificing of Christ for the recovering of the same; and consequently, not only the faithful and righteous, but also the wicked and the heathen, shall enjoy eternal life, without any death at all, much less a second and everlasting death. To salve this, it is said that by second and everlasting death is meant a second and everlasting life, but in torments; a figure never used but in this very case.

23 HOBBES: *Leviathan,* PART IV, 263d-264a

The Gentiles worshipped, for gods, Jupiter and others that, living, were men perhaps that had done great and glorious acts; and, for the children of God, diverse men and women, supposing them gotten between an immortal deity and a mortal man. This was idolatry, because they made them so to themselves, having no authority from God, neither in His eternal law of reason, nor in His positive and revealed will. But though our Saviour was a man, whom we also believe to be God immortal and the Son of God, yet this is no idolatry, because we build not that belief upon our own fancy or judgement, but upon the word of God revealed in the Scriptures. And for the adoration of the Eucharist, if the words of Christ, "This is my body," signify that he himself, and the seeming bread in his hand, and not only so, but that all the seeming morsels of bread that have ever since been, and any time hereafter shall be, consecrated by priests, be so many Christ's bodies, and yet all of them but one body, then is that no idolatry, because it is authorized by our Saviour: but if that text do not signify that (for there is no other that can be alleged for it), then, because it is a worship of human institution, it is idolatry. For it is not enough to say, God can transubstantiate the bread into Christ's body, for the Gentiles also held God to be omnipotent, and might upon that ground no less excuse their idolatry, by pretending, as well as others, a transubstantiation of their wood and stone into God Almighty.

Whereas there be, that pretend divine inspiration to be a supernatural entering of the Holy Ghost into a man, and not an acquisition of God's graces by doctrine and study, I think they are in a very dangerous dilemma. For if they worship not the men whom they believe to be so inspired, they fall into impiety, as not adoring God's supernatural presence. And again, if they worship them they commit idolatry, for the Apostles would never permit themselves to be so worshipped. Therefore the safest way is to believe that by the descending of the dove upon the Apostles, and by Christ's breathing on them when he gave them the Holy Ghost, and by the giving of it by imposition of hands, are understood the signs which God hath been pleased to use, or ordain to be used, of his promise to assist those persons in their study to preach His kingdom, and in their conversation, that it might not be scandalous, but edifying to others.

Besides the idolatrous worship of images, there is also a scandalous worship of them, which is also a sin, but not idolatry. For idolatry is to worship by signs of an internal and real honour; but scandalous worship is but seeming worship, and may sometimes be joined with an inward and hearty detestation, both of the image and of the fantastical demon or idol to which it is dedicated; and proceed only from the fear of death or other grievous punishment; and is nevertheless a sin in them that so worship, in case they be men whose actions are looked at by others as lights to guide them by; because following their ways, they cannot but stumble and fall in the way of religion: whereas the example of those we regard not, works not on us at all, but leaves us to our own diligence and caution, and consequently are no causes of our falling.

**32 MILTON: *Paradise Lost,* BK XII [436-445] 328b-329a**

Nor after resurrection shall he stay

Longer on Earth then certaine times to appeer

To his Disciples, Men who in his Life

Still follow'd him; to them shall leave in charge

To teach all nations what of him they learn'd 440

And his Salvation, them who shall beleeve

Baptizing in the profluent streame, the signe

Of washing them from guilt of sin to Life

Pure, and in mind prepar'd, if so befall,

For death, like that which the redeemer dy'd.

**33 PASCAL: *Provincial Letters,* 71b-80b; 128b- 137b / *Pensees,* 862, 343a; 870 344a-b; 923 351b**

33 PASCAL: *Provincial Letters,* 71b-80b

LETTER X

Paris, August 2, 1656

Sir,

I have not come yet to the policy of the Society, but shall first introduce you to one of its leading principles. I refer to the palliatives which they have applied to confession, and which are unquestionably the best of all the schemes they have fallen upon to "attract all and repel none." It is absolutely necessary to know something of this before going any further; and, accordingly, the monk judged it expedient to give me some instructions on the point, nearly as follows:

"From what I have already stated," he observed, "you may judge of the success with which our doctors have laboured to discover, in their wisdom, that a great many things, formerly regarded as forbidden, are innocent and allowable; but as there are some sins for which one can find no excuse, and for which there is no remedy but confession, it became necessary to alleviate, by the methods I am now going to mention, the difficulties attending that practice. Thus, having shown you, in our previous conversations, how we relieve people from troublesome scruples of conscience by showing them that what they believed to be sinful was indeed quite innocent, I proceed now to illustrate our convenient plan for expiating what is really sinful, which is effected by making confession as easy a process as it was formerly a painful one."

"And how do you manage that, father?"

"Why," said he, "it is by those admirable subtleties which are peculiar to our Company, and have been styled by our fathers in Flanders, in The Image of the First Century, 'the pious finesse, the holy artifice of devotion — piam et religtosam calliditatem, et pietatis solertiam.' By the aid of these inventions, as they remark in the same place, 'crimes may be expiated nowadays alacrius—with more zeal and alacrity than they were committed in former days, and a great many people may be washed from their stains almost as cleverly as they contracted them — plurimi vix citius maculas contrahunt quam eluunt.’ " "Pray, then, father, do teach me some of these most salutary lessons offinesse."

"We have a good number of them," answered the monk; "for there are a great many irksome things about confession, and for each of these we have devised a palliative. The chief difficulties connected with this ordinance are the shame of confessing certain sins, the trouble of specifying the circumstances of others, the penance exacted for them, the resolution against relapsing into them, the avoidance of the proximate occasions of sins, and the regret for having committed them. I hope to convince you to-day that it is now possible to get over all this with hardly any trouble at all; such is the care we have taken to allay the bitterness and nauseousness of this very necessary medicine. For, to begin with the difficulty of confessing certain sins, you are aware it is of importance often to keep in the good graces of one's confessor; now, must it not be extremely convenient to be permitted, as you are by our doctors, particularly Escobar and Suarez, 'to have two confessors, one for the mortal sins and another for the venial, in order to maintain a fair character with your ordinary confessor — uti bonam famam apud ordinarium tueatur—provided you do not take occasion from thence to indulge in mortal sin?' This is followed by another ingenious contrivance for confessing a sin, even to the ordinary confessor, without his perceiving that it was committed since the last confession, which is, 'to make a general confession, and huddle this last sin in a lump among the rest which we confess.' And I am sure you will own that the following decision of Father Bauny goes far to alleviate the shame which one must feel in confessing his relapses, namely, 'that, except in certain cases, which rarely occur, the confessor is not entitled to ask his penitent if the sin of which he accuses himself is an habitual one, nor is the latter obliged to answer such a question; because the confessor has no right to subject his penitent to the shame of disclosing his frequent relapses.' "

"Indeed, father! I might as well say that a physician has no right to ask his patient if it is long since he had the fever. Do not sins assume quite a different aspect according to circumstances? and should it not be the object of a genuine penitent to discover the whole state of his conscience to his confessor, with the same sincerity and open-heartedness as if he were speaking to Jesus Christ himself, whose place the priest occupies? If so, how far is he from realizing such a disposition who, by concealing the frequency of his relapses, conceals the aggravations of his offence!"

I saw that this puzzled the worthy monk, for he attempted to elude rather than resolve the difficulty by turning my attention to another of their rules, which only goes to establish a fresh abuse, instead of justifying in the least the decision of Father Bauny; a decision which, in my opinion, is one of the most pernicious of their maxims, and calculated to encourage profligate men to continue in their evil habits.

"I grant you," replied the father, "that habit aggravates the malignity of a sin, but it does not alter its nature; and that is the reason why we do not insist on people confessing it, according to the rule laid down by our fathers, and quoted by Escobar, 'that one is only obliged to confess the circumstances that alter the species of the sin, and not those that aggravate it.' Proceeding on this rule, Father Granados says, 'that if one has eaten flesh in Lent, all he needs to do is to confess that he has broken the fast, without specifying whether it was by eating flesh, or by taking two fish meals.' And, according to Reginald, 'a sorcerer who has employed the diabolical art is not obliged to reveal that circumstance; it is enough to say that he has dealt in magic, without expressing whether it was by palmistry or by a paction with the devil.' Fagundez, again, has decided that 'rape is not a circumstance which one is bound to reveal, if the woman give her consent.' All this is quoted by Escobar, with many other very curious decisions as to these circumstances, which you may consult at your leisure."

"These 'artifices of devotion' are vastly convenient in their way," I observed. "And yet," said the father, "notwithstanding all that, they would go for nothing, sir, unless we had proceeded to mollify penance, which, more than anything else, deters people from confession. Now, however, the most squeamish have nothing to dread from it, after what we have advanced in our theses of the College of Clermont, where we hold that, if the confessor imposes a suitable penance, and the penitent be unwilling to submit himself to it, the latter may go home, 'waiving both the penance and the absolution.' Or, as Escobar says, in giving the Practice of our Society, 'if the penitent declare his willingness to have his penance remitted to the next world, and to suffer in purgatory all the pains due to him, the confessor may, for the honour of the sacrament, impose a very light penance on him, particularly if he has reason to believe that this penitent would object to a heavier one.' "

"I really think," said I, "that, if that is the case, we ought no longer to call confession the sacrament of penance."

"You are wrong," he replied; "for we always administer something in the way of penance, for the form's sake."

"But, father, do you suppose that a man is worthy of receiving absolution when he will submit to nothing painful to expiate his offences? And, in these circumstances, ought you not to retain rather than remit their sins? Aie you not aware of the extent of your ministry, and that you have the power of binding and loosing? Do you imagine that you are at liberty to give absolution indifferently to all who ask it, and without ascertaining beforehand if Jesus Christ looses in heaven those whom you loose on earth?"

"What!" cried the father, "do you suppose that we do not know that 'the confessor (as one remarks) ought to sit in judgement on the disposition of his penitent, both because he is bound not to dispense the sacraments to the unworthy, Jesus Christ having enjoined him to be a faithful steward and not give that which is holy unto dogs; and because he is a judge, and it is the duty of a judge to give righteous judgement, by loosing the worthy and binding the unworthy, and he ought not to absolve those whom Jesus Christ condemns.' “

"Whose words are these, father?"

"They are the words of our father Filiutius," he replied. "You astonish me," said I; "I took them to be a quotation from one of the fathers of the Church. At all events, sir, that passage ought to make an impression on the confessors,and render them very circumspect in the dispensation of this sacrament, to ascertain whether the regret of their penitents is sufficient, and whether their promises of future amendment are worthy of credit."

"That is not such a difficult matter," replied the father; "Filiutius had more sense than to leave confessors in that dilemma, and accordingly he suggests an easy way of getting out of it, in the words immediately following: 'The confessor may easily set his mind at rest as to the disposition of his penitent; for, if he fail to give sufficient evidence of sorrow, the confessor has only to ask him if he does not detest the sin in his heart, and, if he answers that he does, he is bound to believe it. The same thing may be said of resolutions as to the future, unless the case involves an obligation to restitution, or to avoid some proximate occasion of sin.' "

"As to that passage, father, I can easily believe that it is Filiutius' own."

"You are mistaken though," said the father, "for he has extracted it, word for word, from Suarez."

"But, father, that last passage from Filiutius overturns what he had laid down in the former. For confessors can no longer be said to sit as judges on the disposition of their penitents, if they are bound to take it simply upon their word, in the absence of all satisfying signs of contrition. Are the professions made on such occasions so infallible, that no other sign is needed? I question much if experience has taught your fathers that all who make fair promises are remarkable for keeping them; I am mistaken if they have not often found the reverse."

"No matter," replied the monk; "confessors are bound to believe them for all that; for Father Bauny, who has probed this question to the bottom, has concluded 'that at whatever time those who have fallen into frequent relapses, without giving evidence of amendment, present themselves before a confessor, expressing their regret for the past, and a good purpose for the future, he is bound to believe them on their simple averment, although there may be reason to presume that such resolution only came from the teeth outwards. Nay,' says he, 'though they should indulge subsequently to greater excess than ever in the same delinquencies, still, in my opinion, they may receive absolution.' There now! that, I am sure, should silence you."

"But, father," said I, "you impose a great hardship, I think, on the confessors, by thus obliging them to believe the very reverse of what they see."

"You don't understand it," returned he; "all that is meant is that they are obliged to act and absolve as if they believed that their penitents would be true to their engagements, though, in point of fact, they believe no such thing. This is explained, immediately afterwards, by Suarez and Filiutius. After having said that 'the priest is bound to believe the penitent on his word,' they add: 'It is not necessary that the confessor should be convinced that the good resolution of his penitent will be carried into effect, nor even that he should judge it probable; it is enough that he thinks the person has at the time the design in general, though he may very shortly after relapse. Such is the doctrine of all our authors — it a docent omnes autores.' Will you presume to doubt what has been taught by our authors?"

"But, sir, what then becomes of what Father Petau himself is obliged CO own, in the preface to his Public Penance, 'that the holy fathers, doctors, and councils of the Church agree in holding it as a settled point that the penance preparatory to the eucharist must be genuine, constant, resolute, and not languid and sluggish, or subject to after-thoughts and relapses?' "

"Don't you observe," replied the monk, "that Father Petau is speaking of the ancient Church? But all that is now so little in season, to use a common saying of our doctors, that, according to Father Bauny, the reverse is the only true view of the matter. There are some,' says he, 'who maintain that absolution ought to be refused to those who fall frequently into the same sin, more especially if, after being often absolved, they evince no signs of amendment; and others hold the opposite view. But the only true opinion is that they ought not to be refused absolution; and, though they should be nothing the better of all the advice given them, though they should have broken all their promises to lead new lives, and been at no trouble to purify themselves, still it is of no consequence; whatever may be said to the contrary, the true opinion which ought to be followed is that even in all these cases, they ought to be absolved.' And again: 'Absolution ought neither to be denied nor delayed in the case of those who live in habitual sins against the law of God, of nature, and of the Church, although there should be no apparent prospect of future amendment — etsi emendationis futura nulla spes appareat.' ' "But, father, this certainty of always getting absolution may induce sinners— "

"I know what you mean," interrupted the Jesuit; "but listen to Father Bauny, Q. 15: 'Absolution may be given even to him who candidly avows that the hope of being absolved induced him to sin with more freedom than he would otherwise have done.' And Father Caussin, defending this proposition, says 'that, were this not true, confession would be interdicted to the greater part of mankind; and the only resource left poor sinners would be a branch and a rope.' "O father, how these maxims of yours will draw people to your confessionals!" "Yes," he replied, "you would hardly believe what numbers are in the habit of frequenting them; 'we are absolutely oppressed and overwhelmed, so to speak, under the crowd of our penitents — penitentium numero obruimur —as is said in The Image of the First Century."

"I could suggest a very simple method," said I, "to escape from this inconvenient pressure. You have only to oblige sinners to avoid the proximate occasions of sin; that single expedient would afford you relief at once."

"We have no wish for such a relief," rejoined the monk; "quite the reverse; for, as is observed in the same book, 'the great end of our Society is to labor to establish the virtues, to wage war on the vices, and to save a great number of souls.' Now, as there are very few souls inclined to quit the proximate occasions of sin, we have been obliged to define what a proximate occasion is. 'That cannot be called a proximate occasion,' says Escobar, 'where one sins but rarely, or on a sudden transport—say three or four times a year'; or, as Father Bauny has it, 'once or twice in a month.' Again, asks this author, 'what is to be done in the case of masters and servants, or cousins, who, living under the same roof, are by this occasion tempted to sin?' "

"They ought to be separated," said I.

"That is what he says, too, 'if their relapses be very frequent: but if the parties offend rarely, and cannot be separated without trouble and loss, they may, according to Suarez and other authors, be absolved, provided they promise to sin no more, and are truly sorry for what is past.' "

This required no explanation, for he had already informed me with what sort of evidence of contrition the confessor was bound to rest satisfied.

"And Father Bauny," continued the monk, "permits those who are involved in the proximate occasions of sin, 'to remain as they are, when they cannot avoid them without becoming the common talk of the world, or subjecting themselves to inconvenience.' 'A priest,' he remarks in another work, 'may and ought to absolve a woman who is guilty of living with a paramour, if she cannot put him away honourably, or has some reason for keeping him — si non potest honeste ejicere, aut habeat aliquam causam retinendi—provided she promises to act more virtuously for the future.' "

"Well, father," cried I, "you have certainly succeeded in relaxing the obligation of avoiding the occasions of sin to a very comfortable extent, by dispensing with the duty as soon as it becomes inconvenient; but I should think your fathers will at least allow it be binding when there is no difficulty in the way of its performance?"

"Yes," said the father, "though even then the rule is not without exceptions. For Father Bauny says, in the same place, 'that any one may frequent profligate houses, with the view of converting their unfortunate inmates, though the probability should be that he fall into sin, having often experienced before that he has yielded to their fascinations. Some doctors do not approve of this opinion, and hold that no man may voluntarily put his salvation in peril to succour his neighbor; yet I decidedly embrace the opinion which they controvert.' "

"A novel sort of preachers these, father! But where does Father Bauny find any ground for investing them with such a mission?"

"It is upon one of his own principles," he replied, "which he announces in the same place after Basil Ponce. I mentioned it to you before, and I presume you have not forgotten it. It is, 'that one may seek an occasion of sin, directly and expressly — primo et per se—to promote the temporal or spiritual good of himself or his neighbour.' "

On hearing these passages, I felt so horrified that I was on the point of breaking out; but, being resolved to hear him to an end, I restrained myself, and merely inquired: "How, father, does this doctrine comport with that of the Gospel, which binds us to 'pluck out the right eye,' and 'cut off the right hand,' when they 'offend,' or prove prejudicial to salvation? And how can you suppose that the man who wilfully indulges in the occasions of sins, sincerely hates sin? Is it not evident, on the contrary, that he has never been properly touched with a sense of it, and that he has not yet experienced that genuine conversion of heart, which makes a man love God as much as he formerly loved the creature?"

"Indeed!" cried he, "do you call that genuine contrition? It seems you do not know that, as Father Pintereau says, 'all our fathers teach, with one accord, that it is an error, and almost a heresy, to hold that contrition is necessary; or that attrition alone, induced by the sole motive, the fear of the pains of hell, which excludes a disposition to offend, is not sufficient with the sacrament?'

"What, father! do you mean to say that it is almost an article of faith that attrition, induced merely by fear of punishment, is sufficient with the sacrament? That idea, I think, is peculiar to your fathers; for those other doctors who hold that attrition is sufficient along with the sacrament, always take care to show that it must be accompanied with some love to God at least. It appears to me, moreover, that even your own authors did not always consider this doctrine of yours so certain. Your Father Suarez, for instance, speaks of it thus: 'Although it is a probable opinion that attrition is sufficient with the sacrament, yet it is not certain, and it may be false — non est certa, etpotest esse falsa. And, if it is false, attrition is not sufficient to save a man; and he that dies knowingly in this state, wilfully exposes himself to the grave peril of eternal damnation. For this opinion is neither very ancient nor very common — nee valde antiqua, nee multum communis.' Sanchez was not more prepared to hold it as infallible when he said in his Summary that 'the sick man and his confessor, who content themselves at the hour of death with attrition and the sacrament, are both chargeable with mortal sin, on account of the great risk of damnation to which the penitent would be exposed, if the opinion that attrition is sufficient with the sacrament should not turn out to be true.' Comitolus, too, says that 'we should not be too sure that attrition suffices with the sacrament.'"

Here the worthy father interrupted me. "What!" he cried, "you read our authors then, it seems? That is all very well; but it would be still better were you never to read them without the precaution of having one of us beside you. Do you not see, now, that, from having read them alone, you have concluded, in your simplicity, that these passages bear hard on those who have more lately supported our doctrine of attrition? Whereas it might be shown that nothing could set them off to greater advantage. Only think what a triumph it is for our fathers of the present day to have succeeded in disseminating their opinion in such short time, and to such an extent that, with the exception of theologians, nobody almost would ever suppose but that our modern views on this subject had been the uniform belief of the faithful in all ages! So that, in fact, when you have shown, from our fathers themselves, that, a few years ago, 'this opinion was not certain,' you have only succeeded in giving our modern authors the whole merit of its establishment!

"Accordingly," he continued, "our cordial friend Diana, to gratify us, no doubt, has recounted the various steps by which the opinion reached its present position. 'In former days, the ancient schoolmen maintained that contrition was necessary as soon as one had committed a mortal sin; since then, however, it has been thought that it is not binding except on festival days; afterwards, only when some great calamity threatened the people; others, again, that it ought not to be long delayed at the approach of death. But our fathers, Hurtado and Vasquez, have ably refuted all these opinions and established that one is not bound to contrition unless he cannot be absolved in any other way, or at the point of death!' But, to continue the wonderful progress of this doctrine, I might add, what our fathers, Fagundez, Granados, and Escobar, have decided, 'that contrition is not necessary even at death; because,' say they, 'if attrition with the sacrament did not suffice at death, it would follow that attrition would not be sufficient with the sacrament. And the learned Hurtado, cited by Diana and Escobar, goes still further; for he asks: 'Is that sorrow for sin which flows solely from apprehension of its temporal consequences, such as having lost health or money, sufficient? We must distinguish. If the evil is not regarded as sent by the hand of God, such a sorrow does not suffice; but if the evil is viewed as sent by God, as, in fact, all evil, says Diana, except sin, comes from him, that kind of sorrow is sufficient.' Our Father Lamy holds the same doctrine."

"You surprise me, father; for I see nothing in all that attrition of which you speak but what is natural; and in this way a sinner may render himself worthy of absolution without supernatural grace at all. Now everybody knows that this is a heresy condemned by the Council."

"I should have thought with you," he replied; "and yet it seems this must not be the case, for the fathers of our College of Clermont have maintained (in their Theses of the 23rd May and 6th June 1644) 'that attrition may be holy and sufficient for the sacrament, although it may not be supernatural'; and (in that of August 1643) tnat attrition, though merely natural, is sufficient for the sacrament, provided it is honest.' I do not see what more could be said on the subject, unless we choose to subjoin an inference, which may be easily drawn from these principles, namely, that contrition, so far from being necessary to the sacrament, is rather prejudicial to it, inasmuch as, by washing away sins of itself, it would leave nothing for the sacrament to do at all. That is, indeed, exactly what the celebrated Jesuit Father Valencia remarks. (Book iv, disp. 7, q. 8, p. 4.) 'Contrition,' says he, 'is by no means necessary in order to obtain the principal benefit of the sacrament; on the contrary, it is rather an obstacle in the way of it — Imo obstat potius quominus effectus sequatur. ' Nobody could well desire more to be said in commendation of attrition."

"I believe that, father," said I; "but you must allow me to tell you my opinion, and to show you to what a dreadful length this doctrine leads. When you say that 'attrition, induced by the mere dread of punishment,' is sufficient, with the sacrament, to justify sinners, does it not follow that a person may always expiate his sins in this way, and thus be saved without ever having loved God all his lifetime? Would your fathers venture to hold that?"

"I perceive," replied the monk, "from the strain of your remarks, that you need some information on the doctrine of our fathers regarding the love of God. This is the last feature of their morality, and the most important of all. You must have learned something of it from the passages about contrition which I have quoted to you. But here are others still more definite on the point of love to God—Don't interrupt me, now; for it is of importance to notice the connection. Attend to Escobar, who reports the different opinions of our authors, in his Practice of the Love of God according to our Society. The question is: 'When is one obliged to have an actual affection for God?' Suarez says it is enough if one loves Him before being articulo mortis—at the point of death—without determining the exact time. Vasquez, that it is sufficient even at the very point of death. Others, when one has received baptism. Others, again, when one is bound to exercise contrition. And others, on festival days. But our father, Castro Palao, combats all these opinions, and with good reason — merito. Hurtado de Mendoza insists that we are obliged to love God once a year; and that we ought to regard it as a great favour that we are not bound to do it oftener. But our Father Coninck thinks that we are bound to it only once in three or four years; Henriquez, once in five years; and Filiutius says that it is probable that we are not strictly bound to it even once in five years. How often, then, do you ask? Why, he refers it to the judgement of the judicious."

I took no notice of all this badinage, in which the ingenuity of man seems to be sporting, in the height of insolence, with the love of God.

"But," pursued the monk, "our Father Antony Sirmond surpasses all on this point, in his admirable book, The Defence of Virtue, where, as he tells the reader, 'he speaks French in France,' as follows: 'St. Thomas says that we are obliged to love God as soon as we come to the use of reason: that is rather too soon! Scotus says every Sunday; pray, for what reason? Others say when we are sorely tempted: yes, if there be no other way of escaping the temptation. Scotus says when we have received a benefit from God: good, in the way of thanking Him for it. Others say at death: rather late! As little do I think it binding at the reception of any sacrament: attrition in such cases is quite enough, along with confession, if convenient. Suarez says that it is binding at some time or another; but at what time?—he leaves you to judge of that for yourself—he does not know; and what that doctor did not know I know not who should know.' In short, he concludes that we are not strictly bound to more than to keep the other commandments, without any affection for God, and without giving Him our hearts, provided that we do not hate Him. To prove this is the sole object of his second treatise. You will find it in every page; more especially where he says: 'God, in commanding us to love Him, is satisfied with our obeying Him in his other commandments. If God had said: "Whatever obedience thou yieldest me, if thy heart is not given to me, I will destroy thee!" would such a motive, think you, be well fitted to promote the end which God must, and only can, have in view? Hence it is said that we shall love God by doing His will, as if we loved Him with affection, as if the motive in this case was real charity. If that is really our motive, so much the better; if not, still we are strictly fulfilling the commandment of love, by having its works, so that (such is the goodness of God!) we are commanded, not so much to love Him, as not to hate Him.'

"Such is the way in which our doctors have discharged men from the painful obligation of actually loving God. And this doctrine is so advantageous that our Fathers Annat, Pintereau, Le Moine, and Antony Sirmond himself, have strenuously defended it when it has been attacked. You have only to consult their answers to the Moral Theology. That of Father Pintereau, in particular, will enable you to form some idea of the value of this dispensation, from the price which he tells us that it cost, which is no less than the blood of Jesus Christ. This crowns the whole. It appears, that this dispensation from the painful obligation to love God, is the privilege of the Evangelical law, in opposition to the Judaical. 'It was reasonable,' he says, 'that, under the law of grace in the New Testament, God should relieve us from that troublesome and arduous obligation which existed under the law of bondage, to exercise an act of perfect contrition, in order to be justified; and that the place of this should be supplied by the sacraments, instituted in aid of an easier disposition. Otherwise, indeed, Christians, who are the children, would have no greater facility in gaining the good graces of their Father than the Jews, who were the slaves, had in obtaining the mercy of their Lord and Master.'

"O father!" cried I; "no patience can stand this any longer. It is impossible to listen without horror to the sentiments I have just heard."

"They are not my sentiments," said the monk.

"I grant it, sir," said I; "but you feel no aversion to them; and, so far from detesting the authors of these maxims, you hold them in esteem. Are you not afraid that your consent may involve you in a participation of their guilt? and are you not aware that St. Paul judges worthy of death, not only the authors of evil things, but also 'those who have pleasure in them that do them?' Was it not enough to have permitted men to indulge in so many forbidden things under the covert of your palliations? Was it necessary to go still further and hold out a bribe to them to commit even those crimes which you found it impossible to excuse, by offering them an easy and certain absolution; and for this purpose nullifying the power of the priests, and obliging them, more as slaves than as judges, to absolve the most inveterate sinners—without any amendment of life, without any sign of contrition except promises a hundred times broken, without penance 'unless they choose to accept of it', and without abandoning the occasions of their vices, 'if they should thereby be put to any inconvenience?'

"But your doctors have gone even beyond this; and the license which they have assumed to tamper with the most holy rules of Christian conduct amounts to a total subversion of the law of God. They violate 'the great commandment on which hang all the law and the prophets'; they strike at the very heart of piety; they rob it of the spirit that giveth life; they hold that to love God is not necessary to salvation; and go so far as to maintain that 'this dispensation from loving God is the privilege which Jesus Christ has introduced into the world!' This, sir, is the very climax of impiety. The price of the blood of Jesus Christ paid to obtain us a dispensation from loving Him! Before the incarnation, it seems men were obliged to love God; but since 'God has so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son,' the world, redeemed by him, is released from loving Him! Strange divinity of our days—to dare to take off the 'anathema' which St. Paul denounces on those 'that love not the Lord Jesus!' To cancel the sentence of St. John: 'He that loveth not, abideth in death!' and that of Jesus Christ himself: 'He that loveth me not keepeth not my precepts!' and thus to render those worthy of enjoying God through eternity who never loved God all their life! Behold the Mystery of Iniquity fulfilled! Open your eyes at length, my dear father, and if the other aberrations of your casuists have made no impression on you, let these last, by their very extravagance, compel you to abandon them. This is what I desire from the bottom of my heart, for your own sake and for the sake of your doctors; and my prayer to God is that He would vouchsafe to convince them how false the light must be that has guided them to such precipices; and that He would fill their hearts with that love of Himself from which they have dared to give man a dispensation!"

After some remarks of this nature, I took my leave of the monk, and I see no great likelihood of my repeating my visits to him. This, however, need not occasion you any regret; for, should it be necessary to continue these communications on their maxims, I have studied their books sufficiently to tell you as much of their morality, and more, perhaps, of their policy, than he could have done himself. I am, &c.
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Enough, however, for such paltry falsities. These are but the first raw attempts of your novices, and not the master-strokes of your "grand professed." To these do I now come, fathers; I come to a calumny which is certainly one of the basest that ever issued from the spirit of your Society. I refer to the insufferable audacity with which you have imputed to holy nuns, and to their directors, the charge of "disbelieving the mystery of transubstantiation and the real presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist." Here, fathers, is a slander worthy of yourselves. Here is a crime which God alone is capable of punishing, as you alone were capable of committing it. To endure it with patience would require an humility as great as that of these calumniated ladies; to give it credit would demand a degree of wickedness equal to that of their wretched defamers. I propose not, therefore, to vindicate them; they are beyond suspicion. Had they stood in need of defence, they might have commanded abler advocates than me. My object in what I say here is to show, not their innocence, but your malignity. I merely intend to make you ashamed of yourselves, and to let the whole world understand that, after this, there is nothing of which you are not capable.

You will not fail, I am certain, notwithstanding all this, to say that I belong to Port-Royal; for this is the first thing you say to every one who combats your errors: as if it were only at Port-Royal that persons could be found possessed of sufficient zeal to defend, against your attacks, the purity of Christian morality. I know, fathers, the work of the pious recluses who have retired to that monastery, and how much the Church is indebted to their truly solid and edifying labours. I know the excellence of their piety and their learning. For, though I have never had the honour to belong to their establishment, as you, without knowing who or what I am, would fain have it believed, nevertheless, I do know some of them, and honour the virtue of them all. But God has not confined within the precincts of that society all whom he means to raise up in opposition to your corruptions.

I hope, with his assistance, fathers, to make you feel this; and if he vouchsafe to sustain me in the design he has led me to form, of employing in his service all the resources I have received from him, I shall speak to you in such a strain as will, perhaps, give you reason to regret that you have not had to do with a man of Port-Royal. And to convince you of this, fathers, I must tell you that, while those whom you have abused with this notorious slander content themselves with lifting up their groans to Heaven to obtain your forgiveness for the outrage, I feel myself obliged, not being in the least affected by your slander, to make you blush in the face of the whole Church, and so bring you to that wholesome shame of which the Scripture speaks, and which is almost the only remedy for a hardness of heart like yours: "Imple fades eorum ignominia, et quarent nomen tuum, Domine— Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name, O Lord."

A stop must be put to this insolence, which does not spare the most sacred retreats. For who can be safe after a calumny of this nature? For shame, fathers! to publish in Paris such a scandalous book, with the name of your Father Meynier on its front, and under this infamous title, Port-Royal and Geneva in concert against the most holy Sacrament of the Altar, in which you accuse of this apostasy, not only Monsieur the abbe of St. Cyran, and M. Arnauld, but also Mother Agnes, his sister, and all the nuns of that monastery, alleging that "their faith, in regard to the eucharist, is as suspicious as that of M. Arnauld," whom you maintain to be "a down-right Calvinist." I here ask the whole world if there be any class of persons within the pale of the Church, on whom you could have advanced such an abominable charge with less semblance of truth. For tell me, fathers, if these nuns and their directors had been "in concert with Geneva against the most holy sacrament of the altar" (the very thought of which is shocking), how they should have come to select as the principal object of their piety that very sacrament which they held in abomination? How should they have assumed the habit of the holy sacrament? taken the name of the Daughters of the Holy Sacrament? called their church the Church of the Holy Sacrament? How should they have requested and obtained from Rome the confirmation of that institution, and the right of saying every Thursday the office of the holy sacrament, in which the faith of the Church is so perfectly expressed, if they had conspired with Geneva to banish that faith from the Church? Why would they have bound themselves, by a particular devotion, ' also sanctioned by the Pope, to have some of their sisterhood, night and day without intermission, in presence of the sacred host, to compensate, by their perpetual adorations towards that perpetual sacrifice, for the impiety ofthe heresy that aims at its annihilation? Tell me, fathers, if you can, why, of all the mysteries of our religion, they should have passed by those in which they believed, to fix upon that in which they believed not? and how they should have devoted themselves, so fully and entirely, to that mystery of our faith, if they took it, as the heretics do, for the mystery of iniquity? And what answer do you give to these clear evidences, embodied not in words only, but in actions; and not in some particular actions, but in the whole tenor of a life expressly dedicated to the adoration of Jesus Christ, dwelling on our altars? What answer, again, do you give to the books which you ascribe to Port-Royal, all of which are full of the most precise terms employed by the fathers and the councils to mark the essence of that mystery? It is at once ridiculous and disgusting to hear you replying to these as you have done throughout your libel. M. Arnauld, say you, talks very well about transubstantiation; but he understands, perhaps, only "a significative transubstantiation."

True, he professes to believe in "the real presence"; who can tell, however, but he means nothing more than "a true and real figure"? How now, fathers! whom, pray, will you not make pass for a Calvinist whenever you please, if you are to be allowed the liberty of perverting the most canonical and sacred expressions by the wicked subtleties of your modern equivocations? Who ever thought of using any other terms than those in question, especially in simple discourses of devotion, where no controversies are handled? And yet the love and the reverence in which they hold this sacred mystery have induced them to give it such a prominence in all their writings that I defy you, fathers, with all your cunning, to detect in them either the least appearance of ambiguity, or the slightest correspondence with the sentiments of Geneva.

Everybody knows, fathers, that the essence of the Genevan heresy consists, as it does according to your own showing, in their believing that Jesus Christ is not contained in this sacrament; that it is impossible he can be in many places at once; that he is, properly speaking, only in heaven, and that it is as there alone that he ought to be adored, and not on the altar; that the substance of the bread remains; that the body of Jesus Christ does not enter into the mouth or the stomach; that he can only be eaten by faith, and accordingly wicked men do not eat him at all; and that the mass is not a sacrifice, but an abomination. Let us now hear, then, in what way "Port-Royal is in concert with Geneva." In the writings of the former we read, to your confusion, the following statement: That "the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ are contained under the species of bread and wine"; that "the Holy of Holies is present in the sanctuary, and that there he ought to be adored"; that "Jesus Christ dwells in the sinners who communicate, by the real and veritable presence of his body in their stomach, although not by the presence of his Spirit in their hearts"; that "the dead ashes of the bodies of the saints derive their principal dignity from that seed of life which they retain from the touch of the immortal and vivifying flesh of Jesus Christ"; that "it is not owing to any natural power, but to the almighty power of God, to whom nothing is impossible, that the body of Jesus Christ is comprehended under the host, and under the smallest portion of every host"; that "the divine virtue is present to produce the effect which the words of consecration signify"; that "Jesus Christ, while he is lowered and hidden upon the altar, is, at the same time, elevated in his glory; that he subsists, of himself and by his own ordinary power, in divers places at the same time—in the midst of the Church triumphant, and in the midst of the Church militant and travelling"; that "the sacramental species remain suspended, and subsist extraordinarily, without being upheld by any subject; and that the body of Jesus Christ is also suspended under the species, and that it does not depend upon these, as substances depend upon accidents"; that "the substance of the bread is changed, the immutable accidents remaining the same"; that "Jesus Christ reposes in the eucharist with the same glory that he has in heaven"; that "his glorious humanity resides in the tabernacles of the Church, under the species of bread, which forms its visible covering; and that, knowing the grossness of our natures, he conducts us to the adoration of his divinity, which is present in all places, by the adoring of his humanity, which is present in a particular place"; that "we receive the body of Jesus Christ upon the tongue, which is sanctified by its divine touch"; "that it enters into the mouth of the priest"; that "although Jesus Christ has made himself accessible in the holy sacrament, by an act of his love and graciousness, he preserves, nevertheless, in that ordinance, his inaccessibility, as an inseparable condition of his divine nature; because, although the body alone and the blood alone are there, by virtue of the words — vi verborum, as the schoolmen say—his whole divinity may, notwithstanding, be there also, as well as his whole humanity, by a necessary conjunction." In fine, that "the eucharist is at the same time sacrament and sacrifice"; and that "although this sacrifice is a commemoration of that of the cross, yet there is this difference between them, that the sacrifice of the mass is offered for the Church only, and for the faithful in her communion; whereas that of the cross has been offered for all the world, as the Scripture testifies."

I have quoted enough, fathers, to make it evident that there was never, perhaps, a more imprudent thing attempted than what you have done. But I will go a step farther, and make you pronounce this sentence against yourselves. For what do you require from a man, in order to remove all suspicion of his being in concert and correspondence with Geneva? "If M. Arnauld," says your Father Meynier, p. 93, "had said that, in this adorable mystery, there is no substance of the bread under the species, but only the flesh and the blood of Jesus Christ, I should have confessed that he had declared himself absolutely against Geneva." Confess it, then, ye revilers! and make him a public apology. How often have you seen this declaration made in the passages I have just cited? Besides this, however, the Familiar Theology of M. de St. Cyran having been approved by M. Arnauld, it contains the sentiments of both. Read, then, the whole of lesson 15th, and particularly article 2d, and you will there find the words you desiderate, even more formally stated than you have done yourselves. "Is there any bread in the host, or any wine in the chalice? No: for all the substance of the bread and the wine is taken away, to give place to that of the body and blood ofJesus Christ, the which substance alone remains therein, covered by the qualities and species of bread and wine."

How now, fathers! will you still say that Port-Royal teaches "nothing that Geneva does not receive," and that M. Arnauld has said nothing in his second letter "which might not have been said by a minister of Charenton"? See if you can persuade Mestrezat to speak as M. Arnauld does in that letter, on page 237. Make him say that it is an infamous calumny to accuse him of denying transubstantiation; that he takes for the fundamental principle of his writings the truth of the real presence of the Son of God, in opposition to the heresy of the Calvinists; and that he accounts himself happy for living in a place where the Holy of Holies is continually adored in the sanctuary"—a sentiment which is still more opposed to the belief ofthe Calvinists than the real presence itself; for, as Cardinal Richelieu observes in his Controversies (p. 536): "The new ministers of France having agreed with the Lutherans, who believe the real presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist; they have declared that they remain in a state of separation from the Church on the point of this mystery, only on account of the adoration which Catholics render to the eucharist." Get all the passages which I have extracted from the books of Port-Royal subscribed at Geneva, and not the isolated passages merely, but the entire treatises regarding this mystery, such as the Book of Frequent Communion, the Explication of the Ceremonies of the Mass, the Exercise during Mass, the Reasons of the Suspension of the Holy Sacrament, the Translation of the Hymns in the Hours ofPort-Royal, &c; in one word, prevail upon them to establish at Charenton that holy institution of adoring, without intermission, Jesus Christ contained in the eucharist, as is done at Port-Royal, and it will be the most signal service which you could render to the Church; for in this case it will turn out, not that Port- Royal is in concert with Geneva, but that Geneva is in concert with Port-Royal and with the whole Church.

Certainly, fathers, you could not have been more unfortunate than in selecting Port-Royal as the object of attack for not believing in the eucharist; but I will show what led you to fix upon it. You know I have picked up some small acquaintance with your policy; in this instance you have acted upon its maxims to admiration. If Monsieur the abbe of St. Cyran, and M. Arnauld, had only spoken of what ought to be believed with great respect to this mystery, and said nothing about what ought to be done in the way of preparation for its reception, they might have been the best Catholics alive; and no equivocations would have been discovered in their use of the terms real presence and transubstantiation. But, since all who combat your licentious principles must needs be heretics, and heretics, too, in the very point in which they condemn your laxity, how could M. Arnauld escape falling under this charge on the subject of the eucharist, after having published a book expressly against your profanations of that sacrament? What! Must he be allowed to say, with impunity, that "the body of Jesus Christ ought not to be given to those who habitually lapse into the same crimes, and who have no prospect of amendment; and that such persons ought to be excluded, for some time, from the altar, to purify themselves by sincere penitence, that they may approach it afterwards with benefit"? Suffer no one to talk in this strain, fathers, or you will find that fewer people will come to your confessionals. Father Brisacier says that "were you to adopt this course, you would never apply the blood of Jesus Christ to a single individual." It would be infinitely more for your interest were every one to adopt the views of your Society, as set forth by your Father Mascarenhas, in a book approved by your doctors, and even by your reverend Father-General, namely: "That persons of every description, and even priests, may receive the body of Jesus Christ on the very day they have polluted themselves with odious crimes; that, so far from such communions implying irreverence, persons who partake of them in this manner act a commendable part; that confessors ought not to keep them back from the ordinance, but, on the contrary, ought to advise those who have recently committed such crimes to communicate immediately; because, although the Church has forbidden it, this prohibition is annulled by the universal practice in all places of the earth."

See what it is, fathers, to have Jesuits in all places of the earth! Behold the universal practice which you have introduced, and which you are anxious everywhere to maintain ! It matters nothing that the tables of Jesus Christ are filled with abominations, provided that your churches are crowded with people. Be sure, therefore, cost what it may, to set down all that dare to say a word against your practice as heretics on the holy sacrament. But how can you do this, after the irrefragable testimonies which they have given of their faith? Are you not afraid of my coming out with the four grand proofs of their heresy which you have adduced? You ought, at least, to be so, fathers, and I ought not to spare your blushing. Let us, then, proceed to examine proof the first. "M. de St. Cyran," says Father Meynier, "consoling one of his friends upon the death of his mother (torn, i., let. 14), says that the most acceptable sacrifice that can be offered up to God, on such occasions, is that of patience; therefore he is a Calvinist." This is marvellously shrewd reasoning, fathers; and I doubt if anybody will be able to discover the precise point of it. Let us learn it, then, from his own mouth. "Because," says this mighty controversialist, "it is obvious that he does not believe in the sacrifice of the mass; for this is, of all other sacrifices, the most acceptable unto God." Who will venture to say now that the Jesuits do not know how to reason? Why, they know the art to such perfection that they will extract heresy out of anything you choose to mention, not even excepting the Holy Scripture itself! For example, might it not be heretical to say, with the wise man in Ecclesiasticus, "There is nothing worse than to love money"; as if adultery, murder, or idolatry, were not far greater crimes? Where is the man who is not in the habit of using similar expressions every day? May we not say, for instance, that the most acceptable of all sacrifices in the eyes of God is that of a contrite and humbled heart; just because, in discourses of this nature, we simply mean to compare certain internal virtues with one another, and not with the sacrifice of the mass, which is of a totally different order, and infinitely more exalted? Is this not enough to make you ridiculous, fathers? And is it necessary, to complete your discomfiture, that I should quote the passages of that letter in which M. de St. Cyran speaks of the sacrifice of the mass as "the most excellent" of all others, in the following terms? "Let there be presented to God, daily and in all places, the sacrifice of the body of his Son, who could not find a more excellent way than that by which he might honour his Father." And afterwards: "Jesus Christ has enjoined us to take, when we are dying, his sacrificed body, to render more acceptable to God the sacrifice of our own, and to join himself with us at the hour of dissolution; to the end that he may strengthen us for the struggle, sanctifying, by his presence, the last sacrifice which we make to God of our life and our body"? Pretend to take no notice of all this, fathers, and persist in maintaining, as you do in page 39, that he refused to take the communion on his death-bed, and that he did not believe in the sacrifice of the mass. Nothing can be too gross for calumniators by profession.

Your second proof furnishes an excellent illustration of this. To make a Calvinist of M. de St. Cyran, to whom you ascribe the book of Petrus Aurelius, you take advantage of a passage (page 80) in which Aurelius explains in what manner the Church acts towards priests, and even bishops, whom she wishes to degrade or depose. "The Church," he says, "being incapable of depriving them of the power of the order, the character of which is indelible, she does all that she can do: she banishes from her memory the character which she cannot banish from the souls of the individuals who have been once invested with it; she regards them in the same light as if they were not bishops or priests; so that, according to the ordinary language of the Church, it may be said they are no longer such, although they always remain such, in as far as the character is concerned — ob indelebilitatem characterise You perceive, fathers, that this author, who has been approved by three general assemblies of the clergy of France, plainly declares that the character of the priesthood is indelible; and yet you make him say, on the contrary, in the very same passage, that "the character of the priesthood is not indelible." This is what I would call a notorious slander; in other words, according to your nomenclature, a small venial sin. And the reason is, this book has done you some harm by refuting the heresies of your brethren in England touching the Episcopal authority. But the folly of the charge is equally remarkable; for, after having taken it for granted, without any foundation, that M. de St. Cyran holds the priestly character to be not indelible, you conclude from this that he does not believe in the real presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist.

Do not expect me to answer this, fathers. If you have got no common sense, I am not able to furnish you with it. All who possess any share of it will enjoy a hearty laugh at your expense. Nor will they treat with greater respect your third proof, which rests upon the following words, taken from the Book of Frequent Communion: "In the eucharist God vouchsafes us the same food’ that He bestows on the saints in heaven, with this difference only, that here He withholds from us its sensible sight and taste, reserving both of these for the heavenly world." These words express the sense of the Church so distinctly that I am constantly forgetting what reason you have for picking a quarrel with them, in order to turn them to a bad use; for I can see nothing more in them than what the Council of Trent teaches (sess. xiii, c. 8), namely, that there is no difference between Jesus Christ in the eucharist and Jesus Christ in heaven, except that here he is veiled, and there he is not. M. Arnauld does not say that there is no difference in the manner of receiving Jesus Christ, but only that there is no difference in Jesus Christ who is received. And yet you would, in the face of all reason, interpret his language in this passage to mean that Jesus Christ is no more eaten with the mouth in this world than he is in heaven; upon which you ground the charge of heresy against him.

You really make me sorry for you, fathers. Must we explain this further to you? Why do you confound that divine nourishment with the manner of receiving it? There is but one point of difference, as I have just observed, betwixt that nourishment upon earth and in heaven, which is that here it is hidden under veils which deprive us of its sensible sight and taste; but there are various points of dissimilarity in the manner of receiving it here and there, the principal of which is, as M. Arnauld expresses it (p. 3, ch. 16), "that here it enters into the mouth and the breast both of the good and of the wicked," which is not the case in heaven. And, if you require to be told the reason of this diversity, I may inform you, fathers, that the cause of God's ordaining these different modes of receiving the same food is the difference that exists betwixt the state of Christians in this life and that of the blessed in heaven. The state of the Christian, as Cardinal Perron observes after the fathers, holds a middle place between the state of the blessed and the state of the Jews. The spirits in bliss possess Jesus Christ really, without veil or figure. The Jews possessed Jesus Christ only in figures and veils, such as the manna and the paschal lamb. And Christians possess Jesus Christ in the eucharist really and truly, although still concealed under veils. "God," says St. Eucher, "has made three tabernacles: the synagogue, which had the shadows only, without the truth; the Church, which has the truth and shadows together; and heaven, where there is no shadow, but the truth alone." It would be a departure from our present state, which is the state of faith, opposed by St. Paul alike to the law and to open vision, did we possess the figures only, without Jesus Christ; for it is the property of the law to have the mere figure, and not the substance of things. And it would be equally a departure from our present state if we possessed him visibly; because faith, according to the same apostle, deals not with things that are seen. And thus the eucharist, from its including Jesus Christ truly, though under a veil, is in perfect accordance with our state of faith. It follows that this state would be destroyed, if, as the heretics maintain, Jesus Christ were not really under the species of bread and wine; and it would be equally destroyed if we received him openly, as they do in heaven: since, on these suppositions, our state would be confounded, either with the state ofJudaism or with that of glory.

Such, fathers, is the mysterious and divine reason of this most divine mystery. This it is that fills us with abhorrence at the Calvinists, who would reduce us to the condition of the Jews; and this it is that makes us aspire to the glory of the beatified, where we shall be introduced to the full and eternal enjoyment of Jesus Christ. From hence you must see that there are several points of difference between the manner in which he communicates himself to Christians and to the blessed; and that, amongst others, he is in this world received by the mouth, and not so in heaven; but that they all depend solely on the distinction between our state of faith and their state of immediate vision. And this is precisely, fathers, what M. Arnauld has expressed, with great plainness, in the following terms: "There can be no other difference between the purity of those who receive Jesus Christ in the eucharist and that of the blessed, than what exists between faith and the open vision of God, upon which alone depends the different manner in which he is eaten upon earth and in heaven." You were bound in duty, fathers, to have revered in these words the sacred truths they express, instead of wresting them for the purpose of detecting an heretical meaning which they never contained, nor could possibly contain, namely, that Jesus Christ is eaten by faith only, and not by the mouth; the malicious perversion of your Fathers Annat and Meynier, which forms the capital count of their indictment.

Conscious, however, of the wretched deficiency of your proofs, you have had recourse to a new artifice, which is nothing less than to falsify the Council of Trent, in order to convict M. Arnauld of nonconformity with it; so vast is your store of methods for making people heretics. This feat has been achieved by Father Meynier, in fifty different places of his book, and about eight or ten times in the space of a single page (the 54th), wherein he insists that to speak like a true Catholic it is not enough to say, "I believe that Jesus Christ is really present in the eucharist," but we must say, "I believe, with the council, that he is present by a true local presence, or locally." And, in proof of this, he cites the council, session xiii, canon 3d, canon 4th, and canon 6th. Who would not suppose, upon seeing the term local presence quoted from three canons of a universal council, that the phrase was actually to be found in them? This might have served your turn very well, before the appearance of my Fifteenth Letter; but, as matters now stand, fathers, the trick has become too stale for us. We go our way and consult the council, and discover only that you are falsifiers. Such terms as local presence, locally, and locality, never existed in the passages to which you refer; and let me tell you further, they are not to be found in any other canon of that council, nor in any other previous council, not in any father of the Church. Allow me, then, to ask you, fathers, if you mean to cast the suspicion of Calvinism upon all that have not made use of that peculiar phrase? If this be the case, the Council of Trent must be suspected of heresy, and all the holy fathers without exception. Have you no other way of making M. Arnauld heretical, without abusing so many other people who never did you any harm, and, among the rest, St. Thomas, who is one of the greatest champions of the eucharist, and who, so far from employing that term, has expressly rejected it — "Nullo modo corpus Christi est in hoc sacramento localiter.—By no means is the body of Christ in this sacrament locally"? Who are you, then, fathers, to pretend, on your authority, to impose new terms, and ordain them to be used by all for rightly expressing their faith; as if the profession of the faith, drawn up by the popes according to the plan of the council, in which this term has no place, were defective, and left an ambiguity in the creed of the faithful which you had the sole merit of discovering? Such a piece of arrogance, to prescribe these terms, even to learned doctors! such a piece of forgery, to attribute them to general councils! and such ignorance, not to know the objections which the most enlightened saints have made to their reception! "Be ashamed of the error of your ignorance," as the Scripture says of ignorant impostors like you, "De mendacio ineruditionis tue confundere."

Give up all further attempts, then, to act the masters; you have neither character nor capacity for the part. If, however, you would bring forward your propositions with a little more modesty, they might obtain a hearing. For, although this phrase, local presence, has been rejected, as you have seen, by St. Thomas, on the ground that the body of Jesus Christ is not in the eucharist, in the ordinary extension of bodies in their places, the expression has, nevertheless, been adopted by some modern controversial writers, who understand it simply to mean that the body of Jesus Christ is truly under the species, which being in a particular place, the body of Jesus Christ is there also. And in this sense M. Arnauld will make no scruple to admit the term, as M. de St. Cyran and he have repeatedly declared that Jesus Christ in the eucharist is truly in a particular place, and miraculously in many places at the same time. Thus all your subtleties fall to the ground; and you have failed to give the slightest semblance of plausibility to an accusation which ought not to have been allowed to show its face without being supported by the most unanswerable proofs.

But what avails it, fathers, to oppose their innocence to your calumnies? You impute these errors to them, not in the belief that they maintain heresy, but from the idea that they have done you injury. That is enough, according to your theology, to warrant you to calumniate them without criminality; and you can, without either penance or confession, say mass, at the very time that you charge priests, who say it every day, with holding it to be pure idolatry; which, were it true, would amount to sacrilege no less revolting than that of your own Father Jarrige, whom you yourselves ordered to be hanged in effigy, for having said mass "at the time he was in agreement with Geneva."

What surprises me, therefore, is not the little scrupulosity with which you load them with crimes of the foulest and falsest description, but the little prudence you display, by fixing on them charges so destitute of plausibility. You dispose of sins, it is true, at your pleasure; but do you mean to dispose of men's beliefs too? Verily, fathers, if the suspicion of Calvinism must needs fall either on them or on you, you would stand, I fear, on very ticklish ground. Their language is as Catholic as yours; but their conduct confirms their faith, and your conduct belies it. For if you believe, as well as they do, that the bread is really changed into the body ofJesus Christ, why do you not require, as they do, from those whom you advise to approach the altar, that the heart of stone and ice should be sincerely changed into a heart of flesh and of love? If you believe that Jesus Christ is in that sacrament in a state of death, teaching those that approach it to die to the world, to sin, and to themselves, why do you suffer those to profane it in whose breasts evil passions continue to reign in all their life and vigour? And how do you come to judge those worthy to eat the bread of heaven, who are not worthy to eat that of earth?

Precious votaries, truly, whose zeal is expended in persecuting those who honour this sacred mystery by so many holy communions, and in flattering those who dishonour it by so many sacrilegious desecrations! How comely is it, in these champions of a sacrifice so pure and so venerable, to collect around the table of Jesus Christ a crowd of hardened profligates, reeking from their debaucheries; and to plant in the midst of them a priest, whom his own confessor has hurried from his obscenities to the altar; there, in the place of Jesus Christ, to offer up that most holy victim to the God of holiness, and convey it, with his polluted hands, into mouths as thoroughly polluted as his own! How well does it become those who pursue this course "in all parts of the world," in conformity with maxims sanctioned by their own general to impute to the author of Frequent Communion, and to the Sisters of the Holy Sacrament, the crime of not believing in that sacrament!

Even this, however, does not satisfy them. Nothing less will satiate their rage than to accuse their opponents of having renounced Jesus Christ and their baptism. This is no air-built fable, like those of your invention; it is a fact, and denotes a delirious frenzy which marks the fatal consummation of your calumnies. Such a notorious falsehood as this would not have been in hands worthy to support it, had it remained in those of your good friend Filleau, through whom you ushered it into the world: your Society has openly adopted it; and your Father Meynier maintained it the other day to be "a certain truth" that Port-Royal has, for the space of thirty-five years, been forming a secret plot, of which M. de St. Cyran and M. d'Ypres have been the ringleaders, "to ruin the mystery of the incarnation —to make the Gospel pass for an apocryphal fable—to exterminate the Christian religion, and to erect Deism upon the ruins of Christianity." Is this enough, fathers? Will you be satisfied if all this be believed of the objects of your hate? Would your animosity be glutted at length, if you could but succeed in making them odious, not only to all within the Church, by the charge of "consenting with Geneva" of which you accuse them, but even to all who believe in Jesus Christ, though beyond the pale of the Church, by the imputation of Deism?

33 PASCAL: *Pensees,* 862, 343a

1st example: Jesus Christ is God and man. The Arians, unable to reconcile these things, which they believe incompatible, say that He is man; in this they are Catholics. But they deny that He is God; in this they are heretics. They allege that we deny His humanity; in this they are ignorant.

2nd example: On the subject of the Holy Sacrament. We believe that, the substance of the bread being changed, and being consubstantial with that of the body of our Lord, Jesus Christ is therein really present. That is one truth. Another is that this Sacrament is also a type of the cross and of glory, and a commemoration of the two. That is the Catholic faith, which comprehends these two truths which seem opposed.

The heresy of to-day, not conceiving that this Sacrament contains at the same time both the presence of Jesus Christ and a type of Him, and that it is a sacrifice and a commemoration of a sacrifice, believes that neither of these truths can be admitted without excluding the other for this reason.

They fasten to this point alone, that this Sacrament is typical; and in this they are not heretics. They think that we exclude this truth; hence it comes that they raise so many objections to us out of the passages of the Fathers which assert it.

Finally, they deny the presence; and in this they are heretics.

3rd example: Indulgences.

The shortest way, therefore, to prevent heresies is to instruct in all truths; and the surest way to refute them is to declare them all. For what will the heretics say?

In order to know whether an opinion is a Father's . . .

33 PASCAL: *Pensees,* 870 344a-b

870. God has not wanted to absolve without the Church. As she has part in the offence, He desires her to have part in the pardon. He associates her with this power, as kings their parliaments. But if she absolves or binds without God, she is no longer the Church. For, as in the case of parliament, even if the king have pardoned a man, it must be ratified ; but if parliament ratifies without the king, or refuses to ratify on the order of the king, it is no longer the parliament of the king, but a rebellious assembly.

33 PASCAL: *Pensees,* 923 351b

923. It is not absolution only which remits sins by the sacrament of penance, but contrition, which is not real if it does not seek the sacrament.

**35 HUME: *Human Understanding,* SECT V, DIV 41, 468a-b; DIV 43, 468c**

35 HUME: *Human Understanding,* SECT V, DIV 41, 468a-b

41 . We have already observed that nature has established connexions among particular ideas, and that no sooner one idea occurs to our thoughts than it introduces its correlative, and carries our attention towards it, by a gentle and insensible movement. These principles of connexion or association we have reduced to three, namely, Resemblance, Contiguity and Causation: which are the only bonds that unite our thoughts together, and beget that regular train of reflection or discourse, which, in a greater or less degree, takes place among all mankind. Now here arises a question, on which the solution of the present difficulty will depend. Does it happen, in all these relations, that, when one of the objects is presented to the senses or memory, the mind is not only carried to the conception of the correlative, but reaches a steadier and stronger conception of it than what otherwise it would have been able to attain? This seems to be the case with that belief which arises from the relation of cause and effect. And if the case be the same with the other relations or principles of associations, this may be established as a general law, which takes place in all the operations of the mind.

We may, therefore, observe, as the first experiment to our present purpose, that, upon the appearance of the picture of an absent friend, our idea of him is evidently enlivened by the resemblance, and that every passion, which that idea occasions, whether ofjoy or sorrow, acquires new force and vigour. In producing this effect, there concur both a relation and a present impression. Where the picture bears him no resemblance, at least was not intended for him, it never so much as conveys our thought to him: And where it is absent, as well as the person, though the mind may pass from the thought of the one to that of the other, it feels its idea to be rather weakened than enlivened by that transition. We take a pleasure in viewing the picture of a friend, when it is set before us; but when it is removed, rather choose to consider him directly than by reflection in an image, which is equally distant and obscure.

The ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion may be considered as instances of the same nature. The devotees of that superstition usually plead in excuse for the mummeries, with which they are upbraided, that they feel the good effect of those external motions, and postures, and actions, in enlivening their devotion and quickening their fervour, which otherwise would decay, if directed entirely to distant and immaterial objects. We shadow out the objects of our faith, say they, in sensible types and images, and render them more present to us by the immediate presence of these types, than it is possible for us to do merely by an intellectual view and contemplation. Sensible objects have always a greater influence on the fancy than any other; and this influence they readily convey to those ideas to which they are related, and which they resemble. I shall only infer from these practices, and this reasoning, that the effect of resemblance in enlivening the ideas is very common; and as in every case a resemblance and a present impression must concur, we are abundantly supplied with experiments to prove the reality of the foregoing principle.

35 HUME: *Human Understanding,* SECT V, DIV 43, 468c

43. No one can doubt but causation has the same influence as the other two relations of resemblance and contiguity. Superstitious people are fond of the reliques of saints and holy men, for the same reason, that they seek after types or images, in order to enliven their devotion, and give them a more intimate and strong conception of those exemplary lives, which they desire to imitate. Now it is evident, that one of the best reliques, which a devotee could procure, would be the handywork of a saint; and if his cloaths and furniture are ever to be considered in this light, it is because they were once at his disposal, and were moved and affected by him; in which respect they are to be considered as imperfect effects, and as connected with him by a shorter chain of consequences than any of those, by which we learn the reality of his existence.

Suppose, that the son of a friend, who had been long dead or absent, were presented to us; it is evident, that this object would instantly revive its correlative idea, and recal to our thoughts all past intimacies and familiarities, in more lively colours than they would otherwise have appeared to us. This is another phaenomenon, which seems to prove the principle above mentioned.

**40 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 82a; 294b-d**

40 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 82a

But there are some remarkable instances, in which Zoroaster lays aside the prophet, assumes the legislator, and discovers a liberal concern for private and public happiness, seldom to be found among the grovelling or visionary schemes of superstition. Fasting and celibacy, the common means of purchasing the Divine favour, he condemns with abhorrence, as a criminal rejection of the best gifts of Providence. The saint, in the Magian religion, is obliged to beget children, to plant useful trees, to destroy noxious animals, to convey water to the dry lands of Persia, and to work out his salvation by pursuing all the labours of agriculture. We may quote from the Zendavesta a wise and benevolent maxim, which compensates for many an absurdity. "He who sows the ground with care and diligence, acquires a greater stock of religious merit, than he could gain by the repetition of ten thousand prayers."¹⁵ In the spring of every year a festival was celebrated, destined to represent the primitive equality, and the present connection, of mankind. The stately kings of Persia, exchanging their vain pomp for more genuine greatness, freely mingled with the humblest but most useful of their subjects. On that day the husbandmen were admitted, without distinction, to the table of the king, and his satraps. The monarch accepted their petitions, inquired into their grievances, and conversed with them on the most equal terms. "From your labours," was he accustomed to say (and to say with truth, if not with sincerity), "from your labours, we receive our subsistence; you derive your tranquillity from our vigilance ; since, therefore, we are mutually necessary to each other, let us live together like brothers in concord and love."¹⁶ Such a festival must indeed have degenerated, in a wealthy and despotic empire, into a theatrical representation; but it was at least a comedy well worthy of a royal audience, and which might sometimes imprint a salutary lesson on the mind of a young prince.

Had Zoroaster, in all his institutions, invariably supported this exalted character, his name would deserve a place with those of Numa and Confucius, and his system would be justly entitled to all the applause which it has pleased some of our divines, and even some of our philosophers, to bestow on it. But in that motley composition, dictated by reason and passion, by enthusiasm and by selfish motives, some useful and sublime truths were disgraced by a mixture of the most abject and dangerous superstition. The Magi, or sacerdotal order, were extremely numerous, since, as we have already seen, fourscore thousand of them were convened in a general council. Their forces were multiplied by discipline. A regular hierarchy was diffused through all the provinces of Persia ; and the Archimagus, who resided at Balch. Was respected as the visible head of the church, and the lawful successor of Zoroaster.¹⁷ The property of the Magi was very considerable. Besides the less invidious possession of a large tract of the most fertile lands of Media,¹⁸ they levied a general tax on the fortunes and the industry of the Persians.¹⁹ "Though your good works," says the interested prophet, "exceed in number the leaves of the trees, the drops of rain, the stars in the heaven, or the sands on the sea-shore, they will all be unprofitable to you, unless they are accepted by the destour. or priest. To obtain the acceptation of this guide to salvation, you must faithfully pay him tithes of all you possess, of your goods, of your lands, and of your money. If the destour be satisfied, your soul will escape hell tortures; you will secure praise in this world and happiness in the next. For the destours are the teachers of religion; they know all things, and they deliver all men."²⁰

40 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 294b-d

I. An instrument of the tortures which were inflicted only on slaves and strangers became an object of horror in the eyes of a Roman citizen; and the ideas of guilt, of pain, and of ignominy, were closely united with the idea of the cross.²⁹ The piety, rather than the humanity, of Constantine soon abolished in his dominions the punishment which the Saviour of mankind had condescended to suffer;³⁰ but the emperor had already learned to despise the prejudices of his education and of his people, before he could erect in the midst of Rome his own statue, bearing a cross in its right hand, with an inscription which referred the victory of his arms, and the deliverance of Rome, to the virtue of that salutary sign, the true symbol of force and courage.³¹ The same symbol sanctified the arms of the soldiers of Constantine; the cross glittered on their helmet, was engraved on their shields, was interwoven into their banners; and the consecrated emblems which adorned the person of the emperor himself were distinguished only by richer materials and more exquisite workmanship.³² But the principal standard which displayed the triumph of the cross was styled the Labarum,™ an obscure, though celebrated, name, which has been vainly derived from almost all the languages of the world. It is described³⁴ as a long pike intersected by a transversal beam. The silken veil which hung down from the beam was curiously inwrought with the images of the reigning monarch and his children. The summit of the pike supported a crown of gold, which enclosed the mysterious monogram, at once expressive of the figure of the cross and the initial letters of the name of Christ.³⁵ The safety of the labarum was intrusted to fifty guards of approved valour and fidelity ; their station was marked by honours and emoluments; and some fortunate accidents soon introduced an opinion that as long as the guards of the labarum were engaged in the execution of their office they were secure and invulnerable amidst the darts of the enemy. In the second civil war Licinius felt and dreaded the power of this consecrated banner, the sight of which in the distress of battle animated the soldiers of Constantine with an invincible enthusiasm, and scattered terror and dismay through the ranks of the adverse legions.³⁶ The Christian emperors, who respected the example of Constantine, displayed in all their military expeditions the standard of the cross; but when the degenerate successors of Theodosius had ceased to appear in person at the head of their armies, the labarum was deposited as a venerable but useless relic in the palace of Constantinople.³⁷ Its honours are still preserved on the medals of the Flavian family. Their grateful devotion has placed the monogram of Christ in the midst of the ensigns of Rome. The solemn epithets of safety of the republic, glory of the army, restoration of public happiness, are equally applied to the religious and military trophies; and there is still extant a medal of the emperor Constantius, where the standard of the labarum is accompanied with these memorable words, By this sign thou shalt conquer.³⁸

II. In all occasions of danger or distress it was the practice of the primitive Christians to fortify their minds and bodies by the sign of the cross, which they used in all their ecclesiastical rites, in all the daily occurrences of life, as an infallible preservative against every species of spiritual or temporal evil.³⁹ The authority of the church might alone have had sufficient weight to justify the devotion of Constantine, who, in the same prudent and gradual progress, acknowledged the truth and assumed the symbol of Christianity. But the testimony of a contemporary writer, who in a formal treatise has avenged the cause of religion, bestows on the piety of the emperor a more awful and sublime character. He affirms, with the most perfect confidence, that, in the night which preceded the last battle against Maxentius, Constantine was admonished in a dream to inscribe the shields of his soldiers with the celestial sign of God, the sacred monogram of the name of Christ; that he executed the commands of Heaven, and that his valour and obedience were rewarded by the decisive victory of the Milvian Bridge. Some considerations might perhaps incline a sceptical mind to suspect the judgment or the veracity of the rhetorician, whose pen, either from zeal or interest, was devoted to the cause of the prevailing faction.⁴⁰ He appears to have published his Deaths of the Persecutors at Nicomedia about three years after the Roman victory; but the interval of a thousand miles, and a thousand days, will allow an ample latitude for the invention of declaimers, the credulity of party, and the tacit approbation of the emperor himself; who might listen without indignation to a marvellous tale which exalted his fame and promoted his designs. In favour of Licinius, who still dissembled his animosity to the Christians, the same author has provided a similar vision, of a form of prayer, which was communicated by an angel, and repeated by the whole army before they engaged the legions of the tyrant Maximin.⁴¹ The frequent repetition of miracles serves to provoke, where it does not subdue, the reason of mankind; but if the dream of Constantine is separately considered, it may be naturally explained either by the policy or the enthusiasm of the emperor. Whilst his anxiety for the approaching day, which must decide the fate of the empire, was suspended by a short and interrupted slumber, the venerable form of Christ, and the well-known symbol of his religion, might forcibly offer themselves to the active fancy of a prince who reverenced the name, and had perhaps secretly implored the power, of the God of the Christians. As readily might a consummate statesman indulge himself in the use of one of those military stratagems, one of those pious frauds, which Philip and Sertorius had employed with such art and effect.⁴² The praeternatural origin of dreams was universally admitted by the nations of antiquity, and a considerable part of the Gallic army was already prepared to place their confidence in the salutary sign of the Christian religion. The secret vision of Constantine could be disproved only by the event; and the intrepid hero who had passed the Alps and the Apennine might view with careless despair the consequences of a defeat under the walls of Rome. The senate and people, exulting in their own deliverance from an odious tyrant, acknowledged that the victory of Constantine surpassed the powers of man, without daring to insinuate that it had been obtained by the protection of the gods. The triumphal arch, which was erected about three years after the event, proclaims, in ambiguous language, that, by the greatness of his own mind, and by an instinct or impulse of the Divinity, he had saved and avenged the Roman republic.⁴³ The Pagan orator, who had seized an earlier opportunity of celebrating the virtues of the conqueror, supposes that he alone enjoyed a secret and intimate commerce with the Supreme Being, who delegated the care of mortals to his subordinate deities; and thus assigns a very plausible reason why the subjects of Constantine should not presume to embrace the new religion of their sovereign.⁴⁴

III. The philosopher, who with calm suspicion examines the dreams and omens, the miracles and prodigies, of profane or even of ecclesiastical history, will probably conclude that, if the eyes of the spectators have sometimes been deceived by fraud, the understanding of the readers has much more frequently been insulted by fiction. Every event, or appearance, or accident, which seems to deviate from the ordinary course of nature, has been rashly ascribed to the immediate action of the Deity; and the astonished fancy of the multitude has sometimes given shape and colour, language and motion, to the fleeting but uncommon meteors of the air.⁴⁵ Nazarius and Eusebius are the two most celebrated orators who, in studied panegyrics, have laboured to exalt the glory of Constantine. Nine years after the Roman victory Nazarius⁴⁶ describes an army of divine warriors, who seemed to fall from the sky; he marks their beauty, their spirit, their gigantic forms, the stream of light which beamed from their celestial armour, their patience in suffering themselves to be heard, as well as seen, by mortals; and their declaration that they were sent, that they flew, to the assistance of the great Constantine. For the truth of this prodigy the Pagan orator appeals to the whole Gallic nation, in whose presence he was then speaking; and seems to hope that the ancient apparitions⁴⁷ would now obtain credit from this recent and public event. The Christian fable of Eusebius, which, in the space of twenty-six years, might arise from the original dream, is cast in a much more correct and elegant mould. In one of the marches of Constantine he is reported to have seen with his own eyes the luminous trophy of the cross, placed above the meridian sun, and inscribed with the following words: By this conquer. This amazing object in the sky astonished the whole army, as well as the emperor himself, who was yet undetermined in the choice of a religion: but his astonishment was converted into faith by the vision of the ensuing night. Christ appeared before his eyes; and displaying the same celestial sign of the cross, he directed Constantine to frame a similar standard, and to march, with an assurance of victory, against Maxentius and all his enemies.⁴⁸ The learned bishop of Caesarea appears to be sensible that the recent discovery of this marvellous anecdote would excite some surprise and distrust among the most pious of his readers. Yet, instead of ascertaining the precise circumstances of time and place, which always serve to detect falsehood or establish truth;⁴⁹ instead of collecting and recording the evidence of so many living witnesses, who must have been spectators of this stupendous miracle,⁵⁰ Eusebius contents himself with alleging a very singular testimony, that of the deceased Constantine, who, many years after the event, in the freedom of conversation, had related to him this extraordinary incident of his own life, and had attested the truth of it by a solemn oath. The prudence and gratitude of the learned prelate forbade him to suspect the veracity of his victorious master; but he plainly intimates that, in a fact of such a nature, he should have refused his assent to any meaner authority. This motive of credibility could not survive the power of the Flavian family; and the celestial sign, which the Infidels might afterwards deride,⁵¹ was disregarded by the Christians of the age which immediately followed the conversion of Constantine.⁵² But the Catholic church, both of the East and of the West, has adopted a prodigy which favours, or seems to favour, the popular worship of the cross. The vision of Constantine maintained an honourable place in the legend of superstition till the bold and sagacious spirit of criticism presumed to depreciate the triumph, and to arraign the truth, of the first Christian emperor.⁵³

**41 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 83d; 334b**

41 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 83d

Experience has proved that savages are the tyrants of the female sex, and that the condition of women is usually softened by the refinements of social life. In the hope of a robust progeny, Lycurgus had delayed the season of marriage: it was fixed by Numa at the tender age of twelve years, that the Roman husband might educate to his will a pure and obedient virgin.¹¹⁵ According to the custom of antiquity, he bought his bride of her parents, and she fulfilled the coemption by purchasing, with three pieces of copper, a just introduction to his house and household deities. A sacrifice of fruits was offered by the pontiffs in the presence of ten witnesses; the contracting parties were seated on the same sheepskin; they tasted a salt cake of far, or rice; and this confarreation,¹¹⁶ which denoted the ancient food of Italy, served as an emblem of their mystic union of mind and body. But this union on the side of the woman was rigorous and unequal; and she renounced the name and worship of her father's house, to embrace a new servitude, decorated only by the title of adoption : a fiction of the law, neither rational nor elegant, bestowed on the mother of a family¹¹⁷ (her proper appellation) the strange characters of sister to her own children and of daughter to her husband or master, who was invested with the plenitude of paternal power. By his judgment or caprice her behaviour was approved, or censured, or chastised; he exercised the jurisdiction of life and death; and it was allowed that in the cases of adultery or drunkenness¹¹⁸ the sentence might be properly inflicted. She acquired and inherited for the sole profit of her lord; and so clearly was woman defined, not as a person, but as a thing, that, if the original title were deficient, she might be claimed, like other movables, by the use and possession of an entire year. The inclination of the Roman husband discharged or withheld the conjugal debt, so scrupulously exacted by the Athenian and Jewish laws:¹¹⁹ but as polygamy was unknown, he could never admit to his bed a fairer or more favoured partner.

41 GIBBON: *Decline and Fall,* 334b

Yet the services of Luther and his rivals are solid and important; and the philosopher must own his obligations to these fearless enthusiasts.³⁴ I. By their hands the lofty fabric of superstition, from the abuse of indulgences to the intercession of the Virgin, has been levelled with the ground. Myriads of both sexes of the monastic profession were restored to the liberty and labours of social life. A hierarchy of saints and angels, of imperfect and subordinate deities, were stripped of their temporal power, and reduced to the enjoyment of celestial happiness: their images and relics were banished from the church ; and the credulity of the people was no longer nourished with the daily repetition of miracles and visions. The imitation of paganism was supplied by a pure and spiritual worship of prayer and thanksgiving, the most worthy of man, the least unworthy of the Deity. It only remains to observe whether such sublime simplicity be consistent with popular devotion; whether the vulgar, in the absence of all visible objects, will not be inflamed by enthusiasm or insensibly subside in languor and indifference. II. The chain of authority was broken, which restrains the bigot from thinking as he pleases, and the slave from speaking as he thinks: the popes, fathers, and councils were no longer the supreme and infallible judges of the world; and each Christian was taught to acknowledge no law but the Scriptures, no interpreter but his own conscience. This freedom, however, was the consequence rather than the design of the Reformation. The patriot reformers were ambitious of succeeding the tyrants whom they had dethroned. They imposed with equal rigour their creeds and confessions; they asserted the right of the magistrate to punish heretics with death. The pious or personal animosity of Calvin proscribed in Servetus³⁵ the guilt of his own rebellion;³⁶ and the flames of Smithfield, in which he was afterwards consumed, had been kindled for the Anabaptists by the zeal of Cranmer.³⁷ The nature of the tiger was the same, but he was gradually deprived of his teeth and fangs. A spiritual and temporal kingdom was possessed by the Roman pontiff: the Protestant doctors were subjects of a humble rank, without revenue or jurisdiction. His decrees were consecrated by the antiquity of Fifty the Catholic church; their arguments and disputes were submitted to the people; and their appeal to private judgment was accepted, beyond their wishes, by curiosity and enthusiasm. Since the days of Luther and Calvin a secret reformation has been silently working in the bosom of the reformed churches; many weeds of prejudice were eradicated; and the disciples of Erasmus³⁸ diffused a spirit of freedom and moderation. The liberty of conscience has been claimed as a common benefit, an inalienable right:³⁹ the free governments of Holland⁴⁰ and England⁴¹ introduced the practice of toleration; and the narrow allowance of the laws has been enlarged by the prudence and humanity of the times. In the exercise the mind has understood the limits of its powers, and the words and shadows that might amuse the child can no longer satisfy his manly reason. The volumes of controversy are overspread with cobwebs: the doctrine of a Protestant church is far removed from the knowledge or belief of its private members; and the forms of orthodoxy, the articles of faith, are subscribed with a sigh, or a smile, by the modern clergy. Yet the friends of Christianity are alarmed at the boundless impulse of inquiry and scepticism. The predictions of the Catholics are accomplished : the web of mystery is unravelled by the Armenians, Arians, and Socinians, whose numbers must not be computed from their separate congregations; and the pillars of Revelation are shaken by those men who preserve the name without the substance of religion, who indulge the licence without the temper of philosophy.⁴²
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We have then to probe to its depths the spiritual element in the Church—the form of its power. The essence of the Christian principle has already been unfolded; it is the principle of mediation. Man realizes his spiritual essence only when he conquers the natural that attaches to him. This conquest is possible only on the supposition that the human and the divine nature are essentially one, and that man, so far as he is spirit, also possesses the essentiality and substantiality that belong to the idea of deity. The condition of the mediation in question is the consciousness of this unity; and the intuition of this unity was given to man in Christ. The object to be attained is therefore, that man should lay hold on this consciousness, and that it should be continually excited in him. This was the design of the Mass: in the Host, Christ is set forth as actually present; the piece of bread consecrated by the priest is the present God, subjected to human contemplation and ever and anon offered up. One feature of this representation is correct, inasmuch as the sacrifice of Christ is here regarded as an actual and eternal transaction, Christ being not a mere sensuous and single, but a completely universal, i.e., divine Individuum; but on the other hand it involves the error of isolating the sensuous phase; for the Host is adored even apart from its being partaken of by the faithful, and the presence of Christ is not exclusively limited mental vision and spirit. Justly therefore did the Lutheran Reformation make this dogma an especial object of attack. Luther proclaimed the great doctrine that the Host had spiritual value and Christ was received only on the condition of faith in him; apart from this, the Host, he affirmed, was a mere external thing, possessed of no greater value than any other thing. But the Catholic falls down before the Host; and thus the merely outward has sanctity ascribed to it. The Holy as a mere thing has the character of externality; thus it is capable of being taken possession of by another to my exclusion: it may come into an alien hand, since the process of appropriating it is not one that takes place in spirit, but is conditioned by its quality as an external object. The highest of human blessings is in the hands of others. Here arises ipso facto a separation between those who possess this blessing and those who have to receive it from others—between the clergy and the laity. The laity as such are alien to the divine. This is the absolute schism in which the Church in the Middle Ages was involved: it arose from the recognition of the holy as something external. The clergy imposed certain conditions, to which the laity must conform if they would be partakers of the holy. The entire development of doctrine, spiritual insight and the knowledge of divine things, belonged exclusively to the Church: it has to ordain, and the laity have simply to believe: obedience is their duty—the obedience of faith, without insight on their part. This position of things rendered faith a matter of external legislation, and resulted in compulsion and the stake.

The generality of men are thus cut off from the Church; and on the same principle they are severed from the holy in every form. For on the same principle as that by which the clergy are the medium between man on the one hand and God and Christ on the other hand, the layman cannot directly apply to the divine being in his prayers, but only through mediators — human beings who conciliate God for him, the dead, the perfect — Saints. Thus originated the adoration of the Saints, and with it that conglomerate of fables and falsities with which the Saints and their biographies have been invested. In the East the worship of images had early become popular, and after a lengthened struggle had triumphantly established itself: an image, a picture, though sensuous, still appeals rather to the imagination; but the coarser natures of the West desired something more immediate as the object of their contemplation, and thus arose the worship of relics. The consequence was a formal resurrection of the dead in the mediaeval period, every pious Christian wished to be in possession of such sacred earthly remains. Among the Saints the chief object of adoration was the Virgin Mary. She is certainly the beautiful concept of pure love—a mother's love ; but spirit and thought stand higher than even this; and in the worship of this conception that of God in spirit was lost, and Christ himself was set aside. The element of mediation between God and man was thus apprehended and held as something external. Thus through the perversion of the principle of freedom, absolute slavery became the established law. The other aspects and relations of the spiritual life of Europe during this period flow from this principle. Knowledge, comprehension of religious doctrine, is something of which spirit is judged incapable; it is the exclusive possession of a class, which has to determine the true. For man may not presume to stand in a direct relation to God; so that, as we said before, if he would apply to Him, he needs a mediator—a saint. This view imports the denial of the essential unity of the divine and human; since man, as such, is declared incapable of recognizing the divine and of approaching thereto. And while humanity is thus separated from the supreme good, no change of heart, as such, is insisted upon—for this would suppose that the unity of the divine and the human is to be found in man himself—but the terrors of Hell are exhibited to man in the most terrible colours, to induce him to escape from them, not by moral amendment, but in virtue of something external—the "means of grace." These, however, are an arcanum to the laity; another—the "confessor," must furnish him with them. The individual has to confess, is bound to expose all the particulars of his life and conduct to the view of the confessor, and then is informed what course he has to pursue to attain spiritual safety. Thus the Church took the place of conscience: it put men in leading strings like children, and told them that man could not be freed from the torments which his sins had merited by any amendment of his own moral condition, but by outward actions, opera operata—actions which were not the promptings of his own good will, but performed by command of the ministers of the Church; e.g., hearing Mass, doing penance, going through a certain number of prayers, undertaking pilgrimages— actions which are unspiritual, stupefy the soul, and which are not only mere external ceremonies, but are such as can be even vicariously performed. The supererogatory works ascribed to the Saints, could be purchased, and the spiritual advantage which they merited, secured to the purchaser. Thus was produced an utter derangement of all that is recognized as good and moral in the Christian Church : only external requirements are insisted upon, and these can be complied with in a merely external way. A condition the very reverse of freedom is intruded into the principle of freedom itself.

With this perversion is connected the absolute separation of the spiritual from the secular principle generally. There are two divine kingdoms— the intellectual in the heart and cognitive faculty, and the socially ethical whose element and sphere is secular existence. It is science alone that can comprehend the kingdom of God and the socially moral world as one idea, and that recognizes the fact that the course of time has witnessed a process ever tending to the realization of this unity. But piety as such has nothing to do with the secular: it may make its appearance in that sphere on a mission of mercy, but this stops short of a strict socially ethical connection with it—does not come up to the idea of freedom. Religious feeling is extraneous to history, and has no history; for history is rather the empire of spirit recognizing itself in its subjective freedom, as the economy of social morality in the state. In the middle ages that embodying of the divine in actual life was wanting; the antithesis was not harmonized. Social morality was represented as worthless, and that in its three most essential particulars.

One phase of social morality is that connected with love—with the emotions called forth in the marriage relation. It is not proper to say that celibacy is contrary to nature, but that it is adverse to social morality. Marriage was indeed reckoned by the Church among the sacraments; but notwithstanding the position thus assigned it, it was degraded, inasmuch as celibacy was reckoned as the more holy state. A second point of social morality is presented in activity—the workman has to perform for his subsistence. His dignity consists in his depending entirely on his diligence, conduct, and intelligence, for the supply of his wants. In direct contravention of this principle, pauperism, laziness, inactivity, was regarded as nobler: and the immoral thus received the stamp of consecration. A third point of morality is, that obedience be rendered to the moral and rational, as an obedience to laws which I recognize as just; that it be not that blind and unconditional compliance which does not know what it is doing, and whose course of action is a mere groping about without clear consciousness or intelligence. But it was exactly this latter kind of obedience that passed for the most pleasing to God; a doctrine that exalts the obedience of slavery, imposed by the arbitrary will of the Church, above the true obedience of freedom.

In this way the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience turned out the very opposite of what they assumed to be, and in them all social morality was degraded. The Church was no longer a spiritual power, but an ecclesiastical one; and the relation which the secular world sustained to it was unspiritual, automatic, and destitute of independent insight and conviction. As the consequence of this, we see everywhere vice, utter absence of respect for conscience, shamelessness, and a distracted state of things, of which the entire history of the period is the picture in detail.

46 HEGEL: *Philosophy of History,* PART IV, 338a-d

The objective doctrines of Christianity had been already so firmly settled by the councils of the Church, that neither the mediaeval nor any other philosophy could develop them further, except in the way of exalting them intellectually, so that they might be satisfactory as presenting the form of thought. And one essential point in this doctrine was the recognition of the divine nature as not in any sense an other-world existence, but as in unity with human nature in the present and actual. But this presence is at the same time exclusively spiritual presence. Christ as a particular human personality has left the world ; his temporal existence is only a past one —i.e., it exists only in mental conception. And since the divine existence on earth is essentially of a spiritual character, it cannot appear in the form of a Dalai Lama. The Pope, however high his position as Head of Christendom and Vicar of Christ, calls himself only the Servant of Servants. How then did the Church realize Christ as a. definite and present existence? The principal form of this realization was, as remarked above, the Holy Supper, in the form it presented as the Mass : in this the life, suffering, and death of the actual Christ were verily present, as an eternal and daily repeated sacrifice. Christ appears as a definite and present existence in a sensuous form as the Host, consecrated by the priest ; so far all is satisfactory: that is to say, it is the Church, the spirit of Christ, that attains in this ordinance direct and full assurance. But the most prominent feature in this sacrament is, that the process by which deity is manifested, is conditioned by the limitations of particularity—that the Host, this thing, is set up to be adored as God. The Church then might have been able to content itself with this sensuous presence of deity; but when it is once granted that God exists in external phenomenal presence, this external manifestation immediately becomes infinitely varied; for the need of this presence is infinite. Thus innumerable instances will occur in the experience of the Church, in which Christ has appeared to one and another, in various places ; and still more frequently his divine Mother, who as standing nearer to humanity, is a second mediator between the Mediator and man (the miracle-working images of the Virgin are in their way Hosts, since they supply a benign and gracious presence of God). In all places, therefore, there will occur manifestations of the heavenly, in specially gracious appearances, the stigmata of Christ's Passion, etc.; and the divine will be realized in miracles as detached and isolated phenomena. In the period in question the Church presents the aspect of a world of miracle ; to the community of devout and pious persons natural existence has utterly lost its stability and certainty: rather, absolute certainty has turned against it, and the divine is not conceived of by Christendom under conditions of universality as the law and nature of spirit, but reveals itself in isolated and detached phenomena, in which the rational form of existence is utterly perverted.

In this complete development of the Church, we may find a deficiency: but what can be felt as a want by it? What compels it, in this state of perfect satisfaction and enjoyment, to wish for something else within the limits of its own principles—without apostatizing from itself? Those miraculous images, places, and times, are only isolated points, momentary appearances — are not an embodiment of deity, not of the highest and absolute kind. The Host, the supreme manifestation, is to be found indeed in innumerable churches; Christ is therein transubstantiated to a present and particular existence: but this itself is of a vague and general character; it is not his actual and very presence as particularized in space. That presence has passed away, as regards time; but as spatial and as concrete in space it has a mundane permanence in this particular spot, this particular village, etc. It is then this mundane existence which Christendom desiderates, which it is resolved on attaining. Pilgrims in crowds had indeed been able to enjoy it ; but the approach to the hallowed localities is in the hands of the infidels, and it is a reproach to Christendom that the holy places and the Sepulchre of Christ in particular are not in possession of the Church. In this feeling Christendom was united; consequently the Crusades were undertaken, whose object was not the furtherance of any special interests on the part of the several states that engaged in them, but simply and solely the conquest of the Holy Land.

The West once more sallied forth in hostile array against the East. As in the expedition of the Greeks against Troy, so here, the invading hosts were entirely composed of independent feudal lords and knights ; though they were not united under a real individuality, as were the Greeks under Agamemnon or Alexander. Christendom, on the contrary, was engaged in an undertaking whose object was the securing of the definite and present existence- the real culmination of individuality. This object impelled the West against the East, and this is the essential interest of the Crusades.

The first and immediate commencement of the Crusades was made in the West itself. Many thousands of Jews were massacred, and their property seized; and after this terrible prelude Christendom began its march. The monk, Peter the Hermit of Amiens, led the way with an immense troop of rabble. This host passed in the greatest disorder through Hungary, and robbed and plundered as they went ; but their numbers dwindled away, and only a few reached Constantinople. For rational considerations were out of the question ; the mass of them believed that God would be their immediate guide and protector. The most striking proof that enthusiasm almost robbed the nations of Europe of their senses is supplied by the fact that at a later time troops of children ran away from their parents and went to Marseilles, there to take ship for the Holy Land. Few reached it; the rest were sold by the merchants to the Saracens as slaves.

At last, with much trouble and immense loss, more regular armies attained the desired object; they beheld themselves in possession of all the holy places of note—Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Golgotha, and even the Holy Sepulchre. In the whole expedition, in all the acts of the Christians, appeared that enormous contrast (a feature characteristic of the age)—the transition on the part of the crusading host from the greatest excesses and outrages to the profoundest contrition and humiliation. Still dripping with the blood of the slaughtered inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Christians fell down on their faces at the tomb of the Redeemer, and directed their fervent supplications to him.

Thus did Christendom come into the possession of its highest good. Jerusalem was made a kingdom, and the entire feudal system was introduced there—a constitution which, in presence of the Saracens, was certainly the worst that could be adopted. Another Crusade in the year 1204 resulted in the conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of a Latin Empire there. Christendom, therefore, had appeased its religious craving ; it could now veritably walk unobstructed in the footsteps of the Saviour. Whole shiploads of earth were brought from the Holy Land to Europe. Of Christ himself no corporeal relics could be obtained, for he was arisen : the Sacred Handkerchief, the Cross, and lastly the Sepulchre, were the most venerated memorials. But in the grave is found the real point of retroversion; it is in the grave that all the vanity of the sensuous perishes. At the Holy Sepulchre the vanity of opinion passes away; there all is seriousness. In the negation of that definite and present embodiment, i.e., of the sensuous, it is that the turning-point in question is found, and those words have an application: "Thou wouldst not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Christendom was not to find its ultimatum of truth in the grave. At this sepulchre the Christian world received a second time the response given to the disciples when they sought the body of the Lord there : "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen." You must not look for the principle of your religion in the sensuous, in the grave among the dead, but in the living spirit in yourselves. We have seen how the vast idea of the union of the finite with the infinite was perverted to such a degree as that men looked for a definite embodiment of the infinite in a mere isolated outward object. Christendom found the empty Sepulchre, but not the union of the secular and the eternal; and so it lost the Holy Land. It was practically undeceived; and the result which it brought back with it was of a negative kind: viz., that the definite embodiment which it was seeking, was to be looked for in subjective consciousness alone, and in no external object; that the definite form in question, presenting the union of the secular with the eternal, is the spiritual self-cognizant independence of the individual. Thus the world attains the conviction that man must look within himself for that definite embodiment of being which is of a divine nature: subjectivity thereby receives absolute authorization, and claims to determine for itself the relation to the divine.¹ This then was the absolute result of the Crusades, and from them we may date the commencement of self-reliance and spontaneous activity. The West bade an eternal farewell to the East at the Holy Sepulchre, and gained a comprehension of its own principle of subjective infinite freedom. Christendom never appeared again on the scene of history as one body.
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CHAPTER III

On reaching Petersburg Pierre did not let anyone know of his arrival, he went nowhere and spent whole days in reading Thomas a Kempis, whose book had been sent him by someone unknown. One thing he continually realized as he read that book: the joy, hitherto unknown to him, of believing in the possibility of attaining perfection, and in the possibility of active brotherly love among men, which Joseph Alexeevich had revealed to him. A week after his arrival, the young Polish count, Willarski, whom Pierre had known slightly in Petersburg society, came into his room one evening in the official and ceremonious manner in which Dolokhov's second had called on him, and, having closed the door behind him and satisfied himself that there was nobody else in the room, addressed Pierre.

"I have come to you with a message and an offer, Count," he said without sitting down. "A person of very high standing in our Brotherhood has made application for you to be received into our Order before the usual term and has proposed to me to be your sponsor. I consider it a sacred duty to fulfill that person's wishes. Do you wish to enter the Brotherhood of Freemasons under my sponsorship?"

The cold, austere tone of this man, whom he had almost always before met at balls, amiably smiling in the society of the most brilliant women, surprised Pierre.

"Yes, I do wish it," said he. Willarski bowed his head.

"One more question, Count," he said, "which I beg you to answer in all sincerity—not as a future Mason but as an honest man: have you renounced your former convictions—do you believe in God?"

Pierre considered.

"Yes . . . yes, I believe in God," he said.

"In that case . . ." began Willarski, but Pierre interrupted him.

"Yes, I do believe in God," he repeated.

"In that case we can go," said Willarski. "My carriage is at your service."

Willarski was silent throughout the drive. To Pierre's inquiries as to what he must do and how he should answer, Willarski only replied that brothers more worthy than he would test him and that Pierre had only to tell the truth. Having entered the courtyard of a large house where the Lodge had its headquarters, and having ascended a dark staircase, they entered a small well-lit anteroom where they took off their cloaks without the aid of a servant. From there they passed into another room. A man in strange attire appeared at the door. Willarski, stepping toward him, said something to him in French in an undertone and then went up to a small wardrobe in which Pierre noticed garments such as he had never seen before. Having taken a kerchief from the cupboard, Willarski bound Pierre's eyes with it and tied it in a knot behind, catching some hairs painfully in the knot. Then he drew his face down, kissed him, and taking him by the hand led him forward. The hairs tied in the knot hurt Pierre and there were lines of pain on his face and a shamefaced smile. His huge figure, with arms hanging down and with a puckered, though smiling face, moved after Willarski with uncertain, timid steps.

Having led him about ten paces, Willarski stopped.

"Whatever happens to you," he said, "you must bear it all manfully if you have firmly resolved to join our Brotherhood." (Pierre nodded affirmatively.) "When you hear a knock at the door, you will uncover your eyes," added Willarski. "I wish you courage and success," and, pressing Pierre's hand, he went out.

Left alone, Pierre went on smiling in the same way. Once or twice he shrugged his shoulders and raised his hand to the kerchief, as if wishing to take it off, but let it drop again. The five minutes spent with his eyes bandaged seemed to him an hour. His arms felt numb, his legs almost gave way, it seemed to him that he was tired out. He experienced a variety of most complex sensations. He felt afraid of what would happen to him and still more afraid of showing his fear. He felt curious to know what was going to happen and what would be revealed to him; but most of all, he felt joyful that the moment had come when he would at last start on that path of regeneration and on the actively virtuous life of which he had been dreaming since he met Joseph Alex£evich. Loud knocks were heard at the door. Pierre took the bandage off his eyes and glanced around him. The room was in black darkness, only a small lamp was burning inside something white. Pierre went nearer and saw that the lamp stood on a black table on which lay an open book. The book was the Gospel, and the white thing with the lamp inside was a human skull with its cavities and teeth. After reading the first words of the Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God," Pierre went round the table and saw a large open box filled with something. It was a coffin with bones inside. He was not at all surprised by what he saw. Hoping to enter on an entirely new life quite unlike the old one, he expected everything to be unusual, even more unusual than what he was seeing. A skull, a coffin, the Gospel—it seemed to him that he had expected all this and even more. Trying to stimulate his emotions he looked around. "God, death, love, the brotherhood of man," he kept saying to himself, associating these words with vague yet joyful ideas.

The door opened and someone came in. By the dim light, to which Pierre had already become accustomed, he saw a rather short man. Having evidently come from the light into the darkness, the man paused, then moved with cautious steps toward the table and placed on it his small leather-gloved hands.

This short man had on a white leather apron which covered his chest and part of his legs; he had on a kind of necklace above which rose a high white ruffle, outlining his rather long face which was lit up from below.

"For what have you come hither?" asked the newcomer, turning in Pierre's direction at a slight rustle made by the latter. "Why have you, who do not believe in the truth of the light and who have not seen the light, come here? What do you seek from us? Wisdom, virtue, enlightenment?"

At the moment the door opened and the stranger came in, Pierre felt a sense of awe and veneration such as he had experienced in his boyhood at confession; he felt himself in the presence of one socially a complete stranger, yet nearer to him through the brotherhood of man. With bated breath and beating heart he moved toward the Rhetor (by which name the brother who prepared a seeker for entrance into the Brotherhood was known). Drawing nearer, he recognized in the Rhetor a man he knew, Smolyaninov, and it mortified him to think that the newcomer was an acquaintance—he wished him simply a brother and a virtuous instructor. For a long time he could not utter a word, so that the Rhetor had to repeat his question.

"Yes . . . I . . . I . . . desire regeneration," Pierre uttered with difficulty.

"Very well," said Smolyaninov, and went on at once: "Have you any idea of the means by which our holy Order will help you to reach your aim?" said he quietly and quickly.

"I . . . hope . . . for guidance . . . help ... in regeneration," said Pierre, with a trembling voice and some difficulty in utterance due to his excitement and to being unaccustomed to speak of abstract matters in Russian.

"What is your conception of Freemasonry?"

"I imagine that Freemasonry is the fraternity and equality of men who have virtuous aims," said Pierre, feeling ashamed of the inadequacy of his words for the solemnity of the moment, as he spoke. "I imagine . . ."

"Good!" said the Rhetor quickly, apparently satisfied with this answer. "Have you sought for means of attaining your aim in religion?"

"No, I considered it erroneous and did not follow it," said Pierre, so softly that the Rhetor did not hear him and asked him what he was saying. "I have been an atheist," answered Pierre.

"You are seeking for truth in order to follow its laws in your life, therefore you seek wisdom and virtue. Is that not so?" said the Rhetor, after a moment's pause.

"Yes, yes," assented Pierre.

The Rhetor cleared his throat, crossed his gloved hands on his breast, and began to speak.

"Now I must disclose to you the chief aim of our Order," he said, "and if this aim coincides with yours, you may enter our Brotherhood with profit. The first and chief object of our Order, the foundation on which it rests and which no human power can destroy, is the preservation and handing on to posterity of a certain important mystery . . . which has come down to us from the remotest ages, even from the first man—a mystery on which perhaps the fate of mankind depends. But since this mystery is of such a nature that nobody can know or use it unless he be prepared by long and diligent self-purification, not everyone can hope to attain it quickly. Hence we have a secondary aim, that of preparing our members as much as possible to reform their hearts, to purify and enlighten their minds, by means handed on to us by tradition from those who have striven to attain this mystery, and thereby to render them capable of receiving it.

"By purifying and regenerating our members we try, thirdly, to improve the whole human race, offering it in our members an example of piety and virtue, and thereby try with all our might to combat the evil which sways the world. Think this over and I will come to you again."

"To combat the evil which sways the world . . ." Pierre repeated, and a mental image of his future activity in this direction rose in his mind. He imagined men such as he had himself been a fortnight ago, and he addressed an edifying exhortation to them. He imagined to himself vicious and unfortunate people whom he would assist by word and deed, imagined oppressors whose victims he would rescue. Of the three objects mentioned by the Rhetor, this last, that of improving mankind, especially appealed to Pierre. The important mystery mentioned by the Rhetor, though it aroused his curiosity, did not seem to him essential, and the second aim, that of purifying and regenerating himself, did not much interest him because at that moment he felt with delight that he was already perfectly cured of his former faults and was ready for all that was good.

Half an hour later, the Rhetor returned to inform the seeker of the seven virtues, corresponding to the seven steps of Solomon's temple, which every Freemason should cultivate in himself. These virtues were: 1. Discretion, the keeping of the secrets of the Order. 2. Obedience to those of higher ranks in the Order. 3. Morality. 4. Love of mankind. 5. Courage. 6. Generosity. 7. The love of death.

"In the seventh place, try, by the frequent thought of death," the Rhetor said, "to bring yourself to regard it not as a dreaded foe, but as a friend that frees the soul grown weary in the labors of virtue from this distressful life, and leads it to its place of recompense and peace."

"Yes, that must be so," thought Pierre, when after these words the Rhetor went away, leaving him to solitary meditation. "It must be so, but I am still so weak that I love my life, the meaning of which is only now gradually opening before me." But five of the other virtues which Pierre recalled, counting them on his fingers, he felt already in his soul: courage, generosity, morality, love of mankind, and especially obedience—which did not even seem to him a virtue, but a joy. (He now felt so glad to be free from his own lawlessness and to submit his will to those who knew the indubitable truth.) He forgot what the seventh virtue was and could not recall it.

The third time the Rhetor came back more quickly and asked Pierre whether he was still firm in his intention and determined to submit to all that would be required of him.

"I am ready for everything," said Pierre.

"I must also inform you," said the Rhetor, "that our Order delivers its teaching not in words only but also by other means, which may perhaps have a stronger effect on the sincere seeker after wisdom and virtue than mere words. This chamber with what you see therein should already have suggested to your heart, if it is sincere, more than words could do. You will perhaps also see in your further initiation a like method of enlightenment. Our Order imitates the ancient societies that explained their teaching by hieroglyphics. A hieroglyph," said the Rhetor, "is an emblem of something not cognizable by the senses but which possesses qualities resembling those of the symbol."

Pierre knew very well what a hieroglyph was, but dared not speak. He listened to the Rhetor in silence, feeling from all he said that his ordeal was about to begin.

"If you are resolved, I must begin your initiation," said the Rhetor coming closer to

Pierre. "In token of generosity I ask you to give me all your valuables."

"But I have nothing here," replied Pierre, supposing that he was asked to give up all he possessed.

"What you have with you: watch, money, rings. . . ."

Pierre quickly took out his purse and watch, but could not manage for some time to get the wedding ring off his fat finger. When that had been done, the Rhetor said:

"In token of obedience, I ask you to undress." Pierre took off his coat, waistcoat, and left boot according to the Rhetor's instructions. The Mason drew the shirt back from Pierre's left breast, and stooping down pulled up the left leg of his trousers to above the knee. Pierre hurriedly began taking off his right boot also and was going to tuck up the other trouser leg to save this stranger the trouble, but the Mason told him that was not necessary and gave him a slipper for his left foot. With a childlike smile of embarrassment, doubt, and self-derision, which appeared on his face against his will, Pierre stood with his arms hanging down and legs apart, before his brother Rhetor, and awaited his further commands.

"And now, in token of candor, I ask you to reveal to me your chief passion," said the latter.

"My passion! I have had so many," replied Pierre.

"That passion which more than all others caused you to waver on the path of virtue," said the Mason.

Pierre paused, seeking a reply.

"Wine? Gluttony? Idleness? Laziness? Irritability? Anger? Women?" He went over his vices in his mind, not knowing to which of them to give the pre-eminence.

"Women," he said in a low, scarcely audible voice.

The Mason did not move and for a long time said nothing after this answer. At last he moved up to Pierre and, taking the kerchief that lay on the table, again bound his eyes.

"For the last time I say to you—turn all your attention upon yourself, put a bridle on your senses, and seek blessedness, not in passion but in your own heart. The source of blessedness is not without us but within. . . ."

Pierre had already long been feeling in himself that refreshing source of blessedness which now flooded his heart with glad emotion.

CHAPTER IV

Soon after this there came into the dark chamber to fetch Pierre, not the Rhetor but Pierre's sponsor, Willarski, whom he recognized by his voice. To fresh questions as to the firmness of his resolution Pierre replied: "Yes, yes, I agree," and with a beaming, childlike smile, his fat chest uncovered, stepping unevenly and timidly in one slippered and one booted foot, he ad vanced, while Willarski held a sword to his bare chest. He was conducted from that room along passages that turned backwards and forwards and was at last brought to the doors of the Lodge. Willarski coughed, he was answered by the Masonic knock with mallets, the doors opened before them. A bass voice (Pierre was still blindfold) questioned him as to who he was, when and where he was born, and so on. Then he was again led somewhere still blindfold, and as they went along he was told allegories of the toils of his pilgrimage, of holy friendship, of the Eternal Architect of the universe, and of the courage with which he should endure toils and dangers. During these wanderings, Pierre noticed that he was spoken of now as the "Seeker," now as the "Sufferer," and now as the "Postulant," to the accompaniment of various knockings with mallets and swords. As he was being led up to some object he noticed a hesitation and uncertainty among his conductors. He heard those around him disputing in whispers and one of them insisting that he should be led along a certain carpet. After that they took his right hand, placed it on something, and told him to hold a pair of compasses to his left breast with the other hand and to repeat after someone who read aloud an oath of fidelity to the laws of the Order. The candles were then extinguished and some spirit lighted, as Pierre knew by the smell, and he was told that he would now see the lesser light. The bandage was taken off his eyes and, by the faint light of the burning spirit, Pierre, as in a dream, saw several men standing before him, wearing aprons like the Rhetor's and holding swords in their hands pointed at his breast. Among them stood a man whose white shirt was stained with blood. On seeing this, Pierre moved forward with his breast toward the swords, meaning them to pierce it. But the swords were drawn back from him and he was at once blindfolded again.

"Now thou hast seen the lesser light," uttered a voice. Then the candles were relit and he was told that he would see the full light; the bandage was again removed and more than ten voices said together: "Sic transit gloria mundi.”

Pierre gradually began to recover himself and looked about at the room and at the people in it. Round a long table covered with black sat some twelve men in garments like those he had already seen. Some of them Pierre had met in Petersburg society. In the President's chair sat a young man he did not know, with a peculiar cross hanging from his neck. On his right sat the Italian abbe" whom Pierre had met at Anna Pavlovna's two years before. There were also present a very distinguished dignitary and a Swiss who had formerly been tutor at the Kuragins'. All maintained a solemn silence, listening to the words of the President, who held a mallet in his hand. Let into the wall was a star-shaped light. At one side of the table was a small carpet with various figures worked upon it, at the other was something resembling an altar on which lay a Testament and a skull. Round it stood seven large candlesticks like those used in churches. Two of the brothers led Pierre up to the altar, placed his feet at right angles, and bade him lie down, saying that he must prostrate himself at the Gates of the Temple.

"He must first receive the trowel," whispered one of the brothers.

"Oh, hush, please!" said another.

Pierre, perplexed, looked round with his shortsighted eyes without obeying, and suddenly doubts arose in his mind. "Where am I? What am I doing? Aren't they laughing at me? Shan't I be ashamed to remember this?" But these doubts only lasted a moment. Pierre glanced at the serious faces of those around, remembered all he had already gone through, and realized that he could not stop halfway. He was aghast at his hesitation and, trying to arouse his former devotional feeling, prostrated himself before the Gates of the Temple. And really, the feeling of devotion returned to him even more strongly than before. When he had lain there some time, he was told to get up, and a white leather apron, such as the others wore, was put on him: he was given a trowel and three pairs of gloves, and then the Grand Master addressed him. He told him that he should try to do nothing to stain the whiteness of that apron, which symbolized strength and purity; then of the unexplained trowel, he told him to toil with it to cleanse his own heart from vice, and indulgently to smooth with it the heart of his neighbor. As to the first pair of gloves, a man's, he said that Pierre could not know their meaning but must keep them. The second pair of man's gloves he was to wear at the meetings, and finally of the third, a pair of women's gloves, he said: "Dear brother, these woman's gloves are intended for you too. Give them to the woman whom you shall honor most of all. This gift will be a pledge of your purity of heart to her whom you select to be your worthy helpmeet in Masonry." And after a pause, he added: "But beware, dear brother, that these gloves do not deck hands that are unclean." While the Grand Master said these last words it seemed to Pierre that he grew embarrassed. Pierre himself grew still more confused, blushed like a child till tears came to his eyes, began looking about him uneasily, and an awkward pause followed.

This silence was broken by one of the brethren, who led Pierre up to the rug and began reading to him from a manuscript book an explanation of all the figures on it: the sun, the moon, a hammer, a plumb line, a trowel, a rough stone and a squared stone, a pillar, three windows, and so on. Then a place was assigned to Pierre, he was shown the signs of the Lodge, told the password, and at last was permitted to sit down. The Grand Master began reading the statutes. They were very long, and Pierre, from joy, agitation, and embarrassment, was not in a state to understand what was being read. He managed to follow only the last words of the statutes and these remained in his mind.

"In our temples we recognize no other distinctions," read the Grand Master, "but those between virtue and vice. Beware of making any distinctions which may infringe equality. Fly to a brother's aid whoever he may be, exhort him who goeth astray, raise him that falleth, never bear malice or enmity toward thy brother. Be kindly and courteous. Kindle in all hearts the flame of virtue. Share thy happiness with thy neighbor, and may envy never dim the purity of that bliss. Forgive thy enemy, do not avenge thyself except by doing him good. Thus fulfilling the highest law thou shalt regain traces of the ancient dignity which thou hast lost."

He finished and, getting up, embraced and kissed Pierre, who, with tears of joy in his eyes, looked round him, not knowing how to answer the congratulations and greetings from acquaintances that met him on all sides. He acknowledged no acquaintances but saw in all these men only brothers, and burned with impatience to set to work with them.

The Grand Master rapped with his mallet. All the Masons sat down in their places, and one of them read an exhortation on the necessity of humility.

The Grand Master proposed that the last duty should be performed, and the distinguished dignitary who bore the title of "Collector of Alms" went round to all the brothers. Pierre would have liked to subscribe all he had, but fearing that it might look like pride subscribed the same amount as the others.

The meeting was at an end, and on reaching home Pierre felt as if he had returned from a long journey on which he had spent dozens of years, had become completely changed, and had quite left behind his former habits and way of life.
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He divided the Brothers he knew into four categories. In the first he put those who did not take an active part in the affairs of the lodges or in human affairs, but were exclusively occupied with the mystical science of the order: with questions of the threefold designation of God, the three primordial elements sulphur, mercury, and salt—or the meaning of the square and all the various figures of the temple of Solomon. Pierre respected this class of Brothers to which the elder ones chiefly belonged, including, Pierre thought, Joseph Alexèevich himself, but he did not share their interests. His heart was not in the mystical aspect of Freemasonry.

In the second category Pierre reckoned himself and others like him, seeking and vacillating, who had not yet found in Freemasonry a straight and comprehensible path, but hoped to do so.

In the third category he included those Brothers (the majority) who saw nothing in Freemasonry but the external forms and ceremonies, and prized the strict performance of these forms without troubling about their purport or significance. Such were Willarski and even the Grand Master of the principal lodge.

Finally, to the fourth category also a great many Brothers belonged, particularly those who had lately joined. These according to Pierre's observations were men who had no belief in anything, nor desire for anything, but joined the Freemasons merely to associate with the wealthy young Brothers who were influential through their connections or rank, and of whom there were very many in the lodge.

Pierre began to feel dissatisfied with what he was doing. Freemasonry, at any rate as he saw it here, sometimes seemed to him based merely on externals. He did not think of doubting Freemasonry itself, but suspected that Russian Masonry had taken a wrong path and deviated from its original principles. And so toward the end of the year he went abroad to be initiated into the higher secrets of the order.

In the summer of 1809 Pierre returned to Petersburg. Our Freemasons knew from correspondence with those abroad that Beziikhov had obtained the confidence of many highly placed persons, had been initiated into many mysteries, had been raised to a higher grade, and was bringing back with him much that might conduce to the advantage of the Masonic cause in Russia. The Petersburg Freemasons all came to see him, tried to ingratiate themselves with him, and it seemed to them all that he was preparing something for them and concealing it.
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CHAPTER X

Pierre went on with his diary, and this is what he wrote in it during that time:

24th November

Got up at eight, read the Scriptures, then went to my duties. [By Joseph Alexeevich's advice Pierre had entered the service of the state and served on one of the committees.] Returned home for dinner and dined alone—the countess had many visitors I do not like. I ate and drank moderately and after dinner copied out some passages for the Brothers. In the evening I went down to the countess and told a funny story about B., and only remembered that I ought not to have done so when everybody laughed loudly at it.

I am going to bed with a happy and tranquil mind. Great God, help me to walk in Thy paths, (1) to conquer anger by calmness and deliberation, (2) to vanquish lust by self-restraint and repulsion, (3) to withdraw from worldliness, but not avoid (a) the service of the state, (b) family duties, (c) relations with my friends, and (d) the management of my affairs.

27th November

I got up late. On waking I lay long in bed yielding to sloth. O God, help and strengthen me that I may walk in Thy ways! Read the Scriptures, but without proper feeling. Brother Uriisov came and we talked about worldly vanities. He told me of the Emperor's new projects. I began to criticize them, but remembered my rules and my benefactor's words—that a true Freemason should be a zealous worker for the state when his aid is required and a quiet onlooker when not called on to assist. My tongue is my enemy. Brothers G. V. and O. visited me and we had a preliminary talk about the reception of a new Brother. They laid on me the duty of Rhetor. I feel myself weak and unworthy. Then our talk turned to the interpretation of the seven pillars and steps of the Temple, the seven sciences, the seven virtues, the seven vices, and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Brother O. was very eloquent. In the evening the admission took place. The new decoration of the premises contributed much to the magnificence of the spectacle. It was Boris Drubetskoy who was admitted. I nominated him and was the Rhetor. A strange feeling agitated me all the time I was alone with him in the dark chamber. I caught myself harboring a feeling of hatred toward him which I vainly tried to overcome. That is why I should really like to save him from evil and lead him into the path of truth, but evil thoughts of him did not leave me. It seemed to me that his object in entering the Brotherhood was merely to be intimate and in favor with members of our lodge. Apart from the fact that he had asked me several times whether N. and S. were members of our lodge (a question to which I could not reply) and that according to my observation he is incapable of feeling respect for our holy order and is too preoccupied and satisfied with the outer man to desire spiritual improvement, I had no cause to doubt him, but he seemed to me insincere, and all the time I stood alone with him in the dark temple it seemed to me that he was smiling contemptuously at my words, and I wished really to stab his bare breast with the sword I held to it. I could not be eloquent, nor could I frankly mention my doubts to the Brothers and to the Grand Master. Great Architect of Nature, help me to find the true path out of the labyrinth of lies!

After this, three pages were left blank in the diary, and then the following was written:

I have had a long and instructive talk alone with Brother V., who advised me to hold fast by Brother A. Though I am unworthy, much was revealed to me. Adonai is the name of the creator of the world. Elohim is the name of the ruler of all. The third name is the name unutterable which means the All. Talks with Brother V. strengthen, refresh, and support me in the path of virtue. In his presence doubt has no place. The distinction between the poor teachings of mundane science and our sacred all-embracing teaching is clear to me. Human sciences dissect everything to comprehend it, and kill everything to examine it. In the holy science of our order all is one, all is known in its entirety and life. The Trinity—the three elements of matter— are sulphur, mercury, and salt. Sulphur is of an oily and fiery nature; in combination with salt by its fiery nature it arouses a desire in the latter by means of which it attracts mercury, seizes it, holds it, and in combination produces other bodies. Mercury is a fluid, volatile, spiritual essence. Christ, the Holy Spirit, Him! . . .

3rd December

Awoke late, read the Scriptures but was apathetic. Afterwards went and paced up and down the large hall. I wished to meditate, but instead my imagination pictured an occurrence of four years ago, when Dolokhov, meeting me in Moscow after our duel, said he hoped I was enjoying perfect peace of mind in spite of my wife's absence. At the time I gave him no answer. Now I recalled every detail of that meeting and in my mind gave him the most malevolent and bitter replies. I recollected myself and drove away that thought only when I found myself glowing with anger, but I did not sufficiently repent. Afterwards Boris Drubetskoy came and began relating various adventures. His coming vexed me from the first, and I said something disagreeable to him. He replied. I flared up and said much that was unpleasant and even rude to him. He became silent, and I recollected myself only when it was too late. My God, I cannot get on with him at all. The cause of this is my egotism. I set myself above him and so become much worse than he, for he is lenient to my rudeness while I on the contrary nourish contempt for him. O God, grant that in his presence I may rather see my own vileness, and behave so that he too may benefit. After dinner I fell asleep and as I was drowsing off I clearly heard a voice saying in my left ear, "Thy day!"

I dreamed that I was walking in the dark and was suddenly surrounded by dogs, but I went on undismayed. Suddenly a smallish dog seized my left thigh with its teeth and would not let go. I began to throttle it with my hands. Scarcely had I torn it off before another, a bigger one, began biting me. I lifted it up, but the higher I lifted it the bigger and heavier it grew. And suddenly Brother A. came and, taking my arm, led me to a building to enter which we had to pass along a narrow plank. I stepped on it, but it bent and gave way and I began to clamber up a fence which I could scarcely reach with my hands. After much effort I dragged myself up, so that my legs hung down on one side and my body on the other. I looked round and saw Brother A. standing on the fence and pointing me to a broad avenue and garden, and in the garden was a large and beautiful building. I woke up. O Lord, great Architect of Nature, help me to tear from myself these dogs—my passions— especially the last, which unites in itself the strength of all the former ones, and aid me to enter that temple of virtue to a vision of which I attained in my, dream.
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We already know how rooms are used symbolically. This representation may be extended, so that windows and doors (entrances and ex its from rooms) come to mean the openings of the body; the fact of rooms being open or closed also accords with this symbolism: the key, which opens them, is certainly a male symbol.

This is some material for a study of dream symbolism. It is not complete, and could be both extended and made deeper. However, I think it will seem to you more than enough; perhaps you may dislike it. You will ask: "Do I then really live in the midst of sexual symbols? Are all the objects round me, all the clothes I wear, all the things I handle, always sexual symbols and nothing else?" There really is good reason for surprised questions, and the first of these would be: How do we profess to arrive at the meaning of these dream-symbols, about which the dreamer himself can give us little or no information.

My answer is that we derive our knowledge from widely different sources: from fairy tales and myths, jokes and witticisms, from folk lore, i.e., from what we know of the manners and customs, sayings and songs, of different peoples, and from poetic and colloquial usage of language. Everywhere in these various fields the same symbolism occurs, and in many of them we can understand it without being taught anything about it. If we consider these various sources individually, we shall find so many parallels to dream-symbolism that we are bound to be convinced of the correctness of our interpretations.