

'Dialogue and Syllogism in the Sixteenth Century'

A Study

in the

Life and Theology of William Whitaker (ob. 1595)

Master of St. John's College, Cambridge 1587 - 1595 AD
and

Regius Professor of Divinity 1580 - 1595 AD

Ἀλκιμωτάτος τῆς ἁγίας πίστεως Πρόμαχος.

'Stout Champion of the Holy Faith'

Epicedia 17.

'Opera' Vol.1. 709.

Revd. Edward C. Brooks M.A., B.D.,
Somerleyton Rectory
Suffolk.

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY,
LEEDS.

Contents

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. 'Tempora mutantur , nos et mutamur in illis'.	1.
2. Set on Collision Course ; The Jesuit Menace 1579 - - 1581 ' ; Edmund Campion's 'Brag' and 'Ten Reasons'.	50.
3. Whitaker's Reply to Campion and Duraeus.	51.
4. The Canon of Scripture .	75.
5. The Authority of Tradition(s)	100.
6. The Perfection of Scripture and the Testimonies of the Fathers	160.
7. The Versions of Scripture -- One Exemplar ? .	172.
8. The Right Sense of Scripture	211.
9. The Eucharist.	233.
10. The Church.	277.
11. The Authority of Scripture.	330.
12. The Four General Councils.	388.
13. The Papacy.	434.
14. Master of St. John's College, Cambridge ; The Lambeth Articles(1595) and Whitaker's Death.	500.
15. Appendix --- Antioch and the Petrine Tradition.	544.
16. Bibliography .	557.
17. Index Nominum, Rerum, et Verborum.	566.

Errata	
1. Pagination goes from 542 to 544 but no text is missing.	
2. Two pages numbered 285, but text continuous and unaffected.	

Chapter 1.

' Tempora mutantur , nos et mutamur in illis '

Why has Whitaker remained unexamined for 400 years ? . Living all his academic life at Cambridge , as Regius Professor 1580 - 1595 , and Master of St. John's College from 1587 to his death in 1595 , he was at the centre of important religious changes taking place at that time. Sufficiently daunting is the sheer volume of his work , but patient study evokes the Te Deum rather than the Nunc Dimittis , for there is thrown up a range and vista of ideas in an era populated with fine minds , that any study of the Anglican and Roman relations would be the poorer without them. We may dismiss the thought that this is an attempt at exhumation, tantamount to an act of industrial archeology --the polemic machinery long since dead , the terms of reference now irrelevant, and the contents providing no more than an antiquarian might expect.

From the Anglican side , for the fifteen years mentioned, his work in England dominated the Anglican-Roman controversy and prevented it from lapsing into sterility. The lively exchanges in that developing controversy with Rome reveals a depth of scholarship and integrity of theological insight that makes him one of the outstanding theologians of the day, deserving of a place between Jewel and Hooker , and within that magisterial succession. His work, particularly on the Fathers , contributed to a large degree to the more popular studies of the Fathers in the 17th. Century. He not only kept the Patristic ball in court , but also kept the ball in play. This thesis is an exploration into, and examination of, an unfamiliar aspect of Whitaker's work -- his Patristic Theology, considered in the light of modern scholarship and on texts which are current dialogue today . Like Zanchi , Whitaker had a better knowledge of the Fathers (and more respect for them) than is popularly supposed.

Frequent references are made to Whitaker in critical works and biographies of the period, but there has been no examination, detailed or otherwise, of his thought. Philip Hughes in his 'Reformation in England' Vol. 3. p.232-4 does not allow Whitaker on to the stage till the Lambeth Articles of 1595.

The neglect is not so surprising as at first may appear --though the chief milestones of the period have received textual publication and critical examination, there is a vast hinterland of unexamined works which belong to this period. Bancroft, successor to Whitgift, lacks a biographer, as does Bilson who is not even mentioned in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Strype's Whitgift called for a further study which has been partly met by the excellent studies of V.J. Brook and Professor Powel Mills Dawley but they both lack the examination and assessment of two important MSS which lie behind Whitgift's theology. The thought is still popular that Whitgift was guided only by constitutional or political considerations. There is no full scale English work on Beza or Bullinger or Bucer. Only recently has Jewel's work as an apologist been assessed by J.E. Booty. Sandy's sermons and a biography exist in the edition of T. Whitaker (1812) but there is no assessment of his place in the movements of his time. Harsnett, Fulke, Alexander Nowell (Churton is still the standard work) Henry Alvey, Lawrence Chaderton, John Overall, William Perkins, Bishop James Pilkington, Robert Some, and John Still, the centre of disturbances at St. John's 1576 (Master of St. John's 1574, Master of Trinity 1577, and in 1597 Bishop of Bath and Wells) all need the sort of work that Pearson did on Cartwright. On the Socinian influences of the period --Lelio Sozini (d 1562.) had recently visited England-- and the challenge of the Radicals, only during the past 30 years has serious study evoked an acknowledgement of their importance, and yet Whitaker's works are replete with comments on their thought.

Ernst Troeltsch in his 'Social Teaching of the Christian Churches and Sects' (Tubingen 1912 English translation 1931) had argued that it was the 16th. Century Radicals rather than the Lutheran and Reformed Churches which broke the ethos of the Medieval world. Karl Holl and Heinrich Boehmer reacted to this view by claiming that the Radicals were no true part of the Reformation but were outside it, and that the Anabaptists were the true violent revolutionaries. G. Rupp's 'Patterns of Reformation' (1969) has brought a renewed interest in England in the Radical movement, reflected also in America, but it has been left to American scholars to assess the positive value of this Radical tradition eg. Bender, Smith, Horsch,

G.H. Williams, and Mergal. But it is not necessary to wait for the recent revival in ecumenical Reformation scholarship¹ to hear that belief in the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church was integral to the faith of Protestantism, that it did not regard incorporation into the Church as an optional extra to be dispensed with by men of unusual spiritual stature, and also believed that outside the church there was no salvation -- Whitaker had already said these things in his defence of Luther and Calvin.

By 1536 Calvin had hardly considered the church except under its invisible and hidden aspect as the totality of the elect. Contact with Bucer forced him to consider a more positive attitude towards the visible church and community, which is apparent in the 1543 edition of the Institutes². In Institutes IV.3.2 he states that through prophecy among us and reception of the Apostolic teaching, we grow together into the unity of Christ. Accepting the thought of Calvin in this, that by entering communion with Christ we form ourselves a community which rests solely upon the action of Christ in us, Whitaker enlarges with quotations from Augustine, that all animated by the Love of God constitute one religion and social community and with Bucer emphasises the idea of the church as an organism rather than an institution. Whitaker never lost Calvin's conception of the true church as the invisible church of the elect because it was imperishable and received full salvation, and is the true Body of Christ. The mixed visible church contained the non-elect sharing the same profession of faith, the same sacraments, and unity in doctrine and charity. The church to the non-elect was the object of faith, to the elect, the object of experience. Christ is Head of both. Like Luther and Melancthon in the Augsburg Confession (Articles 7 and 8) Calvin admitted two objective criteria for the discernment of a true church -- the pure preaching of the word, and the sacraments administered according to the Institution of Christ. Whitaker stands by this definition but

-
1. 'The Catholicity of Protestantism' by Flew & Davies (1950).
 2. Institutes IV.1.4. 'outside the bosom of the church one can hope for no remission of sins nor any salvation' -- using the well-known definition of Cyprian (De Unitate 6. ML.V.519) and Augustine (De Baptismo 54.4.17.24. MLXLiii.170) he repeated with Luther (Great Catechism 3rd. Art on the Creed) that the church is our mother and that apart from her there is no salvation.

but emphasizes inherent discipline within the true church to prevent blasphemy, immorality, and to encourage penitence, but unlike Bucer he did not raise this to a third note of the true church.

When we leave the Anglican-Puritan side, we find on the Romanist side an even greater lack of works; it is not simply a matter of selection and printing individual works but a comprehensive study of a man's thought. What Fr. Brodrick did for Bellarmine, and his earlier work on Peter Canisius, needs to be done for many Catholic authors. A.C. Southern wrote¹ 'it is a noteworthy fact that all the Catholic authors with one notable exception to whom reference is made in the chapters of this book (i.e. 'Elizabethan Recusant Prose 1559 - 1582' 1950 ed.) either have been entirely ignored in our histories or have been given such scant reference as amounts to the same thing'². Thomas Alfield, Harding, William Rainolds (who took Whitaker to task for his work on the Rheims Testament) Thomas Heskins, Persons, Richard Shacklock, Brinkley, and Hopkins, not a whit behind their Protestant counterparts in seriousness, scholarship, and importance, also lack critical studies of their thought. What the Parker Society did for the works of Coverdale, Brecon, Cranmer, Grindal, Hooper, Latimer, Jewel, and Whitaker needed a counterpart, which is now seen in the work of the Catholic Record Society but there is still a fund of MSS sources yet untapped which may well provide fruitful material for further investigation and help to elucidate some of the problems arising from the selective printing of individual works. There remains the even wider problem of assessment. No one side had the monopoly of scholarship -- many works of great length, on controversial, historical, dogmatic, and devotional topics, were the products of men of both sides of considerable intellectual standing and in some cases with a European reputation for learning. Much that appeared in the 17th. Century requires the 16th. Century for its understanding.

-
1. Preface (lx) in his 'Recusant Prose 1559-82' 1950 ed.
 2. The notable exception was Thomas Veech 'Dr. Nicholas Sanders and the English Reformation' (1935). Since then Schützeichol and Seybold have produced works on Stapleton.

To redress the balance in a critical examination of this period it is important to realise that many of the recusants were native Englishmen -- driven abroad by the penal laws and drawing inspiration and energy for their theology and spiritual lives from the Continental centres of the Counter-Reformation. But while we hear of the Protestant exiles at Magdeburg , Zurich, and Frankfurt , we have heard little of Richard Smith, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford , Francis Babington the distinguished Vice-Chancellor of Oxford , William Good , Alan Cope, Richard Hall of Pembroke College Cambridge , Thomas Bailey Master of Clare Hall , Cambridge, George Bullock , Master of St. John's Cambridge --and those recusants lost to the universities but who actually remained in the country eg. Thomas Sedgewick . It is perhaps understandable why Whitgift in 1589¹ could call attention to the decay in learning in the universities --the penal situation had narrowed the function of a university as great schools of all sciences and of all learning into their being regarded as little more than seminaries 'for the education of the clergy of the Established Church ' , a view confirmed by the Bishops' Declaration of 1584 that Oxford and Cambridge were ' founded principally for the study of divinity and increase of the numbers of learned preachers and ministers '.

William Whitaker was born in Lancashire in 1548 at the manor house on the estate of Holme , 4 miles S.E. of Burnley. He was the third son of Thomas Whitaker and Elizabeth (married 1530) the daughter of John Nowell of Read and sister of Alexander Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, and Robert Nowell , Dean of Lichfield . William's early education was at the grammar school at Burnley , recently

1. Strype 'Life and Acts of John Whitgift' (1822) p.610 et seq.

opened by Hartgrave , but at the age of 13 , he was sent for by Alexander Nowell, and his biographer speaks of three possible reasons --- 'that Nowell saw him daily tainted with the infection of corrupt superstition , that he perceived an excellent disposition in the boy , or that he was fired with zeal for the exercise of charity and endearing himself to all his relatives '. William is described by his biographer as a 'boy tender and superstitiously disposed' and that his uncle Alexander like Abraham, was rescuing his relative Lot from the midst of idolaters . Gataker described him as 'nursed in popish superstition'. Hartgrave was a well known name in recusant circles , and if Assheton were Whitaker's biographer he would know very well the strength of recusancy in those parts, observing the situation through the rectory window at Middleton. Alexander Nowell reached St. Paul's Deanery as a returned Marian exile in 1560 but the situation in Lancashire was well known to him.

-
1. Gataker Notes from Abel Redivivus (1651) by Fuller Vol.2.p.109 . Vita by Gataker;1867 ed.
 2. Allenson 'Vitae et Mortis Doctiss. Sanctissimique Theologi Guilielmi Whitakeri S.Theologiae Doctoris ac Professoris Regii et celeberrimi Collegii D.Joannis in Cantabrigiensi Academia Magistri prudentissimi Vera Descriptio'. Exists in the latin text, Geneva ed. 1610 of Whitaker's works Vol.1.698-704. The actual authorship is uncertain -- the name A.Assheton is bracketed in the Br.Mus. Cat. of Printed Books Vol. 57 and is accepted as the true author by Churton (Life of Alex. Nowell) and Cooper (Athen.Cantabr. sub Whitaker) . On the other hand Baker (History of St. John's College p.180 - 9 ed. Mayor. 1869 ed.) regarded John Allenson , a Durham man and a Fellow of St. John's as the author , for he had taken notes of Whitaker's lectures and published some of them after Whitaker's death. The Vita had originally carried no author's name before it reached the printer. Allenson was also probably the author of the Preface to Vol.1. of the Geneva edition of Whitaker's works. Allenson however did not reach Cambridge till 1576 & he was also suspended 1583 - 9 for refusing subscription to the Articles and this hardly fits in with the contents and style of the Vita. In support of Assheton , he was a Lancashire man, his father being at the apposite time Rector of Middleton and he followed Whitaker to St. John's. References to boyhood in the Vita suggest Assheton as the actual author--he was also Lancashire born . A translation of the Vita was printed London 1722 (Br. Mus. MS G. 14222)

The closing years of Trent made it sufficiently clear that any hope of a reconciliation between Romanism and Anglicanism was out of the question. The theological gulf had widened considerably in the previous 30 years and on the access^{ion} of Elizabeth in 1558 it was in Lancashire that Romanism hardened into a defence of 'the old faith'. Elizabeth rightly believed that the campaign to stiffen the English in favour of Rome was largely regional, and she informed the Bishop of Chester that the disorders in his diocese were such 'as we hear not of the like in any other part of the realm'. Much can be said about the tempering of legislative severity by administrative moderation, the Queen's diplomacy and forbearance with quiet papists, but the fact remains that her clemency did not run to allowing Romanists to mount an organised effort to 'persuade' her subjects to disobey her ecclesiastical laws, long before the Bull of 1570 gave such efforts their sinister turn. It must however be acknowledged that the reclamation by Romanists was not solely out of respect for Papalism. The ordinary folk may well have been a small constituent element in the struggle. It was rather that the Lancashire folk with their conservatism loved the familiar pattern of medieval church life, the Latin Mass, regular shriving, invocation of favourite saints, death bed anointing, liturgical petitions, the 'simplicity' of eucharistic worship uncomplicated by rival theories of the eucharistic presence, now no longer confined to the theological schools, but hurled across the roof tops each being charged with high emotional content dependent upon which side he had aligned himself with. A stable spiritual framework, had for a long time formed the heart of the Christian Faith. Theological clichés became party slogans.

The emigrés may thunder that such practices as beloved by the conservative were a necessary consequence of Papal obedience; they were claiming to utter sound theological precepts but they were bad psychologists, for it was ^{not} Papal obedience that held the Lancashire folk necessarily to these practices, but the sheer familiarity of them, warp and woof of their day to day lives. Many Romanists of this mould remained fully English in their politics or would have been content to have been left so if they had not been forced by recusants into aligning themselves on the

question of ultimate spiritual obedience. Campion's tract on non-attendance at parish churches only vitiated the controversy, and with reasons which lie outside the *sitz im leben*. Elizabeth's principle as outlined by Francis Bacon was that consciences should not be forced but won over and redeemed by truth, with the aid of time and instruction; but when conscience exceeded its national bounds and proved grounds for faction, then the claim to conscience lost its validity.

Whitaker's boyhood was spent within this context of internal conviction not emerging into overt illegal practice, and this ultimately proved beneficial to his understanding within the wider sphere of disputation. Whitaker agreed with his uncle's words at the opening of the 1563 Parliament that the Queen's dealings were distinguished by clemency and mercy, and that many changes had taken place quietly, but unlike his uncle he never called for the death penalty for the 'maintenance of false religion' because it infected Christian society.

The failure of the English Reformation to take root in Lancashire despite the coercion of bishops and central government can only confirm the view that locally the imposition of an unpopular religion by a clever and powerful bureaucracy upon an unwilling and rebellious people, made the area fertile for the continuation of Papalism. In varying degrees the refusal to be integrated into the Reformed Church of England and the staunch allegiance to the Papal See, particularly by large landowning families, whose estates ran contiguously across the country thus affording a ready path for recusants, and their dependencies and tenants stiff in the old Faith, emerged in a refusal to be associated with oaths enforcing the Elizabethan Settlement or to be associated with the parish church. William (later Cardinal) Allen, was a Lancashire man and remained Papalist till 1560 when he sought refuge in Flanders. Laurence Vaux was also a Lancashire man and the stimulation and growth of recusancy in Lancashire is greatly due to Vaux's endeavour, much enhanced by his popularity, his quiet, sincere, but vigorous defence of the old Faith. The appearance of John Bradford and Pendleton, disseminating Protestantism, served to arouse tenacious Protestantism in the towns but did little to

penetrate the country parts where opposition was only increased by the appearance of town mobs in country churches, smashing, robbing, and burning. Bolton may have been the Geneva of the North, with Bradford, Saunders, and Marsh dying the Protestant martyr's death under Mary, but the western countryside remained unconvinced. Keen minds perceived in the new scholarship a quickening of religion, but before the Elizabethan Settlement could be seen clearly not as a legal compromise but as capable of a rich and vivid life of its own, it was necessary to have the theology of Jewel, Whitaker, Hooker, and Andrewes, the piety of Ferrar and Herbert, and the liturgical stand of Laud. The emergence of recusancy almost as soon as the precarious Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were passed with a narrow majority ---with the full weight of the new Cecil administration behind them and the permanent Ecclesiastical Commission on July 19th. 1559 following the Royal Visitation of the 6 districts of England ---was strongest among those haunted with the spectre of Petrine unity, much encouraged by Allen's return to Rossall Grange, his father's home, in 1562. Ostensibly for ill-health, it is interesting to note that in a short time he covered extensive ground in visits to places which were to become well known in recusant records. Neither Downham the Bishop of Chester nor the Earl of Derby had much enthusiasm for recusancy hunting --this was reflected in the severe reprimand given to the bishop by Elizabeth who wrote ^{l.} that his appointment to Chester had been a reward for his 'former services to us, but now we find great lack in you, being sorry to have our former expectations in this sort deceived'. The disorders in his diocese had 'not the like in any other part of our realm'.

In addition to the stiff papist and persistent Protestant there arose the conformist Catholic; the fear of the Law made him wear the mark of the Gospel which he used not as a means to save his soul but his property; he loved Popery but would not lose by it and though sometimes seared by Bulls from Rome he was more afraid of the Bear from Greenwich. He brought his body into church to save his bail. For Communion he was always sure to be out of charity with his neighbour. He made a bad martyr but a good traveller, for his conscience was so large he could never wander

far from it. What he could not defend , he claimed to be under mental reservation . Allen saw nothing but contempt for such behaviour and by 1566 the Roman position was hardened by the new Pope who had seen signal service in the Inquisition --from now on, conformity was neither lawful nor dispensable . Alexander Nowell began a preaching tour in his native Lancashire , and though much praised by Bishop Downham of Chester , it met with little success and could only confirm Nowell in his wisdom in removing his young nephew from that area. Nowell failed to convert his own brother-in-law~~#~~ John Towneley ¹. It was to take more than evangelical eloquence to eradicate old devotional attitudes and habits and even allowing for the alarmist nature of much of Glasior's evidence, there was certainly truth in the claim that 'great confederacies' of papists existed; in the returns for J.P.s at that time , 431 were described as 'favourable' , and 421 as 'indifferent' or 'hostile' . It is interesting to note the use of the word 'favourable' --this is hardly a synonym for staunch firm Anglicans . The examination at Lathom in 1568 revealed a rich harvest for Allen, Vaux, Coppage, and Thomson. By the time William Chaderton arrived as the new Bishop of Chester , 200 men from Lancashire had been or were being trained for the priesthood and Campion, scholar, priest, hero-martyr, played a leading and hazardous part in the conflict. In 1580 he returned to England , to Tyburn , via Lancashire, where he gave much heart to recusants. He met with stronger support than is generally realised -- his general theme that resistance to the established order was religious and not political , whatever else he had written on non-attendance at the parish church , matched the thought of a great number of recusants who wanted not armed rebellion (the Lancashire gentry are not to be found in the 1569 Rebellion of the Northern Earls) but freedom to follow the old Faith without Papal politics.

On his frequent visits to Holme, Whitaker

-
1. In 1576 John Towneley was handed over by the Privy Council to Mr. Assheton of Chatterton who might convert him , but Towneley remained obstinate and preferred to pay £1,700 in fines for his recusancy.

followed these events with interest . Campion to his dying day affirmed that he had taken a vow to avoid political involvement, and that he had only come to treat of religion, The Jesuits were in a difficult position after the publication of 'The Thirty Six Chapters on the Reformation of the Princes ' in 1563 . The article which prohibited the clergy from mingling in secular and political affairs had been omitted from the original draft of 42 , and the full weight of Papal policy was felt in such a way as left little doubt on intent, and left little to the imagination. Despite attempts by the Emperor , Philip of Spain, and the King of France, against the Decrees on Temporal Power, more than a 100 Fathers of Trent pressed arduously for their implementation. Chapter XX forbade all Princes to make decrees covering ecclesiastical persons or causes.

In 1583 John Finche just before his execution at Lancaster solemnly asserted that Campion and others had been executed for religion not for treason. The Elizabethan government has been successful in fastening the view on history that they died for treason, relying on the dictum that the state has always reserved the right to define 'treason'. Whitaker was never one for the political arena but he was deeply interested in the theological implications of Campion's position . Campion, Finche, and others might well have genuinely desired to treat of religious questions only, to avoid all political controversy, and believed intently that the new reformation energised by Trent and served by the Jesuits was all that the West wanted to return to a new unity and strength. Add to this the sincerity of a single-minded man, driven by zeal and passion for souls , strengthened by a new spirituality grounded on absolute obedience, fired by martyrs with a disregard for anything that does not minister to the chief aim, and there is present in the midst a powerful catalyst. But allowing for this, and there were many that did with Whitaker among them, there was also the other side, which occupied the attention of the government viz. that catholic officials in high places from the Pope down had a more medieval approach , reflected in the exhortation of the Papal Secretary of State in Dec. 1580 , complete with the Bull Regnans in Excelsis in his hands, claiming that whoever despatched the Queen with the 'pious intention of doing God's service , not only did not sin but

gained merit'. Spain was not the only factory for views on tyrannicide with a Papal blessing. Allen's stiff refusal to have anything to do with the English Settlement urged him to intrigue with Philip 2 to invade England. Sander's reputation in Ireland was well known; his journey to Philip to incite him to action had not been forgotten. Though Campion and others were motivated by fresh religious zeal it suited the official Catholic position to let it be so -- the pawn is played to be lost and the sacrifice would prove the superiority of Catholicism in the spiritual field of martyrdom, a field hitherto too strongly occupied by the Protestants. Cecil and Elizabeth knew that the flaming sword of the spirit could be seen, but were really afraid of what lay beneath the cloak -- conspiracy, daggers, and all the impedimenta of intrigue. What might alarm the Lancashire gentry and produce political inactivity (a receptive cultus for Campion's teaching) actually stirred the Elizabethan government to the greatest caution. Even statements on oath could be annulled by dispensation, and surrounded by the possibility of attendant qualifications, it was never absolutely established that the full truth was out. In the examination of Cuthbert Mayne at Launceston 29th. Nov. 1577, Mayne admitted that the situation was such that if occasion were offered, though Catholics formally yielded to the Supremacy Acts, they would be absolved from their oath and were in duty bound to support in every way any invasion or rising to aid the Papal intention.

Taken at its face value, did the recusant martyr realise the full implications of the faith he was propagating, which as Whitaker pointed out, with its logical extensions ~~is~~ involved 'a priori', a firm belief in the deposing power of the Pope? Trent had strengthened the Papacy, and never before had the church seen an organisation like the Jesuits, pledged by absolute obedience, devotion, zeal, and scholarship to the service of that strengthened and absolute Papal Supremacy -- belief in Romanism was synonymous with all that and however deeply spiritual and profoundly scholarly Campion might be, he was wide open to suspected alignment. It was not possible to be a Papist without believing what the Jesuits stood for -- this was the embarrassment to the older country priest, especially as their flocks ran more and more after the young Jesuits fresh from Douay. When

Hooker maintained that politics and religion could not be separated he was already writing to the converted who didn't believe the Jesuits when they said they were trying to act as if they were.

The young Whitaker found an emergent Anglicanism that seemed to offer little to attract the deeply spiritually minded -- much of it was negative and what appeared to be positive was drawn from Geneva, Zurich, or the German states. There was no compendium of Anglicanism, no Fathers of the English Reformation to act as a point of reference as Aquinas to the scholastics, or a Luther, Calvin, or a Zwingli. There were pointers but no polar star. Even so, the Lutheran unity was apparent rather than real. The Book of Concord published in 1580 at Dresden had systematised the Lutheranism of Germany at that time but it lacked the wider authority of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and outside Germany it had only limited acceptance. Drawn up by Andreae, Chemnitz, and Selnecker, the Formula of Concord of 1577 had been precise and emphatic and was claimed to define Lutheran orthodoxy as Trent did the Roman position, but the Melancthon position came to be excluded as much as the Roman and Calvinist, and the Book of Concord¹ failed to resolve the conflict which raged bitterly within Lutheranism. Synergism set Lutheran against Lutheran. On the positive side however, the Book of Concord did provide for a Lutheran self-understanding in the face of Trent and made possible the Lutheran scholasticism of the 17th. Century. But on the death of Luther, a furor theologicus had developed in the Lutheran ranks which lacked a single state system or a bench of bishops to nourish related doctrines into a systemic whole. Luther lore came to float in a formless state of things and was expanded and catalogued in a variety of ways. A religion that had begun with a depth of intensive personal experience failed to pass over into a single verbal or credal orthodoxy. The anti-Romanism of Johannes Agricola passed over into the quieter waters of Melancthon and Jena and Leipzig became the headquarters of the conservative Lutherans eg. Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520 - 75) and Helmstadt of

1. incorporated the Formula of Concord (1577), the 3 Creeds, the Augsburg Confession and Apology (1530) the Schmalkaldic Articles (1537), Luther's two Catechisms, the Swabian and Saxon Formula of 1574 - 5, the Maubrown Formula (1575) and the Torgau Articles (1576).

'Philippist liberalism'. Chemnitz took the way of Lutheran orthodoxy and fulminated on the one hand against crypto-Calvinism, and on the other against neo-Romanism, with his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*. In the doctrinal discord in Germany in the 16th. Century we can detect ideas shared by Whitaker. Osiander had declared that man was justified by an infusion of Christ's divine nature and Whitaker amplified this with reference to 1 Peter and Irenaeus. Whitaker also entered the lists of the synergistic controversy and came off better than Flacius.

The new and rising tide of Puritanism in its various forms provided a simple but severe clarity which emerged in a legal moral dominance in the next century to be rejected in practice if not in principle by the majority of English people. The Lancashire gentry could work up no enthusiasm for the Geneva gown, while the powerful residual of Catholicism looked for better things under a new sovereign, but this also by the end of the 17th. Century dwindled to an insignificant minority when the tide changed. Conversely, Anglicanism which started with such miserable beginnings in the 16th. Century reflected in the Lancashire Rectors' Report of 1590 by the end of the 17th. century produced a vigorous stand which few could have foretold. The rising tide of an intelligent Anglicanism proved fertile for theological debate. The ecclesiastical leadership of Parker and Whitgift infused a new confidence, while the work of theologians like Whitaker strengthened the foundations of Anglicanism.

Whitaker belonged to the second generation of Elizabethan divines. To restrict his reputation and influence (and his theology) as is commonly done to his ill-defined part in the Lambeth Articles of 1595 is to misunderstand his place and importance in the dialogue of the day. He emerged to play an important and determinant role in facing the growing strength of the post-Tridentine Jesuit scholarship on the one hand and those who pushed for further reformation on the Puritan pattern led by Cartwright and Travers on the other. Giants in their generation, Bellarmine had a special admiration for Whitaker as a protagonist standing head and shoulders above his contemporaries in Patristic, Historical, and Biblical Theology. When John Aglionby, chaplain to Elizabeth, was

travelling in Italy at the turn of the 16th. Century , he was introduced to Cardinal Bellarmine now at the height of his powers, having been appointed in 1576 Professor of Controversial Theology at the newly formed Collegium Romanum . Bellarmine , pointing to a picture of Whitaker in his study remarked that he was the most learned heretic that he had ever read ¹. Bellarmine ' privately admired the man (i.e. Whitaker) for his singular learning and ingenuity ' and though they never met , on his side Whitaker was equally appreciative of the personal qualities of his scholarly opponent in matters theological. In the course of his lectures at Cambridge , Whitaker described Bellarmine as a 'man unquestionably learned , possessed of a happy genius , a penetrating judgement and multifarious reading ' .² Both eagerly awaited each other's works-- mostly in manuscript. The regularity with which works proceeded from Whitaker's pen, coupled with the fact that he was the father of a large family , gave rise to the familiar quip ' quod mundo quotannis librum et liberum dedit ' .

The importance of Jewel's work of the 1560's when the general fortunes of the Romanists were at a low ebb , was to be seen in his famous Challenge Sermon and in his controversy with Harding, particularly the latter. Jewel's Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae established itself as the best defence in principle of Anglican claims and his controversy with Thomas Harding (d.1572) determined the main lines which the controversy with Rome was to take, finding official approval in the Establishment, with the episcopal authorisation of the Apologia as a vestry and pulpit document, and later reinforced by Bancroft. But who was to be the immediate successor to Jewel , to face the important period to come, a period replete with Romanist champions -- Stapleton,³ Saunders,⁴ Campion, Bellarmine? It was 1594 before Hooker produced his first four books on the Ecclesiastical Polity by which time Whitaker was dead, at the early age of 47, having proved himself the most prolific

1. Anthony Wood . Athen. Oxon. (under John Aglionby) Vol.1.354.

2. Ep. Dedicat. to Burghley of Whitaker's Disputation on Holy Scripture (1588 , the only work published by Whitaker in his lifetime.

3. 'A Fortress of the Faith first planted ' Antwerp 1565 . 'A Counter-blast to M.Horne's vague blast against M.Fekenham' Louvain.1567.

4. 'Rocke of the church wherein the Primacy of St. Peter and his successors , the Bishops of Rome, is proved out of God's Word' Louvain 1567. 'Rise & Growth of the Anglican Schism' 1585
'De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae' 1571

of Elizabethan divines, Hooker's sights were set against the Puritans in the main -- his controversies with Travers when Hooker was Master of the Temple (1585) exercised his talents in this direction; his Ecclesiastical Polity is addressed to 'those that seek the Reformation of Laws and Orders Ecclesiastical in the Church of England' -- he faced a different way to Whitaker, back to back. While Hooker also quoted the Fathers and Schoolmen in extenso, particularly Augustine, with a newly won confidence, he represented the Anglican reaction against the Presbytery; being conditioned by the terms of that controversy with the Puritans, Hooker emerges with a less strong conception of episcopacy. Hooker defends its antiquity and convenience but denied the necessity of any one certain form of polity or regimen in all the churches. Calvin had erred in this, for though he had done well to establish his discipline and order at Geneva, he erred in teaching that any particular form of church government was de jure divino, and the Puritans under Cartwright and Travers made the same mistake. Church order is necessary but not necessary to be everywhere the same. These things fell into the realm of convenience and rational freedom. Whitaker with his 'residual theory' of church government expands this view by saying that the primitive church with a residual authority in determining church order had evolved episcopacy as an extension of the Apostolic Ministry, but denies that the church now has this freedom since episcopacy had become for more than 1500 years the accepted form, though changes within the episcopal function are necessary from time to time without radically altering its pastoral and doctrinal relationship ^{within} ~~with~~ the church. Episcopacy was not a corruption but a permitted evolution. Hooker also lacks the depth of teaching on the eucharist which Whitaker gives, and there is more than a hint of receptionism in his theology, which is offset by Whitaker with his conception of comprehensive validity, based upon objective reality consistent with Divine Promise, and upon subjective validity consistent with the necessity of faith to make the sacrament effective, which is not the same thing as making it valid.

Both were articulate in opposing absolute Biblicism, in the sense that whatever was not expressly commanded in Scripture in matters of faith and order, was not to be received, and

while Hooker postulated God's Supreme reason as absolute, in the light of which everything including Scripture must be interpreted, Whitaker viewed the function of reason as relative not absolute, since the interpretative function must be grounded in the Analogy of Faith.

There seems to be no doubt that Whitaker was very much impressed by Bancroft's stand on episcopacy; his sermon at Paul's Cross on 1 John IV.1. in 1589 confirmed Whitaker in his growing conviction that episcopacy was de jure divino. Like Whitgift Whitaker had accepted the historical argument --that historically there never had been a time when the church was without episcopacy. As the thesis shows, episcopacy to Whitaker could take many forms, and the grounds of this view were Jerome's words in his Commentary on Titus and his famous letter to Evangelus --eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos; but episcopacy as a separate order is proven by Jerome's own words that the rite of ordination separates the order of episcopacy from that of the presbyterate, and by the Letter to Decentius from Innocent I that the rite of Confirmation is also reserved to the episcopate. The relationship of the minister to the bishop was a test of catholicity since the episcopate is the centre of faith and unity in the church, a view which Whitaker's study of Cyprian had confirmed.

In his earlier works however, Whitaker had, like Luther, regarded ecclesiastical organisation as dependent upon time and circumstances. Under the influence of Bilson, he accepted episcopacy as the best form of government considered in its primitive form, stripped of medieval canonical accretions, an 'episcopus in presbyterio' as evidenced in Jerome and the early Roman episcopate. To Calvin and Bucer, church order was a matter unchangeable, proceeding directly from the Lordship of Christ and the gifts of the Spirit in the fourfold ministry, in which the church was equipped to discharge its essential functions, as prescribed by Scripture. Bucer had elaborated this view when in contact with Oecolampadius and defined it on the occasion of the Strassburg Synod of 1533. Calvin took over the theory of the 4 ministries (Ephes. IV.11) which were incorporated in the Ecclesiastical Ordinances

of 1541 -- two years later Calvin inserted in the Institutes a doctrinal justification, and this became the platform for Cartwright and Travers. The three-fold order must give way to the fourfold ministry i.e. pastors, for the ministry of the Word, administration of the sacraments, discipline, prayer and preaching, doctors, as the interpreters of Scripture, elders, whose function was government, and deacons to whom was committed the oversight of the poor.

Comparison of Institutes IV. 10. 30 however with Institutes IV. 3. 2-4 suggests that Calvin wavered between the view that the four-fold ministry was fixed by the Word of God, valid for all times, and the view that the form and shape of the church may be changed, new forms instituted, old ones abolished 'as may be expedient for the utility of the church'. This view was part of the stock-in-trade of the period. In practice however, Calvin seems to have made up his mind. He attempted a logical classification of different ecclesiastical functions from the fragmentary data of the Pauline Epistles, but never arrived at an absolutely rigid and definitive classification of all N.T. ministries permanently valid.

Up to 1543 Calvin only mentioned three ministries, but after then, four, pastors, doctors, elders and deacons. Calvin combined the ministries of pastor and doctor in his own person and was content to leave the fusion there. When Cartwright and Travers tried to distinguish what Calvin had found difficult to distinguish, Whitgift realised that this was a retrograde step, untenable in the face of history and antiquity and not entirely supported by the original masters. After seeing the elders at work at Basle under Oecolampadius and developed by Bucer at Strassburg, Calvin could by 1543 define their office and that of deacon, but no such clear definition appeared in the functions of pastor and doctor. Sparse indications of them appear in the Institutes and Commentaries and this suggests ambiguity in Calvin's mind which both Whitgift and Whitaker recognised. Whitgift had also realised that the 'lay' ministry of elders had as its principle occupation the exercise of discipline, an important function in Calvin's system, but irreconcilable to the English episcopal scene. As a champion of church unity, by virtue of his doctrine of fundamental beliefs, Whitaker like Calvin came very near to Melancthon's theory of the

adiophorae. Christo-centric emphasis urged fundamental unity in doctrine on which it is never permissible to compromise, for Christ is the only single foundation of the church. The unity must never be severed through dissensions over the inessential -- ultimately there is reached the position that to withdraw from the church is to reject Christ and the communion of saints. The Middle Ages had blurred the distinction between the visible church and the Kingdom of God. Luther had recovered the roots of Biblical Theology from which the nature of the church is derived, and this led to indifference to the principle of Apostolic Succession. Whitaker however emphasised the importance and relevance of organic continuity, properly conceived, but he did not as Montague did later unchurch the non-episcopal Reformed Churches. Apostolic truth is not necessarily tied to Order by virtue of Order alone.

It is not true to say, as J.F.H.New¹ says that Bancroft in his Sermon advanced the theory that episcopacy conformed to the absolute dictates of Scripture -- to have done so would have been to use the Puritan Biblicist argument as premise and merely making a counter assertion which Whitgift had already proved could not be made. Bancroft's appeal for episcopacy *de jure divino* was wider, that it was 'ordained by God, rested on the Scriptures, the practice of the Apostles and the continuation of that form throughout history (i.e. from the days of St. Mark) but it never depended upon a strict doctrine of Apostolic succession without qualification. Whitaker's view was similarly one of continuity in evolution. Whitaker was also influenced by Thomas Bilson's 'Perpetual Government of Christ's Church' published 3 years after Bancroft's Sermon. Bilson rejected the argument 'ex utilitate' -- that church order depends upon what is convenient for the time. (Hooker). Bilson's work is one of the best defences of episcopacy *de jure divino*, and has been described by Professor Sykes² as setting the coping stone on the Elizabethan apologetic for episcopacy, which being traditional, was not a matter

1. J.F.H.New 'Anglican and Puritan' p.55

2. N.Sykes 'Old Priest and New Presbyter' p.63

of choice but of divine appointment , the perpetual form of government to be observed by the church. In the church there had always been an imparity and superiority of pastors, ^{and} ~~and~~ the external order established by Christ , valid for all times and places, was episcopacy fulfilling the whole Apostolic function in the church. Christ established inequality when he sent out the 12 Apostles and the 70 disciples . What Paul preached was to be believed; every doctrine opposed to it was to be judged by it and he requested neither voices from the congregation nor a show of hands ~~from~~ the presbytery. The divine right of episcopacy cannot simply be transferred to the presbytery ; something is lost in the attempt.

The year after Bancroft's Sermon, Adrian a Saravia , a close friend of Hooker, Whitaker, and Casaubon , produced his 'De Diversis Gradibus' which received an English translation in 1592 , the year that Sutcliffe produced his 'Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline' . Saravia , a Spanish Reformer , had ~~originally~~ been ordained according to the Geneva use, had ministered in the Netherlands and Guernsey , and had finally settled in England as Rector of Tattershill in 1588. In his reply to Beza in 1593, Whitgift stoutly defended Saravia's views and those of Sutcliffe who held that 'the office of Bishop and minister had authority and confirmation from God whereas the office of doctor barely teaching is a device of man'. He also emphasised the necessity of succession in ecclesiastical order as in doctrine. Both Whitaker and Saravia taught a threefold function within the Apostolic ministry --the preaching of the Word, ^a and administration of the sacraments, common to bishops and presbyters, to the exclusion of ordination , and the authority of government which like the ordination of ministers was peculiar to the episcopate. This 'imparity of ministers or distinction between bishop and presbyter was of Dominical as well as Apostolic appointment -- episcopi sunt divina institutione et apostolica traditione instituti ; the loss of such an order , though not materially affecting things necessary to salvation , he deplored on the Continent.

Parallel with the hardening defence of episcopacy in the late 1580's came a decline in the influence of Beza , whose repeated letters to the Council opposing the Prayer

Book, and his continued defence of disaffected ministers, with his scathing remarks on the use of episcopal powers, brought a strong rebuff from Whitgift who complained that Beza had been most troublesome in his persistent view that there could be no purity of doctrine without the Geneva discipline, a view he held with almost pathological obstinacy. Episcopacy was not a 'Satanical tyranny or a human and pernicious invention' as Beza had written but was an order grounded in sure foundations --- 'it is referred by the Fathers with one mouth to the Apostles as authors thereof, and that bishops (were appointed) as successors of the Apostles especially in certain points of their functions.' ¹

The position of Trent on episcopacy is mirrored in the heated debate of 30th. Oct. 1562 onwards --- the 7th. Canon. None denied the institution of the Order By Christ. The Confession of Augsburg, it was said, recognised the divine right of episcopacy, but a long contest arose over the relationship of the Papacy with the local episcopate, and the origin of episcopal jurisdiction. It was generally accepted that the episcopate was superior by divine law to the priesthood, but **Layne** (successor to Loyola as General of the Jesuits) argued that episcopal jurisdiction originated in the Pope. Some 150 Fathers spoke to the question and the original draft of the canon was frequently amended. The Spaniards ~~also~~ objected since bishops were successors of the Apostles and were consequently vicars of Christ in their own right with full order and jurisdiction by virtue of consecration. The Jesuits argued with great erudition and zeal that the bishops shared the Pope's Pastorate, and the Bishop of Chioggia argued that as the chief monarch was the Pope, all power derived from him, as rivers from a fountain, rays from the sun. Against this show of ecclesiastical feudalism, the Bishop of Guadix (near Granada) argued that the Papal institution of bishops was not essential, and Peter Danese Bishop of La Vaut affirmed that *de jure divino* meant that a bishop in his own church was equal to the pontiff as a Vicar of Christ, In the midst of this Papal congregationalism, the Spanish Bishop of Aliffi was coughed down when he asserted that bishops derived their plenitude of power from Christ, not Peter of the Pope, and the French, always sensitive to the Legates' powers in initiating and controlling questions, doubted if bishops

ever depended on the Pope for jurisdiction. The Portuguese Fathers were devoted to the Papal Prerogatives and rejoiced at the proposal for an 8th. canon to amply provide for Papal powers. But discussion was not at an end for no sooner than the title 'Rector universae ecclesiae' was mentioned, there was an immediate demand that it be changed to 'rector universarum ecclesiarum'. The final draft of the 7th. Canon (June 1563) under the new Legates, Morone, and Navagero -- the former the Hombre Doblado -- ignored the distinction between order and jurisdiction.

The period in which Whitaker worked, represented a culmination of the Puritan onslaught and the Romanist challenge of the highest quality and order, against the Elizabethan Establishment. By early 1580 the Puritan wing had manifested great dissatisfaction at the way the Church of England was developing. John Whitgift's appointment in August 1583 to Canterbury has been called the most important event in the history of the Elizabethan Church since 1559¹, and he was a sturdy patron of Whitaker. The Lord Chancellor's speech at the opening of Parliament in 1588 represented a triumph for the position defended by Whitaker -- he said ' (the queen is) most fully and finally settled in her conscience by the Word of God that the estate and government of this Church of England as now it standeth in this reformation may be justly compared to any church which hath been established in any Christian Kingdom since the Apostles' times ; that both in form and doctrine it is agreeable with the Scriptures, with the most ancient councils, with the practice of the primitive church and with the judgements of the old and learned Fathers ' ² But like all statements by authority it was subject to a vast hinterland of dialogue, official and unofficial, with varying degrees of generated heat. The death of Field in 1588 marked the failure of the Puritan attempt through Parliament, lawyers, and preachers to change church government to that of the eldership -- Field had given brilliant and forceful

1. Patrick Collinson ' The Puritan Classical Movement' p. 389. Sir John Neale called it, 'one of the decisive events of the reign ' and added that 'it was none too soon '. J. Neale. Elizabeth and her Parliament 2.20.
2. A modified and qualified return was made to the 10 Articles of Henry VIII, that the Regula Fidei was to be Scripture, the 3 Creeds, the authority of the Fathers, and the first 4 General Councils.

leadership to this national Puritan movement , but Travers had no such stature to rally the ranks. The Marprelate Tracts were an embarrassment rather than a threat and by the time of Bancroft's Sermon on the 9th. Feb. 1589 , Puritanism was lapsing into a subversive movement , and the Cambridge Provincial Conference held in September 1589 represented the last concerted action before the triumph of the Establishment 1593 - 1603 . The episcopal Puritans were absorbed into the Establishment , while the presbyterian and congregationalist (independent) Puritans went into separation. Had Puritanism triumphed , it would have submerged if not stifled other religious values developing at this time within Anglicanism , but at the same time it must be recognised that it contributed much to the process. The growing authoritarian orthodoxy in the Anglican ranks attendant on a strengthening of episcopal powers was in its turn to make way later for an explosive resurgence of Puritanism in various forms , more influenced now by Continental Radicals.

The Earlier Elizabethan bishops who had excelled in the realms of diplomacy , accommodation, but rarely in profound learning , had shown a remarkable sensitiveness to Calvin's opinions and a deference to his judgement, which could never be a fertile plain for Anglicanism as it later developed. But even at the end of the century , Hooker could write that ' the perfectest divines were judged they which were skilfullest in Calvin's writings' -- indeed it was sufficient now to quote him and to make sure that you understood what you were quoting. Calvin had achieved a recognised place in the Reformation movement. Luther had staked all on the experience of justifying faith in the doctrine of sola fides -- his preaching was aimed at reproducing the experience in others. Calvin had laid the foundation of his theology in the Will of God and His Absolute Sovereignty. God was Creator, Ruler, Judge and Lawgiver , and the initiative in the salvation process was God's. Faith is not the ground of election, but election the cause of faith. This essential basis and principle of the doctrine of Predestination was accepted by all the Reformers. Calvin's systematisation of Scriptural data into a coherent whole revealed not only his theological standpoint but also his psychological attitude for he retained a predelection for logic which attracted by its simplicity , and he inherited

this from the dialecticisms of Montaigne and the jurists of Orleans and Bourges, which neither religious meditation nor the experiences of life could weaken. Whitaker was attracted to the dogmatic tradition and warmed to the terse and unadorned simplicity of Calvin who also showed a sense of history rare for those times. Calvin's use of ancient and contemporary writers was expert, and Whitaker was attracted to his desire to assert a unity with the tradition of the ancient church. Calvin had burst upon the English scene like a firework exploding in the sky -- it was in the descent that onlookers seized upon single stars, and the seizing was selective, and among the stars selected was that of Predestination. There arose the tendency to place Calvin's dogmatic system as a solar system turning upon one centre, Predestination.

Erasmus in his tract 'On the immense Mercy of God' wrote that 'Christ wept over Jerusalem because He could not save this poor people, and we talk as if He would not'. Curio of Basel in his 'Wideness of God's Kingdom' had adopted universalism and envisaged the salvation of everyone, but the question remained -- why could not Christ save them? It was unthinkable that there was a failure in Christ's power and ministry, ascribable to Christ Himself. A deeper cause than the blindness and unbelief of the moment must be looked for, for these can be corrected by repentance and faith. Why cannot some people repent, however much is done for them and however much they wish it themselves, and earnest souls found the answer in Predestination. By what tests are the elect known? Luther regarded the matter as a mystery, while Muntzer, Zwingli and the Anabaptists offered their definitions. To Muntzer, Assurance rested entirely on possession by the Spirit and he based this squarely on Romans 8. Zwingli held that it is known 'by faith', the Anabaptists 'by the life'. Calvin like Luther disclaimed absolute knowledge and did not aspire like the Anabaptists to compose the church of wheat and no tares; nevertheless Calvin postulated three presumptive tests; -

- a) profession of faith -- which Whitaker expanded to a true profession of faith, and a profession of true faith, taken conjointly.
- b) an upright life
- c) participation in the sacraments. Muntzer's test is dropped as being too subjective, variable, and typical of the Zwickau prophets.

For Whitaker ,like Calvin , and Article 17 of the 39 Articles, Assurance brought with it 'unspeakable comfort' because it eliminated all uncertainties as to whether God will accept our prayers or not ,and freed man from concern about his own salvation, that he might devote all his energy in the service and worship of the Sovereign Lord. So Calvin retorted to Cardinal Sadoletto who pleaded that all should abandon Calvinism because Catholicism offered a safe way of salvation, that man should not be so pre-occupied with his own salvation, for the chief end of man is not to save himself or to be assured that he is saved, but to honour God. This is true of course in a system where a man is already saved or damned , but finds little place in the agonizing experience of Luther.

There was a strong reaction to the itemisation of Predestination as the 'consolidation of the Reformed Creed ' , a reaction led by Henry Altingius , an outstanding theologian , whose work is little known in this country . Altingius inherited at the Academy at Groningen the disregard for this itemisation and looked for a wider Biblical and Historical view. Like Keckermann of Danzig a few years later, and Francis Junius , Predestination was not a preliminary consideration , and Whitaker under the pressure of the Jesuit controversy sympathised with this position . The Post-Tridentine Romanist theologians formulated their doctrine of Predestination with particular emphasis on the freedom of the will eg. Luis de Molina (1535 - 1600) who became a Jesuit in 1553 and abandoned the principle of Divine Predilection ; he taught Predestination post praevisa merita , and in God, the 'scientia conditionata vel media ' which is fundamental to the safeguarding of human free will . By this the Divine foreknowledge of hypothetical future contingents is peculiar to God Himself, and this is the ground of the ultimate efficacy of grace. Both Suarez and Bellarmine recognised the gratuity of Predestination in its priority to the prevision of merits and denied the intrinsic efficacy of the Divine Decree independently of human consent. The view that Christ's atoning death was offered for the elect alone is changed with the substitution of 'efficacious' for 'offered' .

Peter Baro in his 'Summa Trium de Predestinatione Sententiarum' written in 1594 but not published till 1613 --

Whitaker's Last Sermon , the Cygnea ~~Cantio~~ was printed in the 1613 volume -- attempted an analysis of the position . The three views on Predestination appeared to be :-

- a) God decreed absolutely to elect or reprobate without respect to anything outside himself (eg. sin, free will, merits) and this view Baro attributed to Calvin, Beza, and Robert Some, and emerged from the mature Augustine and Luther.
- b) the decrees of election or ~~reprobation~~ dated only from the Fall and the 'material cause' of election was Christ , and of reprobation, sin. But the distinction between elect and ~~reprobate~~ still sprang from an Absolute Decree . All men are invited but only the elect receive that efficacious grace. This placed upon the elect the necessity of being saved , on the reprobate, the necessity of perishing. This claimed Baro was the view of Zanchi, Bellarmine and Augustine in his middle period.
- c) that God created man for good i.e. a life of blessedness and invites all to repentance , faith and salvation. God's foreknowledge of those who would believe becomes the ground of election. Baro used the ~~distinction~~, as did Hooker and Whitaker, between the antecedent Will of God (that all may be saved) and His consequent Will (by which certain are damned through their own perverseness and depravity foreseen by God. Baro agreed with the Lambeth Articles that faith or perseverance were not the efficient or moving cause of election . They are the means by which we partake of election. He also agreed with the Lambeth Articles (no. 7) that saving grace is not granted to all men but offered to all men

Archbishop Whitgift's own mind and convictions on these issues we shall probably never be certain about . On Dec. 8th. 1595 a few days after Whitaker's death , Whitgift wrote to Neville commending the Lambeth Articles but asking that the signed copy should not go out of his hand , or if there was any difficulty about guaranteeing this, the copy should be burnt. Whitgift realised the venture had been a dangerous one. Coppinger gives us the impression that like Chamberlain after Munich, Whitaker came out of the Conference room waving the ~~Lambeth~~ Articles and 'boasting' that he had obtained the

victory ' ¹ but this attitude has been fathered on Whitaker. There was no doubt that he was relieved since he returned with official guide-lines for the Cambridge Heads, but the strange silence of the Cambridge Calvinists certainly does not suggest that they hailed a champion.

It is often assumed that Predestination was a major article of faith for Whitaker as for Whitgift which it was not, and that belief in it was exclusively Calvinistic which it was not. The all-Sovereign God despatching souls to heaven or hell is anticipated in Augustine's Enchiridion , and over the whole vista of Predestination theology there is seen a common regard that the smallest trifle is part of the cosmic drama and relates to God's infinite glory and justice. The status of the Lambeth Articles was discussed by William Prynne , a churchman of the old Elizabethan type , in his 'Anti-Arminianism' where he pointed out that the Lambeth Articles had been incorporated into the Articles of the Church of Ireland and approved by King James I and printed here as by authority . The two churches were one by law as by Supremacy.

Whitaker in fact helped to make impossible the hope to bring into the English Church the Calvinistic system and marked the distinct change in outlook which later was reflected in the four Englishmen attending the Synod of Dort 1618 , who found their outlook and approach very different from that of their hosts. This highlighted the extent of the decay in Calvinism in England at that time and the rapidly disappearing hope of any success in joining the English Church 'with the best Reformed bodies abroad ' . Puritanism supplied suspicions, tensions and pressures that made a viable approach to the Roman question impossible --Whitaker's excursions into the

1. Prof. Dawley ('Whitgift' pg. 213)following Coppinger (op. cit. 62 f.) reminds us that the effort to make the 1595 Lambeth Articles authoritative as the interpretation of the 39 Articles was not in fact made by Whitgift(or Whitaker) but by Reynolds , supported by Spark, Knewstubb and Gatterton, at the Hampton Court Conference; their attempt was forestalled by Bancroft and Overall who explained to James I the original purpose of the Lambeth Articles ,the existence of which James had not previously heard of. Their view had the support of Whitgift who nodded approvingly at James' comment that he was 'unwilling to stuff the book (i.e. the 39 Articles) with conclusions theological.' His own experience would tell him the dangers of such a practice.

historical and Patristic controversies over a wide field kept open the door which many would have liked to slam shut for ever and made possible that avenue of dialogue which earned the praise of Bellarmine and made it also possible for Adrian Saravia and Isaac Casaubon to labour in hope. It says much for Whitaker that he was able to do this without raising a storm of protest from the Cambridge Puritans.

If the Anglican Church was not to be forced into the Puritan mould, was her claim to be Catholic a valid one? The Papists unlike the Puritans were denied a hearing in Parliament. In the eyes of Rome the Anglican Church had lost her claim because she was outside the Roman Communion, without which there can be no catholicism. What had previously gathered momentum during the pre-Reformation era but could be, and was, gainsaid without loss of catholic status was now made explicit in politico-ecclesiastical terms which admitted of no doubt. Could any Anglican defence be more than a rear-guard action, having little or no consequence to the reality of the situation? Saunders who in 1569 had appealed for help for the defeated rebels of the North was assured that a martyr's death was better than living dishonourably under the Anglican Settlement, and that no doubt, God had raised them up for this very purpose.¹ The Jesuits in the van now in varying degrees unchurched the Anglican Church and deposed Elizabeth. To Pius V, who with uninvolved optimism had issued the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, it was not through dialogue that there was to come any expectation of a rapprochement, but through armed confrontation, a view all the more forcible because it was held by a man with clear ideas about his own authority, which did not merit either dialogue or justification.

While the Chancellor in his speech at the opening of Parliament 1588 defended the Anglican Settlement, Whitaker was already engaged in his work against Bellarmine, Sanders, and Duracus. Like Jewel, Whitaker accepted the breach but denied it to be an act of schism and he did not unchurch the Roman Church. On 25th. March 1585 Travers had denounced Hooker to Burghley for such 'unsound points of doctrine' as the statement that 'the church of Rome is a true church of Christ, and that its members could be saved, yea

1. Pius V to Sanders 22nd. Feb. 1570

the Pope himself¹. The middle and later periods of Whitaker's development reflect the same view, during which time Whitaker pulled away from the hard Puritan core at Cambridge because he found it difficult to work on his *De Scripturā*. He had already moved into the Patristic field and caught something of the changes also in that area. Such a study demanded intense concentration and a wide and indefatigably sustained study. It was later claimed that many of the troubles at St. John's were due to his pre-occupation with books and the Jesuit controversy. There may be truth in this but it must also be recognised that such a withdrawal may also have been due to Whitaker's lack of support for the extreme Puritans now meeting at St. John's. Earlier, Cartwright filled Great St. Mary's to overflowing and we get a picture of young men sitting in the windows because of the pressure of numbers, a Eutyochian fall imminent, not because the young men fell asleep, but because of the sheer pressure of fervent numbers. The rising crescendo of public approbation was matched by warning shots across the bows from Whitgift--any support that Cartwright could expect from Whitaker was now very much on the wane. By the time of Cartwright's reappearance after his flight, Whitgift could confidently put Whitaker into St. John's as Master

The earlier dominance of Augustinianism gave way to an appeal over a wider Patristic field. It was more than a case of restoration versus reformation but rather a re-examination of the Patristic Age fostered by the increasing number of Patristic texts coming off the printing presses. The initial confusion caused by the multiplication of uncritical texts was giving way through critical study to a more eager assessment. The process was fundamental for it concerned the general picture of early Christianity with its universal attraction for all ages. Scholarship improved in critical and comparative power, though still remaining largely polemic. The earlier raucous spirit and impact lost a little of its noise once radicalism became interesting if not respectable. Patristic study was taking on a responsible maturity or at least adolescence, and there was a greater willingness to appreciate the best thought and devotion of the catholic centuries where profitable, and there was less reluctance to use philosophic terms to illustrate, but not determine, theological definitions, to use the Schoolmen but with cautious discrimination.

The trumpet notes melted into a richer harmony. The dominant trumpet still sounded but it blended into a richer harmony of more mature scholarship set in a larger score. But first, the Fathers must be liberated to speak for themselves. An edition of St. Ambrose was prepared by the future Sixtus V th. 'correcting' all scriptural quotations to the Vulgate text, transposed words, 'clarified' obscurities, suppressed eccentricities and even inserted ceremonial detail. Had Patristic scholarship been confined to such a control, scholarship would have been impossible. Latini refused to put his name to an edition of Cyprian because the censors insisted upon changes he could not accept. It would be interesting to compile a list of textual changes in Patristic texts made during the 16th. Century (and earlier) and account for the textual and theological approximations. Romanist scholars of the time were perplexed but persevered; ~~like~~ Luis de Leon lecturing at Salamanca who for saying the Vulgate contained many errors, though not affecting faith or morals, was imprisoned for 5 years. On his release he began his lecture with the words 'as I was saying last time' !

Those who appealed to **Scripture** alone were conscious of a verbal vacuum -- Scripture should never be separated from the church viewed in its historical growth. The Appeal to the Fathers and Councils became increasingly important in Whitaker's day. Between 1559 and 1574 the Lutheran Flacius Illyricus and his collaborators published the Magdeburg Centuries, the first serious and scholarly survey of the history of the church bringing to the fore the corruptions of later years. In 1568 Philip Neri charged his fellow Oratorian Caesar Baronius with the task of answering Flacius and the Centuriators. The Annals of Baronius were published in 12 folio volumes 1588 - 1607. Both works were inaccurate, uncritical, and biased, though unlike Flacius, Baronius could improve his work because he was able to use the archives and MSS of the Vatican Library where he was librarian from 1597 but the fact remains, that the range of scholarship contd. 1.

Hooker Eccl. Pol. 1.59. In *ibid.* 1.347 there is the author's willingness to hold fellowship with Rome.

-
- Owen Chadwick 'The Reformation' Pelican ed. 1964.p.301 in 'The Counter Reformation'.

Was widening , though the process of detecting the spurious was both laborious and isolated , hampered by the use of criteria which were primitive in the literary , historical , and theological fields. The new historical learning entered into by Whitaker with such zeal was reflected in Bellarmine's 'Disputations against the heretics of our times' which appeared 1586 - 1593 and was eagerly awaited in MS by Whitaker. This most systematic and cogent product of the Counter-Reformation took the new historical equipment and interest into a calm and magisterial process , seeking victory neither by quip or abuse but rather by a more sober consideration of issues. The days of syllogism were numbered if not over ; the field of church history and textual criticism was to witness a new sort of antagonist. The period of Cano , Maldonatus, and Suarez was a period of distinguished Jesuit writers representing a departure from slavish commentators on Aristotle and Aquinas , and the abandonment of useless subtleties. But it was a rough passage for them. Bellarmine fell into disgrace with Sixtus Vth. for holding that the Pope had only an indirect not a direct power in temporal affairs ; Maldonatus (1533 - 83) fell foul of the Sorbonne which in 1574 went to the length of declaring his work heretical. The Aristotelian bed was too small and narrow for the theology of the day.

Among the Elizabethan divines it was Whitaker that Bellarmine singled out for treatment and admiration --the Scriptural Canon, the inspiration of the Vulgate , the necessity of an infallible church to interpret Scripture , the authority and place of tradition, the Eucharistic Presence , the Papacy in the Church, the inerrancy of Papal decrees and the whole complex of definitions half-formulated at Trent and believed by Protestants to be indefensible, found a stout champion in Bellarmine , who grounded his tenets in history, precedent, reason, and development. Fulke, Horne, Nowell, Knewstubb, Cooper, and Whitgift himself all entered the lists but it is in Whitaker that we see a growing feeling of assurance, replacing the uneasy and forced insecurity of earlier days when Protestants despised Bellarmine out of ignorance, and looked round for some heavy artillery to engage him. It was a time of great change. The University of Wittenberg was in decline, the Jesuit University of Ingoldstadt in rapid ascendancy. Scultet the Calvinist Pastor returned from Wittenberg

in 1591 greatly disillusioned -- " we imagined a golden century was in store for us ; the enemy was thought to have been routed and disposed of, when Lo ! he raised a new army and entrenched himself in his stronghold ". In Catholic eyes the Anglican Church had slowly disintegrated through Puritan pressure of one kind or another . The optimism of the Counter-Reformation in England was due to the belief that the only hope for the Anglican Church was a wholesale and complete return to Papal Catholicity and obedience . Whitaker emerged in the van of the defence that not only did the Fathers and the Councils of the first 6 centuries give no ground for the Papal claims of a true catholicity , he also demolished the optimism that union with Rome was a sine qua non for catholicity.

The attitude of Romanist and Anglican to history was also different -- the Romanist read his history backwards so that everything, the Bible included, is seen in the light of the present Church's teaching which alone had validity . The Church as a growing organism is seen clearest in what it becomes rather than in how it began and that progressive revelation is the determining factor . The Appeal to the Primitive Church and to the Fathers only had relevance when related to the contemporary church. The Anglican read history **forwards**-- the beginning is the bar to which all must be brought ; the Primitive Church was the Eusebian Virgin , whose virginity must be preserved through the present church . With Fulke, Whitaker regarded the church as a necessary link to the Apostolic Church and necessarily linked to it, not through an organisational or ecclesiastical continuity (succession) but by the continuing operation of the Word containing the true doctrine and life of the Church and ordering its functions and patterns. Could the Papacy be in the pattern ? Not in its 16th. century form for it arrogated to itself powers which were proper ^{only} to the Living Word. History recorded processes which were not necessarily progressive ; the historic cycle of the Book of Judges must not give way to the wishful optimism of the day giving full rein to the view that the ultimate was Papalist perfection. The ethos of opposition to Rome may be generally summarised under

- a) Luther , whose main principle was the Word of God , the inner conception of the Gospel
- b) Calvin with a transition to the dominant Biblical principle,

the determinant of systematic theology and church government, with the witness of history as subservient

- c) Bucer, Bullinger and to a degree Melanchthon, whose fondness for Patristic study and authority marked a fusion of the previous two,
- d) and lastly, the introduction of a more liberal and philosophical element, the rational element, a characteristic of Melanchthon.

In Whitaker we see the inter-reaction of these elements as a constituent to his recourse to the Testimonium Patrum, or better the Testimonia Patrum, since the Patristic Corpus was in itself not a canonical norm, and the Fathers themselves were witnesses to not the origin of the Regula Fidei. Whitaker insists on the full range of Article 6 of the 39 Articles and prepared for the deductive method of Hooker, with reason baptised. Matters of faith must be contained in, or grounded on, Scripture with a congruity not repugnant to Scripture.

Has the Papacy and the Petrine tradition a place in the Universal Church? Whitaker does not dismiss the question out of hand and R. Bainton's statement that the 'Protestant Reformation swept away alike Papal and Conciliar Authority' needs qualification. Whitaker probes into the question whether the Papacy really does have a function in the universal church and what that function could be in its relationship to the whole church. There was a general consent of Fathers, Councils, and History, in the early centuries to Papal prestige which Whitaker accepts because in general it preserved the orthodox faith in a manner lacking in other ancient sees, but the claims put forward with the Pseudo-Clementine Letter to James, lacked universality. In spite of Dom Chapman's work on the Clementines, there is still to this day no critical edition or study of the Letter to James and its importance in the Papal development. There is furthermore no English translation of it.

The Patristic evidence is examined as thoroughly as the age permitted and though there is a strong case for reference to Rome in matters of faith and order in the early centuries, such reference had none of the jurisdictional overtones of later Medieval practice. Protestant fragmentation should give way to Conciliar synthesis. Cranmer had suggested a union of Protestant churches on an agreed doctrinal basis but this was doomed to failure because

1. R. Bainton 'The Reformation of the 16th. Century' p. 214.

organic union demands a theological synthesis more than a confessional syncretism. Whitaker suggests a college of bishops to replace the Curia of cardinals -- bishops from all the Reformed church as well as from other Patriarchates, with the Pope as President, a permanent office, coterminous with his election; he was not to be merely a Moderator. He urged a strong pastoral conception of the Papal office to be exercised within the Collegium Episcoporum. This was something more than the ad hoc summoning of ecumenical councils -- the Collegium Episcoporum should have the adjective 'ecumenicorum' added.

When we have finished bewailing the folly and fanaticism of the 16th. Century in the spirit of 20th. Century Ecumenicism, we are discomforted to find that issues of the 1580's have never been resolved. The shades of the Encyclical of Leo XII Satis Cognitum of 29th. June 1896 are still with us -- on the subject of religious unity, it is insisted that the only basis is the recognition of the Pope as the sole source of jurisdiction in the church and therefore the necessary centre of unity. The Reformation issues are not ghosts to be laid but issues to be faced -- the Council of Trent, the 39 Articles, the Westminster Confession, themselves the products of change are subject to change and it is increasingly realised that the quality of a man's faith does not depend upon the number of propositions he can swallow. The Christian churches may have shipped on more ballast than the N.T. sources will justify. In 1967 the Joint Preparatory Commission between the Anglican and Roman churches had as its terms of reference 'to examine the question of authority, its nature, its exercise, and implications'. Cardinal Bea recommended that these 'further studies' be made on the nature of authority in the church and its concrete form in the teaching authority in the Petrine Papacy, but few would go as far as Hans Kung to say that 'all difficulties of a theological-dogmatic, and practical - existential, character that stand in the way of a reunion of separated Christians and in the way of a general council of the whole of Christendom, converge and are rooted in the Petrine office.' For the necessary and continued convergence of Anglicans and Romanists the Papacy is still, as Whitaker often said, of the 'head of all controversies'. The question is not so much whether there should be a Petrine office but how that central office should serve as source and symbol of unity.

Whitaker had insisted that the church exceeded its mandate if it insists on dogmas without Scriptural authority and warrant, and the Papacy had become a matter of dogma as well as canon law, and a particular view of history. Fr. Echlin S.J. wrote¹ that Roman Catholics and many other Christians yearn for a Petrine Office that all can love, respect, and in a true sense obey. The re-united church of the future may well choose wisely if it continues both Papal and Episcopal Offices for the purposes of mission as well as unity. This may well bring about a discontinuity of certain historical processes most marked in the Counter Reformation. With the Collegium Episcoporum -- is this to be a consultative body or merely a means for the propagation of Papal policy? --- the question devolves on collegiality and to give this full expression the Pope cannot, which is rather more than should not, act against the consensus of the church and its bishops.

The Lambeth Conference of 1968 stated that 'the Papacy is an historical reality whose claims must be carefully weighed in any scheme for the reunion of Christendom. The President of the College of Bishops and Ecumenical Councils might most fittingly be the occupant of the historic See of Rome, but there could be no acceptance of the Papacy with its claims to infallibility and immediate and universal jurisdiction as commonly understood today'. The shock of the Encyclical Humanae Vitae coming during the Conference (Lambeth) was sufficient to produce dismay at what was considered to be a non-collegial exercise of authority. With the emphasis on collegiality at Vatican 2 must be taken Vatican 1's declaration on infallibility and the immediate and universal jurisdiction of the Pope which are held to be unaffected. The collegial use of authority takes into account the view that the teachings of Vatican 1 have their limitations within their historical context.

If the Petrine Office is central to the church it is as a diakonia not arché, for the Primitive Church was quick to realise that authority within the church is unique and must not imitate secular rule. To imitate secular forms is to court disaster, whether imperial monarchy or a conciliar mentality approaching ecclesiastical parliamentarianism. The former led to schism, the latter to division

1. 'Theology', April 1970. p.147 et seq.

though the distinction is fine. The triumphal language, the juridical concepts, the defensiveness (against Gallicanism in particular) were historical products of the 1870's -- for the church reflects in its definitions its reactions to the tensions of the times and only in this way can we interpret the church's self-understanding of the Petrine Office in the kairotic and limited teachings of Vatican 1. The thought forms of Benedict XIV (1740 - 1758) were that 'The Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have primacy in the entire world. The Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, true Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole church, Father and Teacher of all Christians' 1. In the light of current thought and N.T. and Patristic scholarship the emphasis of Vatican 2 was on a pastoral Primacy -- Peter the Shepherd, and John XXIII could drain his life to this end. Here again there is modern criticism of the Shepherd-sheep concept, that the laity (and clergy) should not be treated like a lot of silly animals. The last few years have seen a change, a great emphasis on the intelligent apostolate of the laity as a force to be reckoned with in the concept of authority. Roudge in his 'Ministry and Management' outlines the 5 theories of ministry in terms of modern concepts of authority -- the most relevant being his 'systemic view' that authority to be effective, like theology, runs through the bloodstream. If, however, authority lies in the body, what function is reserved for the head? John XXIII in his Homily at the Papal Coronation stated that learning, skill, diplomacy, and executive ability can indeed complete and enrich the pastoral office but can in no way substitute for it nor detract from it. This was 'Peter speaking through John' -- quite a different conclusion from that of Leo 1 but there again the situation is different. The effect is to give real meaning to the historic titles, a servant to the Magisterium. As Servus Servorum, the Pope is represented in collegial dialogue with all Christians and the church's faith is formulated within these terms. The Petrine office is seen to unfold as a Pastoral office surpassing a dying triumphalism and fading juridicism. This avoids the dilemma of the 16th. Century -- like Bilson, Whitaker could never admit the distinction between the Pope as a private person and as public teacher 'ex cathedra'. Pighius had expressed the extreme position that the Pope could never be a heretic even as

1. Benedict XIV Etsi Pastoralis 26th. May 1742.

a private person , and the view was commended by Bellarmine. Bilson wrote that 'you might as well say that the Pope may err in his shoes but not in his slippers , or in the shade but not in the sunshine' ^{1.}

In the 16th. Century the cautious indifference towards Papal claims shown by Erasmus and by another of the Oxford School, Colet, to whom the office of the Papacy was not essential to the church, and the intellectual respectability lent to such a view by Gardiner's *De Verā Qbedientiā* and the fact that to hold such a view was not one of the mala dogmata listed by the Lower House of Convocation in 1536 , had given way to a reforming zeal on all sides demanding not only a repudiation of all Papal claims but a veritable witch hunt to eradicate anything that savoured of Popery. This in turn gave way to a fuller realisation of the cumulative effect of historic and Patristic studies at least in the minds of scholars which tempered by modest restraint and academic moderation made possible the positive contribution that Whitaker made to the Papal debate. It was the Commendone of 1564^{AD} that suggested to Sanders that if the Papal Primacy could be established , all other controversies would be resolved. His *De Visibili Monarchiā* was an attempt to work out this idea and his work was held to be one of the precursors of the works of Stapleton. Canus' *De Locis Theologicis* (1563) had been another, but whereas the Protestants regarded the church as the end product of the salvation process -- the 'receptacle for redeemed souls' -- the Romanists regarded the church as the formal cause of faith, the beginning of the salvation process. Taken up by the Ten Reasons of Campion, the argument was defended by John Durie and underlay the work of Richard Bristow whose 'Reply' to William Fulke's work in 1580 amplified the controversy to well over 1,000 pages.

While at St. Paul's School , Whitaker was placed under the tuition and special care of Cook , the learned Master of the School , who had been a school-fellow of Burghley. Dean Nowell maintained Whitaker till he reached the age of 16 i.e. 1564 when on Oct. 4th. he was admitted pensioner to Trinity College under the tuition of Robert West. To maintain him there Nowell granted him certain leases. One of these , an indenture dated 5th. Aug. 1566 , mentions that a house in Carter Lane adjoining the Deanery was
 1. Bilson 'The True Difference' (1585) 1.424 (1585-1586 ed.)

'freely letten without fine by the Dean to a scholar of Cambridge, his kinsman, towards his maintenance at his study'.¹ Whitaker graduated B.A. 1568 was elected to a minor Fellowship on 6th. Sept. 1569 and to a major Fellowship on 25th. March 1571 the year in which he graduated M.A.. One of the disputes in which he took part is preserved for us in the Br.Mus. MS Sloane 478 -- in two parts, the one between him and Henry Blaxton of St. John's, Goade presiding, on the subject 'animae defunctorum possunt ad corpora redire. Ergo possunt oberrare in terri', and the other being the day after between him and Barlow on 'Petrus non illa Petra'. Gataker of St. John's described Whitaker as a 'man very personable, of a goodly presence, tall of stature, upright, proportionally limbed, of grave aspect, with black hair and a ruddy complexion, of solid judgement, liberal mind, an affable disposition, a mild yet no remiss governor, a contemner of money, of moderate diet, and a most meek and lowly spirit'. Bishop Hall (1574 - 1656) the future ill-fated Bishop of Norwich, who was at Emmanuel while Whitaker was Regius Professor, described² him as 'that honour of our schools and angel of our church, learned Whitaker, more memorable than whom our age saw nothing; what clearness of judgement, what sweetness of style, what gravity of person, what grace of carriage was in that man; he was of unwearied industry and profound learning, combining these rare virtues, charity and humility.' 'Never man saw him without reverence, nor heard him without wonder'.³ Casaubon (1559 - 1614) wrote⁴ of Whitaker 'Magnum omnino fuit Whitakeri ingenium, magna eruditio et magna dicendi copia. Campianus certe doctrina ei par non erat, in cuius vero rationibus prater declamatiunculae argutiae nihil video eximii'. Fr. James Brodrick SJ. calls Whitaker the 'greatest of Elizabethan divines'⁵.

In an age replete with Catechisms as with Confessions Whitaker produced a translation of Nowell's Little Latin Catechism into Greek for the boys at school. Nowell's Catechism had been published

1. Fuller 'Abel Redivivus'. Vol. 2. p.115 (1867 ed.)
2. Morton 'Monuments of the Fathers and Reformers' (1706 ed.) p.52
History of Whalley p. 471
3. Title page 'Vera Descriptio Vitae et Mortis' Geneva ed. Whitaker Works. 1610 Vol.1. 698
4. Cooper Athen. Cantabrig. Vol.2. 198
5. J. Brodrick 'Robert Bellarmine' 1962 ed. p.67

in 1570 and approved by the Lower House of Convocation but never received the formal sanction of the Upper House . In 1570 however the two Archbishops urged its publication, and with Burghley's permission it was ordered for use in the Injunctions promulgated by Parker April 1571 . From the controversy with Duraeus ^{1.} we also hear that Whitaker translated the Catechism of Emmanuel Tremellius into Hebrew- 'eius Catechismus in linguam Haebraicam transtuli' but it is possible that the text omitted the final 't' from the last word . John Emmanuel Tremellius (1510 - 1580) a converted Jew, succeeded Paul Fagius as King's Reader of Hebrew at Cambridge in 1549 and in 1551 he issued his Catechism in Greek and Hebrew. Tremellius had been converted to Christianity by Cardinal Pole in 1540 but moved to the Protestant position under the influence of Peter Martyr. The title page of Whitaker's translation ² of Nowell's Little Latin Catechism has a picture of Isocrates teaching his pupils and the quotation -- 'Εάν ἦς φιλομαθῆς ἔσῃ πολυμαθῆς σοφία μόνῃ τὸ κτηματὸν ἀθανάτων -- ' si cupide didiceris multa disces . Solius sapientiae possessio est immortalis '. Beginning with parallel alphabets in Latin and Greek in school-book form ,it provides instructions on the Greek letters, vowels, consonants, moods and accents, and then follows the Catechism. The return ad fontes to Greek and Hebrew had stimulated the schools and the process ran through translations and retranslations, commentaries and aids to memory. The enthusiastic foundation of new colleges brought out a new seriousness , a concentration on the three languages not as a vehicle for belles lettres but as exciting instruments of communicating saving grave. At Cambridge new colleges appeared -- Magdalene in 1542 , Trinity in 1546 and Emmanuel was to appear in 1584, Sidney Sussex in 1596. Christ's was founded 1506. Latin continued to be the universal language of scholarship given a new grammatical base by Linacre and to interpret Hebrew truth, the Greek of the N.T. and the early Fathers. Greek received its impetus through the appearance of more than 40 grammars in a period which began with Lascaris and included Erasmus' translation (1516) of the Greek grammar of Theodore of Gaza , Melanchthon and Budé at Paris in 1520. In 1572 Henri Estienne had just produced his Thesaurus Linguae Graecae . For Hebrew the most famous work of Johann Reuchlin, the Christian Hebrew

1. Contra Duraeum . cap. 10. section 20 . Geneva ed.

2. Br. Mus. 843 c.21.49. p.12 Printed Lond. John Day 1574 with a

scholar, appeared in 1506 , his *De Rudimentis Linguae Hebraicae*, combining dictionary and grammar , and in 1518 there was the combination of Romansists like Clenard of Louvain and Paganini of Lucca, non-Romans like Capito and Pellican, to produce a small Hebrew grammar at Basle. Fagius of Strassburg and Forster of Wittenberg produced a Hebrew dictionary in 1557 which marked a significant change and reaction away from the old imitation of Jewish methods towards the production of a dogmatic polemic demanded by the intransigence of Trent on Scripture. Johannes Sturm (1507 - 89) influenced both Tremellius and Fagius having fallen under the influence of Bucer. His work at Strassburg covered the period 1537-1581 when he was expelled for his liberalism and inter-confessional sympathies by the strict Lutherans but eventually returned for a little while till his death in 1589. Tremellius' greatest work was his translation of the Bible from Hebrew and Syriac into Latin , a work which was to remain a standard Latin translation for the Protestant world for some time. He translated the N.T. with the Syriac text in Latin translation in 1569 and his Latin translation of the O.T. appeared in 5 parts 1575 - 9. His Hebrew and Greek Catechism appeared 1551 and he produced a Chaldean and Syriac grammar in 1569.

Bishop Pagnet's Fuller Catechism of 1553 was revised and enlarged by Nowell and this was also translated by Whitaker into Greek ; in this we find additional material . In addition to the pattern of Apostles Creed and 10 Commandments, we find duties to parents, teachers and masters , the duties of wives based upon quotations from 1 Peter , Ephesians, and Colossians, and prayers before and after meals.

Br. Museum MS 1353 ¹ preserves Whitaker's translation into Greek of Nowell's 1573 edition of his *Prima Institutio Christianae Pietatis*, and Br. Museum MS 3505 c. 36 ² contains Whitaker's translation into Greek two years later of Nowell's *Institutio Pietatis Christianae* this time defending Christian piety in the veneration of the Divine contd. further edition 1589.

1. Br. Mus. 1353 a.7. in 8 vo 680 pp. with a Greek and Latin text on opposite pages. Pt.1. Decalogue (to folio 171) Pt. 2 Gospel & Faith (fol.172) Pt. 3. on the action of grace (fol.435) Pt. 4 Baptism and the Eucharist (fol. 571). On fol. 656 is a note on public penance and excommunication --that satisfaction must not only be done but be seen to be done coram congregatione.

2. *Χριστιανισμοῦ στοιχεῖαι*

scholar, appeared in 1506, his *De Rudimentis Linguae Hebraicae*, combining dictionary and grammar, and in 1518 there was the combination of Romansists like Clenard of Louvain and Paganini of Lucca, non-Romans like Capito and Pellican, to produce a small Hebrew grammar at Basle. Fagius of Strassburg and Forster of Wittenberg produced a Hebrew dictionary in 1557 which marked a significant change and reaction away from the old imitation of Jewish methods towards the production of a dogmatic polemic demanded by the intransigence of Trent on Scripture. Johannes Sturm (1507 - 89) influenced both Tremellius and Fagius having fallen under the influence of Bucer. His work at Strassburg covered the period 1537-1581 when he was expelled for his liberalism and inter-confessional sympathies by the strict Lutherans but eventually returned for a little while till his death in 1589. Tremellius' greatest work was his translation of the Bible from Hebrew and Syriac into Latin, a work which was to remain a standard Latin translation for the Protestant world for some time. He translated the N.T. with the Syriac text in Latin translation in 1569 and his Latin translation of the O.T. appeared in 5 parts 1575 - 9. His Hebrew and Greek Catechism appeared 1551 and he produced a Chaldean and Syriac grammar in 1569.

Bishop Pagnet's Fuller Catechism of 1553 was revised and enlarged by Nowell and this was also translated by Whitaker into Greek; in this we find additional material. In addition to the pattern of Apostles Creed and 10 Commandments, we find duties to parents, teachers and masters, the duties of wives based upon quotations from 1 Peter, Ephesians, and Colossians, and prayers before and after meals.

Br. Museum MS 1353¹ preserves Whitaker's translation into Greek of Nowell's 1573 edition of his *Prima Institutio Christianae Pietatis*, and Br. Museum MS 3505 c. 36² contains Whitaker's translation into Greek two years later of Nowell's *Institutio Pietatis Christianae* this time defending Christian piety in the veneration of the Divine

contd. further edition 1589.

1. Br. Mus. 1353 a.7. in 8 vo 680 pp. with a Greek and Latin text on opposite pages. Pt.1. Decalogue (to folio 171) Pt. 2 Gospel & Faith (fol.172) Pt. 3. on the action of grace (fol.435) Pt. 4 Baptism and the Eucharist (fol. 571). On fol. 656 is a note on public penance and excommunication --that satisfaction must not only be done but be seen to be done coram congregatione.

2. *Χριστιανισμοῦ στοιχεῖον*

Name and observation of the Divine Law, with prayers before and after study, and from these we can deduce the character of the 'morning assembly' in chapel. Whitaker's biographer also mentions a Latin version from him of the 'whole form of the Public Prayer and the prescribed scheme of all the Liturgy' and he is said ^{1.} to have dedicated to Nowell a translation of the Book of Common Prayer -- probably the Liturgy with matins and evensong. A further work from Whitaker's pen at this time was his 'Short Sum of Christianity' though this was not printed till 1651, then in English. It was in catechetical form and edited by J. Martin. ²

This 'Short Sum' of such a 'glorious jewel and precious gem in the crown worn by the churchand though there were many pious tracts of this sort, none is so distinguished' ³, had come into Martin's hand and he had been persuaded by Mr. Browne Rector of Staplehurst and Mr. Humphreys of Northfleet to surrender this edition to authority, and 'being weighed in the balance of the sanctuary (stateram aurarium) was found to be gold and consonant with the doctrine of the Church of England, the most noble and flourishing branch of the Church Catholic'. It was claimed to be a counterblast to 'sectaries, Catharists (described also as Grindletonians in the North) Anabaptists, Marans, and Libertines and the odd Cappes who rushed into the ministry with a pretended knowledge of the divine mysteries'; he castigates the 'army of capricious uncatechised professors followed by untutored zealots and illbred swaines who behaved themselves as ^{re}vently in the Temple as they would in a stable'. The reference to Joseph Hall as the 'seraphical Prelate of Exeter' would date Martin's work as having been done before 1641 the date of his translation to Norwich. Whitaker seems to have remained in good company, serving the Church of England 50 years after his death. The 'Short Sum' ends with the prayer :- The God of mercy and peace, illuminate our dark understanding with the sweet saving beams of His Holy and Heavenly truth; inflame our frozen souls with the pure fervour of Christian charity and celestial love to the edification and pacification of His church and our own eternal consolation in

1. D.N.B. Vol. 21. 21 f.

2. Br. Mus. E.1375.4. 'A Short Sum of Christianity' Lond. 1651 by that Reverend and famous divine William Whitaker, D.D., to be sold by Thomas Pierrepont at his shop in Paul's Churchyard at the sign of the Sun. Martin is described as a candidatus SS Theologiae.

3. ibid.

our blessed Lord Jesus. Amen'. Non sunt litigandi haec sed orandi Tempora'.

1.

In April 1578 Whitaker completed and published his translation of Jewel's 'Defence of the Apology of the Church of England' (1566-7) into Latin and dedicated it to the two Archbishops Grindal and Sandys, to Bishops Aylmer, Whitgift, Freak and to Dean Nowell. In the same year the Senate waived the usual custom of one of the proctors to be Father of the Philosophy Act, though the two men were senior in standing, and chose Whitaker. His star was in the ascendancy; his disputing aroused great interest and enthusiasm and his lodgings were invaded by eager young students who wished to prolong the arguments. Whitaker enjoyed his table talk, and took his work as well as his friends home with him. In addition to his Scriptural and philosophical controversies, Whitaker now undertook a more serious study of Patristics--his recent work on Jewel's Defence contributing to his enthusiasm for this. But at 30 years of age his health was beginning to suffer; against his love of archery, fishing and shuttlecock, we must place Whitgift's ² observation of his prodigious labours in the academic field.

Whitaker's lectures on the Commonplaces also attracted much attention being delivered in the chapel of Trinity. Notes were taken by Allenson ³ and circulated for the persual of the best divines'. His biographer tells us that Whitaker was well known

1. Strype. Annals. 2. 550. Lambeth MSS. The Convocation of 1570 (from notes of matters to be discussed) intended that;--

- a) Nowell's Catechism (1562)
- b) Jewel's Apology (1562)
- c) the 39 Articles

should be published in one book and enjoined to be taught in universities and grammar schools throughout the realm. Strype. Annals. 1. 474. Parker added in the margin the note 'item, in Cathedral churches and Collegiate and in private houses'.

2. Whitgift became Master of Trinity July 1567 (not 1570 as the OCCC p. 1456) after a short Mastership at Pembroke to which he had been appointed in April 1567. Whitaker had the discipline, earnestness, industry and devotion to learning that Whitgift admired--he 'placed him among his chief delights and esteemed him a son even to his last breath'. Camden 'Elizabeth' p. 507 (3rd. ed. 1675) ascribed Whitaker's early death in 1595 to the fact that 'he had much weakened his body with study'.

3. Geneva ed. Whitaker's works. 1. 511. Allenson went to Trinity May 1576 but subsequently migrated to St. John's where in the same year he was admitted Ashton Scholar (Scholarship founded 1536).

B.A. 1580. M.A. 1583.

for 'popular sermons in the country and domestic catechising'. Baker¹ mentions that it was not improbable that he was Rector of Bluntisham in Huntingdonshire though the local evidence is against this. More likely he was one of those 'godly pastors' who toured the numerous parishes round Cambridge, men holding university places who provided an 'apostolic succession of plain living and high thinking'. The effect on the country folk of being brought up to date with the latest trends in Cambridge is a matter for conjecture. On the 3rd. February 1578 he was installed as a canon of Norwich Cathedral having surrendered his Fellowship at Trinity when he married Susan one of the 4 daughters of the celebrated Nicholas Culverwell who combined an interest in city trade and colonial expansion (as a London merchant-haberdasher) with Puritan piety and Cambridge education. The Culverwell family had recently acquired a pied-a-terre in Cambridge. Whitaker was incorporated at Oxford² on the 14th. July 1578 having graduated B.D. a month before for which he presented 3 'very celebrated praelections according to custom'. This 'second Basil, Origen new born' as his biographer called him in the summer of 1578 delivered a discourse Ad Clerum in Great St. Mary's.

By Susan Culverwell Whitaker had two sons, both dying in 1617. The one Samuel,³ was born 1587, the year of his father's appointment as Master of St. John's and progressed to Eton and then to King's College, Cambridge, becoming Fellow of that College in 1608. Nine years later he 'passed away quietly in his bed at Cambridge and was buried in the Chapel'. The other, Alexander, was born two years earlier than Samuel, in 1585, preceeding Samuel to Eton and Trinity Cambridge in 1602. His college contemporaries included John Cotton and John Winthrop, and in addition to his grandfather's enthusiasm for colonial evangelism he also had the example of his aunt Elizabeth Culverwell who had married Thomas Gouge of Stratford, Middlesex, a member of the Virginia Company, which numbered amongst its members Nicholas Ferrar the father of the famous Rector of Little Gidding. Alexander was ordained priest 1609 and took a living in

1. Rectors' List in the 'History of Bluntisham & Earith' --this together with the Parish Registers give 1559-1570 William Flydd (Flude); 1570 - 3 Christopher Tye (Tyte) 1573 - 1585 John Parker; 1585 - 1612 Miles Bodley.
 2. Foster Alumn. Oxon. 1500 - 1714, Whitaker held his canonry for 3 years.
 3. Cooper Athen. Cantabr. p.198 notes that William Whitaker was admitted Fellow of Eton 13th. Jun 1587 but it is uncertain whether

Yorkshire, but within two years was landing at Jamestown, four years after the first settlement there in 1607. Hunt the chaplain to the colonists had died in 1608, and on his arrival Alexander was appointed chaplain and became the 'Apostle of Virginia' the first effective Anglican missionary in the North American Continent. In the course of a powerful ministry he baptised the 19 year old Princess Pocahontas and in 1613 his remarkable 'Good News from Virginia' was printed in London. He was drowned in the James River 1617.

Susan, William's wife, died in 1589 and he married Joan Fenner at the church of **Stratford**, Bow, Middlesex on the 8th. April 1591. Joan was the wife of Dudley Fenner who died when chaplain to the English merchants at Middleburg in 1589 under the age of 30. At the time of Whitaker's death in 1595, Joan was 'partui vicina' and the child was born and baptised a week after Whitaker's death, being given the name of Jabez -- born in sorrow ($\int \int y' 1$ Chron.4.9). Jabez died in Virginia 1624 having been in the colony for 5 years as a lieutenant, newly married, in charge of one of the plantations known as College Land i.e. acres set aside for the endowment of an Indian College for the training of natives in 'religious, moral, virtue and civility'. William Whitaker had 5 other children -- one Joan went to Virginia in 1625 to enquire after her brother Jabez's goods but found little of value. Of the other four it is possible that Thomas Whitaker (b.1578; went to Trinity 1594 and became a schoolmaster at Burnley till his death in 1626) was a son by Susan, and that William (born 1592; went to St. John's 1609 becoming a Lincolnshire parson 1620 - 42) was a son by Joan.

After his Ad Clerum in 1578 and the heated controversies which Whitaker aroused in his lectures, he became aware that the academic arena was not prepared for the Jesuit challenge now imminent. Having concentrated on the Biblical controversies, there remained wide open the whole question of the place, function, and authority of the Fathers in the church. Was it to be para-Scriptural, supra-Scriptural in the sense that only the Fathers' interpretations of Scripture were to be acknowledged, or sub-Scriptural. the controversies over Patristic texts were already reaching fever heat under the spearhead attack of the Jesuits and it was not sufficient to wipe off contd. this was Samuel's father.

this whole area of Christian thought by claiming that it only complicated the simple issue of Papal versus Scriptural authority or at the most using Patristic texts as a polemic arsenal. The Jesuits were well trained, and in the van of Patristic lore, and they came upon a virtual vacuum at Cambridge. It was essential that attention be given to the contextual relevance of the Patristic texts, and this was tending to widen. The same exercise applied to the General Councils and their canons. Whitaker virtually withdrew from public disputing at Cambridge and began a study in depth of Patristic texts. Bellarmine always the avid reader also at this time was hard at work reading carefully during the summer of 1579 Salmeron's endless commentaries on the N.T. -- they ran to 16 folio volumes, each page in double columns of relatively small print, a laborious undertaking as Bellarmine attempted verification of thousands of references. Though only 37 years of age -- Whitaker was 31 -- Bellarmine produced a budget of errata which was explosive in content. Having been made Professor of Controversial Theology in 1576 at the newly founded Collegium Romanum, Bellarmine had thrown himself enthusiastically into this work. His prolific lecturing, often beginning at an early hour, was eagerly awaited and as the fame of these controversial lectures grew, so eager young students packed their lecture notes. In the Bodleian are two such MSS -- one an early form¹ of his celebrated 'Disputationes de controversiis Fidei' amounting to notes taken on the 26th. Nov. 1576 onwards, and the other² 'dictata' or lectures delivered also at Rome during a period ending 26th. May 1578. Listening to these lectures were many future English Martyrs -- Kirby, Hart, Lowe, Buxton, James, Duke, Ingram, Walpole, and Southwell.

Whitaker was studying the works of two Englishmen, Alan Cope (a canon of St. Peter's Rome) and N. Harpsfield who published

1. Bodleian MS 539; with title 'De Contraversiis' consisting of a Preface and 3 parts, De Verbo Dei, De Ecclesia Militante (beginning at folio 94) and De Conciliis (beginning at folio 204). In different hands. $8\frac{3}{4}$ X $6\frac{3}{4}$. Vllll. + 260 leaves. The hand changes at fol. 94 and 137.
2. Bodleian MS 588. lectures under the title De Pontifice; subject was the position and power of the Pope in two parts a) 9 chapters b) 5 quaestiones, the text beginning 'desseruimus anno superiori de ecclesia universa. In Latin with change of hand at fol. 24, 54, and 127. $8\frac{3}{4}$ X $6\frac{3}{4}$ iii + 242 leaves.

his 'Dialogi sex contra Summi Pontificis oppugnatores' at Antwerp in 1566, of the Spanish theologian Miguel Medina, and Rufus's publication of 1553 of his Defence of Charles du Moulin's 'Pro Pontifice Maximo'. In the closing years of Trent Peter Canisius had pressed for an answer to the Centuriators; on Dec. 7th. 1560 he had written 'it is a great shame and crime that ecclesiastical history should be distorted in so many ways by the sectaries. In Rome there are plenty of learned men skilled in historical investigation. At present the sectaries invent whatever they like while we snore away to a man' ¹. By 1565 heavy tomes had begun to appear to 'refute that most pestilent work of the Magdeburgers' and these found their way into the hands of Hosius, Truchsess, Foscarario and other eminent men. Salmeron and Ledesma were officially deputed to reply to Flacius, but the pressure of business made not Rome but Dillingen the centre of Catholic refutation of the Protestant History. Conrad Braun of Augsburg produced a MS revised and seen through the press by Peter Canisius and in 1564 W. Eisengrein produced a small volume at Ingoldstadt dealing with misrepresentations of the Flacian First Century. Alan Cope followed, as did Nicholas Harpsfield, once Archdeacon of Canterbury but under Elizabeth a prisoner in the Tower. Harpsfield's 'Six Dialogues' against the Centuriators were secured by Cope and printed at Antwerp. The initiative then passed to the German Jesuits who not so much refuted as discredited the Centuriators by instancing contradictions, false allegations, and mutilation of documents. Panvinio, the Augustinian scholar, said by Scaliger to be the 'Father of all History' produced a volume in 3 parts of some 150 folio pages -- less than was hoped, for he died in his 30's. By Sept. 1571 Canisius had written his own bulky quarto volume of 796 pages with two excellent indexes. This revealed a wide range of reading on his part -- of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Peter Martyr, Bucer, Stephanus, Carlstadt, Servetus, Beza, Schwenckfeldt, Brenz, Stancar, Chemnitz and Bullinger. His extensive use of Protestant quotations is matched by his evaluation of the historians Josephus, Eusebius, Nicephorus, Rufinus, Bede and others. Swamped with references and allusions, it demands the enormously erudite. Commended by Sirleto, Pontidonius, and by the Oxford Scholar Alan Cope, the Jesuit theologians 'omnes uno ore

1. Braunsberger Epistulae 3. p. 30 Canisius to Truchsess.

probarunt vehementer'. Flacius was sufficiently disturbed as to go round repeatedly asking his pupils and disciples 'and what are you doing against the Jesuits?' with Canisius in mind.

The capture of Cuthbert Mayne in June 1577 in Cornwall, the subsequent enquiry which revealed a substantial increase in recusants appearing in episcopal courts, the Conference of the Bishops and Council in July 1577 had all made the Papist question one of the highest interest and importance. The alliance of Sanders the Jesuit with Fitzmaurice in Ireland March 1579, though a poor relation as far as the Pope and Philip were concerned, also intensified feeling. In 1574, 3 seminarists, priests, came to England; four years later there were more than 50 and by 1580 more than 110. Many were eloquent men, English-born, but they came with three disadvantages; -

- a) they were supported by Philip of Spain, the Duke of Guise, blind to the effect on English feeling of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew of 1572, the Pope, and men like Don John governor of the Netherlands who talked of crossing to England, dethroning Elizabeth, releasing Mary Queen of Scots and marrying her, both to share the English crown. In Dec. 1576 he had the audacity to ask Elizabeth to shelter his Spanish forces on the English coast should storms drive them there, declaring his 'peaceful motives in removing soldiers from the Netherlands! Walsingham was not the only man to be suspicious.
 - b) they came in flat disobedience to the English law as it then stood. The storm gathered long before Allen's violent pamphlet, preparatory to the Armada, admonishing the English to rise against their bastard heretic queen. The law was already clear on the charge of treason -- against anyone affirming that Elizabeth was not, or ought not to be, queen, or that she was heretic, schismatic or usurper. The experiences of 1577-1581 led to the further Statute of 1581 making traitors of all proselytizers, and to the legislation of 1586 - 7 when all Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests from abroad were ordered to leave the realm within 40 days. Admission to being a priest immigrant was sufficient to establish the charge of treason. There were many men sitting at the feet of Bellarmine who would echo the vow taken by Sherwin in April 1579 with hand laid upon the Scriptures, that he 'was ready to go at a sign from his superiors and that today rather than tomorrow, for the good of souls'. Their
-

minds were fixed on that sacrifice which may well be the crowning glory of their lives. Their cell walls were hung with pictures and drawings of the torture chamber, and the scaffold. When Campion heard of Cuthbert Mayne's martyrdom, he said 'Wretch that I am, how has that novice out-distanced me. May he be favourable to his old friend and tutor !' . Many had only the deeper spiritual motives echoed by Campion on the scaffold 'we are dead men to the world, we travelled only for souls'. They had reckoned the cost, and no indiscretions by their superiors eg. Gregory XIII's patronising the ill-conceived Spanish attack in Ireland, was going to deter them, nor the fact that the English government was unable, even if ⁱⁿ the circumstances it had been willing, to distinguish between those papists who conspired against the state and those who looked only to the conversion of souls. The issue was not as clear as this -- nor was the line separating the use of pax beads as a simple pious devotion from their use as a token of reconciliation to Papal pretensions. Even the most innocent devotional article came to be charged with sinister and treasonable intent.

For the two years 1578 till 1580 when he became Regius Professor, Whitaker was fully occupied with the verification of texts, quotations, exegesis and controversial theology, receiving Romanist writings for perusal and examination. The hour produced the man -- truth must be in every blow -- and though his opponents may not detect it, his friends certainly knew it, that he felt his own inadequacies at entering the European arena. By the time he had replied with his initial skirmish to Campion's Ten Reasons, his understanding of the Jesuit position had considerably clarified and matured. Although it was not till 1586/7 that Bellarmine's first volume of his De Controversiis was published by Sartorius at Ingoldstad Whitaker had already in his hands Bellarmine's lectures in MS 'transmitted to every quarter and treasured up as jewels and amulets, passed from hand to hand and diligently transcribed and read by very many' -- and 'since he had handled these questions with accuracy and method, we will make him so to speak our principal aim'. With these words, Whitaker recognised beyond Stapleton at

1. Vol.1. published 1586/7 were treatises on Scripture, Tradition, Christ the Head of the entire church, the Pope the Head of the Church on earth, the Church Militant, Purgatory (The Church Expectant) and the Church Triumphant. Vol. 2 was published 1588 on

at Douay¹, and Allen at Rome, fellowcountrymen, the masterly hand and encyclopaedic mind of Bellarmine, whom he described as 'unquestionably learned, possessed of a happy genius, and a penetrating judgement'. The actual publication of Bellarmine's works bearing the diploma of Sixtus Vth carried greater weight than the MS copies of his lectures which Whitaker had been working on². Bellarmine's habit of referring points for revision and correction to other scholars gave his MS lectures a tentative character; a close friend and fellow Jesuit, Andreas Eudaemon-Jones, was his constant companion and mentor.

contd. on the sacraments, and vol. 3. 1593 on grace, free will, and justification.

1. Stapleton's 'Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio' on the authority of the church and Apostolic Succession was published 1578, the year Allen arrived at Rheims from Douay.
2. In his Disputatio (1588) Quaest. 6.9. Whitaker notes the differences between what was later printed in the Sartorian edition and what Bellarmine had said in his MS lectures. Three chapters later, Whitaker again notes the differences, for Bellarmine had originally quoted from Innocent's first Letter to Decentius (Ep. VI inter Epp. Decret. on Rescript. Rom. Pont. Matriti .1821 p. 10) and from a letter of Leo, but both were dropped in the printed edition.

Chapter 2.

Set on Collision Course --the 'Jesuit Menace' (1579 - 1581)
Edmund Campion's 'Brag' and 'Ten Reasons'

Amidst a storm of protest and indignation,¹ Whitaker was appointed Regius Professor in 1580, succeeding William Chaderton² the renowned opponent of Cartwright and a protégé of Burghley and Elizabeth. Whitaker was only 32 and there were senior men who regarded themselves as more fitted for the post, an opinion widely held, but ignored, though we are not told who those men were. We are, however, told by his biographer, that it was Whitaker's wide reading, acute judgement, succinct expression, his sound doctrine and knowledge of issues, that proved the grounds for this appointment. The Queen was creating no precedent -- Chaderton had been appointed Regius Professor in 1562 at the age of 30 and there was great merit in harnessing young men in a rapidly changing scene, young enough to be able to break loose from the domestic Puritanism of Cambridge at that time and be able to meet the eminent Jesuit attack about to break. Whitaker did not realise what he was in for, but Elizabeth had recognised in him an acute and challenging mind at a time when this was not a common commodity.

Any hope of success of a conciliar relationship with Rome had by now fast receded. Although attempts had been made as late

1. Vera Descriptio Vitae et Mortis W. Whitaker. Geneva ed. Whitaker's Works 1610. vol.1. 700, though Baker prefers 1579 the date given by Le Neve Fasti 3. 656 and Churton's Life of Alex. Nowell p.327. On Oct. 1st. 1580 the Queen also made Whitaker Chancellor of St. Paul's, which office he held till 1587. Whitaker's Letter of thanks to Burghley is among Burghley MSS LXVIII. no. 35. Whitaker succeeded John Watson who became Bishop of Winchester (1580-4). In a Letter to Burghley 1st. Jan. 1595 (Br. Mus. MSS Add. 4276) Whitaker signs himself 'your honour's chaplain' complaining that he had heard the rumour that Bilson was not accepting the Deanery of Windsor and he begged Burghley's favour with the Queen for the office or one like it; by Nov. 1595 (3 weeks before his death) he complains that he had been passed over in 'the great preferment of so many' - he desired more leisure to continue his Apologia for the English Church. No doubt, in the eyes of Burghley and Elizabeth Whitaker had blotted his copy book by his association with the Lambeth Articles, and the troubles at St. John's lent credence to the suspicion that his hold on discipline was not such as would fit him for the Elizabethan episcopate. Whitaker by this time was feeling

as 1566 to bring Elizabeth (that ' Helen that had been stolen from them ') back to the 'true faith' , the situation had greatly changed. The Vatican had emerged with a strong retentive juristic structure still within a medieval formula, and any attendance at the concluding sessions of Trent would have been looked upon as a voluntary and renewed submission to Papal obedience. In 1560 the Papal summons to reconvene the Council left no doubt that the Council would be firmly under Papal control. In 1561 Elizabeth had despatched the Earl of Bedford to France to urge the Protestant minded King of Navarre that none should consent till the Pope and the rest submit in a General Council to the rule of the Fathers and Bishops of the ancient church and conform to Scripture and the ancient canons. Cecil wrote to Bishop de Quadra that Elizabeth would be willing to send representatives and theologians to the Council if the Pope's position were clarified as President or Head but not Ruler. Matters of faith were to be judged according to Scripture , the consensus of divines, and the declarations of ancient councils. The English Bishops were not to be mere observers but be seated in Council since they were canonically ordained. As English law stood then, there was no Papal Supremacy -- the alternative was that the Bishop of Rome sit as Patriarch of the West with an autonomous (autocephalous) English Church at his side.

By 1563 however any hope of English participation was doomed. Elizabeth could confidently write¹, we and our people-- --thanks be to God -- follow no novel and strange religion but that very religion which is ordained by Christ , sanctioned by the Primitive and Catholic Church, and approved by the consentient mind and voice of the most early Fathers '. The confidence was shared by Cecil in his Letter to de Quadra, and Jewel in his Apology. A similar confidence had been shown by Isabella , with the limitation of Papal interference in the affairs of national churches. The Concordat of 1482 had given the Spanish crown the right of visitation and nomination to benefices . Ximenes of Toledo had initiated a vigorous attempt at reformation , with new schools of theology with a Thomism

contd. sore by this time -- his immediate predecessors both as Regius Professor and Chancellor of St. Paul's had received Sees . Elizabeth was sensitive to many matters-Whitaker ought not to have mentioned them

1. Letter of Elizabeth to the Emperor Ferdinand 1563.

having a strong Augustinian element , and replete with powerful opponents of the Jesuits. Erasmus declared that the work in Spain under Ximenes with the assistance of Mendoza and de Talavera followed the best type of reformation in the church , but the achievement was limited. It did , however, establish that secular authorities were to take the initiative in reform which the Papal Curia was clearly neglecting , and news of this was not slow to disseminate. Little is known, however, of the lasting influence of Giberti (d.1543) a renowned Patristic scholar and foremost reformer , the trusted counsellor of Paul 3rd. , Contarini (d. 1542) who took part in the Conference of Ratisbon 1541 , that last attempt before Trent at reunion with the Lutherans , Caraffa (Paul 4th. d. 1559) who inherited reforming zeal from Paul 3rd. and was the first of the Counter Reformation Popes , or Morone (d. 1580) . The possibility of reconciliation was now remote for any appeal to a General Council such as Burghley had in mind and Whitaker advocated, and was doomed in the post-Tridentine climate since it would have involved an abrogation of that initiative claimed (and won) in the Papal Supremacy from the side of the Counter Reformation. While the appearance of these pre-Trent reformers exercised a fascination for non-Roman theologians of the post-Trent era, but no impact could be made on the Jesuit armoury, this does account for the fact that issues familiar in the earlier part of the century re-appear in controversies later in the century but now encrusted with further ramifying arguments, greater in range and depth.

On the dogmatic side , the Council of Trent made its mind clear when asserting that the Rule of Faith contained the Nicene Creed as 'Symbolum Fidei quo sancta Romana ecclesia utitur ' ; there was no quarrel with the premise but the significance of the addition of ' Romana ' did not escape the observers. Giving parity to (unwritten) traditions with Scripture (pari pietatis effectu ac reverentia suscepit et veneratur) , the Vulgate as the only authentic version with the church as the sole interpreter , raised a whole new crop of controversies in the confrontation with the Reformed position -- so that when the Jesuits appeared , the Patristic battleground became one vast textual engagement , and frequently in the midst of battle there is heard the cry go up for the clarification

of the state of the question at issue for claims had to be examined in the light of changing outlooks. Whitaker repeatedly required further clarification of the issues and challenged Jesuit handling of them for they wilfully ignored the implications of the scholarship of the previous 50 years and flew in the face of history and Biblical scholarship. For justification 'sola fide' there was need for another Contarini to rescue the situation from an arid triumph of conservatism. Did the Jesuits really understand the doctrine of imputed righteousness? Whitaker also wished to protract the discussion on the difference between inherent and imputed righteousness and the nature of concupiscence. As it turned out, as Whitaker hammered away, there was more agreement than had been hoped for. Even so the de jure divino status of the episcopate accepted by Whitgift, Bilson, Bancroft, Whitaker and others, in the case of the Roman Church became overshadowed by the Papal Primacy -- it was Pius IV who understood and undertook the reform of the Curia, not the Council, demonstrating even more the excessive centralisation of the Papacy. The uncompromising rigidity of Trent made it clear that any hope for an episcopal Collegium was doomed from the start and though the Primacy lacked formal definition, it was buttressed with copious theological justification and a certain historical appeal. In an age of rapid fragmentation minds boggled at the divisiveness of theological and confessional debate; even without theological justification it was a short step for those ill-equipped to cope with the changes to grasp at a stabiliser. But Hubert Jedin has shown that there is another side to the question, that Trent must not be regarded as fixing the norm of Catholic theology and that the gradual acceptance in catholic circles of the historical approach, emerging in the liberal position which found a footing at Vatican 2, has led to a historical relativism that refuses to treat Trent as a fixed point to which all other schemes must be referred, to stand or fall. Trent did not give automatic conciliar sanction to a vast mass of Medieval doctrinal tradition. There was a thorough doctrinal revision which involved the verbal rejection or tacit ignoring of much current theology popular in the Middle Ages.

Trent was pressed consciously or unconsciously by a concourse of revising influences -- Humanism, which led to a

revival of the study of the early Fathers with Augustine at the main gate -- the new Dominicanism which quite independently of the Reformation had begun a revived study of Thomas Aquinas --- Curialism, with its nascent enthusiasm and theories for the omnipotence of the Pope in the life of the church, in its practices, and beliefs, an enthusiasm gathering in momentum as Europe foundered in the raging torrents of theological arguments -- and Mysticism, though this made little formal contribution to the doctrinal corpus, in Italy and Spain, it led to a reaction against dogmatisation. The Curialists desired stricter definitions which would in fact make it impossible for the Protestants to return. The progress of Lutheran theology had provided a foil -- for the theological position c. 1550 was very different from that in which John Nathin had taught Luther at the Erfurt convent. On the Roman side, Thomas de San Felicio Bishop of La Cava was prepared to accept the Lutheran justification *solā fide*. The mediating view of Contarini emerged with the new Thomists, led by Seripando, General of the Augustine Eremites since 1539, the order to which Luther had belonged, who distinguished imputed and inherent righteousness, which approximated to the Protestant distinction between justification and sanctification. The only hope for man lay in the imputed righteousness of Christ, and inherent righteousness was impossible without it. Lainez who led the Papal party accepted Seripando's distinction, at least in theory; the importance of this is seen in the 33 canons that followed Trent's 16 chapters with definitions on justification.

There had also been a general tendency among the old Scotists to produce a state of mind equivalent to 'theological scepticism', a state of mind which dissented intellectually from most of the great doctrines of the Medieval Church, but to accept them on the external authority of the church. They showed that there were really no permanent principles in dogmatics but that there was a universal need of reference to a permanent and external source of authority which could be no other than the Roman Pontiff. Here they conjoined with the Curialists who held that the universal church was represented by the Roman Church which was condensed in the Pope and

this was not confined to jurisdiction. There was also a strong feeling for a reduction in definition -- on the part of the Scotists and the Emperor's party, the latter to avoid Lutheran exclusion, though this party came ultimately to realise during the first 7 years of the Council that the Lutherans had already acquired a separate legal standing, within the Empire. The Jesuits in the earlier years (i.e. 1540-1550) who were nearer Loyola's original teaching, also favoured resistance to over-dogmatisation on the grounds that submission to the Papacy made it superfluous.

By the end of the ^{Council of} Trent, the bargaining and dexterous persuasion exercised by Pius IV, a skilled diplomatist, which meant virtually that only the Pope knew what was really happening, disarmed the Emperor, the Kings of France and Spain, and checked the liberal ambitions of French Bishops and the Germans in reform. Even Morone found himself in prison. Far from being an **Ecumenical Council** it emerged a Council of the Roman Church for the strengthening of Papal centralisation and even reforms were made to serve that end. The 10th. clause of the *Professio Fidei Tridentinae* required true obedience to the Pontiff as a test of catholicity, and the Bull *Benedictus Deus* (Jan. 24.1564) reserved the exposition of all decrees to the Pope himself. The church is identified with the Papacy. The opposition of ancient opponents within the council, of the Spanish and French bishops who claimed that episcopal powers were held directly from Christ, against the Curialists who held that all episcopal jurisdiction came from the Pope, the bishops being the Pope's vicars---this opposition was resolved by final embraces as the Council dispersed. Trent had provided a compact system of doctrine, comprehensive-ly opposed to Protestantism, and was to enjoy a new intellectual basis with the Jesuits. Trent also rebuilt a symmetrical hierarchy, removed many of the abuses that had given strength to the Protestant movement, and provided a dogmatic-theological chrysalis from which the new theologians Lainez, Salmeron, Canisius, and Bellarmine could emerge. The diplomatist Pius IV made way for the rigorist Pius V, the sterner Pontiff required for the enforcement of Papalism with a zeal, devotion and intense hatred of anything savouring of heresy (i.e. non-Papal deviations) and this gave strength to the Counter Reformation at its very centre.

The Jesuits made it increasingly difficult to effect any sort of reconciliation in the 16th. Century -- the 'ars definiendi' became an obsession, so that all that did not conform were a priori heretics. This spiritual despotism replaced the intellectual spaciousness and comparative freedom that had characterised the 13th. Century, perhaps the Golden Age of Medieval Catholicism. It laid blight upon any desire for a wider freedom in matters not essential to salvation while at the same time infused those matters de fide with a tyrannical bondage that the faith lent itself not to enquiry but to uninformed acceptance, and the Roman Church was made a single colour spectrum. Rome moved along a single but numerically expanding line, with the single aim at conversion to the dogmatic system alone. Protestantism had by no means exhausted its potential nor reached the limits of its advance, though its weaknesses were apparent in contentious ranks, inability to resolve theological differences, and the increasing difficulty of having to defend conquests against a restored Papacy. Biblicism was a fertile ground for Separatism and proved refractory, isolated from Patristic and Primitive thought -- Cambridge had proved a nursery for Browne, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry. Whitaker reacted with the assertion on the eve of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity that theological truth for its exposition and classification demands an adequate, sound, and clear knowledge of the historical and theological process of doctrine defining, and Scripture cannot be isolated from that process.

Whitaker challenged the Jesuit claim that the end of that process is the erection of a single dogma-defining, and dogma-producing, authority in the See of Rome. This claim had precipitated and perpetuated the crisis of the Papacy, but neither had Protestant rigidity and partiality resolved the problem. Much was to be gained by a re-examination of confessional truth in the light of the Regula Fidei and its contents as emerging from Biblical and Patristic study. This carried a priority over questions of church Order, though nothing seemed to be gained by an abandonment of episcopacy as distinct from a modification of that Order. The scholarly devotion of the Jesuits took possession of the rising generation and surged back into areas since deserted -- education with contemporary school books soon led to consultation, consultation to confession, confession to direction.

A generation of ardent souls arose revived by the incense of the piety of Borromeo , Philip Neri, and Francis de Sales, and influenced in no small way by a general malaise with Protestant discord which the principle of Cuius regio, eius religio had been powerless to prevent. This renewed Romanism under the Jesuits drew to itself both the attention of the best scholars of the day and the worst fears and hatred of which man is capable , and in its first stages was a purist movement in the hands of Bellarmine, but which in due course in the 17th. Century was to lapse into the adoption of questionable theories like that of Probabilism by which directors could transform deadly sins into venial, and casuistry dominated the confessional. In Whitaker's day however, probabilism was in embryo and no formalised weapon till the next generation. For Whitaker the prime question was how far can continuity be maintained in the face of accumulated dogma. The Radicals had provided a severe testing ground.

Whitaker's first public lectures on becoming Regius Professor were on Luke 1-3 , Galatians, 1 Timothy, and the Song of Songs. The first two are no longer extant , but undated MSS of his commentary-lectures on 1 Timothy and the Song of Songs still exist ¹. In the former he speaks of faith as;-

- a) charity directed to giving effect to the Divine Word
- b) prayer which purifies the heart, purging it of all misery
- c) preserving an incorrupt conscience
- d) the agent of truth.

There are abundant quotations from the Fathers , particularly Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, and Augustine with comments on the Rheims Annotations. His longer work on the Song of Songs opens with the assertion that Scripture often uses ^{the}typology of marriage to represent the covenant love of Christ and the Church eg. Hosea 2 ; 2 Cor. 12.2 ; Apoc. 21.2 -- signifying the greatest and most profound of relationships, the sphere of the greatest care and vigilance, the bond of mental, physical and spiritual communion . Theodoret ¹ had

1. De Providentia V.(P.G. 83.555 - 774.) . 10 Discourses , apologetic in tone, delivered before an educated audience at Antioch c.436 AD **Μυστικός** (Lampe.Patristic Greek Lexicon (1965) 893) having the sense of possessing or conveying a hidden sense --its meaning being only evident to those who have experienced or are in, the Covenant.

called the book 'tantum mysticum' --- ἔν τῷ μύστικῳ
 τῶν ἰσχυμάτων... βιβλίῳ . The Jews regarded the book as
 signifying God and His spouse the church and the catholic church
 inherited the idea .

There is some doubt about the date of Whitaker's
 D.D. ; his thesis is said to have been on the Pope as Antichrist , but
 it is no longer extant. A letter from the Senate to Burghley
 requesting a dispensation for Whitaker is dated 2nd. February but no
 year is mentioned. By the series and order in which the letter stands
 in the Public Orator's Book ¹ the two letters preceeding it and the
 one following it , are both dated 1580 .The letter apparently produced
 no effect for it was not till 1582 that he presented his 'Thesis
 proposita et defensa' at Cambridge ² , an answer to Stapleton's
 Demonstrations³, and not till 1587 was he given his D.D.. In this
 work Whitaker refers to the heresy of Innocent 1 in making the
 eucharist necessary to infants⁴ upon pain of damnation . William Fulke

-
1. Baker 'History of St. John's' pp.188 ff.
 2. This work (Geneva ed. of Whitaker's Works . 2.802-6) of some
 4,000 words is repeated in his Contra Bellarmin., and is prefaced
 by a summary of 37 'heresies' under the title 'Ἐρανοιστής
 of which the Papacy was guilty. 'Ἐρανοιστής * one who throws
 a party .
 3. Thomas Stapleton, Professor of Divinity at Douay published his
 Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio in 1578.
 4. Innocent 1 Ep. 30.5. (417AD P.L. 20. 592; Enchirid. Patr. 2016;
 Enchirid. Symbol. Definit. et Declar. 219.) ---- nisi
 enim manducaverint carnem Filii Hominis et biberint sanguinem
 eius , non habebunt vitam in semetipsis '.

who became Master of Pembroke Hall in 1578 and entered the lists against Campion in 1581 had also charged Innocent I with this view¹, as he did Augustine.² Trent condemned the view -- 'si quis dixerit parvulis antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint necessariam esse Eucharistiae Communionem, anathema sit', though it was designated as having the authority of a Rescriptum Innocentii Papae I³. There was no small stir at Trent over this canon, declaring the view anathema -- the Archbishop of Granada argued strongly in favour of the view, since to anathematise it, would have the effect of separating the Eastern and Western churches even further; on the other hand the Archbishop of Rossano argued with just as much heat for the anathema, and his followers won the day.

The practice of infant communion goes back almost to the days of the acceptance of infant baptism -- the first mention of it occurs in Cyprian De Lapsis 16 and it was clearly a recognised practice of the African church. In the Apostolic Constitution 8.12 directions are given to mothers and infant communion took place between that of the various orders and the general body of the faithful. There was no movement within the church against the practice till the 9th. Century. It is open to question, however, whatever authority Augustine gave to Innocent's view, whether Innocent's Letter regards the practice as 'de necessitate salutis'; he doesn't say so, nor does he use the word 'statuimus'. Innocent is writing to the Council of Milevis Jan. 417 and is pointing out that the Pelagian position referred to by the Council viz. that infants can be given the rewards of eternal life 'sine baptismatis gratia' is untenable in the light of the primitive practice of infant communion, supported by John VI. 54. Innocent is recalling a practice which in itself renders the Pelagian position incongruous, in the very same place.

On the morning of June 25th. 1580 Edmund Campion the

-
1. In his 'Stapleton's Fortress overthrown; the Confutation of Stapleton and Martiall' published London 1580 (Parker ed. p.41) and in his 'Discovery of the Dangerous Rock of the Popish church lately commended by Nicholas Sanders' also published 1580 (Parker ed. p. 392)
 2. Augustine 'Contra duas Epistolas Pelag. ad Bonifac.' 2.4. (P.L. 44. 576.) -- 'ecce beatae memoriae Innocentius Papa sine Baptismo Christi et sine participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi, vitam non habere parvulos dicit' -- repeated in Contra Jul. 1.21.
 3. Session XXI. can. 4.

Jesuit landed at Dover , with a lay brother Emerson . Parsons had already arrived a few days earlier -- the last Campion had seen of him had been some 14 days before when he had set out for Calais disguised as a soldier with ' buff and gold braid and a swaggering manner ' after a sharp discussion on the advisability of crossing to England at that time. Sanders had just been despatched as Papal Nuncio with 5 ships of men and arms to assist the Geraldine rising in Ireland , which cast suspicion on the whole Jesuit enterprise. Much has been made of Walsingham's Protestant bias , in his attitude to the Jesuit mission , but from an extensive examination of Walsingham's letters and the replies made to him, and an analysis of the kind of questions involved , Conyers Read has concluded¹ that it was not so much the persons of the priests concerned that interested Walsingham and his spies , as the plans they brought with them . Burghley suspected political treason in the Jesuit movements and he had the pilot schemes in Ireland to go on . The whole exercise was fraught with dangers at the outset. Walsingham , described by Camden as a 'most subtle searcher of hidden secrets ' ² suspected the integrity of captured recusants -- he allowed several to be released where no serious charge applied -- and it was Walsingham's task to search for information and report to the Council which decided whether an indictment was admissible. If so, the normal process of the law took its course. Walsingham entertained strong feelings about Campion as he was never certain that he had a comprehensive picture. Some 3 years later, Mendoza the Spanish ambassador emphatically denied any complicity in the Throgmorton Plot , but this with other complicities were proven after his banishment from England.³

Elizabeth had been on formal trial 'in absentia' in Rome ; a number of English exiles had been summoned to attest the Queen's heresies . The Bull Regnans in Excelsis of Pius V in Feb. 1570 absolved her subjects from their allegiance to the Queen and declared her heretic and usurper--the words of the Bull were -- 'to be ~~free~~ for ever absolved from every such oath and all manner of duty, dominion, allegiance, and obedience .. and do deprive the same

1. Conyers Read 'Walsingham' Vol.2. 339.
 2. Fragmenta Regalia (ed.Arber) p.36
 3. Jernegron's Letter to Walsingham 8th.Feb.1583.Cal.Dom.1581 - 1590. p. 158

Elizabeth of her pretended right to the Kingdom and all other things aforesaid and we do command and interdict all and every nobleman, subject, people, and others aforesaid that they presume not to obey her or her monitions, mandates and laws'. This evoked the Statute 13 Elizabeth cap. 1. (1570) which stated that anyone denying the lawful title of Queen to Elizabeth or asserting that she was a heretic, schismatic, or infidel, was guilty of treason. The Statute goes on in chapter 2 to say that anyone procuring or bringing in Bulls or Briefs from the Pope, absolving or receiving absolution from lawful allegiances, was also guilty of treason, their aiders and abettors liable to Praemunire. Persons concealing Bulls etc. for above 6 weeks were punishable for misprision of treason. Priests bringing in Agnus Dei¹ and similar articles blessed by the Pope or by his authority, to which pardons or immunities were annexed were also subject to Praemunire². Whitaker's own views contained in his Controversy with Duraeus (1.29) were that those papists who in the end suffered capital punishment did so because of the flagrant crime (forense crimen) de laesa majestatis, while those who maintained they were not bound by the oath of obedience (to the Pope) -- the 'juramentum obedientiae' -- were actually freed and did not suffer. 'You have little reason to complain' writes Whitaker 'when your Inquisition is at work; it is not right that enemies (perduelles -- usually used of an enemy actively engaged in war) go unpunished'.

But was the Bull in force in 1573 on Campion's visit to Rome[?]; Pius V had died in 1572 and was succeeded by Gregory XIII. Campion acquainted Cardinal Gesualdi with the difficulties in which many loyal English Catholics found themselves and Campion could put this over in a way that only an Englishman could. He received the reply that the Bull was in force and its purpose lay under 5 heads; -

- a) to restore immediately the whole of England to the jurisdiction of the Papacy.
- b) as long as Elizabeth remained de facto ruler it was lawful for Catholics to obey her in civil matters and co-operate in all just things

1. Cuthbert Mayne the Papist Proto Martyr of the Counter Reformation in England 1577 was captured with an Agnus Dei -- the Dominical Lamb sealed on a piece of wax from the Paschal Candle and blessed by the Pope. Art. 8 of his examination sufficed for a legal condemnation and art. 7 to establish treasonable intent

2. Eccles. History Society 'Book of Common Prayer with Legal and

- c) that she might be addressed with her title as Queen
- d) that it was unlawful for any private person to slay any tyrant
- e) that in the event of anyone being authorised to execute the Bull it would be unlawful for Catholics to oppose him.

These arrangements were confirmed by Gregory XIII in April 1580 but with a codicil that the Bull bound the Queen but not Catholics. Campion's mind was anything but reassured, even if he had heard of the mollification of the interdiction uttered in the original Bull of 1570. Certainly Burghley had no doubts about the Jesuit duplicity. Captured documents revealed that Campion and Parsons had received Papal dispensations to ignore the Bull till such times as the Pope gave other orders. Burghley actually printed the salient words of this dispensation both in the original Latin and in English translation and Conyers Read is of the view that there can be no doubt about their authenticity¹. Meyer notes that 'no booty came more welcome to Burghley than this piece of paper'. It proved Walsingham and Burghley right. The latter's concern was primarily political; his awareness of Papal claims was chiefly on the temporal side and he had long studied this issue, between Emperor and Pope, through the English Statute of Praemunire to the sack of Rome by Charles V & the Siege of Rome by the Duke of Alva.

At the Synod held at Southwark on Campion's arrival, these momentous questions were further discussed -- William Barclay a Catholic lawyer had argued that the Pope acted ultra vires in the question of temporal claims. The situation had changed since the Northern Rebellion, and Sanders excused the English Catholics for not supporting the Rebellion as well as they should because they did not know of the Bull. A statement like this only aggravated and clarified the situation. The Synod decided that Naaman could not be pardoned for worshipping in the House of Rimmon. The case of James Bosgrove did not help. A Jesuit, he had travelled much on the Continent but was not conversant with the contemporary English scene. On his return to England he was arrested and brought before John Aylmer, the

contd. Historical Notes' by A.J. Stephens. Lond. 1849 ed. pp. CXX - CXXI.
 1. Pollen p. 293-4; Simpson p. 141. Meyer p. 138 and App. XVII

Bishop of London. The questions were 'whence come you ? ' -- 'from Germany and Poland ' ; 'what were you doing there ?' ---travelling; 'that is well and befits a gentleman ;what is your religion ? '--- 'Catholic' ; 'that is ours too , but the question is, will you go to church or not ? ' ---'I have no cause to the contrary ' ; Bosgrave was praised for his discretion and conformity and the fact was published. But he was shunned by the Papists , and a kinsman explained the position to a now protesting Bosgrave ;he had found no fault in his practice for he had attended the synagogue in Rome and Germany, the Mosque in Constantinople, to hear their folly and refute it. Any learned man could go to meetings in Germany of Calvinists, Lutherans, and Anabaptists , but he was now told by English Papists that the situation in England is very different, that to attend the parish church was to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy and though the act of a private and learned person may be intentioned by curiosity , in England it amounted to a denial of the Papal Supremacy, and therefore of Catholicism. Bosgrave was confused and though he was incautious to write to Aylmer asking that he might retract his promise, and this brought him to prison with Campion, he was later reprieved and banished and returned to Poland.

Events had taken a sinister turn in April 1580 when Gregory XIII solemnly blessed 'The Association' a group of some 30 men variously called 'subseminaries ', 'conductors ', 'comforters ' who pledged life and property to proselytise . In this Association were to be found many of the principals of the real and pretended plots of the period 1580 - 1610 . Meetings of members even took place at the Marshalsea . Here one of the prisoners , Thomas Pounds, acquainted the Papists of the rumour that the Council was circulating, that the Jesuits were political agents and therefore if caught would be summarily condemned. Would the Fathers write a pamphlet declaring their true aims, leave it , signed and sealed, with friends , so if taken and executed , their true purpose could be made known in their own hand, and their cause and memory preserved from calumny. ?

Campion immediately on Pounds's suggestion and within an hour produced the declaration known as Campion's Brag ¹. --

1. The word occurs in section 6 ; 'I would be loth to speak anything that might sound of an insolent brag or challenge '.

--hastily written ,the matter had been ceaselessly on his mind,and it was addressed to the Lords of the Council before whom he expected to be examined should he be arrested. In the Brag he confesses that as a priest of the Catholic Church and a Jesuit he had resigned all worldly interests , and that he was sent to preach the Gospel,minister the sacraments,instruct the simple, reform sinners, confute errors,and to 'crie alarme spiritual against foul vice and proud ignorance '. He had been strictly forbidden to deal in matters of state or the polity of the realm,as things not pertaining to his vocation ,and from which he gladly restrained and sequestered his thoughts.He requested three kinds of audience ;-

- a) before the Privy Council , a discourse on religion
- b) before the Universities , to further proofs of the Catholic Faith from the Scriptures , Councils, Fathers, History , natural and moral reason.
- c) before lawyers ,spiritual and temporal,when ' I shall justify the said faith by the common wisdom of the laws standing yet in force and practice.' 1.

Campion was resolute but optimistic -- optimistic because he hoped the Council would heed the truth of what he taught and disown the 'errors' of the times ; resolute because he could never despair of the recovery of England while a 'man is left to enjoy your Tyburn,to be racked with your torments,or consumed in your prisons . The expense is reckoned,the enterprise is begun,it is of God ,it cannot be withstood. So the Faith was planted,so it must

-
1. Burghley in his 'Execution of Justice ' Dec. 17th. 1583 (Huntingdon Libraty MS) made the point that 'they suffered under no new laws but that of Ed.111 (1330 AD) when 'the Bishopsof Rome were suffered to have authority ecclesiastical in this realm'. This was the view also of 'A Declaration of Favourable Dealing' published 1583 ,likewise ascribed to Burghley though probably by Thomas Norton. It was an answer to a spate of anonymous Pamphlets claiming that Campion had been martyred for the Catholic Faith. But the penal Statute of 1581 contained religious implications which the old treason law of Ed.111 lacked . Lansdowne MS 33.64 (Br.Mus) has copies of two indictments charging Campion with;
 - a) winning subjects from their (natural) allegiance to the Prince.
 - b) conspiring to compass the death of the Queen and to raise sedition.
 Elizabeth's Proclamation of April 1582 giving her aim to suppress all who would stir up rebellion,might appear to Burghley as a signal for a witch hunt, but to Elizabeth probably meant no more

be restored'. Keeping the original himself, Campion gave a copy of his Brag to Pounce with the request that it should not be published till necessity demanded it. Pounce returned to the Marshalsea and decided that necessity was upon him; he read the Brag and enthusiastically challenged the somewhat alarmed Puritan visiting chaplains Tripp and Crowley with the contents, and confidently wrote to the Bishop of London requesting public conferences, with 4 to 6, or 6 to 6, to each side.

Pounce was sent to solitary confinement at Bishops Stortford, and the Brag passed to Tichbourne and then to Elizabeth Sanders a nun and sister of Sanders in Ireland. Copies were eagerly made -- Nov. 1580 Bishop John Watson of Winchester discovered a copy of it among the 'lewd and forbidden books' confiscated at that time by him. This copy was sent to the Council. A month before, October 1580, Campion, after a conference at Uxbridge, planned a further document, 'De Haeresi Desperata' which became the theme of his Ten Reasons, but the search for recusants was so intensified in London after the November (1580) Proclamation that Campion had to flee North to Lancashire -- he wrote 'I cannot long escape the hands of the heretics; the enemy have so many eyes, tongues, scouts, and crafts. I often change my name, and threatening edicts come forth daily against us'. While Parsons supported Campion's previous tract 'Why Catholics refused to attend the parish church' with a Refutation against Dangdale urging all to act upon the principle of Tertullian,¹ Cyprian² and the Catholic Fathers, Campion was in Lancashire composing his Ten Reasons written within a fortnight in mid-Lent 1581. The MS was sent to Parson at Stoner Park and Campion himself followed at Whitsun to see it through the press, which was under the supervision of Stephen

Brinkley, with FitzHerbert verifying the copious textual references and

contd. than brandishing the penal Statutes as a club over the heads of disobedient subjects, but 1581 had been a critical year. There had been a sharp increase in Papal conversions, the Irish rebellion, and the Bishop of Ross had just returned from Rome.

1. Tertullian a) Scorpiace (213 AD - P.L. 2.142) -- the keys were left to Peter and through him to the church.
- b) De Praescriptione (200 AD - P.L. 2.14) -- the 5 tests of truth; -- sect. 21 Apostolic foundation, 31 antiquity 32 episcopal succession from the Apostles; 33 Apostolic authorship; 20 widespread consent.
2. Cyprian Ep. 70 (255 AD CSEL 3.767) -- 'one church founded by Christ

annotations. At first sight it gives little evidence of the difficulties faced, but the type had to be reset 3 times because of the shortage, and there was no Greek fount, the Greek quotations being given in Roman Italics. 500 copies were placed on the benches in St. Mary's Oxford on June 27th. 1581 and if Strype in the Annals is right it was sure to have a sympathetic hearing for the recent Visitation of Exeter College had revealed that out of 83, only 4 had been found to be obedient (i.e. to the Royal Supremacy) 'all the rest secret or open Roman affectionaries'. Within a month, however, on July 20th. 1581 Campion had been arrested, appearing before the Queen, Leicester, and Bedford at Leicester House on July 25th. Four Conferences were held between July 31st. and Sept. 28th.; he and others were arraigned in Wetsminster Hall on Nov. 14th. and Campion was executed at Tyburn on 1st. Dec. 1581.

Burghley was probably at Leicester House with the Queen ¹---for on the same day, July 25th., he wrote to Aylmer, Bishop of London, that he should read Campion's 'Ten Reasons'. Aylmer lost no time in getting a copy and though ague in his leg did not make it easy for him to concentrate, he replied two days later saying that while there were blemishes (naevi) in the work 'our own learned men are not free from them', particularly in fathering views on to Luther and Calvin that were not theirs. Aylmer requested a formal commission from the Council either to the Archbishops which was not likely for Grindal was still under suspension, or to himself so that a list of divines could be drawn up to answer Campion. Aylmer also wrote to the Regius Professors of both Universities that they should reply to Campion at once. Whitaker did so in a Latin pamphlet but this received short shrift from Aylmer who wrote to Burghley on 29th. Sept. that he meant to prevent its publication probably because Whitaker's abuse of Campion had outweighed any merit he displayed. The glare of legal lights and the presence of oppressive statecraft had made

contd. our Lord upon Peter for the origin and principle of unity'. Cyprian argued 'a Principio fidei' (Song of Solomon 4.8.) that the Name of Christ only had efficacy within the church.

1. Waugh 'Edmund Campion' p. 162-3 adds the two Secretaries of State but he is probably wrong here, as Wilson had died a month before and Walsingham was in France at this time.

Whitaker nervous ; Aylmer was looking for something more than the hurling of texts and a mirror of popular feeling . Duraeus¹ taunted Whitaker with this phase of personal abuse , but there were many precedents in the polemic field of the time. Whitaker soon developed a more mature approach, and brought a depth and confidence to the contest, that marked him out as better than most. Lawrence Humphries, Regius Professor at Oxford produced a less enthusiastic reaction to Aylmer's approach --the first part of his 'Jesuitism' appeared in 1582 and though his Second Part appeared in 1584 he readily confessed that he had no liking for the contest and quietly withdrew. But it was not so much his personal dislike of controversy, but that Oxford contained many sympathizers with Campion who had been popular there, and Humphries was smarting with resentment at not knowing what had transpired at the Conferences . On October 10th. he was actually summoned to attend the Conference , but on setting out he received from Aylmer a cancellation, for the time for Conferences was over-- the time for the trial had begun. As Campion, Sherwin, and Briant moved towards the day of execution , Whitaker/retired to his study to consider the issues in calmer light.

-
1. In spite of Aylmer, Whitaker's 'Responsio' to Campion's 'Ten Reasons' was published ; within a few months it had reached Fr. Duraeus at the Jesuit College in Paris , who published a Reply in 1582 . A Second Edition of Duraeus' Reply was published at Ingoldstadt in 1585 . A copy of the Reply (first edition) was sent by Burghley to Whitaker for him to answer . (Dedicatory Letter by Whitaker to Burghley 31st. Aug. 1583 , from Cambridge).

Chapter 3.

Whitaker's 'Reply' to Campian's 'Ten Reasons' and his 'defence of that Reply' against Duraeus.

Although Campion could dismiss the efforts of Hammer and Charke with some contempt, as being only replete with such exclamations as "fie upon this society (sodalitium), out upon thy seditions, though art a traitor (proditor)", and that these two men "maliciously huddled up the matter", ¹Whitaker's application to the contest was to prove much more profound. Twenty five years later, after the Gunpowder Plot, when copies of the Ten Reasons translated into English were discovered in a papist's house, William, Lord Knowles, Lord Treasurer and member of the King's Privy Council, referred the discovery to his chaplain R. Stocke, who told him that "one of the most glorious lights of our English Church, Dr, Whitaker, had already answered them, but that Whitaker's work was still in the Latin". ²

In view of the fact that Duraeus had replied to Whitaker's work and that the latter had in his turn defended his work against Duraeus, Stocke proposed to translate ³Whitaker's 'Defence against Duraeus' ⁴ preserving the original text.

1. Campian's Letter to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge

May 1581. Charke was abusive to Campian at the Fourth Conference in the Tower Sept. 28th/29th.

2. Geneva Edition of Whitaker's Works 1610 Vol.1.pp.5-52

3. Stocke's Translation exists in Br. Mus. MS. 226.a.9 London 1606 printed by Felix Kyngston for Cuthbert Burby and Edmund Weaver; 326 pp. with printer's errata on pg.326. A printed 8^o edition of ~~the~~

Whitaker's Defence against Duraeus' Confutation had appeared in Latin in 1583, the year of its completion, and ran to 887 pages; printed by Henry Middleton at London (Br. Mus. Cat. of Printed Books 860 f.l.) A further edition was printed in 8^o in 1585 (Br. Mus. Cat. of Printed Books 3936.c.) and a two vol. edition also in 8^o was printed in 1589. The Geneva Edition of Whitaker's Works (Vol.1.56-239) contains the Defence against Duraeus in double columns; 183 pp 13"x8" but it is undated. It runs to about 220,000 words in Latin and contains Duraeus in abstracts from his original work which occupied 437 leaves, with Whitaker's Defence, point by point.

'Defence against Duraeus' Reply' ¹ preserving the original ten headings of *Campion's Ten Reasons*;-

1. Holy Scripture (De Sacris Literis, in two divisions,
 - a) Justification solā fide
 - b) The Canon
2. Their true meaning (De Sacrarum Literarum sententiā .)
3. The Nature of the Church (De Ecclesiā)
4. General Councils (De Conciliis)
5. The Fathers (De Patribus)
6. Sure Ground of the Fathers (De Firmamentis Patrum)
7. Histories (De Historiā)
8. Paradoxes of the Adversaries (De Paradoxis)
9. Sophisms of the Adversaries (De Sophismatis)
10. All manner of witnesses (De omni genere Testium)

When Whitaker began his Preface to his Reply to the Ten Reasons, the events of the First Conference in the Tower August 31st-September 1st, were still fresh in his mind ² --- the only one of the four, ³ ordered by the Council, it appears that Whitaker attended. With no warning, *Campion* with Sherwin, Bosgrave, and Pounce and others were taken to the Chapel. On one side was the state box in which sat members of the Court and Council. Opposite stood a table filled with books and papers, behind which sat Nowell Dean of St. Paul's, and Day the Dean of Windsor, the principal disputants chosen by Bp. Aylmer ⁴ of London, for this session. Around them sat a number of chaplains and clerks. At another table sat Charke, the Preacher of Gray's Inn, and Whitaker, who were to act

-
1. Stocke makes marginal comments but these are brief, and he drastically reduces Duraeus' work, much of which he regarded as irrelevant to the *Campion-Whitaker* controversy. He used the 1583 edition (Preface; 'To the Christian Reader') and noted 'this work touchest the greatest part of the controversies betwixt us and the Roman Church'.
 2. Whitaker refers to hearing *Campion* 'superiore hebdomada in maximā hominum frequentiā dicentem'.
 3. Aug. 31st; Sept. 18th.; Sept 23rd.; Sept. 28th/29th.
 4. Aylmer's Correspondence. Br. Mus. MSS Landsowne 33. passim.

as notaries. The Tower Governor sat with the rack-master and other officials. A large and varied audience crowded into the available space¹. Campion was allowed only to reply to the Disputants' questions to raise none of his own --- from time to time he showed anxiety that he was not being reported properly, and on one occasion he requested one of the notaries that true report be made for 'things heretofore spoken by me have been mistaken and published in print otherwise than I ever meant'.

Much has been made of various offers to Campion that should he recant, suitable rewards and preferments would come his way --- it was reported that Walsingham already had told the French that he had retracted his errors and conformed, and there was talk of his being offered the See of Canterbury, but there is nothing of this in Walsingham's correspondence. It was natural that rumours and speculation would be in the air, as Archbishop Grindal had been suspended from his jurisdictional authority since 1577 and was in disfavour. The Queen was supposed to have offered Campion many inducements to recant --- his oratory and learning had much impressed her when he was chosen some 14 years before by the University to welcome her on her visit to Oxford --- but the most that can be said with any certainty was that he may have been offered his freedom if he attended Anglican Church services. In the light of Campian's 'Why Catholics refuse to attend' it is not difficult to foresee the outcome of such offers. On this point, some may have reckoned on a glimmer of hope since in Scotland, some Jesuits had actually counselled that catholics could attend the parish church,² but it

1. One papist in the crowd took notes, which furnished Bombinus with material for his description; he also received further information from Parsons who had in turn collected it from Yate's servant. Vide Waugh's 'Campion' pg.174. The official reports of this and subsequent conferences were not published till Jan. 1584 (by Field, a notary of the Second Conference)

2. eg. Frs. Cryton, Hay and Gordon, Vide Conyers Read 'Burghley and Queen Elizabeth' pp. 248-9.

appears that the English Jesuits regarded such advice as ' profane and corrupt policy' and insisted on complete segregation.¹

Much, too, has been made of the condition of Campian --- that 'his memory was destroyed and force of mind almost distinguished' but after August 10th. torture had been suspended, being resumed after Oct. 31st., when the Council decided to proceed with a trial for treason.

Thomas Norton in his report to Walsingham in 1582 reaffirmed the principle that torture;-

- a) was legal
- b) must never be so severe as to hinder walking or writing
- c) must never extort answers regarding faith but must simply be used to discover treasonable purposes e.g. the 'bloody question' i.e. whether the accused would remain loyal to the Queen if and when the Pope commanded otherwise --- this was the basis of 'A Declaration of Favourable Dealing' (1583) vindicating the use of torture in Campian's case as being restricted to questions of state not faith. The Queen was reluctant to regard catholics as traitors unless treason or ~~u~~reasonable intent was proved. Certainly the examination of recusants like Kirby, Cottam and others on 10th Dec. 1580 under eight heads had no questions of ~~fa~~ith; the questions took the form of, why had the Pope sent them? Why had the Bishop of Asaph (Morton) moved from Rome to Paris ? Had the Queen of Scots given them anything? What communication had they with Sanders and the Bishop of Ross in Ireland ?.

The chief topic in the First Conference was the Deans' Debate, in syllogistic form, on the defence of Luther's Justification solā fide ² -- here various insults e.g. os impudens, miles

1. Catholic Record Society Misc.1.pg. 111 John Southcote's notebook. Opinion was not unanimous on this in England -- e.g. after Campian's death, Thomas Langdale who had been a Jesuit for 26 years conformed to the parish church. Conyers Read op. cit.p249
2. Simpson 'Edmund Campian' pg.261 was of the view that Campian and the Deans came very near agreement on this article.

gloriosus, were hurled at Campion by zealous Puritans, and such insults found their way into Whitaker's text. Whitaker refers ¹ to the occasion when Campion was charged with saying that Luther regarded the Epistle of James as a 'pompous, barren, contentious, and strawen epistle' ² but on being provided with the Wittemberg edition, he was unable to verify this quotation. It had appeared in the Jena edition, from which he had taken it. ³ Campion asked ~~if~~ that he might be allowed to send to Germany for copies of the Jena edition which would reveal his source, and that the Emperor and the Duke of Bavaria would provide it. On being scoffed at, he appealed to the papists around him who unanimously agreed that the words had appeared in Luther's fragmentary Preface to the N.T., in the 1524 edition. A second occasion of embarrassment occurred when Campion was confronted by a N.T. text in Greek and texts of St. Basil and Gregory of Nazianzen but found difficulty in reading and exegesis and refused to continue the argument. His opponents seized upon this and claimed that ~~this~~ much advertised scholarship was spurious. The Deans apparently nodded to each other and said 'Graecum est; non legitur'. Whitaker did not forget this incident. Campion read

1. Preface to 'Responsio ad Decem Rationes'.

2. 'tumidem, aridam, contentiosam, stramineam'.

3. In his Prolegomena to the N.T. (A.D.1522) Luther described the Epistle of James as 'ein rechte strohende Epistel'. Vide etiam Lib. De.Capt. Babyl; Centur.2. Reinolds in his 'Refutation' Br. Museum MS. 860. f.6. (Paris 1583) in the Advertisement to the Reader fol. 85 refers to these disputations in the Tower and in chapter 1 discusses Luther's Description of this Epistle as 'straminea' he lists the editions of Luther's references as in that

a) edited by Melancthon 2 vol. 1551 AD

b) Zwingli's edition by his son-in-law Rudolph

c) of Foxe's Acts and Monuments 1561 AD printed by John Day

d) of Beza in his Notes on the N.T. printed Geneva 1556 AD

e) Strassburg edition 1566 (Sleiden)

f) Basle edition 1556 AD, Reinolds refers to the chopping and changing in the Reformers' views, and says that Duraeus has already made the point that Luther's full remark was omitted from the Wittemberg edition.

the textx in a whisper, audible only to Mr. Stollard who held the texts.¹ This was probably due to Campion's reluctance to expose himself to gibes because of his pronunciation. It may also have been due to the Greek type being too small for him to read, the more difficult if replete with abbreviations. He was pre-eminently a Latinist,² and there is abundant proof that he read Greek at Oxford and Douay well, could quote it familiarly, and write it in a clear and scholarly hand, but at the Jesuit House at Prague (1573-9) the Greek studies were left to the Ruthenians and other Eastern Europeans, and Campion was concerned chiefly with the Latin Fathers and Councils. It is possible that when he spoke Greek he would speak it even with a Bohemian accent, which would only prove a cause of ribaldry in such a gathering.

Whether Whitaker was an observer in conferences other than the first is not known, but he had no official seat in them. When the Council decided to promote the trial for treason, Whitaker had already written in his Preface "none of your men has been executed for religion alone these past 23 years. True, some have been executed who jump with you in opinion and religion, but they died not for their religion but for open treason".³ Whitaker cites Everard, sent from Rheims, who not only denounces the Queen as heretic, patron of heretics, and no lawful queen at all,⁴ but later in prison professed plainly before sixteen men of credit that it was no sin to commit treason against such a prince.⁵ He suffered as a traitor --- there had been no conferences or trials for those butchered on St. Bartholomew's Day ! " Your butcheries " continues

1. Simpson op. cit.

2. In the Second Conference, he was in error in giving the wrong tense of *κκλειόμενον* in a discussion on the Real Presence.

3. 'at isti non religionis ipsius causa damnati sed laesæ majestatis rei et publico judicio convicti perierunt' .

4. regni jure privatam esse pronunciavit

5. Proditionem in principem non esse peccatum in Deum

Whitaker, "are still fresh in our minds, of the learned and the unlearned, male and female, old and young, children and virgins, clergy and laity, bishops and archbishops ----- who has escaped your hands ?".¹ On the point of execution for treason only, Whitaker may well have had in mind the recantation of John Nichols on February 5th. 1581, who may have been the first to afford real grounds for the notion that all Jesuit priests were suspect- traitors basing his views on lectures he had reported, sermons, and speeches, he had heard, and seminaries he had visited, where such views as 'it was lawful for even the most vile wretch to seek the Queen's death, to burn her bones and those of the Council as summary heretics' Lists of threatened men were compiled e.g. Burghley, Huntingdon, Knowles, Walsingham, a host of bishops, deans and doctors; the country was to be purged by fire, sword and famine, that the catholic faith be restored.²

A few months later, in July 1581, George Eliot revealed a plot of 50 priests to murder Elizabeth, Leicester, Burghley and Walsingham. On the 14th July in the course of an examination of prisoners, Walsingham discovered that many were priests brought up in Rome and Douay --- the Plenary Indulgence offered by Gregory x111 in May 1580 for the Irish invasion was certainly bearing fruit, and that such a gesture was more than religious was proved by the fact that the Pope had provided 'five great ships full of soldiers and munitions of war 'for the external attack and Sanders was to prepare catholics from within.'

Campion rebuked the private spirit of heretics in

1. Vide Mendham Memoirs of Trent pg.22. In 1545 Merinddians was ~~be~~ butchered by papists for religious causes only. Vide Fox Book of Martyrs 111 ²

2. Cardinal William Allen's 'Defence of English Catholics' (1584) written at Rheims, denied that English papists were executed only for treason as the 'Execution of Justice' (1583) had maintained. They were not condemned by the old law of 25 Ed.111 which describe as treason 'to conspire or compass the death of the Sovereign or to levy arms against him, which can by open fact, be convânced' but by the new Statute of 13 Eliz.1. which made it treason to be in England at all, or to bring beads, pictures, the Agnus Dei or Pax boards. Cuthbert Mayne was executed for his Agnus Dei.

cutting out of the canon such books as the Epistle of James, as did the 'peevish friar' ¹ he calls Luther, but that all should heed the ancient Councils and Fathers not the new bible-makers, the Church being the only 'keeper of this gage' (i.e. the Canon). ² Whitaker replies in his first chapter De Sacris Literis that Luther has been charged with more faults than he is guilty of. True, he taxed the Epistle of James a little, ³ but he was not alone in this censure. Eusebius said ⁴ that it should be known that the Epistle fathered, upon James is considered spurious (adulterinam --- ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν) for certainly not many of the ancients mentioned it. Jerome, a presbyter of Rome, wrote ⁵ that this Epistle is held to be published under the name of James the Lord's brother but is by some other man. ~~He~~ ^{Campion} said that, as Jerome says, it was later received by the church --- I will not contend this view nor

1. Campion called Castellio a 'lecherous varlet' who regarded the Song of Songs (which catholics regarded as a 'paradise of the soul, heavenly food, manna, laid up and kept in the tabernacle, the delicate dainty of Christ') as a 'bawdy song, the ribaldous talk of a courtly waiting-maid with her lover'.
 2. custos huius depositi
 3. unam Jacobi epistolam nonnihil exagitat
 4. Eusebius Eccl. Hist.2.23.25
 5. In Catalogo; 'Epistola Jacobi ab alio quodam sub eius nomine edita asseritur'. Whitaker remarks ^{I.4. that Duræus should be more fair & attentive in} ~~Contra~~ Duræum, assessing views --- note the Greek in Jerome αὐθεντίας τινός ἐπελαμβάνετο 'authoritatem quandam obtinuit'--- surely a loose conclusion for a canonical book, of which it should not be said 'paulatim et tempore procedente et quandam authoritatem obtinuerunt'--- the remark too of a presbyter of the Roman Church '(sic)
- (Jerome was actually priested by Paulinus at Antioch, but he had been baptised at Rome where he had studied, and returned there 382-5, acting as secretary to Pope Damasus 1)

'how justly succeeding ages might by calmness of judgement accept a book whose credit and authority was once in doubt and even rejected; we verily receive it as a canonical book, for whatsoever Luther or any other may conclude touching that Epistle or lessen the credit of it in any way, yet we willingly embrace it, and judge it to be written if not by an Apostle then by some Apostolic man, and in it we do undoubtedly acknowledge the doctrine and spirit of an Apostle'.¹ Calvin willingly received it.² Indeed for severity of judgement you might have quoted Erasmus³ who said that this Epistle had no taste of Apostolic authority.⁴ James does not deny or contradict the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, but rather affirms it, since a faith that is not proved by works, is not just, for faith must be living, fruitful and accompanied by good works. There is no reason why Luther should **fear** James (though, as you say, he used the word 'delirat' over this Epistle) and especially when he reads how Augustine reconciled these two,⁵ Paul and James, when he said that Paul speaks of works before faith, James of works after faith.

Duraeus accuses⁶ Whitaker of maliciously twisting the true meaning of *νοθεύεται* in Eusebius⁷ by translating it 'adulterina', spurious---- Eusebius merely meant that some held that James was not the author; *νοθεύεται* is the

1. Though absent from the Muratorian Fragment, it occurs in the Syriac (Peshitto) Version, Egyptian (Sahidic) Version, in the lists of Origen (ob.254 AD) Cyril of Jerusalem (AD 348) Gregory of Nazianzen (AD381) Athanasius' 39th. Festal Letter (AD367) and C. of Laodicea (AD363) and the C.of Carthage (AD 397).

2. In argument, in Ep.Jac.

3. J.K.S. Reid 'Authority of Scripture'pg.66 makes the point that Erasmus drew Luther's attention to certain discrepancies in Scripture; and extensive list of Luther's critical judgements occurs in Seeberg 'Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte ! 419

4. non sapere Apostolicam auctoritatem. Duraeus reminded Whitaker that Luther did write in the Jena edition that 'censet Ep.Jac.in indignam spiritu Apostolico'. Luther and Erasmus appear very close on this point.

5. Quaest. 85.76

6. Defensio contra Confutationem cap.1.3.; Geneva edition of Whitaker's Works Vol.1.pp.56 ff

7 Eccles. Hist. 2.23.25

classification of those books whose authors are not commonly accepted to be the ones named; indeed, the doubt as to the authorship detracts nothing from canonical authority, as the succeeding words of Eusebius show (i.e. it was read publicly in most churches). Whitaker says that there is no malice in his view, which turns upon the meaning of *νοθεύεται*. The mind of Eusebius, from what he says elsewhere, is quite clear; he divides the books of the N.T. into; -

a) those which are acknowledged i.e. *ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις*¹ the genuine books, *κυρωτέα* or *ἀναμφιλέκτω* — indisputably genuine. That a book should be acknowledged in this full sense, it is necessary that its authenticity should be undisputed and its author should have possessed apostolic power. If a book failed in this respect, it was among,

b) the disputed books ----- the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* the books not received by all the churches, but which nevertheless are well known² and recognised by most. In this class Eusebius includes the Epistle of James because of the doubt as to whether it had Apostolic authorship or not i.e. whether by the Apostle or some apostolic man.

c) *νόθοι* the books received by some churches but apparently spurious e.g. Acts of Paul, Shepherd of Hermes, Apoc. of Peter, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Whereas there is

1. the four Gospels, Acts, the 13 Epistles of Paul with Hebrews (though opposed by some at Rome as not being Pauline) 1 Jn. 1 Peter and the Apoc.(?) Eusebius also used the words *ἀνωμολογημένα* which differs from *ὁμολογούμενα* in bringing out the notion of examination, enquiry and judgement, *ἐνδιδοθικά* of this group
2. *γνώριμοι τοῖς πολλοῖς* — vide Eusebius H.E. 3.38.----- implies familiar knowledge.

little ambiguity between a) and c) Eusebius accepts a further ~~dis~~

distinction within the second group b) between the books which according to ecclesiastical tradition are true and genuine

(ἀπλάστους) and generally acknowledged, and those which though not canonical (ἐνδιαθίκοις) but controverted yet they are constantly recognised (γινωσκόμενοι) by most ecclesiastical authorities (ἐκκλησιαστικῶν)¹. Thus all the books of this second group are not of the same kind.

The fact, then, that Eusebius uses the word νοθεύεται would suggest rather more than ~~yet~~, Dureau, apparently understood - ---- Eusebius accepts ~~the~~ recognised position of these books, for which the authority of others can be quoted, but at the same time he gives his own judgement on the matter, together with the comment 'it is considered spurious'. The omission of the Epistle from Origen's canon is a clear indication that Origen regarded it as of less authority than canonical and genuine.

Origen was acquainted with all the books in the present canon and received as canonical and received as canonical all those recognised by Clement of Alexandria, repeating Clement's classification². and quoting from the Epistle of James, referring to it as ^{the} 'Epistle in circulation under the name of James' ---- on one occasion he refers to the author as 'the brother of the Lord', but he is generally designated 'the apostle' in the wider sense of his classification of the N.T. books.

1. Thus 1 Clement is acknowledged as genuine (H.E.3.16.38) but disputed with regard to canonicity (H.E.6.13)

2. Clement of Alexandria divided the books into two major classes; - a) the Gospel b) the Apostle or Apostles

Origen repeated the classification in Hom. on Jer.21f.

Whatever Luther or any other persons conclude on this Epistle, and Whitaker regarded Luther's earlier views as due to his doubts stimulated by the ancient authors¹, Whitaker remarks that Luther's judgement reported by Duraeus in this matter was not satisfactory and 'we do indeed dissent from it'. Duraeus may say that he laugh~~s~~s at the spirit of change so indicative of the 'new Gospel-men' and lament the blasphemy of their omission of this Epistle (from the Canon) but Duraeus must not 'pair us with these nor father them on to Luther'. It is not all condemnation of Luther for he said in his Preface that 'although rejected by antiquity, I much commend and hold (this Epistle) as very fitting and profitable'. Reinolds had already recorded his pleasure² that Whitaker did not follow Musculus, Vitus Theodoret³, Pomeranus,⁴ and others in excluding the Epistle from the Apostolic writings. 'We are no whelps of Luther' writes Whitaker, but Campion had shown himself a 'very young soldier in that fight where he would be thought a captain⁵'; 'we do not hail Luther as our prophet nor Calvin our Moses' as Duraeus had said, 'for we do not hang upon the lips of any man'. Duraeus railed against Luther as a man of doubts, and this was echoed by Luther's disciples in varying degrees of intensity --- and against Calvin without doubts- it seems 'we cannot mention either without escaping your insults or your *ipswreids* (?)'. Whitaker then goes on to say in his answer to Duraeus, that he had hoped Duraeus would realise and perhaps pardon the fact that he himself had only read the Argentinensian and

-
1. Comment. on John T. 19.6. ; T.20.10 ; Comment. on Roman.4.8. ; Vide Westcott 'Canon of the N.T.' pg. 363 note 3 (1881 ed.)
 2. 'Refutation' Br. Museum MS 860.f.6.
 3. 'Epistola Jacobi in aliquot locis reprehensibilis est' Vitus Theodoret in his 'Preface on the N.T.'
 4. Pomeranus in his Comment. cap. 4 Ad Roman. says that this Epistle of James was not to be included among the rest of the canonical books which proclaimed Justification by Faith.
 5. 'tyro es in ea causa in qua videri vis admodum veteranus'.

Wittemberg editions ^{1.} of Luther's works, and that he had only seen the Latin Frankfurt edition, but at no time had seen the Jena edition with its reputed harsh words, but the point at issue with Campian was that Whitaker disliked the dishonest and unjust manner in which he heaped this opinion on to Luther --- a view which Luther in the harshness of the moment in some lecture may have expressed, but in a later and calmer moment retracted; give credit to the fact that what is said in the lecture room or in debate when shorn of its context, does not mean quite the same thing in cold print, and also to the fact that maturer judgements in later days demand changes in what we say. For his own part, he did not regard the words that Campian quoted as genuine Luther --- " I have seen the Preface written by Luther and dated 1525 AD, and although here and at Wittemberg in his public lectures he called the Epistle of James 'straminea' when compared with the Epistles of Paul and Peter, I do not think that I saw in the same Preface the longer statement, that it was 'tumida, arida, contentiosa, straminea, et spiritu Apostolico indigna'.

It is of no consequence that you see the against Luther's disciples, and cite Vitus Theodorus, the Magdeburgians, Pomeranus and others with your detestable comments ---- I scarcely believe that on sober reflection you would prefer the Jena edition to the Wittemberg edition; I know of no other with greater integrity or more genuine than the latter, and it was written by Luther's own hand at Wittemberg. You speak of rigid and moderate Lutherans, and this is true; you should know that the Jensenites were more rigid than Luther himself when he was editing his German Version, with Prefaces, at

 1. The 'Exempla' of Wittemberg and the 'Amendments of the Argentcrati' Contra Duraeum 1.5; Duraeus points out that the moderate Lutherans (molles Lutherani) amended the rigid and harsh views of the Jena edition --- had Whitaker seen the Jena edition he would never had denied Campian's point that Luther had actually given the full description of 'straminea, tumida, contentiosa, arida, et indigna spiritu Apostolico.

The press of Argentissa had produced the 'Catalogus testium Veritatis' of Flaccus Illyricus in 1562 AD

at Wittemberg. It is no wonder to me that items reported to be in the Jena edition are lacking in the Wittemberg edition --- Luther it appears was a 'molles Lutheranus' if we take your classification¹.

Duraeus then complained that it was a remarkable thing how often the Common Places are edited, changed, and altered by the Reformers, and a notable person in this respect was Philip Melancthon. Calvin omitted (sustulit) many things in the process of revision, and if you wish for an example of this vacillation, look to his bitter invective against Henry VIII in his writing on Hosea 1 and Amos. Whitaker replies that it is no imperfection to a learned man to change, amend, increase, adorn, or rearrange his writings.¹ We cannot constantly follow the highest and most perfect, nor

is it shameful to recall what is badly written. It is a correct proverb

οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ ἀπανθ' ὄρα· δευτέραι φροντίδες σοφώτεραι

John Garbrand, Jewel's friend and literary executor, in his Preface to Jewel's 'Certain Sermons preached before the Queen's Majesty and at Paule's Cross (London 1583)' describes Jewel's use of the Common Place Book, when he defended Jewel's integrity as a scholar against Harding's charge of lies and deceit. Under subject headings, taken from the opponent's work, Jewel would list short notes of texts and views in disparity, and would amplify with relevant Scriptural and Patristic quotations, but not before he had re-read the Patristic authors. This brief summary would then be put into literary form under his direction by the clerks and students of his household. A particular hazard of the period was to receive quotations and references, in support of one's argument, from others, without consulting the originals. Corrections, as controversy proceeded, were inevitable, but this happened on all sides.² Augustine wrote 'Magna

1. Contra Duraeum . 1.7.

2. vide. Fr. Brodrick's 'Bellarmine' p.66 (1961 ed.); 'John Jewel as Apologist of the C.of E.' by J.E.Booty C.H.S. (1963) pp.104-125, and especially on his use of Hosius' De Expresso Dei Verbo. 1558 edition.

sapientiae est revocare hominem quod male locutus est ¹ and Augustine himself uses this wisdom, for he corrects many things in his books----- a most pious and honest habit. The realisation of errors was a hazard to which the writers of the 16th. Century in the fever heat of controversy were particularly liable. In the Jewel-Harding controversy we find that Jewel's personal copy of his Defence (1567 AD) now at Magdalen College Oxford, contains many corrections in preparation for the next edition of the work. He had little faith in printers ----- writing to Parker on the 3rd. May 1568 he pleads that the Latin Apology be thoroughly scrutinised for printer's errors; "I am afraid of printers " he writes, "for their tyranny is terrible". These controversies demanded an encyclopaedic mind ---- to locate in such prolific authors as Augustine a particular passage or word without benefit of index or concordance. Indices existed, but for the most part they were little more than elaborate tables of contents.

No practiced author, be it Luther, Melanchthon, or Calvin, deserves scorn when they add or take away from their writings --- Luther in his Preface craves this very consideration from his readers when he writes "ante omnia ora pium lectorem ut ista legat cum iudicio, amo cum multa miseratione et sciat fuisse aliquando Monachum ".

Whitaker does not deny that Calvin wrote some bitter things about Henry VIII over the title 'Head of the Church' but Calvin was not alone in these misgivings. There were many at that time that thought the title not only transferred the temporal and judicial but also the spiritual power of the papacy to the King, so that he might claim to exercise spiritual power according to his ~~own~~ will. But if you look at the same place where Calvin expresses his censure , you will find the person from whom he gleaned the cause --- Stephen Gardiner, later Chancellor of this realm and Cardinal, who

1. Decret. Causa. 22.qu.4.cap.10 (sic)

maintained ¹ that it was impossible for the selfsame man to be in subjection to the King as Head of the Realm in temporal matters and not to be in subjection in spiritual matters (eodem modo) --- to say that the King is Head of the Realm and not of the Church is 'an absurd and foolish saying' says Gardiner. The Pope had no legitimate power over national churches. The unpopularity of such views and their dangers were appreciated in the silence of Convocation --- with the plea 'as far as the law of Christ will allow' be added. Calvin had the same misgivings, but on reassurance, he changed his opinion and manner of writing --- a pardonable fault in which he was not alone.

Duraeus then takes up the question of justification solā fide --- that justification by faith alone is not a true dogma of St. Paul, that it is not the hearers of the law that are justified but the doers of the law, and that though we possessed all faith to remove mountains, yet without love, we are nothing. How then can we be justified by faith alone? Whitaker admits that the words *μόνη πίστις* are not to be found in Paul's writings, but that he clearly teaches 'justificatio de fide solā' ² ---- 'fides spectat rem alienam i.e. Dei misericordiam in Mediatore promissam' ---- this mercy alone justifies us and faith alone apprehends this mercy, so the very name of faith itself gains the power of

1. De Verā Obedientiā (Roane edition) fol. XV111^v - XX (1535), reproduced (original size) from Br. Mus. MS (Huth.106) by Scolar Press Ltd (Leeds) 1966, being the 2nd. Roane edition (1536) with Wood's Preface and translation (1553). On the supremacy see Henry V111's letter to Jas. V1. of Scotland giving papal usurpations of the prerogatives of Christian princes from the Merovingian Kings to John of England (Strype. Memorials.1.2.63). Similar appeals to history and scripture characterized the 'Oratio' (1533) of Richard Sampson of Chichester and Richard Foxe's De Verā Differentiā Regiae potestatis et ecclesiasticae' (1534). Tunstal and Stokesley composed for the benefit of Reginald Pole, the 'Exposition' (1537) on this very subject (reprint in Knight's 'Erasmus' App.66 --- see also Sturge 'Tunstal' pp.205-210) In 1533 Thomas Cromwell ordered the translation of Marsiglio of Padua's 'Defensio Pacis' into English, and the King's Book of 1543 gave an authoritative summary of the princely office i.e. 'A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man' fol. 4^v reprinted Lloyd 'Formularies of Faith during the reign of Henry V111' Oxford 1825 and Lacey 'The King's Book' London 1932

2 Luther had translated *πίστει* in Rom.3.28 as "allein durch den Glauben" (only by faith)

'solā fides'¹ Paul adds nothing to faith in this, and so he teaches the sufficiency of faith alone. What would you join to faith in justification? Works? What does Paul say? Colligimus fide justificari hominem *χωρίς ἔργων νόμου* ——— i.e. absque operibus legis. In Rom.4.5. he writes 'to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifies the ungodly (impium) his faith is reckoned for righteousness' and again in Rom.3.30 'by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight'. In Gal.2.16 Paul writes 'no man is justified by the works of the law' *ἔαν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. David pronounced blessedness on the man to whom righteousness is imputed 'absque operibus'². We are justified freely (gratis) by the grace of God --- 'non ex vobis, Dei donum est, ne quis gloriatur'.³ If righteousness (justitia) be imputed apart from works, if freely by grace, by the gift of God, then are we justified 'solā fide'. Why do you object to the use of the word 'sola' when there is abundant mention of *ἰσοδυναμία*. Yet though we defend 'sola fides' we do not wish to say that the faith by which we are justified is alone.

Your quotation from James' Epistle, that the 'doers of the law are justified, not the hearers of the law' would never have been mentioned if you had understood Paul ----- in this text Paul condemns the empty hope and confidence (of the Jews) in their claim that they heard the law daily and were persuaded that they were therefore 'beati et ^ujusti', yet they violated the law in many ways. Paul denied the righteousness that merely listens and knows, without satisfying the demands of the law ---- 'nisi etiam legi satisfacias' and 'si perpetuo in illis stetissimus, servati fuissetus' are sufficient to

1. Luther had made the point in his Answer to Latomus (1521) that in Rom.7.25 (Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord) Paul gave thanks not for his own righteousness but to the God of mercy through Christ (Library of Christian Classics Vol.16. 'Luther's Earlier Theological Works' pg.362.)

2. Ps.32.1.2.

3. Ephes.2.8.9. -- *χάριτι ἔστε σωθέντες*: here *χάρις* is taken to mean that kindness and favour by which God bestows gifts upon the ill-deserving, to which all blessings are due.

show Paul's thought; flee the righteousness of the law that you cannot keep to another righteousness, imputed, 'non operanti sed ~~cred~~ credanti' unless you are more righteous than Abraham, David and Paul who ^{were} were righteous not in keeping the law but in believing Christ alone fulfills the righteousness of the law, and only He did, and the righteousness that comes to the believer through Him is that of faith. Since no man can do the righteousness the Law demands, then we must ask of the righteousness of the Gospel, the remission of sins, reconciliation, the imputed righteousness of Christ, freely given (propter Christum Mediatorem? and appropriated by faith alone.

To the point that the faith that can remove mountains (of getting things done that appear impossible) is worthless without charity. Whitaker would refer Duraeus to Oecumenius who wrote¹ that the faith here mentioned is the faith which works miracles, and he quotes Chrysostom on this. It is not the common faith of Christians since true justifying faith can never be separated from charity. It behoves a man to show himself justified by exercising true charity, and the faith by which a man is justified can never lack charity. Duraeus maintains that when Ambrose says that we are justified by faith not by works. he merely says that faith removes the works that are proper to ceremonial law, circumcision, veneration of the Sabbath, new moons etc ----- 'non operibus justificamur sed fide quoniam carnalis infirmitas operibus

1. Oecumenius on 1 Cor 13 quotes Chrysostom on the same text (Mont-faucon-Paris ed 1835 Vol.3. pg.315) who says that the disciples could not heal the lunatic (Mt.17.19) because they lacked this kind of faith ----- ἄπιστία . Similarly Peter sank (Mt. 14.31 --- it is the πίστις ἢ τῶν σημείων καὶ τῶν θαυμάτων ποιητικῆ-ποιητικῆ means the producer of some sensible end, in classical use, of some ingenuity, inventiveness, like a new style in architecture, concept in music or art.

impedimento est, sed fidei claritas factorum obumbrat errorem quae meretur veniam delictorum' ¹. Whitaker answers that the text does not bear this construction --- the works that are referred to are not only as Duraeus says, but also the works of the new-born ('Renati') since in the 'hearts not purged by faith, the infirmity of the flesh not only is a great impediment to good works, but nothing can be expected from them, but that which is 'impium et vitiosum'. Duraeus then mentions Augustine's view² on Rom.3.28 that each man knows he is justified through faith (per fidem) though the works of the law had not gone before (praecesserint). Whitaker replies that Duraeus should read on ---- that Augustine goes on to say that the works of justification follow one who is justified, not go before one who shall be justified.³ Faith sufficient to salvation can never be separated from charity (caritatem) since love works the fullness of the law. Duraeus may well write "you flee to the Fathers who greet you on the threshold" but at least, comments Whitaker, we do them the courtesy of quoting all their words, a courtesy you seem to deny them when what they say does not serve your purpose. And so, good works do not beget (pariunt) justification but justification produces (procreat) good works. Judgement will be brought to bear upon works ---- 'Deum unicuique redditurum secundum opera'⁴ but it does not follow that

1. 'De Jacob. (the Patriarch) et Vita Beata' Bk.2.cap.2

2. De Fide et operibus. Cap.14

3. 'sequuntur enim justificatum non praecedunt justificandum' i.e. Augustine removes our justification from works for he asserts our justification prior to works.

4 Rom.2.6

anyone is justified in the presence of God by the merits of works because eternal life is the gift of God, lest those who are justified should have something to glory in by their works.¹

Duraeus' statement that it appears then "we are justified by faith without works because faith is prior", must truly be hissed off the stage, says Whitaker. Duraeus would make formal charity (formata charitas) prior to faith since it is the formal cause of that which is formed. But truth ascribes to faith not that it is the beginning of our justification but is in fact our whole justification. Christ said ' who hears my words and believes in Him who sent me has eternal life'² and 'this is the will of my Father that whoever sees the Son and believes in Him has eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day'.³ St . John writes ⁴ 'that as many as received Him to them gave He the power (potestatem) to become the sons of God' and those who receive Christ, he explains, are those who believe in His Name, and therefore faith truly and perfectly justifies.

St, Basil, writes Duraeus, in his statement⁵ that we are justified by faith alone, rejecting those works done by the strength of free will, (solius liberi arbitrii viribus) exhorts the faithful to humility lest anyone by pride should put his whole trust in good works and his own strength, as sufficient for salvation. He wrote on Ps.110 that faith is not sufficient without a good knowledge (intellectus bonus), and in his Commentary on Ps. 117 adds that fear is necessary; many live corruptly though they have a right faith (fides accurata) but of all men they are most wretched. The ways of the Lord are according to virtue, with which we stretch out (our hands to heaven) i.e. by which we are

1. Rom.6.23; 3.27; 4.2;
2. John 5.24;
3. John 6.40.
4. John 1.12
5. Basil in Hom.De Humilit.

justified. Whitaker replies that it is true that Basil is writing here of this kind of works (de genere operum) and that none should trust in works done by the strength of free will without faith ---- but if you read the whole Homily you will see Basil's mind quite clearly and it is the same as Paul's. Basil takes all things from man which anyone might think to be sufficient and honourable (ampla et gloriosa) for justification, and then goes on to state the true grounds of our glorying (vera materia gloriandi) from the words of Jeremiah 9,42----- 'in hoc gloriatur qui gloriatur se intelligere et cognoscere me, me esse Jehovam'; that all our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption have their origin in the one Christ, and then he adds 'haec enim perfecta est et integra gloriatio in Deo cum quis assertur suā justitiā sed non verā justitiā se vacuum esse novit'.¹ 'Solā vero in Christum fide justificari'. If we are *ἐνδεεῖς δικαιοσύνης ἀληθοῦς* i.e. vera justitia indigemus, as Basil writes in this homily, then we should learn that there is no righteousness to be sought in our own works, nor can we be justified in any other way than by faith alone, in Christ ---- 'solā in Christum fide'.² Though works that precede faith may appear praiseworthy to men (laudabilia hominibus)² nevertheless they are vain (inania)³. In his Preface to Ps. 114 Basil wrote that there remains

1. 1 Cor. 1.30,31; Vide etiam Origen on Rom.3.28 Phil.3.9.

2. Aug. on Ps. 31. Praefat. 'Jacobus in Epistola sua contra eos qui nolebant bene operari, de solā fide praesumentes ipsius Abrahae opera commendavit'

3. Whitaker could have quoted Clem. Str.1.7. that works without faith are futile *οὐδὲν οὖν ὄφελος αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ βίου κἂν εὐεργεῖς ᾧσι κἂν εἰ μὴ πίστιν ἔχοιεν.*

it is therefore of no advantage to them after the end of life, even if they do good works now, if they have not faith. Also Chrysostom

Fid.1. *ἡ πίστις καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἔσωσεν ἔργα δὲ καθ' ἑαυτὰ οὐδ' αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐργάτας ἐδικαίωσε.*

faith can justify without works.

an eternal rest to those who in this life have contended lawfully, not by the merits of their own works but by the manifold grace of Christ in which they have hoped. Origen wrote that the source of righteousness is in God who gives it in return for sacrifice to Him of our own righteousness.¹ Irenaeus wrote 'fides enim quae est ad Deum Altissimum, justificat hominem'² or as Nazianzen wrote *δικαιοσύνη καὶ τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον* 'justitia quidem est vel credere tantum'.

Duraeus then returns to the Epistle of James and says that the faith spoken of by James is 'true Christian faith' and it follows that from this, man is not justified by faith alone. Whitaker replies that this is not true --- since justifying faith can never be without good works. He speaks of 'fides ficta et mortua' which can never be said of true living faith. Read the Epistle --- 'si quis dicat se fidem habere opera vero non habet' ---- this sort of faith, barren of good works, is dissembling faith, and James goes on to the phrase 'abite in pace, calescite, et saturamini' --- the faith that is bare and wanting in good works is dead. Origen wrote that here James is speaking of a dissembling faith void of works, and he goes on to say 'quousque igitur falluntur, qui fide mortuā sibi vitam perpetuam pollicentur'. James says that the faith that is not demonstrated by good works is not efficacious to righteousness and salvation. The point is that faith is not one among many gifts, but the supreme gift, the fount and foundation from which all other things flow, and to be attended by truly good and genuine works, it must be justifying faith. Augustine refers³ to those who thought that Paul said 'justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis, etiamsi male vivat et bona opera non habeat ! Ipsa est fides quae fideles Dei

1. Origen Hom.24 on Numbers.2.

2. Iren. Haer. 4.5.5.; further reference in Irenaeus to those 'qui fide justificabantur' both of the circumcised and uncircumcised occur in Bk.4.25.1. (Library of the Fathers)

3. De Gratiā et Lib. Arbitr. cap.7

separat ab immundis daemonibus, nam et ipsi sicut dicit Apostolus Jacobus, credunt et contremiscunt sed non bene operantur'. In his 'De Fide et Operibus' chapter 14 he wrote 'quoniam haec opinio tunc fuerat exorta (fidem mortuam justificare) Apostolicae Epistolae Petri, Johannis, Jacobi, et Judae, contra eam maxime dirigunt intentionem ut vehementer astruant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse'. James in no way conflicts with justification by faith alone ---- Abraham was declared righteous by the offering of Isaac i.e. true faith bears fruit, and this was the work of true faith --- the offering without it would not have brought righteousness; it was the faith that made the action so.

' If these trifles,¹ as you call them, Duraeus, displease you, it is of no matter, since the view neither depends upon my opinion or the general opinion of mankind. You should know the grounds of your theology better than that'. James regarded no faith as true unless it could be known by the works of true faith, nor is any justified in the presence of God (and here I always exclude the case of infants) unless he show himself righteous by good works. We have not invented this opinion; indeed, we do not need to depend upon Luther for it, since it is the opinion of those you cannot gainsay, or would never admit as Lutherans, those with the highest authority among you e.g. Thomas Aquinas,² who wrote on James 2. 'hic loquitur de operibus sequentibus fidem quae dicuntur justificare, non secundum quod justificatio dicitur justitiae infusio sed secundum quod dicitur justitiae exercitatio vel ostensio vel consummatio '. The word 'consummatio' Aquinas defines as 'augmentata et comprobata'.

1. Duraeus had written "Apage has nugas ! "

2. Whitaker's comment in brackets --- 'Deus Bone ! ut tuis verbis utur, Quantus vir ! "Vide etiam Aquinas Summ. Theol.2.(2) qq 1-7

The works of the justified and newborn (renati) are the gifts of God, pleasing to God, full of promise and reward. You do us an injustice by coupling us with Eunomius,¹ of whom Augustine wrote¹ 'fertur etiam usque adeo fuisse bonis moribus inimicus ut asseveraret quod nihil cuiquam obsesset quorumlibet perpetratio ac perseverantia peccatorum, si huius quae ab illo docebatur fidei particeps esset'. He separated an honest life from true faith and taught exactitude of doctrine as the substance of piety disregarding holy customs, the sacraments and ascetic practices. We have never separated true faith from holy customs (sanctus moribus). He conceded impunity to every crime; we place eternal life only in living piously and holily. We condemn Eunomius as a master of vice, and all his disciples as a pernicious sect.² In passing, Whitaker would refer to Augustine's words after this reference, and how the opinions of the two Apostles, Paul and James, are to be reconciled.³



1. Aug. Ad Quodvult. cap. 54 (sic)

2. The Anomoeans, of which Eunomius was sole head after the death of Aetius; they were resolute opponents of the Faith of Nicea.

3. Aug. Quaest. 85. qu. 76 ---- the complementary uses of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in Paul, James and Hebrews and John are now well known. Vide Weiss Bibl. Theol. de N.T. sect. 82. c. d. 125 b. c. 149 et passim.

Chapter 4.
-----The Canon.

Whitaker dismisses Campiøn's 'silly and lame trick in sophistry' in charging him with the exclusion of the Epistle of James on the grounds that it conflicted with the doctrine of 'justificatio solā fide', and then goes on to discuss the question of the Canon of Scripture ---- but more fully in his 'Disputation on Holy Scripture' ¹ published in April 1588 some 6 years after his 'Reply' to Campiøn's ² Ten Reasons and 5 years after his 'Defence' against Duraeus.

The Council of Trent ² had 'deemed it fitting that a Catalogue of the sacred books should be subjoined to this decree lest any should have the occasion to doubt, what books are received by it', and then follows not only the true canonical books upon which we are all agreed, but there are included Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclus.,¹ and 2 Maccæbees in the O.T. Canon. On the N.T. Canon there is no disagreement. The man who does not receive such a canon ---- anathema sit ! It now appears that we are required by the Fathers of Trent to accept not only the above six (apocryphal) books as authoritative canonical scripture, but also Baruch, the Song of the Three Children, Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and parts of Esther for this is how 'the Jesuits interpret the meaning of this decree'.

If Cyprian says ³ 'all the rules of doctrine have emanated from this scripture' ---- 'inveniet ex hac scriptura omnium doctrinarum regulas emanasse' ---- if Augustine calls ⁴ Scripture the 'balance of God; let us not bring deceitful balances, where we

1. Parker Society 1849 ed.pg. 25-109. Quaestio 1 on the number of canonical books.
2. Sess 4 Decret.1.
3. Cyprian on the Baptism of Christ. This Treatise appears in the works of Arnold of Chartres and is added to Fell's Cyprian (1691) but is falsely ascribed to Cyprian.
4. De Baptismo Conter. Donat. Bk.2.

may weigh what we choose and as we choose, saying at our own pleasure, this is heavy, this is light' ---- if Augustine writes¹ that scripture has fixed the rule of our doctrine, then the number of canonical books is of the utmost importance, and moment.

Tertullian in his 'Contra Hermogenem' calls Scripture the Regula Fidei, Chrysostom in his Thirteenth Homily on 2 Corinthians calls Scripture the 'exact Balance, Standard, and Rule of all things'. Ruffinus (sic) in his Exposition of the Creed, after enumerating the books of Scripture, adds 'these are the books which the Fathers included in the Canon (intra Canonem) and from which they willed that the assertions of our faith should be demonstrated ! Aquinas too lays down that 'the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets is called canonical because it is, as it were, a rule of our intellect'² Eusebius calls the canonical books *ἐνδιαθηκούς* ³ --- Nicephorus often uses the same term; some call them *διαθηκογράφους* The question, then, 'between you and us is this ---- what books are indeed to be esteemed canonical and testamentary.'[?]

Whitaker remarks that the wild assertion about his being a heretic in the number of the canonical books is absurd ---- there is no question of our having suddenly snatched books from the canon, as Duraeus had asserted, but that 'the judgement of the Fathers and Councils are with us, not with you'. The Apocryphal books, adjudged so by Jerome and Epiphanius and others, but added by Trent, form no part of the canon in our Article 6.⁴ The ambiguous language of

-
1. 'Sancta Scriptura doctrinae nostrae regulam figit'. De Bono Viduit. cap.1. Vide etiam Contra Cresc. Grammat.2.31.
 2. Thomas Aquinas on 1 Tim6. Lect.1. 'Regula intellectus nostri'.
 3. H.E. 5.25. i.e. Testamentary
 4. Article 6 De Divinis Scripturis --- the final form of 1571 AD. i.e. with the addition to the 1563 Apocryphal list, of Baruch, the rest of Esther, Song of the Three Children, Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasses, which had not been mentioned in the 1563 list of Apocryphal writings.

the Council of Trent appeared to regard Scripture by itself as insufficient, and to place Tradition on a par with Canonical Scripture as an independent source of doctrine ¹A Decree of 1546 spoke of 'truth and discipline --- contained in the written books and in unwritten traditions which were received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or from the Apostles themselves ---- have come down to us'. Such language suggested that part of the faith was found in Scripture and part in Tradition. Although Article 6 (of the 39 Articles) was not intended to stand alone but to be used with Articles 7 and 20, it clarified the position of the remaining books --- "reliquum libri Esther, Baruch Propheta, Canticum Trium Puerorum, De Bel et Dracone, Oratio Manassis " --- by adding these to the 1563 list of Apocryphal books.²

'We are not,' says Whitaker, 'to be numbered with ~~Est~~ Saturninus, ³ Marcion, ⁴ the Cordonians, ⁵ the Severians, ⁶ who rejected the canonical books of the O.T. nor with the Ptolemaeans ⁷ who condemned the Pentateuch, nor with the Nicolaitans and Gnostics who ejected the Books of Psalms.'⁸ Others rejected Eccles. the Song of Songs, because in the former Solomon seems to invite men to a life of pleasure, and in the latter to relate amatory discourses between himself and Pharoah's daughter. Whitaker refuses both views,

1. 'traditiones pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipiuntur

ac venerantur ! An extreme expression of the view that the whole of Catholic Tradition is embodied in the Papacy appears in the saying attributed to Pius IX (Pope 1846-78) "Sono la Tradizione" ('I am Tradition'). During the Vatican Council 1 (1869-70) emerged the Decree on Papal Infallibility and the ratification of Trent. Whitgift refers to the deposition of copies of Scripture, Fathers and Conciliar Decrees on the Altar during Trent ---a custom perpetuated at Vatican 1 and 2

2. 3 and 4 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ben Sirach, Susannah,

1 and 2 Macc.

3. Iren. 1.24

7. Epiphani. Haeres. 33

4. ibid. 1.29

8. Philast. De Haeres. c. 127

5. Aug. Ad Quodvult cap. 21.

6. ibid. cap 24

because in the former the reverse is true, that Solomon is in fact deterring men from mere pleasure since 'all is vanity', and closes with the teaching that happiness consists not in things of this kind but in true piety, and thus concludes 'Fear God, keep His commandments for this is the whole duty of man'. This is not the judgement of an Epicurus but of a holy prophet. And if Solomon wished to praise his wife, he would not have used such prodigious and absurd comparisons --- comparing her to the Cavalry of Pharoah, her head to Carmel, her eyes to fish ponds, her nose to a tower, her teeth to a flock of sheep, pronouncing her whole person as terrible as an army. Such is neither for a daughter of Pharoah nor for a bride of Solomon. They refer to the mystical bride of another Solomon, Christ, and her 'consummate union of faith and love with her Spouse, this whole book sets forth! Nor is the fact that none of the customary names of God occur in this book any proof that it is not canonical; indeed we should not expect to find them, since 'shepherd, brother, friend, beloved, spouse' are titles more suitable to the style of such a theme. We care little for the Anabaptists' contemptuous rejection of this book, nor do we excuse Castellio¹ his view that 'it is nothing but a conversation between Solomon and his Shulamith'. Whether Castellio held this view on the Song of Solomon by the time he went to Basle in 1551 is open to question ---- Bayle² (1647-1706) writing on Castellio observes that in five editions of Castellio's Bible which he had examined there was no such argument; in the London Edition of his Latin Bible (4 vols. 12^o 1726) there is the following ---- 'Colloquium Servatoris et

1. Whitaker usually writes this name Castalio --- Sebastian Castellio (1515-63) went to Strassburg 1540, he was converted to protestantism there by Calvin who procured for him the rectorship of the College of Geneva. His rejection of the Song of Solomon and his unorthodox views on Christ's Descent into Hell together with a strong Humanism, caused his separation from Calvin. Castellio went to Basle 1551 where he published his principal work, a Latin translation of the Bible, Biblia Sacra Latina, which aroused great opposition because of its annotations.

2. Dictionnaire Historique et Critique (1695-7: enlarged edition 1702)

Ecclesiae; domestici in Ecclesia hostes; servator, liliū columba; Solomon Christi Imago etc'. which suggests a change of opinion.

The N.T. too was assaulted by heretics and others ---- Tertullian or some later hand in the Prescriptions ¹ tells us that Cerdon received only the Gospel of Luke and not even all that; he rejects the Acts and the Apocalypse, and is highly selective in the Epistles of Paul and their contents. Marcion did much the same. The Valentinians received only the one Gospel, John,² which error the papists try to foist upon Luther, while the Alogians rejected it.³ The Ebionites received only the Gospel of Matthew and rejected Paul as an apostate from the Law⁴. The Severians rejected the Acts⁵ and the Marcionites rejected 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews.⁶ Both Chrysostom and Jerome in their Prefaces to the Epistle to Philemon say that this was not received as canonical, being ascribed to a mere 'human spirit', denying it Apostolic and divine authority. Such was the mad raving of the heretics --- and now the Schwenkfeldtians⁷ despise Scripture and demand that we listen only to what the Spirit utters and teaches us internally.^c You often class us with the Schwenkfeldtians which only gives measure to your calumny of our views.'

To support the inclusion of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclus. 1 and 2 Maccabees, Duraeus claims that though excluded by Jerome, because he followed the **H**ebrew canon, there were no doubts at the Third

1. cap.51

2. Iren. 3.11.

3. Epiphan. Haer.1.

4. Iren. 1. 26

5. Euseb. H.E.1V. 27

6. Epiphan. Haer.42

7. So called from Gasper Schwenkfeld, a Silesian knight and counsellor to the Duke of Lignitz; he died 1561. Vide Mosheim Cent.16.3.pt.2.cap.1-5

Council of Carthage (canon 47) ¹, and the canons of this Council ⁸⁰ were received by the Council of Constantinople (canon 2) and the Council of Florence under Eugenius IV (Epistle of Eugenius Ad Armenos) and by Trent under Paul III (Session 4) and by Pope Gelasius with the Council of 70 Bishops. To put forward Cajetan is ridiculous for 'he speaks more arrogantly than is seemly' as Catherinus and Canus will tell you. ²

Whitaker replies that Jerome, one of the first to evaluate the relationship between the apocryphal and canonical books, educated at Rome, his labours undertaken on the text of Scripture at the request of Pope Damasus, later popes republishing the canon which he recognised, had no doubts about this issue --- he wrote 'Ecclesiam legere quidem illos libros sed tamen inter canonicas Scripturas non recipere'. Origen ³ knew of no more canonical books of the O.T. than those which the Jews had received, viz. 22, the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet, and Cyril ⁴ of Jerusalem contended only for the canonical books as received by all Christians, saying that the Apostles and Bishops of the ancient church, far more wise than we, and handed down only those books *πρός τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδέν ἔχει κοινόν* : cum apocryphis nihil tibi rei sit ! Athanasius in his Synopsis ⁵ enumerates the books themselves ---- praeter istos autem sunt adhuc alii

1. Should anyone object that this Council was only provincial not general, as Whitaker had done to Duraeus, it was pointed out by the papists that this Council was confirmed by Pope Leo IV (Dist. 20 cap. de libellis) and also by the 6th General Council at Constantinople (Trullan) canon 2. Of the Fathers, the papists also cited Innocent I's Third Epistle to Exsuperius of Toulouse; Aug, Bk. 2. cap. 8 De Doctrina Christiana; and Isidore of Seville Etymolog. 6. cap. 1.

2. Vide Mendham 'Memoirs of the C. of Trent' pg. 50 --- the question of including these books was raised and hotly debated 11th. Feb. 1546 et seq. On the 12th Feb, it was decided to accept simply the canon as received by the C. of Florence.

3. Euseb. H.E. 6.25

4. Catech. 4. 33 ἀναγίνωσκε τὰς Θείας γραφάς, τὰς εἴκοσι δύο βίβλους τῆς παιδείας διαθήκης.

5. There is a footnote reference here to a 'Synopsis in Principi' --- a Synopsis of the Scriptures with various homilies attached has been doubtfully ascribed to Athanasius (vide Cayre 'Manual of Patrology' 1.348) but it is the work of a later and uncertain author.

eiusdem veteris instrumenti (sic) libri, non canonici, qui

Catechumenis tantum leguntur ' and then he names the **Wisdom** of Solomon Ben Sirach, the fragments of Esther, Judith, Tobit, but there is no mention of 1 and 2 Maccabees. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in his Prologue to his Exposition of the Psalms said 'the Law of the O.T. is divided into 22 books, to correspond with the number of the (Hebrew) letters'. Nazianzen in his verses on the genuine books of sacred scripture (Περί τῶν γνησίων βιβλίων) writes of the 22 books of the canon, though he included Baruch because he wrongfully supposed it to be part of Jeremiah. Epiphanius ¹ counted 27 books of the O.T. or rather, as he subjoins, 22 since some are doubled, and he writes of the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach, besides others which are apocryphal, as 'indeed useful books but not included in the canon, and not deposited in the Ark of the Covenant! ²

Rufinus in his 'Commentary on the Apostles' Creed ~~enumerates~~ enumerates the same canon, ³ and then goes on 'sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri, qui non canonici sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt, ut est Sapientia Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quae dicitur Filius Sirach ----- eiusdem ordinis est libellus Tobiae et Judith et Maccabaeorum non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam! Jerome in his Prologus Galeatus to Paulinus while asserting the Hebrew canon writes 'therefore the Wisdom of Solomon, of Jesus Ben-Sirach, Judith, and Tobit are not in the Canon' and testimonies of the same sort occur everywhere in his books, that these must be put in the Apocrypha.

1. Haer VIII. Contra Epicureas; in his Reply to Campion, Whitaker also refers to Epiphanius' work 'Of Weights and Measures' -- De Mensur. et Ponder'. --- as translated by Cornarius; in Pt.1. of this work, important for Biblical archeology, Epiphanius treats of the Canon and Versions of the O.T.

2. Probably a corrupt reading vide Parker Society ed. pg. 59 note 8

3 Whitaker notes that the papist Pamelius thought very highly of

Rufinus' work but he would expurgate this passage. Rufinus' work Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum which depended upon the Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem presents for the first time a complete and reliable Latin text of the Roman Creed and a complete Canon of the Scripture.

Gregory the Great in his Commentaries on Job ¹ expressly writes that 1 and 2 Maccabees are not canonical. To this authority of the ancient Fathers, Whitaker would add the authority of Josephus as given in his first book against Apion the Grammarian and transcribed by Eusebius, ² and how Josephus gave the highest credit (τὰ δίκαιως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα) to the canonical books --- the 22, the five books of Moses, the 13 Prophets, and the remaining four 'containing hymns to God and moral admonitions to man'. 'It is true' says Josephus that ^{from} the time of Artaxerxes to our own time, particular accounts have been written of the various events in our history but these latter have not been deemed worthy of the same credit (πίστεως δε' οὐχ ὁμοίως ἡγίωται).

Whitaker reminds Duraeus³ that it does not follow that ~~becans~~ because the ancient Fathers like Augustine, Chrysostom, and Cyprian, quote and use testimonies from books like Tobias for example that therefore the book is canonical. The Fathers also quoted the books of Esdras, but Trent left 3 and 4 Esdras to the Apocrypha --- in this we are of one mind. Duraeus claimed that the judgement of Jerome on the canon had been set aside by the Catholic Church ---- usurpari ab ecclesiasticis viribus -- but Whitaker reminds him that this judgement was not Jerome's personal judgement so much as the mind of the Catholic Church. 'Apocrypha nescit Ecclesia, ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum est' ⁴

Melito of Sardis testifies ⁵ that he went to the East (εἰς τὴν Ἰνδοσίαν) and learnt with exactness and accuracy the books of the O.T. and had no doubt about the canon we have

1. Bk. XIX. 16 Paris ed. 1705 pg. 622

2. H.E. Bk. 3.10

3. Contra Dur. 1.21.

4. Pref. on the books Paralip.

5. Bk. 4.26

received ---- except for the Wisdom of Solomon which he would include. There are some, says Whitaker, that think that this Wisdom of Solomon which Melito mentions is in fact the Book of Proverbs, but Whitaker disagrees on the grounds that there is no reason why the book should be twice named. Yet of all the apocryphal books, writes Whitaker, most respect seems to have been given to the Wisdom of Solomon and this is why Augustine defends its authority.^{2.}

To revert to Duraeus' first claim that on the authority of III Carthage canon 47, Innocent I in his third Epistle to Exsuperius, Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana, and Isidore of Seville, Whitaker would deny the major premise of the syllogism, that these Fathers and Councils accepted those books and therefore they are canonical. Both the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent were of recent date and therefore outside the scope of our defence ---- indeed how general Trent was, may be appreciated from the number of Bishops present at the session in question --- the legates, cardinals, archbishops, and bishops who were then present and who published this decree on the number of the canonical books were no more than 50 in all and these almost to a man Italians and Spaniards ! Alan Copus defending this minority said that these were ~~more~~ fewer than those in many famous Councils ---- this, Whitaker allows of provincial synods but no Ecumenical Council can be so named on the paucity of prelates ! III Carthage was merely a provincial synod and carried no authority 'per se' sufficiently strong and clear enough to bind the whole of the church. Further, the papists

1. The clause in question is *Παροιμίαι ἢ καὶ Σοφία* - the question is whether we should read *ἢ* or *ἢ'* ; the former is read by 6 MSS confirmed by Nicephorus and Rufinus (who translates quae et Sapientia) and adopted by Valesius

2. De Praedest. Sanct. cap 14

themselves did not accept all the decrees of this Council, since they refuse canon 26 which condemned the titles 'Summus Sacerdos' and 'Princeps Sacerdotum.' Duraeus had said that the Trullan Council of Constantinople, which was general, confirmed the Carthaginian Synod --- true, but if it confirmed the number of canonical books including the ones here in dispute, it also confirmed canon 26, and how, Duraeus, would divide these things? The papists are also in some doubt about the authority of this Council ----- Pighius calls the acta of this Council spurious, and Melchior Canus declared that the canons of that Council have no ecclesiastical authority; certainly the papists refuse canon 36 (the Bishop of Constantinople is equalled with the Bishop of Rome) and canon 13 (that priests and deacons are not to be separated from their wives). The Council, in canon 2, accepted 85 of the Apostolic Canons but Pope Gelasius declared the book of Apostolic Canons apocryphal. The Trullan

1. 'Liber Canonum Apostolorum apocryphus' -- this clause is wanting in Justellus and two other MSS and the genuineness of this decree has been doubted, though it is defended by Gibbings in his 'Roman Forgeries' p. 93 et seq. Gratian (Dist. 16) on the authority of Isidore (sed vide Hody p. 653 col. 70 for an additional authority) said that there were only 50, and they apocryphal, composed by heretics under the name of the Apostles -- but Trullan accepted 85 though Zephyrinus (d. 217AD) some 500 years before this Synod recognised only 60 the same number as accepted by Pope Leo IX (d. 1054) -- Leo's view was really that of Cardinal Humbert (d. 1061) taken from his Reply to Nicetas (Vide Canisius Antiqu. Lect. T. 6. p. 181). Gratian takes the liberty of attributing them to Leo on the principle that the words of the legate are the words of his employer! . Vide Parker Society ed. pp. 42-44 for Whitaker's arguments against the Apostolic Canons.

Council approved the canons of III Carthage and also the Apostolic Canons --- here we may judge what force and authority may be allowed this synod, and indeed put the papist attitude to Councils to the test, since they deny some canons and accept others, which are themselves suspect.

Whitaker then asks, that although III Carthage, Gelasius with his 70 bishops, Innocent, Augustine and Isidore, call those books canonical, in what sense did they call them canonical? We deny that they intended to make these books of equal authority with the received canonical books, and this you will see from Augustine alone. Surely if a public judgement of the whole church or a general council had made those books of true and genuine canonical authority, that would have been the end of the matter and no dissent would be allowed. But the fact remains that those who lived in the area of such sentences did dissent and in great numbers, and amongst them, those whom Rome acknowledges as her children. Therefore we see that such public judgement in the matter of these (disputed) books did not indicate a final and irrevocable, unimpeachable and full, canonical authority as in the case of the received books. Further Augustine laid down his own rules on the canon by dividing all the books into two classes:-

a) books received by all the churches should be preferred to those not received by some.

b) books received by the 'greater and nobler churches' should be preferred to those which have been taken into a canon by churches fewer in number and of less authority ---- listen to Augustine himself¹ 'now with respect to the canonical scriptures, let him follow the authority of the greater number of catholic churches (Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quam plurimum auctoritatem sequatur) amongst which indeed, those are to be ~~found~~ found which merited (meruerunt) to possess the chairs of the Apostles (sedes Apostolicas) and to receive epistles from them !

1. De Doctrina Christiana 2.8

We, with Jerome and many others, deny these (disputed) books are canonical --- Augustine and some others call them canonical. But do we all use the word 'canonical' in the same sense? No. Because Jerome regarded books as truly canonical which had always ^{been} accepted by the church as canonical --- the rest he banishes from the Canon, denies to be Canonical and calls them Apocryphal. Augustine on the otherhand, though admitting these books not to have the same perfect and certain authority as the rest, yet accepted them as being widely read and used in the Church for the edification of the people. Augustine therefore takes a wider view than Jerome, and yet we must note that Augustine elsewhere concedes that less reliance should be placed on whatever is not found in the Canon of the Jews ¹ --- may we not conclude Augustine's meaning here that such rejection would generally concern only those books not contained in the Hebrew Canon?

To illustrate this difference over the word 'canonical' Whitaker cites the example of 2 Maccabees ---- Duraeus passed over the fact that 2 Maccabees had been rejected (exploserunt) by Epiphanius, Jerome, Athanasius, and Cyprian, and quoted Augustine² who wrote 'Maccabaeorum libros non quidem Judei sed ecclesia pro canonicis habet'; the Jews had refused them, because, comments Duraeus, it was the custom of the Jews not to admit books to the Canon without the approval of the prophet (non propheta aliquis probasset), but it behoves Christians everywhere to hang upon the judgement of the catholic church. Whitaker replies by saying that it was never the custom of the Holy Spirit to draw together ---- ~~contrahere~~ ---- into the Canon the books of a profane author, and the author of 2 Maccabees makes explicit mention of the fact that the whole of

1. De Civitate Dei Bk. 17.20. 'sed adversus contradic^otores non tanta firmitate proferuntur quae scripta non sunt in canone Judaeorum'.

2. De civit. Dei 18.6.

2 Maccabees is an abridgement of the 5 books of Jason of Cyrene 1

Now look at the internal evidence ---- there are many ἀρτιλογία

Between this 2 Maccabees and 1 Maccabees which are irreconcilable;-

- a) 1 Maccabees --- Judas is slain by the army of Bacchides in the 152nd year of the reign of the Seleucids. In 2 Maccabees this happens in the 188th year (1. Macc.9.3-2. Macc.1.10)
- b) in 1 Maccabees 6.8-16 Antiochus died in bed, in grief, because he was a disappointed man, but in 2 Maccabees 1.14 he with his company is stoned by the priests of Nanea through a privy door in the roof, and their heads were cut off and thrown outside the Temple to the waiting crowd outside. ²

Augustine indeed wrote ³ 'quorum supputatio temporum non in scripturis sanctis quae Canonicae appellantur sed in aliis invenitur in quibus sunt Maccabaerorum libri quos non Judaei sed ecclesia pro canonicis habet, propter quorundam martyrum passiones, vehementer atque mirabiles'. Augustine then writes, they are not canonical but read 'pro canonicis' i.e. read like the canonical scriptures publicly in church for piety and edification. Augustine wrote elsewhere 'Maccabaerorum scriptura recepta est ab ecclesia non inutiliter si sobrie legatur vel audiatur' --- would Augustine have used the latter words if the Maccabees had been canonical books? You say that Christians should hang upon the judgement of the catholic church, but;-

- a) the catholic church can never make canonical books out of non-canonical books, and the catholic church has never judged these Maccabees as canonical books.
- b) quotations by the Fathers do not confer canonical authority --- if this is true, and you labour to include Baruch because of this argument, then you must include 3 and 4 Esdras in your canon. Indeed, the experience of Augustine should teach you this point --- he quoted a passage from Sapientia ⁴ and there was a protest that it was not a

1. 2 Macc.2.23

2. There springs to mind the same sort of historical discrepancy between Mt. 27.5. (Judas hanged himself) and Acts 1.18 (where Judas falls headlong, bursts asunder, and all his bowels gush out). There is a tradition (Hegesippus?) that Judas hanged himself but the rope broke and he rushed wildly into the road into the path of an oncoming chariot, and was crushed and mangled.

3. De Civit. Dei 18.36

4. De Praedest. Sanct. cap. 14,

canonical book ---- Jerome ¹ called it *Ψευδοπύργου* for it 'smelt of the Greek tongue'; Augustine replied that he had quoted it because some churches used it, and though he could have confirmed the quotation from undisputed writings he regarded the authority of this book as greater than that of all tracts (tractatorum). Augustine not only quotes but pleads for the authority of a non-canonical book. Whitaker agrees with Duraeus so far, but would point out that the church can and must discern between true and feigned (commentitius) writings, but the Roman church is assuming authority of quite another kind i.e. the sole right (ius) of declaring, approving, and making books divine and ~~canonical~~ canonical which are not so. You can add as much Patristic ammunition as you like, piling up a list of Patristic quotations, but if you do not see the point of this argument, you will never have certainty in this matter of the Canon, and you will fail in your duty as spiritual mentor.² Pighius ², who regarded tradition as a source of Christian truth co-ordinate with scripture, wrote 'ecclesiam scripturis quibusdam eisque praecipuis hoc est Evangelistarum quam neque ex se neque ex scriptoribus suis apud nos habebant canonicam impartitam esse auctoritatem' and 'Magnam partem scripturarum universam suam auctoritatem ab ecclesia ~~acc~~ accepisse' and Stapleton ³ wrote 'est penes ecclesiam huius temporis librum aliquem alium nondum in canonem receptum in numerum librorum sacrorum et certo canonicorum referre posse' but even he adds a caveat on such papal licence by adding 'numquam hactenus ecclesiae iudice reprobatum'.

How then, asks Duraeus, can you distinguish between canonical and non-canonical books; you, Whitaker, reply as Luther and Calvin did, that this is known as the sun is known to be the sun, and God is God, that scripture has its own authority, but surely you will have learnt by now that whenever a canonical book is called into controversy, the truth is declared by the judgement and public authority of the church, not by the testimony of private enthusiasm (occulti enthusiasmi).³ Athanasius in his Synopsis said 'the holy and catholic churches established (sanxerunt) the four books of the Gospel as sacred books and auctoritate

1. Pref. to the Bk. of Solomon.

2. Hierarch. 1.2

3. Bk.9.14

books of the Canon'. If the testimony of a single person suffices to discern true scripture, where will be the end of controversy ? No wonder men are hurled into a raging sea and are swallowed up in atheism ! The sure authority of the church suffices to resolve controversy.

Whitaker replies that it is Rome that is at fault here by plunging the whole church into a raging sea of uncertainties by adding to that Canon generally accepted by the Church of the Fathers ---- we cannot take away or add the slightest thing (tantillum) to that received corpus of the Canon. You claim the consent of the whole church, which you do not have. You claim the authority of the Fathers, but you do not possess it. You claim the intrinsic proof of scripture which you do not have; you claim the authority of Councils, which you do not have--- where are the certainties you speak of ? We accept the perpetual testimony of the true church, the Fathers, and the Councils, in confirming the Canon as self-evident of divine authority, which removes (excuteire) all doubt for us. The reference to private enthusiasm is unworthy of any divine ---- the same Spirit that spoke in the Prophets and Apostles seals (obsignare) this voice of God in our minds. The *πληροφορία* of the Spirit, which is perfect faith, abounds in the true church as in the individual soul. None is more forward in repressing the private enthusiasm you speak of ----- Augustine will tell you ^{1.} that it is not the bare judgement of the church that excluded the apocryphal books (e.g. the Gospel of Thomas) but their disagreement (discrepantia) with Apostolic doctrine. We defend the Canon by the testimonies of the church, as did Athansius, Augustine, Tertullian ---- we are no anabaptists hanging upon sudden enthusiasms or bursts of the spirit; these *ἐνθουσίασμα* are all condemned.'

1. De Consens. Evangel.1.1.; 4,28

Cardinal Cajetan, writes Whitaker, who certainly excelled our Jesuits in judgement, erudition, and authority, clarifies the position of these disputed books at the end of his Commentary on the History of the O.T. ¹ where he notes that Jerome accounted Judith Tobit, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Ecclus., and Wisdom as out of the Canon so 'be not thou disturbed, like a raw scholar, if you should find anywhere, either in sacred Council or sound doctors, those books ~~re~~ reckoned as canonical'. For, the words of councils, as of doctors are to be reduced to the correction of Jerome (ad Hieronymi limam reducenda sunt) in whose judgement given in his letters to Bishops Chromatus and Heliodorus these books are not canonical i.e. not in the nature of a rule for confirming matters of faith (non sunt regulares ad firmandum ea quae sunt fidei). Yet they may be called 'canonical', in the nature of a rule for the edification of the faithful ---- by the help of this distinction, says Cajetan, you may see your way clearly through Augustine, and III Carthage, in the different uses of the Word. The same distinction is perhaps to be seen in the use of Proto-canonical and Deutero-canonical by Sixtus Sinensis (Bibliothec. Bk.1.) and Stapleton (Princip. Fid. Doctr. Bk.9 cap.6) --- the former are those books which are accounted in the legitimate and genuine Canon i.e. of the Hebrews; the latter are called canonical (though in reality

1. ~~Id~~ Ult. Cap. Esther ad fin ---- Whitaker notes that some papists were incensed against Cajetan for this view; Canus said that Cajetan had been deceived by the novelties of Erasmus. Yet Whitaker acknowledges that there never was a papist of more learning and authority than Cajetan whom the Pope sent to Germany to oppose Luther. (1518 AD) His contacts with protestants and humanists, made him a first class controversialist in Biblical exegesis. Between 1527 and 1533 he published 36 commentaries on separate Biblical books. Vide 'Kardinal Cajetan Eine Gestalt Aus der Reformationszeit' by J.F. Groner O.P. (1951) His Commentary on Esther was written 1532, his Commentary on the History of the O.T. not being published till 1546 and then carrying a dedication to Clement VII. Published at Paris.

apocryphal) because they have authority in morals and edification. ¹
Whitaker goes on to say that the Church and Faith of the Fathers was
nourished in Prophetic and Apostolic doctrine ² and these books are
notably absent in quotations de fide.

The Council of Laodicea Canon 59 ³ which was not long
after the time when the books of the O.T. were listed (recensentur)
which we hold as canonical ----and note the precept of this Council
that this was done 'ne aliqui praeterea legantur et in auctoritatem
recipiantur' ---- forbad the reading of any non-canonical book in
the church, allowing only the canonical books of the O.T. and N.T. to be
used for that purpose; *οὐδὲ δεῖ ἀναγινώσκεισθαι*
i.e. in the church, ⁴ though they erred in putting Baruch with Jeremiah

1. Vide Patristic Greek Lexicon ed G.W.H. Lampe Fasc.3.pg. 701 ---- for
reference in Clement Str.6.15 Origen. Princ. 4.2.9. Basil. Spirit. 68
Gr.Nyss. Ascens. et rel. for *κανών* as 'regula Fidei'; and in Clement
Clement Str. 7.3. Ath. Expos. Ps. 36.6. Basil Epi. 261.1. Agath. v. Gr.III
for *κανών* as standard or canon of behaviour; moral standard. ~~7~~
Whitaker notes (Contra Duraeum. 1.15) the distinction between 'norma
morum' and norma fidei'.

2. Hebr.1.1.

3. *οὐδε ἀκανονία βιβλία* Mansi T. 2. p. 574 . Also known as
Canon 60 ; cf. Zahn G.K. p. 193 ff.who held against Hefele that
this was a later addition . Nothing definite is known about
this Council of Laodicea though a mention of the Photinians in
Can. 7 points to a date after 345 AD -- the possible date is
 \pm 360 AD . These canons may be a collection of subject headings
issued by earlier 4th. Century Councils , among them Nicea.
Canon 59 (60) is closely akin to Apostolic Canons 85 (84) .

4. Hence Cosin (History of the Canon pg. 60) supposed the Apocalypse
to be left out, not as uncanonical but as unfit for popular instruction:
it was omitted from the Calendar of Lessons in the C.of. E. though
the Canon was received

and omitted the Apocalypse. However, Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus Wisdom and 1 and 2 Maccabees are not listed as canonical. The papists reply that the Canon was not yet settled and therefore though this Council may omit these books, we cannot do so after the judgement of the whole church has been made. Whitaker says that this is ridiculous since the mind of the church was remarkably clear by the end of the 5th, Century ---- clear enough to exclude them, as already indicated in the Patristic references. Jerome in his Preface to the Books of Chronicles wrote plainly 'the Church knows nothing of apocryphal writings (Apocrypha nescit Ecclesia); we must therefore have recourse to the Hebrews¹; in his Preface to Ezra and Nehemiah, he writes 'what is not received among them, must be thrown away by us' (quae non habentur apud illos, procul abjicienda sunt). Rufinus is quite clear about the canonical books and the ecclesiastical books --- the latter may be read but are not canonical.¹ Isidore of Seville ² (d. 636 AD), John of Damascus ³ (d. 749 AD), Nicephorus ⁴ (died 829), Leontius ⁵ (6th Century) Rabanus Maurus ⁶ (d.856) Hugo of St. Victor ⁷ and Richard of St. Victor ⁸ are all explicit on the Canon ---- and that Wisdom, Ben Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and Maccabees, though indeed read, are not written in the Canon. Cardinal Hugo in his Prologue to Joshua calls

1. Vide Jerome; Preface to the Books of Solomon.

2. Bk. De Offic.

3. Bk. 4. cap.18

4. Apud Cyrum Prodromum in versibus (sic)

5. Book of Sects Act.2.

6. De. Inst. Cler. cap.54

7. Prolog. Book 1. De Sacrament. cap. 7 and Didascal. Bk. 4.8

them apocryphal --- he writes, in metre, poor enough, but in sense, excellent;-

'Restant apocrypha Jesus, Sapientia, Pastor,
Et Maccabaeorum libri, Judith et Tobias,
Hi, quod sunt dubii, sub canone non numerantur
Sed quia vera canunt, ecclesia suscipit illos' ¹

Is the matter of the canon then in so much doubt ? Erasmus did not think so, and Leo X was content to call him his most beloved son. ²
Antonio Braccioli, an Italian, translated the O.T. into the Italian language ³ and wrote commentaries on the canonical books but omitted ^{the Apocryphal.} ₄
Since the Council of Trent, Arias Montanus who was himself present

1. Liber Exceptionum Bk. 2.9.----- non scribuntur in Canone. Whitaker also mentions Lyra (Prolog. on the books of the Apocrypha) and Dionysius Carthusianus (Commentary on Genesis).

2. also ~~qu~~ quoted in Contra Duraeum 1. 15

3. Leo's letter 'Dilecto Filio Erasmo Roterda? ² prefixed to Erasmus' @ Greek Testament Basle 1535. Whitaker makes reference to Erasmus being expelled from the family of the Roman Church --- he was never excommunicated, though he was suspect on both sides, but his teachings were censured by the University of Paris 1527 AD and after his death his writings were forbidden by Paul IV in 1559 AD, by Sixtus V in 1590 AD.

4. First Edition printed 1530 AD ---- three further editions followed in his lifetime, 1539, 1540, and 1541. AD.

at Trent, and is called by Gregory XIII 'my son', in a vast Biblical work, an edition of the Hebrew Bible with an interlinear version, declares that the orthodox church followed the Hebrew Canon, therefore those books are not canonical and have been openly declared so for many centuries by numerous Fathers, ancient and modern, so learned, so obedient, to the godly precepts of the church, and are never to be inserted by any lawful authority. ¹.

On the Canon of the N.T. Whitaker notes that there is no controversy with the papists ----- what Trent enumerated, our church receives. What the Lutherans have thought or written, otherwise, ~~can~~ concerning some of the canonical books, they must answer for themselves, nor is it incumbent upon us to defend them since we are in this respect no followers of Luther, and submit to the directions of better reason. ² They can, however, produce on their side the judgement and example of the ancient Christian church and certain Fathers distinguished for piety and learning, for the books they call in question. Cajetan repudiated the Epistle of James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, Hebrews (which Luther never disputed) the history of the woman in adultery (John 8) the last chapter of Mark, and several

1. Whitaker in his 'Disputation on Holy Scripture' Controversy 1. Quaest 1. cap.7.14 deals with each particular book and why apocryphal. Cap.7 Baruch; Cap.8 and 7 chapters of Esther; Cap.9 the apocryphal parts of Daniel; Cap. 10 Tobit; Cap.11 Judith; Cap.12 Wisdom; Cap. 13 Ecclesiasticus; Cap. 14 1 and 2 Maccabees; Cap.15 those books also a judged apocryphal by the papists i.e. 3 and 4 Esdras 3 and 4 Maccabees the Prayer of Manasseh; the 151st Psalms; the Appendix to Job in the Greek copies; Pref. to the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

2. Disputatio Quaest. 1. cap. 16

Gospel passages which Luther never called into question, but ancient Fathers who questioned the same were not reputed heretics. But Whitaker will not pursue this subject further since there is no cause with the papists except to mention the Epistle to the Hebrews; full canonical authority is conceded but Pauline authorship is doubted. ~~Euse~~ Eusebius reports¹ that the Church of Rome denied Pauline authorship, and Jerome in his Catalogue under the article on Paul recorded the same doubt on grounds of style and diction (propter styli sermonisque dissonantiam) and he writes to the same effect in his Letter to Paulinus. The Dialogue of Caius,³ whom Eusebius calls a very learned person, a Roman presbyter, an orthodox churchman (ἑκκλησιαστικός ἀνὴρ) and who held debate with the Montanist Proclus also expressed doubts about this Epistle; and 'even to this day', writes Eusebius 'among the Romans there are some who do not consider it to be of the Apostles'. Tertullian too, reports that although it was more 'widely received among the churches (in Africa) than the Shepherd'³ it only had limited public recognition ---- it may even be said that the part which had the strongest opposition to it as not Pauline, was Italy and the West; Hippolytus and Irenaeus knew of it, but declared it was not Paul's. On the other hand there is weightier evidence for

1. Bk. 3.3. 6. πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὐσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες.

2. H.E. Bk. 6. 20 Vide etiam Jerome De vir ill. 59

3. De Pudic. 20 --- Tertullian ascribes it to Barnabas; " utique receptio apud ecclesias ille apocrypha Pastore moechorum "

Pauline authorship --- Jerome in his Letter to Dardanus ¹ says that almost all the Greek authors ascribe it to Paul, though 'the custom of the Latins does not receive it among the canonical scriptures as Paul's; Jerome used it freely, and though he qualifies quotations from it with the remark that by doing so he did not decide the question of authorship, his own view (probably influenced by the Greek copies he had before him, and the general Eastern acceptance) was that it had canonical authority --- in his Commentary on Isaiah he uses the Epistle without reserve. Origen, as reported by Eusebius ² regarded the 'thought of the Epistle as admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the Apostle, to this also everyone will consent as true who has given attention to reading the Apostle'. So, while he had doubts about the actual authorship, i.e. penmanship, he had no doubts about the contents being fully Apostolic and therefore canonical. Clement of Alexandria likewise regarded the work as that of Paul, not by actual authorship but by contents ---- Eusebius writes ³ of Clement that he regarded this Epistle as written for the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, and that Luke having carefully translated it, published it for the Greeks; and so as a result of this translation, the same complexion of style is found in this Epistle and the Acts.

1. Ad Dard. 129.3.

2. H.E. .25.11

3. H.E. 6.14.2

Eusebius himself ¹, while reporting the doubts expressed over the work, decided that it was reasonable to accord it canonical authority, 'on the grounds of antiquity it should be reckoned with the other writings of the Apostle'. The judgement of Alexandria found formal expression in Athanasius' Festal Letter of 367 AD, in his Synopsis and elsewhere, and Cyril of Alexandria took the same view. ² That Irenaeus ³ was acquainted with the Epistle may be seen in quotations, but Photius classified him with Hippolytus as denying Pauline authorship. ⁴ Eusebius ⁵ states that in a book now lost Irenaeus mentions Hebrews but his use of the word 'scripture' (e.g. he calls Hermas 'scripture') ⁶ is wider than ours.

The Epistle is also quoted as St. Paul's by Chrysostom and by Gregory of Nazianzen ---- Whitaker could also have said the other two Cappadocian Fathers, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa --- and Theophylact wonders at the impudence of those who denied it as canonical. John of Damascus cites from it as a work of St. Paul (De Fide Orthodoxa 4.17) and Augustine, ⁷ Ambrose ⁸ and Gregory the Great ⁹ all regarded it as Pauline --- the reference in 2 Peter 3.15, says Whitaker, is not without significance, written to the Hebrews. The

~~question of authorship may well have been in~~

1. H.E. 3.38

2. Thesaur. 2.cap.9; De ador. in spir. et ver. 2.

3. Haer.2.30.9 --- 'solus hic Deus invenitur qui omnia fecit verbo virtutis suae' (Heb. 1.3.); ibid 4.11.4 (Heb.10.1) ibid. 5.5.1. (Heb.11.5)

4. Vide Stephen Gobar (apud Photium cod.222 pg.904) 6th Century

5. H.E. 5.26

6. Euseb. H.E. 5.8; Iren. 4.20.2 Westcott (Canon of the N.T. 1881 ed pg. 384) refers to the second Pfaffian Fragment of Irenaeus' writings as quoting Hebrews as the work of St. Paul --- but the Pfaffian Fragments though regularly quoted to the end of the 19th Century have been convincingly rejected by Harnack whose views were based upon Pfaff's (d.1760) use of a late Textus Receptus of the N.T. and of defective printed editions of the Greek text of Irenaeus' works current in the 18th Century, mingled with Pfaff's own theological tenets.

7. De Doctør. Christ 2.8. et passim

8. Comment on Ps. 119

9. Moral. 5.3.

question of actual authorship may well have been in doubt,¹ but this is not fatal to the acceptance of the authority of the Epistle. Jerome in his Letter to Dardanus reminds us that it is of no great matter whose it is 'since it is certainly the work of an ecclesiastical man and is continually used every day in the reading of the churches'² May we conclude in this matter with the words of Gregory in his Commentary on the Book of Job chapter 10 --- ' who wrote these things, it is superfluous to ask, if only we believe faithfully that the Holy Spirit was the Author of the Book ---- since it is more important to know the real author and understand the meaning, than to discover which pen traced the characters.'

In his Commentary on Hebrews published 1st. June 1529, Cajetan had expressed grave doubts as to the authority of the Epistle --- he quotes Jerome at length, and concedes that St. Paul cannot confidently be held to be the author; he then goes on to argue that doubt as to authorship involves doubt as to authority. This doubt he justifies by reference to what he regards as false arguments, e.g. Chapter 9 verses 15 ff. He explains the importance he lays on the evidence of Jerome by a significant sentence ---- 'quos (libros)

1. Westcott 'Canon of the N.T. Pref. LXXIII notes the significant change from the earlier view of the West to that which finally prevailed, in the language of the decrees of the African Councils ---- The Council of Hippo 393 AD and the first Council of Carthage 397 AD has Pauli Ap. Epistolae XIII; eiusdem ad Hebraeos una'; by the time of the Second Council of Carthage 419 AD the two clauses are combined into 'Epist. Pauli Ap. numero XIV.'
2. 'et nihil interesse cuius sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur '.

ille canonicos tradidit, canonicos habemus; et quos ille a canonicis
discrevit, extra canonem habemus.' The Colophon to his Commentary is
also interesting ---- 'Caietae die I Junii MDXXIX Commentariorum
Thomae de Vio, Cajetani Cardinalis Sancti Christi in omnes genuinas
epistolas Pauli et eam quae ad Hebraeos inscribitur, Finis'.

The Authority of Tradition (s)

Duraeus challenges Whitaker on the authority of unwritten traditions (*ὑπόφωσ*) ¹ saying that it was the familiar practice of the ancient heretics to appeal to the written Word of God only. Tertullian ² argued for an appeal to tradition for the resolving of doubts. Basil argued ³ that Apostolic tradition had the force of written traditions, and Augustine writes that these things which are not written but which we hold as traditional (tradita) should be kept throughout the whole world ----- on this he defends infant baptism as being grounded upon Apostolic Tradition ----- and that in those things in which no certainty is derived from Scripture, the custom of the people of God is that the precepts of the greater should be held as lawful. ⁴

1. Contra Duraeum 1.16 vide etiam 6. 14;9.29; - the question is more fully discussed in the Disputatio Quaest. 6. 'Concerning the Perfection of Scripture against human traditions' Parker Soc. ed.pp. 496-704. Vide Trent Sess. IV 8th April 1546 where Apostolic truth is contained in the 'written books and unwritten traditions' received ' by the Apostles from the lips of Christ Himself or by the same Apostles at the dictation of the Holy Spirit' and handed on to us. Bettenson 'Documents' pg.365. Vide etiam Vatican I Sess. 3. Dog. Constitut. Vide etiam 'Documents of Vatican 2.' ed Abbott (1966) pg. 115 and the interesting qualifications of the Tridentine and post-Tridentine view that Scripture and tradition may be treated separately, and statements of revealed truth (dogma) may be gathered from tradition alone, though in no way contained in Scripture. The Question was much debated in Vatican 2; the final text in Art. 8. explains the nature of the two forms of transmission (the Fathers preferred no decision or choice in the primacy of either) while Art.9. insists on their functional unity ---- and so while parity of reverence may be given to both, there is no summary authority given to ~~Scripture~~ ^{tradition} alone. Sacred Tradition and sacred Scripture both in vital communication 'stem from the same divine well spring, and merge into a unity and tend to the same end' and 'form one sacred Deposit of the Word of God. 'Docs. Vat. 2' pg. 117. Art 12 states that the Church always understands and interprets Scripture in the light of her tradition.

2. De Corona Militum Vide R.P.C. Hanson 'Traditions of the Early Church' (1962) pg 136

3. De Spiritu Sancto. 27

4. Contra Donat. Bk. 5.26 De Cypriano; ibid Bk.2. De Baptismo; de baptismo non repetendo loquens. Hanson (pg 136) also quotes Contra Donat: De Baptismo 4.6.9;2.7.12; saying the view was Tertullian's but formally argued by Augustine as the 'proper assumption for Christians to make',

Whitaker replies that it is not true to say that the ancient heretics appealed to Scripture alone; they had their ramifications of venerated hidden writings (scripta occulta), apocryphal books and secret tradition (tacitas traditiones) ¹ There was a superfluity of counterfeit writings (cartas suppositivias) and indeed they seem to have this in common with you, of not being willing to acquiesce in Scripture. Tertullian wrote ² 'aufer hereticus quae cum Ethnicis sapiunt ut de Scripturis solis quaestiones suas sistant et stare non potuerunt'. It was not the heretic that appealed to Scripture alone but those who wished to answer their questions and refute their errors! Tertullian showed himself ³ satisfied with Scripture alone ---- 'nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus nihil desideramus ultra credere; hoc enim primum credimus non esse quod ultra credere debeamus' and he wrote this when he was a catholic. When he became a Montanist he laboured diligently, e.g. in his De Corona Militum (c.211 AD), for many traditions; ~~he~~ ^{whitaker} asked if Duraeus was really arguing on the right side, and if he would urge Tertullian the Montanist against Tertullian the catholic to defend the traditions.

1. Origen Comment. Serm, 46 on Mt. ---- true tradition (i.e. scriptural) maintained 'per successionem' is a safeguard of Scriptural Revelation (vide Vatican 2 Art.12. in Documents of Vatican 2 ed. Abbott pg. 117) against the 'secretae scripturae' of the heretics Vide R.P.C. Hanson Origen's Doctrine of Tradition pg. 182.
2. De Resurrect. Carnis (written c. 199 AD)
3. De Praescript. written c200 AD. Tertullian officially joined the Montanists c.207 AD. He distinguished between 'traditio' (i.e. the traditional doctrine of the church as taught in his day and, as he presumed had always been taught from Apostolic times) and 'observatio' or 'consuetudo' (De Corona 2.1-3) = traditional custom e.g. whether Christians should marry again after the death of their Partner, whether virgins should be veiled during public prayer, whether Christians may wear the corona of victory or celebration during pagan games etc. The latter was more than academic as a Christian soldier had recently been executed for refusing to wear a corona during a military review in honour of an imperial anniversary! He makes use of the phrase 'Christ called Himself Truth, not Custom' (De Virg. Vel. 1.1.) Tradition in this secondary sense, was not a second source of truth beside Scripture, nor did it cover doctrine; it is doubtful whether it may be said on all sides to interpret scripture quite often; it supplements, and where Scripture is silent, may be observed by the rule of antiquity and reason -- the use of the word 'Apostolic' being applied perhaps uncritically if the custom is sufficiently ancient in origin.

For your quotation of Basil, you should read Erasmus on this place -----

he regarded the text as corrupt particularly since Basil had made his mind clear elsewhere ---- ' manifesta est a fide defectio est crimen superbiae, vel rejicere aliquid eorum quae scripta sunt vel introducere aliquid eorum quae scripta sunt'.¹ this would clarify what Basil means by Apostolic Tradition.

In the well known passages in De Spiritu Sancto² St. Basil refers to unwritten traditions ---- that in defending the Doxology he refers to three sources of material :-

- a) 'universal notions' about the Spirit (κοινὰ ἔννοια) which arise from contemporary philosophy (especially Neoplatonic)
- b) the Scriptures
- c) unwritten tradition (ἐκ τῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως) of the Fathers.

and in Chapter 27 he goes on to say that ' secret doctrines' (δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων) and 'public teachings' have been preserved in the church, and some of them we have from written teaching, and others we have received handed down to us in a mystery from the traditions of the Apostles (ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως). Both traditions have the same value for piety. If we disregard the unwritten ordinances of custom (τὰ ἀγραφα τῶν ἔθνῶν) on the ground that they have no great force, we would unawares damage the Gospel in the most important points themselves (εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ καίρια) or rather reduce public teaching to a bare name.

How otherwise can we account for making the sign of the cross, turning east for prayer, the use of the invocation (ἐπικλήσις) at the offering (ἀναδείξει) of the bread of the eucharist and the

1. There is a marginal note in Whitaker's text --- ἐπεισάγειν τι τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.

2. 7.16.93b; 9. 22. 108; 10 .25.112c; 27. 68. 196 (Hanson op. cit pg181)

cup of blessing ? For we are not content with the things which the Apostle or the Gospel recorded , but we add other words before and after on the grounds that they have great force in connection with the mystery , having received them from unwritten teaching (*ἀγράφου διδασκαλίας*). We bless the water of baptism , the oil of anointing , and the person baptised as well . From what documents ? From the secret and mystical tradition (*ἀπὸ τῆς σιωπημένης καὶ μυστικῆς παραδόσεως*). Baptism by threefold immersion -- surely this came from this unpublicised (*ἀδημοσιεύτου*) and secret teaching which our Fathers preserved as a silent proof against meddlers and busibodies (*ἀπολυπραγμονήτω καὶ ἀπεριεργάστῳ σιγῇ*) having learnt that the holy nature of the mysteries is preserved in silence.

St. Basil goes on to say that secret teaching was envisaged in the O.T. --- secret doctrine (*δόγμα*) is preserved in silence; public teaching (*κῆρυγμα*) is published . Daylight would fail him if he were to go through the unwritten mysteries of the Church and in Book 29 Basil goes on to say that most of the mystic rites (*τῶν μυστικῶν*) are given recognition without written authority (*ἀγράφως ἐμπολιτεύεται*) and that it was an Apostolic ordinance to abide by the unwritten traditions. He then quotes 1 Cor XI.2 and 2 Thess. 2.15.

Bellarmino¹ took up these quotations from Basil in his controversy with Whitaker later ² - Whitaker also replied to him that Erasmus doubted whether these were the true and genuine words of Basil , on the grounds that there is a change of style from the middle of book onwards , and Whitaker added that they contradict what Basil says elsewhere ; Basil's meaning appears to be that the Gospel without

1. In his Dedicatory Epistle to the Version of Basil.

John Damascene in his First Oration on the worship of Images quotes these words as Basil's , but he is much later in time and Whitaker notes that he was 'given much to traditions'. Jerome's comment on Basil's 'old tradition' (*λόγον ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀφιγμένον*) of the martyrdom of Zechariah , the father of John the Baptist (Hom. on Christ's Nativity) was that it was purely apocryphal and rejected with many things.

2. Controvers. 2.7.

unwritten traditions has no force but is a mere name (ψιλόν
 ὄνομα) ----- if he meant that it is of no avail without preaching
 and interpretation, Whitaker would have agreed, but he is actually
 speaking of certain rites and ceremonies contained in Scripture e.g.

a) the sign of the cross; - τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦς
 ἡλιπικότης κατασημαίνεσθαι.

Whitaker agrees on this ancient ceremony used
 from the earliest times, but the salvation of the soul does not depend
 upon it.

b) turning to the East when praying ---- πρὸς ἀνατολῆς πετράφθαι
 κατὰ τὴν προσεύχην -- but the Gospel is not ruined if we turn to the West
 like the Antiochenes (Socrates Bk. 5.22) or if we follow Eucherius
 Bishop of Lyons (d.c.449AD) and of the monastery of Lerins, a keen
 exponent of the ascetic way of life, who wrote in his Commentary on the
 Books of Kings (Bk.2.cap.58 - sic) that no precept directs our position
 in prayer 'provided only the mind be present with God'. Ignorance of the
 reason for this custom prompted Basil's remarks --- we agree with the
 custom and reason, writes Whitaker, but tie no necessity to it.

c) The words of Invocation at the Eucharistic Bread and Wine ---- then why
 did the Roman Canon lack it, if it is so important ! In the Roman Mass
 there is no clear Epiclesis. ¹

1. Vide Blomfield ' Eucharistic Canon' pg. 108 (1930 ed) The Apost.
 Tradition of St. Hippolytus (c. 215 AD) contains a petition for the
 illapse of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine, but the purpose
 here seems not to consecrate but to 'empower' the elements (*Σύναισις*)
 with the Holy Spirit that by reception, the communicants may receive Him.
 An Epiclesis exists also to be invoked over the communicants direct, and
 while in the East this form has been conflated with the consecratory
 action, in the West there is no such clear identification. Cranmer,
 following the Calvinist liturgical tradition (as still practiced in
 Scotland (C.17 . Westminster Directory for Public Worship) introduced
 such a prayer (with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and
 sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine) before the
 words of Institution into the 1549 BPC. --- removed 1552, and not
 reintroduced in 1662. The Eastern rites abound with it.

d) Blessing of the water of Baptism ----- but Justin Martyr¹ when he describes the manner and form of baptism among the early Christians makes no mention of blessing the water, nor did Philip use it.² Chrysostom writes³ that Christ by His Baptism sanctified all water --- not to bless is not to render invalid.

e) Triple immersion at Baptism --- *τῆς βαπτίσεως* 4
but Gregory writes⁵ that it is of no matter whether we use trine or single immersion, while Cyprian⁶ seems to favour aspersion rather than immersion; Canon 5 of the Council of Toledo prohibited triple immersion. (633 AD).

f) Renunciation of Satan in Baptism ---- *ἀποτάξασθαι τῷ Σατανᾷ* - true, says Whitaker, but surely this is part of the Faith; formal renunciation is good, but you can hardly profess true and genuine faith without the renunciation of Satan.

It seems, then, the church had Basil's teaching very little in regard on this matter --- to have discarded his injunctions, or never to have adopted them. You will have to look a little more into the meaning of Basil. The time of Basil's writing was a Golden age of forgeries ---- as RM. Grant also writes in his 'The Appeal to the Early Fathers'⁷ -- and as Basil was writing his works, the author of the Apostolic Constitutions may have been compiling his work, and many similar inventions were soon to follow. Much circulated under venerable names in the post-Nicene period -- the appeal to unwritten tradition was a fertile one in an uncritical age, but it can be seen that Basil, though he joins the appeal to traditions in many forms, is quite clear

- 1. Apol.2.
- 2. Acts 8.
- 3. Hom.25 on John
- 4. Vide etiam Apost. Canon. 50
- 5. Gratian Dist. 4 de consecr. C. de Trina. Epi.4.Bk.1
- 6. Epi. 7. Bk. 4
- 7. R.M.Grant 'The Appeal to the Early Fathers ' JTS (NS) 11 1960

when it comes to matters of faith . He supports practices that have no exclusive support in Scripture --- but they have support in time-honoured and recognised traditions , which popularly have come to be known as Apostolic ; this is the only way he can support the customs, but what he is supporting is not primary doctrine but customs and rites ; there is no claim to have a second source of revelation and doctrine parallel to, but independent of, Scripture. Further, the Bible is not a manual of ecclesiastical law nor of liturgy , and by his time both these had become important elements in the life of the church ; the legend of Apostolic origin for rite and custom must be maintained in the lack of anything better , and tradition becomes equated with the exercise. But this is quite a different thing from the 'Regula Fidei' , when tradition becomes a vehicle for expressing the Faith , not the Faith itself. What Bellarmine and Duraeus were trying to do was to make the customs and rites , observances and traditions, define what they should express-- in other words, they had their priorities wrong.

Augustine's mind, too , is clear . Whitaker writes 'quanta semper gravitate Scripturarum ἀὐτάρκειαν defendit' -- for in writing to Petilianus he says ' auferantur illa de medio quae adversus nos invicem non ex divinis canonicis libris sed aliunde recitamus' and when speaking of Cyprian he defines the Apostolic Tradition as 'doctrinam scriptis Apostolicis traditam '. On the baptism of infants, the children of Christian parents , Whitaker says that there is the clear support of Scripture for the practice , and Duraeus can put forward no Roman tradition 'which we disallow, which has been observed by the church universal '. When Scripture leaves these things uncertain, then the custom of the People of God and the practice of the greater number decide them. ' I cannot , for the life of me ' writes Whitaker ' see how you can vouch for the voice of the church when you make so many Fathers strangers to it. '

Duraeus challenges¹ Whitaker's view that Athanasius affirmed the sufficiency of canonical Scripture for all truth so as to put to flight traditions. The writings of the Fathers (*monumenta Patrum*) are to be added to Scripture. Whitaker denies that such sufficiency puts to flight either traditions or the works of the Fathers --- we read the Fathers to learn the mind of Scripture not to collect traditions alien to Scripture . Athanasius' own words are ' *Scripturas ad veritatis indicationem sufficere* ' . It is one thing to say that all heretics reject tradition, and another to say that all who reject tradition are heretics.² Athanasius joined books written by most devout writers with the Scriptures in the complex interweaving of his arguments , but in no other way than as an interpretation of Scripture ; he wrote ' *quos si quis evolvat , intelliget, aliquo modo Scripturarum mentem* ' ³ and at the beginning of this letter are the words ' *piae quidem religionis et veritatis de universo ratio cognitioque non tam indiget humana institutione , quam ipsa se suis notis iudiciisque prodit pr.* ' . As to Paul's words ' *state et tenete traditiones quas didicistis sive per sermonem sive per Epistolam nostram* ' ⁴ which Duraeus took as meaning that Paul commanded the Thessalonians many things not written , Whitaker replies that there is no need to assume the Apostle taught one thing in word , and another in writing -- this argues inconsistency . There is nothing to prevent the conclusion that being present , Paul taught them by word and later committed it to writing -- it would then be *ἀνακόλυθον* .

-
1. *Contra Duraeum* cap. 6.13 *De Firmamentis Patrum* . Duraeus's comment was ' *O Sagacissimos Calvinianos* !
 2. *Disputatio Quaest.* 6.13 Parker Ed. p. 610.
 3. Athanasius *Ad Macarium* (of Egypt d. 390 AD) *Contra Idol.*
 4. *Contra Duraeum* 9. 27. *2 Thess.* 2.15. Duraeus cites Chrysostom *Hom 1. on Acts* ; Epiphanius *Haer.* 61. Basil *De Spiritu Sancto* 29.

Later, to Bellarmine¹, Whitaker draws attention to the point that the old heretics were accustomed to saying that the Apostles taught the 'perfecti' 'viva voce' and all things were not committed to writing ---- so 'scriptura non sufficere ad veritatis cognitionem sine traditionibus'. Irenaeus² said that heretics, convicted out of Scripture, betake themselves off to accuse Scripture as being insufficient, so that the truth cannot be found out of them by persons ignorant of The Tradition, since truth was not delivered in writing but in speech, as Paul said 'we speak wisdom among the Perfect'. The fact is that the heretics not only disagreed with Scripture, but with Apostolic Tradition too, now Marcionites, now followers of Cerinthus and so on. The episcopal ~~sa~~ succession of those primitive days knew of no secret traditions which conflicted with the written word --- the Apostolic Tradition was clear to catholics. It is true, both Apostolic and Dominical words do appear as preserved by tradition and omitted at the beginning e.g. 'it is more blessed to give than to receive' but this did **not** conflict with the truth of Scripture nor did it claim to add to Revelation ---- to attempt the latter is the function of heresy. At one time, the Talmudists taught that God gave Moses on the Mount not only the Law but also the 'Explicatio³ Legis' ---- Moses delivered the Law to the people and left the 'Explicatio'

1. Contra Bellarminum Controvers. 2. chapter 7

2. Adversus Omnes Haereses 3.2.

3. Disputatio Quaest. 6 chapter 13 --- Whitaker claims that it is a mere Talmudic and cabbalistic fancy to suppose that the Law was delivered by Moses but the mysteries of the Law were concealed by him, and entrusted only to persons wiser than the rest. Jerome will tell what he thinks of the Mishnah (*Σευτερωσις*). Bellarmine himself admitted that the papists were not really agreed upon the extent and possibility of Jewish secret traditions. Moses recited all the words of the Law to the People. Exod. 24.3. For *ἄγραφα* (extra canonical sayings of Xt) vide Bloomfield Jackson 'Twenty five Agrapha' S.P.C.K. 1900 edition.

to Joshua and others. The papists seized upon this and as we see from Genebrad's Chronology 1.4. and from Canus 3.3, claim 'Sapientiam loquimur inter Perfectos'. Turrianus had the effrontery to say that if Christ had left Scripture alone as the only rule of faith, then 'quid aliquid quam gladium Delphicum haberemus?'.

It is, however, to the 'Disputatio'¹ of 1588 AD that we must look for a closer examination of this subject of Tradition, and whether the canonical books of the O.T. and N.T. comprehend a full and perfect body of teaching, or whether traditions (unwritten) are required to complete this necessary doctrine. The question is examined under seven heads ---- a definition of the word 'Traditio', a classification of traditions, rules to discern between true and false traditions, the dogmas founded upon tradition, a summary of the state of the questions, and finally the papist arguments and our answers to their arguments.

Παράδοσις or 'traditio' denotes a doctrine or custom handed down or handed over, in any manner, whether written or unwritten. In Acts 6.14 *καὶ ἀλλήλοις τὰ ἔθνη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς* the Vulgate translates *ἔθνη* as 'traditiones'; here the legal ceremonies, consigned to writing, and given the name of Moses. The Fathers, too, sometimes understand written teaching by this term e.g. Cyprian writing to Pompeius, where, in spite of Lindanus' view² that Cyprian is praising an unwritten tradition in defending the rebaptism of heretics --- a strange point for a papist ---- appeals to the canonical N.T., the Gospel, Epistles, and Acts severally considered, as a holy tradition (*haec divina sancta traditio*) as grounds for such a practice since with Tertullian³ he allowed that true baptism was to be found

-
1. Quaest. 6 Parker Society ed. pg. 496-704 in 17 chapters
 2. Lindanus Panoplia 2.5. said that tradition was the Homeric *Μῶλυ* preserving the Christian Faith against the spells of the heretics. In 1.9. he called it the Lydian stone i.e. the test of true and false doctrine; in 2.9 it is the shield of Ajax against all heretics while in 5.2. he calls tradition the 'fundamentum fidei'. Canus (Common Places 3.3.) claimed that traditions are of greater efficiency than scripture for the refutation of heretics
 3. De Baptismo 15

only in the catholic church. Cyprian is quite explicit later in this work ---- "ea enim facienda esse quae scripta sunt, Deus testatur".

Basil in his Contra Eunomium 3, speaking of Baptism, writes of the

παράδοσις τοῦ σωτηρίου βαπτίσματος

in using the threefold Name --- the papists would claim this as an unwritten tradition too, but the use of κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου

παράδοσιν by Basil would suggest the use of the text &

(disputed but early) of Mt.28.19 --- certainly the evidence for unwritten tradition is not strong here.

The παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

of Matthew 15.2. and again in verses 3 and 6 of the same chapter point

to a distinction of origin i.e. the commandment (ἐντολή) was

from God, the παράδοσις was from the elders, or from you (i.e.

the scribes and Pharisees), rather than the fact that the Law was written

but the tradition was not. Indeed the papists should examine 1 Corinthians

11.23 ὁ καὶ παρέδωκε ὑμῖν in this light; Paul had

delivered the tradition to them, but had not yet written it ---- now, he

commits it to writing, and so you get the Apostolic origin for a written

tradition.

Bellarmino would urge an unwritten tradition of the Lord -

--- Dominica Traditio ---- behind Cyprian's words ¹ "admonitos autem nos =

scias ut in calice offerendo Dominica traditio servetur" for the necessity

of mixing water with the wine in the eucharist. It had been said that

Christ was the true Vine and therefore only wine should be used.

Whitaker replies that there is nothing conclusive here for an unwritten

tradition as Chemnitz will tell you, though Bellarmine thought him

deceived. The mixture was approved or mentioned without disapproval by

Justin Martyr ², Irenaeus ³ and Clement of Alexandria ⁴ ----

1. Epi. 63. De Journal Euchiridion 582.

2. Justin Martyr Apol. 1.65 Ἐπεὶτα προσφερεταὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν ἱδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος

3. Irenaeus Adv. Haeres (τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον) 5.2.2.

4. Paedagogus 2.2.19 ἀναλόγως τοίνυν κίρνεται ὁ μὲν οἶνος τῷ ὕδατι ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἀύθις κρᾶσις ποτοῦ τε καὶ λόγου εὐχαριστία κέκληται De Journal Euchiridion pg151

and there are two points made, first, the practice of mixing water with wine was not uncommon in the ancient world and therefore when Christ 'took the cup' what was in it may not have been only wine, ¹ and second, there is coupled with the eucharistic cup the reference in John to the pierced side, from which came blood and water; the eucharist is the covenant of Christ's Passion and Death, as well as His Resurrection. It would appear then, that the reference to unwritten traditions in the early Fathers concerns not a corpus of information independent of Scripture but to primitive practices, institutions, and customs confirming the teaching of Scripture. Whitaker remarks that Bellarmine could have quoted 2 Maccabees. 15.39 "for as it is hurtful to drink wine or water alone, and as wine mingled with water is pleasant and delighteth the taste etc". When it was lawful to use water provided it did not destroy the nature of the wine but only tempered and diluted it. Whitaker in a later passage ² says that Cyprian made too much of this tradition ----- he wrote "if the wine be without water, then Christ is without the people; if the water be without wine, the people is without Christ" ----- can Christ be severed so easily from His Church, Whitaker comments ?

The Fathers, however, do sometimes take the word *παρὰ δόξης* to signify unwritten tradition and Whitaker quotes ³ Tertullian in his 'De Corona Militum' ---- "traditio tibi praetendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix" and Basil in his De Spiritu Sancto chapter 27 ---- but the papists, like Bellarmine,

1. Parker Society ed. pg. 499

2. *ibid.* pg. 603.

3. Whitaker writes De Corona Militis ; Tert. De Corona Militum cap.4.

Whitaker could also have mentioned Chrysostom Hom 4.2. on 2 Thess, and Anastasius Sinaita (ob.c. 700 AD --- vide Migne 89. 40.c.) though the latter is late.

over-simplify the distinction following pseudo-Dionysius claiming the written tradition to be scripture and the unwritten, tradition --- this distinction must be borne in mind during the controversy, as it is so easy to use terms which mean different things to different people, and thus a lot of surplus heat is generated.

On the classification of traditions, Bellarmine following Peiresius,¹ adopts a major twofold distinction;-

a) of the author

1. Divine or Dominical --- of this kind, Bellarmine mentions the matter and form of the sacraments which are not found in Scripture. We affirm that the whole essence of the sacraments is delivered in Scripture.

2. Apostolic --- i.e. with the Holy Ghost, the Apostles left certain traditions not mentioned in the Epistles e.g. the Lenten Fast. Some papists, comments Whitaker, would defend this as Dominical by example. The Rhemists on Matthew 4, from a passage in Jerome, showed that Christ fasted 40 days in order that by His example He might leave us certain solemn days of fasting. Alphonsus de Castro Contra Haeres. 8 said that grave divines affirm that Lent was instituted by Christ. Whitaker comments that if this be so and Matthew 4 is admitted in this way, then it is no longer an 'Apostolic tradition' but Dominical and written and therefore belongs to 1. Hosius, however, in his Confessio Petrocoviensis chapter 4 affirms 'Mater Ecclesia ... quadraginta dierum jejunium instituit' which makes it an ecclesiastical tradition.

3. Ecclesiastical traditions from the powers of bishops, and especially ~~the~~ Roman Bishops, which by decrees and the consent of the nations, obtain the force of laws. He gives no examples of these but Trent commands us to receive and reverence (unwritten) traditions with the same pious affection as scripture; therefore though Bellarmine distinguishes various kinds of traditions, Trent makes no such distinction and so makes ecclesiastical traditions of equal authority with scripture. Bellarmine would add that the authority of the Word of God does not depend upon it being written---

1. A Spanish Jesuit and distinguished Biblical scholar (d. Rome 1610 AD)

a good reason, provided he can prove that those institutions were instituted by Christ or the Apostles.

b) as matter or content;-

1. matters of faith e.g. the perpetual virginity of Mary,¹ and that there are only four Gospels. But neither of these points rest upon unwritten tradition ---- Jerome, Ambrose and Epiphanius wrote against Helvidius and brought scriptural testimonies to prove the perpetual virginity, though Basil in his Homily on the Nativity of the Lord affirms the dogma to be ἀπολυπραγμονήτον τῷ τοῦ μυστηρίου λόγῳ :
The fact that there are four Gospels certainly does not rest upon unwritten tradition ---- they are themselves evidence of divine inspiration, to which all other gospels are brought as to a touchstone, and there is an abundance of written testimonials to their validity

2. Customs --- e.g. the sign of the cross, feast days; Bellarmine makes those perpetual which are means to an end, others he makes temporary such as legal ceremonies to enable the church, composed of Jews and Gentiles, to unite into a body. But, says Whitaker, these are far from unwritten ---- we read of Timothy being circumcised, the injunction to

1. De Perpetua Virginitate B. Mariae Adv. Helvidium (Cayre Vol. 1.pg. 593)
Jerome defends the perpetual virginity of Mary 'ante partum et post partum (against Helvidius) et in partu (against Jovinianus)(Epist 109.1)
Didymus the Blind, entrusted by Athanasius with the Catechetical School at Alexandria gave her the title *λειπαρθενος* (ever Virgin). He numbered Jerome among his pupils. Bonosus, Bishop of Sardica c. 380 AD asserted that the B.V.M. had other children, but he was condemned by the Council of Capua (391-2 AD) the Council of Thessalonica, and Pope Siricius. Epist.9. Cochlaeus stated that neither *Deipara* nor *θεοτόκος* were Scriptural terms but Whitaker replied that the Fathers were clear on this from Mt.1.23 and Luke 1.35. On the perpetual virginity, Whitaker notes Ambrose Epist. 31 and 79, who says that Christ would not have commended Mary to John if she had had a family of her own. Epiphanius wrote even more on this point against the Antidico- Marianites, though Whitaker expresses no desire to 'meddle with that dispute'.

the Gentiles to abstain from things strangled and from blood. Bellarmine will say that they are written to us, not to them. This is not entirely true, answers Whitaker, since the law that requires mutual charity requires that in things indifferent we should consider the weaker brethren and abstain from those things that might offend; therefore these things do not depend solely upon unwritten tradition.

Four further distinctions follow --- the universal tradition such as the whole church everywhere observes e.g. Easter ---- and the particular tradition which only certain churches observe e.g. fasting on Saturdays formerly peculiar to the Roman Church ---- and the necessary tradition, delivered in the form of a precept e.g. Easter to be kept on a Sunday ---- and the free tradition, delivered in the form of a counsel, not of a precept e.g. the sprinkling of holy water.

On the distinction between genuine and spurious traditions, Bellarmine proposed five rules;-

1. Whatsoever the universal church holds as an article of faith, though not found in Scripture, is without doubt Apostolic because the church cannot err, since it is the ground of the truth.¹ Whitaker denies the premise, but defers discussion on the proposition that the church cannot err to a later time. The church however does not always consist of the greatest number, but sometimes of the fewest and meanest. The whole question turns upon what you mean by the word 'universal' ----- vox majorum non semper vox Dei. The University of Paris admits no one to

1. Bk. 4.9. Whitaker Quaest. 6.4. Disputatio

any of the higher degrees in divinity who does not solemnly subscribe 'de fide' to the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.¹, and the Spanish Universities do the same; they have made an article of faith of that which formerly was a matter of opinion ----- is this the action of the universal church, and do you unchurch others without it? Certainly Bellarmine does not agree with Stapleton over this matter ----- Bellarmine wrote that the catholic church rests in all articles of faith as delivered by the Apostles and Prophets and needs no new revelation. Stapleton on the other hand said² that if the church wished, it could add another book to canonical Scripture (if the Holy Spirit so suggest³).

2. If the universal church observes anything such as could not be instituted by anyone but God, though not mentioned in Scripture, then we must decree it Apostolic, since the Church can no more err in act than in belief, and for this he quotes Augustine³ ----- 'illa autem, quae non scripta sed tradita, custodimus, quae quidem toto terrarum orbe observantur, dantur intelligi vel ab ipsis apostolis vel plenariis conciliis (quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas) commendata atque statuta retineri" ---- Whitaker replies that Augustine in saying that it is absurd to dispute that which the whole church observes, is arguing from the general to the particular e.g. infant baptism, and not rebaptising those baptised by heretics ---- the former he regards as an Apostolic custom and tradition,⁴ and on the latter Augustine writes⁵ that he praised Cyprian for saying that we should appeal in this question to the fountain of Apostolic Tradition i.e. Scripture. Augustine, from 'the most weighty testimonies of Scripture' said that he doubted not that Cyprian would have corrected his opinion if he had

1. Parker Society Ed. Disputatio pg. 505. Canus 'De Maria Deipara Virgine' 1.7.
2. Bk. 9.
3. Epist. 118 (sic) should read Epist. 54 Ad Januarium Vide De Journel 1419
4. De Genesi ad Lit. 10.23. Vide etiam Contra Donat. De Baptismo cap. 24 'I will be a God to thee and to thy seed i.e. thy children'; this covenant is sealed in Circumcision. Gen. 17.

been shown that Baptism is not lost to heretics when they went out, since there is 'One God, One Baptism', ¹ But what are these universal unwritten traditions mentioned by Augustine? The keeping of Easter, Ascension, Pentecost; Augustine divides tradition into free (i.e. changeful) and fixed (necessary) ---- but necessary for what? salvation? No---- but to avoid disorder, and that is why he argues from the general to the particular, although Augustine is bold in his assertion that he knows the universal practice of the whole church at that time. There is no issue between us on the keeping of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ ---- the issue is the grounds of authority for such observances.

3. Quoting Augustine's words ² that whatever the universal church has observed in former times and ages, is Apostolic, though instituted by no council, Bellarmine mentions as an example the ecclesiastical Orders quoting the Apostolic Canons. Whitaker argues that this casts a mantle over a very wide area ----- actually Bellarmine would have to consent

1. Ephes. 4.5. -- Augustine points out that though heretical Baptism lacked the charity of the church, yet the Baptism was one common Baptism with the saints ----- "baptismum tamen commune habere cum Sanctis"; 'we perceive', writes Augustine, by so many and great testimonies of Scripture, and clear reasons of truth, that Christ's baptism cannot be destroyed by the perversity of any man'.

2. De Baptismo 2.7.12 ---- "quam consuetudinem credo ex apostolico traditione venientem, sicut multa quae non inveniuntur in litteris neque in conciliis posteriorum et tamen, quia per universam custodiuntur ecclesiam, non nisi ab ipsis tradita et commendata creduntur".

Whitaker would point out to Bellarmine that Augustine's words are not 'whatever the universal church has observed in former times, is (ipso facto) Apostolic' ---- but 'whatever comes from Apostolic Tradition (and is acknowledged as such) though not found in writing or council' ---- the source is acknowledged Apostolic Tradition. In De Baptismo 4.24.31 this is put clearer ---- 'quod universa tenet ecclesia nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate apostolica, traditum rectissime creditur' --- the source is recognised Apostolic tradition, not just a custom found unwritten, and without conciliar authority, though generally followed.

to reduce the Orders to five, since five are mentioned in the Apostolic Canons, bishop, priest, deacon, reader, and chanter ----- you would have to omit exorcist, porter, acolyte, and others for which you claim Apostolic authority. Ambrose in his Commentary on Ephesians IV only names the ~~7~~ aforementioned five Orders.

4. When the Doctors of the Church, whether assembled in council or writing in their books, affirm something to be descended from Apostolic authority, then it is held to be Apostolic. Whitaker dismisses this with the comment ---- " such an egregarious rule"! This could underwrite all the Papal decrees, and Dionysius the Areopagite too !

5. That is to be deemed Apostolic which is held in those churches with an unbroken succession from the Apostles. "Here" remarks Whitaker "you are in real trouble, Bellarmine". Nicephorus ¹ traces the succession of Constantinople from the Apostle Andrew to his own time with less interruptions and breaks than Rome, for there were smaller intervals between successors and less schisms ----- Platina records gaps of two or three years between pope and pope, and in one Council, three popes were deposed and a fourth elected ² But even if we concede an entire and unbroken succession at Rome, it is a matter of no weight, since we regard not the succession of places or persons, but of faith and doctrine. Whitaker complains that for a church to put tradition so

1. Hist.8.6.

2. Council of Constance 1414 AD ----- John XXIII, and Benedict XIII were deposed and Gregory XII resigned; pope elected was Otto de Colonna who took the name of Martin V.

readily and enthusiastically forward as a foundation of dogma, it has ~~prov~~ proved itself remarkably tardy in furnishing a Catalogue of these dogmas so founded upon tradition. True Peter Soto in his book against Brentius, Canisius in his Catechism Chapter 5(De Praecept. Eccles) and the most copious of them all, Lindanus in his Panoplia,¹ have listed such things as the sacrifice of the Mass, unction in Confirmation, Invocation of the Saints, Primacy of the Popes, the necessity of satisfaction and auricular Confession, the Office of the Dead ----- but the frequent citation of Scripture in these matters leaves Whitaker with the impression that they are not so confident in this idea of Bellarmine, in tradition being the grounds of all dogma ---- they readily assert the rules for the use of unwritten traditions, but they are uneasy with their assertions and are not content with any confidence. Such hesitancy should never accompany such boldness in assertions of this kind.

It is true of course ² that everything Christ and the Apostles taught or did is not contained in the N.T. ---- of the 12 ~~A~~ Apostles seven wrote nothing and John 21.25 clearly states that not everything Christ did was committed to writing. Further, the Apostles, we concede, in establishing the church would **order** rites and customs for the sake of ecclesiastical order and decency, which were not committed to writing; but it is clear from 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 that all is directed to the end of securing order and edification, and while particular rites and ceremonies may be designated free not perpetual, all things necessary in faith and practice are plainly set forth in Scripture

1. Book 4. chapter 100

2. Cap.6 Parker Society Ed. pg. 513 ('The State of the Question')

which contains whole and necessary doctrine, which Bellarmine asserts is not 'expressly' contained in Scripture but needs unwritten traditions. The word 'expressly' is ambiguous ---- if Bellarmine means what is inferred and deduced by necessary argument from the Scriptures, we will accept his statement, ¹ We must use Scripture intelligently. We say that all necessary things are contained in Scripture though not always in express terms --- as Nazianzen said ² 'inferences from Scripture stand on the same footing with the actual words of Scripture' e.g. infant Baptism and Original Sin are not propounded expressly or directly and in set terms in Scripture, yet they may be inferred by the strictest reasoning. To comprise the matter in a few words, all things pertaining to faith and morals may be learned and derived from Scripture, so that traditions are not requisite for this purpose, though they are helpful, illuminating, and useful.

Bellarmino had stated that there was no Scripture from Adam to Moses, yet there was the Word of God, and so the Scriptures are not absolutely necessary. Whitaker perceives that this was culled from Chrysostom ³ though Augustine suggested ⁴ that something was written by Enoch, and Josephus refers ⁵ to the twin columns of stone and brick,

1. cp. Article 6 (39 Articles) De Divinis Scripturis quod sufficient ad salutem' ---- Scriptura sacra continet omnia quae ad salutem sunt nec necessaria ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur nec inde probari potest non sit a quoquam exigendum ut tanquam Articulus Fidei credatur aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur'. This paragraph is substantially the same 1552, 1563, and 1571 (39 Articles)

2. Theological Discourses (οἱ τῆς Θεολογίας λόγοι) Bk. 5 where he proves from Scripture, Tradition, and by his answers to the Pneumatomachi that the Holy Ghost is a Divine Person, not begotten as the Son, but existing by virtue of a procession (ἐκπορεύσις, ἐκπέμψις)

3. Hom. 1. on Matthew

4. De Civitate Dei 15.23

5. Antiq. 1.³

each with inscriptions, and Sixtus Senensis ¹ thought that the 'Book of the Wars of the Lord' was more ancient than the Pentateuch. Whitaker however concedes the point that there was no Scripture more ancient than the Books of Moses, and that religion remained pure for many years without Scripture, but he notes a twofold fallacy in the argument: it is said Scripture is not absolutely necessary therefore it is not necessary at all. Here lies the Jesuits' error for it is not every necessity that is absolute; some are hypothetical. God could teach us without Scripture and lead us to eternal life, but He chose that His teaching should be enshrined in Scripture, from which He purposes that we derive His Will and Doctrine. Not even food is simply necessary because God could nourish us without food, but only hypothetically. God conversed familiarly with the Fathers and immediately disclosed His Will, and Scriptures were not then necessary, but afterwards the method was changed and He chose that His Will should be committed to writing, and then Scripture became necessary. The second fallacy is of time ----- that once Scripture was not necessary, therefore it is not necessary now. The reasoning is inconsequential ---- the change is dictated by the necessity to provide more completely for the pure and uncorrupted preservation of His teaching. Doctrine delivered orally is easily corruptible and may be depraved, so that God was compelled frequently to repeat and renew it over and over again. The Scriptures are necessary for us that we might preserve the integrity of true religion. As for the time from Moses to Christ Dt.6. makes it clear where the fount of true religion lay ----- the people are commanded to converse about the Scriptures and to instruct their children in them, and the work of Josiah and Ezra is sufficient indication of the necessity of Scripture to pure religion. On the Third

1. Biblioth. Bk. 2.

Age of the Church, mentioned by Bellarmine, the Church is said to have existed many years after Christ without Scriptures. Whitaker replies ---- not so many; the early Church had the Books of the Old Testament in which were the Promises, and the news of their fulfilment was declared 'viva voce' by the Apostles, and not for many years before the Gospel was written ---- if Theophylact is right,¹ Matthew began to write his Gospel 8 years after the Ascension ----- *μετά ὀκτώ ἔτη τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως*. While Nicephorus says² it was 15, Eusebius³ it was 20, when Peter and Paul had already come to Rome.

Bellarmino proves his assertion with a quotation from Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* Book 3. chapter 4 1 ----- " quid autem, si neque apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissen nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias ?" ---- " what if the Apostles had left us no Scriptures, ought we not to follow the course of that Tradition which they delivered to those whom they entrusted with the Churches ?" Then Irenaeus goes on to mention the unlettered Barbarians, yet made wise and holy, holding firm to the faith (by Tradition). So, comments Bellarmine, nations lived admirably without the Scriptures, by the sole help of traditions. Whitaker agrees, but comments that those nations assented to the traditions delivered by the Apostles, and had salvation written in their hearts without ink or characters --- these are the words of Irenaeus, if you would read the passage further ----- by the power of the Holy Ghost; but examine the articles of Faith they had, and you will find from Irenaeus they were thoroughly Scriptural, which only proves the point about Scripture and Apostolic Tradition.⁷ For a time, though doctrine may be preserved intact without written documents,⁴ it is not safe for long

1. on Matthew 1.

2. H.E. 4. 14

3. H.E. 5.8.

4. Whitaker remarks that many couldn't read, but they held a sound Faith from Apostolic teachers.

--- indeed, it was not long before the Scriptures were in full circulation round the churches. We read from Eusebius ¹ that Ignatius "while he was making his journey through Asia (to Rome for his martyrdom) under the strictest military surveillance, confirmed the communities in the several cities where he stopped by verbal instructions and exhortations ---- urging them to cling closely to the tradition of the Apostles (τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως) which tradition, as his martyrdom was now at hand, he considered should of necessity (ἀναγκάϊον) be given a fixed form, in writing (ἔγγράφως) for the sake of security (ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας) The reason given was that heresies for the first time becoming common should be guarded against in this way as they were corrupting Apostolic doctrine. Whitaker used Christopherson's translation of Eusebius ----- Whitaker was quick to notice that Bellarmine had been using the 'faulty version of Rufinus' which read the plural παραδόσεων instead of the singular παραδόσεως , which he thought would be clear enough from the singular relative following. Whitaker also notices that certain words not found in Eusebius are subjoined by Bellarmine, though he does not say whether he follows Rufinus in this, to the effect that "Ignatius left these traditions in writing" for the safer preservation of Apostolic Tradition against heretics and to provide for the church hereafter. And what is culled from Ignatius that can be claimed as not in the Canon? Lent, the Minor Orders, the Lord's Day ? But on the Lord's Day, surely there are grounds for this in Apoc. 1.10 1 Cor. 16. 1 and

1. H.E. 3. 36 Vide etiam Ign. Magn. 11. 13.; Trall. 6.7; Philad. 3.

Σιγγων 4. (Lightfoot 'Apostolic Fathers' Vol. 2 Sect.2. pp 761 762; 737 738; 789; 804;) In **Σιγγων** IV Ignatius describes the heretics as "Advocates of deceit" (συνηγόρουσι τῷ ψεύδει) since they have not been persuaded by the Prophets, the Law of Moses, or by the Gospel itself (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) †

the *μὴ σαββάτων* of Acts 20. 7. The list of minor Orders does not agree with Ignatius. Lent is discussed elsewhere. Ignatius' Letter to the Philadelphians, chapter 5, ¹ would indicate the tradition that Ignatius has in mind ----- "fleeing to the Gospel, as to the flesh of Christ, and to the Apostles as to the presbytery of the Church. Let us also love the Prophets, foreasmuch as they also have led us to the Gospel, to hope in Christ and to expect Him". Chrysostom says ² that God addressed the Patriarchs immediately because of their purity of soul and faithfulness of mind, but He chose to instruct us through the medium of written documents since we are 'rude and dull'. Bellarmine commented on Chrysostom's first Homily on Matthew, that in his view Chrysostom concluded that Scripture was written by necessity because it was useful. Whitaker replies that the Homily takes a much more serious view in the light of 'enemies and adversaries (inimici et adversarii) ---- that they are so useful as to be necessary, and nothing is more useful than what is necessary !

1. Lightfoot. Apostolic Fathers. Vol.2 sect 2. pg.795

Ad Philadelph. cap.5. προσφυγῶν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας· καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δὲ ἀγαπῶ ὡς Χριστὸν καταγγείλαντας, ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ πνεύματος μετασχόντας, οὐ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι

2. Hom.1. on Matthew. Chrysostom. Opera Omnia. Paris ed. 1836. Vol.7. pp.2-10.

Why then, asks Bellarmine, if the written Canon is so essential, did not Christ command the Apostles to write? Whitaker replies "how do you know He didn't?" In Matthew 28.19 we read the Dominical command ----- *εὐαγγελίζετε*; this is the charge of the Apostolic Ministry -----

πορευθέντες and at the centre of this discharge of the Apostolic Office and Ministry are the words *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* "make disciples of all nations" ---- this by Baptism *λούουσι βαπτίζοντες* then by teaching further *διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλαμην ὑμῖν*.

The Holy Spirit governed the Apostles in the discharge of their Office, and impelled them to write as a thing most needful, sufficient for all ages, the more so with the delay of the Parousia. In Apoc.1.11 we hear

"those things which thou hast seen, write in a book" ----- *γράψον*

εἰς βιβλίον ; this is an express command. In Apoc. 14.13 John heard the voice *γράψον* ! Augustine said ¹ that Christ was the Head, the Apostles the hands, which wrote at the dictates of the Head --- they wrote what He showed and spoke to them, and by His Command and Will. Irenaeus said ² that the Gospel is delivered in the Scriptures 'by the Will of God'. Athanasius says ³ Christ composed both the O.T. and N.T.

1. De Consensu Evangelistarum (c.400 AD) Bk.1.

2. Haeres 3.1. ("in the first place preached by them (i.e. Apostles) and afterwards by the Will of God (per Dei voluntatis) handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith")

M.G. 7.844

3. ad Liberium. Whitaker translates *ὁ δὲ διὰ θεμενως* with 'composuit,' which he perhaps meant to be taken in the sense of 'arrange', ~~but~~ the argument remains valid.

while Gregory says ¹ that Scripture is the Epistle of God the Creator to His creature, and Augustine and Chrysostom make the same assertions.

Stapleton had said ² that *ὁμοουσίον* was not a Scriptural word, neither could the divinity of the Holy Spirit be proved from Scripture; therefore something more than Scripture was necessary to determine the Faith. "We are compared to those heretics", complains Whitaker "mentioned by Nazianzen,³ who maintained that the Holy Ghost was a 'strange God unknown to Scripture' (*ξένος καὶ ἄγνωστος θεός*) but though the Fathers could not produce the word from Scripture, Whitaker claims that they produced in the word the sense and meaning of Scripture⁴. In the Anchoratus (c. 374 AD) Epiphanius mentioned that the Arians blamed the term as unscriptural, but Ambrose proved it⁵ by many testimonies of Scripture, and writes "knowing therefore the unity of substance in the Father and the Son, on the authority not only of the prophets but also of the Gospels, how canst thou say that the Homoussion is not found in Scripture?". Augustine wished⁶ for the dispute to be managed not by the testimonies of the Fathers, or of Councils, but of Scripture itself. The catholics urged the Council of Nicaea which approved the term, the Arians urged the Council of Rimini, consisting of twice as many bishops, which rejected the term ----- Augustine wished that the authority of neither

1. Epi. 84. "Imperator coeli, Dominus hominum et angelorum, pro vita tua suas epistolas transmisit". It is Bk.4. Epi. 31. in the Paris Edition of 1705.

2. Bk. 12.5.

3. De Theolog.5. Cochlaeus maintained against Bullinger that Homoussion was from tradition, and declares it would be easier to prove the sacrifice of the mass from Scripture than the Homoussion or the Trinity.

4. Whitaker quotes Tert. Adv. Praxeas; Epiphan. Haer. 60 (i.e. 69)

5. De Fide C. Arian. capp. 4,5.

6. Contra Maximin. Arian. 3.14.

council should be alleged, but the authority of Scripture " a witness not peculiar to either of us, but common to both". In his dispute with Paxentius, he admits the term is not Scriptural, yet sanctioned by John and Paul. As for the Procession of the Holy Spirit and the Greek refusal to admit the filioque clause, the Council of Lyons in the time of Innocent IV condemned this refusal ----- here Whitaker is confused; it was not the Council of Lyons 1245 under Innocent IV, but the Council of Lyons 1274 AD that dealt with this question. It appears he mentions the correct Council of Lyons, because he refers to Thomas Aquinas dying on the way to it (i.e. 1274 AD) but he was mistaken with the Pope, the convener being Gregory X. During the Council Bonaventura proved in a most learned way from the Scriptures that the Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, a point already made clear by Thomas Aquinas, ¹ as Augustine had done in his 99th. Tractate on John.

True, the term Original Sin is not Scriptural, but Whitaker would have thought that a little reading of Augustine would have brought home the meaning of Romans 5.12 --- ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος -----
and Psalm 51. 7. As to the fourth example, mentioned by Stapleton, Christ's Descent into Hell not being mentioned in Scripture, Andradius ² has made it clear that this article cannot be gathered from Scripture. Bellarmine counters this by saying that it can --- from Psalm 16.10, Acts 2., and 1 Peter 3.19, and he would press these into service.

1. Quaest. 10. Disputat. Prima Secundae Qu. 36. Art.2.

2. Defens. Trident. Concil. Bk.2.

Whitaker replies that Rufinus states ¹ that the article 'descendit ad inferna' was not to be found in the Roman Creed of his time nor was it in the creeds of the Orientals, and it is wanting in the Nicene Creed. Among the 39 Articles, the earlier Article 3 of 1552 was more definite than the later one of 1563 AD which merely stated "quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendum ad Inferos descendisse", ² the earlier article read "the Body lay in the sepulchre until the Resurrection, but His Ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison or hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of Peter doth testify". The Roman Catechism affirms that He remained in Hell as long as His Body lay in the Sepulchre --- a view of the separation of the Body from the Soul that is suggested by Thomas Aquinas in his Summa Pt.3. Qu. 52. Art.4. Augustine in his 99th Letter writes that he has not yet discovered what advantages Christ's Descent into Hell conferred upon the just men of old time, since I do not see that as to the Beatific Presence of His Divinity, He ever withdrew from them'. How did Duraeus reconcile Christ's statement to the Penitent Thief "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise " ---- surely He never identifies this with the infernal kingdom ?

Duraeus had already made the point that

1. Expositio Symboli sect.20. But the article finds its way into the Aquilean Creed as reported by Rufinus; the earliest known occurrences are in the Arian formularies viz. the 4th Creed of Sirmium (359AD) and that of Constantinople (360AD), and from the Aquilean Creed spread over the West and found its way into the Apostles Creed and the so-called Athanasius Creed.

2. Presumably, the theological grounds being, to prove that a Greater than Jonah, a Greater than Soloman was to be the Risen Christ, and afford the souls the guarantee of that pending Resurrection as a historical fact, a seal of all the Promises of God. If the Risen Christ be refused then Sheol or Hades could become Hell.

the purpose of the descent was to free the Fathers ¹----- ut patres a limbo extraheret ---- and he quotes Jerome, ² Origen on Romans 5, Basil on Psalm 48, Ambrose 'De Fide' Book 3, Nazianzen, and Augustine (137 and 99) ---- Duraeus thereupon comments "surely it is not unknown to you, Whitaker, how seriously the Puritanss fume against you ³ for singing in your English verses;-

Tunc ima Christi Spiritus ad loca
 Descendit et lux splendida cordium
 Illuxit illis quos tenebrae
 Nube diu tenere caeca.

His Spirit did after this descend
 Into the lower parts
 To them that long in darkness were
 The true light of their hearts.

Whitaker answers that he accepts the article 'Descensus ad inferos' but it does not follow that this was to free the Fathers; there is a paralogism in Duraeus' argument, since what turns upon the question is conceded ----- descendens in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem' is a prophecy of Christ's Ascension and Triumph to the highest heaven; you cannot ~~deduce~~ necessarily deduce that 'in altum' means to free the Fathers from limbo. As for the verses, says Whitaker, caustically, ask the author of them !

Duraeus then asks Whitaker, what he makes of 'ipse servabitur ita tamen ut per ignem'. Basil ⁴ and Nazianzen and others thought that this refers to the purgation by fire at Christ's Coming. Whitaker replies that the flames of purgatory are very different from Paul's flames for Paul speaks 'de culpa', whereas in purgatory 'culpa' is not burned but punished ---- Paul's fire is a revelation, the fire of purgatory is punishment and reveals only guilt. Ambrose on Psalm 118 does

1. Contra Duraeum. 9.26

2. De Obit. Blesillae.

3. "Puritani in vos graviter invecti sunt".

4. De Spiritu Sancto. 15. Vide etiam Aug. on Psl. 37; Origen Hom. 12. on Jeremiah.

not mention purgatory -- to him Paul's fire is the 'Sermo Christi'. Whitaker concedes that some Fathers follow Origen who held the view that the wicked (dead) will suffer the pain of fire (though he spiritualised the fire) which would be quenched at the Apocatastasis--- but how doubtfully they followed Origen is indicated by Augustine who wrote¹ ' tale aliquid post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est et utrum ita sit quaeri potest ' and ' non redarguo quia forsitan verum est '.² Some Fathers thought that purgatory would come with the Second Advent but this is quite a different thing from the Pontiff's purgatory. Chrysostom wrote³ ' quando Deus peccata abolet nullam reliquam facit cicatricem , nullum vestigium sinit manere sed una cum sanitate eximium etiam confert formae decus . Simul enim atque eximit poenae donat et justitiam ; peccatorem enim facit parem ei qui non peccavit '. Nothing is kept back from purgatory ! Tertullian wrote⁴ ' exempto reatus eximitur et poena ' --- no penalty remains to be washed away in purgatory . Jerome on Psalm 31 writes ' quod tegitur non imputatur nec punietur '. The reference of Duraeus to the Day of the Lord⁵ as the Day of the Ultimate Judgement is not on the mark --- Paul writes not ' Dies Domini declarabit ' but ' dies enim declarabit ' (ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει); the phrase can refer to this present life as Ezekiel 30.8. has it --- 'propinqua est Dies Jehovae cum invadet gladius Egyptum'. Nor can the Romanist purgatory be concluded from the act of Judas Maccabaeus ; Whitaker is amazed to find that purgatory did in fact receive such a cold defence (tam frigidum defensum) from Duraeus.

-
1. Aug. Enchir. 69.
 2. Aug. De Civit. Dei Bk. 21.26.
 3. in Pref. on Isaiah.
 4. Tert. De Baptismo
 5. 1 Cor. 3.13 --- a matter of exegesis ; there is no problem in textual reading . Theodorus regarded it as the day of Judgement (ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως) of final manifestation and award. The ἀποκαλύπτει is the ethical present . The ἐν πυρὶ suggests an all-surrounding element ; vide 2 Thess. 1.8. -- the nature of the Parousia not purgatory.

Judas (Maccabaeus) offered sacrifice for those who perished in a very great sin for they stole away certain *ἱερουργατὰ* consecrated to the Idols of Jannienses ---- would you not put those who die in a great crime 'in inferno' rather than 'in purgatorio' ? In which case the text does not help you. It is true that Luther believed ¹ in the existence of purgatory in his early years, but as probable rather than as certain; in the same vein that he said that he believed in the existence of purgatory as he believed Thomas Aquinas to be a saint! He later changed his opinion and determined otherwise about purgatory.

Bellarmino takes Scriptural passages which to him indicate the existence of true traditions alongside Scripture and necessary to complete Scripture ----- an unfolding medium of revelation !^Rrevelatio revelata', 'revelatio relevans' and a 'revelatio revelatura' --- and he quotes the following texts;-

1. John 16.12 ' I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now' --- hence the rise of unwritten traditions to incorporate these sayings. Whitaker replies that to make the 'many things' refer to a separate corpus of traditions is to conflict with John 15.15 ' all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you'. There is no need to postulate a new means of revelation, since we have a clear example in John 2.22 of the lack of understanding on the part of the Apostles to the words of Christ uttered at one time ---- in three days he could rebuild the Temple. (of His Body) --- and the Evangelist tells us that it was not till after the Resurrection that the Apostles understood the true significance of these words. Whitaker refers to Jansenius, a 'popish author' commenting on John 16.12, who affirmed that the 'many things' are not different from what he had already taught them, but a 'clearer explication of them'. Paul could only feed the Corinthians as babes in

1. Arts 17 Assert

Christ, but we need not deduce from this that he willingly denied them things necessary to salvation. ¹ Whitaker supposes in the Jesuit's reasoning an 'ignoratio elenchi' ---- Christ did not say 'ye shall not write all' or 'ye shall not know all now' but 'I will not say now what I have to say, because you cannot bear it now' ---- does it therefore follow that later they did not know or did not write them all ? And what are these secret traditions you claim? The sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, its rites, ceremonies, gesticulations? ----- are such so pregnant with recondite and deep meaning ~~as~~ as to defy the believer ? Not at all. They can easily be understood by the most ignorant person. The whole argument reminds Whitaker of Augustine writing in Tractate 97 on John where Augustine tells us that many foolish heretics have used this text (John 16.12) to persuade people to accept their own figments as things reserved by Christ ---- and who can say whether they are true or false if Christ be silent? So any heady man can urge anything he pleases with utmost rashness and audacity; then will our salvation be a very slippery thing, without certainty of content.

2. John 21.25. ----- 'there are also many things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain both the books that should be

1. Jansenius was only 3 years old when Whitaker was writing his 'Disputatio' !----- Cornelius Otto Jansenius, the author of the Augustinum was born 1585 and died 1638 ! Whitaker is probably referring to Jansenius' uncle, Cornelius Jansen the elder (1510-1576) Bishop of Ghent from 1564 ---- he gives no reference to any written work.

written',¹ and so, writes Bellarmine, there must be many things unwritten. Whitaker replies that John does not here speak of Christ's doctrine or what He said, but of His acts,² and so the text is irrelevant ~~to~~ the argument. The matter to hand concerns the omission of doctrine not of deeds, for we do not say that all the signs, miracles, and acts of Christ are necessarily recorded. Nothing is wanting because all the acts of Christ are not recorded --- the scope of Christ's miracles was to prove His Messiahship and Divinity and to seal His doctrine as true, and these points could not be more firmly established by a longer catalogue of acts.

The argument 'all things are not written therefore all necessary things are not written' used by Bellarmine is inconsequenti-

-al

---- John 20.31 clarifies the position 'many other signs are not written in this book but these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you might have life through His Name' ----- the things written are sufficient for faith and salvation.³ Many things are omitted but nothing essential.

1. Omitted in the Codex Sinaiticus (~~∩~~) of the 4th Cent., though ~~Origen~~ Origen and others have it.

2. The same occurs in John 20.30. "many other signs did Jesus in the presence of His disciples which are not written in this book".

3. Aug. Tractate 49 on John ----- "electa sunt autem quae scriberentur quae saluti credentium sufficere videbantur". Cyril on John 21. Bk.12 writes that the things chosen and written were sufficient for faith and manners "ut recta fide et operibus ac virtute rutilantes ad regnum coelorum perveniamus" ---- so that clothed with the glory of an orthodox faith and a virtuous life we might reach the kingdom of heaven.

3. 1 Cor. 9 ----- ἔπαινῶ δέ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου
 μεμνήσθε καὶ καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς
 παραδόσεις κατέχετε

"I praise you, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions as I have delivered to you" --- and then Paul handles the question of public prayer and the eucharist, and both from traditions, claims Bellarmine, since they have not been written. ¹ Whitaker replies that the one concerns indifferent ceremonies (praying with the head covered) and the other external polity and order, both of which may be termed indifferent things. We do not say that all indifferent ceremonies are expressly delivered in Scripture, but necessary doctrine. But we concede that all Apostolic doctrine was not written when Paul wrote these words ---- but this does not say that all necessary doctrine was not written later i.e. in Apostolic times. All things are not written immediately, but when all the Apostolic writings were gathered, all things necessary to doctrine were abundantly contained in them. Indifferent ceremonies change, provided the end and reason be preserved -- 'the rest will I set in order when I come' adds no new doctrine but as the word διατάξουμι indicates, will deal with matters of order and decency. Chrysostom understood of τὰ λοιπὰ (the rest) as things of no great matter or weight. The eucharistic tradition was already in the process of being written, by Mark, Luke and Matthew, and that was the tradition received by Paul 'of the Lord' ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, the Dominical tradition. But the papists say that Paul is referring to the sacrifice of the Mass, ordination of clergy, the matter and form of sacraments ---- but then how could Paul write ² that the Corinthian Church was enriched in everything ἐν παντί

1. Bellarmine quotes Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Epiphanius with the same view.

2. 1. Cor. 1.5.

λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει if these 'necessary things' delivered later were omitted? Certainly in 1 Cor. 15.1.7. there is no indication that the Corinthian Church lacked anything of the necessary, whole, and complete body of the Christian doctrine.

4. 2 Thess. 2.15 ---- ἄρα οὖν, ἰδελφοί, στήκετε καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδίδαχθητε — brethren stand fast and hold the tradition which you have been taught — ---- εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν 'whether by word or our Epistle. Whitaker does not agree that Paul is merely speaking of things of no moment since the scope of the Epistle and the context refutes **this** idea; he agrees with Bellarmine that Paul delivered here matters of great moment in oral discourse and written epistle, but he does not agree with Bellarmine that the particle εἴτε is disjunctive, indicating that what was said was altogether different from what had been written. The particle εἴτε is sometimes conjunctive as in 1 Cor. 13.8 Whitaker would agree with Bellarmine that 1 Thess. does not contain all things necessary to doctrine ---- indeed, when Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians, if we believe Irenaeus,¹ not even the Gospel of Matthew was written ----- but it is one thing to say that the Thessalonians did not have the canon with all necessary doctrine, and quite another to say that we have the canon but not all necessary doctrine. Paul at this point mentions tradition as well as written teaching because the Apostolic tradition was not then in writing.

Bellarmino mentions that in 2 Thess. 2.5. Paul ~~delivered~~ delivered to the Thessalonians the actual time (year) of Antichrist's coming as part of his unwritten tradition, and he confirms this view from

1. Irenaeus Adv. Haeres. 3.1.

Augustine.¹ Whitaker accuses Bellarmine of abusing Augustine's words, ~~which~~ which meant not that the Thessalonians knew the time of the Antichrist's Coming but that they knew what delayed his coming, of which we are ignorant, and which we do not question. The impediment may have been that the Roman Empire was still safe and entire, or the Gospel was not yet preached to the whole world. Whitaker is not impressed with Chrysostom's commentary on these words of 2 Thess. 2.15 where he appears to equate Scripture and tradition, as equally deserving of credit (ὁμοίως ἄφιόπιστα) --- his words are "it is plain that the Apostles did not deliver everything in epistles but many things also without writing" --- the words are inconclusive as they stand, but in his 3rd. Homily on Philipians and in his 69th Homily to the people of Antioch, he says the 'Apostles sanctioned the mention of the dead in the celebration of the holy mysteries, as salutary to the departed, but he denies the custom to those who die in their sins'.

Whitaker states that Paul in this text is referring to the whole preceding series and choice of subjects (e.g that Antichrist should be revealed, sit in the Temple of God, and exalt himself) but did not predict the time of Antichrist's Coming. But if it be a tradition, then the papists will know it. But by tradition in this place, says Ambrose writing on Paul's words here, Paul meant 'doctrina evangelica' or the παράδοσις εὐαγγελίου abundantly contained in the canon.

5. 1 Tim. 6:20 ----- τὴν παράθεκην φύλαξον -----
 'keep the deposit' ----- which Bellarmine explained is not Scripture but doctrine and unwritten tradition; if it had been Scripture, the text would best suit the library or the Records Chest. Assuming that the word means sound and catholic doctrine, does it follow, asks Whitaker, that

1. De Civitate Dei 20. 19.

this necessary tradition is not written? Your own mind towards Scripture, Bellarmine, is clearly shown in your remark that they should be stored up in libraries rather than in the minds and hearts of men'---- Scripture is the living tradition of sound, catholic, doctrine not an occasional index or reference book. But Whitaker says 'assuming' at the beginning of this statement, because Cajetan has already made the point, and many divines agree with him, that *παραδόσις* here is not Scripture, but the flock committed to Timothy which suits *φύλαξον* better. Tertullian¹ on the other hand regards the text as referring to the doctrine already contained in this Epistle ---- Whitaker would prefer to amplify the word to include not only sound doctrine but also the office committed to Timothy, and all the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon him to the due discharge of that office.

6. 2 Timothy 1.13 *ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαϊνόντων λόγων*

This text, claims Whitaker, helps Bellarmine even less because

ὑποτύπωσις denotes an express image shining forth in matter or form or both; the Apostles therefore means that Timothy should make no change in the matter or form of the Apostolic Doctrine.

7. 2. John verse 12 ---- " having many things to write to you, I would not write with ink and paper, but I trust shortly to see you and speak with you face to face, that your joy may be full" / --- the same thought occurs in 3 John verses 13 and 14. Therefore, says Bellarmine, John said many things nowhere to be found in Scripture. Whitaker replies against the assumption that it is always conceded that not all necessary doctrine is found in Scripture. The finger is not the whole body, but this is not to say that the nature of the whole body does not consist in all its parts.

1. Praescript. 25.

Canus adds ¹ further Scriptural quotations in proof of unwritten tradition :-

1. 1 Cor. XI. 16 --- Paul presents custom and tradition where Scripture and natural reason fail . Whitaker replies that it is **strange** that ' so great a man , as Canus , should fall into such an egregious hallucination ' -- Paul does not say ' because you despise Scripture and reason, I present you with the custom of the church ' but that such a contention in such a matter is not the custom of the church .
2. 1 Tim. 6.3. -- here Paul refers to the ' wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ ² ' -- Canus excludes Scripture under these words , because only words are mentioned and not writings . Did Christ ever write anything ? Surely this is the correct form ! But, says Whitaker , by the same definition Canus must exclude tradition because this is written too. *Λόγος* when written does not cease to be *Λόγος* .

The Rhemists' mention of 2 Tim. 3.8. --that Paul had received the names of Jannes and Jambres from tradition , as we receive the names of the three Magi as Melchior, Caspar, and Balthazar ³, the name of the penitent thief as Dismas ⁴, and the soldier who pierced Christ's side as Longinus ⁵, who later died a martyr. Whitaker replies that they could have added the genealogies of Christ in Matthew and Luke too ! . These facts are interesting , but hardly necessary dogma. The historicity of the event is established in the Gospel.

1. Canus 3.6.
2. *ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις*
3. Various given by Legenda as Appellius , Amerus, and Damascus ; Magalath , Galgalath , and Saracin ; Ator, Sator, and Puratoras. Vide Casaubon c. Baron. Exerc. 11.10.
4. Gospel of Nicodemus.
5. From *λόγχη* the spear or lance.

Further ramifications are not necessary for if a man be not convinced with the Gospel, it is unlikely that he will be persuaded by the addition of further data. As for Acts 20.35 the unrecorded (sic) saying of Christ, "it is more blessed to give than to receive" this is no new thought ---- its content is in the Gospel e.g. in Luke 6 and 16. There is no need to go in quest of new traditions because of this text, for without it the Gospel would not suffer any diminishing, since it is from the Gospel. But I have already said, we concede that all Christ's sayings are not written,¹ yet all that are necessary are written. On Jude verse 9 the author proves that we must not speak evil of magistrates and gives the example of Michael from tradition. Whitaker replies that this is true but not to speak evil of magistrates does not hang upon this text --- there are other places in Scripture on this question. Lindanus urged the authority of unwritten traditions from Jeremiah 31. vv. 32 and 33 where the new covenant was to be written in the heart, not on tablets ---- Whitaker replies that this text must be understood comparatively, not absolutely or simply.

1. B. Jackson 'Twenty-five Agrapha' SPCK 1900 gives a list of the extra-~~ca~~ canonical sayings of Christ e.g. Acts 20.35; Ap. Const. 8.12 (cf. 1 Cor 11.26); Origen Hom. on Jeremiah 20.3; Clem. Strom. 5.10.64; Luke 6.4. in Codex Bezae only (surely this would fall under the category of passages peculiar to the evangelists); Clem. Rom. Ep. 2.12; Justin Martyr Dialog. cap. 47; Origen De Orat. sect. 2.; Hom. Clem. 2.51 Origen on Matthew Tom. 13.2.; Apost. Constit. 2.60 .

Bellarmino claimed that Arius was condemned at the Council of Nicea by unwritten tradition ----- both sides alleged Scripture, but the actual condemnation emerged from traditive doctrine. Whitaker replies that this is not strictly true ----- it is not the man who heaps together most Scriptural quotations that wins the day; he who brings one sentence of Scripture rightly understood has a better cause than the man who heaps up quotations with verbal affinities. Augustine recalls us ¹ from Councils to Scripture ----- 'neither should I allege the Council of Nicea to you, nor you that of Rimini to me, as if we could prejudice the question. I am not bound by the authority of the latter nor you by the former. Let the contest be matter with matter, cause with cause, reason with reason, on the basis of Scriptural authorities, which are witnesses not peculiar to either side, but common to us both'. ² Athanasius' appeal was to the sense of Scripture, and Constantine ³ plainly said that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is written ----- *ἀνάγραφτον* --- and he goes on to say 'the books of the evangelists and apostles, as also the oracles of the old prophets, plainly teach us, what we should think of divine subjects. Laying aside, then, all factions contention, let us resolve the points of enquiry by the testimony of the inspired words *ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λήβωμεν τῶν ἡγουμένων τὴν λύσιν* .

Theodoret did not assert, as you Bellarmine claim he did, that the Arians were condemned by unwritten tradition ----- Theodoret said that Eusebius of Nicomedia was convicted by Scripture ----- *συνήγαγον* *ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν* ----- 'they collected out of the Scriptures, testimonies against Eusebius and other Arians'. ⁴ I concede that the term *ὁμοούσιος* was proved orthodox out of antiquity as having been used 130 years before by bishops who then flourished in the church, for the Arians wrongly said that it was a new word. Certainly it is not a Scriptural term, but the controversy was resolved, as

1. Contra Maximin. Arian. 3. 14 (Migne PL 42)

2. ibid. 2. 14 sect.3

3. Theodt. H.E.1.7.

4. Theodoret H.E. 1.8.

Theodoret said, "out of the words of Scripture rightly understood" -----

ἔξ ἑγγράφων μετ' εὐσεβείας ἐννοουμένων λέξεων

and adds that the words of Scripture alleged against the Arians had the same force and meaning as the ὁμοούσιος -----

ταύτην ἔχει τὴν σημασίαν.

Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, ¹ in his Ecclesiastical

Hierarchy (Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας)

Chapter 1. writes that the 'chiefs of the sacerdotal function i.e. the Apostles, delivered these matters sublime and supersubstantial &

(ὑπερούσια) partly in writing and partly without writing (ἑγγράφοις καὶ ἀγράφοις μνησέσι -----) ².

Duraeus ³ goes on to accuse Whitaker of denying order in the Church Militant and introducing ἀναρχία into heaven by denying the

Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius and taking away the holy hierarchy of angels ----- what a simpleton (*rudem*) Whitaker is ! While

Duraeus was content with the Pauline convert as author, Whitaker replies that for himself, he is not so content ----- the author is " that man

whoever he may be ", and even the papists are not agreed on authorship.

But authorship apart, though the writings had been popularised by Scotus Erigenus and others, and copiously quoted by Aquinas, Victor, Albertus

Magnus, Bonaventura, the fact remains that what Dionysius says of the

celestial hierarchy goes outside Scriptural warrant ----- "~~nullis~~ Scripturarum testimoniis nitatur" ----- in their functions, number and

order, and in the description of the heavenly regions ---- the idea of the

three hierarchies in three orders will not stand the test of exegesis e.g.

the Dominations, Virtues, Powers ----- though there is no quarrel with the

1. c. 500 AD? The name given to the author of ~~the~~ corpus of theological writings ----- a) Celestial Hierarchy.

b) Ecclesiastical Hierarchy

c) Mystical Theology

to which the Severian Monophysites appealed at a colloquy at Constantinople in 533 AD, attributing them to Dionysius of Athens converted by St. Paul (Acts 17.34). The authorship was rejected by Hypatius Bishop of Ephesus (c520-540 AD).

2. Clement of Alexandria in Str.1 speaks of the labourer who is sent out into the Lord's harvest, having a double husbandry "written and

unwritten (ἑγγράφον καὶ ἀγράφον)

‡

3. Contra Duraeum 1. 18

statement that the Archangels and angels of the third order have an immediate mission to man. We defend the 'Patrocinium Angelorum', comments Whitaker, and we follow Apostolic Order in the Church Militant, but not Dionysius' fine piece of curiosity (ingenium curiosum) in the Celestial Hierarchy. If Paul was snatched into the third heaven and is silent, and does not enumerate those mysteries, we are content, as we are with his forbidding *Ἐπισημασία τῶν ἁγγέλων*. You maintain that sacrifices (munera) may not be offered to them since this is proper to the One Mediator, Christ, but prayers may be directed to them (invocandos esse angelos) ~~since~~ Paul condemned the whole cult as you will see in Colossians 2.18 and Theodoret on this place ----- the condemnation by the Council of Laodicea (can.35) ¹ and Apoc. 19.10 of the cult of angels whether calling upon them (invocare) or praying to them (precari) is clear. We think Irenaeus ² speaks much better and more modestly than Dionysius on this subject ---- "dicant nobis quae sit invisibilium natura, enarrent numerum angelorum, et ordinem Archangelorum, demonstrent thronorum sacramenta et doceant diversitates dominationum, principalium, potestatum, atque virtutum. Sed non habent dicere". Origen gave them an ethereal body, as did Augustine, Ignatius said ³ they must believe in the Blood of Christ to remain in goodness, but it is not till the time of Dionysius that we get all this information and speculation.

1. c. 363AD though the exact date is much under discussion; Hefele Hist. of the Councils. 2.298 gives up the idea of exact dating and places it between 343 and 381 i.e. between the C. of Sardica and the C. of Constantinople 381 AD. J. Stevenson 'Creeds, Councils, and Controversies' pg 375 places it 380. Canon 35 (vide Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series 2 Vol. 14 pg.150) was aimed at a species of angel-idolatry which detracted from the due worship of Christ, an error prevalent in Phrygia. In the Capitular of Charlemagne AD789 (cap.16) reference to this synod is made in which it was 'ordered that angels should not be given names unknown. but only names which we have by authority i.e. Michael, Gabriel, Raphael. Canon 35 of the C. of Laodicea forbids to name (*ὀνομάζειν*) angels, and this was understood to mean giving them names rather than calling upon them 'in genere'. Perhaps the authors of this Capitular had in mind the Roman Synod under Pope Zachary AD745 against Aldebert who was accused of invoking eight angels in his prayers by proper names. Note :- some Latin versions of great authority and antiquity read 'angulos' for 'angelos'

(note continued next page)

Chrysostom¹ wrote of those 'qui dicunt non oportere per Christum accedere ad Deum sed per angelos' and Oecumenius writing on Colossians² reminds us that humility and unworthiness demanded that we flee first to angels and saints who appease God on our behalf (propitiis reddant). Augustine² condemned this view, while John³ quickly found himself in error because he gave into the human infirmity of being taken (victum) by angelic splendour and majesty, and giving the angel more than was due; they are the *συνδούλοι* of the pious. Aquinas comments on Apoc. 19.10 and 22.vv.8. and 9, that in falling down (ceci di ante pedes eius ut ---) there is included in this act of worship! gratia, adoratio dulciae, reverentia' ----- that *δουλεία* may be paid to the angels as to the saints, *ὑπερδουλεία* to the Virgin Mary, while *λατρεία* is reserved for God alone, being demanded by that fullness of Divine worship payable only to God. Whitaker comments that 'adoratio' in the true sense is proper only to God, as in 'reverentia'. Certainly there is no spiritual servitude (*δουλεία*) on the part of man to the angels ----- reverence for them, thanks for them, as creatures ministering, may be acknowledged, as Abraham had, but not *δουλεία*. The angel warned Manoah that if he wishes to make a burnt offering, it must be to the Lord! ⁴

(cont. for page 141)

this would refer to idolatrous rites being practiced in corners, secretly 'occult', but this has not any Greek authority. Canon 35 reads 'Christians must not forsake the Church of God and go away and invoke angels and gather assemblies, which things are forbidden'; this is called 'covert idolatry'.

2. Adv, Haeres. 2. 54

3. Ad Smyrn 6.1.

1. On Colossians 2. Hom. 7.

2. Ad Quodvult. cap. 39 de angelis.

3. Apoc. 19. 10; 22. vv.8.9.

4. Judges 13. 16.

Whitaker admits that Pseudo-Dionysius is a great patron of traditions and is zealously defended by some great men, especially Ambrosius Camaldoli; ¹ Bellarmine had 'waxed wroth' with Luther and Calvin for denying that these writings were the work of Paul's Areopagite. For his own part, Whitaker doubts the value of quotations on any important matter from this work ----- Eusebius and Jerome, who were both most diligent in the collection and search for books of the ancients, do not mention them, which is fairly conclusive against Paul's Dionysius being the author, particularly as the works cover some important and distinguished subjects. No ancient author quotes them ----- the Nicene Fathers would ~~not~~ certainly have used them if they had been extant then. The style too is not Apostolic ----- it is "too subtle, inflated, and full of affection". ~~By~~ Erasmus ² Valla ³, and Theodore Gaza ⁴ all deny the ascription, as does Cajetan who says "those books were not written by the Apostolic Dionysius". If the contents are claimed to be the nature of a revelation, we might read Irenaeus ⁵ who in his day condemned the writers of these hierarchies --

1. Ambrose of Camaldoli (Ambrogio Traversari) c. 1386-1439 AD.

Italian humanist, he became General of the Camaldolensian Order at Florence in 1431 AD. A scholar of refined taste, he was fired by his possession of a splendid collection of Greek patristic MSS to translate many of the Greek Fathers into Latin. He also fostered movements for the reforming of the church and for the reunion between E. and W.

2. On Acts. 17

3. Valla ascribed them to a heretic by name Apollinarius. Lorenzo Valla (c. 1406-1457) an Italian humanist, was ordained priest 1431 AD, and went to Rome 1447 as 'Scriptor' and later Apostolic Secretary ----- one of the first exponents of modern historical criticism; proved the spuriousness of the 'Donation of Constantine' in 'De Falso Credita et Ementita Constantini Donatione Declamatio' (1440) with a bitter attack on the temporal power of the Papacy. His 'Collatio Novi Testamenti' (1444) was a critical comparison of the Vulgate and Greek N.T. His novel and audacious views deeply influenced Renaissance scholars and the Reformers and his writings were held in high esteem esp. by Luther.

4. In His Preface to the 'Problems of Alexander Aphrodisius' addressed to Nicholas V.

5. Adv. Haeres. 2. 54.

'the nature of things invisible, the number of angels, the ranks of archangels, the mystery of thrones, the differences of dominations, principedoms, powers, and virtues' ---- 'there is nothing sound in what they say, nor should we abandon Moses and the Prophets to believe in them'! Such were the words of Irenaeus. Augustine ¹ in his Enchiridion counsels the same caution, and your own Pope Gregory the Great differs from Dionysius substantially on the ranks of the angels, as does Bernard. ²If this Dionysius were Apostolic in tradition or authority, his work would not have been ignored. The reference to catechumens being put outside the 'portals of the church' belongs to the period of Ambrose and Chrysostom, rather than to the mid-First Century AD ³. In 'Divine Names' chapter 4 the author ~~and~~ cites from Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans this brief but very sweet sentence ----- *ὁ ἐμὸς ἔργος ἐσταύρωται* --- 'my love is crucified' --- this Epistle was sent to Rome in the reign of Trajan, ⁴ but the Apostolic Dionysius was martyred in the reign of Domitian. ⁵ The Rhemists mention, in their Annotations on Acts 1, the Epistle of Dionysius to Timothy which is not found among the present extant 10 epistles in the Greek copies ----- perhaps they would have this recognised as the eleventh, in which Dionysius writes of the Assumption of the body of the Virgin Mary in the presence of himself and the 12 Apostles, with the exception of Thomas who arrived

1. E.Evans. 'Enchiridion'(S.P.C.K. 1953) pg. 51 (Enchiridion sect. 58) Augustine states there is no necessity in affirming, denying or defining the angelic names, orders, functions 'when ignorance of them involves no blame' ---- the 'mentāl exercise is not without its utility, provided the discussion is conducted with moderation and the mistake is avoided of people supposing they know what they know not' (Enchir. 59)
2. Hom. 4 De Festo Michaelis
3. Ambrose Epi. 20. 4. Chrysost. Hom. 2.8. on 2 Cor. cp. Hippolytus Ap. Trad 17.1.
4. Eusebius Chronicon. H.E. 3. 36; Jerome. Catalogue.
5. Methodius in his 'Martyrdom of Dionysius' and Simon Metaphrastes in his 'Vita Dionysii'.

3 days later. The Rhemists say that she lived 16 years after the Ascension of Christ, but the Apostle James had already been martyred ----- some say 3 years, others 10 years, after the Ascension, ¹ and so he died 6 years before the Assumption; "did he drop from heaven for this funeral"? writes Whitaker. The Rhemists will also have to solve the problem that Dionysius at the Assumption appears to be a most zealous adherent to the Christian Faith, on familiar terms with the Apostles, but if Paul didn't reach Athens till 17 years after the Ascension, this Dionysius could not have yet been converted. On the other hand, the papists would do well to take their Fathers more seriously ---- in Chapter 3 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, the author says that Christians in his day received the Eucharist every day, and there were no 'half-communions', while Scripture and public prayers were said in the ^{common} tongue; in the seventh chapter he reports the strange funeral custom of saluting the corpse and pouring oil over it. Bellarmine noted that although Luther and Calvin rejected the works, the fact that Gregory the Great quoted from them in his Homily on the 100 sheep and elsewhere, proves they are neither modern nor despicable -----Whitaker comments, that there is no reason to doubt that the works were written before Gregory the Great, but this does not make them Apostolic.

In Eusebius, ² Bellarmine says, we find that Irenaeus speaks of Polycarp as repeating by heart many things which he had heard from the Apostles concerning our Lord, and which were not written on paper but in the heart. Whitaker replies that the text of Eusebius should be read, where

1. Eusebius. Chronicon; Genebrard in his Chronology.

2. Eusebius H.E. 5.20

he refers to Irenaeus writing a letter to Florinus a heretic, who maintained that evil beings were created such by God. Irenaeus requests that he should remember Polycarp, known to them both, and how he would relate the works and teaching of Christ, as learnt from the eyewitnesses of these things, and how Irenaeus wrote these things not on paper but in his heart, and that he constantly ruminated (*γρησίως αὐτὰ ἀναμνησκόμενος*) upon them faithfully. There is no conclusive evidence that the Apostolic Tradition was not written; the text merely states that Irenaeus as a boy so concentrated that the words were in his very heart and mind. And note, Bellarmine, that Eusebius tells us that what Polycarp declared was altogether in accordance with the Scriptures ---- *ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα πῶς γραφῶν*. Bellarmine in replying to Chemnitz on this passage of Eusebius, says that on the word *σύμφωνα*, not everything that is consonant to Scripture can be immediately proved from Scripture; all truth is consonant to Scripture, but all ~~tr~~ truth is not contained in Scripture, nor can be proved by it. Whitaker refers to the text of Eusebius again and says that Irenaeus is refuting a heretic, and the meaning is plain, that the heresy was refuted by Scripture. All things that are consonant to Scripture may be proved by Scripture, but there are many things not dissonant to Scripture which cannot be proved by it ----- it is one thing to be consonant, another to be dissonant, to Scripture ----- that there is gold in the New Indies is not consonant to Scripture, and yet is not dissonant to it. What Bellarmine claimed for tradition is dissonant to it. To Bellarmine's citation of ~~Eusebius~~ Eusebius's Demonstratio Evangelica 1, that the Apostles delivered some

1. Book 1.8.

observances in writing, some orally, following the example of Christ who did not deliver all things to all persons but reserved some points of greater excellence for the perfect,¹ Whitaker replies that as it stands, and in the face of Irenaeus² when the Apostles made known to all churches the whole counsel of God, this text is not conclusive ----- the question turns upon the words "some points of greater excellence; to say these are hidden mysteries reserved only for the perfect and not revealed in Scripture is one thing, but it is another to say that the Gentiles and profane cannot understand them".

Epiphanius had been suggested as a great patron of traditions - in his *Adversus Haeresus Panarium*³ Epiphanius had written "sed traditione quoque opus est; neque enim ex scripturis peti possunt omnia; idcirco alia in scripturis" ---- but, says Whitaker, he clarifies this remark by referring to things indifferent, and says elsewhere⁴ that all things necessary are delivered in Scripture. And what of these traditions of Epiphanius? --- that men should nourish beards, and if a cleric cannot be a celibate, let him marry ---- surely you find these traditions difficult to agree with!

Whitaker now discusses how far Deuteronomy

1. Casaubon noted that the phrase *ἴδοσιν οἱ μεμνημένοι* (the initiated know what is said) occurs at least 50 times in the writings of Chrysostom alone.
2. Irenaeus *Adv. Haeres.* 3.15 "the doctrine of the Apostles is evident, firm, and withdraws nothing, and is not in those who teach one thing openly and another secretly".
3. Epiphanius *Adv. Haeres.* 61.6 *De Journal Enchiridion* 1098 MG 41. 1047. -----
Δεῖ δε καὶ παραδόσει κεχρηῆσθαι· οὐ γὰρ πάντα ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς δύναται λαμβάνεσθαι· διὸ τὰ μὲν ἐν γραφαῖς, τὰ δὲ ἐν παραδόσει παρέδωκεν οἱ ἅγιοι ἀπόστολοι.
4. *ibid.* 70.7 *De Journal* 1106 MG. 42. 349

Chapter 4 verse 2 ('thou shalt not add unto this word.. neither shalt thou diminish it') and Deuteronomy Chapter 12 verse 32 ('whatsoever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it') can be taken to fix the written tradition. Bellarmine states that the tradition was oral when Moses delivered it, and he said 'do that which I command you' not 'that which I have written'. Whitaker replies, be that so, we hear in Exodus 24.4. 'Moses wrote all the words of the Lord' and Bellarmine himself seems to have seen the force of the written Mosiac tradition because although he writes much of the oral tradition in his MS lectures, he omits much of this in his later publication. ¹ The word 'command' is used in Joshua 1.7. ('observe all the law, which Moses my servant commanded you') ----- did this refer to the written or the unwritten tradition? Surely the written tradition, for there follows the statement in the following verse 'this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth'. thou shalt do according to all that is written therein'.² In Deuteronomy, Chapter 28 opens up with the statement 'if thou wilt keep the things which I command thee this day' and in verse 58 the scope of that command is comprehended by the things that are written ----- Deuteronomy 27.26 utters the curse against the man who 'continues not in all the words of this law' and Paul in Galations 3.10 applies this to the written law. Surely if anyone was perfect enough for an oral tradition it was Joshua, but in Joshua 1.8. he is referred to the written tradition, which contained the commands of Moses

1. The Sartorian Edition

2. בְּכָל-הַצִּוִּיּוֹת אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֶת מֹשֶׁה לְכַתּוֹב בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה
 LXX. ἡ βίβλος τοῦ νόμου τούτου ... ποιεῖν πάντα
 τὰ γεγραμμένα.

and so he went forth with a written tradition sufficient for his needs. So, for the Jews, the written tradition was sufficient and binding, as Josephus, quoted by Eusebius,¹ testifies; the authority of the sacred books was so great that nothing was added or diminished for so many ages. Chrysostom in his 52nd Homily on Matthew blamed the priests who dared to add so much e.g. not that washings were contrary to scripture, but that they made holiness consist in them. Thomas Aquinas,² on this passage, wrote 'sacra enim Scriptura est regula fidei, cui nec addere nec subtrahere licet'. Bellarmine asks, then why did the Prophets and Apostles add so much without incurring the curse? Whitaker replies that the Prophets and Apostles are not to be ranked as other men, but stand in authority as Moses did, and are deserving of similar credit. The Gospel is contained in the Law and Prophecy and is fulfilled in Christ ----- the prophets illustrated Moses, and the Apostles the Prophets ----- 'search the Scriptures' said Christ 'for they testify of Me'.

Whitaker dismisses Stapleton's assertion that the faith of Christ is nowhere found in the whole O.T., by saying that Bellarmine was ashamed of such a remark, and 'woe to the gloss that corrupts the text'! Whitaker claimed for the relationship between Apostolic preaching and the O.T. a closer connection than Bellarmine makes in his statement that the N.T. is in the O.T. as the tree is in the seed ---- Paul (Acts 26.22) claimed that he said nothing but that Moses and the Prophets did say; the sea and the rock prefigured Baptism, and Manna the Eucharist (1 Cor. 10) ---- the N.T. is more than 'potentially' in the O.T. ---- the relationship is rather of prophecy and fulfilment than lesser to greater in content. Irenaeus³ saw this point when he replied to the heretics, chiefly

1. H.E. 3.8.

2. Pt Secunda Qu. 1. Art.9.Tom.2. pg.5.Antwerp ed. 1627

3. Advers. Haeres

4. 34.1. Vide etiam 426. 1, when Christ is the treasure hid in a field the prophets ~~dwelling~~ dwelling upon types and parables and Christ's coming brought reality to the Prophets.

Marcion, who said the prophets were of another God, 'read more carefully the Gospel given us by the Apostles, and read the prophets more carefully, and you will find therein foretold all the doings and all the doctrines and all the Passion of our Lord'. Augustine said the 'O.T. is unveiled in the N.T. and the N.T. veiled in the O.T.'¹ and he also says 'Christ came not to add what was wanting but to do and accomplish what was written'.² Jerome in his Letter to Damascus wrote "whatever we read in the Old Testament we find also in the Gospel, and whatever we read in the Gospel, is deduced from the authority of the Old Testament" (hoc ex Veteris Testamenti autoritate deducitur) ---- and so what is found in the N.T. may be confirmed not, as you say Bellarmine, only in the general, but also in the particular by the authority of the O.T.³ Basil is just as clear on this point.⁴

Bellarmino claimed that the words of Apoc. 22.18 'if any man add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues written in this book' only prohibit the corruption of this book not the writing of new books or the delivery of new doctrines, since John had not completed his Gospel by then. Whitaker replies that this may be true but what emerged was prophetic and Apostolic not papist. But does this rule of not adding

1. on Psalm 105 (sic). 'Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet' occurs in Aug. Quaestionum in Heptateuchum 2.73. Vide Aug. De Utilit. Credendi 6. and De Mendacio 5.7.

2. Aug. Contra Faustum Manich. Bk. 17.6. ML. 42. 343.

3. Ancient Christian Writers Vo. 32 ed. Mierow pg. 87. (1963 ed) Letter 18 A sect 7.4.

4. In Ascetics passim. Whitaker could have quoted Origen Hom. 5. on Lev. for the sufficiency of Scripture ---- 'if anything remains which Holy Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorize any knowledge, but we must commit to the fire what remains, i.e. reserve it unto God'. Athanasius in Festal Epistle 2 writes 'in these alone, the doctrine of salvation is contained'; vide etiam Contra Gentes 1.

or diminishing apply to the whole of the Canon? Whitaker would say that it did. Ambrose in his De Paradiso had written ¹ 'he who expounds Scripture adds nothing, but that those who would add or detract from it are heretics and anathema'. Whitaker notes that this work of Ambrose had been under suspicion as not being one of his genuine writings,² but that he would follow the Rhemist Annotators and accept the work as genuine ----- and he would further follow the Rhemist Annotators in saying that this text of Apoc. 22.18 applied to the whole of the Canon. Similarly Thomas Aquinas accepted this text as referring to the whole of the Canon, and uses the same references, including Dt.4.2. as Whitaker did. There are no grounds for supposing that the Apostolic *κηρύγμα* was anything different from the written Apostolic Tradition in Scripture ³ ----- Galatians 1. vv.8.9. would suggest a similar test against addition to the *κηρύγμα* i.e. Scripture.

Bellarmino takes up here, the use of *παρ' ο'* in Galatians 1.9., which could mean 'against' rather than 'beside' i.e. Paul condemned those who delivered doctrines 'against' but not 'besides' Scripture, and so new doctrines are not barred provided they do not contradict Scripture. The Rhemists agreed with this, as did Stapleton,⁴ on the grounds

1. Ambrose De Paradiso. 12 (c.375 AD)

2. Accepted as genuine by Cayre Vol. 1. 529 and Altaner Patrology pg. 447

3. Aug. Contra Liter. Petilian. 3.6.; Basil in Summa Moral. 72. cap.1. ----- both condemn the habit of heretics in adding new doctrines outside the canon of Scripture.

4. Stapleton Demonstratio 12.10

that Paul, John, and other canonical writers produced many things after this. Whitaker replies that Paul is referring to the Gospel preached by him, not merely what is contained in Galatians ----- and the Gospel is one preached by Paul, Peter, or John. Whitaker concedes that *παρὰ*¹ is sometimes conveniently translated "against" ----- Erasmus, and Beza, translate it in this way in Romans 16.17 ('mark those who cause divisions and offences against the doctrine which ye have learnt') ----- but the contexts are different. In Galatians 1.8-9 Paul complains not of something added to the Gospel (for it is not another Gospel ----- *ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο*) but of depravers and perverters of the Gospel they had already received --- *καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* but Whitaker says that what is perverted is not only against but beside the Gospel. It is however a slender use of *παρὰ* on which to base any strong conclusion, as Bellarmine had done. Chrysostom wrote on this passage 'The Apostle said not, if they tell you all the contrary, or subvert the Gospel, but even if they preach to you anything beside that Gospel you have received, if they shake any portion of it, let them be accursed,' ---- he couples both senses under *παρὰ ὅ* viz. not only contrary to Scripture but also anything in addition to it.² Theophylact preferred the sense 'beside'. If there is any lack of faith, then it is subjective not objective -----

1. AV. 'contrary to'.

2. Chrysostom Comment. on Galatians Cap. 1. sect.6 ----- here, The evangelists and Paul preach the one Gospel, and anyone who subverts this even in the smallest particular (*τὸ βραχύτατον ἀνατρέψας* corrupts the whole ----- *τῷ παντὶ λυμδινέται*).

Vide etiam Aug. 98th. Tractate on John.

the Apostle had delivered the whole doctrine , as he had to the Thessalonians but they had not received it all . Scripture is not one medium or one means to salvation , but the entire and sole medium, perfect and complete , because it alone produces a perfect faith . True, our faith in this life is not perfect , but that is our fault not the fault or deficiency of Scripture.

Bellarmino questions Whitaker's use of 2 Timothy 3. 16 & 17 -- 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine , reproof , correction, and instruction in righteousness , that the man of God may be perfect , throughly furnished for every good work ' , that Whitaker had equated profitableness with sufficiency . The two words were quite different in meaning and scope. 1. Everything that is useful is not necessarily sufficient . Whitaker replies that this maxim is true but the Romanists are agreed that the four points in this text ---

--- *διδασκαλία* (sound doctrine)
ἑλεγχος (refutation of false opinion)
παιδεία (godly direction of life)
ἐπιτιμωσις (correction of manners)

mark the sufficiency of the minister , thoroughly furnished (*ἐξηρτισμένος*) to every good work. If the pastor may find all things necessary for his functions from the Scriptures, then the sufficiency of Scripture is proven --- the pastor is made *ἑρπίος* . True , Jerome on these words said that the ' Scriptures are not sufficient without faith ' -- we agree , but this does not detract from the premise but only proves it. The Cologne edition (1575) of Hyperius' ' De Recte Formando Studio Theologico ' in four books ,deserving of study by all students ,

1. The same point was made by the Rhemists and by the author of the Censure against Charke.

in Book 1 Chapter 3 makes the same point about the pastor being ^{ἄριστος} through Scripture, and though this book was corrected by Hyperius¹ to allow the work to be read by papists 'without danger', he made no change in the words "The Scriptures can by themselves instruct us to salvation".

As Psalm 19.18 has it ----- "The Law of the Lord is entire, and giveth wisdom to babes"----- the ^{הנהיג} here meaning the doctrine delivered in the O.T., doctrine which is ^{השכלה} rendered by Tremellius, Bucer, and Vatallus as 'integra', and by Pagninus, Arias Montanus, and Calvin as 'perfecta' i.e. the full, perfect, sufficient, body of doctrine. So in Luke 1. 3-4, Luke writes that Theophilus, (previously instructed in the Christian religion ^{περι ἡμῶν} ^{κατηχήθη}) may have assurance and certainty ^{τὴν ἀσφαλείαν}. Out of Scripture, there is no certainty or security. On Luke 16.19 where Abraham says to Dives "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them" Stapleton had remarked² that it is one thing to hear Moses and the prophets, and quite another to hear nothing else, for by the latter, the N.T. would become superfluous. Whitaker replies that the perfect doctrine of Moses and the Prophets make all other revelations and visions superfluous, and that if this is not heeded, then no other teaching or revelation will persuade men to the truth. Cyprian commenting on Mt.17.5

1. Whitaker mistakenly attributes it to one, Augustinus Villavicentium, but this apparently is the place of origen, not the author's name.

2. Demonstratio 12.8

and the Father's Voice from Heaven, expressly states that 'hear Him' means that we need only to listen to Christ; Christ Himself adds the word 'only' in Mt. 4.10 when He quotes Dt.10.20 ----- 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve'.¹ The N.T. was not then published for Christ was present ---- to understand Him the disciples must learn from Moses and the Prophets (Lk. 24.25-27); the Scriptures must be searched (John 5.39) and if the Jews had made right use of the Scriptures they would have found life in them.² When Luke writes in Acts 1.1. that he wrote of all things that Jesus began both to do and to teach, we find the Gospel in the Acts, and if we only had this, it would be sufficient, and yet the four Gospels are not superfluous ----- they do not say different things, but the same things in different ways and with a firmer foundation, as God willed them to be written. Luke did not write all things (or the world would not contain his books) e.g. the story of the Magi, the cruelty of Herod ---- absolutely, but all things necessary and sufficient, as the Rhemists admit. God willed the Evangelists to write for the more abundant instruction. In Acts 17.2-3 Paul reasoned ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν and confirmed his doctrine from them, and the same is true in Paul's witness before the governor in Acts. 24.14 while in Acts 26.22 Paul says that by divine assistance he had said nothing beside (οὐδὲν ἔκτος) those

1. The same is true of Dt 6.13. Idem De Lyra and Jansenius' Commentary on the Evangelists cap.97 (Louvain edition 1571)

2. Whitaker quotes from Vulgate Ps. 119.2. 'Blessed are they who search His testimonies' ----- beati qui scrutantur testimonia eius, following the LXX οἱ ἐξερευνηταί for Hebrew יָדְּוּ for Hebrew יָדְּוּ
 = who keep; but the root idea is to watch, look at narrowly.

things which Moses and the prophets did say should come'----- there need be no extraneous appeals. In Rom.10.17 'faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God' ----- *ἀρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ* — faith is conceived by hearing; many things are heard but only Scripture begets true faith. Basil in his Ascetics goes as far as to say that 'whatever is beside the divinely inspired Scriptures is sin, because it is not of faith; faith is by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God'. Scripture, as Paul says in Romans 15.4. was written of old time (*προεγράφη*) for our instruction (*εἰς ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν*) therefore no part is idle, barren, or unfruitful, but begets faith, and through patience and comfort of the same writings, hope. We are built *ἐποικοδομηθέντες* upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Himself being the chief corner stone ----- Aquinas, Cajetan, and all concede this means prophetic and Apostolic Doctrine. In 2 Peter 1.19 we have the most sure word of prophecy ----- *βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον* the single light in a dark world, which demands our full attention. Cajetan interprets *λόγον προφητικὸν* as Scripture. In 1 John 1.4. John writes of the Life manifested, heard, seen, handled, looked upon, and that he now bears witness ----- 'these things we write unto you that your joy may be full' *ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν) ᾗ πεπληρωμένη* not *γράφω* but *γράφομεν* for what the Apostles heard and saw they had written, and fulness of joy comes from the contemplation of Scripture.

Whitaker and Bellarmine then discuss the rational grounds for unwritten traditions. Bellarmine had said that God preserved the oral tradition from Abraham to Moses, and with the same providence preserves the mind of the Church against subversion, neglect and ignorance. Whitaker replies that the premise is true but the consequent is not so, or else, why did Moses commit all to writing? Was it not to guard against defection? Furthermore, the Patriarchs received frequent and familiar visitations from God, to guide, inspire, and direct within the era of this oral tradition, but to guard against corruption, the tradition became written and guarded and hedged. True, the care of tradition rests with God not with men, and God can preserve from destruction whatever He chooses, but the fact remains that the unwritten does perish ---- *litera scripta manet* ---- where are the Laws of Lycurgus, the unwritten dogmas and secret institutions of Pythagoras, the discipline of the Druids? What slight traces of these things we have, compared with written sources. ¹ The truth of 'Vox audita perit, litera scripta manet' is strikingly illustrated here. And where are the unwritten traditions of Moses you would contend for? In Isaiah 30.8 God says 'Go, write it in a table and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever' and in Psalm 102.19 the prophet says 'let this be written for a memorial to those that come after'. To be preserved for posterity would seem to demand a written tradition ---- Theophylact on Luke 1.2. writes

*ἔγγράφως σοὶ παραδίδούς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀσφαλίσματα
τὸν σὸν λογισμὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλάβῃται τῶν
ἔγγράφως παραδεδομένων (sic)*

1. Disputatio Quaest 6. cap. 16 (Parker ed. pg. 651)

Thomas Aquinas on Philipp. 3.1. writes "words pass away easily, but those things that are written remain". Paul said that to write was the safe thing for the Philippians. Cajetan wrote on the continual record of Exod. 17.14 'write this for a memorial in a book'.¹

Even so, once written, God protects the Scriptures against Satan, the constant enemy, who would destroy or pervert them, knowing they stand in his way --- "I would suggest", writes Whitaker, "that human erosion rather than Satanic influence destroyed unwritten tradition, and yet if God so wished its permanence, why did this happen" ? There is no special faculty here for the preservation of unwritten tradition, even as there is no need for it. Even the Fathers, erudite as they are, differ about traditions ---- what uncertainty would haunt the Gospel, if left to the memory of man?

Bellarmino claimed that continued use would suffice for the accurate preservation of unwritten tradition, as common language is preserved, with no formal or written grammar. Whitaker replies that nothing in fact changes more than the vulgar languages, with every generation even with daily and most frequent use, or perhaps because of it. For Scripture to be the 'regula credendi et regula fidei' it is needful that it be written, as Andradius says² --- not a partial rule, as Bellarmine says, but a complete rule of faith. Traditions

1. Vide Aquinas Proem. on Mt. that Matthew wrote to preserve the Gospel in memory, and to guard against heretics.

2. Defensio Tridentina 3. 'Scripturas ideo canonicas appellari quia pietatis fidei et religionis canonem hoc est regulam atque normam e coelis summo Dei beneficio ad nos delatam continent amplissimam'.

may help our faith, but they cannot be the source of our faith.

Chapter 6.

The Perfection of Scripture
and
The Testimonies of the Fathers.

In the last Chapter of the 'Disputatione de Sacra Scriptura', Whitaker adds ¹ the testimonies of the Fathers to the Perfection of Scripture in matters of faith.

Irenaeus writes ² "we have gained our knowledge of the economy of our salvation by no other than by those by whom the Gospel reached us, which Gospel they then preached and afterwards by the Will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the bases and pillar of our faith"----- first the Apostolic oral tradition, the entire Gospel, second, that those persons wrote it or supervised the writing of it to us,³ by the Divine Will and authority, third, the Gospel so written is the basis and pillar of our faith. In his reply to Campion, Whitaker had remarked that it was true that Luther in his Preface to the N.T. said that he preferred John's Gospel to the other three not because they are less true or less excellent, but because in John's Gospel the acts of Christ were short and the sermons more full, for a Gospel rightly consists rather in heavenly doctrine than in the history of things done. In his Preface to 1 Peter, Luther wrote that a Gospel is 'the preaching and publishing of the grace and mercy of God by Christ, merited and purchased to us by His Death'. The Gospel therefore is found not only in the four evangelists but in the writing of the Apostles, especially Peter and Paul, and since Justification by Faith is the 'sum of the

1. In Reply to Bellarmine Controversio Bk. 4. cap.2

2. Irenaeus Adversus Haereses. 3.1.

3. The Gospel in the Epistles, then the Gospel in the Gospels

Gospel', Paul may be said to speak more of the Gospel than Matthew, Mark or Luke ----- Paul spoke of the grace of God in and through Christ, the three evangelists for the most part speak of the acts and miracles of Christ. This is what Luther meant when he said that Paul has more excellently and clearly described the power of the Cross in his Epistles, than the evangelists. Such a remark does not disparage the necessary historicity of the gospels. It was an 'impudent remark' of Campion, to say that Luther condemned Luke's style as wanton ----- what he meant in his Sermon on the Pharisee and the Publican was that he urged a warning lest Luke's frequent mention of works led men astray, away from Justification by Faith to Justification by works. Though the outward testimony and judgement of the Church in the Canon may shame us if we reject portions of the canon, it is the Holy Spirit, the author and publisher of them, that really persuades our hearts to credit them, and seals such credit. Without the gift of the Spirit we shall always be uncertain and doubtful though we hear the Church a thousand times ; the authority of Scripture does not depend upon the authority of the church. ¹

In his Reply to Duraeus, Whitaker points out ² that Scripture must never be accommodated to the judgement of any Church, but exegesis should be founded on the interpretation of all the churches, whereas

1. Whitaker Responsio Ad. Decem Rationes cap.1.

2. Contra Duraeum. 1. 20.

Duraeus would restrict all exegesis to the Church of Rome. A little later,¹ in the same Reply to Duraeus, Whitaker said that Luther had reaffirmed the opinion that there is a single Gospel (*unicum evangelium*) contained in all the Evangelists and Epistles ---- as Chrysostom had said in his Commentary on Galatians 1² ----- and Whitaker goes on to repeat his statement that the Gospel is seen in Paul's Epistles more extensively (*copiosissime*), containing the highest truth (*summum Evangelii*) of the Gospel, the most blessed message (*nuncium*) fully explained, grace and mercy through Christ's Death and Resurrection. The three Evangelists are almost totally (*fere tota*) absorbed in the acts and miracles of Christ. Peace is born of remission of sins and reconciliation with God, which comes from faith alone ---- being justified by faith we have peace towards God (*erga Deum*). Theophylact wrote³ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν δικαίωσιν, ἄνοδον εἰς οὐρανοῦς υἱοθεσίαν Θεοῦ — 'remissionem peccatorum, justificationem, aditum in coelos, adoptionem Dei'.

Campion⁴ had accused Beza of a solecism in translating Luke 22. 20 ----- τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινῆ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον ----- but

Campion followed the Vulgate, and indeed "he did not dare to go a hair's breadth from it for fear of the anathema of Trent", and translated this 'hic est calix novum testamentum in sanguine meo, qui (understanding this of calix) pro vobis fundetur'. To Campion and Duraeus, Whitaker replies⁵ that there are important points here;—

1. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 1.34

2. κὰν μύριοι γράψωσιν εὐαγγέλια, τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ γράψωσιν εἶν' ἔστι τὰ πολλὰ. quamquam mille homines scribunt evangelia, si tamen eadem scribant, unum multa sunt.

3. Theophylact on Matthew Cap. 1.

4. Campion Decem Bationes 1.

5. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 1.34.

a) you translate ἐκχυνόμενον by the future 'qui fundetur' understanding a metonymia in the cup i.e. the cup is not poured, but the contents are, not wine but blood (sanguis) is in the chalice. Duraeus said that he did not impute error to Beza but blamed him for snatching τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον from the margin and putting it back again into the text where it should stand and not be removed. Rainolds¹ in his Refutation condemned the Protestant versions as always changing and differing among themselves, and cites Beza's editions as an example, and not only catholic writers but protestant writers complain about this too e.g. Sebneccerus the German, Sebastian Castellio, and Carolus Molinus, who said that Beza 'de facto textum mutat' ----- it is not merely a matter of difference in interpretations, but of actually changing the text, in word and letter. Later, in the same work,² Rainolds makes the same complaint ----- a common Vulgate for a 1,000 years and now in less than 80 years numerous versions add to the confusion of the Christian world with the abandonment of the Regula Fidei; the "putting forth of new texts is now the sport of every scolmaster". Printers Jugg and Barker have been kept busy in England trying to cope with the changes in the text of the Bibles issued in England under Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth I, and the fruit is 'confusion by Royal Warrant'. Rainolds complained of Whitaker's view on this text of Luke 22.20 that he 'mixed an unguent of Luther's doctrine of predestination with a tale of Robin Hood'. To babble about the metonymia is to play William Somerset the King's Jester rather than William Whitaker the Queen's Reader. Why maintain the 'bakerlie communion' devised by Carolstadius and Zwingli? You may just as well say there is no blood in the cup, as to say that Christ was no lamb because He had no wool on His back. The metonymia is there.

1. Rainolds 'Refutation' (Paris edition 1583 p. 382)

2. ibid p. 449.

Whitaker does not deny the metonymia and is in fact glad that Duraeus has accepted the figure, but he denies the change (mutatio) into blood for Christ spoke after the Apostles had drunk, as Mark says; and therefore on Duraeus' argument, the blood was not in the cup but in the Apostles (ventriculis Apostolorum).

b) your insertion of the copulative 'est' is in the wrong place ----- you write 'hic est calix novum testamentum' and make a genitive of the latter i.e. 'this is the cup of the New Testament;' better to say 'hic calix est novum testamentum in meo sanguine,' otherwise on your interpretation, you are left with a futher solecism 'this is my blood , the new testament in my blood'. On τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον you never replied to my point, that there is no real doubt here, and my citation of Basil's Ascetica who has this reading and relates it to the shedding of Christ's Blood on the Cross, fulfilling the Blood of the Lamb in the Passover, being the Blood of the Covenant sprinkled over the faithful. ¹ Whitaker has confidence in the English versions and has no doubt that these will compare favourably if not stand against the work of Gregory Martin when it arrives. ²

The statement of Irenaeus in Adversus Haereses 3.1., already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, is sufficient to answer Bellarmine who said that the Apostles preached to all, but did not write everything (necessary to salvation) but that mysteries were reserved

for the more perfect,

1. Acts

1. The Vulgate of Clement VIII translated the two participles of Luke 22.20 τὸ σῶμά διδόμενον τὸ ποτήριον ἐκχυνόμενον

with the present passive;- 'corpus meum datur', and the future passive 'in sanguine meo qui pro vobis fundetur' which Campion notes in Chapter 2 of his Decem Rationes.

2. Gregory Martin (d.Oct.1582) was the principle translator of the Douay-Rheims version, with Worthington, Bristowe, and Allen, all Oxford men; the work was begun at Douay but was moved to Rheims 1578. The N.T. was published 1582, and the O.T. 1609 (at Douay). The Rheims N.T. was strongly attacked by W. Fulke in his "Defence of the Sincere and True translations of the Holy Scriptures against the cavils of Gregory Martin (1583)" Fulke printed the Rheims Version side by side with the Bishop's Bible.

everything (necessary to salvation) but that mysteries were reserved for the more perfect, the bishops, ¹ to which others approximated by growth in the faith, as Paul had supplied what was wanting in the faith of the Thessalonians. ² Whitaker replies that Bellarmine sounds like a heretic ----- Tertullian in his Prescriptions declared it to be the opinion of the heretics "that the Apostles either did not know all or did not deliver all to anyone". Irenaeus made it quite clear there was not one Gospel to the people, another to the bishops, because he wrote "we know the economy of our salvation" and later in Book 3 chapters 2 and 3 he refutes strongly the assertion of the heretics that the Apostles delivered some things secretly and privately and apart to a few. In Book 5 chapter 17 he wrote that "we should betake ourselves to the church, be reared in its bosom and nourished by the Scriptures of the Lord", and then he goes on, "like Adam, we may eat of all the trees i.e. of every Scripture of the Lord, except for one tree, heretical heterodoxy".

Origen wrote ³ that our opinions and discourses have no credit unless confirmed by the witness of Scripture ----- by the mouth of two witnesses (the O.T. and N.T.) or of three witnesses (the Law, the Prophets, and the Apostles), "so shall every word be established". His Commentary on Romans 3 emphasises the necessity of divine testimonies from Scripture in teaching the church, while in his Homily 25 on Matthew he says that "the Temple of the Glory of the Lord is all-inspired Scripture, and the gold is the meaning lodged in it; as the gold outside the Temple is unsanctified, so every sense which is beside Scripture (however admirable it may seem) is not holy; as the Temple sanctifies the gold in it, so Scripture sanctifies the sense of the thing; making the sense great and venerable like consecrated gold. Like Rebecca going daily to the well, we should come daily to the

1. Acts 20.17.18; Paul took the Ephesian elders aside from the people ---- 'yes,' says, Whitaker, 'because they were to receive the Apostolic charge, but this was not new to the whole church.'

2. 1. Thess. 3.10

~~-----~~

3. Homily 1 on Jeremiah

wells of Scriptures, the Waters of the Holy Spirit, draw continually and bring home a vessel full ".¹

Constantine is reported by Theodoret as addressing the Fathers at Nicea that " the Evangelical and Apostolic Books plainly (*σάφως*) instruct us what we ought to think on divine subjects. Let us, then, laying aside all hostile discord resolve the debated questions by the testimony of the inspired Scriptures (*ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων*) "

Bellarmino objected that Constantine, though a great Emperor, was neither Doctor nor Bishop. Whitaker concedes this, but would note that Constantine was a pious and learned man, studious in religion, and 'very useful to the Church' and no bishop either present at Nicea or at any time later ever blamed these words or called them heretical or unorthodox. A similar stand was made by Bishop John of Antioch at the Council of Ephesus, and was approved by Cyril of Alexandria.²

Bellarmino, as indeed Harding before him, claimed that the words *περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ* do not mean 'on divine subjects' but merely 'on the divine nature' i.e. the question of Christ's Divinity must be solved from Scripture but Scripture does not decide all divine subjects. Whitaker replies that they could have added the explanation of Cassiodorus, that the words could also mean 'concerning the divine will or divine law'. But if Bellarmino looked at Theodoret just before this text he would find the answer to his dilemma ----- Theodoret writes

περὶ τῶν θείων πραγμάτων (of things relating to faith and religion). If Theodoret had wanted to refer to the divine nature he would have used *Θειότης* or *φύσις Θεότητος* as in his Epistle 83.³ Bellarmino replies that the Arians were not in fact refuted by Scripture ----- Whitaker asks that he read Chapter 8 of this same book of Theodoret where he says *ἐξ ἐγγράφων μετ'*

1. Homily 10 on Genesis

2. Evagrius Hist, Book 2 ---- the reference presumably is to Book 1. Chapter 6 where Cyril speaks of his joy at finding John of Antioch and he had the same faith.

3. *Θείος* is used as a neuter substantive 'divinity' by Greg. Nyss. (Apol.2.) John Damascene, Athenagorus, and Isadore but Whitaker's point stands with reference to Theodoret.

κατεκρίθησαν and Socrates in his History Book chapter 6 who wrote; -
 καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντες καὶ ἀναπτυσσόντες τὰς
 θείας γραφὰς πολλάκις ἀνετρέψαμεν
 αὐτούς ("we have often refuted them by unrolling (explaining) the
 Scriptures"). True he did not write this of Nicea but of the Council
 of Alexandria, but the point remains.

Whitaker concedes that Chemnitz had added the word 'every'
 to the words of Athanasius in his Contra Gentes "the Scriptures are
 sufficient for every purpose of instruction or education in the truth"
 but Chemnitz did not violence to the sense, for the clear meaning of
 the words of Athanasius is to be seen at the beginning of this work.
 Bellarmine claimed that Athanasius is only talking about two subjects
 viz. that idols be not worshipped, and Christ's twofold nature, and
 Whitaker has no right to extend the text to cover all divinity. Whitaker
 replies that he says no more than Athanasius did.

Basil had written in his De Confessione Fidei that "it is
 a clear piece of Infidelity either to reject what is written or to add
 anything which is not written";----- Bellarmine had maintained that
 Basil is not referring to Scripture here but to writings in general ,
 but Whitaker replies that Bellarmine is mistaken; a little before this
 quoted passage Basil makes it clear that his subject is 'divinely
 inspired Scripture' (Θεοπνεύστος γραφή) and that
 all points of faith are to be found therein, and that persons who seek
 doctrines outside Scripture violate the Testament of God ---- they are
 'strange and foreign (ξένα καὶ ἄλλότρια)'. True,
 Basil used unscriptural expressions and terms against the heretics but
 their sense were not foreign to Scripture and they were orthodox in
 their Scriptural foundations. To some who urged the custom of the
 church to affirm the ὁμοούσιος Basil replied that it was not fit

that "custom should be the rule (νόμος και κανὼν τοῦ ἁγίου λόγου) but let us stand by the arbitration of the Holy Scriptures----- for doctrines consonant to the oracles of God (τὰ δόγματα συνωδῶν τοῖς θείοις λόγοις).

In his De Pastoribus,¹ Augustine writes "hear the voice of the Shepherd; draw near to the mountains of Holy Scripture" ---- formerly the true Church was seen clearly in the contrast with paganism, but says Augustine, the issue is no longer clear to those who wish to know what is the true Church of Christ, for the churches in schism have "all things which truly belong to Christ; they have churches as well as we, they have divine scriptures, bishops and other orders as well as we, baptism, the eucharist, and all the rest as well as we, and finally they have Christ Himself ! But if one wishes to know which is the true Church of Christ, where the points of resemblance are so confounded, whence can he know it but from Holy Scripture?----- volens ergo quis cognoscere quae sit vera ecclesia Christi, unde cognoscat in tanta confusione similitudinis, nisi tantummodo per Scripturas' ---- the true possession is Scripture and is therefore the touchstone. Chrysostom on Psalm 95 will tell you that stumbling uncertainty, hesitancy, even frivolity arises when we make 'a mere device out of our own minds, without the support or proof of Scripture', but to utter the Voice of God from Scripture is to confirm the discourse, and the mind of him who hears, In his 13th Homily on 2 Corinthians Chrysostom maintains that Scripture is the exact balance and perfect rule of all things (ἀπάντων) in the declaration of the laws of God (ἀπόφασιν τῶν θείων νόμων). Epiphanius says that he gave his book the title Ἁγκύρωτός because he collected the whole doctrine out of Scripture, to be as it were an anchor.

1. Augustine De Pastoribus Cap. 12. (sic)

Cyril of Alexandria wrote ¹ " it is needful for us to follow the Holy Scriptures and in nothing to depart from what they prescribe' but Bellarmine remarked that Cyril is only affirming that no new doctrine contrary to Scripture be allowed. Whitaker replies that this is not so --- Cyril plainly affirms the sufficiency of Scripture in matters of faith. In his work on the Gospel of John Book 2 chapter 68 Cyril wrote of the Scriptures as sufficient for practice and doctrine, and in his 5th. Homily on Leviticus he writes of the two days as the two Testaments, and so no third scripture is to be received since the two Testaments are sufficient. Bellarmine comments that these words are from Origen, from his 5th Homily on Leviticus, and not from Cyril who never wrote a 5th. Homily on Leviticus. Whitaker admits that this is probably true ---- thereby exposing one of the weaknesses of using proof texts without recourse to the original works, a mammoth task in controversial theology of this scope ---- but the authority of either in this matter would be sufficient. The point remains ---- there is no Testamentum Tertium. Theophilus of Alexandria in his 2nd Paschal Letter writes "extra Scripturarum Sacrarum auctoritatem divinum aliquid putare, Diabolici Spiritus est".

Apollinaris said ² that he deferred writing against Montanus for a long time lest he should seem to add something to the words of the Gospel. Bellarmine comments that these words are not found in all versions, and Apollinaris does not mention the written Gospel. Whitaker states that they are found in the Greek copies (Chapter 16) and in the versions of Christopherson and Musculus, and though the word 'written' does not appear before the word 'Gospel', Apollinaris' words are, lest he should seem *ἐπιδικάσασθαι τῷ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης λόγῳ* ----- and so the reference is clear. Tertullian

1. Cyril Alex. De Recta Fide ad Reginas

2. Eusebius H.E. 5.15

in his De Resurrectione Carnis calls the heretics 'lucifugas Scripturarum'--shunners of the Light of Scripture; the heretics cannot stand by Scripture alone or indeed, at all.

Cyprian in his 74th Epistle (Ad Pompeium) sought the fountain head of Scripture, as Augustine ¹ had said of him --- true, Cyprian was in error over the rebaptising of heretics, but he was correct in the major premise, though he erred in the deduction. While Augustine could censure and condemn this letter because of the rebaptism of the heretics, he approved and praised Cyprian's opinion about Scripture, and says that if Cyprian had done what he should have done, and gone to the fountain head of Scripture, he would never have persisted in this error.

Augustine's view on the sufficiency of Scripture in faith is seen in the De Civitate Dei 19.18 where he speaks of the faith conceived by Scripture, remaining safe and sure, while in his De Pastoribus 14 (sic) he wrote "away with human writings, let us hear God's Words" a thought which he repeats in his Commentary on Psalm 57 and in his De Unitate Ecclesiae chapters 3,6,10,16 and 20. Origen ² had written "behold how these man stand on the brink of peril who neglect to exercise themselves in Holy Scripture, from which alone the discernment of this examination can be learned". Ambrose ³ wrote "I would not have your sacred Majesty trust mere argument or any reasoning of mine; let us ask the Scriptures, let us ask the Apostles, let us ask the Prophets, let us ask Christ". Augustine ⁴ is more explicit ----- he maintained the singular authority of Scripture, so that whatever is confirmed by ~~it~~ ~~must~~ immediately be received; all other testimonies lack such immediate authority and require examination. Elsewhere he writes "quia solis canonis debeo sine recusatione consensum" (I owe absolute assent only to canonical Scripture).

1. Augustine De Baptismo 5.26

2. Origen on Romans 16.1.10

3. Ambrose De Fide ad Gratian 1.6.

4. Augustine Epi.112

Vincent of Lerins, despite his emphasis on tradition, maintained that the final ground of Christian truth was Holy Scripture, and the authority of the church was only to be invoked to guarantee its right interpretation ----- " the Canon of Scripture alone ~~is~~ self-sufficient for all" (solus Scripturae Canon sibi ad universa sufficit).¹ John Damascene² is clear that we should receive, honour, acknowledge and approve all things delivered by the Law, and the Prophets, the Apostles and the Evangelists, seeking nothing else beside them" (οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητούμεν). Scotus,³ proposing the question [<] utrum cognitio supernaturalis necessaria viatori sit sufficienter tradita in Sacra Scriptura?[?] replies in the affirmative.

1. Vincent of Lerins Commonitorium (c. 434 AD) cap.2. "cum sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon sibi ad omnia satis superque sufficiat, quid opus est ut si ecclesiasticae intelligentiae jungatur auctoritas ? ". M.L. 50. 639.

2. John Damascene De Fide Orthodoxa 1.

3. Quaestio. 2.

Chapter 7.The Versions of Scripture ---- One Exemplar ?

Whitaker opens his Second Question in the Disputatio, on the authentic versions of Scripture, with the assertion of the Council of Trent ¹ ----- "the old Latin Vulgate edition should be held for the authentic (version) in public lectures, disputations, preachings and expositions, and no man shall dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatsoever " ² --- and so, as Melchior Canus says, ³ the Vulgate is the only authentic version in faith and morals, and that no appeal in these matters is to be made to the Hebrew or Greek copies. Whitaker remarks that they carry the corruptions of a translation document with them, and argues for the Hebrew copies of the Old Testament as the original language of prophecy. Whitaker quotes Augustine's view ⁴ that before Babel, the one common language for prophecy remained in the family of Heber, Hebrew, the mother of all languages says Jerome, ⁵ and though Ezra may have modernized the characters and letters, ⁶ as Jerome in his Letter to **Paulinus** says, there is no change in the text. The scrupulous regard for the text in his days would prevent that. The Hebrew books were

1. Parker Edition pg. 111

2. Trent. Sess.4. Decr.2

3. Vide etiam Lindanus De Optimo genere interpretandi; Andradius Defens. Trident. Bk.4.

4. Eucherius on Gen. Bk.2.2.; De Civitate Dei 16.11
Aug.
L

5. Jerome on Zephan. 3.

6. Nehem 8.; the Books of Moses did not perish in the conflagration of the Temple, under Nebuchadnezzar, but were preserved safe in Exile.

translated into various languages, particularly Chaldee ¹ and Greek ². Clement of Alexandria ³ appears to mention Greek translations of the Old Testament long before the LXX, and parts read by Plato ---- Numenius the Pythagorean philosopher alleged *τί γάρ ἐστὶ Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς Ἀττικίζων*. what else is Plato but an Attic Moses? Whitaker doubts whether this means what it is said to mean, that Plato read the Books of Moses or parts of them, but ideas and thoughts are not national or necessarily localised, especially in the ancient world. Theodoret speaks of Greek versions 300 BC. and some being in the royal library of Ptolemy and remaining there till the time of Chrysostom who confirmed their storage in the Temple of Serapis. Augustine had ⁴ the highest view of the LXX, as made by "divine dispensation and held in greatest repute among the best learned churches". Irenaeus and Augustine ⁵ both testify that "one and the same Holy Spirit was in them all (i.e. translators)". Whitaker, however, would follow the caveat of Jerome, ⁶ that the credit often given to the LXX was exaggerated, since faults are evident, and he would assert with Jerome that these after all were translators, and not prophets. The Version of Aquila of Sinope, the lapsed Christian who became a Jew (c. 140AD) and who translated the Old Testament into Greek, lacks 'faithfulness and sincerity'. Theodoret said that it had a

1. Whitaker gives great credit and authority to the Onkelos version of the Pentateuch
2. The most famous being the LXX; Vide Epiphanius De Mensur. Eusebius Preparat. Evang. 8 and Justin Martyr's Dial. with Trypho.
3. Clement of Alexandria Strom.1.1.
4. Augustine De Doctrina Christ. 2.15
5. Irenaeus Adv. Haeres. 3.25; Augustine De Civit. Dei 18.42
6. Jerome Pref. to Pentateuch.

depraved and perverse intention,----- *καμπύλω και διστραμμένω λογισμῷ* . This literal translation certainly obscured the sense. Later Symmachus, of the later part of the 2nd Century AD, translated the Hebrew into Greek, (*πρὸς διστροφὴν*) for the Samaritans with better sense. Theodotion of Pontus, the Marcionite as Epiphanius calls him, did better, ² though he abjured Christianity and went over to the Jews. The papalists put forward the apocryphal 13th and 14th chapters of Daniel from this version as canonical. Theodoret, and Athanasius in his Synopsis also mention the translations of Lucian the presbyter of Antioch (d.312 AD) who revised the LXX and indeed the four Gospels, a remarkable scholar. ³ Whitaker remarks that the text was found in the martyr's own hand at Nicomedia in the marble tower. Jerome refers ⁴ to copies in his day known as Lucianea. Two other editions are known ---- one found at Jericho in a pitcher in the reign of Caracalla, ⁵ and another in a similar vessel at the Northern Nicopolis in the reign of Alexander the son of Mannea. ⁶ Finally we record the labours of Origen, assisted, as Epiphanius says, by one Ambrosius, a rich and pious person, who bestowed 'incredible pains' on the collection and comparison of the various editions;-

- a) Origen's Tetrapla ----- *Τετραπλῆ βιβλία* ---- the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the LXX, and Theodotion.
- b) Origen's Hexapla ; to the above, the addition of the Hebrew text in Hebrew and Greek characters.

1. Jerome called him an Ebionite Christian, Irenaeus described him as a Jewish proselyte.
2. Origen in his Hexapla placed his text next after the LXX.
3. The Lucianic text became the accepted standard in Syria, Asia Minor, and Constantinople ---- Hort and Von Soden argued that the N.T. text is the one represented in the great body of Greek MSS and is thus embodied in the Textus Receptus and the A.V.; its marks were the elimination of barbarisms, the conflation of various readings, intelligibility, and smoothness. Known as the 'Byzantine text' or to Hort and Westcott as the 'Syrian text' (Cross 'Dictionary of the Christian Church sub Lucianic text')
4. Catalogue
5. Epiphanius De Mensur et Pond. cap 17
6. ibid. Vide etiam Theodoret

c) the Octopla ---the above,with the addition of the two anonymous versions found in the jars --- a 'laborious and super-human work, now lost , to the irreparable injury of the Church '. Origen marked these texts with various obelisks, obeli, lemnisci, hypolemnisci, as the various and manifold characters of those editions required.

On the Greek N.T. , Whitaker remarks that with the exception of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the originals were certainly in Greek ---- 'to bring forth the Gospel from the narrow bounds of Judaea into the broader field of all nations and peoples.' True, the Roman Empire was the widest, but Cicero acknowledged that the Greek language was the more widely spread for thought, than the Latin (Cicero's Oration for the poet Archias), and we are talking about the East. On Matthew in Hebrew, Irenaeus said ¹ that Matthew published the Scripture of the Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language -- τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ² and Jerome under Matthew in his Catalogue, writes that this Gospel was first written in the Hebrew character and language, ³ and the 'Hebrew text itself was preserved in his time in the Library of Caesarea built by the martyr Pamphilus'. ⁴ Jerome also writes in his Catalogue under Paul, ⁵ that the Epistle to the Hebrews began in a Hebrew original, but Whitaker is doubtful , since as it stands, the Greek text does not bear the signs of a translation document. ⁶ Whitaker is also sceptical about the Hebrew original for Matthew, unless by Hebrew is meant Syriac or Aramaic , since in Christ's day, Hebrew was a written language not a spoken one. This is the view, says

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.1.
 2. Vide etiam Eusebius H.E. 5.8.
 3. Hosius of Esmeland (De Sacro Vernac.); Jerome Pref. to the Four Evangelists, addressed to Damasus. Whitaker does not refer to Papias (c. 130 AD) who records that Matthew wrote the Logia (τὰ λογία) in the Hebrew tongue---probably because he was not sure whether this referred to the Gospel or not.
 4. Jerome Adv. Pelag. 3.1. where Jerome seems to suggest that it was written in Syriac.
 5. Vide etiam Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius H.E. 6.14.
 6. Accepted as Pauline at Trent Session 4 1546 AD but not Pauline authorship. Accepted at an early date in Alexandria as Pauline whether Luke's translation from Paul's Hebrew (Clement of Alexandria) or as St. Paul's in substance

Whitaker, of Widmenstadt and Guido Fabricius, to whom Bellarmine and Duraeus subscribed. But neither Matthew nor the Epistle to the Hebrews are any longer extant in the Hebrew, and the Greek copies were published (whether translated by Luke, James, Barnabas, as variously stated, or by some others) in the Apostolic era, and so the N.T. in Greek may be taken as the 'peculiar and native tongue of the (early) Church'.

On the Latin versions, Augustine said that 'whereas those who translated the Hebrew into the Greek Scriptures may be numbered, those who translated into the Latin cannot'. Jerome complained that there were as many texts as copies, and 'everyone at his own caprice added or subtracted what he pleased (quod ei visum est)'. Augustine, however, preferred what he called the 'Itala'³ for accuracy, clarity, and intelligibility, but this was not Jerome's version, but the newer version of the two used at Rome, according to Gregory. The older version was probably this 'Itala' or Italic. Augustine in his 10th. Letter to Jerome wrote of the complaint that 'cucurbita' (gourd) in Jonah in the old Latin version had been changed by Jerome in his new version into 'hedera' (ivy). The Hebrew Version may indicate neither, but quite a different plant, 'ricina' (palma Christi). Of the many Latin versions then, there appear to be two emerging, the Old Latin and Jerome's Vulgate, of which only the latter remains in use. But is this Vulgate true Jerome? Xantes Pagninus in the Preface to his own translation, inscribed to Pope Clement VII, declared that the Vulgate then in circulation was not true Jerome, and he wished that Jerome's own version remained. The same doubts were expressed by Paul of Forosombrone,⁴ John Driedo,⁵ Erasmus, and others. Sixtus Senensis⁶ had the same doubts--revisions had produced a different Jerome--while Bellarmine⁷ said that

1. Augustine De Doctr. Christ, 2.11.
2. Jerome Pref. to Joshua.
3. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 2.15. Some authorities eg. Potter, maintain this should read 'usitata' --the initial 'us' having been absorbed into the final letters of the former word 'versio' and 'itata' becoming 'Itala' -- but the reading cited has strong support.
4. Paul of Forosombrone De Die Passionis Domin. 2.1.
5. John Driedo De Catalog. Script. 2.1.
6. Sixtus Senensis Bibliotheca Book 8.
7. Bellarmine Controvers. 2.9.

the Psalms are not Jerome's and the N.T. is not a new translation by Jerome but his revision of the older Latin version, as Jerome himself says, towards the end of his Catalogue.

Whitaker is right in drawing attention to the various recensions eg. that of the Psalms, which Jerome issued---- in his earliest Recension (sometimes called the 'Roman Psalter') the changes were slight and based wholly upon the LXX. In a Second Recension (the 'Gallican Psalter') the revision was more thorough but still based upon the LXX, but due to Jerome's growing study of Hebrew, he produced over 15 years the whole of the O.T. on the basis of the Hebrew MSS and in this work was found the Third Recension of the Psalter (the 'Hebrew Psalter') but this never won general acceptance, the Gallican Psalter being printed in the modern Vulgate Bibles. Whitaker thought this was because the 'Gallican Psalter' was in more common use by then and there was resistance to the change. When Jerome's edition first appeared, this new edition had to face considerable opposition through associations with the earlier texts and it was always liable to approximations and assimilations to the older versions by subsequent revision, so that Jerome's work was seriously threatened. From Cassiodorus onwards, serious attempts were made to standardise the text notably by Alcuin, Theodulf of Orleans, and Hartmut of St. Gall. A fresh but defective Exemplar or standard text² was issued by the University of Paris in the 13th. Century, but following Trent, the edition of Sixtus V th. in 1590 AD was intended to be definitive. Within two years, due to various errors,³ this edition was recalled and a new one issued in 1592 AD by Clement VIII with some 3,000 corrections, in spite of the fact that the Bull of

1. Parker Edition 'Disputatio' pg. 180-1.

2. Exemplar Parisiense.

3. This Clementine edition had on the title page 'Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti Quinti Pont. Max. jussu recognita atque edita'. Departures from the Jerome text were noted. Another revision was published by Vallarsi in 1734 AD, not as a Bible because the Papal Decree forbade it, but in an edition of Jerome as 'Divina Bibliotheca'. Fresh emendations have appeared with Bentley, Wordsworth, and White (1889-1954 AD) and recently the Roman Church has adopted a more liberal attitude to this matter. Vide 'Documents of Vatican 2' (ed. Abbott (1967 AD) cap. 6, sect. 22, (pg. 125), under 'Sacred Scripture in the Life of the Church', called the 'soul of Theology'. In a footnote, Fr. Abbott the general editor makes the comment that this is perhaps the most novel section of this Constitution viz. the availability of Scriptures to all. Appeal is made to the LXX while

Sixtus V authorising the 1590 AD edition maintained this to be the approved edition, with a text unalterable.

In the 'Disputatio', Whitaker lists the variations between Jerome and the Vulgate. Bellarmine had taken the 'Ten Reasons for the Authentic Version of the Vulgate' given in the Preface to the Rheims Version of 1582 AD (largely the work of Allen, Martin, and Bristowe) as the basis of his arguments. To these ten reasons, Whitaker had replied that the translations made much of Jerome's edition being corrected from the Greek originals and therefore for this reason they were authentic. Surely, asks Whitaker, this answers the question of authentic appeal? Not so, claim the Rhemists, for they would correct the Greek from the Latin, as if that were the language in which the Scriptures were first promulgated. Whitaker points out that the Romanists were not agreed on the Decree of Trent ----- the whole question turned upon whether Trent regarded the Vulgate as the authentic version among all other Latin versions, or as the absolute authentic version i.e. the bar to which all other versions, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac etc. were to be brought and judged. The Rhemists tended to take the latter view as the Preface of 1582 AD indicated.

To the taunt of the Rhemists that in his Preface to the N.T. (1556 AD) Beza preferred the Vulgate to all other Latin versions, Whitaker replied that this is for the most part true, for Beza valued the Vulgate for its general accuracy and care in translating the Greek, but this does not apply in all parts -----

 the Vulgate, commonly so called, is given a special place of honour, but this is not exclusive, others, Eastern and Western, being given the honour. Further, as a practical consequence from the Encyclical 'Divino Afflante Spiritu' (1943 AD) modern language translations are to be made with 'separated brethren', from originals not from pre-existing translations.

1. Beza in 1556 AD published an annotated Latin translation of the Greek N.T. which has often been reprinted, the best edition being that of 1642 AD (Cambridge). In 1565 AD he produced his first edition of the Greek N.T. to which were added the Vulgate and his own Latin translation. For this he also used 17 MSS and variants collected by H. Stephanus and R. Stephanus 1550AD. In 1582 AD he issued his second edition of the Greek N.T. supplemented by the Codex Bezae (discovered at Lyons 1562 AD) the Peshitta and a Latin translation of the Arabic version.

he blamed the Vulgate for not knowing the difference between *πληροφορία* and *πεποίθησις* and if he had regarded the Vulgate as the final authority, he would not have made his own new translation. There is no perfection in translation, but there is authenticity in the originals. Jerome realised the deficiencies of his own version eg. on Jonah 4 he translated 'ivy' following Aquila, not 'gourd' with the LXX and notes that neither word is a true translation of the Hebrew. Similar difficulties are found in his Tradition on Genesis, while in his Preface to the Pentateuch he points clearly to the issue ---that he is not a prophet but a translator and interpreter where learning and the copious command of words translate what they understand. Augustine in his 8th. Letter to Jerome points out some errors, and the Jesuits did not use Jerome's version of the Psalms in the Second Recension.

Melchior Canus¹ speaks well of the value and advantage of conferring with the originals, that a knowledge of idioms, phrases, and proverbs, in the original tongue, give us a variety and richness of terms which are not always carried over into a translation medium ----- the meaning of some places cannot be explained without a knowledge of the original languages, while such knowledge weighed against the context removes ignorance, doubts, and ambiguity in the translations eg. Anathema, Maranatha. These advantages Bellarmine will allow--- then Bellarmine must confess that the Vulgate cannot express the majesty of the Holy Spirit, and since it has not light in itself sufficient to illustrate the diction and sense of Scripture, it cannot be said to be absolutely authentic. The process of the revision of the Versions is a continuous one, but always with the original in mind --- and so Whitaker can commend the Rheims Version with its revision of the Vulgate for entertaining the emendment of 'sacculi' for 'seculi' in Proverbs 16.11 and 'Bethel' for 'Bethel' in Cantic. 2, to agree with the Hebrew verity.

1. Op. cit. 2. 15.

Erroneous opinions and comments have arisen over the past 1,000 years, says Whitaker, from the corrupt Latin text but these would tend to disappear with a purified text and therefore to decree the Vulgate as absolutely authentic, as Trent does, is as false and ossified as it is premature. So Jerome referred himself to the Hebrew for the O.T. as to a 'fountain rather than streamlets'² or to a 'citadel and fortress'³. Augustine said⁴ that we must not trust a translation so implicitly as the language from which the interpreters make their translation, and Damasus was aware of this when he urged Jerome to do his work.

What is the position, then, when the originals are at fault? . eg. Psalm 22.17 where all Christians read 'they pierced my hands and my feet' but the Hebrew has not קָרַוּ (they pierced) but קָרַוּ לִי (as a lion). John Isaac in his book against Lindanus (Book 2) said that he had seen Hebrew MSS with קָרַוּ; the Massora on this text says that this reading is found in some MSS. Again, in Exodus 2.22 we read 'he begat another also and called his name Eliezer, saying, the God of my father hath helped me and delivered me from the hand of Pharoah' ---- Whitaker notes that this verse is asterisked in the Louvain edition, to be omitted from the text, and rightly so, for it should have no place as Cajetan has already said, but this is an error of the Vulgate not of the Hebrew. But these, with the other texts cited, are hardly proof of the Hebrew text being so utterly corrupt as Lindanus and Canus maintained. Bellarmine is more mild in his judgement, as he only 'finds fault' with the original. There is nothing serious here, and there are certainly no grounds for saying that the Hebrew fount was more corrupt than the Latin streamlet.

-
1. Whitaker notes that Jerome read 'seculi'---'stones of eternity' which described 'men just and strong in faith' which is of course a true opinion, but not from this text. Gregory on Cantic. 2. interpreted 'Bethel' as the 'Church in which God dwells' --- this too is a true opinion, but not from this text.
 2. Jerome Commentary on Zech. 8.
 3. Jerome Letter to Vitalis.
 4. Augustine De Civitate Dei 15. 13 ;vide etiam Ambrose De Spiritu Sancto 2. 6.
 5. Lindanus De Optimo Genere 1.11.
 6. Canus op. cit. 2.13.

In both, you have to allow for scribal errors in copying, a fact which any book must face up to ^{1.} --- though Augustine ^{2.} actually praises the fidelity and diligence of those 'book-keepers' of the Scriptures (capsarii) in preserving the original , and the clarity of the Hebrew in pointing the way to Christ in its text , more so than was the case in the Greek and Latin copies , as Andradius ³ and Jerome ⁴ say. The errors or defective readings may be classed as 'casual, slight, or common ' and are not really germane to the Faith --- to expound on this would take many books and merely repeat what others have already said. Emendations may be many but none constitute an Addendum to the Depository of Faith.

To Bellarmine's view that it was absurd to pretend that for a 1,000 years from Gregory the Great , the Church had no authentic or true Scripture or true interpretation of it , Whitaker , who has already made his point on the variations of the versions , replies that the Church may be deceived in the translation of some passages without meanwhile ceasing to be the Church --- indeed, variety of readings, as well as faulty readings , do not unchurch a Church , unless Bellarmine took his own theology to its logical conclusion--- i.e. if there is no agreement with Rome , a Church cannot be a Church. The fundamental points of the Faith are preserved in the Latin Vulgate , but the real point at issue is that Bellarmine defended this faulty version as the only authentic Scripture, taking away credit from all other versions. Indeed, Trent has gone beyond all Roman claims , both before Gregory the Great and afterwards by decreeing the present Vulgate as the only authentic version ---- in Isidore's time (d. 636 AD) though Jerome's version was preferred , other versions existed and were used , and the quotations in Bede and Gildas do not always agree with the Vulgate ; Gregory the Great therefore did not decide the matter as finally as Bellarmine claimed. The latter took the view that as in the case of the O.T., the Jewish Church had their authentic version in the Hebrew , and the Greek Church had their authentic version in the LXX , so it is necessary

-
- ^{1.} Sixtus Senensis Bibliothec. 8.2. cleared such errors as there were in the Hebrew of 'malice'.
- ^{2.} Augustine Enarr. on Ps. 41.; Contra Faust.
- ^{3.} Andrad. Defens. 4.
- ^{4.} Jerome Ep. 74 Ad Marcellam.

that the Latin Church have its authentic Scriptures in Latin. Whitaker replies that the premise is false ---- Augustine states that the LXX which he held in high esteem¹ should be corrected from the Hebrew originals ; the Latin text therefore cannot be authentic of itself. Indeed, no translation ever has or ever could be authentic in this sense , for all translations must be referred to originals. To claim the version in the vernacular , is not the same thing as saying that the Scriptures in one's own vernacular is the only authentic version for the whole Church --- each Church should have the Scriptures in its own language , but these are translations and must be referred to the Hebrew and Greek languages in which they were originally written , and this is knowledge which is most necessary.¹ Bellarmine comments that the bishops at Rimini did not understand the meaning of *ὁμοούσιος* as Rufinus tells us² ---- all that is necessary is a few masters of terminology . Whitaker replies that it is not true to say that there was no-one to be found in the Council at Rimini capable of understanding the term *ὁμοούσιος* ---- there were many bishops from Greece who were well acquainted with the Greek language , but perhaps some who understood the whole force of that term felt that in a church divided over the Arian question, it was better not to define the nature of the *ὁμοούσιος* as Nicea had done, and so they 'rashly and wrongly rejected it , for reasons of diplomacy '. In any case, this is an absurd basis for Bellarmine's argument --- the bishops were ignorant , therefore the authenticity of the Vulgate edition is proven ! .

Bellarmino then quotes the words of Luther/against Zwingli , that due to the variety and mutually discordant editions of Scripture , it would seem to be necessary to have decrees of a Council to decide the authentic version --- Trent had done just that ! . Whitaker asks, what sort of argument is this ? That heretical versions differ , therefore the Vulgate is the authentic ! . There is some doubt as to whether Luther actually said this --- Cochleus records it but his table talk is not always reliable . The Exemplar of all

1. Vide 'Documents of Vatican 2' ed Abbott cap.5.sect. 13 (p.449) where priestly studies must include 'suitable knowledge' of the languages of sacred Scripture' --- a key theme of the Decree.

2. Rufinus H.E. 10.21

versions must be the Greek and Hebrew versions --- if this had been accepted as the axiom, Thomas Aquinas would never have read 'ordinata' for 'ordinatae' in Romans 13.2. and based his argument thereon that ceremonial precepts are thus given divine authority, omitting

ἑξουσία from the text², putting a comma in the wrong place (quae a Deo sunt, ordinata) and making the text refer to all things, not ἑξουσία.

In the 'Disputatio' Whitaker lists the Vulgate³

'corruptions' ;-

1. Genesis 3.15 --- where the Vulgate reads 'ipsa conteret caput tuum'.⁴

Bellarmino defends the Vulgate 'ipsa' on the grounds that some ancient MSS have it and goes on to say that there is a great mystery here, that the woman crushes the serpent's head not by herself but by her Son ---- a thought echoed later by Salmeron, that Mary stood by the Cross and she herself offered the Son to the Father in sacrifice for the whole world 'ex obedientia' as Abraham offered Isaac, and for this was commended to the care of the beloved disciple. Whitaker replies that this is a very nice thought and commendable, and Augustine reads 'ipsa' ---- 'ipsa tibi servabit caput', the reading 'servabit' (Cyprian Ad Quirin. 2. reads 'observabit') coming from the LXX Τηρήσει (717 --- vide Gesenius) and perhaps Chrysostom, though Philip Montanus has detected a copyist's error. But the fact remains that the Hebrew is

שׁוֹרֵץ 717? 717

and 717 is the constant Hebrew reading. The αὐτός in the LXX means 'ipse' or 'ipsum' referring to the seed of the woman not to the woman herself. Whitaker notes that Bellarmine's commentary on the

1. Thomas Aquina Prima Secundae qu. 102.1.
2. So does the Old Latin, the Syriac (HL) Irenaeus and Origen.
3. Nearly half of Whitaker's 'corruptions' in the Vulgate turn out to be disputed readings, which are omitted here; they concern variant readings, omissions and additions, appearing in some but not in other MSS. Since finality in this matter is not to be expected, these variants are omitted. Vide Whitaker 'Disputatio' Cap. 10. 2.
4. Vide Jerusalem Bible in note on Gen. 3.15 which reads 'it will crush your head' --this merely refers to the Greek Version(LXX) using 'ipse' for one of the descendents of Eve in particular

'ipsa' is missing from the Sartorian edition, while some Latin copies have retained 'ipse', some 'ipsum'. Certainly Cyprian reads 'ipse' while Irenaeus (Advers. Haeres. 3. 77¹) Leo Sermo 2 De Nativitate Domini), Jerome (Qu. on Genesis) all read 'ipse' or 'ipsum'. Isidore Clarius has restored 'ipsum' in his Bible.

2. Genesis 3.17. --- 'maledicta terra in opere tuo' for 'cursed be the earth on thine account' --- the translator mistook the word

פַּעַל בּוֹרָה reading it with a Daleth ר instead of a Resh ר, thus making an unauthorised derivation from עֵבֶר 2.

3. Genesis 4.15. --- 'nequaquam ita fiet' is redundant --- the Lord did not promise Cain that no-one should slay him, but only that Cain is member of a clan that will exact blood for blood.

4. Genesis 6.3. --- 'non permanebit Spiritus Meus in homine in eternum' instead of 'My Spirit shall not strive' --- the Hebrew being לֹא יִדְוֹן where the radical idea of דוֹן is depression.³

5. Genesis 6.5. --- the Vulgate reads 'cuncta cogitatio cordis est intenta ad malum' --- the Hebrew is

וְכָל-יִצְרָר מִחַשְׁבֹּת לְבוֹ רַק רַע כָּל-הַיּוֹם :
and would require 'figmentum cordis eius tantummodo malum omni die'.

Bellarmino remarked that the sense was the same, but Whitaker disputes this. It is one thing to be 'intent on evil' and another 'to be evil' and only evil. It is a lighter thing to be 'propense' towards evil, than to be already actually evil. The Vulgate would blame only the thoughts of man, the Hebrew, the thoughts, principle, and source of all thoughts. There is nothing in the Hebrew to answer

contd.) rather than 'ipsum' seed in general; the note then goes on to say that the Latin has 'ipsa' and mentions the 'Messianic interpretation' of the text, with Messiah and Mother together, the 'ipsa' referring to the Mother. This 'application has become current in the Church'.

5. Augustine De Gen. ad Liter. 2.36.

1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.38 --the reference in the text is Whitaker's mistake --there were not 77 chapters in this work Bk. 3 in any edition that Whitaker could have used.

2. The Jerusalem Bible corrects this, reading 'Accursed be the soil because of you'.

3. The J.B. reads 'My Spirit must not for ever be disgraced in man' which is nearer the Hebrew.

to 'intenta' and the particle 'only' is omitted which has weight here. Bellarmine deduced that it does not follow from this text that, as the Lutherans supposed, all the works of man are evil, since this is hyperbole, similar to 'all flesh hath corrupted its way' and yet Noah is called a 'righteous and perfect man'. Whitaker replies that the Lutherans do not say that all man's works are evil, but only the works of man not yet regenerate. Further, this is not hyperbole, since the desires of such men are nothing but evil ---- Noah's righteousness was not innate in his nature but a gift from God.

6. Genesis 6.6. --- 'praecavens in futurum.' should be struck out.

7. In Genesis 9.6. the Vulgate 'qui fuderit sanguinem hominis fundetur sanguis illius' omits 'homine' in the second clause. Bellarmine commented that this made no difference to the sense of perfection of the text. Whitaker replied that Cajetanus insisted that 'by man' or 'in man' is emphatic --- it is one thing to say the murderer is merely to be left to divine vengeance --- that 'he who slays man shall himself be slain' --- and quite another to say that human justice requires the searching out and punishment of the murderer, which is the sanction of the authority of magistrate and judge.²

8. Genesis 14.18 --- Bellarmine had written much on this text as a Figure of the Sacrifice of the Mass --- interpreting the \int of $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ as 'because' i.e. Melchizedek brought forth (protulit) bread and wine because he was Priest of the Most High God. Whitaker does not deny that the \int could bear the meaning 'because' rather than 'and' --- when a Hebrew clause leaves a reader's mind searching for a reason of the thing stated, then the conjunctive particle may become causative --- but Cajetanus does not agree with Bellarmine in his note on this place; he denies causation and states that \int is conjunctive, explicative, 'and he was Priest to the Most High God'.³ Further Cajetanus referred the use of bread and wine to his royal bounty, and his blessing of Abraham to his sacerdotal dignity.

-
1. Omitted in the Clementine Vulgate and in the J.B.
 2. The J.B. restores the 'homine' and reads 'He who sheds man's blood, shall have his blood shed by man'.
 3. The J.B. reads 'Melchizedek King of Salem brought bread and wine; he was a priest of God Most High' thus omitting the difficulties over the Hebrew.

9. Genesis 21.9. --- the expression of the Vulgate 'Ishmael played (lusisse) with Isaac' is too gentle --- 'played upon' in a hostile manner is better, or as Paul has it in Galatians 4.29 'persecuted'.
10. Genesis 24.22 --- the Vulgate has 'duo sicli' instead of 'half a shekel' and in verse 32 'destravit camelos' hardly translates the Hebrew, 'loosening or unburdening the camels', and as the Vulgate stands, water is brought to wash the camels' feet as well as the servants' feet.
11. Genesis 27.33 --- 'ultra quam credi potest admirans' are redundant. ²
12. Genesis 37 2. --- the Vulgate says that Joseph 'accused his brethren to his father with a very grievous accusation' suggesting some fixed and foul crime, but the Hebrew text merely suggests that he reported their ill³behaviour towards him. ³
13. Genesis 38.5 --- the Vulgate 'quo nato, parere ultra cessavit' ⁴is foreign to the Hebrew text.
14. Genesis 39.6. --- the words 'wherefore he left all his goods in the hand of Joseph' are omitted in the Vulgate. ⁵
-

1. Whitaker has 'distravit'. The J.B. reads 'and Laban unloaded the camels'.
2. The J.B. adds the word 'unsuspecting' and comments in the note 'conj.'
3. Vulgate reading 'accusavitque fratressuos apud patrem crimine pessimo'. The J.B. reads 'Joseph informed their father of the evil spoken about them' suggesting an evil attitude towards the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, which is not the same thing as Whitaker read. The hostility of the brothers against Joseph would appear to arise at the end of verse 4 as a result of Isaac's special favour of Joseph.
4. The English Versions AV and RV have 'he was at Chezib when she bare him'. The J.B. has the same.
5. They are restored in the J.B. 'so he left Joseph to handle all his possessions'.

15. Genesis 49. 32 --- 'now that piece of ground was bought and also the cave which is therein from the sons of Heth ' is omitted from the Vulgate. ¹

16. Ezra 9.8. --- where the Vulgate reading is 'pax illius' , though this bears an asterisk in the Louvain edition which did not remove the words . The true reading , which Bellarmine acknowledges is 'paxillus' ($\gamma \Pi \tau$) or 'stake ' or ' pin ' i.e. a 'sure and certain abode ' . ²

17. In Micah 5.2. --- there should not be the reading 'parvula ³ es in millibus Judah ' --- Osiander has 'parum est ut sis in millibus Judae ' as Bellarmine had said , but it was not incumbent upon Whitaker to defend Osiander here. Matthew 2.6. has $\text{o}\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\mu\ddot{\omega}\varsigma$
 $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\epsilon}}\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\epsilon}}\iota$.

'So', says Whitaker, 'we have run over a single book i.e. Genesis , and there are many other corrections to be made in Genesis ' . These are not merely different readings as in the LXX but concern errors in both . Anyone 'diligently and accurately working over the errors in the Vulgate would in my opinion undertake and perform a work of very great utility ' . ⁴

In Chapter 12 of his 'Disputatio ' , Quaestio 2 , Whitaker moves on to the Vulgate edition of the N.T. and opens with Matthew 9.13 --'non veni vocare justos sed peccatores ' and asks where is 'ad poenitentiam ' ? Chrysostom reads the text $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\epsilon}}\iota\varsigma \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\mu}}\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$ as does Theophylact , and the Textus Receptus of Stephanus has it. Bellarmine replies with the defence that some Latin copies are without it , and the words are wanting in some Greek MSS ; it is found in Luke 5.32 but this is not conclusive without approximating readings which should not be done. The weight of evidence is on Bellarmine's side here , for the words are wanting in Codex Vaticanus , Codex Bezae ,

1. The J.B. has these words , with a note that they were omitted in the Vulgate.
2. The Clementine Vulgate has 'paxillus' . The J.B. has 'and Yaweh has granted us a refuge in his holy place ' .
3. The Clementine Vulgate has 'parvulus ' with no negative.
4. In the 'Disputatio' Quaest. 2 cap. 11 Whitaker writes on 14 places in the Vulgate edition of the Psalms.

in the Syriac , Ethiopic and Armenian Versions and other ancient MSS.. For this reason the addition did not appear in the latest Missal for the Gospel for the Feast of St. Matthew ,which Whitaker mentions. Further comments on the Vulgate are;-

1. John 14. 26 --- 'Spiritus Sanctus suggeret vobis omnia quaecunque dixero vobis ' --- why 'dixero' ? The Greek is not $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \delta\epsilon \delta\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ but $\delta\epsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega\upsilon\acute{\nu}$
 2. Romans 1.4. --- 'qui praedestinatus est filius Dei ' --Bellarmino claimed that 'praedestinatus' rightly translated $\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$? Whitaker replies that Chrysostom did not think so ----- $\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ means 'to declare manifest, show ' and Theophylact , Theodoret, Erasmus , Faber , and Cajetan follow this meaning. The words 'praedestinated' and 'declared' certainly do not mean the same thing ,as Bellarmine acknowledges.³
 3. Romans 11.6. --- 'but if it be works ,then it is not of grace, otherwise work is no more work ' are omitted , and Bellarmine supports the omission by saying that Erasmus said it could not be found in Chrysostom. Whitaker replies that Erasmus was mistaken here , that although the words are wanting in Chrysostom's Commentary, they are to be found in Chrysostom's text ,and they are to be found in Greek copies'of the greatest fidelity ' and in the Syriac. This is a matter of great debate -- the words are found in recensions of Sinaiticus , the Old Latin, Codex Vaticanus, but are wanting in Codex Alexandrinus , and several other MSS.. The Jerusalem Bible has these words ' remnant , chosen by grace ... by grace,you notice , nothing therefore to do with good deeds , or grace would not be grace at all '.
 4. Ephesians 6.13 --- 'et in omnibus perfecti stare' is not a sound translation of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. Thomas Aquinas and the Schoolmen made a great thesis of the twofold perfection, one of the 'Via ' (The Present) and the other of the 'Domus' (Eternal Life) ,which though true in themselves, are wholly
-
1. Corrected in the J.B. to 'remind you of all I have said to you '
 2. J.B. has 'was proclaimed Son of God '
 3. Acts 2.23. is no help to Bellarmine here.

based upon this text 'perfecti' ; Chrysostom better understands the force of *κατεργάσασθαι* i.e. to conquer completely, subdue, quell, all the powers of the adversary.

So far, Whitaker has replied to Bellarmine, but now he goes on to list his own points, without textual variants bringing debate into the issue¹, against the Vulgate N.T. :-

1. Matthew 3.2. ---- *ἤγγικε* -- 'hath drawn nigh' is translated 'appropinquabit regnum coelorum'² ; the same is true of Matthew 4.17.
2. Matthew 6.7. -- *μὴ βαττολογήσητε* -- is rendered 'nolite multum loqui' but *βαττολογεῖν* means not 'much speaking' but tedious and hypocritical repetition of the same words³. Christ did not prohibit long prayers.
3. Matthew 14. 26. ---- the omission⁴ of the words 'the disciples' -- the Latin has merely 'videntes eum' for *ἰδόντες αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί.*
4. Matthew 20.15 --- 'aut non licet mihi quod volo facere' instead of 'is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?' ----- where is *ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς?*⁵
5. Matthew 26. 61. --- *διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν* which means 'in three days' is rendered 'post triduum'.⁶

1. In addition to the texts above, Whitaker lists some 'errors' in the Vulgate which are in fact only textual variants; these are omitted above as they are still matters of debate on the relative importance of MSS, Texts and Versions including the Patristic evidences.

2. J.B. has 'the K.H. is close at hand', the same as R.V. 'the K.H. is at hand' ---- the graphic Perfect with a Present meaning eg. *οἶδα* = 'I know'; Vide C.F.D. Moule 'Idiom Book of N.T. Greek' pg 16.

3. J.B. has 'do not babble'.

4. *ibid.* restores the words 'the disciples'.

5. *ibid.* adds 'with my own'.

6. *ibid.* has 'in three days'.

6. Luke 1.28. --- 'gratia plena' does not translate *κεχαριτωμένη*
- 'highly favoured'.
7. Luke 3.13. --- 'faciatis' does not translate *πράσσετε*
which means not 'to do' but 'to exact', for the Baptist
is addressing the publicans here.²
8. Luke 6.11 --- 'insipientia' does not translate *ἀνοίας*
'with madness'.³
9. Luke 15.8 --- Whitaker dismisses the rather picturesque
'evertit domum' for *σαροῖ τήν αἰκίαν*, for 'everrit' (she
sweeps), though he confesses that Gregory I read 'evertit' in
his 34th. Homily on the Gospels.⁴
10. Acts 2.42 --- 'et communicacione fractionis panis' for *καί
τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καί τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου*⁵
'in fellowship and breaking of bread'
11. Acts 3.18 --- 'qui praenunciavit' for *ἃ προκατήγγειλε*
'which things he foretold.'⁶
12. Acts 18.5. --- 'instabat verbo Paulus' for *συνείχετο*
τῷ πνεύματι - 'Paul was constrained by the Spirit'⁷
13. Acts 22. 12. --- 'vir secundum legem' for *ἀνὴρ εὐσεβής*
κατὰ τὸν νόμον --- 'a devout man according to the Law' (RV).⁸
14. Romans 7.25. --- 'gratia Dei per Jesum Christum' for
εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
'I thank God through Jesus Christ'. It must however be noted
that *χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ* appears in the Codex
Sinaiticus, Codex C, Ethiopic (Boh.), and Cyril and the
reading *ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ* appears in Codex Bezae
and Origen.⁹

-
1. J.B. has 'Rejoice, so highly favoured'.
2. Ibid. 'exact no more than your rate'
3. Ibid. 'they were furious'
4. Ibid. 'sweep out the house'
5. Ibid. 'remained faithful to the brotherhood, to the
breaking of bread' translating the Greek.
6. Ibid. 'God has carried out what He had foretold.'
7. Ibid. 'Paul devoted all his time to preaching'. Moffat has
'Paul was engrossed in this preaching of the Word'.
8. J.B. has 'a devout follower of the Law'
9. Ibid. has 'Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord'.

15. 1 Corinthians 3.5. --- 'Ministri eius cui credidistis' for
 Διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε
 'ministers by whom (through whom) you believed'.
16. Galatians 3. 24 --- 'Lex paedagogus noster fuit in Christo' for
 εἰς Χριστόν?
17. Ephesians 1. 22. --- 'super omnem ecclesiam' for ὑπὲρ
 πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ - 'over all things to the Church' 3
18. Philemon 9 --- 'cum sis talis ut Paulus senex' for τοιοῦτος
 ὧν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης - 'being such a one as Paul
 the aged' 4

Whitaker quotes some 14 other instances from the remaining books of the N.T. but in each case they appear to be disputed readings. On one of these, Duraeus had asked Whitaker what he thought of the Vulgate reading of 1 John 4.3. 'omnis Spiritus qui solvit Jesum ex Deo non est' since Socrates⁵ said the Nestorians snatched these words from the text, in the same way that the enemies of the faith are reported by Augustine⁶ to have taken out of the text the 'pericopé Adulterae' of John 8.1-12 for the reason that it gave impunity to adultery. Did not Beza, Duraeus asks, do the same on the authority of Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Eusebius?

Whitaker replies that Beza must answer for himself; for his own part he did not agree with Beza's judgement on this passage. Duraeus should know how often Beza had changed his mind on the text. The quotation from 1 John 4.3. should not be read, in Whitaker's opinion, since these words did not appear in the Greek copies (exemplaribus)⁷. What should be read is 'omnis Spiritus qui non confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse ex Deo non est' and Whitaker reads this with Cyprian⁸, though Augustine⁹ had both. But here is a disputed reading --- λυεῖ is read by Socrates,

1. J.B. has 'servants who brought the faith to you'
2. Ibid. has 'the Law was to be our Guardian until the Christ came and we could be justified through faith'
3. Ibid. 'ruler of everything, the head of the Church'
4. Ibid. 'Paul ... an old man now'
5. Socrates H.E. 7.32.
6. Augustine De Adult. Conjug. 2.7.
7. J.B. has 'any spirit which will not say this of Jesus, is not from God' but the marginal note has the variant (Vulg.) which is 'strongly supported' viz. 'which dissolves (breaks, splits, divides) Christ.'
8. Cyprian Testimon. Contra Judaeos. 2.8.
9. Aug. Ad Pollent. 2.7.

Irenaeus , Clement, Origen , Lucifer bishop of Cagliari (the fierce Anti-Arian theologian ,who vigorously opposed all conciliatory action towards even repentant Arians) , Priscillian , and Fulgentius , as well as the Vulgate ---- but 'Ἰησοῦν Κύριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα is supported by Codex Sinaiticus (,N') , the Old Syriac (Peshitta and Heracleon) , the Armenian , Polycarp, and Tertullian --the weight of evidence would appear to be on Whitaker's side.

For the 'Pericopé Aduletrae ' its inclusion has very strong support , suggested by Codex Bezae ,some Old Latin (b.e.) Syriac and Ethiopic (Sah. and Boh.) versions, Ambrose, and Augustine , and though it is omitted by Sinaiticus ,some Old Latin versions (a.f.g.) the Armenian , Ulfilas (Gothic) , Clement, Origen, and Theodore of Mopsuestia , yet the Armenian Version and some Greek copies have it but at the end of the Gospel or at Luke 21.38.

Whitaker denies that Scripture can be accommodated to any one church , but exegesis must be based upon the widest possible acceptance and interpretation of all the churches ;interpretations cannot be tied to the Pope any more than to any other Doctor of the Church.

In Chapter 13 Whitaker discusses the problem of publishing the Scriptures in the vernacular ,and starts with the Decree in the Fourth Rule of the Index of Prohibited Books published by Pius IV and approved by Trent ---the Rule has four parts ;-

-
1. in 1564 AD. The recent abolition of the Index, the publication of the Jerusalem Bible in English, and the decrees on the vernacular of the Divine Office and the Liturgy show a radical change brought about by Vatican 2. Vide 'Documents of Vatican 2 ' ed. Abbott pp. 149-167 ; it is to be noted that such changes into the vernacular are subject to 'competent territorial ecclesiastical authority ' i.e. the bishops , but the issue of the whole Rite in English from Advent 1967 AD and the appearance of the whole Rite in Italian and used for the first time 'in toto' in Italy 24th. March 1968 AD indicate the movement's strength. On the universal use of Scripture in the vernacular by all the faithful Vide Abbott op. cit. p. 128 onwards.

- a) that no man may read the Scriptures in the vernacular , without first obtaining permission from the bishops and Inquisitors (the First Index was issued by the Congregation of the Inquisition under Paul IV in 1557 AD)
- b) that the consenting bishops should consult the parish priest and confessor first.
- c) that the bishops shall not permit any kind of vernacular versions but only those by some catholic author.
- d) that the reading of such versions shall not be permitted to all but only to those who in the judgement of their curates and confessors are likely 'to receive' no damage therefrom but rather an augmentation of faith'. The Preface to the Douai-Rheims version of 1582 AD praises this 'moderate view' , steering between those who would forbid the vernacular to any, and those who would allow it to all , making the grounds of this view the increase of faith to those who would benefit from the exercise , and this under the direction and supervision of the curate and confessor who decide the fit and proper persons to read them, under licence. Bellarmine was also of this latter opinion , while John Molanus, a Louvain divine, said that it was sufficient for men to follow the direction of their pastors and the doctors of the church without recourse to Scripture.

Bellarmino had maintained from Nehemiah 8 that the Hebrew language had become disused and replaced by the Chaldee, so that Ezra's exposition was necessary ---- it was this that made the people rejoice. Whitaker replies that Bellarmine should read the text more closely -- it is an odd exercise to read from morning till evening every day for seven days from a book which no-one could

1. Bellarmine Controvers. 2.15.
2. John Molanus's Book of Practical Theology 3.27.
3. Stanislaus Hosius (1504 - 1579 AD) in his 'small piece upon the Divine Service in the Vulgar Tongue ' (Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christianae --1553 AD ?) held this view. He was Papal Legate entrusted with leadership in doctrinal discussion at Trent in 1561 AD; Sanders too, was of this opinion . Vide De Monarchia Visibili 7.

understand , and to read distinctly (שׁוֹרֵף) and to be heard intelligently (שׁוֹרֵף נִיבֵר). By expounding, Ezra opened up the sense and meaning ; he was skilful in the Law i.e. in explaining the sense and meaning of the Law ,so Bellarmine was building too much on this text. In Nehemiah 8.3. we read 'those that could understand' , but these were only part of all the people attentive to the Book ; they could hardly be attentive for seven continuous days if it was a foreign language . Those few that could understand were not those who knew the language but those who understood Ezra's exposition.

A further testimony that Bellarmine brought forward to prove that Hebrew was not the tongue understood of the Jews after Ezra , is the use of Talitha Cumi (Mark 5. 41) Abba (Mark 14. 36) Aceldama (Acts 1. 19) , and Golgotha and Pascha (Matthew 27. 33 and 26.17) which are neither Greek nor Hebrew . Whitaker replies that if he could produce Haggai , Zechariah, or Malachi in a tongue other than Hebrew , as original , Whitaker would discuss this further. As to the Aramaic terms mentioned , Bellarmine must know that ἀναγινώσκειν is not the same thing as κηρύσσειν and that Aramaic is not so much a different language from, but a dialect of, Hebrew, and though it was the vernacular in Palestine, Hebrew was read in the synagogues.

On the assertion that Augustine affirmed that the Scriptures were wont to be read in the church only in the three languages of Hebrew , Greek , and Latin , if Bellarmine examined the text he would discover what Augustine really said , viz. that to those whose native language is Latin ,the knowledge of the other two languages is needful , Hebrew and Greek ' ut ad exemplaria praecedentia recurratur ' i.e. to the originals . Augustine expressly states that he is speaking to 'men of the Latin language', that

1. Augustine De Doctrina Christ. 2.11.

greater deference be paid to the Hebrew and Greek editions, and that the claim that the Latin only is authentic is without foundation. Jerome is said by Hosius¹ to have translated Scripture into Dalmatian, and after a long editing of Jerome, with great diligence, Erasmus accepted this view. Harding maintained² that the Armenians, Russians, Ethiopians, Dalmatians, and others read the Scriptures in their own languages. Ulphilas translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language³. Sixtus Senensis said⁴ that Chrysostom translated them into Armenian, and Jerome wrote that at the funeral of Paula, the Psalms were chanted not only in Greek and Latin, but also in the Syriac language for the whole week. Stapleton, however, maintained⁵ that this reference was not to the Book of Psalms, but to some extraordinary hymns, since some MSS omit the word 'Hebreo' and others use the word 'Syriac' for 'Hebrew'. Whitaker replies that Stapleton appears to be seriously out of step with his own companions and particularly with Jerome, who clearly said that they chanted the Psalms 'in order'. To come to the question of England, it is true that there is **no** complete Anglo-Saxon Bible or even N.T. but vernacular translations were made⁶ eg. Bede on St. John (no longer extant), a prose version of PSS 1-50 (possibly by King Alfred himself), parts of Exodus 20-23 in the introductory section of King Alfred's Laws, and the Four Gospels in West Saxon (10th. Century?). Bede tells us that⁷ the Scriptures were read in five British languages --- English, Britonic (?) Scot, Pict, and Latin. Whitaker states that Athelstan (c. 894 - 940 AD) commanded translations to be made. Whitaker could have added, from Bede's Ecclesiastical History 4.24. the metrical version of Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel, which Professor

-
1. Hosius De Sacro Vernacule Legendo Opp. Col. 1584 AD. This is now conceded to be erroneous. Vid Hody .3.2. cap.2.
 2. Jewel 'Controversy with Harding' Vol.1. p.334 Parker ed.
 3. Socrates H.E. 4.38.
 4. Bibliothec. 8.
 5. Stapleton 'Return of Untruths upon M. Jewelles Replie' (1566 AD) Art.3.
 6. Caedman's Song (Bede H.E.) is not a Bible translation but an epic.
 7. Bede H.E. 1.1.

Bruce says may reasonably be attributed to Caedman --the Genesis version containing what is known as Genesis B (an insertion into the genuine Genesis text) an Old English translation from a continental Old Saxon text. Whitaker could also have mentioned Aldhelm, the first Bishop of Sherborne , and his translation of the Psalter c. 700 AD and the translation of Acts 15. 23-29 to which was added a negative form of the Golden Rule (whatever you would not like others to do to you, do not that to others) by King Alfred. Aldred in the 10th. Century wrote a linear gloss in English in the Northumbrian dialect into the Lindisfarne Gospels , and a similar gloss appears in the Rushworth Gospels. There was also Abbot Aelfric's translation of the first seven books of the O.T. and he was the author of homilies which included English renderings from the Books of Kings, Esther, Job, Daniel and Maccabees. An Anglo-Saxon version occurs between the lines of the Latin text of the Psalms in the so-called Vespasian Psalter (c. 825 AD).

The liturgical significance of most early English translations is clear from the books chosen , chiefly the Psalms and the Gospels -- this only enhances Whitaker's point ,that it is quite wrong to suppose, as the Jesuits had done, that no vernacular version of Scripture is mentioned by ancient authors and that the Vulgate was the only version. True, in England, as elsewhere, the majority of translations were based upon the Latin Version ,but the point at issue is that vernacular translations were made and used ,more so than is perhaps generally known,as the liturgical use shows. Professor Grant writes² that it is erroneous to suppose that the Bible was completely withheld from the people and was only known in the Latin in the Dark Ages ---there were Greek and Hebrew MSS at Alcuin's Library at York --- but it is true that in general the Vulgate was the fundamental text. The Anglo-Saxon Scriptures thus contained the

-
1. These may have been known to Milton . Vide Paradise Lost with its portrayal of a heroic Satan.
 2. F.C.Grant 'Translating the Bible ' p. 49. (1961 ed).

Hexateuch with several other O.T. books , the Psalms (50 in prose , the rest in metre) and the Gospels ; the Acts, Epistles, and the Apocalypse were found only in fragmentary translations, cited in homilies.

It would appear after cursory examination that the Decree of Vatican 2¹ authorising vernacular translations and versions of the Scriptures , subject to the authority of 'competent territorial ecclesiastical authority (Article 22.2.) is not so much a new departure but a recognition of the practice of earlier days with the same safeguards.

In Africa, in the days of Cyprian, Optatus, and Augustine, Latin was read and understood, and in his Retractions²

Augustine says that he had composed a certain Psalm in Latin letters against the Donatists ,that the lowest of the people , the unskilful and illiterate , might understand. Strabo found the use of Latin in Gaul and Spain general ,and this is supported by Isidore³ and Sulpicius Severus who records the story that when the people chose Martin for their bishop ,when the Reader did not appear ,one of the bystanders seized the book and read Psalm 8 --they all understood Latin. Latin was the universal language at one time --- Augustine wrote⁴ that 'care was taken that the Imperial City should impose not only her yoke but her language also , upon the vanquished nations ' and Plutarch in his Platonic Questions affirmed that all men used the Latin language. For further evidences of the wide use of this language we note the words of Miss Deansley⁵ --- 'Ireland , with its noble libraries of Durrow and Armagh ,to which England may have owed her earliest Scriptures , from which Columba carried his MSS , was the fount and reservoir of classical learning ,even while her society was tribal and semi-migratory --- a Beautiful Irish hand embellished the Book of Kells, but the text still remained Latin. The strong Latinity of the Celtic Church ,particularly after the Irish scholar monks

-
1. Given at Rome Nov. 18th. 1965 AD by Pope Paul VI.
 2. Augustine Retractiones . l. 20.
 3. Isidore De Offic. Eccles. cap. 10
 4. Vita Martini
 5. Augustine De Civitate Dei 19. 7.
 6. Margaret Deansley 'Europe 476-911 AD' pg. 225 (1960 ed).

drifted to the Continent , joining a monastic settlement after the pattern of Columbanus or the household of a Frankish bishop , made contact with the rich manuscript sources of the Graeco-Latin world even in the Dark Ages , merging into the Carolingian Renaissance, so that at the Court of Charles the Bald , stood distinguished John Scotus Erigena , the Irishman. '

The position in Whitaker's day however was very different . Whitaker writes 'in truth ,it is hardly less common, for at the present day none understand Latin ,but those that have learnt it from a master. Formerly the native and common language of many people , now in the greatest multitude that can be collected, few you will find acquainted with Latin '. Whitaker repeats the words of Augustine where he warned the people not to ridicule if pastors expressed themselves ungrammatically ! , Would that there were so many of the laity now that could do this, writes Whitaker ! . Italian , French, German, Polish , English , are mother-tongues of great nations , Latin is the mother tongue of none , and is indeed a stranger in Latium ; it is the vernacular tongue of no people , but a medium peculiar to learned men and the schools .

Bellarmino doubted whether the adultery of David read in the vernacular would really be conducive to faith and morals ; indeed a friend had told him that a certain woman in England ,on hearing the English Bible read on Ecclesiasticus 25 , rose up in a rage and spoke with little modesty of the Scripture , saying 'Is this the Word of God ? Nay , rather , it is the word of the Devil ! ' And what of the incest of Tamar , the lies of Judith , and other passages ? . Whitaker replies that Scripture is a book of humanity in all its experiences ,the proper scope of God's redemption ,and therefore nothing is hid .The adultery of David is narrated ,but Bellarmino

1. Few would go with Whitaker in this ; Latin certainly was the language of government in its official and documental aspect, both ecclesiastical and civil , but he rather overstates the claim for the language being the 'native and common language of the people '.

should read on ----so is David's repentance and punishment ,most useful knowledge for the Church ,since sin must undergo the penalty of punishment ,as chastisement or vengeance. We learn faith, that however degraded the sin , there must be no despair in the sin, since repentance opens the door to salvation . It was the indignant woman herself who was wrong in her attitude to Scripture, not Scripture itself.!

To Bellarmine's point ,that since language changes from century to century , as Horace says in his Art of Poetry ;-

Ut Silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos

Prima cadunt ; ita verborum vetus interit aetas,

Et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque (v 60)

the multiplicity of these changes would demand numerous translations and it would be impossible to find persons fit to make such translations. Whitaker replies , reassuringly, that the primary languages of Hebrew , Greek , and Latin , have changed little , and as for the secondary tongues 'there is never in the Christian churches a lack of sufficient interpreters , able to translate the Scriptures and render their genuine meaning in the vernacular. ²

Theodoret relates ³ the story that when, in the presence of Basil, the Prefect of the Imperial Kitchen , was prating with intolerable impudence and ignorance on the dogmas of Theology, St. Basil of Caesarea answered 'it is your business to mind your sauces, not to cook the divine oracles '. Bellarmine goes on to quote the words of Jerome in his Letter to Paulinus , that in his day , the garrulous crone, the doting old man, the wordy sophist , all indiscriminately seize, tear, and teach before they learn ,and it seems that whereas the proper business of physicians we leave to physicians , all claim theology for themselves. Whitaker replies that

-
1. It is interesting to note that whereas the 1549 and 1552 Lectionaries for Evensong on November 11th. ordered the reading of all Ecclesiasticus 25 , the subsequent Lectionary of 1662 AD ordered only the verses to v. 13 to be read.
 2. An apt comment to the later work of the various Bible Societies . On the concession of Vatican 2 to the distribution of Scripture in the vernacular vide Abbott op. cit. p.128.
 3. Theodoret H.E. 4.19.

the Prefect of the Imperial Kitchen , Demosthenes , was a stupid barbarian , as Theodoret says , but St. Basil did not censure him for reading the Scriptures , but for the conceit and arrogance with which he used them when he did not understand them ---his ears were 'stuffed against the divine oracles ' said St. Basil. Likewise Jerome did not blame men for reading Scripture , but their impudence , unskilfulness , insolence , and arrogance , in assuming they understood them , a habit which would never be tolerated in their own craft or calling , whether it be cookery or carpentry. Let all read the Scriptures but with that modesty , reverence, discipline, and patience which all crafts demand.

The movement towards a vernacular edition of the whole Scriptures as distinct from the translation of particular books eg. the Hexateuch, the Psalter , receiving its impetus mainly under the Lollards and the influence of Wycliffe , issued in the production of the MS Bodley 959 --the greater part of the O.T. (as far as Baruch 3.20 in the Vulgate order) by Nicholas of Hereford, the rest of the O.T. and the whole of the N.T. by an unknown translator --- and Purvey's Version, a late revision c. 1395-1408 AD . Versions suffered in clarity by being too slavish to the Vulgate, and the Council of Oxford 1407 AD forbade such work without the sanction of either episcopal or synodical authority. In 1534 AD the Canterbury Convocation petitioned Henry VIII that the whole Bible be rendered into English , and though no royal command was issued to this effect Coverdale published in 1535 AD a complete Bible dedicated to the King - he based his work on Tyndale where possible, or the German edition of Luther, the Zurich version of Zwingli and Leo Juda, with guidance from Pagninus and the Vulgate. In 1537 AD there followed Matthew's Bible , the first to bear the King's authorisation , really the work of one , John Rogers. The Great Bible of 1539 AD printed in Paris , was issued under T.Cromwell's patronage and was revised in 1540 AD and issued with Cranmer's Preface and the Injunction of 1538 AD ordering it to be set up in churches --both editions were made from the Hebrew and Greek originals. In 1542 AD Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, headed a reaction in favour of the Vulgate , but the movement failed and the continuing movement towards the vernacular received impetus again under Edward VI. The German Bible issued in 1560 AD, though gaining

great popularity , lacked the royal and ecclesiastical authorisation possessed by the Great Bible in England , and under Archbishop Parker a further revision of the Great Bible was issued in 1568 AD and again in 1572 AD --the Bishops' Bible.

Whitaker commends this movement towards the vernacular Scriptures on all sides and available to all , in his quotation from Deuteronomy 31. vv. 11 and 12 --- 'thou shalt read the words of this law in the presence of all Israel ... to all the people collected together ' and this universal reading of Scripture is of perpetual obligation, and not only in the congregation. Deuteronomy 6. verses 6 to 9 makes it clear that the divine precepts and Law should be the study of man at all times, that it be familiarly known to all the people. The whole people were to hear Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer. 36. 6-7) that each man become penitent and return to righteousness . Christ said (John 5.39) **ἔρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς** --this charge was not merely to learned Pharisees but to all who seek and desire eternal life. Chrysostom notes on this place in John that Christ said 'search ' (**ἔρευνᾶτε**) not merely 'read ' . The shield (**θυστῶν**) against the fiery darts of Satan is Faith (**πίστις**) which is nourished and strengthened in Scripture , for the Word of God is the Scriptural sword (**μάχαιρα πνεύματος**)--and so from Scripture, we take offensive and defensive arms against Satan who wages war against all men and so all men should be armed .Further, to derive the greatest advantage, Scriptures should be read publicly in a known tongue , and with understanding (**διὰ νοῦς**)!

That the people may be full of wisdom and knowledge and perfectly acquainted with the mysteries of our salvation², it is therefore necessary that the Scriptures be in the vernacular --- as Paul says ' that the Word of Christ may dwell (**ἐνοικῆν**) abundantly (**πλουσίως**) in the mind and heart '. In 2 Peter 1.5. virtue shall be added to faith , knowledge , to virtue and sanctity of life. Jerome on Colossians 3.16 says

1. 1 Corinthians 14. 7 f.

2. Dt. 4.6. Israel , so endowed with knowledge of the Law, will thus be acclaimed by foreign nations ' Lo! A People wise and understanding , a great nation ! '.

that the people must have not only a sufficient but an abundant knowledge of the Scriptures, and to instruct each other.¹ Chrysostom in his Ninth Homily on Colossians on the same verse writes that the Apostle requires the people to know the Word of God 'not simply but in great abundance' -- οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς περισσεύσεως ----- 'hear ye secular (κοσμικοὶ)'¹ writes Chrysostom 'read not in a perfunctory manner but with great diligence (ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς)--the Word of God is not merely to be 'in you' but 'dwell in your richly' '. The use and practice of the early Church, with Scriptures translated, pastors diligently exhorting the people to read and understand, leaves us in no doubt as to the desirability of the Scriptures in the vernacular. The Jesuits replied that this may be so, but they should not be read publicly in the churches. Whitaker urges Bellarmine to consider the purport of Augustine's words in De Doctrina Christiana 2.5. which reveals the desire of the nations to read in their own tongue, and those of Theodoret in his Therapeutic Discourses 5 where the knowledge of God is recorded as having passed through the Hebrew tongue, to the Greek and Latin, and now the versions, Egyptian, Persian, Indian, Armenian and so on. Bellarmine should remember that when he reads the Vulgate he is reading a vernacular version, and yet all men must appear to be frigid on this matter in Whitaker's own day when there is to be read Chrysostom's passionate appeal in his Ninth Homily on Colossians --- 'hear me, all men of secular life; procure for yourselves Bibles, the medicine of the soul; the one great cause of all evils is ignorance of the Scriptures'. This is more than a counter to the secular pursuit of games and spectacles; it is a genuine charge to all Christian people; in his Third Homily on Lazarus, Chrysostom urges the people to examine at home the passages he was about to examine and treat in church; the people were not merely to be attentive in church, but 'at home, to betake yourselves assiduously to the

1. The words do not appear in Jerome on this text.

perusal of Holy Scripture'. Chrysostom then deals with the excuses drolled out in his day --- but he too was a layman, not a monk, he too had a wife and children, a family to mind, and was 'distracted by a multiplicity of avocations'. To pretend that Scripture was too obscure, was merely a 'pretext and cloak for carelessness'. Origen in his 12th. Homily on Exodus blamed the people for not attending to Scripture in church and not meditating upon it at home also. When writing the Epitaph of Paula, Jerome said 'none of the sisters was allowed to remain ignorant of the Psalms or to fail to learn something from Holy Scripture every day' --- 'quotidie aliquid de scripturis sanctis discere' --for, from times of old, souls warmed with any zeal for piety were nourished on the Scriptures.

'The difference between us' writes Whitaker 'is quite clear'; 'we would like to rejoice with Theodoret, who wrote in his Therapeutic Discourses 5 'you may see everywhere those doctrines of ours understood, not only by those who are masters in the church and teachers of the people, but by cobblers and smiths, weavers and artisans of every kind, yea, and by women too of all classes, and by those who work for hire with their needles, though unacquainted with literature, by maid-servants, and by nursery girls, by the inhabitants of the cities and by rustics, by men who dig the ground, tend cattle, plant vegetables-- --disputing of the Divine Trinity and the Creation of all things, better acquainted with human nature than Plato and the Stagarite'.⁸ Bellarmine, however, appears to take sides with Hosius, who in his De Sacro Vernacule Legendo condemned this profanation, rather than translation, of Scripture, that beltmakers, porters, bakers, tailors, cobblers, sewers, stitchers, she-apostles, prophetesses, and the rest of the brood, deal popularly and familiarly with the mysteries of the Faith'. Whitaker quoting from Eusebius, writes that the divine doctrines should be learned by women as well as men, by poor as well as rich, by servants as well as masters, and that Erasmus was right when he defended the vernacular before the divines of Paris by the precedent of the ancient church and the necessity of the thing itself.

1. Eusebius. Demonstrat. Evangel. 1.6.

On October 9th. 1964 AD Abbot Butler of Downside made a forthright appeal to the Vatican Council for a truly critical scholarship on a wide front ; the Italian Bishop Mgr. Caminida , Bishop of Ferentina, countered with a warning against an indiscriminate diffusion of Scripture among the faithful --surely an echo of Trent ! . An intermediary view came from Mgr. Cekada, Bishop of Skopje, who insisted that the Roman Church should provide translations on a wide scale to bring the Scriptures to the people ; there were some countries without an authorised complete N.T. in their own language. The Holy See should therefore set up an international Biblical Society to produce translations of Scripture in all languages, though he hesitated to propose collaboration with non-Catholic Christians. Much has been done to implement this by the Decree (passed by an overwhelming majority of 2,000 against less than 100) that such co-operation should take place in the matter of vernacular translations.

A similar principle, contended for by Whitaker, applied to the vernacular in public prayers --- Trent Session 22. 8. (1562 AD) reaffirmed that 'it did not seem good to the Fathers , that the mass should everywhere be celebrated in the vulgar tongue '---non tamen visum est patribus ut vulgari passim linguā celebratur'---here under the word mass is implied the whole liturgy and all the offices of the Church. Nevertheless it was permitted that pastors and those with the cure of souls should frequently during the celebration of mass , either themselves or through others, expound some parts of what is read in the Mass. Hosius in his De Sacro Vernacule Legendo maintained that Latin was the only language ever used in the Western Church , Greek in the Eastern --which gave no room for the vernacular. On the contrary, writes Whitaker, in the ancient church there is ample proof that lessons and public prayers were held in the language understood of the people ; if that were true, it is but a short step

1. Session 22. cap. 9. in Mendham's 'Memoirs of the Council of Trent ' p.225

to opening up the central mysteries in the vernacular.¹

To the argument that the peculiar dignity, majesty, sanctity and venerable antiquity of Latin requires that this language should be the medium of divine truth, rather than the barbarisms of vulgar tongues, Whitaker replies that these qualities are in the things expressed not the tongues, and the profound truths expressed in the Latin text must always be referred to the more profound media of Hebrew and Greek for exegesis. The Gospel is not profaned in the vernacular, in spite of what the Rhemists were saying in their annotations on 1 Corinthians 14 but rather communicated. What Pseudo-Dionysius says is quite true --- *ἁγία μυστήρια καὶ ἅπαντα τοῖς ἀτελέστοις* ---that the sacred mysteries should not be imposed on the uninitiated, for Christ said the same in Matthew 7.6. that pearls are not to be cast to swine. The sense here is not as Bellarmine likes it, that the Scriptures therefore should be kept from the people, but as was the custom of the ancient church, the mysteries of the Faith, the sacraments, must be treated with the utmost caution and respect. Maximus the Confessor (fl. c. 645 AD) treats further on this meaning of Pseudo-Dionysius, and Bellarmine should read him, and must not compare the laity with swine ---they are sheep to be fed, as Basil says.² The reference to Leviticus 16.17 where the priest is commanded to enter the sanctuary alone, that the people did not even hear the priest, can have no part in the Christian liturgy, since it is the audible and full offering of the whole church.^{1*}

-
1. Vatican 2. October 15th. 1963 AD Amendment 4 on the draft Decree De Ecclesia Cap. 3. (The Decree was promulgated Sept. 12th. 1965 in Session 4) extended the use of the vernacular to the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals, under the guidance of regional or territorial episcopal conferences, though Latin was to be retained for the precise Form of the Sacrament. On Oct. 13th. Archbishop Heenan, the R.C. Archbishop of Westminster, said in Rome that he felt 'great anxiety' on the scope and influence of episcopal conferences -- 'how much will the majority view be forced on a reluctant bishop?'. Hosius would have found his view due for revision if he had been at Vatican 2 on October 9th. 1964 when the opening mass was celebrated by the Persian Archbishop of Urmia and Salmas in the Chaldean Rite, one of the most ancient of the Oriental Liturgies, of the Syriac family. On Dec. 7th. 1965 among the 12 documental addenda placed before Vatican 2 was one (the first) containing the innovation that most of the mass should be said in the vernacular--this had already been discussed on Oct. 8th.--the ^{opposing vote} was very small, only 13, while 2,280 voted for the change.

2

As to Hosius' claim that religion and piety have diminished since the familiarity of the vernacular has been used, even if this were true, it is no fault of the medium ;when Christ preached, the Pharisees and people became more obstinate, and the Gospel, though a savour of life to some , became a savour of death to others . But in fact the claim is not true -- deaf superstition has given way to sincere piety and religion. The three languages on the Title of the Cross were not intended to be restrictive of the media in which the services of the church should be made known --the contrary is actually true ;the intention was that Christ's death should be as widely known as possible.

The demands of edification and understanding made clear in 1 Corinthians 14 require the natural movement to the vernacular , not only in sermons and exhortations , but also in the Liturgy and the public services of the church. Stapleton had made the point in his book against Jewel (Article 3) that Paul used the words ' how shall he that occupies the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks' --- *ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἀμήν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ* that it is sufficient if one only , whom people commonly call the Clerk, understand and answer 'Amen' on behalf of the whole congregation . Whitaker replies that *τόπος* never means the persons of those represented , and *ἀναπληροῦν* means ' to fill' not 'to supply ' as Stapleton had written ; the sense then is rather ' one ranked as an unlearned person', which Ecumenius has⁴. True, the Clerk does make these solitary 'Amens', but this is an abuse --the ancient church knew of no such practice. Jerome writes of 'the whole church replying with a thundering 'Amen' '⁵ A single Clerk must

contd. 2. Basil De Spiritu Sancto 2.27 -- note Basil's use of *ὀριζομένω* in the sense of openly displaying cp. Colossians 2.15. ; 2 Corinthians 2.14.

- 1* This has a modern ring --- to it -- the iconostasis and screen gives way to the open altar and the fully audible congregational liturgy.
2. De Sacro Vernac. Legendo.
3. 1 Corinthians 14.16.
4. *ἰδιώτην λέγει τὸν ἐν τῷ λαϊκῷ γάματι τεταγμένον*
Ecumenius 'Commentary on the N.T. ' sub loco.
5. Jerome Second Prologue to the Commentary on Galatians' -- 'Tota Ecclesia instar tonitruui reboat Amen '.

have been 'a Stentor' for this. Cyprian attests the whole people's part in the Sursum Corda, but more plainly Justin Martyr in his Second Apology writes *πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ Ἀμήν*. --'the whole people reply in token of assent, Amen'. Bellarmine and the Rhemists never forsake Stapleton's views on this text, and say that Paul only referred to certain spiritual songs, extraordinary to divine service and lessons from Scripture --such as are mentioned in Ephesians 5.19 and Colossians 3.16 and in Tertullian's Apology chapters 36 and 39, since at Corinth, the public prayers would be recited in Greek, a language not understood by all. Whitaker replies that surely Greek at Corinth was the vernacular and Paul in the texts quoted is saying that 'spiritual songs' (*ὡδαὶς πνευματικαῖς*) must not be subject to glossalalia but must be in a known tongue to be understood. The text actually is wider than this ---it refers to Psalms, hymns, doctrine, revelation, --the Apostle's meaning is clear, that whatever is spoken in the church in an unknown tongue is spoken fruitlessly and in vain.

Whitaker shows little sympathy for the view put forward by Bellarmine and Stapleton that the priest in the sanctuary is praying for the people to God, but not to the people and therefore it is not necessary for the people to hear what is prayed --- indeed they have their own prayers, and the fact that many pray their own prayers adds richness and variety to the whole action of the church, which is thereby not reduced to a prayerful monologue. Whitaker does not dispute the value of the latter point, but he challenges the simile that if a noble intercede for a rustic to the King, it is not necessary for the rustic to hear or even be present. Whitaker fears that this conclusion might be made-- that in fact the people need not bother to attend the church at all.

True, the prayer life of the pastor is involved in intercession for the souls in his care without the necessary presence of such persons

1. Cyprian 'Discourse on the Lord's Prayer'

remembered in the intercession , but the point at issue is the Liturgy and public prayers of the church , and these must be the prayers of the whole church , the Body of Christ , and no member can ever move such responsibility onto a minister . The prayer life of the laity is more than the bare recitation of the 'Amen' to the prayers in an unknown tongue . Paul in 1 Corinthians 14.19 by the use of *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* certainly means public prayer , which must be in a known tongue , or else it will be *ἄκαρπος* 'unfruitful' since the ground of prayer is not to change God's Will but to accord ours to His , to kindle an affection for, and understanding of, the Divine Will , that the 'Amen' may be said with fervent devotion . The Amen is more than a 'full-stop ' or a 'punctuation ' . Augustine wrote¹ that no-one is edified by hearing what he does not understand . The Jesuit reference to Origen's Homily 20 on Joshua² --- 'we often indeed do not understand what we utter , yet the Virtues understand it ' -- does not in fact refer to prayer but to the reading of Scripture , and Origen is making the point that the laity sometimes refuse the Scriptures because they are too difficult and transcend our understanding ; Origen insists that they should be read although at the moment they are not understood , because the Virtues understand. This is quite different , says Whitaker, from reading in an unknown tongue . Scripture must be read for through the word comes the sense -- prayer is of a different order ; prayer is a colloquy with God and springs from an understanding of Him . To Stapleton's quotation from Cassian with the words of St. Anthony , that prayer is perfect when the mind is so affected as to rise above the verbal medium , Whitaker wonders how this helps the Jesuit view. Anthony does not say that we should pray in an unknown tongue , but that the soul by its affection to God reaches a certain perfection when its prayers are no longer contained within the bounds

-
1. 'Nemo aedificatur audiendo quod non intelligit ' . Vide etiam De Magistro cap.1. for the reference to understanding.
 2. The Greek is preserved in Philocalia cap. 12 -- the whole chapter is a curious discourse , where Origen suggests that the mere words of Scripture may have a beneficial effect , after the manner of a spell , upon the man who reads them , through certain spiritual powers in intimate contact with our souls.

of verbal expression -- in short, the mystical experience, when the Holy Spirit so infuses the soul in experience that words are irrelevant. This is quite different from praying in an unknown tongue, but in fact amounts to praying in no tongue at all!

Surely, says Whitaker, Bellarmine had read 1 Corinthians 14. 11 -- if the minister speaks in an unknown tongue would he not feel a barbarian, perhaps like Ovid when banished to Pontus? ---- 'Barbarus hic ego sum, quia non intelligor ulli' --- or like Anacharsis, who when an Athenian reproachfully called him a barbarian, said *ἐμοὶ πάντες Ἕλληνες σκυθιζούσι ?* ? Whitaker cannot understand why the Romanists concede the vernacular to the Armenians, Egyptians, Muscovites, Bohemians,² and Ethiopians, and thus admitting the principle, but deny it in general. Surely this permission to these churches dismisses the Jesuit argument that Latin alone, with its majestic dignity, is the sole medium for the divine offices. !

Harding had taken the view on Justinian's Injunction³ that ministers in church should pronounce everything with a clear voice, that this injunction concerned only the Greek (Eastern) Church and then only involved what he called vocal prayer as distinct from mental prayer, since both can be congregational exercises and could be within the mass.⁴ Whitaker replies that Justinian was not merely Emperor of the Greeks but of all Europe too and therefore his Injunctions concerned not only Constantinople but also Rome, as is clear from the final chapter --- 'we order therefore the most blessed Archbishops and Patriarchs i.e. of old Rome and Constantinople-- *τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*'. Further, the purpose of this audibility is made quite clear i.e. that the people may be 'inflamed to devotion' (which is impossible without an understanding of

1. Ovid Trist. 5. Eleg. 11 (10.36)

2. Aeneas Sylvius (later Pope Pius 2 - 1458-64 AD) in his 'Historia Bohemia' (written in 1458 AD the year of his election) cap. 13 writes of Cyril and Methodius allowing the Moravians to use the vernacular -- Whitaker denies the Jesuit view that this was merely because no ministers competent in Latin were to be found. Eck in his Common Places cap. 34 concedes the same practice to the Indians. (The 'Historia Bohemia' of Aeneas Sylvius was printed in the Omnia Opera published Basle 1551 AD pp. 387-471.)

3. Justinian Novell. Const. 137 (123)

4. Harding Art. 3. sect. 14 Confutation of Jewel's Apology (1565 AD)

the language used) and the Jesuit claim that these words are not found in ancient copies is answered by the fact that all the Greek copies have them ---- one may conjecture ¹ says Whitaker , the grounds of their omission from the Latin copies. Gregory Holoander had them in his Latin version, and he is certainly a faithfully translator of the Greek text.

Was it not Basil ¹, writing to the clergy of Neocaesarea , who referred to the 'day dawning and all the faithful with one heart and voice rising to offer Psalms to the Lord , and thus the church becomes like the sea ²; the tidal waves roar when driven onto the coastal rocks , so time draws the church to roar with the voice of men in prayer to God.' This was not meant for Greeks only -- ' these constitutions are observed with one accord by all the churches of God ' wrote Basil who encompasses within the range of his statement all the Christians of Egypt, Lybia, Thebea, Palestine, Arabia , Phoenicia , Syria , up to the Euphrates'---- ' all who have any value for watching , prayer , and common psalmody '. It was therefore the 'custom of the primitive church for the whole people to combine their desire and assent with the prayers of the minister '. We are bound to pray and sing with human reason and understanding and not merely as the birds , to respond with an unintelligent urge of nature ³; to speak in an unknown tongue is useless (*ἀχρηστος*) not only to others but for oneself , in Chrysostom's view ⁴; and this is the view of Ambrose ⁵, Jerome ⁶, Isidore of Seville ⁷, and the Council of Aix. ⁸ Cajetan writing on 1 Corⁱⁿthians 14 says that it is ' more fit for the edification of the church that the public prayer should be said in the common language of clergy and people , than that they should be said in Latin '---this sentence really made Catharinus angry, for when he came to write his Annotations on Cajetan, he said this view was the devil speaking in Luther ! .

1. Basil Ep. 63.

2. Vide Hom. ⁴ on the Hexaemeron. PG 29. 308 f.

3. Augustine 'Second Exposition on Ps. 16': 'scientes autem cantare non aviseo homini , divina voluntate concessa est ' The reference is to the Vulgate of Ps. 19. vv. 12-13. 'ab occultis meis munda me, et ab alienis parce servo tuo' which follows the LXX reading $\square \cdot \gamma \cdot \delta$ for $\square \cdot \gamma \cdot \delta$.

4. Homily 35 on 1 Corinthians.

5. Ambrose on 1 Corinthians 14.

6. Jerome in eodem loco.

7. Isidore of Seville De Eccles.

8. Canon 132

Offic. 1.10

Chapter 8

The Right Sense of Scripture

Campion had wished for an audience in the university schools, where 'like a knight, I might call out these ruffians (who misuse the Scripture in its meaning) from their dark dens into the open field and then discomfort them by the certainty of the truths we maintain'. Campion sincerely hoped that, like Luther, Whitaker might traverse the road from subtle juggling with the text, and denial of catholic teaching, into the clear light and certainty of believing what the Scriptural text actually says. Luther, at one time, entertained Zwingli's conception of the Eucharist, but, says Campion, he was forced to yield¹ to the power of the words 'Hoc est enim corpus meum'. Was Whitaker so 'stuffed up in the nose that he could not smell³ the subtle concoctions and brews of Zwingli, Calvin, Beza and others?'.²

Unlike Campion, who concentrates on the meaning of the Words of Institution in this chapter on the correct interpretation of Scripture, Duraeus considers the subject in its wider scope --- that unless we are going to juggle (iacto) with word and sense (*ῥητὸν καὶ διανοίαν*) we must acknowledge the fact that there is a genuine meaning in the words (*ἐν τῷ ῥητῷ διανοία*) as given by the Holy Spirit; what Whitaker had previously referred to as the 'germaine truth of Scripture'. The Catholic Church is the guardian (custos) and mistress (magistra) of both faith and truth, handed down from Christ and the Apostles through the succession (series) of learned pastors by tradition (per manus) and carried through to our time; Duraeus was claiming that the Roman Catholic Church was plainly Catholic in its agreement with Vincent of Lerins who so rightly said that we should be guided (dirigi) by that line (linea) of prophetic and

-
1. Decem Rationes 2.
 2. Luther Ep. ad Argent.
 3. 'tam esse mucosis naribus quibus artificium monitus non persentiscat'

Apostolic interpretations according to the pattern (norma) of ecclesiastical and catholic meaning¹. St. Vincent defended himself against the false depravity of heretics by adhering to the catholic faith --- 'idcirco multum necesse est propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticae et apostolicae interpretationes linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus normam dirigatur. In ipsa item catholica ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quae omnia fere universaliter comprehendit ab his sensibus² nullatenus recedamus quos sanctos maiores ac patres nostros celebrasse manifestum est¹.

Whitaker agrees that Scripture is not in the word (ἐν τῷ ῥήτῳ) only, but in the meaning (διδραϊδ) of the word, and that they do justice to Scripture who do not juggle but who show the force of the words as Basil wrote³, since 'the Word of God must have meaning and content'⁴, therefore 'we both look not for sheaves of words (verborum foliis) or any mere arsenal of verbal ammunition, but for the satisfaction of intrinsic judgement (fructu ipsius sententiae). Whitaker agrees that the church is the guardian (custos) of the faith, the pillar (columna) and ground (firmamentum) of the truth -- that writings without the Spirit (sine Spiritu) will amount to no more than the Anabaptist ἐνθουσιάζοις --- verba singillatim'. What Duraeus says, however, of the continual succession of pastors and learned men adds something to the dignity but nothing to the necessity of the case. The Faith is not necessarily tied to succession; the scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' seat, and though they must be heard as containing some truth, yet their embellishments and errors did constitute an endless mixture (infinitum

1. Duraeus cites Vincent 'Contra Haeres' -- he means the Communitorium (c. 434 AD) cap. 2. (De Journal 2168; ML 50. 639). Quoted in the Bulla Definit. Immacul. Concept. Mariae 8th. Dec. 1854 AD and again in Session 3 cap. 4. De Fide et Ratione Vatican Council 1870 AD and in the Papal Encyclical of Benedict 15 Nov. 1914 AD 'De Indole Progress. in Scientia et Praec. Religiosa'.

2. i.e. 'universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem'

3. τὴν δύναμιν τῶν σημαζομένων --- Contra Eunom. 2.

4. Theodoret 'Verbum enim Dei ἄροντος νοούμενον non est Verbum Dei'

fermentum) . Succession in the early church was not a mere succeeding (τῆς προέδριας) but appertained to doctrine (τῆς εὐσεβείας) as Nazianzen wrote of Athanasius. Augustine wrote many things about the diligent enquiry into the true meaning of Scripture in his De Doctrina Christiana (c.397 - 427 AD) particularly in the second and third books --- but the ' most sure foundation of succession ' which Duraeus alleged is not even mentioned. Augustine first advised that where obscurity occurs, comparison must be made with those texts where the meaning is clear (aperta) and if there are many opinions on the one text, then we should follow the most edifying (edificatio optissima) , and moreover , we must have a knowledge of languages and consult the various versions, and weigh carefully the circumstances , not least , paying attention to the context , to that which precedes and that which follows , and finally we must never avert our gaze from the mind and purpose (propositio) of the writer. Indeed , the very exegesis of Scripture for a long time was broadly based on the lines that Augustine proposed ; True, Augustine used the seven rules of the Liber Regularum (c. 382 AD) of Tyconius the Donatist³ , whom he says was gifted ' acri ingenio et uberi eloquio ' , but what Augustine says in his De Doctrina Christiana is a true compass (amussim) for all traditions and exegesis.

Whitaker claimed that the Jesuits had been busy weaving ' as many knots and tangles as in a spider's web (with their Biblical exegesis) but when a man begins to move and shake, the whole construction collapses . It is not safe (tutus) to rest

1. Gregory Nazianzen; Orat. 21.7. In Laudem Magni Athanasii.
2. A careful and comparative study of vocabulary was emphasised by Luther ; vide 'Luther speaks ' ed. H.P. Ehrenberg p. 72 . Luther's linguistic equipment was by no means negligible -- he had studied Hebrew through Reuchlin's Rudimenta from 1509 AD and Greek from 1511 AD ; in his essay on Translating, Luther confessed that he and two helpers had spent 4 days over 3 lines of Job.
3. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 3.30.7 . There is some doubt about the measure of Tyconius' Donatism eg. unlike the Donatist, he did not claim that the Donatist Church was the only entire church; vide. Giles 'Documents illustrating Papal Authority'(1952 ed.) p. 188

merely in the majority judgement of the multitude -- the Bereans didn't ¹; they examined the Scriptures, resting neither upon majority nor common opinion --- and Cyprian makes it clear ² that the most profitable way of arriving at the truth is not, as Duraeus had suggested, hanging upon the opinion of the multitude, but

' ut ad divinae Traditionis caput et originem revertamur. Quemadmodum enim si canalis aquam ducens subito deficiat, ad fontes pergatur; sic facere oportet Dei sacerdotes ut si in aliquo mutaverit aut vacillaverit veritas, ad originem Dominicam et Evangelicam et Apostolicam traditionem revertamur'.³

The question here was not who was right in this particular dispute between Stephen of Rome and Cyprian who had the support of the two African Councils of 256 AD, but what were the principles on which the Fathers of the Church argued, and plainly Cyprian maintained that the way to find out what traditions are genuine is not to take the word of the Bishop of Rome, but to search the Scriptures as the only trustworthy record of the Apostolic mind and tradition. Where, as in this case, it was a matter so profound as to affect the very nature of the sacrament, this was necessary. The issue was not the re-baptism of those who had gone from the Baptism of the Church to heresy, but now returned, but the baptising of those who had received only heretical baptism. Both sides had a case --- Cyprian and the Carthaginian Councils argued ' a principio fidei ' (Song of Solomon 4.8.) that the Name of Christ only has efficacy within the Church, while Stephen argued that whoever is baptised in Christ's name at once receives Christ's grace ⁴, but the justice of Stephen's judgement was decided not on his claims to be the mouthpiece of the Apostles ⁵, or any submission to a threat of excommunication by him, but upon the force of Scriptural arguments, as indicated in the canons of the Council of Arles in 314 AD ⁶. Augustine regarded Stephen's view as the true one in

1. Acts 17. 11.

2. Ep. Ad Pompeium, Bishop of Sabrata (in the Province of Tripolitana). Library of the Fathers 'Treatises of St. Cyprian' (1876 ed) pg. 260 f.

3. *ibid.* cap. 12.

4. Ep. 75. sect. 18.

5. Ep. 75 sect. 5 and 6

6. Turner 'Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Juris Antiqua.' C.H. Turner (Oxford) 1899-1939 under 381 A

accordance with the mind of Scriptural and primitive customs, but he did not condemn Cyprian for his error, for at that time the consent of the whole church had not been declared authoritatively by the decree of a general council'. Indeed, he commended Cyprian for maintaining communion with those who disagreed with him, and by inference suggests a censure of Stephen for lack of charity in speaking of the excommunication of those who practiced rebaptism, and yet no evil of schism followed. The support of the general consent of the church ---- securus judicat orbis terrarum ²---did not mean the majority is always right 'provided they stick together like sheep' ----this would be unscriptural and historically untrue. The Nicene Faith stood condemned by acclamation, and the whole world groaned in surprise to find itself Arian'. ³

The judgement of the church on the meaning of Scripture is of great weight, and, as Duraeus had said, the office (munus) of a bishop demands that true doctrine be given to the people, that Councils and Pontiffs should heed the same charge, the church making judgement in controversies, but Whitaker asks that he be not misunderstood in this matter. The true church is evident in the true mind and teaching of Scripture and this is the touchstone of true catholicity. There is no question of appealing to the hidden testimony (occultum testimonium) of the Spirit which Duraeus had mentioned, but precisely what Augustine says 'sunt enim Scripturarum autoritates non quorumcunque propriae sed utrisque communes testes'. ⁴ Furthermore, Duraeus would confine (revocari) the right of interpretation, the name and power (nomen et vires) of the church to the bishops, all others being excluded from the Councils, whereas Paul ascribed this authority not only to bishops,

1. Augustine De Baptismo Contra Donatistas 1 (401 AD)
2. Augustine Contra Parmen. 3.
3. Jerome Adv. Lucifer. sect. 19
4. Augustine Contra Maximil. 3. 14.

but to all ministers and doctors , who are just as much involved in this succession of pure doctrine as the bishops. The knowledge and doctrine of Scripture is not hereditary², nor necessarily passed from hand to hand . That bishops and councils have removed many errors by a right interpretation (recta interpretatio) of Scripture does not give a sole 'ius interpretandi' to the episcopate or councils ; where then would there be a protection against impious and unlearned councils ? Duraeus claimed that the Pope acts as the sole protection in such cases, but, comments Whitaker , he never consented to the Sixth African Council , which disapproved of his peculiar deceit (singularem fraudem) yet its authority stands. It is true Christ said ' pascere oves meas ' to Peter³ , but He did not say 'pascere oves omnes meas ' . Christ said ' sicut misit me Pater, ita ego mitto vos '⁴ --notice the plural in the word 'vos' . Cyprian said 'pastores sunt omnes sed grex unus ostenditur , qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimes consensione pascatur ' and he also writes ' hoc erant utique et ceteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus , pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis '⁵ and so Peter had no active power of universal jurisdiction in these matters .

Duraeus pointed to the events of the early 5th. Century AD , which, he claimed, demonstrated forcibly that the Pope had the sole right of interpretation . Augustine, writes Duraeus , recognised that the Pope had the care of all the flock

1. 1 Corinthians 14. 3,29, and 30 Vide 'Documents of Vatican 2' ed. Abbott p. 401-3 where Vatican Council 2 requested that the Curia give ' a greater hearing to laymen outstanding in their virtue, knowledge and experience ' in the re-organisation of the Curia ; encouragement is also given to the involvement of the laity in the apostolate of teaching both at Diocesan level and parochial level . Vide etiam the Pope's address to the Curia 21st. Sept. 1963 AD . It must however be said that since Sixtus V established the Curia in its present form , laymen have functioned along with cardinals, bishops and priests --- but at present there is no suggestion of lay voting in a general council of the church. Only bishops have a voice and vote , though priests and laymen may be present and may even address the assembly as specialists. In a Motu Proprio dated 6th. Jan. 1967 AD entitled 'Catholicam Christi Ecclesiam ' Pope Paul VI announced the establishment of a council on the laity (Concilium de Laicis) which will work for the 'service and promotion of the lay apostolate ' and the 'integration of the laity in the general apostolate of the church ' . The Council will consist of 12 members , all lay, with 'consulters'

when he wrote that Boniface was pre-eminent as the highest point (celsiore fastigium) in the pastoral order, and the 61 bishops of the Council of Milevis (416 AD), among them Augustine, wrote to Innocent that it was of the utmost importance for the suppression of heresy that the Pope should condemn Pelagius, and that whereas the Palestinian Synod had been deceived in this matter, the primacy of the Apostolic chair could never tolerate it. Whitaker replies that Duraeus could not have read Augustine's actual words --- he did not say that Boniface was the highest point in the pastoral order but that he was pre-eminent, on a loftier height, in the function of being a pastoral watch-tower in the matter of heresy --- 'common to all of us who discharge the episcopal office' --- 'communisque omnibus nobis, qui fungimur Episcopatus officio, quanquam in eo praemineas celsiore fastigio, specula pastoralis'¹. And note, that Augustine wrote that he submitted the heresy to examination by Boniface, and if necessary his brotherly correction, and not to any universal jurisdiction in those matters. After the initial failure of Zosimus to condemn the heretic Celestius, it was of the utmost importance that though the Roman clergy fall into error, the prestige of the Roman See should be restored and upheld, but there is no question of relying solely upon the judgement of that See. Boniface had succeeded Zosimus in December 418 AD. Augustine showed great charity² in covering Zosimus' mistake with a modest silence, but he did not regard the hoped³-for consent of the Pope as of sufficient weight by itself. The subsequent condemnation, deposition, and excommunication of Julian Bishop of Eclanum, enhanced the respect

contd. appointed by the Holy See; doctrinal clarification is envisaged in their terms of reference.

2. 'non in praeside'

3. John 21. 15-17.

4. John 20. 21.

5. Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiae cap. 4.

1. Augustine Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum 1. (420 AD) PL. 44. 550 sect. 2.

2. Augustine Contra Julianum bk. 4. sect. 37.

felt for the Roman See as guardian of the faith, but such a stand was shared by various local councils, and was finally illustrated in his being repeatedly exiled by the civil powers, none dependent upon the jurisdiction of Rome.

The Council of Milevis (416 AD) did not, says Whitaker, call Pope Innocent the Shepherd of the whole Church, but charged him to use his pastoral care diligently to extirpate the Pelagian heresy. In the background of the events in Rome, from the attack on the city by Alaric in 408 AD to its capture and pillage in 410 AD¹ and the consequent chaotic condition of the civil power, an opportunity for the advancement of papal power offered itself. In his Letter to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, Innocent² appears to claim jurisdiction over the churches in Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Sicily and the adjacent islands, on the grounds of their having been founded by those who received their Orders from Rome (sic)- while those churches seem 'keen on foreign statements, they seem to neglect the head of their institution'. The Letter from the Council of Carthage³ (June 416 AD) to Innocent, condemning again Pelagius and Celestius, reiterated the need⁴ for the Pope's condemnation to arrest any further spread of the heresy, particularly as the Eastern Synod of Diospolis had acquitted them and they had deceived many in Palestine. Now the Pope had before him the acts of that Synod, together with the views of many who had opposed Pelagius, among them 'your holy son, our brother and fellow priest, Jerome', and so he would be in an even better position to see that their judgement had been correct. The hope was that those who had been led into error might yield to the 'authority of your Holiness, drawn from the authority of Scripture'. How are we to interpret these words, asks Whitaker? That the Pope's authority will condemn the heresy on

1. Kidd 'Church History' 3.101. regarded the episcopate of Innocent as a landmark in the development of the Papal theory, and many regard Innocent as one of the originators of universal papal jurisdiction.
2. 19th. March 416 AD. PL. 20. 552.
3. This Letter was followed by one from the Council of Milevis, in the same month, June 416 AD, stressing the need of the Pope's condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius.
4. They had been condemned by the Council of Carthage 411 AD.

Scriptural grounds, or that the condemnation will rest upon a Primacy revealed in Scripture? The latter is too far-fetched, comments Whitaker, in the light of the later African Canons against clerical transmarine journeys and appeals, and is alien to the contents of the Letter. The long private Letter of the five leading African Bishops --- Aurelius, Alypius, Augustine, Evodius, and Possidius ² --- to Innocent in 416 AD supporting the Letters of the two already mentioned African Councils, certainly contains no hint of the necessity to submit to the Pope's jurisdiction in this matter of Pelagius and Celestius and the right sense of Scripture. The Letter states that Pelagius had many supporters at Rome ---- let him therefore be sent for and examined as to his meaning of the word 'grace'; if this correspond with ecclesiastical and Apostolic truth, then let him be acquitted, that the minds of many in Rome can be re-assured.

The Letter of the five bishops contains no hesitation as to how Innocent's authority should be used, and the scope of the judgement would only be universal if it accorded with Apostolic truth. 'It is true' says Whitaker, 'that the Letter ends on a note of abject humility' ---- the bishops wrote 'we do not pour back our little stream for the purpose of replenishing your great fountain, but in these times of severe testing...we wish this to be proved by you, whether our littleness flows from the same head of waters as your abundance, because we share with you in common, the one grace'. But Innocent in his reply, commends them for their 'care for the churches which you rule, and having concern for the advantage of all'. The bishops' final salutation suggests a common doctrine and not a subservient discipline.

1. This was the view of Chapman 'Studies on the Early Papacy' (London 1928 AD) who, with passages from Augustine, held that this was the contemporary view of African Christianity. He held that both the 'episcopalian' or 'non-interpolated text of Cyprian' and 'De Unitate' which was the primary document of the Primacy text, the later document written to support Cornelius' case at Rome, were both Cyprianic in authorship; that in Cyprian's time the *πράξις* of doctrine had become the *πράξις* of discipline, and that in the face of the lax policy of the confessor-presbyters at Carthage, he countered with the single Cathedra, the source of disciplinary rather than dogmatic authority.
2. Augustine Ep. 177. PL 33. 764.

Duraeus' view that all abandon themselves to the one voice of the Pontiff is, to Whitaker, tantamount to making it a waste of time (*temporis impendere*) to read Scripture, to open the books of the Fathers, or to record the views of Councils, when the one continual absolute authority of the Pope is all-sufficient -- a man need only to hang upon the Pontiff's interpretation and meaning of Scripture, so that 'our very souls, all things human and divine, do wait upon his very oracle! ' Christ needed not to give his church pastors and doctors to preserve pure doctrine, to root out the seeds of error, making their expositions agreeable to the Analogy of Faith --- *secundum analogiam fidei* --- these men would appear to be **ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι** for they do not ask for the interpretation of the Pontiff. There is not a word of Scripture that confines the '*ius interpretandi*' to one Pontiff or to any one man. Duraeus had claimed that if God had so much care for the Jews to appoint one High Priest, surely He would have more care for the church throughout the world, by raising up one judge, one High Priest, the Pontiff himself. Whitaker replies that the High Priest was a figure of Christ to come, not of the Pontiff, and again the High Priest of the Jews judged from what was prescribed in the Law as Deuteronomy 17.11 says ----- '*ex praestituto legis quam docuerint te*' while the pontiff claims interpretations '*ex ingenio suo*', of his own invention.

The term **ἡ ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως** (the Analogy of Faith) used by Whitaker is from Romans 12.6. --the chapter in Romans beginning with the need for an enlightened mind and the proper function of that gift in the Christian community, the right use of spiritual gifts. ' If your gift is prophecy, then use it as your faith suggests ' ¹ or 'if your talent is that of prophecy let us employ it in proportion to our faith ' ² or ' the prophet should not strain after effects for which his faith is insufficient'. ³

-
1. Jerusalem Bible in loco.
 2. Moffat in loco.
 3. Sanday and Headlam 'Romans' I.C.C. p. 354

It is not merely a matter of the spiritual progress of the individual, for when Paul is speaking of that, he uses exhortation (eg. Romans 12.1) but of the discipline and order of the community which demands the exercise of authority as well as admonition. The wise man (σωφρών) will know that his position in the Christian community depends not upon any merit of his own but on the measure of his faith which is the gift of God (χαρίσμα) --- while the carnal man will try to distinguish himself 'vain-gloriously' and disturb the peace of the community. Liddon wrote that most of the Latin Fathers and many later commentators take πίστῶς objectively --- the 'majestic proportion of the (objective) πίστις is before him, and keeping his eye on it he avoids private fancies and wild fanaticism, which exaggerates the relative importance of particular truths to the neglect of others'. Though this is inconsistent with Liddon's previous interpretation of πίστις in Romans 12.3., it does take us half way to Luther's use of the phrase ἡ ἀναλογία τῆς πίστῶς² while Whitaker did not dispute the equation in Romans 12.6. κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστῶς = κατὰ τὸ μέτρον πίστῶς since this is the gift of doctors and pastors. Whitaker does not mention Luther by name but the view was common that the rule of faith is Scripture itself and no extraneous canon is invoked. But the appeal is not merely to Scriptural texts but to the whole of Scripture which provides the Analogy of Faith, the yardstick or measure by which utterances are verified. The sophists indeed 'support themselves with Scripture since they would look ridiculous if they tried to force their own dreams on men, but they do not quote Scripture ἐν τῷ σημαινόμενῳ or 'in toto'. They snatch up whatever favours them, but what is against them they either cleverly conceal or corrupt with cunning glosses'.³ That is why Luther could call the Bible a 'heresy book' because the mere

-
1. Sanday and Headham 'Romans' I.C.C. p. 356.
 2. Vide Skevington Wood 'Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation' Tyndale Press (1960 AD) p.22. Luther's use of this phrase in Romans is called a 'misapplication' but its usefulness is acknowledged in delineating Luther's own attitude.
 3. Martin Luther 'Works' ed. J. Pelikan l. p.107

recitation of texts without recourse to the Rule of Faith may be so engineered as to give the impression of vindicating the most extreme heterodoxy. What Luther meant by the Analogy of Faith is the interpretation congruent with the general Norm of the Word of God. Such an exercise --- the 'usus magisterialis' --- is not mastered by study and talent only, but as Luther wrote to Spalatin, the Holy Spirit wrote Scripture, and the Holy Spirit interprets Scripture, --- scholarship must be baptised and receive Pentecostal gifts. The Exegete is not^a free agent but must bring his whole mind into conformity with Scripture by the gift of the Spirit, and Scriptural knowledge is neither abstract nor esoteric but is always related to life --- 'sola experientia fecit theologum.' The Holy Spirit instructs in His own school -- after Luther's death in 1546 AD a scrap of paper was found on his table containing the following, in Latin, --- 'no one can understand the Bucolics of Virgil who has not been a herdsman for 5 years, nor his Georgics unless for 5 years he has laboured in the fields. To understand Cicero's letters a man must have been full 20 years in the public service of a great state, while no one has tasted Scripture who has not ruled the churches for 100 years with prophets like Elijah, and Elisha, with John the Baptist, Christ and the Apostles'.² The resulting 'experiential' exegesis would appear to be wholly subjective³ but it is saved from this pitfall by the Analogy of Faith --- Scripture is the objective Norm; congruence in experience and exposition reveals the new creation. This would answer the doubts expressed by Erasmus, that, whereas in his *Paraclesis* prefixed to his edition of the Greek Testament, he had wholeheartedly dissented from those who refused the Scriptures to 'unlearned and ignorant men, for I wish that they should be read not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also Turks and Saracens, by the

-
1. Skevington Wood op. cit. p. 22.
 2. M. Luther 'Werke' Erlangen ed. 57 p. 16.
 3. Skevington Wood op. cit. p. 16 -- takes to task Prof. R.M. Grant who in his 'Bible in the Church' (pp. 113-7) reiterates the 'tiresome and stale charge of subjectivism' against Luther -- as partial as it is untrue. Experience in the Spirit must be brought to the bar of Scripture, which is the point of Luther's controversy with the Schwärmer or enthusiasts.

ploughboy , the weaver, the traveller ' , nevertheless Erasmus had argued that while the 'precepts destined to regulate our existence' were patent and evident in Scripture , there were obscure passages 'sanctuaries of the Holy Spirit into which God has not willed that we should enter too soon , and if we try to penetrate them , we are surrounded by darkness ' .² Luther met this obscurantism with the phrase ' Scriptura suā radiat lucē ' ; the Romanists had used the obscurantist argument to restrict Scripture to a privileged few and to refer its final interpretation to the prerogative of the Pope . ' With the books of the doctors of the church ' writes Whitaker , ' we run to the clear light of Scripture and the dogma of Scriptural Obscurity gives way to the 'bonus textualis ' ' , and quoting Luther, the Holy Spirit is ' no longer the author of darkness and obscurity. Mysteries there are and must be , and all life exists in paradoxes, for finite mind cannot hope to climb up into the majesty of the divine , but the lamb has broken the seals , the stone is rolled away from the door of the sepulchre , and the greatest of mysteries is brought to light ' .³

In the interpretation of Scripture , Whitaker accepted the phrase ' Scriptura sui ipsius interpres ' -- the true method of interpretation being to put Scripture alongside Scripture in a right and proper way. Origen, Jerome, and Augustine , had all recommended the comparative method⁴ -- the plainer text to illuminate the more difficult. To Duraeus who refers all interpretation to the Pope , Whitaker points out that this has proved a slippery position in the past --- ' in lubrico ' . It is, of course, true that Jerome in his Letter to Damasus writes⁵ that the East had torn piecemeal the undivided tunic of Christ (reference to Arianism) and that foxes were

-
1. This passage is printed in full in E.E.Reynolds 'Thomas More and Erasmus ' (1965 AD) p. 107. Reynolds states that the Paraclesis prefaced the Novum Testamentum , which gave the best method of studying the N.T. -- both of these were expanded in later editions the second, (the Paraclesis) being published separately as 'Ratio sine Methodus verae Theologiae ' . Reynolds calls the passage cited the key passage of the Paraclesis.
 2. Quoted in E.G.Rupp 'The Righteousness of God ' p. 272
 3. From Luther 'Bondage of the Will ' ed. Cole. p. 26.
 4. Origen De Principiis 4.; Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 1-3 ; Jerome Ad Paulam Ep. 53. 6.7.
 5. Jerome Ep. 15 to Pope Damasus (375AD) PL.27.355 1845 edition. (there are two editions in Migne of Jerome's works.)

destroying the Vine of Christ , so that among the broken cisterns which have no water it is hard to locate the sealed fountain and the enclosed garden and therefore I ought to consult the Chair of Peter' -- 'ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens , beatitudini tuae id est Cathedra Petri ; communione consocior ; super illam petram aedificatam ecclesiam scio ' . But note the reason for this appeal . That whereas others had squandered their doctrinal Patrimony , Rome alone kept its heritage of the catholic faith intact . There , at Rome, the earth reproduced a hundredfold the purity of the Lord's seed , while in the East , the corn being cast into farrows , degenerates into darnel or wild oats. Jerome, therefore , sought safety from the Shepherd for the sheep , for 'whoever will eat the lamb outside this house (i.e. Rome) is profane , and if any be not with Noah in the Ark, he shall perish in the flood ' . But the grounds of this impassioned appeal ----- the 'exaggerated' statements of one young man in sore perplexity ' ----- were that Jerome regarded Damasus as a 'consociatus' in doctrine with himself. So intense was his belief in the doctrinal integrity of Damasus that Jerome writes that if Damasus wished, he could issue a new creed after Nicea and the orthodox would confess it --- but this makes nothing for the confirmation of the Pontiff's highest authority , since it was not the Chair or the Succession, but the occupant who was pious, learned , a diligent defender of the Orthodox Faith against the Arians. Indeed, Jerome records that² Liberius (352-367 AD) the Pope previous to Damasus (367-384 AD) had in fact subscribed to the Arian heresy ' giving in to the irksomeness of exile ' .

After the condemnation of Arianism at Nicea (325 AD) , Athanasius , the champion of orthodoxy , was confirmed in his See by Pope Julius and the Council of the 50 Western bishops at Rome in 340 AD,³ after Athanasius had spent a year and a half in Rome being

-
1. Puller 'Primitive Saints and the See of Rome ' 3rd. ed. Rome 1900 AD p. 162. Gore . 'Roman Catholic Claims ' 11th. ed. London 1921. Gore felt that in view of Jerome's changed attitude to Rome (eg. in Ep. 22 PL 22,413) in later years, the terms of this Letter should be read with caution. Kidd (Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church . London 1920-3. 2. 322.) described the letter as the 'letter of a young man in a hurry ' ,
 2. Jerome Chronicon ad Ann. 352 (382 AD) PL. 27. 683.
 3. Athan. Apol. 20.36. ; PG 25.281 ; Julius to the Eusebians 340 AD

summoned there by the Pope. As Julius pointed out in his Letter to the Eusebians, they had acted in a high-handed way against the important See of Alexandria whereas custom required that 'they first write to us, and justice be determined from here'. When bishops of an Apostolic See are accused, the matter must be reported to all the bishops who would jointly pass sentence. Where the Bishop of Alexandria is concerned, custom demanded that the investigation take place at Rome. Two years later, at the Council of Sardica in 342 AD, the Nicene Creed was upheld, but in 351 AD Constantius became the sole Emperor, and the Arian reaction set in. Constantius brought pressure to bear on Liberius to make him sign against Athanasius and communicate with the Arians, but when he refused he was exiled in 355 AD. In 356 AD he submitted to Constantius and in the following year he was allowed to re-occupy his See having in the interval signed an Arian formulary. This Arian formulary, says Whitaker, appears to be uncertain, ^{but} that it was heretical seems beyond dispute. ¹ This desertion by the Pope on a central dogma of the Faith must have been a far greater shock to Athanasius than the lapse of Hosius. Certainly in his 'Apologia Contra Arianos' sect. 89, he treats Hosius much more lightly --- that 'Hosius, for fear of the Emperor's threats, seemed for a short time not to resist, yet the great violence and tyranny of the Emperor, and the many insults and stripes, proved that he yielded to them for a short time not because he gave us up but because the weakness of old age did not bear the stripes.' ² In his 'Historia Arianorum', Athanasius makes

1. The evidence for Liberius' lapse is weighty --it consists of four letters of Liberius himself (Studens Paci; Pro Deifico; Quia scio; Non doceo;)--the last three are in Hilary's Fragments (PL. 10. 689); Athanasius Apologia Contra Arianos (358 AD) sect. 89 (PG. 25. 409) and Athanasius Historia Arianorum (358 AD) (PG. 25. 733) sect. 41; Jerome Chronicon ad Ann. 352 AD and De Viris Illustr. sect. 97 where Fortunatian, bishop of Aquileia, is blamed for weakening Liberius to sign. Vide etiam Sozomen H.E. 4.15; and Jalland 'Church and the Papacy' pg. 229. n. 3. Hefele (2.242) said that the letters were forgeries, but Renouf 'Condemnation of Pope Honorius' p. 44 (1868 AD) and other recent R.C. scholars have accepted them. Vide Hilary Liber ad Constantium and Nicephorus H.E. 9.37. Thomas Aquinas De Regimen. Principis cap. 16 admits fully the 'vacillatio fidei', and Cusanus De Concord. Cath. 2.5. wrote 'Liberius consensit errori Arianorum'--the fact is admitted.

2. Vide Chapman 'Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims' London 1905 19.72
Note B. Chapman accepts the 'fall' of Liberius

it clear that in 355 - 357 AD, Liberius had been under great pressure , and finally, from 'fear of threatened death ' he subscribed ---- ' minisque mortis ad subscriptionem inductus est ' -- and that this showed two things:-

- a) the intolerable violence, treachery and threats of the heretics. Athanasius himself had experienced this sort of thing -- after the exile of Liberius and Hosius , it was the turn of Athanasius. Duke Syrianus was sent to Alexandria and surrounded the church with 5,000 soldiers . Athanasius calmly took his place on the throne and had the deacon recite Ps. 136 the people taking up the refrain 'For His mercy endureth for ever ' . The troops broke in and many were killed , though his friends urged him away safely and he remained in the desert 356 - 362 AD , the period of his Apology to Constantius , the Apology for his flight, his History of the Arians, and the Great Orations.
- b) the fact that he succumbed only in the last resort demonstrated Liberius' hatred of the heresy , to have persevered in such conditions ; that while he had had free choice , he had supported Athanasius ,and that what he subsequently did was virtually under torture. The Arian wrath was then vented on Hosius -- the 'father of bishops , a Confessor, for more than 60 years a bishop himself , the President of Councils ' ²---- since they claimed no success at all as long as Hosius remained. If he remained, the banishment of the rest (including Liberius) was superfluous. This gives the background to Hosius' signature of the 'Blasphemy' at Sirmium in 357 AD which involved communicating with the Arians - --- but he repudiated this a few months later , just before his death.

1. Athanasius Historia Arianorum sect. 38-42.
2. Hosius was consecrated Bishop of Cordova 296 AD at about the age of 39 , took part in the austere Council of Elvira (c. 306 AD) and from 313 AD to Nicea 1 seems to have acted as ecclesiastical adviser to the Emperor Constantine . He was sent to Alexandria to investigate the dispute between Alexander and Arius , and it was in consequence to his report 'inter alia ' that 1 Nicea was summoned.

Bellarmino maintained that as Hosius's subscription was under duress, it was an 'actus externus' ² and both Athanasius and Jerome appear to excuse Liberius on this grounds that his subscription was also forced. Whitaker reminds Bellarmine that there remains the dilemma of Felix 2, the so-called anti-Pope confirmed by the Emperor in the place of the banished Liberius. True, the people would have little to do with Felix, but he had imperial confirmation and he was consecrated, though secretly. This archdeacon Felix was no friend of the 'official' church of Rome ³, and though the Emperor was besieged by women of high standing at Rome, ⁴ when he left for the East in May 357 AD, he left Felix 2 in possession. The subscription of Liberius to the formula at Sirmium some months later removed the Emperor's cause for the exile of Liberius but he was not restored, and even when he signed the *ὁμοίως ὁμοίως* clause later, with the court bishops under the leadership of Basil of Ancyra, this clause purporting to mean the same thing as the Nicene term but without being liable to the same objections, he was only permitted to return to share the See with Felix 2. This decree of the Emperor was greeted with derision

-
1. Whitaker's 'Responsio' to Sanders' 'Demonstrationes De Antichristo,' in Whitaker's Opera Geneva ed. (1610 AD) Vol. 2. pp. 737-800.
 2. Vide J.H. Newman 'Historical Sketches' 3. 340 note; he agrees that the Pope subscribed to Arian confessions, but that signature under duress cannot be a decision of the Pope 'Ex Cathedra'.
 3. The Roman clergy met in conclave and in the presence of the laity took oath that they would never consent to acknowledge any other bishop as long as Liberius lived. (quae gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos ' in the so-called 'Collectio Avellana' ed. Guenther in C.S.E.L. Vol. 35 p.1.). In this latter document Felix is described as 'Archidiaconus' but 'presbyter' in Liber Pontific. l. 207. Athanasius Historia Arianorum 75 (PG. 25. 784) narrates his consecration in contemptuous language, and mentions Epictetus of Civita Vecchia as the Emperor's principle agent in the matter. Jerome De Viris Illustr. 98 includes Acacius of Caesarea (Palestine) among the consecrators of Felix.
 4. eg. Constantia, daughter of Constantine 1; she provided Liberius with an asylum on his return, on her estate at St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana. Vide Lib. Pontifical. l.207.
 5. Germinius of Sirmium, Ursacius and Valens --Jalland op. cit. p.231 calls them 'weathercock prelates', veering with every change in the imperial policy --supplanting the *Σύνοδος* of the Emperor for the *παράδοσις* of the Apostles.

as a violation of canonical precedent , and the populus rejected it with the cry ' One God, One Christ , One Bishop ' ,and Felix retired in some comfort to his estates at Portus where he died nine years later. But for Bellarmine , the dilemma remains ---Rome suffered a loss of prestige , both in its people and in its Popes -- for the defenders of the Nicene terms at the new Council of Arminum were not Roman legates , for none were present, but Restitutus of Carthage , and Phoebadius of Agen ¹. It would have been convenient, continues Whitaker , for the Roman Church to have disposed of the Arian Liberius , but far from it ; he was reinstated 'cum edicto, cum clericis , coram populo '!. Rhegino has already made this point ² with the comment ' illum reversum ab exilio favisse haereticus '. Sabellicus writes ³ that it was more the Beneficium Arianorum --- the sort of thing that Auxentius the court bishop of Milan , who had little use for policy or doctrine which was in disfavour with the Emperor, could well advise him in --than any 'metus supplicii' that caused Liberius to subscribe. Whitaker answers Duraeus ⁴ that if infallibility be the touchstone of the Papacy , it would have been far better to have an orthodox in banishment than a heretic 'in sede' ; he was already in banishment for his original orthodoxy. It would appear that Vincent's words were right ---- ' non tantum portiunculam aliquam Ecclesiae sed totam etiam Ecclesiam novella aliqua contagione maculari '. ⁵

There had been an attempt of late, says Whitaker, to make the balances equal by denying that Felix ² was an Arian --- that the words of Jerome ⁶ 'Felicem Arianum Romae episcopum esse constitutum ' are not the true reading of Jerome , because the word 'Arianum ' does not appear in the ancient exemplars , but hangs upon the words of Marianus Victor. ⁷ This reluctance to admit

1. Vide Kidd 'Documents' 2.166.

2. Rhegino Historia 1.

3. Sabellicus Eunead .7.8.

4. Whitaker Opera Contr.2.Qu.3

5. Vincent of Lerins Common. 4.

6. Jerome Catalog. in Acacio ; Vide De Viris Illustr. 98.

7. Bishop of Rieti ; published 9 volumes of Jerome's works
1565 - 1572 AD at Rome.

Felix 2 an Arian was seen in the discussions at Rome , which Bellarmine had reported , and which debated the question as to whether the name of Felix 2 should be placed in the new Martyrology. Use was made of the inscription on the Arca Marmorea --- 'hic jacet corpus Sancti Felicis Papae et Martyris qui Constantium haereticum damnavit ' . Whitaker comments that the Archdeacon Felix may well have been amenable to Constantius , but this does not preclude the inscription. There does, however , appear to be some confusion here --Felix 2 was not a martyr ; he died apparently quite peacefully on 22nd. November 365 AD on his estate at Portus ! There was a local Portuensian Martyr of the same name , and in the Liber Pontificalis Vol.1. 207 the compiler appears to confuse Felix 2 with this martyr , representing him as an innocent catholic victim of an Arian persecution engineered by Constantius and encouraged by Liberius -- the date of the martyrdom is given as July 29th. The inscription on the Arca Marmorea appears to follow the same identification.

Pope Honorius (625 - 638 AD) however, was a condemned heretic which Bellarmine admits --- judged and condemned by the Third Council of Constantinople in 680-1 AD.² Bellarmine said that this was for personal heresy and did not touch the Papal Chair. Whitaker replies that allowing for the distinction between office and the man , Bellarmine's point did not stand. The Reply of Honorius to the Letter of Sergius in 634 AD on the 'one energy ' (μία ἐνέργεια) of Christ certainly contained the terms ' una voluntas'³ and when he issued the injunction (which he would not have done had he been

-
1. Gesta in Coll. Avell. 4. vide Jalland op. cit. p. 232 note. ⁶
 2. Session 13. Vide Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series 2 Vol.14 Decrees and Canons of the 7 Ecumenical Councils p. 342 -- 'and in addition to these (i.e. Sergius, Cyrus--monothelites) we decide that Honorius also, who was Pope of elder Rome , be with them cast out of the Holy Church of God and be anathematised with them '.
 3. Denzinger - Schönmetzer. Enchiridion sect. 487 . Vide E.Amann 'Honorius 1 ' in Dict. Theol. 93-132. (PL. 80. 463 ff).

acting merely in person) to silence both parties , this was ignored , and in his second Letter he rejected the two Wills though insisted on the two natures . The *Ἐκθεσις* published by the Emperor Heraclius¹ in the year of Honorius' death (638 AD) used Honorius' formula of the one Will. Honorius had stood ' pro tribunali et in iudicium atque examinationem adduci et pro se respondeat ' . So much for the marvellous skill (mirificia solestia) of the popes. Nicholas of Cusa (c. 1400 - 1464 AD) has written² that Scripture of itself has no stable or certain interpretation, for he said that it is adapted to the times and understood in various ways ; it is changed by the demands of the age (una cum tempore mutari) and that therefore the custom (praxim) of the church should be followed , subject to the ' jus pontificium' . Whitaker comments that it is well known how this view fared in just two examples , Liberius and Honorius , but this ' interpretatio vacillata' of Nicholas is an unworthy judgement , for Scripture is a constant and unchanging rock , to be recalled to the analogy of the prophets ; it is the Word of God remaining sure for all eternity , the measure (statera),³ not an elusive and deceiving thing (dolosa).⁴ Augustine wrote ' Scriptura tanquam in sede sublimiore constituta est, cui serviat omnis fidelis et pius intellectus ' .⁵

The fourfold sense of Scripture so clear to the schoolmen , the Quadriga , around which according to Guibert of Nogent every sacred page revolved as on wheels,⁶ consisted of the literal, the allegorical, the moral , and the anagogical senses. ' The Literal meaning speaks of acts , the allegorical of what you believe , the moral of what you do, and the anagogical of what you hope ' .⁷ The text was held to contain a double meaning, literal and spiritual , the latter being divided into the moral and allegorical, or the tropological and the anagogical . The tropological sense applied to the individual believer , the allegorical to the church , and

1. Mansi Concil. 10. 1029 - 1032 . A new edict issued by the Emperor Constans 2 in the year 648 AD forbade the use of *ἐνέργεια* and *θέλημα* with the intention of ending discussions.

2. Ep. 2 et 4.

3. 'steelyard, balance, goldsmith's scales , pole-bar of a chariot'
4. Used of Jupiter changing into a bull Hor. Od. 3.27.25.

5. Contra Faust. Manich. 11. 5.

6. McCracken & Cabaniss (L.C.C. 9) p. 291 'Early Medieval Theology'

7. Skevington Wood op.cit. p.24

the anagogical to the future ; much had been written about the abuses of exegesis in the Medieval period , but it ought to be observed that Aquinas represented the prevailing thought, that only the literal sense is admissible and valid for doctrinal argument and disputations , and in exegesis it was not considered essential to search for all four possibilities in every verse. But while Duraeus quoting Ambrose --- ' duos oculos habens Ecclesia , moralem et mysticum fidei oculo plus videt Christum ' --- was appealing for the widest possible basis for exegesis , Luther had already reinstated the primacy of the 'sensus literalis' , as Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and Richard of St. Victor , had already maintained . Nicholas of Lyra more immediately prepared Luther's path ;-

' Si Lyra non lyrasset

Lutherus non saltasset'

but he did not abandon allegory², nor did he rest in the historical, literal and grammatical interpretations , but pressed on to the 'true spiritual interpretation ' which is built upon the former and not opposed to it , and allegories became the adornment and flowers to embellish and illuminate the account. Bare allegory , standing in no relation to the account , and not illuminating it , is but an 'empty dream ' . The Holy Spirit speaks plainly -- Erasmus was rebuked for his excessive use of trope.³

Whitaker, answering Duraeus, says that while anagogical and allegorical interpretations may obscure the proper and grammatical sense of Scripture , no one denies that tropology is a pious and necessary interpretation germane to the ministry. Tropology, --- the figurative use --- is not necessarily a new sense or diverse from the grammatical , but conjoined with it eg. when we deduce from the example of Lot that drunkenness is to be avoided , and as from other narrative portions of Scripture of this kind, arguments and exhortations are deduced. Jerome excelled in the grammatical, Gregory in the tropological, Ambrose in the allegorical, Augustine in the anagogical , use of Scripture , but it is madness to assert that

1. Ambrose on Ps. 118.

2. Tischreden Weimar edition l. 136 . Luther says before 1517 AD he was 'an expert in allegories; I allegorized everything ' . He later admits the allegory but only when the author intends it. The historical and literal sense is primary -- vide his Comment on Isaiah.

3. 'Bondage ' ed. H.Cole. p. 205

all must be interpreted allegorically -- Epiphanius wrote
 οὐ πάντα ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλληγορίας ἀλλ' ὡς ἔχει.
 'non omnia Dei indigent allegoria sed interpretenda sunt uti verba
 habent'. Origen reduced sacred theology to absurdity at times
 by his allegories, and provided Porphyry and Julian and others
 (given to the dregs'---'faeci') with opportunities to bring religion
 into calumny. Allegory may be approved when the words cannot be
 understood without it, when the literal sense is either absurd or
 repugnant to true doctrine eg. when we are commanded to heap coals
 of fire on the heads of our enemies, or that we should cut off the
 hand or pluck out the eye. In this way the true meaning of Scripture
 and the inherent majesty of the divine words are preserved. 'I am happy'
 writes Whitaker ' to follow Ambrose, though with reservations on the
 mystical and allegorical method, which, though it often delights me,
 it is sometimes meaningless, as Thomas says'.²

1. To Origen, all Scripture has a spiritual meaning, but not all
 has a literal meaning (De Princip.4.). He used the threefold
 analysis of St. Paul of human personality -- the bodily sense is
 the literal, the soul the moral, and the allegorical the spiritual
 sense, but in actual practice he rarely distinguishes the moral
 from the other two, and generally only distinguished between
 the 'letter' and the 'spirit'. There is, however, a difference
 between his 'literal' sense and say that of Augustine, and there is
 a further difference in the application of the Regula Fidei as the
 exegetical Norm. Origen relies far more upon individual scholarship
 and intelligence than on any consensus of opinion, Like other
 Alexandrians, he was a 'somewhat self-conscious intellectual'
 (Grant ' Interpretation of the Bible p. 66). Harnack scornfully
 dismisses Origen's work as 'Biblical alchemy' -- it must however
 be acknowledged that the times demanded the utmost use of reason
 to defend the Scriptures against the charge of 'triviality' (eg.
 by Porphyry); Christians were keen to be thought intellectually
 respectable.

Whitaker refers to Chrysostom's methods of interpretation
 -- these and his place in the Antiochene school are discussed fully
 in F.H.Chase ' Chrysostom - a study in the History of Biblical
 Interpretation ' (1887 ed) especially pp. 28-78.

2. Quaest. 1. art. 10.1.

Chapter 9.The Eucharist.

In continuing his discussion with Duraeus on the right and literal sense of Scripture, Whitaker now considers Duraeus' remark that such a view would require transubstantiation as a necessary doctrine. In Duraeus' view, Whitaker was following Calvin in asserting that in the Eucharist, Christ is truly eaten but only in the sense that the Spirit effects the unity which is by nature impossible.² The question is 'de modo' -- Whitaker slipped away (dilaberis) from the true Body to assert merely the strength and benefits of receiving, a strong faith indeed, that did not recognise the change in the nature of things!

As Whitaker had answered Campion, he now repeats, that all Christ (totum Christum) is received in the Eucharist, and if the whole Christ is received, no part is excluded. The true, human, and natural Body of Christ is in heaven, and is perceived through faith. Berengarius³ wrote that it does not follow that because the Body is not received sensually, broken and crushed by the teeth of the faithful (cannibal-wise) that Christ is excluded from the table. If Christ be not present except He be touched, then He is not received in the preaching of the Gospel, whereas Peter writes,⁴ that through the Gospel we are *κοινωνοὶ θεῶν φύσεων* and Paul,⁵ that Christ lives in our hearts through faith ---the Baptised are joined in one body with Christ. The secret (arcana) strength of the Holy Spirit can unite (copulare) things by nature separated (res disjunctissimas) but if

-
1. O Monstrum ! O Portentum ! writes Duraeus. In his Reply to the Ten Reasons of Campion, Whitaker had repeated Article 29 that the 'wicked and such as be void of lively faith, though they carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Augustine says) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ'.
 2. 'Spiritus vere unire quae locis disjuncta sunt' i.e. the Natural Body of Christ cannot be in heaven and on the altar at the same time.
 3. Berengarius De Consecrat. Dist. 2. Ego Berengarius.
 4. 2 Peter 1.4.
 5. Rom. 6.5 ; Gal. 3.27 ; Vide 1 Cor. 10.17 ; 12.13 ; John 6,35 ;.

nothing be joined except joined corporeally (i.e. *σύνσφρη*) what binding chains of society (*vincula societatis*) can there be ? Duraeus claims a carnal and Capernaitical Presence , but Christ is not received in any carnal strength (*crasso modo*).

The Term 'Capernaitical ' ¹ (variously spelt as Capharnaitical) presumably meant that the consecrated elements had become by nature the same as the carnal Body of Christ which walked the streets of Capernaum or more probably (John 6.41-42) because the Jews at Capernaum had interpreted Christ's words materially . The term 'stercoriston' (gross physical language) was first used by Humbert ² in 1054 AD in the controversy with the Greeks and refers to the disposal of the sacramental elements after human metabolism has taken place. In 1556 AD Sir John Cheke was compelled to recite Humbert's 'Confessio' and Bellarmine defended the terms of this 'Confessio' ³. John of Damascus, adopting a suggestion of Gregory of Nyssa -- a man ordained does not have the essence of manhood destroyed for he is *μεταμορφωθείς πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον* ⁴ ----- postulated a transformation of the elements and repudiated the word 'symbols' (*ἀντίτυπα*) applied to the elements after consecration as for example by Euty chius of Constantinople. ⁵ Epiphanius the Deacon repeated John's repudiation of the word at 2 Nicea and denied that the Fathers ever used it of the elements after

-
1. Vide Parker Society ed. 'Latimer' Vol.1. 45-9 ; Vol.2. 266 ; Augustine Ennarr. on Ps. 98.9 defines the 'Capharnaitae' as 'carnaliter illud cogitaverunt , et putaverunt quod praecisurus esset Dominus particulas quasdam de corpore suo et daturus illis ' ML. 37. 1264. Duraeus refers to Augustine's Tract 27 on John where he deals with those who talked of Christ's carnal Body being dismembered (*dilaniatur*), which carnal thoughts Augustine regarded as shameful (*flagitium*). Vide etiam Aug. Quaes. 57 on Leviticus.
 2. Nägle PG. 174. n.2.
 3. Darwell Stone 'History of Eucharistic Doctrine' Vol.2. 366 ; Steitz 'Die Abendmahlslehre der Griechischen Kirche' (1864-8) Vol.9. 243 f. held the view that the natural presence appears first in the teaching of Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem (634 AD) and in Vol.12 p. 278 the identification is made by John of Damascus but rather in the sense of transformation than transubstantiation, and that the manner of the change is unknown and inscrutable (*ἐκδόσις*).
 4. **Gregory** of Nyssa on the Baptism of Christ PG. 46. 584.9.
 5. Euty chius of Constantinople 'Sermo De Paschate et S. Eucharist.' PG 86. 2391.

consecration --- but the controversy hangs upon the definition of the terms used.

The term 'transubstantio' appears to have been first used by St. Peter Damian (c. 1072 AD)² and became widespread by the end of the 12th. Century . At the Lateran Council of 1215 AD Transubstantiation was defined as 'de fide' and the doctrine was further elaborated by Thomas Aquinas. At the Marburg Colloquy (October 1st to 3rd. 1529 AD) Luther, Melancthon , and Osiander , discussed with Zwingli , Oecolampadius , Bucer , and Sturm , the 15th. Article dealing with the Lord's Supper ; both sides denied the sacrificial character of the Mass and the 'Capernaitic eating of the actual Body of Christ ' ; the Lord's Supper was the 'sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ ' and 'the spiritual partaking of the Body and Blood was necessary to every Christian ' . They agreed to refrain from further polemic writing on this point , and to study it in Christian love. At the end of the formal meeting , Luther drew up a formula which described Christ's Body as being present ' essentially, and substantively ' but not 'qualitatively , quantitatively, or locally'. Bucer at first was willing to accept this , but Zwingli refused, and the break between Luther and Zwingli became final. Luther's formula became the basis of agreement between him and the theologians of southern Germany in the Württemberg Concord of 1534 AD and the Wittenberg Concord of 1536 AD . Luther insisted that faith was essential to render the sacrament effective , though in his discussions he never seemed to get very far away from the concept of the sacrament embodying grace because of the Bodily Presence of Christ. It may be said that he was not an unqualified receptionist.³

William Rainolds, a Romanist Professor at Rheims, in 1583 AD produced his 'Antidote or Treatise of 30 Controversies ' ⁴ against Whitaker , Fulke, Bilson and others and wrote 'they term us

1. 2 Nicea act. 6.

2. PL. 145. 883.

3. Vide H.J.Grimm 'The Reformation Era 1500-1650 AD' (1964 ed.) p. 195 f.

4. British Museum 698. c.24 Printed 1622 AD in three parts, though Whitaker only appears in Part 1.

Capharnaïans , Ubiquitaries , Idolaters , whereas we detest the inhuman and gross imaginations of the Capharnaïans , condemn the Ubiquity and 'everywhere-being ' of Christ ,adore not with divine honour (as Bilson had said) the elements of bread and wine , but we adore, to use Ambrose's words in De Spiritu Sancto 12 'the Flesh of Christ in the mysteries , that Flesh which no man eateth as Augustine said on Psalm 24, before he adore it '.

The Council of Trent had re-affirmed the Medieval doctrine but minimised the technical-philosophical language based on Aristotle . Since the 13th. Century the Eastern Church had used the word *μετουσίωσις* (which received formal approval at the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672 AD and was vindicated at the Synod of Constantinople in 1691 AD) refusing the Protestant 'under this is My Body ' as also the Aristotelian distinction between substance and accidents. The consecration of the elements involved a conversion in essence and a Real Presence *χωρίς πίστεως πιστευόμενου*.

Christ was with the Fathers of the Old Testament, and the fact that the Body was not yet formed or born, as Duraeus had mentioned , does not destroy Whitaker's opinion but rather strengthens it --- faith benefits, though the Body be not yet created ; *ὑπόστασις τῶν ἐλπιδόμενων καὶ ἔλεγχος μὴ βλεπόμενων*. The lamb was slain from the foundation of the world , and His Presence Body and Death were beneficial to those Fathers. Christ said of Abraham that he rejoiced to see His day ; Paul wrote that the Fathers of the

-
1. Rainolds' Antidote' Pt.1. Bk.1. 2. Controversio 4. p.91.
 2. Trent Sess. 13. cap. 4.
 3. Vide Gavin 'Some aspects of Contemporary Greek Thought '(1936) p 328 ff. The Test Act of 1673 AD in England imposed the Declaration against Transubstantiation . 'Modern Roman Theologians allow to the consecrated bread and wine all the reality which anyone believes any bread and wine to possess , or in other words explain away transubstantiation till it remains little more than a verbal incumbrance due to an inopportune intrusion into Christian doctrine of a temporary phase of metaphysics ' Gore 'Body of Christ ' p. 120.
 4. Hebrews 11.1.
 5. Apoc. 13. 8
 6. John 8. 56.
 7. 1 Corinthians 10. 3-4.

Old Covenant ate the spiritual food and drank the spiritual drink, even Christ. ' So we freely use the help of faith (subsidium fidei) for nothing surpasses it (praestantius). Faith receives and embraces Christ the Author of salvation and of all good things in word and sacrament.

On the figurative use of the words of Institution Duraeus claimed that to speak of Circumcision and the Paschal Lamb as the Covenant was not true --- Circumcision is never called a Covenant which refers to the 'conventio' or 'pactum' between God and Abraham ; circumcision was the sign (signum) of this Covenant. Similarly the Lamb is never called the Pasch ,since the Pasch was the 'Transitus Jahweh' -- כִּסּוּת הַיָּג לַוְהוּה -- it was not the lamb but the blood of the lamb that was the sign. These figurative uses can never be applied to the Words of Institution , where the Covenant is in the Blood. Whitaker maintains that 'hoc est enim meum corpus' was to be understood *τρόπικως* ; to say that the 'Conventio' only was the Covenant is a new interpretation --- Genesis 17.10 has 'hoc est foedus meum inter me et inter vos , et inter semen tuum post te , quod servabitis , ut circumcidatur vobis omnis mas ' ; Genesis 17.13 'erit foedus meum in carne vestra in foedus perpetuum '. The Hebrew א'ן clearly shows that the Lord was speaking of the lamb , and what is clearer than Exodus 12. 27 'victima pascha est Jahwehae ' ? Christ is called the Rock *μετονομαστικως* as Augustine has said ² --- in all sacraments the name of a thing is attributed to the sign ; so circumcision is called a covenant , the lamb the Pasch, the Rock is Christ , but it must not be thought that the sign is changed into the thing itself or transubstantiated. So in Exod. 24.8. the blood of the victim is called the blood of the covenant , confirming the

-
1. Tertullian Adv. Marc. 3.19. ' hinc iam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse '. Vide etiam Adv. Marc. 4.40 'haec quidem de typico et symbolico corpore '. Origen Commentary on Mt. 11. 14. Aug. ep. 98.9.; Contra Adimant. 12.3. (corpus divinitate dotatum hoc est meum corpus) ; John Damascene in his De Fide Orthodoxa 4.13. writes of Basil's use of the term 'antitypa' in the phrase 'antitypa corporis et sanguinis Domini' that it refers to the elements before consecration , not after it.
 2. Aug. Quaest. super Leviticum 9. 57.

covenant and the reconciliation . Whitaker did not in fact say that the Body and Blood of Christ were to be taken 'improprie ac figurate' ; what he did say was the ' *πρόπριον* Christi corpus et sanguinem ' as taken but sacramentally . The bread is the true Body but 'mystically' -- 'mystice , *μετωνύμικως* sacramentaliter -- neither the cup nor the wine nor the blood is properly the New Covenant , and so Chrysostom could write that the body and blood are received figuratively --- ' *figurate non proprie* ' .

2

To Duraeus' quotation from Ambrose --- ' non hoc esse quod natura formavit , sed quod benedictio consecravit ; majoremque vim esse benedictionis quam naturae , quia benedictione etiam natura ipsa mutatur ' , that these words of Ambrose mean that Christ took bread but did not give bread to the disciples , otherwise the words ' hoc est corpus meum ' are meaningless (inanis) ----- Whitaker replies that what Duraeus was proposing was a twofold Christ or even a manifold Christ (multiplicem Christum) ; one sitting in the midst of the disciples , the other concealed in the image of the bread ³ . Duraeus would make the change co-terminous and contemporary with the recitation of the Words of Institution . There are two points here --- Paul spoke ⁴ of bread after the Words of Institution , and second, the Words of Institution were spoken after the action of taking, blessing, breaking and giving it to the disciples. Cyril wrote ⁵ ' credentibus discipulis fragmenta panis dedit ' . The use of the term *εὐλογία* is not empty of meaning , for though there is no transubstantiation as Duraeus would have, yet the bread becomes *εὐχαρίστια* as Paul shows , and Ambrose in the quotation given describes the strength of this *εὐλογία* , that by the blessing, the nature of the bread is changed because what was before common bread

-
1. 'Corpus enim Dei corpus est spirituale ' Ambrose De Mysteriis 9.58. ML. 16. 408.
 2. Ambrose De Mysteriis 9. 50 ML. 16.405 ; In the De Sacramentis, Ambrose says that it is the Word of Christ that consecrates (conficit) the Eucharist , and on the Canon he writes that the species are a figure (figura) of the Body and Blood of Christ. Vide Serapion's *ὁμοίωμα*.
 3. 'in illa panis imagine latentem'
 4. 1 Corinthians 11. 26.
 5. Cyril . Commentary on John 4.24 ; 12, 58 .

by the Divine Will, and blessing, becomes now the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; new qualities (proprietates) are added, which were wanting before so that the nature of the bread is changed, but 'natura' is not equivalent to 'substantia'. Ambrose adds --- 'nonne valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum!'. The disciples took bread but by faith more than that -- Christ gave them a missive (diploma) and not a blank sheet of paper (carta) ² i.e. with writing, signed and sealed.

This represents a change of value but not a change of substance. Ambrose alleges the force of consecration as greater than that of nature, so that the consecrated elements may be described as being not what nature formed but what blessing has hallowed, but it does not follow that Ambrose means that the elements of bread and wine formed by nature are destroyed on the altar, for no comparison can take place unless two things actually exist.³ The Word supplements but does not destroy the bread -- so when Paul in 1 Corinthians XI. 24 speaks of 'this is my Body which is broken for you,' he is referring to the bread, not the carnal Body of Christ which was crucified but not broken.⁴ It is true that the author

-
1. Ambrose De Sacramentis 4.4.14. ; 4.5.23 .; the doubts expressed by the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose c. 1690 AD as to the authorship of the De Sacramentis were shared by later scholars eg. Tillemont and Schermann, ascribing it to Maximus of Turin c 451-465 AD and dated 5th. Century or a little later, but Ambrose's authorship is now generally accepted due to the work of R.H. Connolly, Probst, and especially Morin. Vide etiam 'St. Ambrose On the Sacraments and On the Mysteries' translated by Thompson and edited by Srawley. A short liturgical treatise of 6 books (addresses to the newly baptised in Easter week) the De Sacramentis deals with Baptism Confirmation, and the Eucharist. It is the earliest form of the Roman Canon of the Mass in substantially its present form, giving evidence of the influence of Roman usage in N. Italy.
 2. Nilus Epp. 1 and 44 . PG. 79. 104 Kidd 'Documents' Vol.2. 250
 3. Berengarius made this point in De Sacra Coena. Vide A.F. and F.Th. Vischer's ed. 1834 AD. pp. 160 and 218.
 4. In his Reply to Campion's Ten Reasons, (2) Whitaker makes the point that Paul speaks of bread and that, four times after Consecration. Campion had spoken of neither bread nor wine remaining but certain qualities of these 'hanging in the air and void of the things themselves' --- 'sed harum rerum inanes quasdam et pensiles in sacramento qualitates reliquas esse'.

of De Sacramentis used freely the terms 'convertere', 'mutare' and asserts the Real Presence by virtue of Consecration, but he also wrote 'si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu ut incipient esse quae (not 'quod' --- which would conceivably amount to a destruction of essence) non erant (i.e. by nature) quanto magis operatorius est (in the eucharistic elements) ut sint quae erant ~~et~~ in aliud commutentur'.

The change is not a miracle, as Campion and Duraeus thought, but a mystery. It is true, remarks Whitaker, that Augustine attributed religious honour to this sacrament, but the bread and wine remain. If there were a miracle, the senses would perceive it; though Augustine wrote three books on miracles, (sic) we hear nothing of a miracle in the eucharist. Some of the Fathers mention miracles connected with the Eucharist, but make no mention of a miracle within the Eucharist. No one denies the wondrous mystery --- with our mouths taking bread and wine, with our souls the Body and Blood of Christ, so that by the Divine Life we are transported to enjoy heaven, far surpassing any strength of nature --- 'naturae viribus longe' --- deserving of the highest wonder, as Augustine said.² But Augustine, with his strong symbolic and figurative tradition is no help in transubstantiation; he spoke of the consecrated elements as in themselves signs of the Body and Blood of Christ,³ signs because they are called by the names of the things they signify; the spiritual gift of the Eucharist is really the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the same Flesh and Blood in which He lived on earth, but raised to a new spiritual power, becoming 'spirit and life'⁴ but Augustine appears to distinguish between 'Flesh' and 'Body' --perhaps he was

-
1. Berengar's reading, accepted by Gore 'Dissertations' p. 230 f.. Lanfranc quoted a variant reading and tried to extend the meaning of the text. Durand of Troam (c.1010 - 1088 AD) in his Liber De Corpore et Sanguine Domini' attacked Berengar for his merely 'figurative doctrine' and upheld the conversion of the elements into the identical Body and Blood of Christ; he records the story of a woman who in the time of Gregory the Great laughed when the Pope gave her the Host and said 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ? I see only a piece of bread' (ML. 149.1418 b)
 2. Augustine De Trinitate 3.4.10; De Utilit. Credendi. 16.
 3. Augustine Ep. 98.9 Ad Bonifac.; Contra Adimant. Manich. 12 (cum signum daret corporis sui); Comment. on Ps. 32; in writing to Boniface (Ep. 185.50) Augustine says of the Donatists 'rem ipsam non tenent intus cuius est illud sacramentum' i.e. the bread, of many grains, represents the mystical Body of Christ, and this

really thinking of the 'spiritual essence' of Christ's humanity, the 'Flesh' as receiving a new symbolic 'Body' in the bread and wine, this spiritual essence of Christ's humanity, the invisible energy (*ἐνέργεια*) becoming also the spiritual essence of the Church, but there is nothing here that would help transubstantiation. The idea of the invisible energy of the Word goes back to Justin Martyr¹, but, says Whitaker, this is really the death knoll of transubstantiation, since it proposes a dynamic symbolism. So the bread does indeed become the 'Flesh', 'mystice et sacramentaliter'. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote² -- *μη προσέχε οὐν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτι καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ* -- 'the wine is not common and vulgar, but the true sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ'. Cyprian³, like Augustine⁴, made it clear that both bread and wine remain after consecration.

Any man, says Whitaker, who handles the picture (image) of a prince unworthily, is guilty of 'laesa majestatis' though he never touch the person of the prince. In the Eucharist, God offers the thing (res) signified with the sign (signum) --- Judas Iscariot received the 'signum' but not the 'res', as Augustine said⁵ --- 'illi manducabunt panem Dominum, ille panem Domini contra Dominum'. Gratian⁶ wrote 'non dicendum eum manducare corpus Christi qui in corpore non est Christi'. Evil men do not truly eat the Body of Christ⁷, because they do not eat that which Christ offers in the sacrament.

Augustine's relationship between figure and reality (res ipsa) demands

 Cont'd Mystical Body is spoken of in this text as the 'res sacramenti'.

4. Augustine on Ps. 98.9. Vide Tract 27.5. on John 6.63.

-
1. Justin Martyr Apol. 1.66; the idea certainly goes back to Irenaeus (Adv. Haeres. 5.7.2.)
 2. Cyril of Jerusalem Cat. Myst. 3.3. Cyril of Alexandria on John 2.1. (PG. 73. 245) uses the term 'transubstantiation' *ἀναστοιχείουται* of the waters of Baptism as Cyril of Jerusalem did of the chrism, but the elements were not thought of as ceasing to exist. Theodoret Bran. 1. uses *ἐτέραν γίνεσθαι* = 'to become other', and Gregory of Nyssa *μεταστοιχείου* (Cat. Orat. 37) and *μεταποιείσθαι* = 'to be reformed'.
 3. Cyprian De Coena Domini; Ep. 63. 13-14.
 4. Augustine Serm. ad Neophytos
 5. Augustine Tract 19 on John. 6. Gratian De Consecr. Dist. 2.
 7. Augustine De Civitate Dei 21.25.

that the bread be not a carnal transubstantiation, since if we admit transubstantiation, there will be no figure and no sacrament. Augustine conceived true reception by faith and in a spiritual manner (*spirituale modo*); his words are '*passioni Domini esse communicandum et suaviter et utiliter recolendum quod pro nobis caro eius crucifixa est*'. Duraeus' views of transubstantiation suspend the accidents in the air (*in aere*) cut off from their substance, whereas the very nature of a sacrament demands '*materiam et quandam naturam*', and so Duraeus leaves no sacrament. Ratramn of Corbie (d. 868 AD) in his book on the Eucharist '*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*' condemned the carnal view held and defended by Paschasius Radbert, whose work with the same title had been published in 844 AD; the former makes it clear that to take the Flesh carnally is not of true religion but a 'foul invention' (*facinus*).

Duraeus quotes Theodoret² --- 'mystical symbols do not banish proper reality (*propria natura*) --- the Body and Blood of Christ (the reality) are contained under the symbols of bread and wine --how then can Whitaker deny transubstantiation? . In replying to those who

1. Whitaker comments on Duraeus 'O Noble Patron of transubstantiation to whom it appears no less a crime to eat a man than to beget him!'. The book '*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*' was wrongly attributed to John the Scot (d. c. 877 AD) by Berengar and Lanfranc and the Synod of Vercelli held on the 1st. September 1050 AD where it was condemned and burnt. Vide Nagle '*Ratramnus und die hl. Eucharistie*' (1903 AD) and Heurtevent '*Durand de Troam et les Origines de l'Heresie Berengarienne*' (1912 AD). ML. 121.125-170. Vide A.J.Macdonald '*Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*' p. 231 note 7. Cranmer had a high regard for the work of Ratramn, which was placed on the Index in 1559 AD but removed in 1900 AD.
2. Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus (or Cyrrhus) the last great writer of the Antiochene school, wrote in his *Eranistes* (*The Beggar*) c. 447 AD (also called the '*Versatiles*' -- *πολύμορφος*) the Four Dialogues --- Duraeus and Whitaker refer to the first two of these:
 - a) *ἀτρέπτος* -- the unchangeable Divine Nature
 - b) *ἀσύγχυτος* -- no confusion of the divine and human natures.

Duraeus is here taking up Whitaker's previous quotation from the Second Dialogue of Theodoret, that '*symbole mystica post sanctificationem non omittere propriam naturam*' which renders transubstantiation unnecessary. Also cited by Whitaker against Campion. *Contra Decem Rationes* 2.

used the Eucharist as an example of the twofold nature of Christ , Theodoret had said that the elements do not dissolve (abiisse) into the Body and Blood of Christ , but that they retained their proper natural qualities. To Theodoret ' natura' was equivalent to 'res' . He had spoken of the bread and wine being transubstantiated (*μεταστοιχειώσθαι*) into the Flesh and Blood of Christ . Whitaker's answer was that the Eutychians -- with the Eranistes , the Beggar , or Multi-Form One personifying them ---held that Christ's human nature lost its natural properties when invested with the Divine nature, and they took their argument from the nature of the sacraments. Theodoret immediately replied to the Eutychians that after sanctification, the bread remained bread , retaining its pristine nature, though taking a better condition (*conditionem meliorem*) . Similarly, Christ's Body remained a natural body though after the Ascension it reached the highest glory. If the natural properties of the bread and wine remain , then their realities (*res ipsa*) also remain. Duraeus had in fact distinguished between natural properties and reality or substance , whereas this distinction is absent from the catholic Fathers, and Theodoret is no exception. The words quoted by Duraeus from Theodoret ---' *corpus et sanguis Christi sub panis et vini symbolis contineri* ' -- do not actually occur in that author ; what he wrote was ' *symbola post sanctificationem esse corpus et sanguinem Christi ac credi quae dicuntur et tanquam talia adorari* ' . The certain gift (*quidem donum*) was placed on the altar , and after consecration was the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally conceived (*nimirum sacramentaliter*) -- the symbols retained their natural properties and former substance completely (*integram*) . The ' *adorari* ' refers not to the elements but to the Body and Blood of Christ , though the symbols must be taken with the highest honour and piety. Theodoret exposes the premise of Eutyches as indeed that of an assumption (*λήψια*) -- he writes ' *symbola quae videntur corporis et sanguinis sui appellatione honoravit non naturam mutans sed naturae gratiam*

addens '.

Duraeus claims that in his 27th. Homily, Macarius ² uses the term ἀντίτυπος not in the sense of 'pre-figure' or 'prophetic type' but to represent a substitution in the place of the figure ---- the antitype gives way to the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ, as Baptism became the spiritual reality of the Deluge in 1 Peter 3.21. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote ³ that 'in the type of the bread, the Body is given' and Macarius adds 'qui sumunt ³ ἐκ τοῦ φαινόμενου ἄρτου i.e. ex quo qui apparet panis'. Whitaker answers that however attractive these words appear to bolster up the theory of transubstantiation, they are no help whatsoever ---in Macarius the antitype has no less the thing itself than the type; there is no difference in meaning, but a relationship is established. In 1 Peter 3.21. the Deluge was an antitype

1. Whitaker quotes Chrysostom's Letter to Caesarius of Nazianzus (d. 369 AD) --- 'dignus habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione etiamsi natura panis in illo remanserit'. In his 1 Prod. Judae 6 Chrysostom writes that Christ is the real priest at the altar, and the words of Institution change the offerings --- μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα; there was no general theory on the nature and number of the sacraments in the 4th. Century AD --Chrysostom explained that God gave to man 'the intelligible in the sensible' i.e. grace in the visible, and palpable signs or symbols, called sacraments.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. c. 428 AD) wrote on Matthew 22.26 Χρίστος... διδάσκων ἡμᾶς μὴ πρὸς τὴν φύσιν ὄραν τοῦ προκειμένου, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς γενομένης εὐχαριστίας εἰς σάρκα καὶ αἷμα μεταβάλλεσθαι.

docens non attendere naturam rei propositae sed eam per gratiarum actionem in carnem et sanguinem transmutari'. MG. 66. 713.

2. Macarius the Elder of Egypt (d. 390 AD) to be distinguished from Macarius of Magnesia in Lydia and Macarius the Younger of Alexandria (d. 394 AD aged 100). Macarius the Elder was credited with 50 Spiritual homilies (ὁμιλίαι πνευματικά) printed under his name c. 1559 AD and have aroused great interest since the 16th. Century 'placing Macarius in the forefront of Christian mystics' (Altaner op.cit. p.304) though recent research (eg. by H.Doerries) indicate Simeon the author -- he is designated as one of the founders of the Messalian or Euchite heresy by Theodoret (H.E. 4.11.2.) and the ascription to Macarius may have been the result of identification with the one who was the 'blessed' (Μακάριος) in the text. The writings are variously dated 4th. to 7 th. Centuries.
3. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 4.

of Baptism but there is no transubstantiation in the baptismal water. The author of Hebrews calls the tabernacle the antitype of heaven. Nazienzan calls Abraham's sacrifice the antitype of Christ's sacrifice --- the word indicates not the reality (rem) but a pattern (exemplar) of the thing (rei). Basil calls the bread the **ἀντίτυπον** of the Body of Christ and that after consecration. If the Body were concealed, it could not be the antitype. John of Damascus said the same, though he spoke of the bread before consecration. Theodoret spoke² of 'divina mysteria sunt **ἀντίτυπα** veri corporis' and Chrysostom wrote³ 'this sacrifice is the type (τύπος) of that'; Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the Body of Christ given **ἐν τύπῳ (panis) φαίνομενου** ----- the bread to Macarius is not the empty likeness of bread (similitudinem vacuum panis) but true bread eaten spiritually (**πνευματικῶς**). If the bread was transubstantiated, the Body of Christ could not be eaten **πνευματικῶς** but **σώματικῶς**.

'They (the Docetists) receive not the Eucharists and Oblations because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father raised again in His mercy' --so wrote Ignatius in his Letter to the Smyrneans (7.1.) and quoted by Theodoret (Eranistes Dial. 3.); this makes the Eucharist for Ignatius the **σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παθούσα**⁴; surely, says Duraeus, this is sufficient ground for transubstantiation? Whitaker repeats

1. Hebrews 9. 24

2. Theodoret Eranistes Dial. 2.

3. Chrysostom Hom. 17 on Hebrews.

4. Ignatius calls the Eucharist also the **φάρμακον ζωανθείας** and **ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν** (Ad Ephes. 20.2) --the Eucharistic content is a **φάρμακον** to heal the wounds of the soul, and to supply the principle of eternal life. Ignatius (Ad Phil. 4) has 'endeavour to partake all of the same holy eucharist for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of His Blood, one altar, one bishop,' -- but here the suggestion is of a symbol of unity. Batiffol 'Etudes d'hist. et de theol. posit. 2nd. series pp. 44 ff. claims that the symbolic sense does not necessarily exclude the literal sense--but neither does it demand it.

his challenge that if Duraeus could produce one testimony from antiquity to prove transubstantiation, he would concede the argument; otherwise he could not concede to these allurements (tuis lenociniis). This quotation is no exception -- the flesh is eaten sacramentally. He did not say the bread is the flesh. But there is more to this quotation than exegesis -- while Whitaker accepted the 7 Ignatian Epistles -- Ephesians, Magnesians, Trullians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, and Polycarp, the first four written from Smyrna, the last three from Troas, -- as genuine, he confesses the dilemma of interpolations in the accepted writings of Ignatius as a real one², and in this quotation from Ad. Smryn. 7.1. there is found a material instance of this practice, since it is not found in the accepted text.

The problem of the genuine Ignatian Epistles returns later in the controversy³, where Whitaker cites instances where Jerome and Theodoret quote passages as Ignatian which are not in fact genuine eg. Jerome in Advers. Pelag. 3 quotes 'elegit Dominus Apostolos qui super omnes omnes peccatores erant' but the words are not found in Ignatius. 'Recent examination of these Epistles' writes Whitaker 'have revealed that less trust should be put in them; we do not think these things because we are overburdened with testimonies, but because we do not wish to be deceived by a false authority of the Fathers'.⁴

-
1. Archbishop Whitgift treated the Longer Recension of the Ignatian Epistles as genuine. Altaner wrote (op. cit. p. 107) 'From the Protestant side the authenticity of the 7 letters was almost unanimously rejected.!
 2. It is missing in Lightfoot's text, but it was used by Pusey 'Doctrine of the Real Presence' (1855 edition) p. 315.
 3. Contra Duraeum 5.2.
 4. Faber (Stapulensis) in 1498 AD produced a Latin version of the 7 genuine but interpolated letters together with 4 spurious letters, but the genuineness of this collection was long disputed. This Longer Recension was printed in Greek in 1557 AD. Ussher (1581-1656 AD) later pointed out that quotations from Ignatius in Medieval authors differed from Faber's text but were to be found in Patristic quotations from Ignatius -- this view had already appeared in the Tigurian edition of 1593 AD and was later incorporated in Ussher's 'Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolae' (1644 AD). In 1646 AD Voss edited the corresponding text of Ignatius (Greek) in the Florentine MS (Laur. Plut. 57.7.) and in 1672 AD the 7 Letters were

authenticated by Pearson. Vide Lightfoot Apost. Fathers. 2 Pt. 2. p. 711

Justin Martyr speaks of the bread and wine 'blessed by the prayer of the Word which proceeded from Christ' as no longer common bread or common drink, but the 'Flesh and Blood of that Jesus who was made flesh' and that our flesh and blood 'by assimilation receive nourishment' --- 'per mutationem aluntur' -- (*κατὰ μεταβολήν*)². There is here the idea of the activity of the Liturgical Logos which comes from Christ the Incarnate Logos, exercising a creative and transforming action on the species. Through the consecration, the food is blessed *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ*.³ Whitaker draws attention to the difference between the Divine-Human Personality of Christ and the sacramental content. There is no conversion of nature or personal assimilation of the elements in the sacrament -- the bread and the wine remain. We are nourished 'per immutationem' for a change from common bread to hallowed bread there is, but it is not a substitution. Whitaker goes on to recall Duraeus' quotation of Irenaeus that the Eucharist 'consists of two elements, the one earthly, the one heavenly' --but there is no suggestion of hypostatic union. Origen's words that when we eat the Body, Christ enters 'sub tectum tuum' indicate neither metabolism nor symbolism, but the plain truth that the Body of Christ is in the Word of God --- indeed, in his Ninth Homily on Leviticus he makes it clear that the Christian should pass on from the mystical (*μυστικῶς*) eating to the fuller knowledge of the mysteries --- 'stop not at the Blood of the Flesh but learn rather the Blood of the Word!'. The Body can be eaten without transubstantiation and the entering of Christ 'sub tectum' demands no transubstantiation; Origen puts under this thought of Christ entering 'sub tectum', belief in the Gospel, reception of a godly ministry, hospitality to the poor, and

-
1. Justin Martyr Apol. 1.66.
 2. Cayre (Manual of Patrology l.p. 229) calls this simple doctrinal exposition one 'no different from the present catholic doctrine of transubstantiation'. Altaner (op. cit. p.126) calls it 'the first attempt to formulate the doctrine of transubstantiation'.
 3. The idea of the Body of Christ being present in the Sacrament as a working or efficient principle, the influence of a non-personal Logos, is seen in the teaching of Haymo, Remi of Auxerre, and Heriger of Lobbes (Vide Migne 117. 564 c; 101. 1260 d.; 139.187 a-b) and in the anonymous work 'Dicta Cuiusdam Sapientis de Corp. et Sanguin. (Migne 112. 1517 d.). Hugh of Langres also used the view -- 'dynamic symbolism'.
 4. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 4. 18.4f.; 33.2.; and 5. 11. 3.

if we believe the Son and keep His Word, the Father will take up His abode within us.

On Cyprian's words 'panis ille quem Dominus discipulis dedit non effigie sed natura mutatus omnipotentis Verbo Dei factus est caro' there is little that requires comment, says Whitaker, except to say that by virtue of consecration, that which was of common use now has become a new nature and condition (nunc novam naturam ac conditionem nactus est) as the mystery and sacrament of Christ. By the word of the Omnipotent God, what had once the force of a common creature (vim communis creaturae) now has the nature of a sacrament. But the nature signifies the qualities and properties not the substance. The proper nature of the bread is not dismissed (amittere) but after consecration is far more sublime and excellent (sublimior et praestantior) being raised to the condition of a sacrament. Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367 AD) writes that there is no ambiguity in this matter --- 'vere caro est, et vere sanguis est', and of these words Whitaker thoroughly approves, as he does of the mind of Hilary on the Eucharist, but there is no carnalism or we should perceive by the senses, by tasting, the flesh and blood. 'We neither separate the sacrament from the reality (re ipsa)' writes Whitaker, 'nor do we make it merely a symbol or sign, but we receive the Body by faith and sacramentally.' Similarly, the authority of Gregory of Nyssa in his Catechetical Oration² stands, when he says 'the bread at the moment when it is sanctified by the Word of God is changed (μεταμοιεύεται) into the Body of the Divine Logos. Christ is not diminished though he be distributed to all the faithful; no particle of this Body is withdrawn (decedunt) and faith does not nibble away (arrodit) the Body of Christ -- the whole is spiritually received!' There is a change indeed, but 'sacramentalis' not 'substantialis vel naturalis'.

The Mystagogical Catecheses³ (Catecheses 19-23, preached to the newly baptised during Easter week and so called from μύστυς -- 'initiate') of Cyril of Jerusalem state that by

1. Hilary De Trinitate 8. 13 - 17.
2. Cat. 37. 3. (MG. 45.93) (Enchiridion Patrist. 1035) 'Panem Dei verbo sanctificatum in Dei Verbi corpus commutari'
3. Cyril of Jerusalem Mystagogical Catecheses 4 and 5. (MG. 33. 1097-1106; 1109 - 1128.)

receiving communion we partake of the Body and Blood *σύσσωμοι* (concorporei) *καὶ σὺνδαίμοι* (consanguinei) *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and we become Christ-bearers (*Χριστοφόροι*). But Cyril, comments Whitaker, does not state a change in the elements as at Cana of Galilee of the water into wine -- he uses this miracle which no-one disputes, to ask if anyone who believes such a miracle could in fact doubt that the bread of the Eucharist could become Christ's Body i.e. *verum sanguinis sacramentum*. This is no basis for transubstantiation for not every change is a 'transubstantio' --- it is that the elements are no longer to be treated *ὡς ψιλούς - τουτὸ ἡγιασται καὶ μεταβεβλήται* (hoc sanctificatum et mutatum est) but there is no change to the senses. As Ambrose points out, the bread is changed *in aliud*, from common bread it becomes sacramental, but transubstantiation demands another nature and substance. We ourselves are made new creatures in Christ, but do we not retain our pristine substance? There is a change in the elements, but what is fundamentally important is that there should be a change in us, that by faith we may benefit by what the Sacrament offers in Christ.

Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403 AD) in his *Anchoratus* said that he who does not believe that it is Christ truly present has fallen from grace and salvation, while in his '*Expositio Fidei*' he spoke of Mother Church offering 'day by day the draught which lightens toil, the Blood of Christ, unmixed and true'. Whitaker states that in quoting Epiphanius in this way, it would appear Duraeus didn't understand what he was saying --- Epiphanius is asking how it is that man should be made in the image of God when he has none of those things that are agreeable to the divine nature. Man has certain properties through grace by which he resembles God, and he illustrates this from the Eucharist, which though it has nothing similar to the Body of Christ, yet through grace Christ calls it His Body. Man is not converted into God though he bear the image of God, so the bread and wine are not converted into the carnal Body and Blood of Christ. Epiphanius refers to it as *στρογγύλοειδές καὶ ἀναιόθητον*.

1. Epiphanius *Anchoratus* 57. MG. 43. 117.

The words of Gregory of Nazianzus in his Funeral Oration for his sister Gorgonia, that the Lord is present on the altar, and that He is to be invoked -- this is not to be denied, but it is no ground for transubstantiation. The words of Gregory are 'despairing of all, Gorgonia betakes herself to the Physician of all, and having waited for the dead of night, she falls in faith before the altar, calling upon Him who is honoured thereupon -- then anointing her body with the ointment which she had and whatever of the antitypes of the precious Body and Blood **her** hand treasured, mingling with it her tears, she departed straightway, feeling health, light in her body, soul and mind.'

Duraeus then appeals to Chrysostom's 24th. Homily on 1 Corinthians --- 'this same body, crucified, pierced by the spear, by the fount of blood and water, is scattered for the salvation of the whole world' ¹ ----- and in his De Sacerdotio ² 'Oh! the Wonder of it! Oh the lovingkindness of God to men! He who sits above with the Father is at that moment held in our hands, and gives Himself to those who wish to clasp and embrace Him --- which they do, all of them, with their eyes!'. Whitaker goes on to say ³ that Chrysostom is describing in a mystic realism, and with that vivid phraseology so common in Chrysostom's writings, the spirit in which we should approach the Holy Eucharist -- he is not describing the 'modus transubstantiationis'. We are to behave as if in the very

1. 'hoc est illud corpus quod cruentatum fuit, lancea perforatum, quod salutare fontes scaturivit (τὰς σωτηρίου πηγὰς ἀκλύουσαν) alium sanguinis, alium aquae --- hoc corpus dedit nobis et tenendum et domedendum, quod intensae dilectionis fuit.' Hom. 24. sect. 4. MG. 61. 203.
2. Chrysostom De Sacerdotio Dial. 3. sect. 4. MG. 48. 642-3.
3. Vide Macdonald 'Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine' p. 334 where Peter Damiani (1007-1072 AD) uses popular eucharistic terminology and demonstrates how the earlier type prevailed in the 11th. Century AD i.e. a Real Presence by 'an infusion of grace' by the Holy Spirit making the elements dynamically effective in an Augustinian sense, giving 'life and sanctification to the faithful recipient'. Damiani wrote no treatise on the Eucharist though the 'Expositio Canonis Missae' has been assigned to him (ML. 145. 879 - 892). There is a marginal note in Whitaker's work -- καὶ πάντας ἑκείνῳ τῷ τιμίῳ φοινισσομένους αἵματι --- 'seeing all the people reddened with that precious Blood'; this is from the De Sacerdotio 3.4. and is followed by the words 'do you not straightway remove to heaven, and shedding from your soul every carnal thought, with bared soul, and pure mind, survey the things in heaven?'. could

presence of that Body of Christ , crucified and pierced , because , as Chrysostom says , the essence of that 'communicatio Corporis Christi' is that with such thoughts and reverence a quick-sighted mind and fervent love , we become eagles mounting up to heaven itself --- οὐχ

ἀπλῶς αὐτὸ τούτο τὸ σῶμα ἑρᾶς --- 'for eagles, not jackdaws, (graculi) have a right to this table.'. Chrysostom goes on to speak about the extreme terror for those that believe -- for they would tremble to touch the king's royal robe, how much more to touch 'Him descending from heaven ' ? 'Do not kill yourselves by irreverence '. If Christ be wholly (totus) on the altar , what need is there of lifting up mind and heart to heaven ? To 'approach at random is dangerous enough , but not to communicate mystically is famine and death ' Chrysostom's words are -- οὕτω τὸ μὴ κοινῶναι τῶν μυστικῶν δεῖπνων ἐκείνων , λιμός και θάνατος .

'This mystery makes earth a heaven -- would you not if entrusted with a king's child , with the robes, purple and diadem , cast away all earthly things for this joy ? But you receive the Only Begotten Son of God Himself , so why look again¹ to earthly things , to love money, and flutter¹ after gold ? ' You receive the King within (ὑποδεχέσθαι) by communion , and there ought to be a great calm , great quietness , a deep peace of thoughts .'² To Chrysostom the nature of the bread remained , and when speaking of the Eucharistic elements he uses the term 'symbols'³ eg. in his use of the 'coal of fire ' , Isaiah's vision , where there was outward and inward substance, a type of the Eucharist , the use of the preposition 'in' signifying substance within as distinct from substance without , while the senses only report the outward.

So , writing in his 82nd. Homily on Matthew , Chrysostom could say that 'This is my Body' gives us nothing to be

 contd. This is the 'oculus fidei ' --- ποιῶσι δὲ τούτο πάντες
 διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς πίστεως (ibid)

1. Vide etiam Chrysostom De S. Pentecost. Hom. sect. 4. ; In Diem Nativ. J.C. sect. 7. , in which Chrysostom says that while Elijah left his mantle to his disciple , Christ ascending left His flesh to us. This passage was quoted in favour of transubstantiation against Bp. Ridley in the Disputation at Oxford 1554 AD ; Vide De Baptism. Christi ; Ad Pop. Ant. De Statuis Hom 2.
2. Chrysostom De B. Philogon. 3.1.
3. Chrysostom Hom 2. on 2 Tim.

perceived by sense , but in things of sense , all spiritual.
 So in Baptism , 'regeneration and renewal is wrought spiritually in water, the matter of sense , since the soul is united with the body , so He giveth thee things spiritual in things sensible.' Neither *μεταρρυθμισίω*¹ nor *μετασκευάσω*² imply any change of substance , but rather indicate the contrary.

In his Commentary on Ps. 33 , Augustine wrote ³ the words ' et ferebatur in manibus suis ' and then he asks to whom this refers. A man can be carried in the hands of other men , but no one can be carried in his own hands. Augustine goes on to say that this can only refer to Christ , and can never be said of David. Christ was carried (ferebatur) in His own hands when He commended His Body with 'Hoc est corpus meum ' -- ferebat illud corpus in manibus suis . Whitaker answers Duraeus by saying that what Augustine actually wrote was 'ipse se portabat quodammodo ' -- if the bread be transubstantiated Augustine could not have written 'quodammodo' but something like 'se omnino tulisset' . Duraeus had concluded from Augustine's words on Ps. 98 -- 'no one eateth that flesh unless he has first worshipped' and ' we sin not in worshipping but we sin in not worshipping ' and 'as He walked in the flesh, so he gave the same (ipsam) flesh to be eaten ' --that Augustine's mind was clear , that no one can eat the Flesh unless he has first worshipped. To this Whitaker replies that the worship of Christ in the sacrament does not of itself require transubstantiation , or how could Duraeus explain the Veneration of the Cross ? Is Christ carnally present there ? Indeed, the true worship of Christ does not require the carnal presence .

-
1. Chrysostom De Prod. Jud. Hom.1.6. *μεταρρυθμισίω* = 're-order' i.e. the operation of the Word of God in nature ; to stop the lion's mouth (the Daniel story) is not to make any physical change in the mouth , but to re-order the function according to the Will of God, or to provide another energy (*εἰς ἑτέραν μετατίθησιν ἐνεργειῶν*)
 2. Hom. 76 on Matthew 24.29 *μετασκευάσω* = 'refashion' ; creation at Christ's Second Coming will be transfigured *μετασχηματιζόμενος* --the sun is darkened but not destroyed, but overcome by the Light of His Presence . The word is also used of man's reformation in Baptism , the 're-harmonizing' of his being, the restored state of that pristine harmony with God (*ρρυθμίζεται*) as Christ was in the womb of the BVM. The deformed is reformed (*μετέβαλε* : *μετέπλασε* : *μετερρυθμισεν*) the unpleasing becomes pleasing, the shapeless is remodelled ; thus the visible nature remains, and by the Word is made to contain that which is above nature.
 3. Augustine Enarrationes in Psalmos 33.1.10. ML.36.306.

Augustine distinguishes between the 'res sacramenti' and the consecrated elements which are 'signs', 'figures', 'similitudes', 'pledges', (i.e. symbols) ----- 'sacramenta ipsa ita etiam signa, figuram, similitudinem, pignusque appellari' -- Berengar speaks of the communion 'non sensualiter sed intellectualiter non per assumptionem sed per assumptionem'; not materially but spiritually, not through absorption but addition, and this is Augustine's teaching. In his Sermo ad Neophytos, the substance of the bread and wine remain --- 'that which is seen has material form (speciem habet corporalem) that which is apprehended spiritually, by the mind, has spiritual fruit (fructum habet spiritualem).

On the interesting question of the Eucharistic Remains, Duraeus quotes from Cyril of Alexandria --- 'they are mad (insaniunt) who say that the mystical benediction avails nothing for sanctification if any of it be left until another day'. Whitaker replies that he knew this text had been used by others, but that he had not found it in Cyril's works. Whitaker, however, is mistaken here, as they do occur in Cyril's Letter to Calosyrius² who did not regard the consecration as lasting till the next day. Origen witnesses³ to the custom, founded apparently on the rules of the Mosaic Law, by which the Eucharistic Remains were kept until the morrow, but not reserved till the third day, the Christian practice agreeing with the Jewish with regard to the consumption of certain sacrifices. On this precedent, later rules for the disposal of the Eucharistic

-
1. Augustine Epistle to Boniface; 'assumptio' is used in a judicial sense, not a philosophical sense, as in the Greek doctrine of assumption. Ratramn with Paschasius declined to admit the identification of the Eucharistic Body with the Body of Christ received from the Virgin, but admitted a 'Eucharistic virtue' in the Augustinian sense --- the 'virtus sacramenti'. ML. 107. 317 d.
 2. Duraeus had quoted Cyril of Alexandria's Letter to Caelestius; he means his Letter to Calosyrius or Adv. Anthropomorph. l. PG. 76. 1073-6. Bucer in his 'Censure' and 'Second Book on Leviticus' refers to this Letter to Calosyrius but Bucer condemned the practice of Reservation, since 'the Eucharistic Elements have nothing in them of sanctity more than have other bread and wine'.
 3. Origen Hom 5. on Leviticus 8. MG. 12. 459.

Remains were based. Origen's text highlights the practice as signifying that Christ did not intend the Eucharistic bread to be carried externally, but 'you must always bear the bread of the Word of God within you, fresh'. But Origen's mystical lesson does not in itself disapprove of reservation a practice common in his day, as Tertullian and Cyprian show.

Justin Martyr, describing the Eucharist (as celebrated at Ephesus?) records the practice of the deacons carrying the Eucharistic elements to those absent. Tertullian records the great care necessary in the handling of this sacrament --- 'we suffer anxiety (anxie patimur) if anything of the cup or even of the bread fall to the ground' --- but does this refer to the Eucharistic elements or to ordinary food? The section begins with the observation of unwritten tradition eg. triple immersion, at Baptism, oblations for the dead (oblationes pro defunctis), not fasting and kneeling on the Lord's Day or between Easter and Pentecost, and after the text cited, Tertullian goes on to the sign of the cross used on entering and leaving, putting on shoes, at the bath, table or work. The position of the text would strongly suggest the Eucharistic elements but not necessarily so. Similar care over the Remains occurs in the so-called Egyptian Church Order, lest 'a mouse eat the remains' or a 'strange spirit' lick up spilled wine. Origen also wrote on the care to be exercised towards 'that body which is to be reserved' --- 'quodsi circa corpus eius conservandum tanta utimini cautela' --- as did Cyril of Jerusalem (c.348 AD) in his Catechetical lectures, where the elements which hallow the eyes with the touch of the holy body should be guarded from loss as more precious than gold dust. Chrysostom in his First Letter to Pope

1. Justin Martyr Apol. 1. 65.5 and 67. 5 ; MG. 6.428.

2. Tertullian De Corona 3 (c.201 AD) ML. 2. 80.

3. Hippolytus (d.235 AD) Vide Dix 'Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus' pg. 59.

4. Vide Connolly 'The so-called Egyptian Church Order' pp.190 - 1 Hauler 'Didasc. Apost. Fragm. pp. 117 - 8.

5. Origen on Exodus 13.3. MG. 12 . 391.

6. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. Lectures . 23 Mystag. 5.21. MG. 33.1125.

Innocent (404 AD) describing the great riot in Constantinople said that the soldiers burst into the place where the Holy Things were stored and saw all things therein, and the Most Holy Blood of Christ was spilled upon their clothes.

----- ἀλλὰ ἐνθα τὰ ἅγια
ἀπέκειντο εἰσελθόντες οἱ στρατιῶται ὡν ἐνιοὶ καθ' ὡς
ἔγνωμεν ἀμύητοι ἦσαν πάντα τὰ εὐρύων τὰ ἔνδον
καὶ τὸ ἁγιώτατον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς ἐν τοσοῦτῃ
θορύβῳ εἰς τὰ τῶν προειρημένων στρατιωτῶν
ἱμάτια ἐφέχεϊτο

It is evident that reservation (in both kinds) was the practice here. in Africa, the reservation was usually in the church itself². The Prosp^honesus of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria (c.385 AD) canon 7 also refers to reservation, while canon 58 of the Quini-Sext Synod (692 AD) forbids self-communication if a bishop, priest, or deacon be present; no doubt by then, domestic communion self-administered by Anchorites and hermits, had been copied by others with less reason, but with complete disregard for the regular ministry.

In the 'Apostolic Constitutions'³ the Remains are carried into the sacristy (pastophorium), a practice alluded to by Jerome on Ezekiel Chapter 40, though this may be no more than an interpolation into the text from what was perhaps originally in the margin --- 'the sacristy (παστοφόριον) is rightly called the Bridal Chamber (πιδότης) for there lies the Body of Christ, the true bridegroom of the church and of our souls.' The παστοφόριον in the O.T. was the 'priest's quarters'⁴ or the treasury.⁵

Evagrius writing c. 594 AD gives the usage at Constantinople in his day --- the Remains are to be eaten by 'uncorrupted boys, selected and summoned from the school of grammar' a practice which apparently lasted till the time of Nicephorus i.e. 13th. Century,

-
1. Chrysostom; Letter to Innocent sect. 3.
 2. Vide Scudamore W.E. 'Notitia Eucharistica' 2nd. ed. p.1025.
 3. Apostolic Constitutions 8. 13. (late 4th. Century AD) -- the so-called Liturgy of St. Clement.
 4. Theodoret of Cyrrihus on Ezekiel 40.17 M. 81. 808.
 5. Olympiodones of Alexandria; Fragmenta Jeremiah 35.4. M. 93.696.
 6. Evagrius H.E. 4. 36. MG. 86. 2769

who wrote ' cum plusculum de partibus immaculati divinique corporis Domini et Dei et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi reliquum esset , sacerdotes pueros incorruptos (παῖδας ἀφθόρους) ex eis qui ad praeceptores in ludum literarium eunt, accerserent , qui ieiuni reliquias eas ederent ' .¹ The same practice apparently applied in Gaul in the 6th. Century for in the 6th. canon of the Council of Mâcon in 585 AD 'innocent boys were to be brought to the church after Mass on Wednesdays, and Fridays , and the fast being imposed upon them , they are to eat the Eucharistic Remains ' The reference to fasting in both cases seems to preclude the idea of unconsecrated bread merely to satisfy hunger. The practice receives a caution at the Third Council of Tours (813 AD) and was forbidden at the Synod of Paris in 1198 AD held under Odo. The Pseudo-Clementine Letter to James the Lord's brother , possibly representing the practice of the 7th. Century (?) states that the remains should not be reserved (quod si remanserint in crastinum non reserventur) but be consumed with fear and trembling by the clerks who should continue to fast lest ' food be mingled with the Holy Portion ' . This is not an argument against Reservation , since this injunction is operative on the second day when the elements had already been reserved , but it does indicate the special precautions taken with the consecrated elements --- the eating is still 'the communion of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ ' .² The injunctions condemned not the seemly reservation of the sacrament , but the negligent treatment of the Eucharistic Remains.

Reservation for the sick on the day of celebration was provided for in the first rubric of the 'Communion of the Sick' in the 1549 AD Book of Common Prayer ---following the Brandenburg Order of 1540 AD --- this reservation was omitted in the 1552 AD Prayer Book which required the presence of the parishioners with the minister and sick person at a celebration in the house, except in 'times of plague,

1. Nicephorus H.E. 17. 25.

2. Vide Arabic Canons ascribed to the Council of Nicea can. 19.

sweat , or such like contagious times of sickness or diseases '. There was no provision in the 1549 AD and 1552 AD Prayer Books for the consumption of the Eucharistic Remains, though there is good evidence to show that in many cases the practice preceded the post-communion 'gratias tibi' , much to the annoyance of certain bishops (eg. Ridley , Hooper) who favoured the new idea of the practice at the end of the communion service. ¹

The words of John Damascene on the change or conversion of the bread and wine after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit , are quoted by Duraeus to prove that the consecrated elements were no mere figures ---- *οὐ τύπος τοῦ σώματος ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ οὐ τύπος τοῦ αἵματος ἀλλὰ τὸ αἷμα* --- 'non figura corporis, sed Corpus Meum. '.

They are now *ὑπερφύως (μεταποιούνται)* -- prater naturae vires --- and John Damascene goes on to say that though some eg. Basil, used the word *ἀντίτυπα* this was often before consecration -- *πρὶν ἄγισθῆναι* . Whitaker replies that Duraeus should read on in the text quoted from John Damascene --- after consecration *νῦν μὲν δι' αὐτῶν μετέχουμεν τῆς Χριστοῦ Θεότητος τότε δὲ νοητῶς διὰ μόνης τῆς Θεᾶς*

Much had been built on this text and also on Leo's 6th. Sermon on Fasting --- ' hoc (corpus) enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur ' --

though here Leo is replying to Eutyches arguing that it is the sacrament of the true not fictitious Body of Christ. ; but neither support the transubstantiation theory ; Whitaker denies that the bread is 'tantum figura ' ; if there was a transubstantiation, then the practice of burning the Remains is no less a crime than crucifying the flesh , if the church had believed in a carnal presence. Whitaker is quite content to accept the ' holy and unbloody sacrifice in the Eucharist ' but Cyril of Alexandria's words to Calosyrius and his use of the word 'sacrificium' as 'memoriam ac monumentum unius

1. In the 1662 Book of Common Prayer the 'priest and such other of the communicants as he shall call unto him , shall, immediately after the Blessing , reverently eat and drink the same '. Rubric 6 at the end of the Communion Service. Private reservation (i.e. the laity taking the consecrated elements home as a 'preservative' in trials and tribulations) is referred to by Tertullian (Ad Uxor. 2.

2. cap. 5 -- 'non sciet maritus . quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes ?'
 2. John Damasc. De Fide Orthodox. 4. 13. MG 94.1144 (Cyprian De Lap. 16

sacrificii Christi ' demand no more than Whitaker holds. ^{1.}

Campion had quoted the 18 th. canon of Nicea on the unbloody sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ (on the altar) --- that 'those who had not the power of offering the sacrifice (qui offerendi sacrificium non habent potestatem) should not administer the Eucharist (Ἰσοῦναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) to those who have the power (i.e. presbyters). The reference here is not to presbyters actually celebrating but to presbyters concelebrating, and the deacons must remember their inferior gradus. This did not remove their authority to administer the consecrated elements to the minor orders or laymen . Some deacons had even touched ('received' -- Isidore's version) the consecrated elements before the bishop and had taken their place among the offering presbyters. The point here,

1. Contra Duraeum 9. De Sophismatis sect. 45. Whitaker accuses Duraeus of 'hurling into the middle a list of Fathers quite alien to the subject eg. Ambrose, Prosper , Chrysostom ' to 'affirm that the church has always prescribed a sacrifice of the Mass -- -- the unbloody sacrifice ' (sacrificium incruentum).

The burning of the Eucharistic remains is referred to by Hesychius (d. c. 438 AD) in his Commentary on Leviticus XI (MG. 93. 886 - 7) where he cites the Jewish practice of burning the remains of their sacrifices as a parallel. Burning or burying the Eucharistic Remains survived , according to the Penitentials for some centuries -- the Rule of St. Columban (c. 600 AD) has 'let him who has shown negligence towards the sacrifice so that a worm is found in it, even though it be whole, burn it in the fire near the altar and put away the ashes underneath the altar and himself do penance 40 days ' . (ML. 80. 222). The Penitential of Theodore (668 - 690 AD) and the Penitential of Egbert (735 - 766 AD) both stipulate burning the neglected remains . Others, eg. the Penitentials ascribed to Gregory 3 (731 - 741 AD) Bede (d.735 AD) Halitgar bishop of Cambrai (817 - 831 AD) and Robert of St. Victor also the canons under Edgar (d. 975 AD) , the Codices of Bobbia and Rheinau monasteries , and the rubrics of the Medieval Missals (eg. those of Salisbury and York) all contain such directions.

says Duraeus , is that if you teach that the Body of Christ is present only in the soul of the worthy communicant (and in no way connected objectively, really, or substantially with the form of bread, which was merely an appointed sign or assurance of the heavenly gift) then the Body of Christ could not be given by the priest , whereas the canon explicitly states this.¹ Duraeus goes on to say² that it had become a part of tradition not merely that bishops and presbyters had the power of offering -- τὴν εὐχαριστίαν προσφέρειν τοῦς ἐφουσίᾳς ἔχοντας -- but that the Body of Christ was given, the unbloody sacrifice (sine effusione sanguinis) and that by now it was read among the canons (διὰ τούτων). So the Agnus Dei is placed upon the Holy Table, who takes away the sins of the world, who without stain (mactatione) is offered (immolatur) by priests , and His Blood should be venerated.³ Whitaker wonders if Duraeus had in fact read the canon --- it is true that it is directed against the deacons administering out of turn and it is to this that the words ὡςπερ οὔτε ὁ κάρων οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε refer , but what Duraeus adds are his own words and do not belong either to the text or meaning of the Canon. There is no mention of an unbloody sacrifice , or an altar, or even of a sacrifice at all. Duraeus had tried to join together things which in their content were very far apart -- to postulate a type of the 'reale externum incruente sacrificium ' in the offering of the bread and wine by Melchizedek , and by pressing support from Arnobius, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom. The more Duraeus wrote on the unbloody sacrifice (ἀνδιδυκτον θυσίαν) that it was unbloody not because it is void of blood but

-
1. Vide Article 28 'Of the Last Supper ' of the 39 Anglican Articles. 'Corpus Christi datur, accipitur et manducatur in Coenā tantum coelesti et spirituali ratione . Medium autem , quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Coenā fides est ' . The author of this section which in 1563 AD altered the original article of 1553 AD was Bishop Guest who expressly stated that it was drawn up not to 'exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the sacrament , but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof.' The Article excluded :-
 - a) Anabaptist views which made the Supper a mere Love Feast.
 - b) Zwinglian views which made it a bare memorial of Christ's Death.
 - c) Transubstantiation.
 2. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 5 De Conciliis sect. 5.
 3. Duraeus quoted Peter Galatinus (De Arch. Cath. Ver. 10.6. 5-7) and Arnobius (the Younger d. 451 AD) on Psalm 107 and Jerome

because it was offered without the effusion of blood, the worse it became for his premise of the carnal presence. If the Mass be the sacrifice of the whole Christ (totius Christi) then it is bloody and unbloody at the same time, which is a contradiction. There cannot be 'the same sacrifice, blood poured out and no blood poured out'. No Father ever taught that the Blood of Christ was substantially present on the altar but not poured out --- it is present 'in mysterio' a 'memoria illius effusionis'. One quotation from Theodoret of Cyrrihus (d. 485 AD) one of the most gifted exegetes of the early church, given to summarising ideas (of the Antiochene school) rather than originality, will give the mind of the Fathers on this question - he writes in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews 'cur Novi Testamenti sacerdotes mysticam liturgiam seu sacrificium peragunt cum Christus qui est Sacerdos secundum ordinem Melchizedek, offerens sacrificium effecit, ut alia sacrificia non essent necessaria' --- --'sed clarum est eis, qui in rebus divinis sunt eruditi, nos non aliud offerre sed illius unius et salutaris memoriam peragere! **Hoc** enim nobis praecepit ipse Dominus hoc facite in meam recordationem; ut per figuram contemplationem earum quae pro nobis susceptae sunt perperessionum recordaremur et in benefactorem benevolentiam conservemus, et futurorum beneficiorum perceptionem expectemus'. The sacrifice is there not 'in reali' but 'in commemoratione atque recordatione'.

Whitaker denies that the Eucharist is but a 'sola nudaque memoria' --- it is not 'nuda' because it contains (complectitur) the thing itself (rem ipsam) and its fruits. Eusebius wrote² that Christ offered for the salvation of all men a wonderful sacrifice (admirabile sacrificium) and excellent victim (victimam

 on Ephesians 1.1.7 (ML. 26. 451) though the latter can only be taken as against the carnal presence, for Jerome distinguished the Body and Blood ('crucifixa et qui militis effusus est lancea') from that in the Eucharist 'spiritualis illa atque divina', and Arnobius's Commentarii (expositions) on the Psalms are strongly allegorical.

1. MG. 82. 35 - 878. On Chapter 8 of the Hebrews.

2. Eusebius 'Demonstratio Evangelica' (c. 315-320 AD). 1.10.

MG. 22, 85.

eximiam) , 'memoriam etiam et nobis tradens quam pro sacrificio semper Deo offerremus ' . Quoting the Greek in the margin ¹ , Whitaker goes on to say that to Eusebius , the *μνημείον* (monimentum) consists not in the oblation of the carnal body but in the lawful perception of the symbols , and that the reference to Malachi 1. 11. ² was not to prove an unbloody sacrifice but to speak of prayer and penitence ---- 'immolamus scilicet Deo Opt. Max. *Θύσιαν δίνουσίς* , ---- the sacrifice of praise , the contrite spirit, and the humble heart (cor humiliatum). 'Incendimus suffitum propheticum in omni loco offerentes ei suavem fructum sanctae religionis , per preces ad illum nostras'. Eusebius calls the virtues *ἀσωματούς καὶ νοεράς* (incorporeas et intellectuales). Tertullian, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Augustine all write of Malachi 1.11 that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is *μνημόνικον* atque *εὐχαριστικον* . The Death and Sacrifice are celebrated by a living faith (vivā fide) and thankful memory (gratā memoriā) . Augustine wrote ³ ' huius sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur , in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur , post Ascensum Christi per sacramentum memoriae celebratur ' .

In an unpublished MS ⁴ , Whitaker enumerates seven points ;-

-
1. τουτου δηλα του θυματος μνημην επι τραπέζης εντελειν δια συμβολων . θυομεν(?) τουτω μνημην του μεγαλου θυματος δια των προς αυτον ευχων ἀνα(?)οντες
 2. Malachi 1.11 the *ἡ ἅγια ἡ ἅγια* -- *Θυσία καθάρη* -- 'pure offering to be offered in every place to the Holy Name' .
 3. Augustine Contra Faustum Manichaeum (c 400 AD) 20.21 . ML.42.385.
 4. MS Casaubon 15 Bodleian; 4 pages ; in English and undated, and therefore the occasion is unknown , but it is an attempt at a summary of the issue , which is declared by Whitaker ' to be the doctrine agreeable both to Scripture and to the Confessions of the best Reformed Churches , and writings of the most learned men of ancient and later days ' . The MS bears Whitaker's personal signature.

1. The 'res sacramenti' in the Lord's Supper is not a memory of Christ alone or Christ's merits alone, but Christ Himself. Wherefore in the Eucharist there is exhibited to us, and we do partake, not only a representation or remembrance of Christ nor yet the merits and gifts or Spirit of Christ only, but even Jesus Christ Himself, even the Body which was delivered and the Blood which was shed.
 2. As we do draw our death from the First Adam, in that we do participate of his substance, even so also must we truly participate in the substance of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ, that we may draw our life from Him.
 3. We cannot be partakers of, or communicants with, the effects and fruits of Christ and His Death, except we first be partakers and communicants with Himself, His very Flesh, His very Blood, from whence all life is derived unto us.
 4. Therefore in the Eucharist we do not 'representative' vel 'effective' tantum (as some imagine) but 'truly, really, essentially, substantially partake and communicate with the Body and Blood of Christ'. The words 'truly and really' to exclude the opinion of a representation or remembrance only, and the words 'essentially and substantially' to exclude the opinion of partaking His merits and benefits only.
 5. In this sense the Ancient Fathers have used and retained in the church these words 'truly, really, substantially, delivered; truly, really, substantially present; truly, really, substantially received.'
 6. Neither does our church teach and maintain a less true and straight conjunction of us and Christ, nor a less real and substantial
-
1. Vide Cal. State Papers Spanish 1558 - 1567.50; referred to in Conyers Read 'Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth' London 1955 AD where Elizabeth I in a conversation with the Spanish ambassador said that avoiding the Lutheranism of the 1552 Prayer Book her own views differed little from his and she believed that God was in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and she only dissented from 3 or 4 things in the Mass.

communion with the very Flesh and Blood of our Saviour than the Church of Rome or the Lutherans, neither is there any difference or controversy betwixt us and the Papists and Lutherans touching the truth of the thing received, but touching the manner of receiving or Presence only.

7. We enquire no further but 'worship with the Apostle this supernatural Feast as a mystery far beyond the reach of our reason'.

Whitaker concludes with a translation into English of the 36th. Article of the Gallican Confession (1559 AD) --- 'we confess that in the Lord's Supper, by the secret and incomprehensible power of His Spirit, Christ feeds and strengthens us with the substance of His Body and of His Blood; this is done spiritually, not because we put imagination and fancy in the place of fact and truth, but because the greatness of the mystery exceeds the measure of our senses and the laws of nature; it is heavenly and can only be apprehended by faith'.² Whitaker adds 'there is therefore no conjunction, transfusion, or connection, which might be of a carnal or fleshly fashion --- there is no conjunction of bodies natural or artificial, so straight and so narrowly knit together.'

William Rainold's 'Refutation' printed in Paris in 1583 AD containing 561 pages in 17 chapters, complained of Beza's corruption of Acts 3.21. *ὅν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δεχέσθαι*
Beza read δεξαοθαι i.e. instead of reading the Vulgate 'quem oportet quidem coelum suscipere usque in tempora

-
1. The 'Confessio Gallicana' or 'Confession de foi' was adopted by the First National Synod of Protestants at Paris 1559 AD --the Geneva Draft, the joint work of Calvin, Beza, and Vint, of 35 Articles, was made by the synod into 40, the first two being expanded into six. The Second Article is interesting as it admits Natural Theology into a Reformed Confession. Vide 'Reformed Confessions of the 16th. Century' ed. A. Cochrane (1966 AD) p. 138.
 2. Vide Cochrane op. cit. p.157. Whitaker's translation is considerably longer and fuller than the one given in Cochrane's work. Whitaker also quotes from the Acts of the Synod of Rochelle --the 7th, National Synod was held at La Rochelle 1571 AD, when the Gallican Confession of 1559 AD was confirmed in all three National Churches, Admiral Coligny for the French Church, Theodore Beza for Geneva, and Queen Jeanne d'Albret Queen of Navarre (mother of the future King of France Henry IV). According to Schaff (Creeds of Christendom; Vol. 3. (1919) p. 356 ff.) and Müller (Die Bekenntnisschriften der Reformierten Kirche' Leipzig 1903) there were 3 copies of the original text, one of La Rochelle, one of Geneva, one of Beza.

restitutionis omnium ' , Beza reads 'quem oportet quidem coeli
canient usque ad tempora restitutionis omnium ' and Rainolds
 complains that it was not the heavens that should take Christ, (out
 there, or over there, or up there) but that Christ should take
 heaven. Christ is not contained in heaven but entering His glory
 He takes heaven to Himself. This had a bearing on the Real Presence.
 Kemnitius in his 'Examen Concilii Tridentini' had approved the custom
 of the adoration of the Real Presence in the Eucharist , and that it
 was impiety not to do so.

If the use of the word 'corpus' in the Words of
 Institution of itself demands transubstantiation , then when Paul
 says ' ye are the Body of Christ ' , this would require the
 transubstantiation of men . In his final remarks to Duraeus, Whitaker
 repeats ² Berengar's view that accidents and substance are inseparable
 in nature --- the accidents of the bread remain , and therefore so does
 the substance . There are echoes also of the words of Guitmund of

-
1. Rainold's 'Refutatio' f. 181.
 2. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 2. 40. The Council of Constance Session 8
 on the 4th. May 1415 AD condemned the error that the
 'substantia panis materialis et similiter substantia vini
 materialis remanent in sacramento altaris ' ; it also
 condemned the view that the 'accidentia panis non manent
 sine subjecto in eodem sacramento ' and also the view
 'Christus non est in eodem sacramento identice et realiter
 (in)propria praesentia corporali ' . As propositions these had
 already been condemned by two English synods in London 1382 AD and
 1396 AD being placed sub nomine John Wycliffe . The condemnations
 were repeated in a Papal Bull 'Inter Cunctas' February 1418 AD
 Vide Denzinger-Schönmetzer Enchiridion 1151 ff.

Aversa in Whitaker's further comment that there are four types of 'substantial change' :-

- a) ex nihil -- i.e. from that which is not, to that which is.
- b) in nihil -- i.e. from that which is, to that which is not.
- c) by nature or miracle into another substance eg. Aaron's rod into a serpent, a nut into a tree, seed into herb.
- d) that which 'is' becomes that which 'no less is' -- bread and wine changed 'substantialiter et realiter' into carnal 'corpus' and 'sanguis'; this is the hall-mark of metabolic realism.

Whitaker comments that if the bread is transubstantiated, not only are the substances which are vital to the living body separated (body is given first, then blood) but the carnal body is comixed with our bodies which makes for a physical union (*ὑπόστασις*) but not a spiritual communion. The statement under b) also robs communion of its meaning.

-
1. Guitmund of Aversa 'De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate' c. 1073-8 AD. ML. 149. 1427 ff. Lanfranc established the theory of the change 'essentialiter' which Guitmund reinforced with his terminology 'transubstantialiter transmutari'. The word 'substantialiter' appears in the formula offered to Berengar in 1079 AD, the word 'essentialiter' being abandoned for 'transubstantialiter'. Guitmund was the chief dialectical defender of realism in the Middle Ages. Vide Macdonald 'Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine' pp. 331 ff. Guitmund op. cit. 3 maintained we eat the true Body not a Berengarian symbol --- 'non in umbra berengariana'. Berengar of Tours in 1050 AD declared his adherence to the teaching of John the Scot to whom the work of Ratramn had been attributed, but he was condemned at Rome after being opposed by Lanfranc. In 1059 AD he was induced to assent to the 'real' change after consecration -- that the communicant handles and tastes the true flesh. Twenty years later, under Gregory VII, Berengar was required to assent to a material change. Peter Lombard while maintaining the substantial Presence, later repudiated the breaking of Christ's real Body in the Fraction of the Host. At the Institution, Christ bore Himself in his own hands, for 'this' (*τοῦτο*) has a demonstrative not a relative significance i.e. it refers not to the substance of the bread but the qualities of the Eucharistic substance. The Host, though divided into many parts, is but One Host, as the voice, though audible to a 1,000 people, remains intact to the speaker, as Augustine had said. The human soul exists as a whole in each part of the body.

On the aspect of the miraculous, Guitmund had stated that a miracle may intervene to save the Eucharistic Body from harm eg. in the story of the martyr Tarsicius¹ (c257 AD) who was caught by pagans as he was carrying the host to Christian prisoners but when he was killed by the pagans they found the 'linen veil' empty. Duraeus mentions Satyrus, who 'offering that awful host (hostia) he was full of faith and prayer, and leapt from the shipwreck into the ocean and was saved'. Whitaker replies that Satyrus carried (circumgestare) the sacrament as was the custom, but others too were saved without the sacrament --- 'would any Jesuit with this belief in the miraculous element of the Eucharist care to jump into the sea (in mare sese dimittere audet) without having learnt to swim first?' This evidence is not of itself sufficient to assert a miracle at every Eucharist; mystical signs do not lose their proper nature. As Cyprian said,² miracles are a sign of God's mercy -- Whitaker adds, they do not prove a transubstantiation.

Guitmund had attempted to combine his realism with Augustine's sacramentalism, in which, when the word 'sign' is used, it is not a sign of the Body but of the Passion. By 'figure' Augustine meant not a sacramental presence but a sacramental act, and so 'sign' and 'figure' in Augustine never refer to a 'real' content of the Sacrament. Symbolism is concerned not with the Eucharist but with Soteriology for in Scripture, Christ Himself is called a 'sign'. Setting aside 'impanation' (consubstantiation), a part change (part of the bread being changed, part left), and reversion (when the unworthy receive, the Body and Blood revert back to the bread and wine) the last two not appearing in Berengar, there remains 'symbolic dynamism' which was a theme of John the Scot (d. c. 877 AD) or perhaps the more popular 'efficacious symbol' of the De Sacramentis -- where the accessory faith of the believer must be present; this was a strong point in the Augustinianism of the Carolingian period, with the symbolic teaching of Rabanus Maurus and Ratramn.³ Here there is a

-
1. Damasus 'Epigrammata'. 2. Cyprian Ep. 55. 9.
 3. The name Ratramnus was interchangeable with Bertram cp. W. Hoskins 'Bertram or Ratramn' (1686 AD), though the earliest reference to this interchange appears in the debate in the House of Lords Dec. 1548 AD on the nature of the Eucharistic Presence, during the preparatory discussions before the First Prayer Book. Vide Ridley's 'Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper' ed. H.C.H. Moule (1895 AD) p. 141.

change of value in the elements but there is no evidence of a material change (sensualiter) . The realism of Paschasius Radbert¹ with his theme of a 'new creation at each Eucharist' is valid in a subjective sense , not in an objective sense. St. Ambrose² spoke of the 'conversion' of the nature of the bread and wine (at the recital of the Words of Institution) but he went on to say that the Eucharistic Body is 'spirit , that is to say , invisible, palpable, ' and so carnal realism is no part of the eucharistic conversion.³

For more than 400 years,⁴ admits Duraeus , the early church was free to take the eucharist in both kinds , and none

1. Paschasius Radbert (c. 785 - 860 AD) in his 'De Corpore et Sanguine Christi ' (831 AD revised 844 AD) the first doctrinal monograph on the Eucharist, maintained (chapter 1 sect. 2.) that the Body of the Eucharist was the same as the Flesh of the Incarnate Lord i.e. the Flesh of the BVM , which had suffered on the cross and rose again and which miraculously multiplied by the omnipotence of God at each consecration -- to eat the Flesh is to be incorporated into the Mystical Body of Christ , the Church. (Vide-- note on Capharnaites) . This view was opposed by Rabanus Maurus who refused the identification of the Eucharistic Body with the Incarnate Flesh , while Ratramn went so far as to appear to be a 'virtualist ' i.e. the eucharistic elements by consecration are made 'spiritually efficacious without any objective or 'real' change '.
2. Ambrose De Mysteriis.
3. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 6 De Firmamentis Patrum sect. 20. ; there is no *σαρκοφάγία* or *ἀνθρωποφάγία* in the eucharist. Pope Gelasius (d. 496 AD) wrote in his 'De Duabus Naturis Adv. Eutychem' that 'esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur '. Ridley had used this text in his Determination (Works p. 174) given at Cambridge in June 1549 AD.
4. Whitaker Contra Duraeum Bk. 6 De Firmamentis Patrum sect. 20. the custom persisted in the West till the 12th. Century.

was bound by any precept in this matter¹, though Tertullian attests² that the Eucharist at home was received in one kind³ --- 'non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes', --- and in his De Oratione he refers to the practice of daily réception at home (to give the phrase 'give us this day our daily bread' the full eucharistic meaning) as does Cyprian⁴ --- 'et ideo panem nostrum id est Christum dari nobis cotidie petimus'. Duraeus refers to a 'historical note on Serapion in Eusebius H.E. 6. 36 and Sozomen H.E. 8.5. , but the former contains no reference there or elsewhere to Serapion and communion in one kind , while the latter only mentions a supposed miracle where a woman was compelled by her husband to become a Christian but at the time of communion ,when the host was given to her she kept it (in her hands) with head bowed as if in prayer ; a servant girl by a pre-arrangement placed in her hand a piece of bread but on placing this between her teeth , the piece of bread turned into stone , and this still with the teeth marks in it , she carried to John the Bishop and told him what had happened , imploring forgiveness and promising to hold the same faith as her husband . The record , asserts Sozomen, ' is still preserved in the treasury of the Church at Constantinople'.

-
1. Vide Didache 9.1. Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν ἄλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐχαριστήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.
Justin Martyr Apol. 1. 65. μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.
Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 22 (Myst. 4) 3. Ὡστε μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ... μεταλαβῶν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ σύσσωμος καὶ σύνδικος αὐτοῦ
Gregory of Nyssa Orat. Catechet. 37 (MG. 45. 93). ;Fulgentius (d. 533 AD) Ep. 12. 11. 26. 'tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque dominici participem fieri' (ML. 65. 392) ; Eusebius of Caesarea De Solmen. Paschali. 7. (MG. 24.701) αἶμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ σωτηρίου ἐμφορούμεθα αἶμα τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ προβάτου μεταλαμβάνομεν.
 2. Didymus Alexandrinus In Psalmos 36.4. (MG. 39. 1336) (d.c.398 AD) Communion in both kinds is found in Cyprian De Lapsis 6.16.
 3. Tertullian Ad Uxorem 2.5.
 4. Vide etiam Caesarius of Arles (d.543 AD) Hom. de Pasch. 5 (ML.67. 1054) ;reservation in one kind is mentioned by Cyprian De Lapsis 6.16
Cyprian De Dominica Oratione 18 ; vide etiam ibid. 7.12 ;daily reception in one kind was a custom in Africa (Cyprian op.cit. Tertullian Ad Uxorem 2.5.) and in Alexandria (Basil Ep. 93) and in Milan (Ambrose De Excessu Fratris ; ML. 16.1289 f.) and in Rome (Jerome Commentary on Ezek. 40) and survived in the East till the 9th. Century. The Synod of Lambeth (1281 AD) canon 1 restricted the consecrated wine to the celebrant only, the laity receiving

Whitaker recalled the hopes of many in the early stages of the Council of Constance that the restriction of communion in one kind for the laity should be ~~abolished~~ as an abuse, as the Calixtines had hoped. Certainly it was argued among some that communion in one kind though a custom was not the primitive custom of the church. Unfortunately, writes Whitaker, the Council of Constance thought fit to insist upon communion in one kind, asserting that 'though Christ instituted and gave this Sacrament to His disciples under both kinds, yet the church has the power of ordering that to the laity it be given under one kind only' --- 'nullus presbyter sub poena excommunicationis communicet populum sub utraque specie panis et vini'.² Gelasius, however, did not think so, continues Whitaker, for he condemned the 'dry supper' and made precept that both kinds should be received³ since 'the division of the one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege'. Duraeus⁴

 communion in one kind only. Intinction was forbidden by the Third Council of Braga (675 AD) but the custom continued till forbidden by the Council of Westminster 1175 AD. Albertus Magnus in Sentent. Dist. 4 .Dist. 12. 2. attached special significance to the share in the chalice.

1. Denzinger-Schönmetzer . Enchiridion Symbolorum. 1198. The Calixtines (also known as the Utraquists), the moderate party of Bohemia and Moravia, insisted on communion in both kinds, which was passed by the Prague Compacts of 1433 AD and confirmed at Iglau in 1436 AD.
2. Concil. Constant. Session 13. 15th. June 1415 AD. and confirmed by Papal Decree 1st. Sept. 1425 AD by Martin V th. . Vide Denzinger-Schönmetzer Enchiridion Symbolorum 1198-1200.
3. Corpus Juris Canon. Decret. 3.2.12. Gelasius 1 (492-496 AD) writing to Bishops Majoricus and John said 'we have learnt that certain persons after receiving only the portion of the Sacred Body, abstain from the chalice of the Sacred Blood. These persons without doubt (since they are said to be bound by I know not what superstition) should either partake of the sacraments in their entirety or be excluded from the entire sacraments, because division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege'. Vide M. Andrieu 'Immixtio et Consecratio' (1924 AD) pp. 114 ff. who gives an imposing list of instances 6th. to 11th. Centuries for communion of the sick in both kinds; in several instances, the chalice being carried from the church. Numerous allusions occur in Medieval Ordo-s where the priest celebrates in church, and then laying aside his chasuble, he takes Host and Chalice (in solemn procession) to the house of the sick. Vide Freestone 'The Sacrament Reserved' p. 31.f.

Aquinas (Summa Quaest. 80. Art. 12.) held the view that Gelasius only referred to the priests who as they consecrated both elements, so they should also communicate in both;

reiterated the view that only the Apostles were at the Supper and therefore only priests (the Apostolic Ministry) should receive the whole sacrament (integrum sacramentum) . Luke 22.19 says that Christ held out the bread and said :- ΤΟΥΤΟ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν

but the latter words are not repeated with the cup :- ΤΟΥΤΟ τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον -

as in the Old Covenant , there was a precept for all to eat the Lamb , but no precept for all to drink the wine . Whitaker replies that he had heard the same argument from Campion and others , and the plain answer was that the affinity of Luke's text with St. Paul's should be sufficient to clarify this ; Paul in 1 Corinthians 11. 25-26 says τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν

of both , and there is no restrictive prescript in the words -- ὅσακις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τούτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ .

The referenceto the paschal lamb was a fallacy --Whitaker writes 'the lamb was the type of Christ and could be eaten with or without the wine as far as precept was concerned -- indeed the blood was not to be drunk by people or priest '.

Duraeus had quoted Basil as evidence for communion in one kind --- καὶ τὸ κοινῶν δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καλὸν καὶ ἐπιωφελέες

but it is certain from this that both kinds were used. Whitaker asks ----- he refers to communion in one kind as 'the custom of many churches'. Communion in one kind however was condemned by the Council of Clermont (canon 28) under Urban 2 (1095 AD) and by Paschal 2 in 1118 AD who referred to Cyprian in his tradition of both kinds as being 'in the Lord's Tradition' --- ' nor let any departure be made through a human or novel institution , from what Christ the Master ordained and did'.

4. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 9.12.

1. Basil Ep. 93. Ad Caesarium Patriciam c. 372 AD (MG.32.484) where the solitaries in the desert were accustomed to retain the Eucharist in their cells. Vide Aug. Serm. 227 (ML. 38.1099)

for a public example of communion in one kind for a 1,000 years in the church's history, and all that Duraeus could furnish were (a few) instances of private examples, of Christians communicating privately at home, and even in the few examples cited, it is not always clear and absolutely sure that only one kind was used.

Gregory Nazianzen suggests that at one time both kinds were received and kept at home -- *καὶ εἴ ποῦ τὶ τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος, ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἢ χεῖρ ἑθροαύριον* —.

Jerome wrote that Exuperius carried 'in his wicker basket the Body of the Lord and in his glass cup, His Blood'. Justin Martyr wrote clearly that both kinds were carried by the deacons to those not present at the Eucharist. Ambrose indicates that Satyrus used wine as well as bread --- 'Satyrum fratrem id quod oratio involueret ore sumpsisse et fustum in viscera hausisse' -- which we understand to refer to wine.

3

In England the restoration of the chalice had followed immediately upon the death of Henry VIII with the publication of the 'Order of Communion' in London in March 1548 AD, printed by Richard Grafton under Royal Proclamation. This Order was chiefly suggested by Hermann's 'Consultatio' (1543 AD) and clearly orders communion in both kinds, which was carried over into the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 AD and continued. Archbishop Parker composed the article 'De Utraque Specie' in 1563 and this was one of the four added to the original Articles, becoming Article 30 in the 39 Articles.

-
1. Gregory Nazianzen Orat. 8.18 De Gorgon. Sorore (MG. 35.787 - 818)
Vide Thurston 'The early culture of the Reserved Eucharist' in J.T.S. XI. (1909 -1910) p. 275-9.
 2. Jerome Ad Rusticum sect. 25 Ep. 125 (Loeb translation p. 437)
Exuperius was Bishop of Toulouse (d.410 AD) ; he lived in Rome before his episcopate ---- 'corpus domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat vitro'.
 3. The Confession of Augsburg (1530 AD) De Utraque Specie Pt. 2. art 1 ('Sylloge Confessionum' Oxford 1827. p.135) restored the chalice to the laity on the grounds that 'one kind was unscriptural, contrary to the ancient canons and the received example of the church. Nevertheless none should be forced in this matter' -- 'ut aliter facerent cum offensione conscientiae'. Vide Gee & Hardy 'Documents Illustrative of English Church History' December 1547 AD 1 Ed. VI. cap. 1. 'An Act for receiving in both kinds' p. 322.

The Council of Trent asserted the sufficiency of one kind, and the church had the authority to decree rites and ceremonies to ordain it; all who denied this were anathematised though the division on this subject was strong and there was a promise that in the future, the question should be considered further, with the possibility of some relaxation of this rule. The theological basis for the canon was the doctrine of concomitance, and the view that only the Apostles received both kinds at the Last Supper. It was, however, acknowledged to be mainly a matter of discipline and custom by which it was reserved to the ministry. Vatican 2 has clarified the situation further -- both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit, to non-celebrating clergy, the laity, the Religious, the newly ordained, the newly Professed and the newly baptised. Fr. Abbott writes in a footnote that both kinds 'give a fuller expression of the Eucharistic symbolism'. It was also urged that the recommendation of the 'Mediator Dei' and the Liturgical Instruction of 1958 AD be fully practiced i.e. that communicants receive the host consecrated at the mass they attend, and not from the reserved sacrament. The Decree 'Ecclesiae Semper' of the 15th. April 1965 AD brought in the reforms on both kinds with extended permission also for both kinds at Nuptial masses, or masses at Silver and Golden wedding anniversaries.

Whitaker clarifies² his views on the Sacrifice of the Mass in keeping with Article 31 -- that there is a proper sense in which the 'Sacrifice of the Eucharist' is acceptable without recourse to immolation (or re-immolation), destruction, or quasi-destruction or physical modification of the Victim, but there is no justification for the 'Sacrifices of the Masses' which conjoined with merits and indulgences, introduced a quantitative and repetitive element in the value of masses as such. The Lutheran ambassadors of

-
1. Concil. Trident. Session 21. canons 1-3 June 1562 AD. 'si quis dixerit ex Dei praecepto vel ex necessitate salutis omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiae sacramenti sumere debere; anathemasit! In canon 1 it is stated that none should be compelled to receive in both kinds 'jure divino vel divino praecepto'.
 2. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 9. 75. The English Articles from 1552-1571 AD were repeatedly brought back to the anvil by a generation of divines who, whatever their point of view, were at least acquainted with the doctrinal system which they revised. Vide Hardwick 'Articles' pp. 331 - 2 who compares the Articles of

1538 AD **bluntly** stated that the Mass ' non potest dici sacrificium cum nemo ignoret magnum inter sacrificia et sacramenta discrimen -- his nos dona a Deo oblata accipimus , illis vero opus nostrum Deo reddimus et offerimus ' . Whitaker does not reject the Sacrifice of the Eucharist -- what he avoids is 'quibus vulgo dicebatur' in the Articles -- but it may be said that before Trent there was no absolute and authoritative statement of the Doctrine of the Mass and Whitaker was willing to accept and allow primitive and even Medieval views provided that they did not conflict with evangelical truth and the catholic doctrine of the undivided church. There is a careful distinction in Article 31 between 'offering for quick and dead '(recognised by the Fathers and the Ancient Liturgies) and 'offering for quick and dead to have (ut) remission of pain and guilt ' -- this latter view was a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit ' .

Bellarmino had taught that in Consecration, three things take place:-

- a) the bread and wine from being a 'res profana' become 'res sacra ' .
- b) the thing so offered to God on the altar is by consecration directed (ordinatur) to a real change consummated in the act of communion ; therefore consecration and communion are necessary to sacrifice , the first to put the victim in a condition for immolation or destruction ; the second to complete it.
- c) the destruction of the victim ; though it is interesting to note that in Bellarmine's thought this destruction is not an essential element , for in his definition of sacrifice (De Missa l.2.) he takes an objective view --- 'sacrificium est oblatio externa facta soli Deo quae ad agnitionem humanae infirmitatis et professionem divinae majestatis a legitimo ministro **res** aliqua sensibilis et permanens ritu mystico consecratur et transmutatur ' .

1552 , 1563 , and 1571 AD and deducts that the changes in the Article 'De Unica Christi Oblatione' are insignificant.

1. Bellarmine De Eucharist. 5.1.

Cranmer had denounced the traffic in masses as a 'thing intolerable ' . Vide DE Missa Privata (1538 AD) in Jenkyns 'Cranmer's Remains ' l. p. 292 f. (and Parker Society ed. Works of Archbp. Cranmer 'ed.J.E.Cox.p.480 f.

In his 'Babylonish Captivity' Luther had argued that there is no reason to suppose that the substance of the bread ceases to exist at the moment of consecration --- 'iron and fire are two substances which mix together in red-hot iron in such a manner that every portion contains both iron and fire ; why therefore cannot the Glorified Body of Christ be similarly found in every part of the substance of the bread ? In his 'Confession concerning the Lord's Supper' (1528 AD) he further develops this idea against Zwingli's symbolism, to maintain a real objective Presence. The multiplicity of eucharistic theories is evidenced in the publication in 1577 AD of Christopher Rasperger's 'Two Hundred Interpretations of the Words 'This is My Body ' '.

Whitaker writes 'Calvin never doubted that the Eucharist could be celebrated often and on the same day and even at the same time (quam semel) if the numbers of the people demanded it'. Leo had a precept to this end. What is objected to are so many private masses and for reasons of merit and indulgences -- Duraeus had quoted Augustine² for the private mass, but Whitaker pointed out that the buildings concerned were infected by demons, and priests were asked 'ut aliquis illo pergeret, cuius orationibus cederent. Accessit quidam sacrificium obtulit oravit vexationem sustulit'. Whitaker says that he will not ask how Duraeus 'stretched out this one lawful act to conclude a precept for private masses to be offered in houses'. The canons³ of the Synod of Laodicea have the words 'non fierent in domibus oblationes ab episcopis aut presbyteris' and Justinian ordered that the holy things should not be celebrated in private houses. Even the Viaticum (ε̅φ̅ο̅δ̅ι̅ο̅ν) was by reserved sacrament, there being very few instances of celebration in a house for the sick⁴ --- private celebrations for the sick were not unknown⁵ in primitive and later times, but they were rare. Whitaker notes⁶

-
1. Leo Ep. 81.
 2. Augustine De Civitate Dei 22.8.
 3. Canon 58. 'Nicene & Post Nicene Fathers' Series 2 Vol. 14. p.158.
 4. 'Only one of the very numerous surviving early and Medieval Ordo-s for the Visitation of the Sick contemplates the consecration of the Eucharist in the sick man's house, and in no instance is a direction given to celebrate in the sick man's chamber' (Harris 'Liturgy and Worship' p. 541). The unique 'Missa Pro Infirmis' in the 10th. Century Moissac Sacramentary (Martone 1.7.4.) suggests the practice, though it is not clear

that the Gelasian Sacramentary provided an Ordo for a mass in a private house (without reference to sickness) and this may be taken to mean celebrations in private oratories for prominent citizens, but the weight of custom is against it. The Council of Carthage (c. 390 AD) canon 9 has 'any presbyter who without consulting his bishop celebrates a service in whatever place he wishes, acts dishonourably' --and presbyters may not offer the Holy Mysteries in oratories in private houses without the consent of the bishop; this is the substance of the canon 31 of the Council of Trullo (692 AD).

Clearly the mind of the church is against private masses. Whitaker designates the practice *μονοφαγία* --- Duraeus had said¹ that there is no such thing as a private mass, since all masses whether attended by few or many are the offering of the whole church by the ministry 'pro populo'; the offering could therefore be made 'absque populo'. The frequency, place, time, and external customs Christ left to His Apostles as Paul indicates when he says he will put things in order when he comes; he had written only of the nature and essence of the Sacrament. Whitaker replies that the use of *συνάξις* (Dionysius Eccles. Hierarch. 3) and *λειτούργια*² indicate a sufficiency of numbers, not one man. Jerome said³ 'Dominica Coena omnibus debet esse communis, quia omnibus discipulis suis qui aderant aequaliter tradidit sacramenta'. The Apostolic Canons³ (reflecting the practice of the 9th. Century) have 'omnes introeuntes fideles et audientes Scripturas, non permanentes autem in oratione et sancta communione vel ut inordinatum quiddam perturbationemque facientes in ecclesia separari oportet'.⁴

 that it should take place in the bedchamber ---- the injunction may refer to the common oratory. Vide Cyprian Ep. 5.2.

5. Vide Uranius Ep. De Morte Paulini (of Nola) 2.

Archbishop Dunstan had mass celebrated by his bedside while he was dying, and so received the Viaticum.

6. Vide Paulinus' Life of Ambrose' 10.

1. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 6.7.

2. Jerome. Commentary on 1 Corinthians 11.

3. Apostolic Canons 9.

4. The first 50 of these canons were translated into Latin 6th. Century AD by Dionysius Exiguus, becoming part of the canon law of the Western Church, and though the Trullan Council of 692 AD condemned the Apostolic Constitutions (of which in Bk. 8.47 the Apostolic Canons were a part) the Apostolic Canons were given formal recognition in the East.

1
 Duraeus had criticised Luther for his statement that he approached the Eucharist 'troubled, afflicted, confused, with the conscience wandering'. If Luther, and others, believed rightly in the Presence, these words could never be said by the troubled conscience. It would also suggest that Luther's whole attitude to auricular confession (*ἐξομολογήσιν*) had been unsound -- it was by this means, with its proper satisfaction for sins, that peace comes to the soul. Whitaker replies that true faith, once born in us, does not end sadness and grief and 'cogitationes ancipites'; the prophets (Ps. 38) tells us that it is in sore penitence and grief that we seek the refreshment of God. An uneasy conscience (erratica conscientia) is not the same thing as a defective faith.

1. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 8. 97.

Chapter 10

The Church

1

Campion had attacked the idea of the invisible church --- that 'airy body',² subject to the private insight and speculations of a few men only by special inspiration --- and maintained that 'the concept was an unscriptural one, that the Letters to the Seven churches were to particular and visible churches, and for 1,500 years there had been comparative silence till the concept loomed large in Luther, Calvin and Zwingli. All Christian people are commanded to cleave steadfastly to the church, to commit their souls in trust unto this pillar of truth, the Holy City, the Fruitful Vine, the direct path, the only Dove, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Spouse of Christ, the multitude into which the Holy Ghost, being promised, poureth all things needful for salvation'. Those who do not cleave to the church 'are to be taken for heathen and publican' and Duraeus reiterates these points, adding that the Nicene Creed contains our belief 'in One Catholic Church' --- it appears that Whitaker believed in two, rejecting the succession of place, seat, and office.

Whitaker answers that as to the church 'there are many questions and great controversies, and at that time almost all the disputations about religion were reduced to this head'. Whitaker knows nothing of any 'airy church' --- the churches of Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, as 'were all the Apostolic Churches to which we subscribe, were all visible' --- nulli nos nisi Apostolicae (ecclesiae) subscribemus³ --- but Duraeus had failed to realise that distinction does not remove unity. The church is not severed between the one that is visible (aspectabilis) and the other which is hidden from

-
1. Campion. 'Decem Rationes' 3 sect. 1.
 2. 'Corpus hoc aerium' -- probably a pun on Aerius; Campion numbers Aerius among the heretical forefathers of the Reformation. There is a marginal reference to Calvin Inst. 4.1.
 3. Article 19 (39 Articles) 'Of the Church' -- mentions only the Visible Church, a 'congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's Ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same'.

sight (aspectum lateat) any more than the approved distinction between the Church Triumphant and the Church Militant , universal and particular , sever the unity. When the Nicene Creed professes belief in the 'One Catholic Church ' this cannot mean the visible church only since the Catholic Church is not confined to any one age , but embraces the prophets, apostles, martyrs , and all the saints who either have been or will be. Particular and visible churches can perish and have done so, but the church of the elect can never perish.

Whitaker wonders if Duraeus had ever read Calvin's Institutes 4. 1. ; here Calvin treats of the Visible Church and the Invisible Church , and speaks of the Visible Church in exalted language --- ' if God be our Father, then the Church is our mother ; the church stands by the election of God and therefore though the whole world were to give way, it could not be destroyed ; as long as we remain in the bosom of the church , the truth will remain in us ' . ' While it belongs to God not to us to distinguish the elect from the reprobate , we are assured that those who by the mercy of God and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit have become partakers with Christ, are set apart as the people and peculiar possession of God ' ; 'vital membership of the Visible Church is presupposed in election ' and Calvin goes on to say 'there is no other means of entering life unless she conceive us in the womb and give us birth , unless she also nourish us at her breasts and keep us in her charge and government till divested of mortal flesh we become like the angels ' . For ' our weakness does not permit us to leave the school until we have spent our whole lives as scholars ; moreover , beyond the pale of the church , no forgiveness of sins , no salvation , can be hoped for as testify Isaiah 37.32 (for out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant , out of Mount Zion they that shall escape) and

Joel 2.32 (whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be delivered, for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape). 'The abandonment of the church is always fatal'. And here, comments Whitaker, Calvin is talking about the Visible Church not a 'locus adorandi' since Temples are only consecrated by His Word, but the 'populus Dei' raised to glory by worship and the Word. 'Seek God in His Sanctuary (Ps. 105.4.) by all means, but let that sanctuary be properly consecrated by Sacrament and Word'. But when Calvin writes 'how necessary the knowledge of the Church is' he emphasises the fact that the progenitor of faith is the Holy Spirit, and the Seed is the Word of God, for 'we are begotten through the Gospel in the Spirit'.

The Church is Visible 'propter externam politiam' but it is not Visible insofar as God foreknows the elect --- 'electio et fides electorum ab oculis removentur'¹, and it is the church of the elect that never perishes. Augustine wrote 'Corpus huius capitatis est Ecclesia, non quae hoc loco est, sed est quae hoc loco et per totum orbem terrarum; nec illa quae hoc tempore sed ab ipso Abel usque ad eos qui nascituri sunt usque in finem et credituri in Christum, totus populus sanctorum ad unam civitatem pertinentium'. Writing to Vincent, Augustine says 'catholicae nomen non ex totius orbis communione interpretaris, sed ex observatione praeceptorum omnium divinarum atque omnium sacramentorum, quasi nos, etiam si forte hinc sit appellata catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat'². Epiphanius wrote 'una est columba mea, perfecta mea, hoc est, ipsa sancta sponsa, et catholica ecclesia. Columba quidem et dixi propter mansuetudinem et innocentiam et puritatem vitae; perfecta vero quia perfectam ex Deo gratiam accepit et cognitionem ab ipso Servatore per Spiritum Sanctum'³. Thomas Aquinas says⁴ that 'the Catholic Church is like the human body -- as the soul which is not seen vivifies the body, so the Holy Spirit vivifies the Church, and only those filled with

1. Isaiah 1.9. ; Matthew 22. 14 ; Romans 9. 6f.

2. Augustine on Psalm 90.2.1. ; ML. 37. 1159.

3. Augustine Ep. 93. 7. 23 . Vincentio (c. 408 AD) ML. 33.333.

4. Epiphanius Advers. Haeres. 35. MG. 41. 572.

5. Thomas Aquinas Exposit. Symbol. Apostolic.

the Holy Spirit and joined with Christ the heavenly Head and in eternal bliss are properly the Catholic Church.'

'There is not one Scriptural text' wrote Bellarmine¹, where **ἐκκλησία** (**ἑκκλῖα**) is applied to the Invisible Church; the whole weight of Scripture was on the side of the 'congregatio visibilis'. Bellarmine goes on to say that the church was certainly well known (notissima) when the people challenged Moses in Numbers . 20. 4. --- 'cur eduxistis Ecclesiam² Domini in solitudinem' ? ; when King Solomon turned and 'benedixit omni Ecclesiae Israel³', when Christ said 'Dic Ecclesiae⁴'. How could the elders of Ephesus rule⁵ a church they did not know or how could Timothy teach⁶ a church how to behave if he didn't or couldn't know who was in this church? It is true that the foundation of the church, Christ, is not visible, but this makes no difference, writes Bellarmine, to the fact that 'ecclesia ipsa est sensibilis ut patet'. The Kingdom of Naples is not invisible when the King is absent.

Bellarmino takes eight points in proof of the visibility of the Church. There are texts which do not name the church but which are generally understood to refer to the church eg. Ps. 19. 5. 'in sole posuit tabernaculum suum', Isaiah 2.2., Daniel 2.35 and Micah 4.1. where the church is compared to a great

-
1. Bellarmine De Ecclesia Militante 3.12. Erbermann's edition (1712 AD) Vol. 2. p. 84. Bellarmine writes 'nec unum saltem locum Calvinus proferre potuit nec protulit ubi hoc nomen tribueretur congregationi invisibili'. Stapleton De Princip. 1. takes Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon to task on this point. Turrianus Contra Sadeel. 1.4. says it is true that the Church Triumphant as part of the Catholic Church is not visible, but the Church Militant is --- in Tract 2. 3.4. he writes 'una tota ecclesia partim visibilis partim invisibilis' the former the Church Militant, the latter the Church Triumphant.
 2. LXX has **συναγωγή Κυρίου** Heb. **הקהל** **ἑκκλῖα**
 3. 1 Kings 8 . 14 LXX **καὶ εὐλόγησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάντα Ἰσραὴλ**
(**ἑκκλῖα** **ἑκκλῖα** **ἑκκλῖα**) **καὶ πάντα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραὴλ**
(. **ἑκκλῖα** **ἑκκλῖα** **ἑκκλῖα** **ἑκκλῖα**)
 4. Matthew 18.17.
 5. Acts 20.28 **ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**.
Other references are to Acts.15.3 ; 18.22 ; 1 Cor. 15.9 ; Gal. 1.13 ; Philipp. 3.6.
 6. 1 Tim. 3.15.
 7. eg. Aug. Tract 2 on the Ep. of John Ad Parthos (416 AD) ML. 35. 1991. Jerome in loco.

mountain, splendid and visible to all. Micah 5.14 has 'ye are the light of the world, a city set on a hill cannot be hid' which Augustine certainly interpreted of the church.¹ The church of the New Testament was in the Apostles who were certainly visible, and upon them the Holy Spirit descended at Pentecost; no society can claim the name without being visible; since it is of men not angels. To obey the Head and communicate with its members is a basic necessity² -- it follows that if the church is the congregation of faithful men using the same sacraments, professing the faith of Christ and under the governance of lawful pastors, it must be visible.

Why does Bellarmine load his premise by inserting 'semper' in his statement 'nam semper nomine Ecclesiae visibilis congregatio significatur ex scripturis', asks Whitaker; while the word 'ecclesia' does in fact, as Bellarmine says, signify the 'coetus visibilis' and there is no dispute on this premise as far as Scripture is concerned, this did not exhaust the meaning of the word 'ecclesia' as Bellarmine should be the first to acknowledge. Particular churches have external form and profession -- on this there is no dispute. Augustine's words on Ps. 19.5. 'ita nec Ecclesia possit abscondi' are based on the LXX version -- ἐν τῷ ἁλῶνι ἔθετο τὸ σκηνώμα αὐτοῦ and the Vulgate agrees with it, but it should be noted that this is not what the Hebrew says :-

: □ 7 7 ³ ב 7 7 - □ 7 7 7 7 7

and Jerome rightly says in his Commentary on this Psalm 'soli (dative) posuit tabernaculum in eis scilicet coelis'; Theodoret in his Commentary on this Psalm says that this is the reading of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion. It would appear, writes Whitaker, that Augustine 'mala expositione nititur' for the meaning of the context is clear, that God's 'Sedes Splendida' is set in the heavens as the sun.

-
1. Augustine De Unitate Ecclesiae 14.
 2. Jerome Ep. 1. Ad Damasum; Augustine De Baptismo 4.1.; Origen Hom 30 on Matthew wrote 'Ecclesia plena est fulgore, ab Oriente usque ad Occidentem'. Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiae wrote 'Domini luce perfusa, radios suos per orbem terrarum spargit'. Chrysostom Hom 4. on Isaiah 6 wrote 'facilius est solem extinguere quam ecclesiam obscurari'.
 3. Oesterley 'The Psalms' Vol. 1. p. 168 (1939 ed.) has emendation

□ 7 7 (in the sea) for □ 7 7 (in them).

Yet in the context of Augustine's words , what he says is true --- in contrast to the Donatists who maintained that the Catholic Church existed only in Africa . Augustine made the point that like the sun the Catholic Church shines at all times and in all places , and is raised up for all to see , as Micah and Isaiah proclaim. The fullness and the glory of the Catholic Church however has yet to be revealed ; they are not at present visible to all mortal eyes , but will be at the gathering of the 'Coetus Totus Professorum' to the Mount Zion where those endowed with true faith will be revealed. The Reference in Matthew 5. 14 is to the Apostles and Pastors of the church -- ye are the light of the world -- and Christ goes on to say that their witness virtue, piety , and life should not be hid , though Augustine does use this text of the unity of the church. Whitaker adds that this text can be used of particular christians as of particular churches.

The analogy of the church as a visible society taken from human and worldly associations eg. the Kingdom of Naples, does not apply to the church , since the whole church is united to an invisible Head . The very use of the word 'catholic' as co-terminous with 'visible' produces problems , since as in the days of the O.T. so in the New Covenant , the greater number of catholics are invisible i.e. the departed saints. The word 'catholic' cannot be restricted to 'visible' ; Whitaker writes ' nos qui in terris versantes ad ecclesiam catholicam pertinemus , in omni communione cum Christo et beatorum animabus quae in gaudio perpetuo in coelis cum Christo fruuntur ' . It is true there is 'nulla societas nisi inter socios ' but this pertains to particular churches. In the time of Christ , had enquiry been made as to where the true church was, the answer would have been in the scribes, Pharisees , and priests , but they crucified Christ. The true church was in Zachariah, Simeon, Anna and Mary -- surely this proves the point ? . Illyricus and Melanchthon both deal at length with this view. True, they were members of the visible church ; they went to the Temple, offered sacrifices and prayers by divine precept as many others , but something more was required viz. 'fides pura ' which did not persecute Christ.

With Augustine's words in mind , that he who leaves

the church, loses his salvation, for 'salus extra ecclesiam non est', and that under peril of eternal death, we must cling to the church and persevere in it, Bellarmine asks how can a man do this if he cannot see the church? Whitaker replies that there is no controversy over Augustine's words but if Bellarmine had read Augustine further, he would have seen that whereas Cyprian² had placed the centre of Christian unity in the episcopate -- that to separate from the divinely ordained unity is to renounce Christ, to bear arms against the church, and to commit spiritual whoredom and sin against charity ---- Augustine worked out more fully the doctrine of the church. Cyprian, Irenaeus, and others arrived at a rigid theory of a visible church, recognised by its catholicity and its communion with catholic bishops --- this view was held by Optatus --- but Augustine under the pressure of the Donatists' insistence upon empirical holiness and an ardent pastoral desire for the re-union of African Christianity, modified this view and developed the doctrine of the Invisible Church, which eased the practical problem. Schism was still the negation of charity, the work of the Devil,³ pride and sacrilege, but the 'communio externa' is not necessarily co-terminous with the 'communio sanctorum', insofar as the latter is identified with the number of the elect and predestinated. At times when a particular church errs, when a faithful soul is excommunicated, the dilemma is clear --- Elijah was told of the 7,000 { who had not bent the knee to Baal', the elect of God, known only to His inscrutable wisdom, but not to Elijah except by revelation.⁴ For Augustine, the perfection and revelation of the 'societas coelestis' cannot be on earth, where the church is a 'corpus permixtum'.⁵ In reviewing his De Baptismo, Augustine consistently warns the reader to recognise the distinction between the Visible Church and the Invisible Church of the Elect; external membership of the catholic church does not necessarily

1. Augustine De Baptismo 4. 17. 24. Augustine did not say 'extra ecclesiam nulla gratia conceditur' -- his doctrine of the soul of the church in the De Civitate Dei demands on grounds of perfection, love, and unity, that salvation in its fullest sense cannot be realised except through the church. To remain deliberately outside the church visible, offends these virtues, essential to salvation and therefore on pain of damnation.
2. Cyprian De Unitate Eccles. 17.15. Optatus of Milevis in the heat of the Donatist debate accepted the Cyprianic view of schism being equivalent to apostasy.

guarantee election. There is no controversy over the church being the pillar and ground of the truth, writes Whitaker, as Origen writes in his Homily 30 on Matthew, but Bellarmine should read on, in what Origen has to say about this being the result of the church having Scripture and the Passion of Christ. Certainly there is no suggestion that we cling to the Church of Rome on penalty of loss of salvation; the visible church must declare itself as 'radices in coelò fixas'; she must be 'in monte posita, aperta, et in manifesto constituta' for 'nulla est securitas unitatis nisi ex promissis Dei ecclesiae declarata'.²

Whitaker discusses Jeremiah 31.33 that though many were saved under the Law, they were not saved by the Law, and this text emphasises the fact that without denying the inward and spiritual life of the Jew under the Old Covenant, acts of faith and charity leave open the question of hypocrisy --- members of the true church 'visu aspectuque dijudicari non possunt'. He also discusses Luke 17.20, John 4.23 (where Bellarmine agreed that true worship is not bound to place (Gerizim) or rite (Jerusalem) but this does not rule out the idea that spirit and truth may be contained within rite and ceremony) Hebrews 12.18 (where Whitaker points out that the text is richer than Bellarmine makes it -- Bellarmine confines the contrast to between the synagogue and the catholic church; Whitaker notes that the text embraces also those who have gone before) Ephesians 5.25 - 27 (which distinguished between those who will enter glory and those who have only a 'speciem sanctitatis' -- both known only to God) and Psalms 45.13. (where true glorification does not take place till the daughters have entered the King's Palace) --- Augustine De Baptismo 5.27 wrote 'omnis pulchritudo filiae Regis intrinsecus in quibus est numerus certus sanctorum praedestinatus ante mundi constitutionem'. If the beauty/^{is}within (intrinsecus-interna) the

contd. 3. Augustine De Baptismo 1.2.2. 'diabolica dissensio'

4. 1 Kings 19.18.

5. Augustine Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis 3.10.20
c 411 AD. ML. 43. 635.

6. Augustine Retract, 2.18.

1. Chrysostom Hom. 4. on Isaiah 6.

2. Augustine Ep. Contra Parmen. 3.3.5.

true catholic church is not visible.

Examining the Apocalypse, Whitaker quotes Apocalypse 21.10 where the Holy City is discerned not by sight but in the Spirit; Bellarmine counters with the view that this text refers to the Church Triumphant but Whitaker says that Augustine did not think so for he spoke of the church being 'per totas mundi partes diffusa est'. In Apocalypse 12.1 Whitaker agrees that splendor and lustre should be attributed to the church, with the moon under her feet, the promises of Jacob made sure, but her true excellence is internal and only perceived spiritually; the 'glory' of earthly kingdoms is subject to rise and fall and decay (incrementa; decrementa; totumque statum) but the glory and sanctity of the church is known in poverty, suffering, and martyrdom. The names of the 144,000 standing on Mount Zion with the Lamb are known only to God -- where the Apocalypse expounds the mark on the forehead of Ezekiel 9.4. -- but here Whitaker is mistaken for the Apocalypse does not say this (Vide 14.1. of the Apocalypse). The reference to the Name unknown only occurs in Apocalypse 19.12 and this is applied to Christ--the thought here is that all the names given to Christ do not exhaust the utmost and inmost significance of His Person and Work; there remains the ultimate mystery of His Being.

²Turrianus used the universalistic argument, that the catholic church was the 'sum totum' of all particular churches, diffused throughout the world, but Whitaker challenges the concept by saying that putting all particular churches together as a 'sum totum' does not make them catholic; the term *καθολικός* is not exhausted by the contrast between the universal and the

1. Luther equated the 'ecclesia invisibilis' with the 'ecclesia (spiritualis) sola fide perceptibilis' (Vide Weimar Augs., 7.710-~~the~~ oldest passage). Boni, a former Swiss R.C. priest, wrote in 'Der Kampf um die Kirche' (1934 AD) p.130 'when one reads about the church in the N.T. one gets the impression that it is speaking only of an invisible church'; the church is never Triumphant, it is only Militant. A Triumphant Church would be the Kingdom of God, no longer *ἐκκλησία* the corpus permixtum!.

'The criterion of catholicism is in the proved conviction of the congregation to represent the Whole Body, in all aspects of truth'.

2. Turrianus Contra Sadeel. 1.4.

particular , but also refers to containing the fullness and wholeness of Orthodox Christian Doctrine ; applied as a merely universal term , it could apply more to the Devil! Furthermore, it has more than a lateral significance , and as Augustine ¹ points out , it looks backward to Abel and forward to the Last Times , a thought which Gregory the Great repeats in his 19th. Homily . When Arius ² recited the Creed , he gave the word 'catholic' the universal interpretation
 ---- εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς περάτων ,
 and though Cyril of Jerusalem gave this the first meaning of the word he goes on to say that the word must contain the meaning of all necessary truth (κατὰ - ὅλος ³) and universal obedience to Christ , because it must contain all graces to cure all diseases of the soul , all spiritual virtues , so that it bears the fullness of truth.

Whitaker quotes Cyprian's remark ⁴ that heretics are like apes (simiae) which are not men but imitate men, and writing of Novatian he says 'Novatianus simiarum more , quae cum homines non sint, homines tamen imitantur , vult Ecclesiae Catholicae auctoritatem sibi et veritatem vindicare quando ipse in Ecclesia non sit , imo adhuc insuper contra Ecclesiam rebellis et hostis extiterit !. To define the church, Whitaker refers ⁵ to the Song of Songs --- 'Columba unica , Christi Soror , Spousa, Amica , Hortus, denique conclusus et consignatus appellatur'--- and in Ephesians 1. 23 ἡτίς ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ , τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου
 Apocalypse 21.10 τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλήμ καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 Psalm 80.9. the Fruitbearing Vine , 1 Timothy 3.15 the Foundation and Pillar of the Truth , Galatians 4.26 the Mother of us all ,
 Ephesians 2.21. πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη
 ἀΐθει εἰς νάον ἁγίον ἐν Κυρίῳ ,
 and being founded upon the rock of faith , the gates of Hell cannot

-
1. Augustine Enarrationes on Ps. 90.
 2. Socrates H.E. 1. 26.
 3. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 18.
 4. Cyprian Ep. 73 ML. 3.1110.
 5. Whitaker Controvers. 2 Quaest. 1. Geneva Edition.

prevail against it . The ^ἑἐκκλησία is defined by Whitaker as 'evocata in concionem vel in unum coetum et corpus et quasi Rempublicam Sanctam '. None can come into this number unless called by God ¹, and within this universal church on earth, there are the particular churches. Bellarmine notes that although the ancient People of God in the O.T. are called συναγωγή, the word is nowhere to be found in the N.T. as denoting the People of God --- there, the word is ἐκκλησία ; Augustine in his Commentary on Ps. 81 and in his unfinished Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, wrote 'Ecclesia in vocatione appellata est ; synagoga vero ex congregatione ; convocari enim magis hominibus congruit congregari autem magis pecoribus , unde greges proprie pecorum dici solent '. Bellarmine is not entirely correct in this, for in James 2.2. the word is used of a Christian assembly εἰς συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν though in general it is true. Whitaker regards the distinction as more asserted than proved --- ' magis argutum quam solidum ' -- because the Jews being assembled were called. The LXX translates $\eta\gamma\gamma$ or $\beta\eta\beta$ not only συναγωγή but also ἐκκλησία as in Deuteronomy 23. 1,2,3, and 8 and in 1 Samuel 17.47 we find γνώσεται πάσα ἡ ἐκκλησία αὐτή and in 1 Kings 8.14 Solomon blessed ²πάσα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰσραὴλ . Turrianus is wrong when he says that the Church of the Israelites was/^{not}called an ἐκκλησία before Aaron was made priest; the word is found in Exodus 12. 3,6,19 and 47.

In his definition of the 'Catholic Church ' , Bellarmine had written of three essentials ;-

- a) a true profession of the Christian Faith , and a profession of the true Christian Faith ; this would exclude those who had never been in the church i.e. Turks, Jews, pagans, and those who had once been in the church but did not remain eg. heretics and apostates.
- b) a 'Communio Sacramentorum ' -- this would exclude catechumens and the excommunicated.
- c) a subjection to lawful pastors and especially to the visible head

1. Romans 1. 7. ; 1 Corinthians 1. 2 and 9
 2. Turrianus De Ecclesia 1.1. . As these quotations are from the Priestly Document (c. 6th. Century B.C.) the evidence is not conclusive.

of the church , the Pontiff. This would exclude schismatics who though they may profess a true faith and have sacraments yet they are outside the doors , and not in the bosom of the church (in sinu ecclesiae)

Both Bellarmine and Whitaker agree that these definitions do not exhaust the meaning of the words 'catholic church ' for there must also be found 'internae virtutes', chiefly faith, hope, and charity¹, but Bellarmine notes that the lack of them (as distinct from the absence of them) does not of itself remove a member of the true church from membership. If it did, there would be no members.

The term 'catholic' as applied to the church first appears in Ignatius Ep. Ad **Smyrnaeos** 8.2. and then in the sense of the universal church as distinct from the particular churches --- ' wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the universal church ; wherever the bishop is, there is the particular local church.' In view of heresies and errors, it acquired the doctrinal meaning of orthodoxy , 'consensus fidelium ' (church universal) against individual opinions , **by** the time of the Muratorian Fragment , which declared that heretical writings cannot be received into the catholic church². The two ideas of spatial universality and doctrinal orthodoxy remained combined till later writers drew out deeper meanings eg. Cyril of Jerusalem³, who gives an eminently spiritual and ethical conception of the church as containing cures for all sins, and containing all virtues and all spiritual gifts. External 'notes' eg. constitution and ministry , are scarcely hinted at , but it is clear that he identifies this spiritual society with the external (visible) society of which he was a presbyter. It was by the time of Augustine that the most careful and complete consideration of the whole question of the church was made -- that love could only be obtained in the church and could only be preserved in the unity of the church , and only in this same unity that any benefits of the sacraments could be obtained and the Holy Spirit possessed ----

-
1. Augustine Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis 3 (411 AD)
 2. Vide Clement of Alexandria Strom. 7.17.
 3. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 18.33

therefore 'extra ecclesiam nulla salus'. In his controversy with the Donatists he developed the theory of the 'corpus permixtum' of good and bad alike, the external and visible church (externa communio) and the spiritual (invisible) society (communio sanctorum) of the predestinated and elect, who alone were worthy of their calling, and were the catholic church in the true and real (timeless, immaterial, good) sense. The Civitas Dei is largely the church visible on earth, the Civitas Terrena is the civil society -- the former is the home of all spiritual aspiration and power, the latter of carnal and selfish ideas and physical force.

The credal use of 'catholic' does not appear in the earliest interrogatory Roman Creed, but in the Eastern Church it appears as early as the Creed of the Dair Balaizah papyrus (6th. Century AD ?) -- representing a mid-4th. Century AD Liturgy though it may reflect a later 2nd. Century usage at Alexandria. It appears in the 4th. Century AD Apostolic Tradition (Syria ?) and occurs in the early 5th. Century AD Creed of Charisius of Philadelphia (preserved in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus 431 AD), in Niceta of Remesiana and Jerome.

Whitaker says that it is unfortunate for Bellarmine that he had quoted from Augustine's eloquent Collationes with the Donatists, because in this work Augustine is emphasising the necessity of the internal virtues, as vital as the soul to the body, and this would upset Bellarmine's definition. To Augustine, the church is both 'corpus' and 'anima', the latter represented by the internal gifts of the Holy Spirit i.e. 'virtutes fidei, spei, et caritatis', the former represented by the external profession of faith and communion of the sacraments; both are necessary in a true member of the church. 'Without the internal virtues would it not be that a man is in the church, but not of the church?'. Bellarmine had no justification for his equating the Anglican Church with the Novatians, on the grounds that the latter were rigorists, demanding the internal virtues, though Whitaker says that it is interesting to

1. Vide Brightman JTS. XII. (1911 AD) p. 311.

note this identification -- the Novatians were not unorthodox in faith 'apart from not accepting papal supremacy ! ' . Nor is it fair, says Whitaker, to equate the Anglican Church with the Pelagians who professed the internal virtues without orthodoxy , since the doctrinal positions are quite different , as for example, on the question of lawful authority. Indeed, Bellarmine could not have both identifications levelled at the Anglican church without projecting into the field a whole host of ~~conflicting~~ ideas . The essential definition of the 'Catholic Church ' , in Whitaker's view, would be 'coetus sanctorum hominum quos ab eterno Deus in Christo elegit ad vitam eternam ! . The elect cannot perish , but Bellarmine should note the idea of 'sanctus' added to the word 'electus' in the definition -- sanctification is a necessary extension of the assurance of election, which by its true divine origin, brings us to a true confession of a true Faith and communion of the sacraments.

Particular questions arise as to membership of the catholic church and Whitaker shows a strong Augustinianism throughout . Taking the necessity of baptism , Whitaker quotes Alphonsus de Castro on the just punishment of heretics that 'hereticum esse partem ecclesiae et membrum illius et non esse omnino ab illa separatum ; quia etsi fidem non habeat , habet tamen characterem Baptismalem , quo durante semper erit membrum Ecclesiae ! . In his disputation on the unbaptised , Bellarmine maintained that though distinguished in faith (praeditus verā fidē) if a man is not baptised , he is not in the church , and he supported this with Acts 2. 41. --- ' qui ergo receperunt sermonem eius , baptizati sunt et appositae sunt ecclesiae in die illo animae circiter tria millia ' ; actually the word 'ecclesiae' does not appear in the text. Baptism 'added' or 'joined ' men , but Luke does not say 'to whom ' or ' to what ' . In Acts 2.47 we find *ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* (Vg. in idipsum --Codex Bezae has *ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* Erasmus reads 'congregationi) -- verse 42 shows that they were added

1. Alphonsus de Castro De Eccles. 2. 24.

to the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, prayer and breaking of bread, but on this text alone, Bellarmine could not conclude that they were not members of the catholic church till they were baptised. The view has already been expressed on this text that such baptism admits to a particular church (here Jerusalem) only, though Whitaker dissents from this view since the basis of the sacraments is their universal application. It does however raise the question whether all the unbaptised must necessarily be excluded from the catholic church, since all who are being saved are 'de ecclesia' and it is by the nature of a syllogism that catechumens endowed with true faith 'possunt in eo statu servari; ergo sunt in ecclesia' and as martyrs have been accepted as such. There is no question of refusal here, merely one of the state of the unbaptised -- the former, i.e. those who refuse baptism, would ipso facto deny Christ's commands and therefore would possess no true faith. Bellarmine does not deny the premise, that all who are being saved are 'de ecclesia'; some catechumens are being saved, therefore some catechumens are 'de ecclesia'. It is an axiom that 'extra ecclesiam salutem nullam aut sperandam aut omnino expectandam esse'. Bellarmine admits the difficulty but adheres to the view that a man cannot be 'de ecclesia' if he does not partake of the universal sacraments i.e. Baptism and the Eucharist.

Whitaker quotes Ambrose that 'quosdam catechumenos servari posse, de quorum numero Valentinianum fuisse' and asks Bellarmine to read carefully Mark 16.16 -- 'he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved', but the converse is not true; Christ did not say 'he that is not baptised shall be damned' but 'he that believeth not shall be damned'. This saving faith does not hold the sacraments in indifference or contempt, as Augustine says.² Bellarmine quotes Melchior Canus's distinction within the term 'de ecclesia' as being

- a) proprie Christiana
- b) that which 'comprehendit omnes fideles ab Abel usque

1. Ambrose De Obitu Valentiniani.
 2. Augustine Tract 4 on John -- 'catechumenis esse perniciosum si dedignentur (if they should scorn) venire ad Baptismum'. St. Bernard wrote that 'it is fatal (exitiosum) not to be deprived of Baptism but to contemn that sacrament'.

ad mundi consummationem ac propterea salvari posse ' -- but Whitaker is not sure that the distinction is valid . It is true that the church of the Old Testament was not Christian in the sense that it had not the fulfilment of Christ , yet Paul is clear in 1 Corinthians 10 that Christ was Head of that Church . If this is true then the argument of Melchior Canus cannot be accommodated to the time. 1 Corinthians 10.4. makes it clear that the Israelites drank of the spiritual *Πέτρα* that accompanied (*ἄκολουθούσης*) them, which was Christ. They ate and drank as of no earthly rock (eg. Rephidim or Kadesh) but of the spiritual Rock, the manifestation of the spiritual and wonder-working presence of Christ who as *Λόγος ἰσαρκος* accompanied His people. Whitaker regards it as rather a fraud to talk of catechumens being in the church 'non re et actu tamen voto et potentia ' --perhaps Bellarmine's difficulty is that he is thinking in terms of 'in ecclesia' rather than 'de ecclesia' . The catechumens would be 'de ecclesia catholica' but not 'in ecclesia catholica' -- Whitaker wonders if there is such a distinction , since there is substantially no difference. The catechumens are 'palmites vitis' (branches of the Vine) and are being saved , not merely 'de voto et potentia ' but also 'de re et actu ' . The desire to be saved is not sufficient -- no doubt many at the Flood desired to be saved but in fact only those were saved who were 'de re et actu in arca' --the desire itself is of no profit. Similarly no member (of Christ's Body) lives unless joined to the Head 're et actu' . Christ said to the unbaptised thief 'hodie mecum eris in Paradiso ' . The martyrs were sometimes baptised not of water but 'voluntatis , flammarum , ac sanguinis ' . Quoting the Liber de Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis , chapter 74 (ascribed to Augustine, but Whitaker with many others had / disputed this) Whitaker writes 'martyres etiam non baptizatos servari ' .

-
1. Augustine De Baptismo 4.17.24 ; Ep. 108.3.9 does however make the point that martyrdom outside the church (eg. among the Donatists) lacks this 'baptism of desire ' since it lacks the order and charity demanded by St. Paul (1 Cor. 13.3) . Those baptised in schism received the sacrament validly , because this, with the Eucharist, imprint a 'character' similar to the 'character militiae ' (Contra Ep. Parmen. 2.13. 28.)

The position of the excommunicated is also examined ---- a man excommunicated from a particular church does not necessarily cease to be a member of the Ecclesia Catholica ;if he is unjustly excommunicated , he may be 'Christo adhaerescens ' . Bellarmine refuses to accept this and says that the excommunicated whether justly or unjustly is ipso facto 'ex ecclesia catholica ejici ' , though he retains baptism , the external profession of the faith, subjection to the bishop , and does penance and performs ' illa tria ante absolutionem (contrition, confession, and amendment) ' ; in that state before restoration he is merely in the church ' animo sive desiderio non corpore sive communicatione externa ' ; he is nevertheless ' de ecclesia ad salutem ' . Whitaker recalls the weakness of this position -- if 'extra ecclesiam nulla salus est ' then the act of excommunication deprives a man of the means of salvation, and he is not in a state of salvation. If the whole catholic church is 'omnino visibilis' then excommunication unchurches a man completely and he is no longer a subject of salvation. But if the Ecclesia Catholica Invisibilis be accepted , then the dilemma is resolved , since membership of Christ does not depend entirely upon external communion or jurisdictional conformity. The ground of membership of the catholic church is that ultimate bond of the soul with Christ by faith , and external communion is not of itself the sole test. 'Excommunicatio' is not the same thing as 'praecisio' -- with the latter eg. of the hand , this cannot be restored to the body, but 'true excommunication is a spiritual medicine (medicina quaedam spiritualis) administered for the health of the soul , and the grace of penitence and restitution is the sign of recovery ' . But 'whoever is cut off from Christ must needs perish and therefore excommunication by the church is not the same thing as 'praecisio a Christo ' . The excommunicated is not cut off from the Body of Christ / , but from the external communion of a particular church. Christ's sheep will never perish ! .

-
1. Bellarmine admits 'aliquis excommunicatus potest esse amicus Dei ' and 'is not separated from the Church Triumphant ' . Later he writes the Church Triumphant and the Church Militant are 'non modo unita sed et una est ' .

When Bellarmine speaks of 'I believe in the Catholic Church' he has in mind the visible Church of Rome --- when Whitaker uses the words he is thinking not of particular visible churches but of the true invisible church of the elect, known only to God, the members of which are joined to Christ, 'sic ut non pereant nec perire omnino possint' ; i.e. the elect, to be revealed at the last day. To this ^{the} mixed church of good and bad (Matthew 3.12 ; 13.47--wheat and chaff ; 22.1-14--wedding feast) the particular and visible, will give way. The parables mentioned cannot apply to the true and invisible catholic church, but only to the particular visible churches --- as Augustine says in his 48th. Letter 'ecclesiam crescere inter zizania sed non esse agrum zizaniorum'. Bellarmine maintains the view that the dragnet is the 'generalis vocatio' through preaching the Gospel ; Whitaker comments that this does not alter the interpretation, certainly as Augustine has it, for he wrote 'ipsa est Ecclesia quae intra sagenam (σαγήνη) Dominicam cum malis piscibus natat' ; the true church is found with the bad fish (σαίπρα -- bad, not so much rotten because they are caught alive, but worthless for eating) not consisting of it. On Matthew 22. 1-14 Augustine notes that not all the 'vocati' are 'electi' --- those without the wedding garment (i.e. sinceritas fidei) are rejected though summoned. The visible church contains many eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ but with a great distinction --- those, in honour of the Spouse, wearing the wedding garment ; seeking not their own righteousness but that of Christ ; others having no such wedding garment because they work their own righteousness, not Christ's. The catholic church is the 'Corpus Spirituale et Mysticum' .²

The position of Judas Iscariot is no different ---

-
1. The phrase 'catholic church' is separate and distinct from the exclusively liturgical phrase 'communio sanctorum', ambiguous, because the 'sanctorum' can be either masculine or neuter. Vide Badcock 'History of the Creeds' (1938 AD) p. 248 f.
 2. Whitaker at this point refers to Romans 8 where predestination is to the invisible catholic church (as Paul says in Gal.1.15) calling is to the visible particular church, and following these two stages, come justification and glorification, and conforming to the 'Imago Filii Dei'. All the predestinated are called, each 'suo tempore'. Paul the predestinate (Gal.1.15) was a 'lupus' (Augustine) or 'fictile vas' (Chrysostom) before he was called, and then he made for the visible church (ad ecclesiam).

raised to the highest office as one of the Twelve and subject to the 'vocatio Christi' he fell because he was not of the true (invisible) catholic church ; that the Scripture must be fulfilled , one like Judas must be raised up, as the heart of Pharoah was hardened, that God's Will be done. None was lost but this ' son of perdition' and his place was quickly filled. ¹ Augustine said that Judas was 'numeros unus non merito , unus specie non virtute, unus commixtione corporali , non vinculo spirituali , adjunctione non cordis socius unitate ' and with 1 John in mind , Augustine said that Judas was among the Twelve but not of them. To Bellarmine's question that if the catholic church consisted only of the predestinated whom only God knows, how can we know the brethren ---- Whitaker replies that we know the brethren of the visible church through a common profession of faith , through the 'jus adoptionis et futurae haereditatis ' but in this life we can never be sure because we do not know the final result as this is only declared by the operation of the 'donum perseverantiae ' --- God knows the outcome, we do not. The stages (in Romans 8) of predestination, calling, justification, and sanctification , are all necessary to salvation ; it is unthinkable that the predestinated should stay outside the visible church , though until called, they remain 'sheep outside the fold, waiting to be called, waiting to hear ' (John 10. 16) the summons to the flock -- but the movement is 'ad ecclesiam visibilem' St. Augustine writes of the visible church that the good and the bad are 'separati spiritualiter corporaliter tamen cum eis in ecclesia videntur esse permixti usque in diem judicii , quo etiam die corporaliter debitas separabuntur ad poenas ' . Thus the 'reprobati ' (Romans 1. 28. -- ἀσέβητοι -- who refuse to have God in their knowledge and therefore are rejected after testing) are separated from the elect. Predestination alone does not fit a man to be a member of the catholic church ; there must be the 'vocatio in externam ecclesiam , justificatio, et sanctificatio et tum actu de ecclesia sunt et vera Christi membra sunt ' . The reprobate,

Contd. John Huss commented on Gal.1.15 that this alone explains why Paul the predestinated could persecute particular visible churches.

1. Psalm 109 ; Acts . 1. 16 - 20.
2. Augustine Tract 61 on John.
3. Augustine Contra Cresc. 2. 34.

says Augustine, though in the church visible, are not joined to Christ the true Head of the church but are in fact 'mali humores' (evil fluids) which pervade the visible body and are not part of the true body, the catholic church. It follows from Augustine that 'Ecclesia Catholica ex solis praedestinatis constare' and no other has the gift of perseverance. The 'reprobati' do not receive the justifying grace of Christ since they are not joined to the Head.

Bellarmino asks whether Whitaker is not following the Novatians who required that the catholic church consists 'ex solis perfectis' or even the Donatists who maintained it consisted only 'ex solis sanctis'. Augustine writes ² 'bonos et malos esse in catholica ecclesia sed tanquam grana et paleas' --surely this confounds Whitaker's thesis of the invisible catholic church? Whitaker replies that it will be found in Augustine's writings that he uses the word 'catholic' in two senses :-

- a) pro tota ecclesia quae est corpus Christi i.e. the church of the elect¹
- b) pro particularibus ecclesiis omnibus quae Fidem Catholicam profitentur. Was it not Fulgentius in his 'De Fide' that said 'in finem seculi malos cum bonis Sacramentorum communione in Ecclesia miscere'? Gregory wrote ³ that there were evil men in the catholic church i.e. in sense b) above. The true members of the Mystical Body of Christ partake truly of the sacraments, spiritually not merely 'corporaliter' ⁴, since they are joined to the

1. Augustine De Corr. et Gratia 9.
2. Augustine Tract 6 on John ML. 35.1431.
3. Gregory the Great Hom.11 and 38 on the Gospels (c 591 AD) ML. 76. 1131 ; ML. 76. 1268.
4. 1 Corinthians 10.17 -- the 'one bread' (the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ which is more than a 'commixtio'--it is a 'conjunctio membrorum cum Christo') is made not from the chaff but from the wheat (Vide Jerome Dialog. Contra Lucifer. ML. 23. 163 -for the 'Corpus Mixtum' of Noah's Ark -- there can be no goats in the true church). The prophecies of Ezekiel 36.25 (I will sprinkle clean water) and 36.26 (a new heart) can only apply to the elect since they only have sanctifying grace. Vide Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.19 (MG. 7. 938) where through the Spirit the elect receive 'quod est ad incorruptionem unitatem' and this conjunction is spiritual. But 'qui Spiritu Christi carent, non pertinere ad Christum'. Rom. 8.9. ; 1 Cor. 12.13 and Rom. 8 especially v. 28 and v. 29 contain the theme of the grace of election and sanctification.

Head , and are of the catholic church with not merely a profession of the Catholic Faith but also the grace of sanctification and glorification ... this is not so with those who have no such election.

Thomas Aquinas makes it clear ¹ that Christ is the Head of all men but diversely. Within the church there are those who are members of the Mystical Body both potentially and in act , according to faith , charity, and the fruition of the life to come. But first and principally Christ is only true Head of such as are united to Him by glory , charity, faith and in potentiality --- and he means by this latter term , as he says, those 'united to Him in potentiality not yet reduced to act , yet will be reduced to act according to Divine Predestination '. He also speaks of those who will never be reduced to act i.e. in the world but not predestinated , and on leaving this world wholly cease to be members of Christ as being no longer in potentiality to be united to Christ . 'To be a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle ' writes Thomas Aquinas ' is the ultimate end to which we are brought by the Passion of Christ , and this will be in heaven , not on earth. '. 'The ancient Fathers (of the O.T.) by observing the legal sacraments were borne to Christ by the same faith and love whereby we also are borne to Him, and hence the Ancient Fathers belong to the same church as we ' ² .

On the position of evil pastors within the visible church , Augustine writes ³ that they are like a stone channel (canalis lapideus) through which water is conveyed to open spaces (ad areofas) in the garden ; the channel receives nothing from the water by which fruit is borne. So, certain members of the church are instruments but, asks Whitaker , can they really be described as members ? Surely only instruments , dead (mortui) *as* far as the Body is concerned . They are vehicles , not members . On the other hand , true members who are instruments become 'viva instrumenta ' . To speak of the 'Sancta Ecclesia' if the church visible is mixed ⁴ , requires three

-
1. Thomas Aquinas Summa Pt. 3. Qu. 8 art. 3 - Dominican translation (1913 ed.) Vol.15 p.141
 2. op. cit. p. 142
 3. Augustine Tract 5 on John.
 4. cp. Cyprian 'nullos bonos esse extra, sed multos malos esse intus '.

qualifications , all mentioned by Bellarmine and Stapleton ;-

- a) it is holy ' non propter sanctitatem singulorum sed propter alias causas ' --- because all things given to it are holy eg. Baptism, union with Christ. Whitaker comments that there is no spiritual or any other union of the impious with Christ the Head , and to fashion an external and corporal union with Christ is absurd. The union is spiritual or not at all ; it is mystical.
- b) it is holy because it contains the saints --- Whitaker qualifies this by saying that the catholic (invisible) church consists of the saints whereas the visible church contains them . The endowment of true sanctity is a gift from God rather than derived from membership of the church only.
- c) it is holy by virtue of its consecration to God i.e. 'ecclesia consecrata et separata ' . Truly this cannot be applied to the non-elect , but only to those joined mystically and spiritually to the Head . Perhaps, remarks Whitaker, it would be better to return to the Scriptures on the holiness of the church ; in Scripture the holiness of the church is not derived from its members or its separation , but rather from the fact that she is washed by Christ's precious Blood , cleansed and given the Holy Spirit.

Augustine wrote of the holiness of the church as when the Head is Christ , the Word made Flesh , living in us , embracing and giving effect to the church , breathing into her life , sanctity , and holiness , and making her hear the Voice of God and alive to it, listening , adoring, tasting, enjoying (gustare) in all its members the Holiness of God , with Christ the Mediator. In his Enchiridion, Augustine wrote ² that the right order of the Creed demanded that the church be subjoined to the Trinity as the Inhabitant of the House, God in His own Temple , the Founder in His own City , and that this fullness applies not only to the church of any one time but of all time . Therefore the position of the Holy Spirit in the Creed is before

1. Augustine De Agone Christi cap. 20. ML 40. 300.

2. Augustine Enchiridion cap. 56. Transl. E. Evans (1953 ed.) p. 49 .

that of the church , because He with the Father and the Son indwell the church and thus make it holy , universal in heaven and earth.

Thomas Aquinas said that the church is holy bec-

--ause ;-

- a) the faithful are washed (loti) by the Blood of Christ, quoting Apocalypse 1. 5 and Hebrews 13.12,
- b) the faithful are anointed (inunguntur) by the grace of the Holy Spirit.
- c) The Trinity inhabits the church.

These benefits, comments Whitaker, can only apply to the elect , in which case 'holy' as an exact term can only be applied to the Holy Catholic (invisible) Church. Cyprian's statement can only refer to the sons by regeneration³, since the 'reprobati'² cannot be said to have God for their Father. Membership of the visible church does not necessarily convey the regeneration of the just.

Taking the analogy of the human body , Bellarmine draws⁴ the distinction between the 'living members ' and the 'functional parts'⁵ which neither live nor feel ,but they do belong to the body. Whitaker answers that this might apply to a particular church but could never apply to the invisible church of the elect in which there are only living members , and this is where the analogy breaks down .

To emphasise the points he has made , Whitaker enumerates the four Scriptural analogies of the church ;-

- a) as a building ; Matthew 16.18. 'Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam Meam ' . This Πέτρα to Chrysostom, Epiphanius,

1. Whitaker mentions Aquinas' 'little work on the Apostles' Creed'.
2. Cyprian De Unitate 6. (ML. 4. 502) -- 'non habet ecclesiam matrem qui non habet Deum Patrem '.
3. Bellarmine had mentioned Augustine's threefold definition of the word 'son' (From Aug. Contra Adimant. 5)
 - a) ratione productionis vel generationis (as Christ) vel creationis (as all men) vel regenerationis (as only the just are the sons of God).
 - b) ratione imitationis -- as the sons of Abraham imitate the faith of their Father Abraham .Gal. 4. Rom. 4.
 - c) ratione doctrinae -- Bellarmine says that sons of this description need not necessarily be sons of regeneration.
4. Bellarmine Contro. 2 Qu. 1. cap. 12 Fourth Argument.
5. Bellarmine does not define them but other authors had eg. 'pilos et ungues' -- hairs and nails ,replaceable elements.

Hilary, Origen, Jerome, Ambrose, and Bede was 'fides'!. In Ephesians 2.20 the church is built 'in Christo per prophetarum et apostolorum doctrinam' -- **πᾶσα οἰκοδομη συναρμολόγουμένη** and this only applies to the elect who have the foundation of faith, and growth in faith, and enjoy the fruits of that faith. 'Facere verum et custodire Verbum Dei' amounts to that blessedness of faith referred to in Luke XI. 28 and is the theme of the man building upon the rock in Matthew 7. 24 - 25. The vital function of a living faith is also seen in 1 Peter 2.5. **καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομῆσθε οἶκος πνευματικός εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἄγιον.**

b) as the Body of Christ; in Ephesians 1.22 Christ is the Head **ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἣτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πασὶ πληρουμένου.**

(the fullness of Him that filleth all in all); both Chrysostom and Oecumenius speak of the church as the **πλήρωμα** (complementum) of Christ --- 'corpus complet et perfectum reddit caput, quemadmodum et caput totius reliqui corporis complementum est'. Christ is the 'Caput Vivens et Vivificans'. Excommunication does not cut off the member from Christ, or all would be lost, but from the sacraments and fellowship of a particular church, as a matter of discipline. No members die in Christ and therefore Bellarmine's statement that there are dead members of the church --- 'membra acquivoce non proprie et vere' -- which Turrianus had tried to force on us' is highly suspect. Dead members are not incorporated. Ephesians 4.16 would suggest that excommunication is disciplinary not a complete cutting off from Christ; if this were so, the soul would be abandoned by Christ when he most needs help. Christ must continue to dwell in the soul that he may be restored to the 'complementum Christi' but on Christ's terms. Dead members can never have **ἐφῆ²** or **ἐνέργεια**, that force within, that increases the spiritual life and force

-
1. Chrysostom Hom 55 on Matthew; Epiphanius Contra Haeres. 2.1.59; Hilary De Trinitate 2 and 6; Origen Tract 1 on Matthew 16; Jerome Contra Jovin. 1.; Ambrose on Ephesians 2, De Dominicæ Incarnationis Sacramento 5.; Bede on John 21.
 2. Ephesians 4.16; Col. 2.19 Vg. junctura (nexus).

(ἀύψῃσιν ποικίσθαι) and builds us in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ οἰκοδομεῖν) . Bellarmine had urged the difference between πᾶσα and πᾶν (totum et omne corpus) in Ephesians 2.21 and Col. 2.19 but Whitaker notes that this does not really affect the argument.

c) Spousa Christi --- in the Song of Songs 4.7. the Spouse is ' tota pulchra et vitium nullum in te est ' --- the ' pulchritudo inchoata ' in the Church Militant is made perfect in Chapter 6.8. (perfecta mea , electa genitrici suae , beatissima) by the love between Christ and His Spouse . Bellarmine maintained that this refers to the faithful soul not to the catholic church , but Whitaker comments that faithful souls are the catholic church , as Augustine and Gregory write on this text² . Scripture bears out the allegory in Apocalypse 21. 9 and 10 , and Paul in Ephesians 5.32 where τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα is the church being ' unam carnem cum Christo ' . Only those endowed with faith , the elect , can attain such a ' tota pulchritudo , tota gratia et intus et extra pulchra ecclesia ' .

d) The στύλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας . The nature of impiety is to be unstable , and ' veritas constantissime manet ' . Hebrew 3.6. illustrates this point ; we are His House ἐάν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατασχωμεν --- this perseverance and stability to the end will not be found except in those with faith.

There is no dispute, says Whitaker, on the Church Triumphant , since in this are the good alone , those endowed with faith , and Whitaker approves of the definition of the Trent Catechism under the Article ' Credo Ecclesiam Catholicam ' as ' Ecclesia Militans quae cum irmanissimis hostibus , Satana, carne , et mundo , perpetuum bellum gerit ' , and those endowed with faith do this, while those without it ' serviunt Satanae , carni , et mundo ' . Augustine said that only the faithful (fideles electi et dilecti⁴) ' congregari in unum spiritum et in unum corpus cuius unum caput est Christus ' .

1. Whitaker comments ' in charitate mutuo aedificare ' .

2. Augustine De Doctrina Christ, 2 ; Gregory Commentary in loco ; Vide Bernard Sermo 1. on the Song of Songs.

3. Augustine Ep. 57.

4. Augustine Ep. 80.

Those without this 'spiritualis regeneratio' do not belong to the Body of Christ, since they have only 'quaedam forma pietatis sed carent veritati'. The elect are 'in corpore (Christi) fides sincera sit, spes certa, charitas accensa'.

Where is the true church to be found and what are its marks? Whitaker quotes Augustine¹ --- 'civitatem Dei dicimus, cuius Scriptura testis est' and if Scripture be the witness of the church, it cannot be denied that it is a note of the church. Jerome wrote² 'ecclesia non in parietibus consistit sed in dogmatum veritate; ecclesia ibi est ubi fides vera est'. Duraeus replies that these are not the marks of the church or the true notes of the true church, but such things as should be learnt in the church, and taught by the church -- possessing them, it is the function (not the mark or note) of the church to use them. More is required than the true use of the sacraments, lawful preaching of the Word, and Apostolic truth and Scripture. The answer 'go to the Scripture' is not enough, for the enquirer will still need to find the 'Verbum ex verbo' and the infant will not know where to find its milk. Whitaker answers that there is a very true sense in the phrase that Scripture begets (procreat) the church -- it is a constant and stable foundation; doubts there may be about obscurities but none so great as the many doubts about the church. The phrase 'Verbum ex verbo' sounds devastating, but has it really any meaning except to prove what is being said, that the infant knows the true and copious source of the milk and will find true nourishment there because the **searching** is by faith. Where the 'verba ecclesiae' agree with the 'Verbum Dei' there is no problem; where they disagree, then nothing the church can say can alter the fact, the touchstone is still the Verbum Dei.

The Nicene Creed gave 4 distinct marks of the Church --- One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic³ --- are these the 'signa et notae' by which a true and visible church of **Christ** may be known?'

1. Augustine De Civitate Dei, 3.1. (sic)

2. Jerome on Ps. 133.

3. Though forming the opening words of the Bull 'Unam Sanctam' of Boniface VIII, they were not generally discussed till the 16th. Century when treatises 'De Notis Ecclesiae' became numerous, and the 'via notarum' became a particular form of apologetics.

1
 Stapleton mentions three others viz. the vast number of believers ,
 visibility , and uninterrupted devotion , the Polish Jesuit ² spoke
 of seven marks, Horantius ³ concentrates on the one most genuine
 note or mark viz. the 'continual succession of bishops and priests,
 chiefly Roman ' , Soto ⁴ speaks of the two chief notes as 'unity and
 concord ' . Lindanus ⁵ said that the Pontiff and Roman Chair was
 the truest mark of the church . The Catechism of Trent mention two,
 Catholic and Apostolic , Cardinal Hosius ⁶ four , sanctity, catholicity ,
 unity and apostolicity . Canisius ⁷ spoke of 'one essential note ,
 'subesse Romano Pontifici ' , Vincent of Lerins three, 'universitas,
 ecclesiasticae traditionis, antiquitas, et confessio ' , Sanders ⁸ seven,
 and Cunerus ⁹ twelve --- Whitaker comments 'and the adversaries upbraid
 us for not having a certain mind on the notes of the true church ' ! .
¹⁰ Bellarmine had stated that there were fifteen , and though this would
 appear to be 'top score ' , and the number which Whitaker wishes to
 examine , Socolorius mentions twenty.

-
1. Stapleton De Princip. Doctr. 1.19 -- Multitudo , visibilitas ,
 perpetuitas --- Whitaker says that there was no request for 'accident
 -ales , vel incertas notas ecclesiae sed essentialies et perpetuas
 notas quae in ipsa re inhaerent ' i.e. those marks of a true
 church , which if not found , means that that visible church
 is not a true church .
 2. Jesuitae Posuaniensis --- 'claritas , diffusio sive amplitudo ,
 antiquitas , Apostolice ecclesiae appellatio , Pastorum ordinatio
 et vocatio legitima , sanctitas , unitas ' -- Whitaker notes that
 'veritas ' is not found !
 3. Horantius Contra Calvini Institutiones 6.6.
 4. Soto (1494 - 1560 AD) Contra Wirtembergenses Cap. De Ecclesia ;
 Soto was appointed in 1532 AD to a chair of Theology at Salamanca,
 and in 1545 AD was appointed by Charles Vth. , Imperial Theologian
 for the Council of Trent . He returned to Salamanca in 1550 AD
 and in 1552 AD was elected to the principal chair of Theology
 in succession to Melchior Canus . The two Sotos , famous Dominican
 theologians, Pedro and Domingo , were special favourites and
 authorities with Bellarmine.
 5. Lindanus Panonlia . 4.38.
 6. Hosius Confessio Petrocoviensis 21.
 7. Canisius Catechism cap. 9 De Praeceptis eccle^{le}siae.
 8. Sanders De Visibili Monarch. cap. 6. -- 'altitudo et sublimitas ,
 splendor et claritas , latitudo et immensitas , successio et
 perpetuitas ' , confessio et unitas , invicta fides , constantia ' .
 9. Cunerus De Notis Ecclesiae
 10. Bellarmine De Ecclesia Militate 4. 1-18 Ebermann ed. (1721 AD)
 Vol. 2. 95 - 132.

Bellarmino, Allen and Bristow had all made much of the fact that the Reformed Churches bore the names of their principal Reformers eg. Martinists or Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, whereas the Church of Rome bore the true mark in its title viz. 'Catholic'. Whitaker answers that even if the statement is true, it lets the Anglican Church out because this church bore no personal name, but Whitaker attacks the logic of the statement -- 'nam vocari et esse non sunt idem' (' to call a thing something is not to make it so '). Bellarmine's deduction contains a fallacy that those who are not called by a Reformer's name are ipso facto Catholics.

2

The first Patristic testimony is from Augustine -- ' cum omnes haeretici se catholicos dici velint, quaerenti tamen alicui peregrino, ubi ad catholicam (ecclesiam) conveniatur, nullus haeticorum vel basilicam suam vel domum audeat ostendere ' ---- but Bellarmine should read the context; although Augustine makes much of the word 'catholic' in his controversy with the Manichee, who also laid claim to the title, he did not charge the title with the same necessity of being tied to the Roman See ³ --- he did, however, demand that the adversaries show the truth and then they can have the title. Bellarmine had made catholicity the first note of the church, but Augustine in fact makes it the last evidence (postremo loco) of the true church, for the 'nomen sine re sive veritate' says Augustine means nothing. Let the Manichee show the truth. Bellarmine takes up the words of Augustine on the 'consensio populorum et gentium' ⁴ that if a stranger were to appear in a town where there was a catholic church, a church of the Manichee, one of the Arians, one of the Donatists, and were to ask for the Catholic Church, all would direct him to the same building! The same applies today, comments Bellarmine, in a town with various churches -- the common people recognise the Catholic Church!

-
1. Bellarmine quotes 1 Cor. 1. 12.
 2. Augustine Contra Ep. Fundamenti 4.5. The same insistence upon 'veritas' to justify the use of the title 'catholic' appears in Augustine De Utilitate Credendi 19 which is behind Bellarmine's first comment. Augustine here says 'they (the heretics) are called each by names of their own, but there is one catholic'.
 3. Augustine Op. Cit. 4.5. writes of the 'Sedes Petri Apostoli cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum' -- but this follows

Whitaker replies that if Bellarmine must get his theology from the common people, he will always be making claims like this -- the fact is that the argument contains basic weaknesses. First, it depends who is enquiring 'if today a man enters a town and asks for the catholic church' -- if he is a Romanist, he will be directed to the Roman church, if he is not, he will be directed to the parish church, for that to him is the home of catholicism in England -- Bellarmine should recognise that the name 'catholic' has stuck as a designation not as a description. Cyril of Jerusalem² has a similar thought -- that on entering a town a man does not ask where is the church or the house of God for every heretic will direct him to his own church, but the man asks for the catholic church, and then he will be directed to the one church 'id enim nomen proprium est cuius sanctae ecclesiae, matris omnium nostrum' but like Augustine it is not merely a matter of nomenclature --- the context of these words is quite clear, that where heresies and sects abound, Cyril exhorts them to seek the church which is catholic in fact as well as in name --- Catholicus non finiebatur ex sole nomine -- the latter alone is not sufficient to establish the claim and demonstrate the catholic church. Cyril however does not point them to Rome! There must not be a defect in dogma, there must be right worship (cultus rectus) and the universal cure in doctrine and grace of all ills. Various churches lay claim to the title, but, says Cyril, a man must discriminate in that which is catholic 're et nomine -- res non potest e nomine definiri'. If the Roman Church at present, says Whitaker, was the true church for this very reason 'we should freely embrace her ex animo eique nosmetipsos sine mora'!

contd. the words 'vetustate firmata' and illustrates them; it does not tie catholicity to Rome. Furthermore 'cui' refers to 'Petri' not 'sedes'.

4. Augustine op. cit. 4.5.

1. Whitaker says that the people are not the 'optimus rerum aestimator'; they merely hang on to names eg. Simon Magus had the popular acclamation 'Magna Dei Potentia' which he was not; Diana of the Ephesians was called the 'Magnum Numen' which was the last thing the idol was. The Antichrist of Matthew 24.5. and 2 Thess. 2.4. will call himself 'Deus'. Names are bestowed 'passim sine iudicio et ratione'. Vide Bernard Serm. 33 De Statu Ecclesiae.
2. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 18. 26. MG. 33. 1048.

Pacian is remembered for his epigrammatic passage ¹ --

'Christianus mihi nomen est , Catholicus vero cognomen ' . In the multiplicity of names and heresies that have grown up , the title 'catholic ' is clear of heretics as authors , it is Apostolic in content , and has the central idea of 'vera fides ' ² --- a thought, says Pacian , which had been hallowed by Cyprian. Whitaker reminds Duraeus that the word 'catholic' did not begin with the church and therefore cannot be a true note of the church -- it was added to the church and that which is added can be taken away . Though Apostolic , as Pacian / says , weight must be given to the view that the word 'catholic' described a content, function, and purpose of the church which already existed before the word was applied -- it has therefore the nature of an 'accidens' rather than ' de essentia ecclesiae ' . The note or mark of the church must be something inseparable from it , without which it would not be ^{the} church -- yet the Creed known as the Apostles' Creed originally made no mention of the 'ecclesia catholica' .

The notes of the true church must be 'in natura ecclesiae ' -----
 ΤΕΣΜΗΡΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΧΥΡΙΟΤΑ ³ --- proofs or criteria ,
 and inseparable . Vincent of Lerins wrote ' ille est verus et germanus catholicus qui veritatem Dei , qui ecclesiam , qui Corpus Christi diligit , qui divinae religioni qui Catholicae Fidei nihil praeponit , non hominis cuiuspiam auctoritatem non amorem non ingenium non eloquentiam non philosophiam ' .

The second note mentioned by Bellarmine is that of 'antiquity ' , and here Bellarmine had made much of the new dogmas of Luther , amounting to novelty. Whitaker's comment was that Bellarmine should have realised by now that there was nothing very new about the dogmas of Luther -- ' si aliqua doctrina fuerit multis seculis sepulta , si tamen eadem ; ex Scripturis probari potest , non novam illam esse sed antiquam dicimus ' . Luther is not the author of a new church but a minister of a very ancient church. The Doctrine of

-
1. Pacian Ep. 1.4. Ad Sympronianum ML 13. 1055 -- ' my name is Christian, my surname is Catholic ' .
 2. Vide 2 Cor. 2.9. ; Romans. 5.19 ; In Augustine De Symbolo Serm. Ad Catechumenos 1.6.14 (ML 40. 635) Augustine uses the words 'sancta, una, vera , catholica ' .
 3. Vincent of Lerins op. cit. 25 . (Whitaker refers to it as Advers. Profan. Nov.). Salvianus wrote 'Nomen sine actu atque officio suo

Justification does not have Luther for its author but as its defender, and it is a calumny to accuse Luther of following Eusebius in the doctrine of justification by faith.¹ Bellarmine quotes Tertullian² writing of certain heretics --- 'qui estis vos? unde et quando venistis? ubi tamdiu latuistis?' -- but Whitaker wonders whether Bellarmine realises what he is quoting, as Tertullian is attacking new dogmas introduced by heretics who were really heretics because they followed their own choice (*dipoeis*) and received and admitted the name of heretic. Tertullian recalls them: 'ad ab Apostolis scripta sunt et ad doctrinam Apostolicam' and this is the point at issue. In Bellarmine's quotation from Optatus, the meaning of 'cathedra' here cannot be defined as a 'successio episcoporum' since Optatus's grounds are much wider; the substance of his appeal is also a true succession of faith and Catholic (i.e. Apostolic) doctrine. The Donatists had affirmed that the church had completely perished in the world except among them only, and they attacked not only catholic doctrine but also customs (mores). Optatus argued that their premise was false -- that the succession at Rome and the preservation of catholic faith and doctrine was evident in the Church of Rome from Apostolic days and therefore Rome could not be unchurched. Whitaker comments 'neither do we deny you a church, but we do say that there has been much corruption of dogma and doctrine since those days.'

Augustine⁴ listed 'antiquity' among the notes of the true church but he conjoined it with 'veritas' and 'sincerissima sapientia' --- the importance of this is seen in his remark 'si possent Manichaei ostendere se habere veritatem velle se ad eos transire'.

 contd. nihil est' (De Providentia 4) -- the name of Christian is like a golden ornament (aureum decus), if used without truth, it is but a trinklet. Athanasius wrote 'non accipere nomina ab Apostolis' (Sermo 2. Adversus Arianos). Vide etiam Augustine on Ps. 44.

4. Bellarmine said that the origin of heresies can be dated -- the Arian in 324 AD, the Nestorian in 431 AD, the Lutheran in 1517 AD. Whitaker remarks that this had become a common argument but it is not really true. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, had excommunicated Arius in 321 AD; the beginnings of heresies as distinct from their exposure are not always easy to date.

2. Tertullian De Praescript. 37. (ML. 2.50)

3. Optatus Contra Parmen. 2.2. (ML. 11. 947) 'vestrae cathedrae originem ostendite, qui vobis vultis sanctam Ecclesiam vendicare'.

4. Augustine Contra Ep. Fundament. 4. (ML. 42. 175).

Bellarmino agreed with Whitaker that 'antiquity' cannot stand alone -- 'sola et per se' -- but must be joined with 'doctrina sana et prima et Apostolica'; on this submission Whitaker states that he could agree with Bellarmine on this note of 'antiquity' as long as it is recognised that it is conjoined to true faith and sound doctrine. Antiquity is an impressive note, but it must not always be assumed that because a thing is old it is necessarily true. The study of antiquities is interesting but not necessarily conclusive in matters of truth and doctrine -- to carry weight (authority) something more than a date stamp is required. Ezekiel 20, 18-19 puts it rather well -- 'walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers neither observe their judgements; I am the Lord your God, walk in my statutes and keep my judgements and do them'. A sufficient note of the church requires that it is a perpetual note, which antiquity, by its very definition, cannot be; the church was true even when it lacked antiquity, which is of the nature of an 'accidens' like, for example, adolescence, old age, but if antiquity alone confess the best note, then Rome must give way to Jerusalem and Antioch.

The third note is 'duratio diuturna et minime interrupta' --- 'ecclesia semper fuit et semper erit ergo Catholica dicitur'. This is true, Whitaker agrees, in Christ, not in the Pope, and it does not follow that something that lasts indefinitely

-
1. Tertullian De Praescript. Haeres. 29; Apol. 50 -- 'veritas est antiquior omnibus'; 'hoc mihi proficit antiquitas, praestructa divinae literaturae, quo facile credam, thesaurum eam fuisse posteriori cuique sapientiae'. Cyprian Ep. 74 Ad Pompeium (256 AD) sect. 6. wrote 'consuetudo, sine veritate, vetustas erroris est' and in Ep. 63 (Ad Caecilium -ML. 4.376) 'neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet sed Dei veritatem'. Whitaker also quotes the pagan rhetorician Symmachus who wrote a letter to Theodosius which is extant in Ambrose Ep. 30 and in Prudentius 'si longa aetas auctoritatem religionibus faciat, servanda est tot seculis fides et sequendi sunt nobis parentes qui sequuti sunt feliciter suos'; Ambrose and Prudentius both comment on Symmachus's appeal to the ancient pagan religion under which the state had flourished that 'antiquitatem sine fide et veritate nullum pondus habere'. Augustine De Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test. 114 writes the pagans 'verum se tenere contendunt quia quod anterius est falsum esse non potest; quasi antiquitas aut vetus consuetudo praejudicet veritati'. When antiquity is conjoined with truth, it is to be venerated, when separated from it, to be rejected. Ignatius wrote (Ad Philadelph. 8.2. --MG. 5.704) that some said 'nisi evangelium in antiquis invenero, non credam' -- Ignatius replied 'Jesu Christum mihi pro archivis esse' --

is ipso facto the church, because the synagogue of Satan will last 'ad finem usque mundi'; the wheat and the tares last till harvest, the sheep and the goats till the Judgement. Whitaker has no quarrel with the premise, but with the syllogisms.

The Fourth note is 'amplitudo et multitudo, et varietas credentium' --- Vincent of Lerins wrote 'Catholici enim proprie sunt qui tenent quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est' but Bellarmine agrees with Whitaker that universality requires further conjunctive notes eg. the Catholic Faith; that where true faith is found, be it in one nation or a province, there is the catholic church. Whitaker, however, points out that this discussion often turns out along the lines that the Roman Church has grown and grown through the ages so that it alone is 'amplissima ergo catholica'. Taking Bellarmine's statement as it stands, Whitaker says that the Ecclesia Anglicana is not insignificant in this matter of 'amplitudo' since its profession is based upon Scripture, the Fathers, and the Ancient Councils, which is a far wider platform than the 'Pontifex solus'. Bellarmine had given a witness to the territorial spread of papal religion, Italy and the whole of Spain, but Whitaker notes that the Inquisition has another side to this story, since France, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, and elsewhere, in the Indies, Japan, Africa, the story of papal religion is far from favourable --- certainly in the Indies the Jesuits complain 'fides nulla est adhibenda, illos enim homines (the converts) non religione sed armis, non argumentis sed bellicis instrumentis ad fidem traductos fuisse'. Tyranny reigns in Spain -- 'plures interfecerunt quam vivos reliquerunt' -- this is certainly a new conception of Apostolic preaching; would that they did give the Holy Spirit rather than fire and the butcher's knife! Chrysostom writes that precious stones are few, Elijah was one, the true church stands 'in virtutis probitate non in numeri multitudine'. The splendor of Sodom fell, the solitary faith of Abraham conquered.

 contd. 'nihil antiquitati sine veritate tribuendum est'.

1. Bellarmine De Ecclesia Militante 4,5.

2. Chrysostom Hom. 18, 12 Ad Popul. Antioch.; Chrysostom also wrote 'what does the multitude confer if the manner of the city be vicious' on Matthew 23, 37.

Bellarmino for his fifth note takes the succession of bishops from the time of the Apostles -- an argument used by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eriphanus, Optatus and Augustine in refuting heretics of their own time. Whitaker agrees in the strength of this argument but says that no catholic Father ever based catholicity on succession alone, but refuted the heretics by Scripture -- *Scriptura sit absoluta et sufficiens veritatis regula* -- and then sealed ~~the~~ victory by confirming it with an appeal to succession as holding the faith from the Apostles. Faith was the 'anima successionis' and succession was more than a 'series hominum'. The Roman succession was often appealed to in the old days but then it was 'notissima, illustrissima et spectatissima, praeluxit enim caeteris ecclesiis'; it had the pre-eminence of dignity and prerogative of the imperial city, and there Paul taught as Scripture testifies, and died as history tells us. The bishops of that city were pre-eminent in virtue, constant in faith.

Whitaker now turns to Bellarmine's particular quotations from the Fathers starting with Irenaeus who lists the Roman bishops from Peter to Eleutherius (his own time).

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.3. (MG. 7. 848). Vide 'Disputatio' of Whitaker Quaest. 6. 12. (Parker ed. p. 583). Bellarmine had spoken of the Greek churches having a succession from the time of Constantine only, not from Apostolic times. Whitaker replies that Nicephorus Chron. 8.6. makes it quite clear that in enumerating 23 bishops, Antioch had continuous succession from Andrew the Apostle, and he even gives the year of each reign. Bellarmine also states that the Fathers never call the Church at Byzantium 'Apostolic' (though the Histories of Sozomen and Theodoret did); Whitaker replies that this is also true of Ephesus Corinth and others but all these were Apostolic foundations, and when Bellarmine says that the Fathers of the First Council of Constantinople called ^{not} that church a 'new church' he was mistaken -- it was an 'ecclesia novella' but ~~vél~~ *vél* *Πύλη* referring to the fact, not that the church was a new one, but that the city was raised to imperial status as the old Rome had been. Whitaker distinguished between 'successio de jure divino' which is 'successio cum Apostolica fide' and 'successio de jure politico' which may be in heresy.

Irenaeus was writing against those who claimed the fullness of an Apostolic oral tradition (deposited by Christ --- 'secreta et perfecta mysteria') in excess of Scripture because the latter was obscure , may be diversely understood with various meanings , and cannot properly be understood without tradition which was prior to it. When Irenaeus challenged this with the tradition openly held from the Apostles by the succession of presbyters , they replied that they were wiser than any succession since they had the fuller tradition. Irenaeus reminded them that the succession was Apostolic in origin and fully declared the Apostolic mind --to save himself the trouble of compiling succession lists of all the churches , he chose one, that ' very great and most ancient known to all , the Roman Church , established by Peter and Paul ' ; because of its 'higher original' (potentioem principalitatem) the 'whole world must agree (necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam -- in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique --vel ; qui praesunt ecclesiis --- conservata est ea quae est ab Apostolis traditio) 'because the tradition which is of the Apostles has always been preserved by them of all countries . ' Whitaker notes

1. Whitaker agrees with Bellarmine's statement that the Apostles 'laid up in the church as in a rich depository in full abundance all things which pertain to the truth , that everyone that choses might thence derive the water of life ' , but Whitaker emphasises the fact that this is no ground for an independent unwritten tradition ' -- he adds ' not too great a stress should be laid upon Irenaeus in the matter of tradition -- he was a Chiliast (Eusebius H.E. 3.39) and he also said that Christ lived for 40 years , a tradition he said he had from John and the Apostles (Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 2. 39) which is most unlikely from Scripture.

that 'necesse est' here is equivalent to ἀνάγκη not δεῖ (oportet) implying a natural necessity not a moral obligation, to prove this particular point viz. that we should see how the fullness of the true Apostolic Tradition has been kept by the Roman Succession, and there is no secret tradition here.

Irenaeus does not demand reference to Rome at all times for all things because of the succession; the succession is approved because it maintained the Apostolic Tradition. He states that the task of working out ² all the succession lists of all the

1. The Greek text of Irenaeus is not extant here. Vide MG. 7.848. The chief problem in this text -- the meaning of 'propter potentiorem principalitatem' or perhaps the more correct reading as indicated by Jalland 'The Church and the Papacy' (ed. 1944) p. 112 of 'propter potioram principalitatem' --- is not discussed here or later in Whitaker Contra Duraeum 9. 30 or in his controversy with Bellarmine 2.6. ; Jalland suggests 'superior origin' and points out the importance of a right exegesis here, as a number of subsidiary problems hang on this text.

The doubts about the probable Greek text, the frequent use of later meanings of 'principalitas' and its cognates make the question more difficult. Harvey in his edition of Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. (1857 AD ed) Vol. 2. p. 9 has *διὰ τὴν διαφωρωτέραν ἀρχὴν* for the original Greek. A further problem arises as to the true antecedent of 'in qua' -- is it the Church of Rome or 'omnem ecclesiam'? The question is important because the answer affects the precise nuance of 'necesse est' -- if it refers to 'omnem ecclesiam' then the words of Irenaeus are wider in scope i.e. the tradition is preserved not only in the Roman Church but 'by those who are from everywhere' i.e. passing visitors, and those who settled at Rome comparatively late in life, who brought the traditions of their own churches and thus ensured that the local Roman tradition was comparatively true. This would make Irenaeus's appeal to the Roman succession unnecessary! Bearing in mind Irenaeus's conviction that the successors of the Apostles are the guardians of tradition (eg. Advers. Haeres. 3.3.1-3) it seems unlikely that he wrote *οἱ πανταχοῦ εἰσὶν* and that the reading 'qui sunt undique' is an assimilation to the words of the preceding line, and that the reading bracketed above of 'qui praesunt undique' is to be preferred i.e. the bishops of each local church.

2. It may be noted that Eusebius, who deliberately set out at a later date to collect 'succession lists' for his History admits that he was unable to find reliable information and dates for some of the early bishops of Antioch and Jerusalem, while in the case of his own See, Caesarea in Palestine, he could not trace the succession further back than Theophilus, a contemporary of Irenaeus. Irenaeus therefore may have found in the 'potior principalitas' of Rome a convenient way out of the difficulty.

churches would be impossible and he therefore proposes to give a typical example, the 'succession series' of the Church of Rome, and by this means it is possible to show that the present day faith of that church represents the whole and not merely a part of the original body of teaching imparted by the two Apostles. Further, he adds, to reproduce the succession lists of all the churches would be rather a waste of time because with that of the Church of Rome before us, the proof is sufficient viz. that the paradosis of the Apostles may be equated with current Roman doctrine (i.e. refute the Gnostic contention that the present teaching of the church was not all that was originally imparted) --- it was quite unthinkable that the Apostles imparted to other churches traditions which were quite different from that of Rome, then and now, especially having regard to the fact that both Peter and Paul were its original teachers.

The meaning of 'convenire ad' (= *συμβαίνειν* *πρός*) 'agree with' --- is that we must agree that the Apostolic Tradition is preserved by the Church of Peter and Paul without recourse to secret traditions; here Rome is the example of a norm in questions of faith, and this recognition makes unnecessary any speculation as to whether 'convenire ad' (as distinct from 'recurrere in') means 'resort to' or 'agree with', or to define the limits of 'principalitas' which is used three times in Irenaeus' Advers. Haeres;:-

- a) in 1.26 as translating *ἐξουσίας* in a phrase describing the Demiurge.
- b) ibid. as translating *αὐθεντίας* = 'self-moved source' (not absolute power)
- c) 1.31.1 also as translating *αὐθεντίας* as before.

The point of Irenaeus's appeal to Rome (and to Polycarp)¹ was to show that no/^{such} tradition was taught as the heretics had fashioned -- the succession, to Irenaeus, was primarily that of Apostolic Tradition safeguarded, without any appeals to secret traditions or additions. From Irenaeus, Whitaker concludes that we must look for a succession of faith and doctrine more than a succession of place or men --- the latter should have the former,

1. Polycarp in Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.4.

and without it, there can be no claim to a true Apostolic succession. The 'series episcoporum' is important but not the deciding factor -- the true successors of the Apostles, Irenaeus writes¹, are those who 'acceperunt certum charisma doctrinae et veritatis et qui una cum episcopatus successione'. The 'Successio Principalis' is that of faith and doctrine, the 'Successio Minor' that of place and men. The heretics were offering strange doctrines as strange fires at the altar of God and would suffer the fate of Nadab and Abihu, and such as rise against the truth and stir up others to oppose the church, remain in the lower regions as Korah, Dathan, and Abiron, and such as rend the unity of the church will suffer as Jereboam the son of Nebat.

² Tertullian, writes Bellarmine, had demanded that the heretics show their episcopal succession and origin from the Apostles; the Apostolic Churches reckoned their origin from the ordination of their first bishops by the Apostles or Apostolic men, as Rome did from Clement ordained by Peter.³ Whitaker replies that this text raised more problems than it solved for Bellarmine, as Rome has a rival in Smyrna and other Apostolic churches -- Tertullian wrote 'in this manner (i.e. Apostolic Ordination) do the Apostolic Churches reckon their origin, as the Church of Smyrna tells that Polycarp was placed there by John⁴, that of Rome tells that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter⁵; just so can the rest also show those whom being appointed by the Apostles to the episcopate, they have as transmitters of the Apostolic Seed'. Furthermore, Tertullian states that the heretics are full of inventions, but 'their doctrine, when compared with that of the Apostles, will of itself declare by the differences and

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 4. 21. 2 'quapropter eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui cum Episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt. Reliquos vero, qui absistent a principali successione et quocumque loco colliguntur, suspectos habere, vel quasi hereticos et malae sententiae vel quasi scindentes et elatos et sibi placentes aut rursus ut hypocritas, quaestus gratia et vanae gloriae hoc operantes. Omnes autem hi decidunt a veritate'.
 2. Tertullian De **Praescript.** Haer. 32.
 3. Vide Appendix.
 4. Irenaeus Advers. Haer. 3.3.4. 'Polycarp .. by the Apostles made Bishop in Asia, in the Church at **Smyrna**'.

contrast between them , that it had no Apostle for its author nor any Apostolic man ' 1 . The heretics are in no way Apostolic because of the 'difference of the sacred mystery which they teach ' . So Tertullian could write ' sum haeres Apostolorum sicut illi caverunt testamento suo , sicut fidei commiserunt , sicut adjuraverunt ; ita teneo ' . He continues ' Proxima est tibi Achaia ? Habes Corinthum . Si non longe es a Macedonia , habes Philippos , habes Thessalonicenses . Si notes in Asiam tendere , habes Ephesum . Si autem Italiae adjaces , habes Romam , unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est . Ita quam felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt ' .

Stapleton² referring to Tertullian³ says that Tertullian deferred to those Apostolic Churches (i.e founded by the Apostles) which contained the Apostolic Epistles --- those churches were ' wombs and originals of faith and must be accounted as true, as without doubt containing that which the churches have received from the Apostles , the Apostles from Christ , Christ from God , and that all other doctrine (reliquam doctrinam) must be judged at once to be false --- we have communion with the Apostolic Churches because we have no doctrine (nulla doctrina) differing from them ' ; in Chapter 36 Tertullian writes ' go through the Apostolic Churches in which the very seats of the Apostles⁴ at this very day⁵ preside over their own places , in which their own authentic writings are read speaking with the voice of each and making the face

contd. 5. Jerome De Vir. Ill. 15 states that it was the 'ordinary Latin opinion that Clement was the second bishop , following the Apostle Peter.'

-
1. Tert. Advers. Marc. 4.5. (c.207 AD) writes ' si constat id verius quod prius , id prius quod (ab initio) id ab initio quod ab Apostolis , pariter utique constabit id esse ab Apostolis traditum , quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum ' -- and note the plural in 'ecclesias ' .
 2. Stapleton De Author. Script. 2.9.
 3. Tertullian De Praescript. 21 et 36.
 4. For the use of *κρῖον Πρωτοκρίτων* Vide Ignatius Ad Roman. where *κρῖον* is defined; as the 6th. canon of Nicea interpreted it, the ancient usage was that the bishop of the city of Rome should have the chief authority so as to govern carefully the places contiguous (locos suburbicanos) and the whole province . Rufinus also refers to 'ecclesiae suburbicanae ' governed by Alexandria as well as by Rome.
 5. 'authenticae literae ' -- here 'autographic (echoing the voice of each Apostle) as opposed to the transcripts (mutilated copies

of each present to the eye'. Stapleton claimed that possession of the Apostolic Epistles was thus proof of Apostolic authority. Whitaker replied that it would have been better if Stapleton had spoken of the Apostolic Churches professing the Apostolic Regula Fidei rather than possessing the Apostolic Epistles (and none does of the originals) ---far more than possession is spoken of here. Tertullian's five tests (from De Praescript. 21-36) were :-

- a) Widespread consent (20)
- b) Apostolic Foundation (21 and 36)
- c) Antiquity (31)
- d) Episcopal Succession from the Apostles (32)
- e) Apostolic authorship (ibid.)

In his Advers. Haeres. 36 Tertullian spoke of that common fellowship with Rome which Africa had --- how Rome joined Law, the Prophets, the Evangelists, and the Apostles, and from these drinks in her faith which she seals with water, clothe~~r~~ with the Holy Spirit, feeds with the Eucharist, exhorts to martyrdom and so receives no-one in opposition to this teaching.

Bellarmino also gives the Roman Succession List from Peter to Anastasius, quoting Augustine², that 'in this order of succession no Donatist bishop is found'. Whitaker replies that Augustine's remarks would be meaningless if they did not refer to the steadfastness of faith preserved in the Roman See -- he wrote 'ut certa sit spes fidelis quae non in homine sed in Domino collocata numquam tempestate sacrilegi schismatis discipetur'. The succession was in the Faith of Peter -- the converse is not necessarily true! . It was more than succession that held Augustine to Rome -- 'tenet me in ecclesia, ab ipso sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas Dominus commendavit usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum'. The Donatists were in communion with no Apostolic Church

 possessed by the heretics) -- the argument, says Whitaker, does not depend upon the churches having the very original Epistles but in their being Apostolic, of which this echoing of the Apostolic Voice is proof.

1. Bishop Gore wrote in his 'Roman Catholic Claims' (1892 ed. pg.96) that in Tertullian it appears that 'Rome is but one element in the consentient testimony' and yet 'the testimony of the Roman Church had a microcosmic character'
2. Augustine Ep. 53 Ad Generos (c. 400 AD) HL. 33. 196.

-- but Augustine writes that Peter was the figure of all the Apostles, the 'figura totius ecclesiae'. No more weight should be put on this text than Augustine intended. On the Episcopal succession, Whitaker agrees with Bellarmine that 'ecclesiam quidem sine episcopis constare non posse'; Bellarmine had quoted Cyprian's 'ecclesiam esse plebem episcopo adunatam', 'ecclesia in episcopo', 'episcopatum esse in ecclesia' and Jerome's 'ecclesia non est quae non habet sacerdotes' but he disagrees with Bellarmine's example of a succession taken from the O.T. because the O.T. priestly succession was a 'successio in sanguine' whereas the catholic succession was not 'ex uno genere, sed ex variis locis et ex variis hominum generibus'. Christ was successor to Melchizedek, not Aaron.

The agreement of both Bellarmine and Whitaker on the point that the true Apostolic Church must have an episcopal succession which has a 'conspiratio in doctrina cum antiqua ecclesia' -- and both agreed that the word 'antiqua' referred to the universal and undivided church of the first 600 years -- leads Bellarmine to his quotation from Sozomen², where Sisinius says 'examinemus ergo doctrinam vestram (i.e. the Novatians) ad illorum scripta (i.e. the expositors of Scripture who lived before the church was rent by division) et si cum illis consenserit, retineatur; si minus, abjiciatur'. Bellarmine reminds Whitaker that it should be noted that Theodosius imposed the decisions of the Fathers who appealed to the expositors of Scripture, not to Scripture itself, who lived in

1. John Jewel (1522 - 71 AD) one of the disputants selected to confute the Romanists at the Conference of Westminster after Easter 1559 AD, on November 26th. 1559 AD in the famous Sermon at Paul's Cross challenged the Romanists to prove their cause out of Scripture, the Councils, and the Fathers of the first 600 years after Christ. He repeated this challenge in 1560 AD and Dr. Henry Cole took it up. The chief result was Jewel's 'Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae' (1562 AD) answered by Thomas Harding 1564 AD which brought out Jewel's Reply 1565 AD. Bancroft officially enjoined Jewel's theology on the Church of England in James' 1's reign, the 'Apology' being set up in churches. The Act of Supremacy 1 Eliz. c.1. (Restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical and Spiritual) sect. 20 enforced the authority of Canonical Scripture and the first Four General Councils in determining heresy. There was no mention of the Fathers. Vide Elton 'The Tudor Constitution' (1960 AD edition) p. 368. Convocation in 1571 AD had ordered 'they (the preachers) shall in the first place be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the O.T. and N.T. and collected

the church before the Novatian schism. Whitaker replies that the point at issue was the doctrine of the Trinity -- there is no dispute on this --- and Theodosius accepted the orthodoxy of Agellius and Susinius and others, and ejected those who refused the term *ὁμοούσιος*. But this text was of no use to Bellarmine -- surely Theodosius should have referred the matter to the Papal chair, since competence in such matters is not granted to Emperors? Sisinius knew the Fathers not as judges but as witnesses of the Faith, not as innovators but as expositors --- there was here a true 'conspiratio in doctrina cum Scripturis'.

Nor is unity itself a note of the church -- Augustine wrote 'ut est Dei una ecclesia, sic est Diaboli una Babylon' -- unity must be joined with true faith and doctrine. It is not sufficient that the faith of all hang upon the Pope, for this produces two kinds of people, those who believe and know (scire est in credendo) and those who believe and do not know, but on Bellarmine's own admission must yield a 'consentionem in silentio'. Discussions in the Papal ranks are sufficient evidence that all is not well in the papal camp --- the dissensions are not only in small things but on matters of dogma and faith eg. whether the Pope is above a General Council or not. Alphonsus de Castro³ defends strongly the old opinion that a Council is above a Pope and not a few Romanists support him, and those of considerable theological stature. Ambrosius Catharinus⁴ fell foul of his Dominican Order,

out of that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.²

2. Sozomen H.E. 7.12.

-
1. Sozomen op. cit. says that Theodosius enacted laws (Edicts 6,7, et al.) enforcing this subscription to the *ὁμοούσιος* but he had no desire to persecute; those voluntarily renouncing the heresy were highly commended.
 2. Augustine De Civitat. Dei -- unity is the seventh note of Bellarmine.
 3. Alphonsus de Castro Contra Haeres. l. 6.
 4. Ambrosius Catharinus c. 1484 - 1553 AD Dominican theologian; controversialist against Lutheran doctrines. He came into conflict with his fellow Dominicans at the Council of Trent in which he took a prominent part. He defended the opinion that the Holy Spirit permits every man to know whether or not he is in a state of grace, against the traditional Thomist view upheld by D.Soto.

especially Cajetan, in defending the Immaculate Conception and other opinions opposed to the Dominican tradition, and a further serious division appeared at Trent on Catharinus's defence of the Thirteenth heresy of the Lutherans, which was that the intention of the minister is not necessary and does nothing in the sacraments. He would not rest with the explanation that the intention extended no further than to do what the church intended, for even this required further definition.¹ Erasmus says much on the dissensions between Scotists, Thomists and Occamists --² there is more study of subtle and deceitful arguments, than to search out the mysteries, they have such confidence as perfect divines though they never read the Scriptures.³ To hang upon the judgement of one man (The Pontiff) is no remedy in these matters, nor without the attitude of 'consentio in silentio' can it remove doubts and uncertainties and provide a 'pax animorum' or 'conscientiae tranquillitas' such as the Romanists boasted. Whitaker admits dissensions among the Reformers,⁴ but the church had never been without them,⁵ and they are not such as bring burnings for heresy. Whitaker writes 'precatur Deum ut nostras ecclesias uniat et sic aliquando futurum speramus' on the basis of Scripture as the Regula Fidei, the Councils, and the Fathers of the undivided church. Bellarmine doubted if such a prayer could ever be answered because the Reformers lack 'ulla regula finiendarum controversiarum; ac Catholici habent certam regulam, nimirum sententiam Summi Pastoris in qua acquiescunt'. In reply, Whitaker says that this is precisely the point the Reformers are making -- that such an appeal to the judgement of the Pontiff is no such 'regula idonea' since that can err, defect, change, and become heretical. The 'Regula Fidei Scripturae non est studiosa partium!'

1. Council of Trent Sess. 7. (1547 AD) 20th. January. x
2. Erasmus Contra Latomum 2. Vide Enchiridion Dedicat. Epistle.
3. Erasmus Enchiridion 2.
4. Whitaker resents being classed with the Anabaptists, Zwenckfeldians, Osiander, Memnon, Servetus, Fabricius or Staphylus.
5. Acts XI.2. ;heretical baptism in the time of Cyprian; the date of Easter -- but none were excommunicated and all held to the same church and sacraments, but unity, comments Whitaker, is more than a conjunction of pious persons, but may be represented rather as a 'goal of faith than a mark of the church'-- donec omnes occurramus in unitate fidei et evadamus in virium perfectum, ad mensuram staturae Christi

req. if the minister lack that intention, are the sacraments administered by him null or void?

and was the touchstone of the primitive and Patristic church, councils, and magistrates. True unity cannot be tacit acquiescence in the dogmatic declarations of any one voice -- this can be tyranny. True unity demands not only 'externa consensio' but also 'concordia in fidei et Spiritus unitate' and the Fathers teach us that unity is from faith not faith from unity while they worked 'in unitate ad fidem'. Cyprian wrote 'unitas servatur in origine' and that Original is Christ.

On the sanctity of doctrine and efficacy of doctrine as the eighth and ninth notes of the true church, Whitaker regards these as qualities rather than notes of the church, dependent on doctrine i.e. truth. This proves an occasion for Whitaker to defend Luther against some of the calumnies of Cochlaeus, which had been repeated by Bellarmine. Erasmus had said of Luther in his Letter to Wolsey, Archbishop of York --- 'hominis vita, magno omnium consensu probatur iam id non leve praedictum est, tantam esse morum integritatem, ut nec hostes reperient quod calumnientur'.²

The necessity of miracles as a sufficient testimony of true faith is quoted by Bellarmine as the eleventh note,³ but Whitaker says that this is not true -- 'if they hear not Moses and the prophets'.⁴ Augustine regarded miracles as edifying but not necessary since we have Scripture. Making the distinction between 'mirabilia' i.e. events which appear miraculous because the causes are not known, and 'miracula' which have God as their true author and are therefore 'supra naturam'.⁵ it is true to say that true doctrine or every

 contd. 6. Cyprian De Unitate 5 (ML. 4. 501) cp. Prayer for the Church after the Sanctus in the 1549 AD Canon (English Prayer Book) -- 'truth unity and concord' -- the same order of words is in the 1552 AD Order.

1. Bellarmine had claimed that 'sancta' in the Creed referred to the faith and morals professed by the church. Whitaker doubts whether 'sancta' can be used merely in the sense of an external profession of faith. The church is 'holy' because she is in a state of sanctification, by virtue of the 'donum sanctificationis' with which she is endowed, and there is a close relationship between conduct and right belief.

2. Vide etiam Erasmus's Letter to Cardinal Moguntinus.

3. a) miracula esse necessaria ad novam fidem vel extraordinariam missionem persuadendum.

b) miracula esse sufficientia ad veram fidem declarandam.

Bellarmino quotes Exod. 4. where Moses is given the 'potestas faciendi miraculum', that the Hebrews should believe, and Matthew 10, 7 and 8 where this 'potestas' was added to Apostolic preaching.

4. Aug. De Civitate Dei 22.8.

5. 'vel sicut scholastici dicunt contra naturam'

extraordinary mission or vocation carries no necessity for miracles, for John the Baptist worked no miracles, and Whitaker himself is rather sceptical over many miracles attributed to the saints eg. Catherine of Siena, Francis Xavier and others. The general view of the Fathers 'in controversiis de religione, miraculis non finiendam esse aut ex miraculis doctrinam judicandam esse' --and therefore miracles are not true notes of the church --'miracula non indicare ecclesiam'.

In his Reply to Sanders's 'Demonstrationes' and to Bellarmine, Whitaker is also sceptical over the talking images, apparitions, visions, levitations at mass (recorded by Ludovicus of Granada) and incorruptible bodies (eg. of Dominic) --he does not deny the reality of miracles and the necessity of them in God's own plan to arouse or confirm faith, but he does question the necessity of them to prove true faith or the presence of the true church. Gregory of Turin had exposed many frauds --- 'Satanas mille artifex est'. Chrysostom complained 'miracula potius inveniri nunc apud eos qui sunt falsi Christiani'. The destruction of the People of God can in fact be hastened 'non aperta vi sed fraudibus' as in Daniel 8.23-24; perhaps Capistrano is near the mark when he said 'Apud Deum et Papam sufficit pro ratione voluntas' since the Pontiff sits asking 'Quis similis mihi?' and decides alone true faith on the evidence of miracles. Whitaker gives no credit to the whole process of canonization. Alexander 3 in his Letter to King Canute of Sweden (c.1170 AD) had asserted that none be accounted a canonized saint without Papal authority -- this was included in the Decretals of Gregory IX (c.1148 -1241 AD) and became part of Western Canon Law. The long legal process is described in the Codex Juris Canonici (canons 1999 -2141) involving the Promotor Fidei popularly known as the Advocatus Diaboli. The first formal mention of the Office appears to be in the mid-15th. Century.

-
1. Bellarmine states that the birth of John the Baptist was a miracle; Whitaker says that this is true but it was not a divine seal of his Ministry made known to all. What Bellarmine is talking about are 'manifesta miracula, omnibus nota, per quae populo commensentur(sic) doctores quasi a Deo missi'.
 2. Whitaker Contra Bellarmine 4. Quaest. 5.2.
 3. Chrysostom Hom 49. on Matthew.

Augustine is no exception to this view -- 'miracula non indicare ecclesiam' --- he condemned the secret visions and miracles of the Donatists which they put forward without any text, while they rejected catholic miracles, and he writes 'ecclesiam demonstrari ex miraculis non ex Scripturis'.² -- Bellarmine should note that he uses the word 'demonstrari' not 'probari'. Augustine's view was that miracles are 'probabilia in ecclesia non necessari et firma'.

The twelfth note -- 'lumen Propheticum' or 'donum Prophetiae' -- is, agrees Whitaker, a very great gift and one that satisfies the true church under the Old as well as the New Covenant, but it must be rejected as a perpetual note of the true church in the sense that Bellarmine used the words;³ there is a sense in which the true church is always prophetic by its very nature, but this is included under the note of 'veritas in verbo'.

Bellarmino concludes the Fifteen Notes with the three dealing with the unhappy end of those who oppose the true church, the happy state of those within the true church,⁴ and the personal witness of adversaries as to the high esteem in which the true Church of Rome is held among the nations, but all but one of his references on the latter refer to the early Roman Church; the one relevant reference was that Bonaventura recorded that the Sultan had held St. Francis in the highest honour (sic). Whitaker wonders whether the nations have much to thank Rome for now -- the Crusades, the Inquisition especially against the Jews, rather darkened the horizon, and if the Sultan honoured St. Francis in the East, he had returned to Assisi only to find his leadership had passed to others 'more suited' to the work, but with less appreciation of his

-
1. Augustine De Unitate Eccles. 16.; Vide De Civit. Dei. 10.16
 2. Augustine Ep. Fundament. 4 et 5.
 3. Bellarmine cites Joel 2.28; Acts 2.17-19; Isaiah 41. 2-3; -- a gift of prophecy 'peculiare ad tempus'.
 4. Bellarmine had listed 'claritas et amplitudo' among the notes of the true church -- but when faced with the text of Augustine (Ep. 48 Ad Vincentium) - 'catholicos fuisse paucos' -- and the historic facts that the catholics had been driven into obscurity under Diocletian, Maximilian, Valerian, and Galien, and the ejection of catholic bishops under the Arians, Campion had to admit at the Second Colloquy in the Tower that 'amplitudo et claritas' were qualities and not notes of the church.

simple faith and devotion. Whitaker agrees that many enemies of the church had died horrid and tragic deaths --but he again warns Bellarmine not to believe everything Cochlaeus and Bolsec had said about the Reformers! Bellarmine should read Beza's Life of Calvin

1. 'Mendacia Cochlaei' -- Johannes Cochlaeus (1479 - 1552 AD) from 1521 AD became the bitter opponent of Luther. 'Innudentia Bolseci' -- Jerome Hermes Bolsec (d. 1584 AD) became a Calvinist but refused to accept Calvin's teaching on predestination; in December 1551 AD he was banished from Geneva but the episode was sufficiently important for Calvin to reformulate his doctrine of predestination in the Consensus Genevensis. Bolsec became a vitriolic writer and began an unseemly personal attack on Calvin and in his last years he returned to the Roman Church. His Life of Calvin was hostile, though he did approve of one act of Calvin viz. the burning of Servetus.

Bolsec describes Calvin's death as 'vermibus consumptionem' dying amidst horrible blasphemies against the Papists. It is true, writes Whitaker, that he suffered greatly in the disease and fatigue of an overworked body but this was no wonder; annually he held 286 conciones, gave 186 lectures, beside many other labours and he was quite exhausted by the age of 55. He did not live 'molliter et delicatè'. On the eve of his death he wrote to Farrell now 80 years of age, urging their friendship, and asking that he put himself to no trouble as he had planned to visit him. At his death he was surrounded by friends and 'animam efflavisse leniter et placidè sine violento singultu, sine pedum manuumque motu ut dormire potius quam mori videretur'. The Romanists had tried to make much of 'illa horrenda exempla irae Dei' to prove that the Reformers died miserably, without hope, tormented, cut off from grace. The end was sometimes painful with disease, but they were not alone. Vide John of Salisbury in Polycratice 6.24, about Paul 2nd. in Gratian, Eck in Carion's 'Chronica'. Pighius is said to have died insane. Whitaker also mentions the death of Cardinal Lotharingus, Sadoletus, Crescentius, (the first President of the Council of Trent) and his black dog with glittering eyes (micantibus oculis), Francis Spier, Guarlacus; Whitaker concludes that because a man dies a fearful death, it is no proof that he dies out of grace or does not profess the true faith --therefore this cannot be a sure and certain note of the true church.

2. 'More of a panegyric than a historically accurate biography' Cross ODCC n. 165.

(1564 AD) , Melanchthon and John Sleidanus , and Whitaker rejects the story that Luther died suddenly in rioting and drunken laughter --- Luther died² in serious and godly mood, of great sanctity and piety and learned religion , the matter under discussion at his death being whether some would recognise others in that life to come.' After dinner he went to his bed feeling his illness more grave , and called for his wife and John the tutor of his children. Count Mansfeld arrived, with whom he had many pious words and then he commended his soul 'placide et suavissime sine cruciatu '. Temporal felicity is not a universal and permanent note of the true church --eg. Josiah (2 Kings 23,29); Jovian (c 332 -64 AD) died suddenly by suffocation though a great ornament of orthodoxy , Gratian was killed by the swords of his enemies (sic) . God does not work out His purpose on the simple formula of felicity as the reward for piety , or piety would cease to be piety and become a step to felicity . True religion cannot be tied to victories , success , or prosperity , though the hand of God has been seen in the death of Justinian the Elder³ . If victory be the test of true faith , then the Armada needs explaining , comments Whitaker , who uses Augustine's word on this Great Enterprise of Philip 2nd. --- 'quisquis non videt, caecus ; quisquis videt nec laudat , ingratus ; quisquis laudanti reluctatur, insanus est !'⁴

-
1. Sleidanus was the annalist and historiographer of the German Reformation. Born 1506 AD he came to England 1551 AD for a short time , at Crammer's suggestion , but soon returned to the Continent where he represented a group of South German cities at the Council of Trent (1551-2 AD). In 1554 AD he was appointed Professor of Law at Strassburg . His 'impartiality met with little favour from his contemporaries, Protestant or Catholic ' Cross ODCC p. 1264.
 2. Sleidanus Bk. 16 ;Vide Melanchthon sub Luthero. Whitaker refers Bellarmine to the Letter of Nicholas Gallasius affixed to his Commentary on Isaiah, to Bezà's 'Vitae' contained in his 'Opuscula' and his Second Apology against F.Claud.de Xaintes , which deal with these calumnies.
 3. Evagrius H.E. 4.16 ;Justinian the Elder while a catholic, ruled well and was blessed , but when he became a heretic and issued the Edict for receiving heretics , he died quickly'. Heraclius ,while a catholic had victories against the Persians ,but when he became a Monothelite , he developed a rare disease and died (John Zonara). Vide Socrates H.E.7. 18.
 4. Augustine De Civitate Dei 1.7. Vide idem 1.8. ; 2.23.;--Augustine even calls worldly felicity 'infelicem' .The saints spent much more time in affliction and persecution than in worldly felicity. Moses chose to suffer affliction for Christ rather than the pleasures of Egypt. 'Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you' Mt. 5.10

1
 Luther had mentioned seven notes of the true church, with which Whitaker concurs, but he notes that ignorance of that Gospel or of dogmas based upon it does not mean that a church forfeits all claim to be the true church, if the fault be immediately rectified. A horse may be left with only two legs but it is still a horse, not a pig, or a cow, and so it would appear that Whitaker would not unchurch a church because of error, for the error may be 'in membris non membrorum'. By 'praedicatio' Whitaker means 'explanatio, expositio, interpolatio, et declaratio illius doctrinae quam in Verbo suo scripto proposuit et revelavit Deus' and through it, the catholic church begets and nourishes faith. So those who were not before the People of God, by the efficient cause of the Gospel, become the 'Populus Dei et Ecclesia' and therefore this is the true 'Nota et Index necessario'. Irenaeus regards the church as the most ample and rich depository of Divine Wisdom in possessing the Scriptures --- recourse must be had to it for true exposition and definition. This leads to the Public Profession of Faith, the Sacraments, which constitute the Form of the Church and differentiates it from all other gatherings of men (coetus hominum). True doctrine therefore is a note of the church --- as Augustine says², 'we know His Body best in the Words of the Head' --- 'vera religio coelestam civitatem instituit'.³

No controversy on the church can ever escape the perennial question whether the church can err or defect from Faith. Duraeus⁴ described Whitaker as a 'dolt' for ever entertaining the idea, to which Whitaker replies 'don't shout a triumph before you have won the victory'. The possibility of corruption entering in is

1. Luther De Concil. et Eccles.:-

- a) pure and sincere preaching of the Gospel b) lawful administration of the sacraments c) the Eucharist d) authority of kings
 e) ordained ministry f) Public Prayer, Psalmody, Catechism and
 g) persecution --- the 'mysterium crucis'

2. Augustine De ~~Unitate~~ **Eccles.** 2.

3. Augustine De Civitate Dei 6.3. ; Epiphanius Contra Montan. Haeres.

2.1. wrote that discord from Scripture makes a soul 'alienus a Sancta Catholica Ecclesia'; Vide Chrysostom Hom 49 on Matthew where the true church is only known through the Scriptures -- Stapleton (De Princip. Doctr. l. 25) made the interesting comment that this work was written by an Arian; Lactantius 4.30 wrote 'sole igitur Catholica Ecclesia est quae verum cultum retinet' without which a man is alien to eternal life and salvation.

4. Whitaker Contra Duraeum De Historia 7.9.

seen in Christ's Parable of the *σίτηνια*¹, of Paul's statement on the corruption of the Corinthians, and the Galatian Church was in danger of corruption by another Gospel.³ Eusebius states⁴ that not all public doctrine was so pure and incorruptible after the Apostles as it was before, as Polycrates of Ephesus had said⁵, that the church was a pure virgin and undefiled during the time of the Apostles but after that time were the beginnings of heresies.⁶ To err, however,

-
1. Matthew 13.25 ; 1 John 2.18 --already many antichrists.
 2. 2 Cor. 11. 3. ; 1 Cor. 11.19 -- 'oportet haerese esse; ut probati manifesti fiant'
 3. Gal.1.6 et 3.1. ; 2 Thess. 2.3. -- 'mysterium iniquitatis iam operatur'

4. Eusebius H.E. 3.32.

5. *ibid* μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρή καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἐμείνει ἡ ἐκκλησία

Duraeus states that Eusebius did not get this from Polycrates but from Hegesippus (mid-2nd. Century) whose Five Books of Memoirs (*ὑπομνήματα*) no longer extant, as Bellarmine had rightly pointed out, are preserved in Eusebius (H.E. 4.8.) who refers to them as the 'unerring tradition of the Apostolic Preaching' -- *τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικῆς κηρύγματος*. Whitaker (Disputatio Qu. 6.3.) is content with the correction, as of little moment, but points out that Polycrates (c.190 AD) could not have known of the claim that Christ left to the power of the Pontiff the power to protect that virginity, since this learned man sturdily opposed Pope Victor (189 - 199 AD) in the Quartodeciman controversy, so that Victor withdrew from communion with him. Whitaker mentions that Jerome in his Catalogue sub Hegesippo said that the Five Books contained what was done by Christ, the Apostles, and succeeding bishops, down to his own time; there was a Paris edition (1511 AD) of these works which are somewhat suspect because this new Hegesippus mentions the Church of Constantinople, the 'New Rome as being equal to the Old Rome' which was an anachronism.

6. Eusebius H.E. 4.22.4. 'false christ, false prophets, false apostles, who divided the unity of the church eg. Thebuthians and the Seven Sects, springing from the Menandrianists, Marcianists, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Basilidians, and Saturnilians; Stapleton points out (Controvers. 2. Qu. 3.) that the Reformers seem to be in great doubt when the church began to defect i.e. Luther dated the defection after the Council of Constance or after 900 AD; the Editors of the Augsburg Confession dated it 300 years before this; Calvin after 500 AD; Melanchthon in his Common Places after 300 AD; the Magdeburg Centuriators and Beza after the time of the Apostles. With such variety, the question still remains to which period can appeal be made when the church is supposed not to have defected. ?

is not to perish and Whitaker takes Stapleton to task for comparing the Ecclesia Anglicana with the Donatists who said that 'ecclesiam omnium Gentium aut apostatasse aut periisse' ; Luke 18.8. -- 'when the Son of Man comes, shall He find (the) faith (τὴν πίστιν) on the earth' --- the examples of Moses and Elijah² indicate the time of 'generalis corruptio fidei, et haereses et pravae opiniones passim obtinebunt, quia omnes propter electos seducentur' ; the dispute is not on the Church of the Elect which cannot defect, but on the Visible Church. Bellarmine had argued, following the Rheims Annotations³, that the faith referred to in Luke 18.8 was the faith that works miracles, but Whitaker reminds him that this cannot be so, because the meaning is that 'caritas multorum refrigescet' ; true faith (fides formata) is always conjoined with charity. The text of Luke 18.8. is 'when the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith (τὴν πίστιν) on the earth, i.e. the necessary and proper faith towards Christ. Some take it to mean 'the faith which perseveres in prayer' since the statement followed the story of the unjust judge but here again there is no suggestion of merely the faith in miracles. The final apostasy will carry with it the concluding and most appalling phenomenon of the Revelation of the Antichrist, the complete spiritual apostasy or falling away from Christ. The power of the Antichrist will be so great that the church will be excluded from the society of men --- the church will not have 'publicum splendorem publicum statum et regimen nec libera sanctorum munerum exercitia'

1. Whitaker agrees that Adam and Eve were the 'tota Ecclesia earum temporis' -- 'ante lapsum, in lapsu, et post lapsum'. Sin and apostasy does not mean that a man ceases to be 'de ecclesia'. Bellarmine had written that the church began in Adam but that when Christ suffered, 'ecclesiam in sola Maria fuisse'. Whitaker refers to the solitary candle at Tenebrae in the Triduum to indicate the defection of Israel.
2. Bellarmine makes the point that the 400 prophets of Baal were not of Israel, but functioned under the impious **Phob**. Whitaker replies that the point remains -- Elijah's ministry was to Israel, but if Bellarmine maintains that Judah (not Israel) remained the true church, then the argument still applies ~~to~~ Jeremiah ; vide Zeph. 3.12 ; Isaiah 24.13 ; in Luke 12. 32 Christ says of His church 'lexiguum et rugillum cresem'
3. J.B. on Luke 18.8 has 'when the Son of Man comes, will He find any faith on earth' ?

The discussions which had become prominent in the School of Salamanca on the system of Probabilism ----- if the lawfulness of an action is in doubt, it is lawful to follow a solidly probable opinion favouring liberty, even though the opposing opinion favouring the law be more probable ----- is referred to by Whitaker in **his** controversy with Stapleton. ² The Romanists had put forward the opinion that the Church can err and be deceived (falli et errare potest) in certain things, especially in those not revealed by God, but in the sphere of probabilism ³ faith is neither removed nor excluded, not truth taken away. What the church believes and says should be believed, not only in those things 'simpliciter ad salutem necessaria sunt' but in other things, is true. Alphonsus ⁴ however said that the church can err in those things that do not pertain to 'jus' (right) and can err in fact eg. whether Charles Vth. was ever in Italy. ⁵ Campion admitted the church can err in fact i.e. it can condemn an innocent bishop, or absolve a guilty one. Bellarmine had said the church 'absolutè non posse errare nec in rebus absolutè necessariis nec in aliis quae credenda vel facienda, sive habeantur expresse in Scripturis sive non' but he uses the word 'expresse' rather ambiguously. Whitaker comments -- without the casuistry or skill of the confessor (sic) -- that morality and action as well as faith must be tied to the unchanging norm of Scripture, but he also adds 'fidei veritas quoad nos ecclesiae auctoritate nititur, ut domus a columna sustentatur' though he cautiously slips in the phrase that this is not quite the same thing as Bellarmine's contention that 'ergo verum est quicquid ecclesia probat; falsum quicquid illa improbat'.

-
1. 'sic est opinio probabilis, licitum est eam sequi, licet opposita probabilior sit'; Medina, the Dominican, in his 'Commentary on the Summa of Thomas Aquinas' (1577 AD). Till the rise of Probabilism in the mid-17th. Century, this was the opinion of both Dominicans and Jesuits, though the latter developed the 'principle of possession' i.e. in cases of doubt, one is not obliged to change the state of things i.e. if a law is doubtful, human freedom remains 'in possession'. By 1604 AD the tendency towards laxism i.e. allowing men to act freely on a slight chance of probability was condemned by the Jesuit General Acquaviva.
 2. Quaest. 4; Stapleton De Princip. Doctr. 3.6. had written 'ipsi carnales peccant, quidem sed non errant'.
 3. 'in probabili errore'
 4. Alphonsus Contra Haeres. 4.
 5. Campion Colloquy on the Second Day.

The church as the 'Pillar and Ground' of the truth leads into a discussion of 1 Timothy 3.15 --- **στυλος**

καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας

and Whitaker notes that there is a division of opinion on this text as to whether the (local) church is the 'pillar and ground of the truth' or Timothy himself i.e. not how a particular church should behave in these matters but how pastors should act. **Στυλος** is generally used of persons in the N.T.²; the Letters to the Churches of Lyons and Vienne³ speak of the martyr Attalus as **στυλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα** with an obvious reminiscence of this passage. If, however, this phrase refers to Timothy should we not expect it to be in the accusative case in apposition to **πρὸς σέ**!; on the other hand, Timothy is the subject of the sentence. So either would be right :-

a) nominative as subject of **εἰδῆς** and outside the **δεῖ** clause.

b) accusative within the **δεῖ** clause.

Furthermore **ἑδραῖωμα** (not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible, though Paul has **ἑδραῖος** several times) means a 'bulwark, stay, (firmamentum) rather than ground or foundation (fundamentum)' --- Bellarmine had used 'firmamentum' and had given it the meaning of 'fundamentum'⁴; claiming that the truth of the faith depends upon the authority of the church (ecclesiae autoritate innititur) and 'quicquid statuit aut docet ecclesia id esse verum, et recipiendum et quicquid improbat, id falsum esse et rejiciendum'. Chrysostom wrote⁵ :- **ἡ γὰρ ἀληθεία ἐστὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ**

στυλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα ---

and Irenaeus wrote 'scripta Apostolorum esse columnam et firmamentum fidei'

1. Controvers. 2. Quaest. 3 also at fol. 488 where Whitaker says that the Rheims Annotators had 'multa argumenta congerunt et accumulunt accurate et vere Ecclesiam non posse errare'; they argued that the Church has the Holy Spirit (John 14.16 ff.) and therefore cannot err. Whitaker says that the same promise applies to the individual believer (Romans 8.9.) but no one concedes that he cannot err. None of the titles -- Spouse of Christ, House of God, Christ's Body, Hereditas, Regnum, -- carry immunity from error. Error can exist, but not prevail; error separates from Christ but not 'continue'.

2. eg. Gal. 2.9.; Apoc. 3.12. 3. Eusebius H.E. 5.1.6.

4. So does the AV. The Jerusalem Bible has 'the church of the Living God which upholds the truth and keeps it safe'.

5. Chrysostom on 1 Tim. 3.15 Hom. XL. ed. Montfaucon Vol. XL. p.667

and ' columna et firmamentum Ecclesiae est Evangelium et Spiritus Vitae ' ¹. The church can defend, sustain and vindicate the truth but nevertheless she is not inso facto immune from error ² -- the Fathers rightly appeal to the church, what it decrees, what it thinks, but this does not confer infallibility ³; to appeal to a judge in matters of law does not give the judge infallibility ³. Our knowledge (scientia) writes Whitaker, is not perfect and 'errorum esse scientiae contrarium ² omnisque erroris matrem ignorantiam esse' -- Bellarmine is afraid to admit error on the part of the church because this would remove and destroy the nature of the church since it would introduce doubt and defection. No such prosyllogism is really necessary -- error does not unchurch particular churches ⁴ and the fact that Gregory Nazianzen ⁵ looking back on 1 Nicea and 1 Constantinople felt that the Councils of the Church had become worse not better, that Augustine could write 'Concilia etiam plenaria errare posse ⁶', suggests that the Fathers did not regard infallibility as of the proper nature of the church.

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.11.
 2. Bellarmine quotes Matthew 18.17 (si ecclesiam non audierit) that under pain of anathema all should obey Conciliar decrees and assent ~~to~~ things uncertain, for the church cannot err. Whitaker concurs with the former under caution (Councils do not have the 'facultas non errandi' that Scripture has) but rejects the conclusion as non sequitur. Matthew 18.17 however refers not to doctrine but to ecclesiastical cens^ure, against the brother who refuses reconciliation; a pious minister may excommunicate but he is not infallible.
 3. Vide Augustine Contra Cresc. Grammat. 33. --the appeal to the church is only in the matter in hand viz. the baptism of heretics; Augustine does not refer to appeals 'de omnibus rebus simpliciter'
 4. Isaiah 56. 10 and 11; John 8.8.
 5. Gregory Nazianzen. Ep. 42. Ad Procop.
 6. Augustine De Baptismo 2.3.

Chapter 11

The Authority of Scripture.

Whitaker wrote two major works on Scripture. One was the 'De Sacra Scriptura' written in 1583 AD and published in 1588 AD with a Dedication to Lord Burghley; this was the only work of his to be published in his lifetime. It was mainly an answer to Bellarmine and Stapleton. The other work, 'De Autoritate Sacrae Scripturae' is dedicated to Archbishop Whitgift, the date of the Dedicatory Preface being 19th. April 1594 AD and it concerns mainly Stapleton, who is described as 'Anglo-Papista in Academia Louaviensi'. It had been against Whitaker that Stapleton had written his 'Defensio Ecclesiasticae Autoritatis' in 1592 AD. Whitaker confesses in his 'De Autoritate Sacrae Scripturae' that he had 'laboured with great pains to read and understand what Stapleton wished to prove and say, both sincerely and without malice, but had found much delirious ranting'.

An English translation of Whitaker's 'De Sacra Scriptura' is contained in the Parker Society Edition and also in Harleian MS 789, while the Latin text is preserved in the Geneva Edition of Whitaker's works.² The Harleian MS contains marginal and textual alterations, all in the same hand, and probably Whitaker's, but whereas the marginal notes in Greek are incorporated as a rule in the Parker Edition, few of the English ones are, nor are the alterations and additions within the text itself eg. Parker Society Edition p.526 omits the English marginal note on the Laodiceans but the Greek marginal quotations on fol. 40 a. and fol. 81.b. are incorporated in the Parker Society Edition and also appear in the Geneva Edition which points to an English translation by Whitaker

-
1. Parker Society Edition 'A Disputation on Holy Scripture' transl. and ed. by W. Fitzgerald 1869 AD.
Harleian MS 789 ; a
fol. 1-112 contains Quaest. 6 (On Tradition) Parker. Society Ed.
p. 498 ff.
fol. 113 - contains Quaest. 2. (On Authentic Editions of the
197 Scriptures) Parker Soc. Ed. p.110 -274.
fol. 198 - ~~275~~ contains Quaest. 3 (On the Authority of Scripture)
235 Parker Soc. Ed. p. 275 - 358 .
 2. Geneva Edition of Whitaker's Works Vol.1. 256 - 425.

or a near hand with corrections and alterations not noted in the Geneva Edition eg. fol. 26 b. at the beginning of Quaest. 6 10. the marginal notes do not appear in the Parker Society Edition. Yet there are verbal similarities between the Parker Society Edition and the Harleian MS¹; the similarities are too close to be accidental. In the Harleian MS (in English) there are marginal references to pages in another edition.²

In the Geneva Edition of De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae³ the marginal notes of an editor are comments distributed between Stapleton and Whitaker -- descriptions which each had made of the other eg. Mendacium Impudens, Assine Professor, Stulte Professor, Maledicta et Virulentia Lingua, vana et falsa evasio, crassus error et stupor, biliosus es! . Fr. Brodrick writes⁴ 'Stapleton, great man that he was, became ill-tempered in debate, and laboured the doctor (Whitaker) furiously' --- 'should Bellarmine once more step into the arena and devote a few hours to cleaning up Whitaker's Augean Stables, then will that fellow find himself blacker than the blackest coal dug out of a mine'. Stapleton wrote with pen dipped in gall --- Whitaker was 'indocte doctor, futilissime disputator, barbare scriptor, fatue assine -- his head was thicker than any mallet ever made, a ridiculous head, fitter to wear the cap and bells of a fool than a doctor's boards'. Bellarmine had better taste, though against the Magdeburg Centuriators he vented 'certain sarcasms and was too ready to brand Protestant assertions as lies' -- Fuller said of him, that he wrote 'ingenuously, using sometimes slanting, sometimes downright, railing' and that Bellarmine was the 'fiercest dog behind Whitaker'.

5

Stapleton complained that Whitaker as a 'tyro ineptior' was much too ready to add to Stapleton's propositions words which were not his, and then draw conclusions which were certainly not Stapleton's --- even 'a boy at school would know the rules of dialectic better than Whitaker appeared to do'; Whitaker was

1. eg. Harleian MS fol. 174; Parker Soc. Ed. p. 235

2. eg. Harleian MS fol. 28 a.

3. Geneva Ed. of Whitaker's Works Vol. 2. 1. - 509.

4. James Brodrick S.J. 'Robert Bellarmine' (1961 ed.) p. 83.

5. Stapleton 'Defensio' 2.1. (cp. Whitaker's De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae 1 3. 19.8.

an 'assinus in academia', for he not only violated the rules of logic in not meeting the demands of the antecedent premise before going on to the subsequent conclusion, but he even added to Stapleton's antecedent propositions things which were not there in the first place, and makes a conclusion far and away beyond the mind, word, and scope of the original proposition eg. Whitaker made Stapleton say 'certain things not of the Apostles and Prophets are received into the Canon (by the judgement of the church)'; Stapleton protests that he never said that -- what he did say was 'certain things not of any particular Apostle (eg. Mark and Luke) are found in the Canon (of Scripture) --- why? --- because though not Apostolic in the strict sense of authorship, by the judgement of the church, they were believed to be Apostolic in teaching and content'. Another example was when Stapleton was supposed to have said 'ergo ecclesie iudicio totus canon Scripturarum nititur ac definitur; ex eius ergo testimonio Scriptura habet suam auctoritatem'. Stapleton protests that he never said these words nor is it a logical conclusion of what he had said. Stapleton denied that Scripture had its authority from the church; its authority is from the Holy Spirit. 'The testimony of the church does not', says Stapleton, 'lend (conciat) faith and authority to Scripture but makes clear (patefacere) to us the faith and authority of Scripture. No dogma has its truth from the church; the truth of all dogma is made known (innotescere) to us through the church (per ecclesiam)'. Whitaker replies that he has done his best with the 'confusam quandam verborum massam, informemque congeriem' supplied by Stapleton, but it would appear that the latter's mind had changed considerably since he produced his Book (i.e. Defensio Bk.8) whence the premise and conclusion are both drawn.

Stapleton also accuses Whitaker of being a 'barbarum scriptorem et acri quadam reprehendendi impetigine laborantem' since Whitaker had used an unrevised text of Bellarmine -- 'in campis producis ut contra illa disputes quae in eius (i.e. Bellarmine) dicatis **manuscriptis** invenisti, sed in editione Sartoriana vel praetermissa vel correctis (sunt) ut ipsemet agnoscis'. Whitaker replies that Bellarmine's works in MS were in his hands almost a year before the

1
Sartorian edition was produced , but he noticed on reading the latter that certain things had been omitted or changed ,and so he always advised the reader on this point ' non ut id vitio verterem Bellarmino sed ut me calumniae suspicione liberarem ' -- this is hardly 'barbarum et inhumanum ' eg. Quaest. 6.9 where Bellarmine states that Scripture is insufficient to determine the faith ,since Tradition is needed for example to determine the essential parts (matter and form) of the sacraments. This argument , as others, was omitted in the Sartorian edition.

2
Calvin had rightly pointed out, says Whitaker, that if the authority of Scripture depended upon a decision of the church, this would expose its acceptance or rejection to an authority outside itself which is not necessarily Apostolic or Patristic. The reverence due to Scripture is of two kinds -- that which Scripture contains within itself viz the coherence of Scripture in Revelation , and that which is owed to it from outside/Scripture i.e. the 'approbatio ecclesiae ' which adds nothing to the authority of Scripture but only by this act gives authority to its own Faith and confirms it. When the church receives the Canonical Scripture as true and adds the stamp of her own authority ,she does not make that authoritative which before was doubtful , but shows by her assent , her reverence for the Word . Stapleton had done a 'lot of juggling' with the words ' in se ' , 'ex se ' , 'quoad se ' , 'quoad nos ' ,which at various times he had inserted in Calvin's sentences when having the phrase ' quae reverentia Scripturae debeatur' in mind. The external and ordinary testimony of the church is not necessary for Scripture but

-
1. First Vol. printed 1586 AD by David Satorius of Ingöädstadt ,and bore the diploma of Pope Sixtus V th. the Emperor Rudolph, and the Republic of Venice. It was dedicated to the Pope who sent the author 400 gold pieces to help in the expenses of publication.
 2. Calvin Inst. 1.7.

1

it is for the church. Augustine wrote 'canonicam Scripturam tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti suis certis terminis contineri ; ergo terminis suis canonica Scriptura iisque iamdudum certis atque fixis circumscripta est ' and he certainly thought of no addition to be made 'ecclesiae iudicio ' over and above the books he had named.

2

Whitaker then mentions Canon 60 of the Synod of Laodicea the first Synod at which the Books of Scripture were made the subject of a special ordinance, but there are problems here. First, the date of this Synod is not definite , though the mention of the Photinians in canon 7 suggests a date not before 345 AD ; the general consensus of modern opinion is for c. 365 AD. The second problem is that of the genuineness of this canon which has been very much in doubt . Spittler's view in 1777 AD was that the list of Scriptural books was no part of the original canon adopted by Laodicea (i.e. canon 59) ; further that Dionysius Exiguus did not include this canon in his translation of the Laodicean canons , though on this point it may be said that Dionysius may have excluded it because in Rome, where he composed his work, another list, that of Innocent I was already in use. The canon is omitted by John of Antioch , an able collector of canons, and the 6th. Century Bishop Martin of Braga , though he has the 59th. canon does not have the 60th. Westcott , however, favoured the view that though external evidence weighed heavily against the authenticity of the list, there is strong evidence for its inclusion at not too late a date. It is necessary to look to the West for the first synodical decision on the canon of Scripture viz. the Third Council of Carthage c. 397 AD.

Even so, Whitaker has a strong position here ,

in spite of the (understandable) omission of the Apocalypse. The

-
1. Augustine Contra Cresc., Donat. 2.5. (ML.43. 445) Vide Contra Faust. Manich. 2.5.
 2. In the margin , Whitaker has canon 58 . Vide 'Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers Vol.14 Decrees and Canons of the 7 Ecumenical Councils ' p. 159. Westcott 'Canon of the N.T.' 4th. ed. p.431 ff.
 3. There is a further point that Whitaker did not mention, that the Synod of Laodicea was in fact only a small gathering of clergy from parts of Lydia and Phrygia. Gratian mentions 32 Fathers, though from a Parisian MS of Isidore , Gratian mentions 24 Fathers passing 64 canons.

strong exclusive note of the early canons of the church and of Patristic lists, argue against Stapleton, that the case for the canon is not so open as he had supposed, a point further enforced by the fact that the Quinisext Council of 692 AD accepted the List of Gregory of Nazianzen (and of Amphilochius of Iconium) drawn up some 300 years previously. The careful selection indicated by these lists would indicate the mind of the church, that such judgement was based not merely upon ecclesiastical authority but actual recognition of the Word of God --- a canonical position promulgated by Jerome and Augustine in the West, and received in France (Eucherius of Lyons--5th. Century) Spain (Isidore of Seville -- 6th. Century) Britain (Bede -- 7th. Century) and Ireland (Sedulius -- 8th./9th. Centuries).

Cajetan in his 'Commentary on all the authentic historical books of the Old Testament' dedicated to Clement VIIIth. wrote 'the whole Latin Church owes very much to St. Jerome ... on account of his separation of the canonical books from the uncanonical books '. Cajetan's views were dominated by considerations of actual Apostolic authorship, but it was under Catharinus who largely abandoned the argument from history, that refuge was taken in the decrees of Innocent, Gelasius, and Eugenius IVth. From the divergent views expressed at the Third Session of the Council of Trent (February 1546 AD) there emerged the decree which became 'de fide' embracing the O.T., N.T., and Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Maccabees, in the same order as the decree of Eugenius IVth. This decree, ratified by 53 prelates, came under close non-Roman scrutiny on the grounds that few of those 53 prelates were distinguished for historical learning, nor fitted to pronounce on such a subject determined largely by antiquity. This was Whitaker's point, that the decision was so opposed to the spirit and letter of the Greek and Latin Fathers in their original judgements, that it had two effects:-

- a) made for a doctrinal equalisation of the disputed and acknowledged books, at variance with the traditional view of the West,
- b) it was unprecedented in the sense that recent ecclesiastical usage was converted into an article of belief.

1. Whitaker does not mention the 39th. Paschal Letter of Athanasius (367 AD)

The Canon (of Scripture) became not a problem but a tradition, and where doubts existed (eg. Augustine's doubts over the Apostolic authorship of Hebrews, though he had no doubt about its canonicity) they became the grounds of an erudite exercise rather than of exclusion. Gerson¹ had written 'ex his aperitur intellectiis qualiter dicta Apostolorum et discipulorum Christi sunt alterius auctoritatis quoad aliquid etiam purè de fide quam successorum suorum' and 'consequenter deducitur quomodo major fuit primitivae ecclesiae auctoritas quoad praedicta quam nunc sit et quod non est in potestate papae aut concilii aut ecclesiae immutare traditiones datas ab evangelistis et a Paulo sicut quidam delirant. Nec habent quoad hoc quod est facere aliquid esse purè de fide parem auctoritatis firmitatem'.

Whitaker does not deny that it belongs to the church 'ut Scripturas approbet, agnoscat, recipiat, promulget, commendet suis omnibus' but Stapleton² had written 'Scripturis nos fidem adhibere ob ecclesiae commendationem tantum' which in fact is not true, for this amounts to a denial of the internal testimony of the Spirit 'a Scripturarum certa dijudicatione'. Stapleton had claimed that the testimony of the church was the medium sufficient and infallible 'ad fidem ingenerandam, tametsi efficax non fiat sine interno testimonio' and that such a testimony was comparable to the miracles and preaching of Christ as 'media apta ad fidem procreandam nil tamen sine testimonio Spiritus valuerunt'. The external testimony of the church, however, cannot be equated with the miracles and preaching of Christ as the effective and generative medium of faith, for Christ's preaching was 'per se sine ullo alio testimonio αὐτοπίστοσ'. The testimony of the church is capable of error

-
1. Gerson De Vita Spirit. Lect. 2. cor. 7.
 2. Stapleton 'Defensio Ecclesiasticae Auctoritatis' (1592 AD) Bk. 9. accused Whitaker of being a Calvinist turned Lutheran; Whitaker replies 'nos Calvinistae non sumus' though there is much in Calvin that is true. Whitaker refuses the charge of 'laesa majestas' in respect of the authority of the church; on the contrary he will not have the church separated from Scripture, nor the church in spite of Scripture, and this is the position of the Fathers, where there is no suggestion that we must have the Pontiff 'pro numine' and as such become a sect. Stapleton generates much heat here--Whitaker is again 'Professor Assinane.'; 'Homo Stupidissime; Homo Turpissime; Scribis cum stilo Calviniano' and he is castigated for holding

and is not therefore *ἀυτόπistos* nor can it be 'in pari gradu cum Christi praedicatione'. The authority of the church is not the formal cause of faith, nor the foundation of our faith. The authority of teaching, preaching, testifying, and authenticating (consignandi) necessary to the church is not placed under its will (sub voluntate ecclesiae) -- the foundation of its faith is from Scripture, and the church must not be severed from it.

Whitaker does not dispute the view that the external Medium of the Voice of the church can be such that obedience to the Faith is obedience to the church, the Wisdom of the Faith is the Wisdom of the Church, so that the church is the 'mater omnium fidelium sicut Deus est Pater' but he refuses Stapleton's argument that the voice of the church is the 'formalis ratio fidei' and that

 contd. the necessity of infused grace before justifying grace, and and of infused faith alone without the testimony, doctrine, and magisterium of the church.

1. Whitaker here mentions the views of :-

- a) Cusanus -- that the authority of Scripture lies in the 'approbatio Ecclesiae'
- b) Prierias, Prefect of the Papal Palace -- that the doctrine of the Roman Church and the Pontiff was the infallible rule of faith -- from this, Scripture derived its strength (robur) and authority.
- c) Pighius -- that the authority of Scripture was 'ex ecclesiasticae traditionis autoritate'
- d) Thomas Moore -- who said that 'Christ professed (praeposuisse) the church before all the evangelists'
- e) Costerus SJ -- who said that 'Christus ecclesiam a chartaceis Scripturis pendere noluit'
- f) Verratus the Carmelite -- who said that the Church authenticates (authenticare) Scripture and what 'firmitas' is found in the Gospel is not 'ex se' but due to the 'determinatio/ ecclesiae'
- g) Tapperus the Deacon of Louvain -- the authority of Scripture does not prevent/certain and doubtful confusion and therefore recourse must be had to the stability, certainty, and authority of the church.
- h) Harding (Confut. Apol. 2.9.1.) who wrote 'quid de Scriptura ipsa statuitis? Unde nostis hanc esse Scripturam?'. Franciscus Horantius (2.7.) said that Scripture had no authority, certainty, or truth apart from the church (per ecclesiam) while Stapleton had followed this up in his De Doctrina 8.2. and 9.1. with the claim 'Ecclesiae Vox est illa plerophoria et plenissima fluctuantis animae pax et resolutio' and so the Voice of the Church is not only the 'formalis ratio fidei sed etiam resolutio'. Whitaker asks does not Stapleton really mean 'hoc quidem modo verissimè fides resoluitur, hoc est liquescit, vim nullam retinet'.

'fides tota ex ecclesiae autoritate pendet' since in revelation, God can declare His mysteries 'extra-ordinaria' apart from the external testimony, the 'magisterium' or 'ministerium' of the church--- 'fidei donum ² *quod* infundere'. Stapleton however must note that such a statement did not put Whitaker in the Anabaptist camp, where there is no revelation unless it is extraordinary.

Stapleton's statements 'debere nos Scripturarum pro sacra propter Ecclesiae iudicium acceptere' and 'ecclesiam facere ut Scripturae pro veris credantur' suggest two propositions; first 'non possumus Scripturis credere nisi ecclesia eas approbet' and second 'non possumus omnino credere nisi ecclesia praedicando nos doceat'. To these Whitaker says that the approval of the church is not the grounds of faith, but the Scriptures themselves are read with the internal testimony of the Spirit. The external testimony of the church (fides ex auditu) is necessary but not 'absolute'; it is necessary to the church, not to Scripture --- 'gratia salvari estis per fidem non ex vobis; Dei enim donum est'. In other words, we do not believe 'propter ecclesiam docentem' but 'per ecclesiam praedicantem et docentem et ministrantem' -- and although Stapleton complains bitterly that Whitaker is putting words into his mouth, Whitaker cannot but conclude that Stapleton is simply saying 'non possumus simpliciter credere sine ministerio ecclesiae nec testimonio, atque approbatione ecclesiae'. Whitaker² is quite aware of the necessity for the ministry of the church 'ad fidem et *gignendam* et confirmandam' and if Stapleton presses the point, all ought to believe the things declared by the ministry, but care should be taken to distinguish between the church as 'medium et via' and the claim that it is also the 'causa et ratio fidei' as if the 'donum fidei infusum non sufficeret ad actum fidei eliciendum vel ad totam fidem ingenerandam'. To place the authority of a church above

1. Stapleton writes (Bk. 1. cap. 2. -- quanta ecclesiae ergo Scripturarum autoritas tribuatur?) -- 'an talis idiota es? (Whitaker should really go back to school and read more thoroughly what is meant by the 'Testimonium Ecclesiae' for it is obvious that with such a 'malum intellectum' Whitaker should never have embarked on the 'De Autoritate Sacrae Scripturae et Interpretatione'. Whitaker does not rise to this, nor does he react apart from the comment 'calamus tuus cucurrit ante mentem'.
2. 'necessarium et saluberrime ac sapientissime a Domino institutum' -- to question this, says Whitaker is to be alien to the Faith.

that of Scripture is certainly to martyr Cyprian and to banish the Greek Church and its attitude to the Filioque clause, and is the most uncatholic statement Stapleton could ever make. There has always been a wide and generous attitude to Scriptural interpretation, particularly among the Fathers, while it was the nature of heretics to narrow the meaning of Scripture down to their own dogmas. To make the authority and judgement of the church the 'causa et ratio fidei' is to replace the 'Verbum Dei' with the 'anima Pontificis' ¹. Christ said ² 'semen est Verbum Dei' not 'vox et testimonium ecclesiae'. As Gregory ³ wrote, the foundation of preaching is of Scripture, not the preaching of Scripture.

Whitaker, having said that the church is the 'testis et custos sacrarum literarum' goes on to say that the church is also 'instar tabellionis', a phrase that Stapleton is quick to remind him is neither Patristic nor Scriptural. Whitaker ~~refers~~ refers him to Deuteronomy 31.24 (and 17.18) where the Levites received the Mosaic Books, and Augustine called ⁴ the Jews 'our librarians' since they kept the books of the O.T. ; Whitaker admits that though

instar (ὁμοίωμα -- ἀπεικόνισμα -- likeness, equality, copy, statue)
 tabellionis (ἀγορᾶριος -- ρητορικός -- a scribe practised and learned
 in business or law)

as a description of the church's office is neither Scriptural nor Patristic, he would draw Stapleton's attention to the Theodosian Code ⁵ where a 'tabellio' is defined as a 'scriba publicus et juris aliquantum peritus qui contractum et testamentorum instrumento publice conscribit'. Behind this title are four points :-

- a) qui credit in Filium Dei habet testimonium Dei in se ⁶
- b) omnis qui est ex veritate audit vocem meam ⁷
- c) Eritis mihi testes ⁸
- d) the Apostolic Office as revealed in Acts 2; 1 John 1; 2 Corinthians 15; and 2 Tim. 1. --- 'perpetuo in ecclesia' not only to preach but also to witness.

1. Whitaker adds by way of comment -- 'it is little wonder that the market abounds in books De Antichristo and that this claim indicates the vast space between the Arx Summa Coeli and the Moles Adriani'
 2. Luke 8. 11 --but in Mt. 13.38 the seed are the 'children of the Kingdom'
 3. Gregory 1--Expositio on Job 8.14.
 4. Aug. on Ps. 56; vide etiam De Civit. Dei. 18.46.
 5. Cod. Theodos. 9.19.1. Vide Ulpian Dig. 48.19.9

The Apocalypse XI. has two witnesses :-

- a) externa praedicatio Verbi
- b) Intus testimonium Spiritus.

So far there was no issue according to Stapleton --the real issue came when consideration was given to the distinction between the 'nuda et simplex narratio' and presenting a full declaration of all things certain and necessary to salvation. Whitaker denies the validity of the former as a description of preaching and testimony, and indeed the necessity of the distinction at all since Scripture is the full declaration. Stapleton was still thinking in terms of 'estne ecclesiae testimonium divino par' ? and admitted the affirmative; therefore the authority of the church was the 'formalis causa fidei' not Scripture, and the Apostolic authority reached its highest point in the Pontiff's Infallibility. Those who edited the Roman Catechism had therefore passed from being 'testes' to becoming 'testificatores'. It is true that Augustine made the church the ¹ εἰσαγωγή of his ministry but the witness of the church is not ² αὐτόπιστος and a 'legatus' cannot go beyond his mandate. Before Rome can claim such authority she must show her letters of credence (litterae credentiae); Stapleton had claimed Tradition, but Whitaker reminds him that true Tradition is nothing but the Living Voice of God, which urges that we bring all to Scripture, the Primitive Church, and the Fathers in matters of faith.

Coupled with the duties of the wise scribe², the church must also be the Protector (Vindex), Surety, and Vindicator of the Faith and for this office, she is given the Spirit, to acknowledge Scripture as divine in origin, content, and purpose. As the goldsmith does not make the gold, but its value is recognised by him, so the church by possession of the Spirit and Faith recognises Scripture. Augustine wrote³ 'Fides enim praecedit intellectum, ut intellectus sit fidei praemium'. The judgement of these things is not

 contd. 6. 1 John 5.16 7. John 18. 37. 8. Acts 1.8.

1. Augustine Contra Ep. Fund. cap. 5. (ML. 42.176)
 2. Matthew 13.52 --- **ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά** — καινὰ --'fresh' not **νέα** 'novel'; the former 'new' in quality and relevance, the latter 'new' in novelty and quantity.
 3. Augustine Contra Faust. 4.2.

necessarily restricted to any extraordinary gift possessed by Pastors and Doctors by virtue of the unction of the Apostolic Ministry ; Stapleton had claimed that such matters concerned not the whole church but the Apostles and elders met at Jerusalem who alone had the power to discern the truth ,with powers of abrogation and observation . The basis of Stapleton's argument was Matthew 16.17 'Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jonah , for flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee but My Father in heaven ' . Whitaker comments that 1 John 2.20 has ' ye have an anointing from the Holy One and ye all know ' --this makes no such distinction ,and Acts 15 indicate that not only the Apostles and Elders were concerned in the decision but also the whole church . First in Acts 15.6 the Apostles and Elders were gathered together and Peter spoke . Then in verse 12 'all the multitude (*πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*) kept silence and heard Barnabas , Paul, and James ; in verse 22 choice is made of the emissaries to go to Antioch by the Apostles and Elders with the whole church (*σὺν ἅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*) and the letter in verse 28 has 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us ' ----- as the text stands ,the final 'us' is ambiguous ,but certainly the unanimity of the church at Jerusalem on these questions is emphasised ~~throughout~~ and the decision is that of the whole church, grounded upon the mind of the spirit. Peter's argument had already been accepted in Acts XI.18 by the whole assembly of the church. So, although the initiative rested with the Apostles in summoning the Council ,the consent of the whole church was required.

Canon 1 of the Quinisext (692 AD) makes it quite clear that no innovation in the Faith of the Apostles is to be allowed , and canon 19 of the same council reminds us that the substance of the Faith was fixed within the limits of the canonical O.T. and N.T. and is against any composition that lacks canonical skill (*ἀπειρώς*). This was presumably the basis of the decision of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1571 AD that clergy should

1. Irenaeus Adv. Haeres. 3.4. speaks of the whole church (universa ecclesia) as meeting together ; and in Acts 15.6. in some Bezan texts the words 'with the multitude' were added .

teach nothing except that which is agreeable to the O.T. and N.T. and what the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected out of the same.¹ The Pontiff cannot pronounce on such a question since he does not possess full ecumenical authority. Whitaker has no quarrel with Stapleton's continual cry --- 'ecclesiae semper credimus eiusque testimonio' so long as the words 'propter se' are not added. Whitaker also adds that the word 'semper' is strangely out of place in Stapleton's cause, because what the Roman Church now holds, has not always been held.²

In defining the office of the church as praeco (herald, town crier,) Stapleton writes that it is certainly true that the herald has no authority to deviate from, alter, or add to, the substance and meaning of the King's mandate, and full regard should be paid by the church to Chrysostom's words³ *ὡς περὶ ὁ κηρὺς πάντων παρόντων ἐν τῷ θεῷ κηρὺς οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς* —

and this should be done accurately and clearly, so that the church may be deemed *ἀφίππιστον*⁴. Yet Thomas Waldensis supplies adequate proof against Whitaker's *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*⁵ comments Stapleton, and Thomas had said that the highest authority is given by Christ to the church to permit, sanction, and order articles of faith, as 2 Corinthians³ indicates. Whitaker answers that Ephesians 2.20 is clear -- that the highest authority is not given to the church but to the Apostles and Prophets in Christ. Augustine writes⁶ that as Christ spoke first through the prophets, then through Himself, and afterwards through the Apostles 'quantum satis esse iudicavit loquutus etiam Scripturam condidit eminentissimae auctoritatis'.

1. Vide 'Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Vol.14. Decrees and Canons of the 7 Ecumenical Councils p. 357 -- the Quinisext was not an Ecumenical Council being an almost entirely Greek gathering though the Emperor Justinian 2nd. thought of it in this way: it is true that the Greek Church thought of it as a continuation of the 6th. Council, but the West never acknowledged it as Ecumenical. Hadrian 1 however appears to have recognised it.

2. Whitaker also criticises Stapleton for his interpretation of the Article in the Creed -- *Credo Ecclesiam Catholicam* -- Stapleton did not distinguish between the church as the instrument or means, and the view that the church is the Principal Cause of Faith.

3. Chrysostom Hom.1. on Titus.

4. Though this word is used of Christ (Basil .Hom.13.3 --MG.31.429 c) contd.

Stapleton , however, seems to have missed Whitaker's point and to have settled on the word ' praeco ' , failing to appreciate Whitaker's progress through ' praeco ' to 'praedicator ' ; the two words are quite different . While the ' praeco' merely states and reiterates the mandate, the 'praedicator ' which is the pastoral office of the church, expounds but does not expand the revelation with conflicting matter or matter which is not there. The Voice of the Teaching Church must be heard (audiendam) but though Christ committed the office of Herald and Expositor to the church , he reserved the 'Principatum' to Himself.

Stapleton's view was that while the Word of God is read in Scripture , the Voice of God is heard in the Church -- Whitaker asks whether there should be any difference. If the Vox Ecclesiae has no power to alter , change, or delete Scripture, then the latter has supreme authority . Paul did not distinguish the two ---- *παραλαβόντες*
λόγον ἰκοῦνς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Thess. 2.17) -

the 'Vox Apostolica est Verbum Dei ' ; Certainly 'fides particularis' must be brought to the Voice of the Church , that it may be 'fides catholica atque orthodoxa ' ; the doctrine of assurance must never be set over against the catholic church since the latter is necessary to fulfil it ---the Holy Spirit seals the hearts of believers and confirms that sealing by its own testimony ,but this does not render the church unnecessary or its Voice less important ; rather, it has the opposite effect since it makes the catholic church necessary with a necessity it lacked before , viewed 'privatim'. Any contemner of the catholic church ' veram fidem nullo modo habere potest '. Similarly private and immediate revelations do not stand on their own over against the church -- they must come to the bar of the church , but this is not to say that the church will not be found guilty and the particular revelation true eg. in the case of Elijah, Paul

 and of Scripture (Cosmas Indicopleustes 6th. Century Topographia Christiana 2. (MG. 88 .73 d) ; John Damascene De Fide Orthodoxa 4.27 (MG.94.1224 c)) ---it is not found in the Fathers or Scriptures as used of the Church.

5. A LXX word 'chief friend or companion ' transliteration of *רֵעַ* applied to Cush in 2 Sam. 15.32 and 16.16 .Stapleton is not referring to a person but to Whitaker's axiom that 'the testimony of the church in matters of faith be subject to the bar of Scripture.
 6. Aug. De Civit. Dei 11. 3.

Peter, or Cornelius . There is, however, no real issue on this point, for as Whitaker writes ' we are not taking refuge in revelations of this kind nor do we say that we should eavesdrop for private revelations (neque illis (i.e. revelationibus) auscultandum esse) nor do we hold with those who hurl such revelations against the Word of God or the Ministry and testimony of the church '. Stapleton had 'strangled himself on this one ' ---by saying that private revelations have no authority and must not be accepted 'de catholica fide' he has negated the Pontiff's position. The authority of the church is not lessened by saying that God speaks ' per ecclesiam ' but rather it is strengthened as Chrysostom writes in his Homily De Spiritu Sancto ' ---' si quem videritis dicentem Spiritum Sanctum habeo et non loquentem Evangelica sed proprie is a seipso loquitur et non est Spiritus Sanctus in eo . Si videritis aliquem Evangelica repotentem profecto Spiritum Sanctum habet '. In his De Sacerdotio 4 , Chrysostom made Scripture a law for every preacher. The man who is 'totus alienus a fide ' , if he is not persuaded by Scripture , will not be persuaded by the testimony of the church to believe the Gospel ; John Isaacs , the converted Jew , said (Contra Lind.) that he was converted by reading Isaiah 53 . Faith may begin with the Church , but this is ' a scripturis non ecclesia' , as Athanasius 2 said in his Letter in Defence of the Nicene Definition --'the tokens of truth are more exact as drawn from Scripture than from any other sources ---- ἀκριβέτερα γὰρ ἐκ τούτων γράφων μᾶλλον ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρων ἀληθείας γνωρίσματα ---

3

and in his De Incarnatione sect. 57 he states that for a searching and right understanding of the Scriptures there is need for a pure mind and virtue. In his Letter concerning the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia sect. 8 Athanasius writes that ' divine Scripture is sufficient above all things ' and that 'with the Fathers and Councils

-
- 1. Among the spuria in Montfaucon's edition Vol.3. 963 ff.
 - 2. Athanasius op. cit. sect. 32 MG.25. 472.
 - 3. Athanasius De Incarnatione sect. 57 MG 26. 1140 . English translation by a Religious of the GSMV (1963 ed.) p.96

2

their doctrine and words, remind us of that religion towards Christ announced in divine Scripture. ¹ Cyril of Jerusalem also declares that the orthodoxy of the church is established from Scripture. Basil writes ² 'the Tradition of the Fathers is not the whole of our case, but following the meaning of Scripture'. The Letter of Eusebius of Caesarea ³ to the people of his diocese speaks of that faith received from the bishops who preceded us, our catechizings, when we received the Holy Law and as we have learnt from divine Scripture, believed and taught in the presbytery and in the episcopate'.

⁴ John Chrysostom writes of the Scriptures ---

Ἐὰν οὕτως ἐαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν
 τειχίσωμεν καὶ δι' ἀναγνώσεως καὶ δι' ἀκροάσεως
 καὶ διαλέξεως πνευματικῆς δυνασόμεθα καὶ
 αὐτοὶ ἀχείρωτοι γενέσθαι ---

⁵ Augustine writes that 'faith is conceived from Scripture (fides ipsa concepta est) from which the just live (ex qua justus vivit); the church is the mother of believers not of faith (mater credentium non fidei)'.

There is a necessary place for dogma in the church but like the church its function is not 'propter se' --as Jerome on Matthew 23 writes 'quod de Scripturis auctoritatem non habet, eadem facilitate contemnitur' --and this covers all dogma, truths, revelations, for which Stapleton had claimed that 'ecclesia est idonea testis'. Whitaker does not disagree with this position but he did refuse Stapleton's conclusion that therefore the church's testimony is the ground of authority for Scripture; the latter has no borrowed authority or testimony, but stands as the authority of God, whereas the Voice of the Church may not.

Whitaker defends Calvin's eight 'media ad fidem' which arise from the internal testimony of the Spirit without the

-
1. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 5.12 MG 33.530
 2. Basil De Spiritu Sancto sect. 16.
 3. Socrates H.E. 1.8.
 4. Chrysostom Hom.10.8 on Genesis.
 5. Augustine De Civitat, Dei 19.18.

necessary medium of the ministry , by saying that Calvin did not invent these 'media' -- they are to be found in Origen, Eusebius and Scotus. ¹

Stapleton had 'danced happily ' to the tune of *ἄφισπρίστον* as describing the church but had failed to appreciate that this word is not the same as *ἀυτόπριστον* ; he had used the former and given it the meaning of the latter . 'Papa dixit' is not the same thing as 'Christus dixit ' -- the dicta of the former can be challenged and set aside without loss of salvation . The words *δι' αὐτοῦ* (genitive -- the author or cause of the action as well as the instrument -- Romans XI.36) are not the same thing as *δι' αὐτόν* (accusative -- the means or instrument only) . Whitaker asks if Stapleton had in fact read Thomas Waldensis or is merely quoting him -- certainly this man 'should be *castigatus* for his theme that the *testimoniū ecclesiae obiectum fidei est* ' but in all fairness , Thomas Waldensis does not run all the way with Stapleton because he also wrote ' *omnis ecclesiastica autoritas cum sit ad testificandum Christo et eius legibus , vilior est Christi legibus et Scripturis sanctis necessario postponenda* ' and ' the testimony of the church should submit to Scripture *quasi scabellum pedibus eius* '

Both authors are agreed that it is not necessary ' *absolutē et singulis ad fidem et salutem* ' to have a prescribed canon (*certum canonem*) of Scripture or that all the canonical books be known in the same way , since before the 4th. Century AD the canon was not fixed and for some time there were disputed books eg. the Apocalypse , the Epistles of James , and Hebrews . Many Fathers disputed both fully and wisely ' *de fide et pro fide* ' . The church grew from the Apostolic Faith , but Stapleton goes on to say that surely, here, there are some grounds for believing that its authority is over all other forms of authority in this respect -- it is the church that removed the doubts over the disputed books . Whitaker replies that this may well be true but it does not alter the axiom that the church's authority is not above Scripture itself . Much confusion of thought arose over the decree of Trent that the church gave authority to

1. Origen *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* 4.1. ; Eusebius of Caesarea 'Preparatio Evangelica' 1.5. ; Scotus 'Prologue on the Sentences' qu.2.

Scripture -- it depends what you mean by these words ; it was said that the church gives authority to traditions and decrees . So far, this is true -- it is when the word 'like' is inserted before the word 'authority' so that it reads 'the church gives like authority to traditions and decrees ' that the position is reached where the three are lifted up 'per auctoritatis' i.e. the authority of the church. At the Council of Trent on a central altar , a copy of Scriptures appeared on a par with a book of Conciliar Decrees and a copy of the Fathers , to give like authority to all , the suggestion being that it is by the authority of the church that this is done , but the authority of the church is not 'simpliciter de divino ' . Stapleton had accused Whitaker of separating God and His Church , of putting divine authority over against ecclesiastical ; Whitaker answers that this is far from the truth --- what in fact he was attempting was to put them together again. He agrees that to the confession of personal faith must be added the dogmas of the church, to produce an orthodox faith -- the church is the 'probatio evidens' -- but as the instrument of faith and internal grace it is an 'instrumentum non physicum quod ex se efficit sed medium per quod fides efficitur ex vi et maiore causa ' . 'No man ' writes Whitaker ' is exempt from the duty of discipline , obedience and instruction , as far as the church is concerned ; to this end the ministry of the teaching church is essential --- Scripturis et ministerio ecclesiae quae habemus . In 2 Peter 1.19 the light shining in a dark place is Scripture , not the dogmas of the church viewed separately ; no prophecy is limited to independent and private solution of it. The Gospel is the great interpreter of Prophecy . As is said in 2 Peter 1.21 holy men spoke the word of prophecy ' acti a Spiritu Sancto ' not 'acti Ecclesia Sancta ' . The 'light ' of this passage belongs to the 'supernaturalis atque increata veritas ' with its origin in Christ , to be distinguished from ' veritas creata in ecclesia ' which is derivative. Each dogma of the church is **ΘΕΟΤΥΠΕΥΣΤΟΝ** but not merely because it is preached by the church ; as Cajetan said ' to possess the light is to stay with the Scriptures (manere in Scripturis) . The light of

1. Also at Vatican 2.

learned men in the church was not their own but as Augustine writes /
'Scriptura fide accepta mentem illuminat'

Whitaker is pleased to note that Stapleton uses the phrase 'ecclesia est ministra et magistra fidei nostrae' and not the word 'domina' --- Paul wrote ² οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν

ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως

Stapleton had been particularly sensitive on this point because he had refused the Oath of Supremacy 30 years before (1563 AD) --what he described as 'manicipium miserum' --claiming that the Supremacy in Ecclesiastical causes amounted to this. For this refusal he had been deprived of both canonry and prebendal stall at Chichester and Whitaker commends him for his honesty of conscience on this matter, but he adds that he was surprised that Stapleton would rather be content as a 'homuncio miserimus' (little man) to gabble away (garrulas) wantonly (patulariter) a master of malicious rebellion, serving the Pontiff's dubious patronage, than swear lawfully to a most honest and just obedience to a Christian Prince, whose office as Supreme Governor was to defend not to dominate in matters of faith. Stapleton's change appeared only to produce the old chatter (cantilenam veterem) and the old refrain (indoctus citharoedus) that God speaks through the church 'ergo quicquid ecclesia docet, id Deus docet'. Whitaker continues 'Ego vero Ecclesiam audio; Ecclesiae discipulus sum; Ecclesiam pro matre agnosco' but even Stapleton must recognise that filial obedience is not absolute, but subject to divine law. To assert the authority of the mother 'absolute' i.e. 'quicquid a me postulat, assentior' carries with it the genuine doubt as to whether these are the words of a true mother. It would appear from Alphonsus de Castro ³ that the songs of Rome are not as they should be-- he writes 'constat plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse ut grammaticam penitus ignorent' and of the Pontiffs he writes 'at Pontifices etiam summi et Hebraicae et Graecae linguae ignovi sunt nonnumquam et Latinae'. Whitaker claimed to be less troublesome to the catholic

1. Augustine Tract 35 on John.

2. 2 Cor. 1. 24.

3. Alphonsus de Castro Advers. Haeres. 1.4.

church than Stapleton with his 'interrogatiunculae' (short syllogisms) and magisterial 'interpellationes' (interruptions) though Whitaker acknowledges that Stapleton had made 'progress' since the day that he argued that like the finger of John the Baptist the church was the 'medium solum' of faith leading and pointing men to Christ, so, 'si ex regula fidei tanquam uno medio inquirendum est an haec sit divina Scriptura, ecclesiae iudicio haec in parte nullum est certius'. Scripture shines by its own light, not by the reflected light of the church and God speaks in Scripture not merely through it --- Augustine wrote 'titulabit fides (faith will totter) si divinarum Scripturarum vacillat auctoritas'. As to Paul's Epistles needing an authority other than the O.T. and the Gospels to verify them, they were written in fact before the Evangelium (the literal Gospels) and proceed from that same Apostolic witness as produced the written Evangelium. Augustine has written 'Vetus Testamentum ex Novo, et Novum ex Vetere' -- Whitaker asks how often did Augustine appeal to the 'iudicium solum ecclesiae'?

What sense then can we attribute to Augustine's words ², 'Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas'? -- here surely is the argument for the efficacious authority of the church, to lead to a healthier mind, to resolve doubts or even resolve the whole canon? On these grounds i.e. the sole authority of the church, infant baptism is accepted. Whitaker denies that infant baptism is so grounded on the sole authority of the church nor had he ever defended the practice against the Anabaptists on these grounds. There is more to this question than the mere historical argument of primitive practice. Both Luther and Calvin based their conclusions on grounds wider than the historical authority of the church or on precedent ³---

1. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 1. 37.

2. Augustine Contra Ep. Manich. Fundam. 5.6. ML. 42. 176.

3. Vide Whitaker Contra Duracum 8.78 De Paradoxia.

Carpion abused Luther's opinions on this question when he said that to Luther, infant baptism meant nothing more than 'washing a brick' (*nihil aliud quam laterem lavare*). In writing against Cochlaeus he attacked those (the Anabaptists) who held the view that infants may be baptised but that no internal grace or efficacy of the Holy Spirit was given i.e. baptism was merely that of 'res inanimatas'. When Christ gave the commandment to baptise, this pertained first to adults and then 'ex vi foederis' to their children also. Similarly Calvin wrote 'nemo iam est qui non videat paedobaptismum nequaquam humanitus fabrefactum fuisse, qui tanta Scripturae approbatione fulciatur'. The practice belongs to the sub-Apostolic age,² but it is untrue to say that there are no arguments from Scripture. Calvin devoted a great deal of thought to this question, and concludes, against those who said that paedobaptism was a novelty not appointed by God but newly invented by men of the sub-Apostolic age', that the question is an important one if only to reassure weak consciences. To Calvin the practice was of divine origin. The right consideration of signs, he says, does not lie merely in the outward ceremonies but depends chiefly upon the promise and the spiritual mysteries, to typify which the ceremonies themselves are appointed. The promise to Abraham in circumcision³ was that Yahweh would be God to him and his sons when circumcised --- Paul reiterates this thought when he writes to the Ephesians⁴ that as uncircumcised they were without God, without hope, aliens to the Covenant of promise, all these being comprehended in the Covenant. The first entrance to immortal life is the remission of sins --- the later Covenant with Abraham demands that the

-
1. Calvin Inst. 4. 16. 1-9
 2. Vide Kurt Aland 'Did the early church baptise infants?' (1963 AD) and Joachim Jeremias 'Infant baptism in the first Four Centuries' (1960 AD). Jeremias op. cit. p. 19-21 under the *oikos* formula quotes 1 Cor. 1.16; Acts 16.15; 16.33; and 18.8, as material proof that infants were undoubtedly baptised in the Apostolic period. Aland challenges this on the ground that the *oikos* formula should never have been elevated to a theological status (op. cit. p. 91) and nowhere cited mentions an infant, and some of the situations eg. Lydia (widow) would suggest that there could have been no infants. The practice was established by the time of Tertullian's *De Baptismo* (c. 200 - 206 AD).
 3. Gen. 17.10 .
 4. Ephesians 2.12.

latter walk in sincerity and innocence before God ,and this is mortification or regeneration. If Christ be the foundation of Baptism , He is also the foundation of Circumcision -- and everything applicable to circumcision applies also to baptism , saving the difference in the visible ceremony. To this analogy we are led by the rule of Paul, the analogy of faith . Circumcision was adoption as the People and Family of God ,their first entrance into the church. Stapleton divided the unity of baptism ¹ if baptism is denied to infants -- they shared the covenant under the Old Dispensation ,and therefore they must share the merits of the Covenant under the New Dispensation. The sign cannot be separated from the sacrament and the Word of God is destined for infants , and so why should the sign be denied them ? The children of the Jews, says Calvin, were made heirs of the Covenant , separated, holy, and to deny Baptism to infants is to say that the Work of Christ is less applicable to Christians than to Jews . So Christ who came to enlarge rather than limit the grace of the Father , takes little children ² ,and rebukes his disciples for preventing their coming to His Presence.

Against those who say that Christ was not baptising them (i.e. the infants brought to Him) but receiving, embracing and blessing them , and therefore we should give infants the benefit of prayer but not of baptism , Calvin replied ³ that Christ had said ' of such is the Kingdom of Heaven ' and then commends them to His Father . Can we deny baptism to those to whom Christ has opened the door and made heirs of the Kingdom ? Objectors discuss the differences between Christ's Act and Baptism , and in how much higher esteem we should hold baptism than mere blessing --- to them Calvin replied that Christ took them for His own and sanctified them, and not only the older children as some said, but *βρέφη και παιδια*

1. Romans 12. 3-6.

2. Matthew 19.13

3. Calvin Inst. 4.16.7

terms which denote infants still at their mothers' breasts . Therefore , paedobaptism is no human invention but grounded in Scripture -- to those who object that we hear of no infant or child being baptised in the Gospel , Calvin replied that neither do we hear of women at the Last Supper. Calvin is not moved by the objection that the Promise suffices to confirm the salvation of children -- it was otherwise with Christ , and all should rejoice to see the Covenant ' engraven upon the bodies of their children ' . To those who object that circumcision was a figure of mortification not of baptism , Calvin replied that Paul in Colossians did not think with such a dichotomy --- 'in Christ we are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands , in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ ' and he adds by way of explanation that ' we are buried with Him in baptism ' . There is the positive side to baptism--to live in the Risen Christ; mortification is the negative side. The original Covenant was concerned positively with spiritual promises and had reference to eternal life.

To those who object that there is a difference in the subject, that carnal generation was the ground of circumcision whereas Christian Baptism is not so bound since it concerns the spiritual seed of Abraham ingrafted by faith , Calvin agreed that this appeared so , but the distinction disappears in Matthew 8,11 where Christ is made the author of all spiritual blessing irrespective of the carnal ordinance. The wall of partition between Jew and Gentile is broken down and God becomes the Father to all in the Covenant , circumcision being replaced by baptism. Paul declares that the Jews are sanctified by their parents , and that the children of Christians derive sanctification from their parents , and in baptism the privileges of the Covenant. To the objection that such infants are not capable of understanding the mystery , or of making a conscious reply of faith, Calvin says that denial of baptism amounts to leaving infants , as the sons of Adam, to death.

-
1. Colossians 2,11 cp. Ephesians 4,5. ; there is one Baptism.
 2. Ephesians 2, 14.

Christ commands them to be brought to Him -- He is the author of life , the quickener of the soul , and He makes them partners with Him. To become heirs of life, we must communicate with Him -- the corruption from the womb must be regenerated by Christ . Infants must not be left to lie in the wrath of God due to their nature ; Christ sanctifies at any age, without distinction, and He wills to wipe away the guilt of disobedience that He might perform perfect obedience. The age of infancy is not incapable of receiving sanctification . To those who object that baptism is a sacrament of penitence and faith, neither of which is applicable to infants, Calvin answered that Jeremiah 4.4. describes circumcision as a sign of repentance, and Paul called it (Romans 4.11) the seal of the righteousness of faith. There is nothing in circumcision that cannot be conceded to baptism. Children are baptised for the future realisation of penitence and faith , and though these are not formed in them yet the seed of both lies in them by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Christ would look upon infants as His members , and we ^{do} them injury if we say that either He cannot, or will not, baptise them -- infants must not be dis severed from His Body.

Thomas Aquinas,² continues Whitaker, also writes of the objection to infant baptism on the grounds that grace and virtues are not possessed without faith and charity , and since faith depends upon the will of the believer , and charity on the will of the lover,³ and children have not the use of the will , they have neither faith nor charity and so children do not receive grace or virtue in baptism , nor

1. Calvin notes that Acts 2.37 and 38 make no mention of faith, and Acts 8.37 of penitence . To those that say that both passages must be taken together , Calvin maintained that this is precisely what he is doing in this whole Baptismal Controversy. All insistence must be placed upon the values of conversion and faith in adults but infants are in a different class. In choosing Abraham, God did not start with circumcision but announced a Covenant with him, and after his faith in this , confirmed Abraham in the sacrament. The sacrament came after faith, in Abraham, and preceded all intelligence in Isaac. The children born to Israelites and circumcised are begotten and born to God (Ezek. 16.20 ; 23.37) but the child of unbelieving parents is alien to the covenant till united to God by faith. Alien adults lack the necessary faith and repentance which alone gives them access to the Covenant and so their children are sanctified in baptism.
2. Thomas Aquinas Summa 2.2. Qu. 69. art.6 Dominican Ed. Vol.17 p.176

can children possess that co-operative will necessary for justification . Thomas answers first that being made members of Christ in baptism, infants ' de necessitate ' receive an influx of grace and virtues from the Head . Second, if the objection were true, children dying after baptism would not come to eternal life , but Paul writes (Romans 6.23) that the ' grace of God is life everlasting ' . Baptismal grace profits them unto salvation ' writes Thomas Aquinas . The inability to acts of virtue is not due to absence of habits --- a sleeping man may have the habits of virtue yet is hindered from the acts through sleep. In Baptism, an infant receives the habit of faith --as Augustine wrote ' itaque parvulum etsi nondum fides ille quae in credentium voluntate consistit iam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum fidelum facit ... ita fideles vocantur non rem ipsam mente annuendo , sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo ' . But no man is reborn unwillingly --these are Augustine's words ,but these are understood of adults not infants. The children believe not by their own act but by the faith of the church which is applied to them . Augustine wrote ² ' Mother church lends other feet to the little children that they may come , another heart that they may believe , another tongue that they may confess.' The effect of baptism is to open the gates of the Kingdom of Heaven ,by removing guilt and begetting to spiritual life . Whereas adults who approach baptism through their own faith are not equally disposed to baptism since some approach with greater ,some with lesser devotion , all infants receive an equal effect in baptism. Whitaker concludes that while Calvin looks at the question with the view that ' ex analogia foederis ' there are no Scriptural grounds for excluding the infants of Christian parents from baptism, Thomas Aquinas looked at the question ' ex gratia' . If they retain habitual grace ,then they have a prior knowledge of the mysteries of the faith ---if faith be separated from grace ,then another controversy arises . The faith of the receiver does not call into being a sacrament --- as circumcision is called the *Opayis* of the righteousness

3. Augustine Ep. 98. ML. 33. 364.

1. ibid. . Whitaker also writes that infants receive the 'sensus fidei ' .

2. Augustine Sermo. 176 ML. 38. 948.

of faith, and can avail nothing without the promise of God, such a condition can be applied to infants.

Whitaker refers to Augustine's 'De Spiritu et Anima' sect. 42 ' non excusat parvulos a culpa quia eam non norunt neque excludit gratiam ab eis quia eam nesciunt . Quaeris in eis culpam ; invenis ex carne traductam ; quaeris in eis gratiam , invenis a Deo collatam ' . Whitaker on the necessity of baptism at all says that it is generally necessary but not 'absoluté' ---- 'gratiam dei non esse alligata sacramentis ' , but it would be tied to the sacraments if there were no salvation without them , and the Penitent thief would have to be dragged from heaven. St. Bernard wrote that 'it is a crime not to lack baptism but to condemn it' . Scripture does not teach nor reason demand that infants believe --the whole strength of the sacrament is not to be placed in the faith of the receiver ' .

Although the question of anointing baptised persons did not touch the main controversy , Bellarmine reminds³ Whitaker that Cyprian⁴ said that anointing was necessary after baptism and he pronounced this a tradition. Whitaker answers that Augustine received with approbation what Cyprian said but these things are not canonical Scripture nor are they necessarily Apostolic⁵ . Cyprian himself advises us to reject customs which cannot plead for themselves the authority of Scripture and the example of Christ, and therefore the subject of unction may be omitted without detriment to the grace of baptism. Erasmus said that baptism was formerly celebrated with water alone but later the Fathers added chrism -- the Fathers, not the Apostles. There is also considerable difficulty in this text of Cyprian and the question arises as to whether Cyprian is in fact referring to Chrism since ' ungi ' does not necessarily mean here the

1. Ambrose De Obitu Valentini (c. 392 AD) ML. 16. 1374
2. Bernard Ep. 72 Ad Hugon.
3. Whitaker's Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura Quaest. 6. 12 Parker Soc. edition p. 601
4. Cyprian Ep. 70.2. ML.3.1040 . 'ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus est ' .
5. Augustine Contra Cresc. 2.32.

formal use of oil. The difficulty comes with the words following--
 ' porro autem eucharistia est unde baptizati unguuntur oleum in
 altari sanctificatum '.

Stapleton had written ' fides nostra tota ex
 auditu ecclesiae est ' but Whitaker reminds him that 'tota' does
 not appear in Romans 10.17 the text he was quoting . It is useful here
 to read Tertullian (Apol. 1. 39) where Tertullian speaks of
 Christians coming together --- ' coimus in coetum et congregationem
 ad litterarum divinarum commemorationem certe fidem sanctis vocibus
 pascimus , spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus , disciplinam praeceptorum
 nihilominus inculcationibus densamus (Whitaker reads 'defensamus') ' .
 The whole chapter, comments Whitaker, breathes with the words
 'pascenda ergo fides est non praeceptis ecclesiasticis sed divinarum
litterarum vocibus ' .³ The Fathers speak with one voice , that the faith

1. Whitaker writes 'Christ was the anointed of God ' but nowhere do we read of external anointing with oil. Paul wrote of Christians as the 'anointed of the Lord' but at this early date there is no mention of unction in baptism. Whitaker thought that Cyprian probably received this tradition from Tertullian (De Baptismo 15) from whom he received so much . Trent had claimed Fabian (d.250 AD) for its earliest authority ,with Tertullian and Cyprian, but there is no historical certainty ; Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus claimed that the tradition went back to Christ Himself, though the earlier schoolmen tended to regard the practice as a purely ecclesiastical institution.
2. Erasmus , with Panormitanus , read 'et' for 'est' and 'sanctificatur' for 'sanctificatum' , though one would expect 'sanctificantur' . Vide Library of the Fathers 'The Treatises of St. Caecilius Cyprian (1876 ed.) note pp. 234-5 . The use of the strength-giving richness of oil and the fragrance of the balsam represented the fullness of the sacramental grace and the sweetness of Christian virtue , and so became a favourite subject for allegory. The use of the chrism in Baptism is attested also by Ambrose ,Theodoret, Cyril of Jerusalem (τὸ μυστικὸν χρίσμα) and the Council of Laodicea ; the addition of the chrism to Baptism is symbolically useful but not necessary.
3. Whitaker also quotes Tertullian Ad Uxor. 2 where 'scripturarum interlectionem esse fomentum fidei ' and Epiphanius Haeres. 74 'fidem in Scripturis annunciatam credi per assensum auditus.'

from which righteousness and salvation are born, is born not of the authority of the church but of Scripture. Thomas Aquinas¹ is helpful here, in six points;-

- a) fidem nostram inniti revelationi divinae.
- b) hanc revelationem esse Prophetis atque Apostolis factam.
- c) Prophetas atque Apostolos Scripturis canonicis eam revelationem complexos.
- d) soli inhaerendum esse Scripturarum doctrinae, quandoquidem nulli revelationi nisi quae facta est Apostolis et Prophetis fides innititur.
- e) Nostram fidem non inniti voci aut revelationi Ecclesiae sed Apostolis ac Prophetis i.e. canonicis Scripturis.
- f) cum fides nostra ex revelatione divina pendeat, majorem esse Scripturarum quam Ecclesiae auctoritatem.

There are of course many ways by which faith may be awakened (excitari) by God eg. reading Scripture, miracles, examples, private instructions, adversities and calamities, private and public, but to none of these (externa et extraordinaria media) ~~calls~~ Stapleton does God bind us, whereas He does bind us to the 'medium ordinarium' of the church.² Whitaker replies that though this may be true in principle and in particular when the doctrine of the church is the doctrine of the Spirit as revealed in Scripture, it does not release us from the obligation of reading, examining, and studying Scripture, since Scripture is not only an external medium but contains an internal 'testimonium' superior to that of the church. Paul in 2 Timothy 3.16 calls all Scripture *θεοτικῶν λόγων* quia a Spiritu

-
1. Thomas Aquinas Summa Pt.1. Qu.1. art. 8.2. Aquinas notes the passage in Augustine (Ep.19) where Augustine extols the canonical authors as without error in the divine revelation which cannot be said of any book outside canonical Scripture. Calvin did not say that God shows His power 'in the authority of the church' because 'evangelium est Potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti'. Stapleton cannot transfer it to the church since it is proper (proprium) only to the Gospel.
 2. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 4.15.

Sancto dictatae et editae sunt ¹; the internal testimony of the Spirit is not ¹ alienum a Scripturis -- non quidem cum characteribus Scripturarum permistus aut in foliis involutus Spiritus est, sed ex doctrina Scripturarum in animis nostris enascitur, ideoque a libris sacris sejunctus esse non potest. ²

Is the word *Θεόπνευστος* in Paul's statement *πᾶσα γραφή Θεόπνευστος* in 2 Timothy 3.16 an adjective or the predicate (as with Calvin)? If *γραφή* refers to the O.T. and *πᾶσα* means 'all Scripture' the use of *Θεόπνευστος* would appear to be irrelevant since it is not the inspiration but the profitableness of the O.T. that Paul stresses. If *πᾶσα* means 'every Scripture' then *γραφή* need not refer to the O.T. and *Θεόπνευστος* becomes an adjective. To follow Origen, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, Luther (and the translations of Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer and the RV) is to render the text 'every scripture inspired by God is profitable'. The word does not occur again in the O.T. or LXX but was a common one. Clement of Alexandria ³ was the first to call the N.T. *Θεόπνευστος*. Scripture represents the Voice of the Holy Spirit in Origen ⁴ and Gregory of Nyssa ⁵. Irenaeus ⁶ regarded Scripture as the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith, begun in Scripture. To Athanasius ⁷, Scripture was the Anchor and 'Sustentaculum' of our Faith, which hangs from Scripture and is bound to it.

-
1. Vide Reid 'Authority of Scripture' p.33 ff. --there are strong arguments for deducing that Calvin (Commentary on 2 Tim. 3.16) did not hold the view of literal inspiration such as appeared in the *Θεόπνευστος* of the Formula Consensus Helvetica 1675 AD. There is no evidence to suggest that Whitaker held the view of literal inspiration --- he merely uses the phrase to emphasise his point that Scripture contains the 'internum testimonium Sancti Spiritus'. Vide Trent Sess. 4. April 8th. 1546 AD --the phrase 'dictation of the Holy Spirit' appears. Vatican 2, (Documents of Vatican 2 ed. Abbott p. 118 f.) spoke of 'divinely recorded realities contained and presented in Sacred Scripture, committed to writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit'.
 2. Whitaker 'De Autoritate Sacrae Scripturae' cap.11.
 3. Clement of Alexandria Strom. 7. 16 sect. 102. Vide Lampe Patristic Greek Lexicon p. 630.
 4. Origen Commentary on John 6. 48. MG.14.284.
 5. Gregory of Nyssa Contra Eunom. 7. MG. 45.744.
 6. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.1.
 7. Athanasius In Synopsis. Whitaker adds 'scrutamini' involves more than 'lectio, meditatio, dies noctesque et examinatio'. Chrysostom wrote in his Preface to Romans that anyone reading *μετὰ προθυμίας* 'fore ut ei nulla re alia apus sit'

Stapleton had misread both Luther and Calvin in asserting that they made private persuasion the grounds of the canon of Scripture ; neither had said this. Stapleton's words were ' Calvinus per arcanum Spiritus testimonium nihil aliud intelligit quam privatam quandam lucem et persuasionem quae sibi quisque Spiritum Dei venditat , et juxta quem Spiritum, tum de Scriptura , tum de Scripturae sensu , tum etiam de quovis alio dogmate judicare unumquemque posse dogmatizat.' and 'Calvignus semper utitur vocabulo arcani testimonii , quod sibi quisque seorsim venditat ' and 'singularis haec eius sententia est a Lutherano multum diversa ' ; how can the Holy Spirit be the author of such confusion , asks Stapleton , yet they all claim the internal testimony of the Spirit amounting to private persuasion ? It is one thing to deny the Gospel , another to call in question 3 John -- comments Whitaker -- if Stapleton dubbed those who doubted the authenticity of 3 John as altogether bereft of the Spirit , his list would have to be longer than ~~that~~ of Luther and Calvin but must include many ancient flourishing churches and not a few Fathers of the Church , to say nothing of Cajetan who was much more devastating than Luther in his examination of the Canon . There is however a distinction between ' fides ' and 'scientia' . The Anabaptists knew that Christ died for us but they were heretics not because they rejected books now canonical but once in doubt , but because they fail ' salutariter cognoscere ' . It is not a defect of 'fides informis' but of 'fides formata ' . The 'scientia' of the Canon becomes the necessary adjunct of true regenerating faith which in itself contains the true Catholic Faith . It is a question of 'credunt ut salutariter cognoscant ' . The true knowledge of the Canon is not merely an opinion but recognition by true faith. The question therefore is not so much whether a man who rejects part of the Canon has or has not the Spirit , but whether he has or has not true faith. True faith acknowledges the Canon but it is not 'fides informis' but 'fides formata' and not to receive a particular book , or part of Scripture is not an 'error capitalis' . Stapleton accuses Whitaker of writing ' si adsit Spiritus Sanctus , omnem Scripturam omnibus ex se et per se constare ' but Whitaker replies that

he has never said this or written it , nor could he --- what he did say was that the internal light of the Scripture dispels the darkness of our minds and we come to acknowledge true Scripture by faith.

That dissensions exist among the learned and best defenders of the Catholic Faith is an acknowledged fact, writes Whitaker , and there is no suggestion either in Augustine¹ or any other Catholic Father that those who differ lack the essential Faith or the Spirit , but Augustine was quite clear that those differences are outside the limits of the Regula Fidei . Julian had accused Chrysostom of denying Original Sin in little children . Augustine defended Chrysostom by saying that though dissensions existed among learned men, there must be agreement (consensio) on the very foundations of the Faith since truth (veritas) demands it.² But the Regula Fidei is not the same thing as 'aliquid institutum vel definitum simpliciter ab ecclesia absque Scriptura ' . Baronius³ had suggested that Cyprian 'recantavit illam opinionem (rebaptism of those baptised by heretics) antequam mortuus est ' after Stephen's Letters ; Whitaker thought that in the light of Augustine Ep. 48 this was probably not likely ; it is nevertheless true that Cyprian was never described as 'Spiritu desertum aut hereticum aut in Regula Fidei non permansisse ' . But if 'a definition of the church carries with it the necessity of the Regula Fidei and of the Spirit , then both had fled from Cyprian.'

Whitaker points out that it is one thing to define heresy as a violation of the Regula Fidei and another thing to define it as a violation of a decree of the church --- the latter is much wider than the former and represents the extension to the word 'heresy' given it by the church of Rome . This was particularly

1. Augustine Contra Julian 1.2.

2. Vide Cyprian Ep. 48 and De Unitate Eccles. 10 --'sic ubi forte fallantur contra canonicas Scripturas sentiant ' .

3. Baronius Annals 2.

noticeable in three instances ;-

a) Whitaker says that Gregory 2 (715 - 731 AD) in writing to Boniface² insisted that those baptised by pagans should be rebaptised . Whitaker is wrong here --- Gregory writes ' in his tua dilectio teneat antiquum morem Ecclesiae , quia, quisquis in Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatus est , rebaptizari liceat minime non enim in nomine baptizantis sed in Nomine Trinitatis huius gratiae donum perceptit. ' Nicolas 1 (858 - 867 AD) in his Reply to the Bulgars³ in November 866 AD said the same , that though a person be baptised by a Jew or pagan , if the Formula be of the Trinity or of the Name of Jesus alone, 'constat eos non esse denuo baptizandos '.

b) Celestinus 3 (1191 - 1198 AD) did not regard the dissolution of a marriage as heresy , and that it was lawful (liceat) for the faithful person to contract a new marriage. Innocent 3⁴ (1198 - 1216 AD) refers to this in his words ' licet quidam praedecessor noster (scl. Celestinus 3) sensisse aliter videatur ' but Innocent was of a different mind , that it was not lawful if one party lapse from the faith for the other to contract a second marriage (ad secundas nuptias

1. The distinction of heresy as a) a violation of the Regula Fidei and b) a violation of a decree , had been highlighted by two recent Acts ;-

- a) 31 Henry VII cap.14. (1539 AD --after the breach with Rome) the Heresy Act which imposed the Six Articles on pain of heresy and burning.
- b) 1 and 2 Philip and Mary cap. 6. (1554 AD --Statutes of the Realm 4. 244) which renewed three statutes for the punishment of heresies;-
 1. 5 Richard 2 cap. 5 (1382 AD) ' for the arrest of erroneous and heretical preachers.'
 2. 2 Henry IV cap. 15 (1401 AD) -- for 'the repression of heresies and punishment of heretics '
 3. 2 Henry V cap. 7. (1414 AD) -- for ' the suppression of heresy ' , especially Lollardy.

It is of course difficult to disassociate heresy charges from charges of a jurisdictional or common law nature eg. in 1513 AD Hunne was found hanged in the Bishop of London's prison (murdered ? --vide Ogle 'Tragedy of the Lollard Tower Ptl) ‡ he had been charged with refusing to pay mortuary fees , contempt of church courts, and of possessing a Lollard Bible cp. Kett of Norwich --popularly thought to have suffered for his denial of transubstantiation, but in fact charged with leading an agrarian rising and revolt.

The Act of Supremacy 1559 AD (1 Eliz.1.cap.6.) repealed the heresy laws revived by Mary.

2. Gregory 2 Ep. *Desiderabilem mihi*. Nov. 726 AD . ML. 89. 525 . cd.
3. ML. 119. 980 c.
4. Innocent 3 Ep ad Hugon. bishop of Ferrari May 1199 AD .ML.214.588.

convolare) and the Council of Trent has decreed the view heretical. Bellarmine had maintained that Celestinus 3 had not made a definition 'de fide' but merely gave an answer to the Bulgars ; this, however, was not what the Bulgars thought and Alphonsus de Castro² called it a 'definitio' , disagreement with which carried the connotation of heresy.

c) John de Turrecremata and Cajetan had both been very much exercised by the term to be given to the view of Nicholas IVth. (1288 - 1292 AD) that Christ possessed nothing either in person or in common -- neither Trent nor John XXII (1316 - 1334 AD) regarded such a view as a permissible opinion but as a heresy . Pope John's comment on the original Franciscan Order was that in violating Order, it also violated Faith and therefore the view was ipso facto heresy. Bellarmine had softened the controversy to one of conflicting opinions.

Stapleton had claimed that the Roman Canon of Scripture as defined by the Roman Church could now never be called into question without the charge of heresy --- Whitaker replies that in such an attitude to the Canon , Stapleton had made a definition of the church a norm of heresy , which is not a catholic opinion and will never find grounds of authority in the Fathers. The ancient churches not only entertained doubts about , but rejected, certain canonical books , without the charge of heresy for such opinions.³ The charge of heresy can only be applied to deviations from , or refusal of, the Regula Fidei. Cusanus⁴ on writing of the unity of the Scriptures said that they should be bent to the church (inflectio ad ecclesiam) since definition by the latter constituted the norm of heresy⁵. Whitaker here refers to Augustine for the 'definition' of children⁶ receiving the eucharist ---a custom also referred to by Pseudo-Dionysius; 'are we heretic' he asks ' because we no longer observe such a definition that infants go straight from baptism to the eucharist ? It is

-
1. Trent Session 24. Nov. 1563 AD.
 2. Alphonsus de Castro Contra Haeres. 1.4.
 3. Vide Didymus' Commentary on 2 Peter.
 4. Cusanus Ep. 3. Ad Boh.
 5. Augustine De Pecc. Merit. et Remiss. 1.20 and Contra Julian.1.2.
 6. Pseudo-Dionysius De Eccles. Hier. 2.

not sufficient to say that this merely touches custom and tradition which are changeable -- this touches the Faith since it concerns the effect of Baptism ' . 'To us ' he writes ' and to the Fathers , the Regula Fidei is not an inconstant definition of the church but the perpetual opinion (sententia) of Scripture ' --- 'regula fidei papistica incerta et inconstans et multiplex est ; nostra simplex et perpetua ' , writes Whitaker.

The differing degrees of divine splendour and majesty apparent in the canonical books -- eg. in Proverbs as compared with Isaiah, the Epistle of James with the Epistle to the Romans --- does not lead to a denial of their canonicity but to the recognition of a difference of divine impression and inspiration² in them , a relative degree of divine inspiration --relative because it is allied to the purpose of the writer under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Stapleton claimed that the only medium for the Living Voice of God was the church -- Scripture was the Verbum Dei not the Vox Dei --Scripture must be known through the church 'immediate' . Christ had said 'audite ecclesiam ' , 'qui vos audit me audit ' . Whitaker replies that the texts are sound enough but the use Stapleton makes of them is not so. Scripture is not only *ῥῆμα* but also *λόγος* and God speaks to us 'immediate' through Scripture. Jerome wrote ' Vox Domini auditur in civitate eius ecclesiae

1. On the powers of the Pontiff to define ' de fide ' vide Vatican 1 Mansi 52.1213 and for Vatican 2 'Documents' ed. Abbott pp. 47-49.
2. A.G. Hebert 'Authority of the O.T. ' p.101 held that 'the conservative view (both Catholic and Protestant) always refuses to accept the notion of degrees of inspiration ' on the grounds that it demands a further norm of choice ; the Scriptures are either inspired or they are not, and to promote 'degrees of inspiration ' is to bring in a merely human standard. Vide J.K.S. Reid 'Authority of Scripture' p. 161 - 5 . W.Sanday's Bampton Lectures (1893 AD) on Inspiration. Vatican 2 (Documents ed. Abbott p.118 - 124) asserted the unity and general and exclusive inspiration of Canonical Scripture while stressing the pre-eminence of the Gospels -- the term 'degrees of inspiration ' does not appear ; the thought is rather that care should be taken to discover the purpose of the particular book -- instead of speaking of greater or lesser inspired books, Vatican 2 spoke of 'extensions of the Gospel , where those matters which concern Christ the Lord are confirmed. His true teaching is more and more fully stated , the saving power of the divine Work of Christ is preached, the story is told of the beginnings of the church and her marvellous growth and her glorious fulfilment is foretold ' .

et in Scripturis sanctis quotidie personat ' . Augustine in his Commentary on Micah 6.2. wrote that the strength and fruit of the Divine Voice is heard resounding in the reading of Scripture, and those who act upon it come to reward , those who do not, come to judgement --- one word of Scripture ,with or without the church ,is more powerful than all the voices of the churches in confirming faith to salvation ². Stapleton had written ' omnia nobis tantum per Ecclesiae vocem discere oportet ' --Whitaker remarks that there would be full agreement on this between them if he removed the word 'tantum' otherwise he could remove the Spirit ,the Word of God, and the internal testimony of the Spirit (the word 'oportet' is operative here). The Voice of the Church depends upon all these sources to be efficacious --- ' ultima resolutio fidei non est ~~authoritas~~ ^S ecclesiae ' --- it has neither πληροφορία ³ nor is it 'plenissima' but it is dependent .

The infallibility of the church had been defended by Stapleton on the grounds that an 'inquisitio' is always held on doubtful points of faith and that though the church may err 'in mediis' it can never err 'in conclusione' after due inquisition has been made and the matter has been considered ' de novo' . To this

-
1. Vide etiam Aug. De Civit. Dei 2.28 ; Commentary on Amos 3.1. ; Gregory wrote 'disce cor Dei in Verbis Dei ' (Ep. 40. PL.77.450)
 2. It is interesting to note that the early draft of Vatican 2 on 'Revelation' (Documents ed. Abbott p.119) which described the truth in Scripture as 'salutaris (tending to salvation) was changed to ' for the sake of our salvation '.
 3. 'full of assurance , certainty ' Vide 1 Thess.1.5. Col.2.2. and Heb. 6.11 . Whitaker comments that Stapleton had ~~complained~~ ^{complained} about 'fides sola ' which had at least St. Paul , but he made much of 'Vox (Ecclesiae) Sola' which has neither Scripture nor Fathers. The Promise was made through the Word of God not in the 'Vox Ecclesiae Sola' and there is a difference between the 'infallible church has truth ' and 'the church has infallible truth'--with the latter Whitaker is in full agreement .When Stapleton says that since Scripture is the 'res fidei' it is necessary to have the voice and approbation of the church (hoc externum et ministeriale medium Spiritus Sanctus adjunctum habet ---Verbum et Spiritus non suff-iciunt ad cognoscendas Scripturas sine adjumento ecclesiae vocis) Whitaker asks, 'necessary for whom ? ' -- for the church, yes, for the Holy Spirit, no ,for the individual soul ,if the voice of the church is joined with the Spirit , the Verbum Dei, God speaks through the church , a greater than which He has not ordained but the Pontiff and bishops do not stand in the same relation to

Whitaker replies that this argument is defective in two ways -- first, if error occurs 'in mediis' then there is no certainty that error will be excluded 'in conclusione', and second, it is a rule of logic that you cannot come to a conclusion through a false premise without the introduction of new evidences. If these amount to private revelations, then they are subject to the same Scriptural norms and therefore provide no new grounds for conclusions. The same argument would apply to Stapleton's view that whereas the external 'media' of the Regula Fidei, Testimonia Patrum and the Consensus Antiquitatis acts as antecedents, the infallibility of the voice of the church is the consequent. The dependence of the Regula Fidei, the Testimonia Patrum and the Consensus Antiquitatis on Scripture is self-evident --- it is not merely a temporal priority but one of content. Whitaker has never doubted the statement 'per ecclesiam Scripturas et sacram doctrinam cognesci' provided that statement is understood in the orthodox manner. Peter put forward prophetic testimony not his own authority. Stapleton's exegesis of 2 Thess. 3.14 (si quis nostro per epistolam sermoni non obtemperat) required an Apostolic (ecclesiastical) authority in excess of Scriptural authority, but Whitaker would have Stapleton realise that Paul here is speaking not of matters of faith, but of works and ecclesiastical discipline -- the point at issue now is not discipline but revelation. Faith is received from the church but not from the sole authority of the church.

Whitaker agrees with Stapleton² that it is possible to profess the name and faith of Christ without knowing the whole of Canonical Scripture, and this upon the authority of the church; this is historically true, but it is no foundation for Stapleton's conclusion 'qui ecclesiae auctoritatem vel omnino ignorat vel simpliciter negat, fidelis omnino aut Christianus non est'. It is one thing to be a catholic and not to know the whole Scripture, as it is to be received, and quite another to be an Anabaptist or in England contd. the church as the Apostles do -- Ambrose wrote (De Officiis l.1. ML. 16. 140) 'non mihi Apostolorum gloriam vendico, non Prophetarum gratiam' and Chrysostom Hom. 33 on Matthew wrote 'fateor me longe abesse ab Apostolorum dignitate'.

1. Stapleton accuses Whitaker of not reading his Eighth Book properly - Whitaker's answer is 'illius operis tui nullus angulus est quem non penitus inspexerim atque excuserim'
2. Stapleton here addresses Whitaker as 'amice' !

'superilluminatus vel familista' , but this is not to put the authority of the Apostolic Preaching in the sole authority of the church. Few deny the necessity of *κρυπύματα* or the testimony of the church and all would rest upon this if the canonical Scripture is not known -- to move the people to penitence , to discern the true books from the false , is an office of the church , but the church is the chest to the treasure , not the treasure itself. The treasure is found in the church , revealed by the church , and for the church, and the two should be inseparable , the church the casket containing the treasure but having no intrinsic value apart from the treasure, unlike the reliquaries. There is a vital relationship between the casket and the treasure , for if the casket lacks the treasure, the casket is worthless . A man, without 'scientia' of the Canon , may hold the catholic faith through the promulgations and practices and fellowship of the church , but the ground of his faith is not in the authority of the church alone, but in the revelation of God in Christ in Scripture.

Stapleton had said that a man may not know Scripture but can be saved through the church and either way , none can be saved unless he know the church. Whitaker answers that this is an open question since God is not bound to the church but the church is bound to God and to the necessity of promulgating those heads of doctrine necessary to salvation and contained in Scripture ; this is the ultimate authority of the church in matters of faith. Whitaker notes that Stapleton unconsciously puts 'Roman' in front of 'church' (that none can be a Christian ' qui Romanae Ecclesiae Communionem non tenuerit') and this puts him in the tradition of Boniface 2nd.; although there has often been a move (actum de reconciliatione) for reconciliation between the churches, it has never been achieved because of the lack of good faith (bona fides) . Boniface 2nd. writing to Caesarius of Arles (531 AD) said that catholicism had fled from Carthage , and Aurelius and Augustine had returned to Rome through Eulalius ; though this may be true in a sense , the attitude of mind such a statement could engender and was general among

Stapleton's contemporaries was an attitude of mind that produced much bloodshed, as Bede tells us. Because of the 'heresy' of not subjecting themselves to Rome, Augustine prophesied, after the meeting at Augustine's Oak, the slaughter of the English ('Augustinus fertur minitans praedixisse, quia si pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent, bellum ab hostibus forent accepturi'). This was not merely a clash of customs, since after the healing of the blind man, the British Bishops had agreed to conformity and wished for a second synod after receiving the full approval of the people in this move towards the reconciliation of the churches. The will for unity was there, but this was prevented till 30 years later in Ireland and till 654 AD at Whitby in England, by this 'very sentence so proudly displayed by the sitting Augustine'.

The recitation of the Creed and Baptismal doctrine by the catechumens long before they came to a knowledge of Scripture is no exception to what Whitaker has already said --- the creed is not a product of the church's authority alone 'absque Scripturis' but it is in fact The Scripture, the 'medulla Scripturae'.² The voice of the church is the medium of **believing**, but not the principal cause and ground of faith³ --- Calvin said that the church was the 'ὄργανον' Spiritus Sancti ad credendum' but he did not say that the voice of the church was the 'causa principalis credendi' since the voice of the church to be the medium must be joined to the Spirit and therefore the word 'principalis' cannot be applied to it. The church is an Article of the Creed not the grounds of faith --- faith rests upon divine revelations not ecclesiastical propositions.

What had been said by Whitaker did not cover the addition of the article to the Creed⁴ 'descendit ad inferna' which was, like the other additional articles, added on the authority of the church. Whitaker replies that Rufinus in his Commentary on the

-
1. Bede H.E. 2.2.
 2. Augustine Ep. 166 (ML. 33. 721). Whitaker writes that the Creed is the *summa* of Scripture under 12 articles. Ambrose (Serm. 38) had called it the 'claven fidei' by which the heavens were opened.
 3. Stapleton greets Whitaker with the words 'Salve sollertissime Investigator Medii'!
 4. The later additions were a) Maker of heaven and earth b) conceived c) suffered d) dead e) descended into hell f) God-Almighty g) Catholic h) communion of saints i) Life Everlasting

Creed (c. 404 AD) omitted it when he gave the Baptismal Creed in use at Rome in the 4th. Century --- he wrote 'sciendum sane est quod in Romanae Ecclesiae symbolo non habetur additum 'descendit ad inferna' This article appeared in very few of the early Creeds --- Whitaker writes ' I could number 50 different creeds (quinquaginta varia Ecclesiarum symbola) in which this article is wanting. Duraeus² had thought that the reason for the omission was due to the fact that there was no heresy on this point at Rome as yet, But Whitaker advises

1. and in Aquileia . Rufinus (c. 345 - 410 AD) was born near Aquileia in N.Italy and became a presbyter there . He travelled in the East in 371 AD and visited the monks of Egypt and stayed at Alexandria and Jerusalem , returning to Italy in 397 AD. His text of the Creed (ML. 21. 373) is the earliest continuous text of the 4th. Century form of the Creed in use at Aquileia and Rome. The Article 'descendit ad inferna ' (ad inferos) was foreshadowed in a similar clause

Εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα (κατελήλυθόντα)

which appeared in the three allied formulae of Sirmium (Vide Eusebius H.E. 2. 37) (c.359 AD) Nike in Thrace (359 AD) and Constantinople (360 AD) -- the Sirmium Formula composed by Mark of Arethusa in Syria (Sanday JTS lll. p.17) and appearing next in Jerome's Creed from Pannonia , ran ' was crucified, died and descended into Hell (εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα) and disposed matters there ; at the sight of whom the doorkeeper of Hades (πύλωροι Ἰδου) trembled . ' (Vide LXX on Job. 38. 17. πύλωροι δὲ Ἰδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτησαν. Heurtley (Harmonia Symbolica p. 134) suggested the insertion in the Creed was due to the orthodox opposition to the views of Apollinarius (c.310 - 390 AD) since the article was a proof of the human soul in Christ , for this alone was the subject of the Descent. Sarté (Apostles' Creed p. 61) puts its formal use much earlier , at the end of the 2nd. Century AD or early 3rd. Century as a protest against Docetism.

2. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 8. 22.

him to read the words of Rufinus further --- Rufinus writes ' sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo ' ; were there no heresies in the East ? The teaching on Limbo based on Luke 16. 22 (Lazarus and Dives) either as Limbo Patrum in which the saints of the O.T. remained till Christ's Second Coming , or as the Limbo Infantium , the state of those who died unregenerate (eg. unbaptised infants) -- both excluded from supernatural beatitude by Thomas Aquinas but admitted to natural happiness --- was regarded by Whitaker as the view of those 'sick in the mind ' (mentis *ἀρρωστίᾳ*) . Neither Scripture nor the Fathers can be used to postulate a Limbus or a 'Rhombus ' !² Apocryphal references may be interesting and speculative but the Apocrypha does not carry the same weight as canonical Scripture --- 'apud me una Scripturae uocula plus habet ponderis quam mille patrum sine Scripturis pronunciata' .

The earliest Christian tradition, however, probably quite independently of 1 Peter 3.19³ (and perhaps 4.6) supports a ministry of Christ to the dead , the 'spirits in prison' , that those who rejected the warnings of Noah may be faced with the ultimate choice of the acceptance or rejection of Christ Himself in the power of His embryonic Resurrection. Though Bucer and Calvin did differ on the interpretation of the article 'Descensus ad inferos' they were agreed on this one point , that the Death of Christ availed no less for the First Fathers who lived before Christ than for those who followed Him. The souls of the Holy Patriarchs and of others who

1. Augustine taught that those dying unbaptised being in Original Sin suffer some degree of positive punishment.

2. 'Rhombum'--- ' magicians circle ' . Ps. 16.10 *יְיָ שָׁמַר לִי מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמַח בְּמוֹתָי* --- saved from the corruption of the 'sepulchre ' ; Zech. 9.11 -----

אֵלֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְעֵתָא דְּבִרְיָא דְּמַלְאָכָא דְּבִרְיָא דְּמַלְאָכָא
'emisisti vinctos tuos de lacu ' --Duraeus had constructed his theory of Purgatory on this text , but this is hardly Limbo , filled with peace and quiet , free from suffering . In Eth. Enoch. 22.1-14 Sheol had 4 sections ;-

- a) martyrs
- b) the righteous who were not martyrs.
- c) sinners who had lived prosperously
- d) sinners who had to some degree been punished --- the situation varied from extreme bliss in a) to loss of all hope of resurrection in c) .

3. 1 Peter 3. 19 *ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν* : 1 Peter 4.6 *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη* .

Luke 23.43 (Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise) assume the ancient Judaistic belief

embraced the (hope of the) Messiah by a sure faith are not in Hell but are in celestial living , as Lazarus in the Parable (Luke 16.22). The Ministry of Christ to the dead is found in Ignatius --- 'even the prophets being His disciples , were expecting Him as their teacher, through the Spirit . And for this cause He, whom they rightly awaited, when He came, raised them from the dead (Justin Martyr² and Irenaeus³ both quote a passage , described as coming from Jeremiah (Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 4.36) or from Isaiah (Iren. op. cit. 3.22) which reads 'the Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves , and descended to preach to them His own salvation '. Tertullian (states Whitaker) also attests the fact of the Descent into Hades , and the general Patristic consensus was that such a Descent was beneficial ' sub specie salutis ' to the saints of the Old Covenant. Whitaker does not, however, mention by name Tertullian's De Anima⁴ in which he speaks of a treatise he had written De Paradiso -- ' habes etiam de Paradiso a nobis libellum , quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini ' --- but Whitaker's omission was probably due to the fact that the De Anima belonged to what is called the semi-Montanist period (c.206 - 212 AD) and therefore could not be classed as a catholic work. Tertullian

1. Ignatius Letter to the Magnesians (c.115 AD)
2. Justin Martyr Dialogue with Trypho 72.
3. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 4. 55 gives the passage but does not mention the author. Justin Martyr accused the Jews (probably without sufficient justification) of having cut the passage out of the sayings of Jeremiah , but there is no trace of it in existing copies of the LXX . Irenaeus also quotes a certain presbyter ' who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles and from those who had been their disciples , that the Lord descended into those parts which are under the earth (in ea quae sunt sub terrā) preaching His Advent there also, and declaring remission of sins received by those who believe in Him , whose hope was set on Him i.e. those who foretold His Advent , and submitted to His dispensation , just men, and prophets & Patriarchs (Iren. Adv. Haeres. 4.42).
4. Tertullian De Anima cap. 55 (ML. 2. 744 -c. 210 AD) 'Christ in Hades (apud inferos) underwent the law of human death not did He ascend to the heights of heaven until He descended to the lower parts of the earth (in inferiora terrarum) that there, He might make Patriarchs and Prophets sharers of His life (compotes sui) Vide Gospel of Peter cap. 44 ; Gospel of Nicodemus 31-34 ; Clement of Alex. Strom. 6.6. ; Origen Contra Celsum 2.43 ; idem on Luke Hom 4. on John. 2.30 ; Cyprian Test. Advers. Jud. 2.24 ; Cyril of Jerusalem Cat.4. 11 ;14 .18. 19 ; Athan. Orat. Contra Arian. 3.23 and 29 ;Basil on Ps. 68.9. ; Ambrose De Excid. Fratris 2.103 ; Aug. De Genes.ad lit. 12.53.

distinguishes between Paradisus and Inferi , holding that the martyrs alone go direct to Paradisus . All others including the souls of the faithful generally are 'apud inferos' which is divided into 'sinus Abrahae ' (thus distinguished from Paradise) and the place for the unregenerate wicked. In Apology 47 , Paradise appears as the place of heavenly bliss , appointed to receive the spirits of the saints (after the Last Judgement) . The terms 'inferi ' / , 'Sinus Abrahae' and 'Paradisus ' are discussed by Augustine in De Genesi ad **Literam** 12. 33 where Dives is 'apud Inferos'.

Scripture, comments Whitaker, states the fact of the Descent , but not the many theories that go with the words 'descendit ad inferna ' --- and this is all the Creed does , to state the fact of the Descent. What construction is placed upon the words must not in any way conflict with the Scriptural conception of Christ's Work in salvation which may be said to demand the article . Without 1 Peter 3.18 - 4. 6. the Descent would be **req**uired that Christ might fulfil the condition of death as really and truly as of life and hallow every condition of human existence. But with 1 Peter 3 we go beyond the fulfilment of the condition of death to the object of that Descent viz. to declare Christ's saving Work on the Cross and to demonstrate Christ's victory over sin and death.

The direct reference to 1 Peter 3.19 though appearing in the Articles of 1553 AD was omitted in 1563 AD and 1571 AD because of the controversies raging at that time --though it was retained for the Epistle for Easter Eve . The clause was untouched by Archbishop Parker in his preliminary revision and is found in the MS² which he submitted to the bishops , though a pencil mark through it suggests its future omission. Bishop Alley of Exeter drew up a paper for the Convocation of 1563 AD in which he mentions³ the great differences and vitriolic exchanges among the preachers in his diocese , their views on 1 Peter 3 being;-

- a) to manifest the virtue and strength of Christ and His Death to the dead.
 - b) that Christ sustained upon the Cross all the infernal pains of
1. The singular 'infernum' appears in Rufinus and the Creed given by Venantius Fortunatus (-c.570 AD) based on Rufinus ;the plural 'inferna' is found in the Gallican Service Books ;the phrase 'descend-it ad inferos' appeared probably for the first time in the (contd.

Hell (Calvin) hence the Cry of Dereliction.

- c) that the article should be excluded not on theological grounds but historical ,since it does not appear in the Creed of Cyprian nor in any creed before Rufinus.
- d) the article should be included on theological grounds because it has the consent of the Latin and Greek Fathers --- for the Latin Fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory the Great , Cassiodorus , Sedulius, Virgilius, Primasius, and Leo -- for the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Emissemus, John Damascene, Basil the Great , Gregory of Nyssa , Epiphanius, and Athanasius, -- 'quod anima Christi fuit vere per se in inferno (sic) '.

Bishop Hooper in his 'Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith ' (1550 AD) states that Christ not only suffered the distress and heaviness of death but also the pains and torments of Hell i.e. the great and severe judgement of God as if He were the enemy of God. In Cambridge in 1567 AD the 'dispute was managed with so much heat that it came to the Chancellor who referred it to Archbishop Parker '.

The Catechism of Trent on the Article of the Creed ' mortuus et sepultus' had the words 'Christum tormenta et cruciatus animo percepisse ' and advises every parish priest to teach his people that Christ suffered the innermost grief of the soul-- which is rather more than Duraeus had allowed viz. that Christ deplored the misery of our nature . Christ took the punishment of all sins and the fulfilment of Isaiah 53, 4-6 is a real one ;the experience was fully one of abandonment by God even when He was Totum Deo . Satisfaction for sins demanded much more than a heroic conquest of death ; it was a pouring out of the utmost grief of the soul ' pro peccato' --- the punishment proper for sin in body and soul. Whitaker has no quarrel with Duraeus's words that not only are we debtors in prison who cannot pay but await our ransom , but also we are 'sponsores ' who cannot satisfy our creditors -- but

contd. Bangor Antiphonary (c. 680 - 691 AD) Vide 'Antiphonary of Bangor ' fol. 19. Bradshaw Society ed.
 2. MS in Corpus Christi Library Cambridge.
 3. Strype Annals l. 348.

1. Strype ~~Annals~~ Parker ' 3. cap.18

Christ's Death was more than a mere payment of debt ; it was active redemption through suffering the punishment for sins. But there was in the 'tristitia Christi' no danger of Christ despairing -- to take upon the griefs of Hell (dolores inferni) is not to be overcome by despair. The article , therefore , in Whitaker's view stands for Christ's Victory over all punishment for sins , in body and soul, through perfection in both , and the declaration of that full Victory on the Cross to the Fathers (ad inferos).

The words of Augustine answer Stapleton's ^{assertion} that 'Credo in Unum Deum' and 'Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam' is proof enough, to profess a belief in God is to profess that God is true (verum) and the same is true of the Church , and therefore the Church's Faith must be received. Whitaker replies that this is a 'non sequitur' --- the one is an absolute premise on which all other articles hang , while the article on the church carries no such universal deduction. The church has neither divinity nor infallibility of itself , nor is it Omnipotent or Omniscient , nor is it the end of our faith or the Beatific Vision . Augustine listed the three ways (trifaria) of talking about 'Credo' ;-

- a) Credo Deo --- to believe God, to trust that what He says is true, have confidence in Him.
- b) Credo in Deum --- this is to love (diligere) Him. As Augustine says ³ 'qui fidem habet sine spe ac dilectione , Christum esse credit , non in Christum credit.'
- c) Credo Deum -- to believe God because of what He is i.e. 'quia ipse est Deus.'

Thômas Aquinas said that these three things --- Credo Deo, Credo in Deum and Credo Deum ---are not three different acts of faith but one and the same act of faith ' in quo sit diversa ratio ad fidei objectum ' ⁴. It is sometimes said that demons believe that God is, this being an act of the intellect , but

1. Aug. Serm. 181 De Tempor. cap. 1. ML. 38. 979.

2. eg. Luke 1.20 'quod non credidisti verbis meis' (Vg.)
eg. 'Credo tibi hoc ' -- I take your word for this.

3. Aug. Serm. 144. 2.

4. Thomas Aquinas Summa Pt. 2. Qu. 2. art. 2. Reply to Objection 1 Dominican Ed. Vol.9. pp. 32 - 33 . Bonaventura Comment. on the Sentences 3.23.3. said 'una fide omnia haec tria facimus '

Aquinas said that though this may be true , to lack the other elements of faith as unbelievers do , means that they do not believe that God exists under the conditions that faith determines , and so they do not believe truly in a God ; for ' to know simple things defectively is not to know them at all ' . 'Credo in Deum ' means that the will moves the intellect and other powers of the soul to the end . The end of the church is not itself but God . Augustine said that the three activities should be distinguished but by definition not in operation , and so demons and unbelievers cannot be said to have the 'actus fidei' which is ^{the} necessary content of 'Credo' . We profess our belief in the catholic church as a fellowship to be realised , a communion to be known, a holiness to be achieved -- and the fact that there is an article on the church but not on the Scriptures is not to make the latter dependent on the former but because the whole creed depends upon Scripture and therefore Scripture cannot be an article of the Creed, since the Creed is Scripture . The article on the church is a derivative from the belief in the activity of the Spirit .

In the history of the canon of Scripture , Stapleton says ² that disputed books were received into the Canon on the authority of the church , and Sixtus Senensis taught ³ the distinction between *πρωτοκανόνικαι* and *δευτεροκανόνικαι* producing a first and second order of books. Stapleton goes on to say that the inclusion of the second order , the deutero-canonical was based upon the concept of the canonical *χαρακτήρ* due to which the church elevated them into the canon. This would therefore suggest a distinction between *ὁμογενής* and *ἑτερογενής* --- and the authority of the church decided that the disputed books in possession of this canonical character were to be elevated into the Canon. If this happened once , then the church has the authority to make uncanonical books into canonical. Whitaker replies that Stapleton had changed the argument of Sixtus Senensis from one of 'Order' into one of 'Genus' ;

-
1. Whitaker comments to Stapleton ' abi nunc et ride cum sodalibus tuis ! ' 'Ecclesia nullo modo est formale objectum fidei neque formalis ratio fidei nostrae ' .
 2. Stapleton op. cit. 9.6.
 3. Sixtus Senensis Bibliothec. 1.

Stapleton was analysing the books into ;-

- a) Primum Genus -- having Apostolic character and order and so are canonical.
- b) Secundum Genus -- having Apostolic character and order (but admitted to the Canon eg. Apocalypse.)
- c) Tertium Genus -- mutilated books with a show of Apostolic character and order, and typical of heretical books.

Christopherson (d. 1558 AD) had recently discussed the use of 'genus' and 'germanus' in connection with the **corpus** of canonical books --- he stated that the tradition and authority of the church is a 'perspicua nota librorum canonicorum' (with which Whitaker wholeheartedly agreed) . He listed the canonical books over which there was no dispute and then the disputed books which were received 'pro sacris' and which he described as 'germanae canonicis libris' and therefore possessed 'perspicua nota quaedam' , on which grounds they were ultimately received. Whitaker maintained that both Christopherson and Stapleton were inventing terms which were of no help --- how does Stapleton define 'perspicua nota' ? ; the weight of tradition had never been denied by Whitaker in dealing with the Canon -- indeed it may be said that it carried greater weight with Whitaker than it did with Stapleton who disregarded the weight of tradition by asserting that the church had simply the authority to insert apocryphal books. Whitaker claimed to profess the testimony of antiquity --- ' non unius aetatis sed omnium a Christo ad Tridentinum ' . The external testimony of the church must be added to the internal testimony of the Spirit --- Stapleton should not reverse the order of these phrases , but when speaking of the

-
1. Christopherson was appointed Master of Trinity on Mary's Accession and in 1554 AD Dean of Norwich , 1557 AD Bishop of Chichester, but he was imprisoned for a violently anti-Reformation Sermon preached on 27th. November 1558 AD (10 days after Elizabeth 1's Accession) and died soon afterwards. He was a learned and enthusiastic Patristic scholar, ~~translating~~ also the Ecclesiastical Histories . Whitaker comments on his translation of Eusebius that it was ' eleganter magis quam sincere ' and though he much admired his work and often used it , Christopherson did on occasions use Eusebius badly (Eusebium mala fide transtulit) in his translations from Greek into Latin eg. Eusebius H.E. 2.23.25.

external testimony of the church ,were they both talking about the same thing ? By ~~these~~ words Whitaker meant the external testimony of the whole church at all times ; Stapleton appeared to mean the current defining authority of the Roman Church at Trent.

Whitaker embraced all the implication of Augustine's thought in his 'De Doctrina Christiana' 2.8.-- and elsewhere in that work. In reply to Stapleton he says that by all means we should listen to the church with the eagerness and attention of a novice -- this was precisely what Whitaker was doing --- 'Ego novitius Ecclesiam Anglicanam in qua natus sum , magistram et monitricem habui , eamque audiui, eiusque iudicium sequutus sum ' and she would have him accept the Canon 'antiquitatis monumentis antiquissimis ' -- what more could Stapleton bind (litigas) him to. Being nurtured and educated in the Ecclesia Anglicana , Whitaker would die in her Faith , and he would rather do this than inherit through Rome the dilemma of quoting Augustine as saying that the judgement of the church is final, which he did not say , and then teaching doctrine contrary to him. What he did say was that in the Scripture , he would follow the catholic churches --- 'In canonicis Scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur ,inter quas sane illae sint quae apostolicas sedes habere et epistulas accipere meruerunt . Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Scripturis canonicis ut eas quae ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis , praeponat iis quas quaedam non accipiunt ; in iis vero quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus , praeponat eas quae plures gravioresque accipiunt iis quae pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiae tenent. ' !

It is true that in the 40 books of the O.T. Augustine included the LXX as inspired ² , of divine origin , but from what he has said in 'De Doctrina Christiana' 2.8. his judgement must be submitted to the doctrine that as revelation becomes a norm by Canonical Scripture so Canonical Scripture becomes authoritative because it witnesses in a unique and unchanging way to the revelation. No other

1. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 2.8. (ML. 34. 40)

2. ibid. 2.8. 13 (ML. 34 . 41)

can make the promise of future divine revelation and so it is the duty of the church to proclaim Scripture because of this intrinsic revelation. The LXX though inspired is not of the same efficacy. What Augustine was saying here and in 'ego vero evangelio non crederem nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas' is that he grasped the Living Christ by means of the living church, that he learnt Christ from the uniform life of faith of the whole church, a life 'fertilized' by Apostolic teaching, but that in the matter of the Canon he followed the widest possible authority --- that of all the catholic churches with Apostolic chairs, and whose letters of definition should be accepted. With the Fathers down to the 4th. Century Augustine regarded the LXX as the standard form of the O.T. but Jerome's Vulgate did most to dispel the belief that the LXX carried the same weight of inspiration as the Hebrew O.T. While Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian could quote books of the LXX (of those in the Canonical O.T. and those now designated Apocrypha) passim, without distinction, by the 4th. Century many Greek Fathers eg. Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzen, were establishing a distinction between those canonical in the O.T. and the rest. The distinction was accepted by Jerome and the term Apocrypha appears, to describe the latter class -- to distinguish the 'Libri canonici' from the 'Libri ecclesiastici'. From then on, doubts existed on the canonicity of the apocryphal books and though Ambrose and Augustine treated them without distinction, as inspired, and they were used in Liturgy and Legenda, they lacked the great weight of the O.T. Hebrew Canon. Trent, however, demanded their acceptance as 'de fide' --- a decision which the Eastern Churches have not made; there, too, opinions are divided². No one denies their value, but it is not of the same weight as the inherent authority of the canonical O.T.

The question therefore remains an open one-- in the light of custom, the use of the Apocryphal Books by Ambrose and at Rome would suggest that Augustine in his use of them followed the customs of the day --- he was never definite enough to say that

-
1. Council of Trent Sess. 4. 8th. Spril 1546 AD
 2. At the Synod of Jerusalem in 1627 AD only Tobit, Judith, Ecclus. and Wisdom were acknowledged as 'canonical'.

the Canon was to be decided , altered, added to, 'ex sola Ecclesiae autoritate '. In the light of the situation of the day, Augustine advised that novices should listen to those books which were adjudged authoritative by most (if not all) the churches, particularly those with Apostolic foundation rather than listen to those books accepted by only a few . True, this would turn them to Rome but not only to Rome ---if there had been a formal decision on the Canon from Rome and defined 'de fide' Augustine would have had to defer to it on Stapleton's arguments ,but there was no such thing in existence. When Jerome wrote on his choice of books in his 'Helmeted Preface'² he says that the books not found in this list (his list) must be placed among the 'apocryphal writings' i.e. Wisdom, Ben Sirach , Judith, Tobias , Shepherd of Hermas -- but this was not to disparage the ancient translators, for ' in the Tabernacle of God there are some gold, some silver , some precious stones , others linen, blue and scarlet ' but following St. Paul in his preference³ for the canonical O.T. Jerome would not deviate from the Hebrew original (de Hebraica Veritate). There is a distinction here , but Stapleton should note there is no condemnation for Pope Damasus , nor was Cyprian condemned and his name is repeatedly honoured in the Latin Canon of the Mass ! .

That the Canon was carefully defined before Augustine's day is seen in the *Κατηχησεις* of Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 348 - 350 AD)⁴; on the N.T. his list is the traditional Canon with the exception of the Apocalypse , and he concludes ' let all the rest be excluded (from the Canon and be accounted) in the second rank

-
1. Augustine De Doctr. Christ. 2.8.
 2. 'Prologus quasi galeatus ' , the Helmeted Preface to Jerome's translation of Samuel and Kings , the first of his Prefaces to be published (391 AD) ; ML. 28. 1242.
 3. Vide E.Earle Ellis' 'Paul's Use of the O.T. (1957) p. 76-84 for a discussion on Paul's use of the Apocryphal books ; vide etiam Jowett's 'Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans -- A Commentary ' (London 1894.) p. 200. St. Paul used many sources ,but it is one thing to use a quotation to illustrate a truth already given , another to use a quotation (from extra-canonical works) as the origin of new truth. Michel 'Bibel ' p. 111 who cites the synagogue worship as the means by which exegetical traditions spread , comments that Paul's relation to Philo is best explained , as in the case of Wisdom, as mutual dependence upon a common tradition ' Vide Ellis op.cit. p. 150 Appendix 1 (A). For 1 Cor. X Vide Ellis pp.66-69 ; Thackeray 'Paul and Jewish Thought ' p. 205 ff. . Paul was selective not dependent.
 4. MG. 33.517

(ἐν δευτέρῳ) and all the books that are not read in the churches , neither do thou read by thyself as thou hast heard ' .

On the O.T. he **lists the 22 books**

πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχει κοῖνον .

Whitaker maintained that there is no such thing as an order of deuterocanonical books -- the very mention of canonical-apocryphal books (a term which Stapleton had used) was a contradiction in terms ; Stapleton had put the Clementine Epistle in the order of canonical-apocryphal books, but Whitaker reminds him that by quoting such an example , he should see the impossibility of an analysis by 'genus' or 'ordo' -- the judgements of the church in this matter are 'de fide ' not ' de disciplina' . Dissimilarity was no bar to canonicity . It takes more than an ecclesiastical judgement and opinion to make a book canonical ; the formation of the Canon has much wider references than this, but fundamentally it is true to say that no synod or council admitted a canonical book which had no Apostolic origin , Apostolic authorship or Apostolic authority , and this is endemic to the function of the Apostolic Office and is incommunicable. Though the church rejected certain books eg. the Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Andrew , Gospel of Peter, this rejection was based upon more than the sole criterion of the judgement of the church ; the church has the common faith of the Apostles , the bar to which writings must be brought , at which heresies are proved, but 'quantum ego Ecclesiae debeo , tantum Ecclesia Scripturis debet ' . It is true that Augustine often uses the judgement and testimony of the church in refuting heretics but 'testimonium ecclesiae ipsum nec scientiam nec fidem generat ' . Augustine says that heretics are rarely moved by the authority of the church alone, since often they are contemptuous of it and heretics such as the Manichee were contemptuous of Scripture, and no amount of ecclesiastical authority could

1. Vide Cajetan Comment. in Libros Hist. Vet. Test. passim.
2. Eusebius H.E. 3.25 --the Gospel of Peter and others were rejected for their 'ipsa dictio, character et phrasis quae non Apostolicae ; differt multum ab orthodoxa religione ac doctrina ' . Dionysius of Alexandria weighed the objections against the Apocalypse but found them insufficient to overthrow its canonicity but this had little to do with the 'judicium solum ecclesiae ' -- but 'ex rebus in ea (i.e. Apocalypse) contentis ' .
3. Augustine Ep. 56 ML. 36. 666

change that. The testimony and judgement of the church may convince the intellect, but this does not necessarily bring about the persuasion of faith. Whitaker reminds Stapleton that Augustine did not give the grounds of the church's acceptance of the canonical books when he spoke of the Scriptural 'media' ;-

- a) Ordo Rerum (secundum historiam)
- b) Causae dictorum et factorum (secundum aetiologiam)
- c) Veteris et Novi Testamenti tanta congruentia (secundum analogiam)
- d) Figur^{ar}um Tanta Secreta (secundum allegoriam)

these were the four well known 'media interpretandi non definiendi Scripturas' ---- 'verum quidem est ex hac tam varia interpretatione **ipparum** Scripturarum, earum majestatem et veritatem vehementer elucere' --- variety of interpretation adds lustre to Scripture, but this is the very thing the Roman Church will not admit; variety of interpretation does not necessarily add up to heresy.

The argument now turns upon the meaning of Augustine's words 'Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi ~~me~~ Ecclesiae Catholicae commoveret autoritas' ² -- words which Stapleton claimed had sent many a catholic to the stake these 30 years past, suffering for Augustine. Whitaker replies that no one has suffered persecution in England for holding to St. Augustine --- 'Papistae **turbulenti** propter laesae majestatis crimen ultimo supplicio afflicti sunt; alii superstitione Papistica imbuti sed a prodicione ac perduellione semper alieni pecunie quidem jacturam aliquam vitae nullam fecerunt', though some Papists in the provinces and in families under the Jesuits had now learnt better sense --- 'speramus sane fore iam indies **pauciores**'. None suffered for Augustine. Calvin, ³ Peter Martyr, and Musculus had written much and well on this text of Augustine and

1. Stapleton op. cit. 9.8. Aug. De Util. Cred. 3.7.
2. Stapleton op. cit. 9.9. Augustine Contra Ep. Fund. (ML. 42.176). Stapleton complains that he has had to leave his work on his 'Promptuarium Morale' on the Sunday and Saints' Days Gospels -- 'quod multis precibus multi a me efflagitarunt' ! -- to which he would rather turn mind and pen, but he is forced to play the 'Mastix et Orbilius' and waste his time with sheer argument. 'Nullum duriores asinum quam te inveni' !
3. Calvin Inst. 1.7.

took the view that the words should not be taken out of context . Augustine was now a catholic , had heard Ambrose at Milan , and others , and he is now pointing out that as a Manichee he could not have used these words, but as a catholic he can because he accepted the full catholic teaching on the Gospel. The words ' nisi me Ecclesiae Catholicae auctoritas commoveret ' should not be read ' si me Ecclesiae catholicae auctoritas non commoveret ' which is what Stapleton had done ; there is also a difference between ' credere et ad credendum commoveri ' . In his Confessions 6.5. Augustine looks back to the time when he was neither Manichee nor catholic, when he was moved by the authority of Scripture --- ' mankind was too weak to find out the truth by the way of evident reason (liquida ratione) and for this cause there was need of the authority of Holy Scripture ' --this authority was divine , since ' fidem per Scripturas gigni ' . Augustine came to see that ' syncerissima sapientia in ecclesiae catholicae esse in gremio ' . But ' veritas manifesta in ecclesia ' is not the same thing as ' nos debet credere propter auctoritatem solam ecclesiae catholicae ' . The substance of Ambrose's teaching as Augustine tells us in his Confessions 6.4. was not the authority of the church but 2 Corinthians 12. 16 , Isaiah and the Spirit ; the authority of the church moved him ' ut crederet ' but it was not the foundation of faith but the expression of it. As a Manichee , he could not say these things , for he could not have believed that truth was to be found in the Apostolic Ministry eg. Ambrose , Aurelius of Carthage , Possidius and others , whose authority was established in Apostolic truth. His life had been governed by philosophy not by grace. Now the Regula Fidei was commended to him by the authority of the Apostolic Church , not commanded since that authority was congruent with Scripture in matters of faith.

On the relationship of the Regula Fidei to Scripture , Stapleton makes the point that many were saved before Scripture was written , on the basis of the Regula Fidei ², and therefore it is the wrong way round to postulate a Regula Fidei arising out of the written Scriptures. Whitaker has no quarrel with this but would

1. Stapleton op. cit. 12.

2. Iren. Advers. Haer. 3.4.1. claims that if the Apostles had not bequeathed the Scriptures to the church, the Regula Fidei would

point out that there is a vast difference between these two statements and the postulation of a 'compendium ad salutem' prior to and independent of Scripture. The appeal to a Regula Fidei as an autonomous authority independent of Scripture is only rarely made among the Fathers and then unconvincingly. Irenaeus¹ frequently stressed the point and says that heretics **override** (ὑπερβαίνοντες) the order (τὴν τάξιν) and structure (τὸν εἶπνον) of the Scriptures as if to dismember a mosaic of the emperor and reassemble the pieces to make a picture of a dog. They destroyed the proper construction (ἰσότησιν) of the Scriptures, but the man who retains the Regula Fidei will recognise scripture but not those blasphemous constructions. But there is no question of subordination of Scripture to Tradition² --- the Fathers writing frequently on the Regula Fidei regarded the contents of Scripture as congruent with the contents of the Rule of Faith and professed to draw all their doctrine from Scripture.³ Origen⁴ regarded the church as taking its doctrine from Scripture and appealing to Scripture to commend its Rule of faith, and by the time of Pseudo-Cyprian's Adversus Judaeos 10 we find that if a Jew asked any Christian, boy, child, old woman or rustic, then 'he would expound the Scriptures to them, **illiterate** though he be'. This is an interesting contrast to Irenaeus's claim¹ that barbarians who do not have the Scriptures learn Christianity from the Regula Fidei --- Contd.) have sufficed as a body of doctrine; unbelievers become Christians without reading the Scriptures. Paul preached to the Gentiles without appeal to the O.T. Iren. Advers. Haer. 4.38.2. Vide Tert. Adv. Marcion 4.2.5.

1. Iren. Advers. Haer. 1.1.15.
2. Iren. 'Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching' passim; the tradition of the church (fides quae creditur) should be defended and proved through Scripture.
3. On Scripture as the complete permanent Regula Fidei vide Whitaker's Disputatio 6.16. (Parker Society ed. p.662). To Tertullian the contents of the Regula Fidei and of Scripture are identical Tert. Advers. Marcion 4.2.1.; 4.5.1.; Vide Clement of Alexandria Strom. 7.16. 95. (PG. 9. 532)
4. Origen Contra Celsum 2.71.

had the Regula Fidei lost an autonomous authority ? If considered separately from Scripture , yes, but Whitaker points out that these are inseparable , and not a separate 'compendium ad salutem' which gives the church a right to add or subtract from the Canon.

To define a Rule , Varinus said that

κανών ἐστὶ μέτρον ἀδιάψευστον, πᾶσαν πρόσθεσιν
καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν μηδαμῶς ἐπιδεχόμενον —

an infallible measure admitting no addition or diminution , and Theophylact had said the same on Phil. 3.16 ὁ κανὼν γὰρ οὔτε πρόσθεσιν ἔχει οὔτε ἀφαίρεσιν. Eunomius was blamed severely by Basil for admitting the Regula Fidei of the Fathers but saying that it could be added to. As Whitaker had already said to Bellarmine, that if addition or emendation is necessary , it cannot be a rule. Chrysostom² wrote that Scripture, the sentence of divine words , is the 'exact balance and standard , the rule of all things ' and so it is no partial rule nor a mere commonitorium (as Bellarmine had claimed) but Queen-Mistress of all. Durandus⁴ had written that the measure of the Regula Fidei is bound by two limits -- 'ut non subtrahatur fidei quod sub fide est nec attribuatur fidei illud quod sub fide non est ; utroque enim modo mensura fidei exceditur et a continentia sacrae Scripturae quae fidei mensuram exprimit , deviatur '.

So, many have been saved without the Scriptures but none without the doctrine of Scripture.

A further definition is required on the use of the word 'authentic ' --that while Scripture is 'per se , et ex se , sacra , divina , summaque autoritate digna , ' yet to make the Canon authentic there must be the judgement and authority of the church (publica, comprobata et authorata) --so wrote Stapleton. In reply, Whitaker says that to use the word 'authenticate ' in relation to the Scriptures is to add nothing to the authority of the latter but to

1. Basil Adv. Eunom. 1.

2. Chrysostom Hom.13 on 2 Cor.

3. Vide Augustine Contra Faust.Manich. 2.5. .Andradius in his Defensio Tridentina 3.1. wrote ' I am far from disliking the opinion of those who say that the Scriptures are called canonical because they contain the Canon i.e. the amplest rule and standard of faith piety and religion . Gerson De Examin. Doctr. 2.1. wrote 'Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam Regula sufficiens et infallibilis '.

4. Durandus Pref. In Magistro 12.

affirm the necessity of this action by the church to guarantee the orthodoxy of her Faith . When the church authenticates the canon, it adds public approbation and declaration . Justinian's definition of 'authenticate ' when used of a Will means that the original Will which those who sign have no authority to change , receives authenticity viz. the assertion that the contents ~~is~~ ^{are} the Will of the testator and the seal genuine. ² The necessary , true, perpetual , and proper cause of that authenticity of Scripture is the Holy Spirit not the public judgement of the church , which without the Regula Fidei and the Spirit could descend from an authority ' de divino' to an authority 'de humano ' -- the church may be said to be a 'Regulatura ' --- 'pendere et confirmari non sunt synonyma '

At this point Whitaker asks whether the Vox Ecclesiae amounts to ' fides acquisita an infusa ' , the former coming from 'studium et persuasio ' and the latter being infused by the Holy Spirit into the heart of the believer . He quotes Durandus --- 'assensus fidei nostrae non potest reduci ad fidem acquisitam qua credimus Ecclesiam esse veracem tanquam in regulam vel rationem formalem credendi -- fides infusa est spiritus interna persuasio ³ ! .

1. Justin. Digest. 29.3.12.
2. Whitaker quotes Paulus Jurisconsultus Dig. lib. 22. tit. 4 'Quicumque ' ; he also quotes Budaeus --the Latinised name of William Bude (b. Paris. 1467 AD) a renowned scholar in philology philosophy and jurisprudence ,with the royal patronage of Charles and Francis ; he became the Royal Librarian . Bude interpreted Cicero's use of *ἀὐθεντικῶς* as ' non sine certo authore' , synonymous with 'verus et germanus ' the true original. Whitaker also refers to Accursius and Alciatus although of the former he says that he was not altogether a good Latin scholar. ('etsi non valde bonus author Latinitatis ').
3. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (c. 1270 - 1332 AD) scholastic philosopher , 'Doctor Modernus ' and sometimes called 'Doctor Resolutissimus ' . Becoming a Dominican he taught in Paris lecturing on the Sentences , and in 1312 AD became Magister in Theologia ; a year later he was summoned to the Papal Court at Avignon and in 1318 AD became Bishop of Limoux. Opposed to Thomas Aquinas he was one of the earliest exponents of Nominalism ;he stood for a strong contrast between reason and faith , and held that the Real Presence in the Eucharist did not preclude the continuing existence of the bread and wine. His principal work was 'Commentary on the Sentences' which survives in three recensions a) before 1308 AD b) 1310-1312 and c) 1317 - 27 AD ,the later recensions omitting points to which objection had been made by his superiors .The Commentary on the Sentences (which Whitaker quotes here -- bk.3.dist.25.qu.3.art 4) was published in Paris 1508 AD and several other editions

Whitaker affirms, defends, and acclaims the external testimony of the church but our faith does not rest upon it, and to be thoroughly authentic there must be the conjunction of Scripture, the internal testimony of the Spirit, and the external testimony of the church eg. 1 Cor. 12. 3. οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ .

The testimony of the Fathers is that spiritual truth ' non aliter nobis certo constare nec alia ratione in animis nostris confirmari posse quam Spiritus Sancti testimonio '. Stapleton said in his Eighth Book that no catholic ever denied this --Whitaker was glad to hear it, because he feared that not a few papists did. Augustine spoke of the necessity of infused grace ; speaking of Moses he wrote ' unde scirem an verum diceret ? '. But since Moses was dead , we believe ' per Mosem non propter Mosem , the Holy Spirit supplying the deficiency.

Stapleton regarded Whitaker's analysis of the relationship between the internal testimony of the spirit and the external testimony of the church as inadequate --- Basil wrote on Ps. 115

πίστις ἢ ὑπὲρ τῶν λογικῶν μεθόδων τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς συγκάθεσιν ἑλκούςα πίστις οὐχ ἢ γεωμετρικαῖς ἀνάγκαις ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργείαις .

But here and elsewhere Basil explains how faith arouses (provocare) and entices (invitare) the soul to consent to that orthodox faith which is the external testimony of the church . Basil entreats (flagitare) his hearers to give their consent without disputation since the axioms provided by the church are similar to those of geometry and incontrovertible. Whitaker suggests that Stapleton return to the text and read it a little more closely ; then he will be embarrassed to find that it is quite contrary to the thought he had expressed. Basil argued that in all disciplines , certain principles can receive assent without demonstration , and this applies to religion that there are certain ἀναπόδεικτα that require consent ' sine

contd. appeared in the 16th. Century.

1. Augustine Confessions 11. 3. Vide etiam Contra Fund. 14 (oportere mentes nostras intrinsecus ab ipso Deo firmari ac illuminari) and De Vera Religione 31 (aeternam Dei legem mundis animis fas est cognoscere , judicare / fas non est ')
2. 'provocare' --used in the sense of the progress of an appeal to a higher tribunal.

probatione ' because in essence they are incapable of proof -- these have been called ἀρχαί, στοιχεία, and πρῶται ὑποθέσεις. These receive the assent of faith in the primary sense. St. Ambrose wrote 'Noli, Ariane, ex nostris aestimare divina; sed divina crede, ubi ~~humana~~ non invenis ergo divina ex se probantur ex se creduntur ' and again ' non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum '. Gabriel Biel (c. 1420 - 1495 AD) had written 'veritates catholicae absque omne approbatione Ecclesiae, ex natura rei sunt immutabiliter et immutabiles verae et sic sunt immutabiliter catholicae reputandae ' . Stapleton regarded Biel's view as amounting to saying that the church did not function by its own testimony as sacred Scripture and catholic truth did --- their validity and orthodoxy did not depend upon whether we accepted them or not ; so immutable truth stands in the church because the church cannot otherwise think or declare, but judgement stands in the testimony of the church. Leaving the last statement aside for the moment, Whitaker notes that Stapleton had in fact strangled himself because he had written ' sine errore et per consequem est credere omnia per ipsam approbata ' which in the light of Biel's words needs to be qualified. But Biel was in fact asserting that truth was of five kinds ;-

- a) quae divinitus revelatur
- b) quae in Scriptura divina continetur
- c) quae ab ecclesia recipitur
- d) quae a Summo Pontifice approbatur
- e) quae ex harum aliqua sequitur necessario

Biel then writes ' ea credenda esse quae ab ecclesia approbantur ' and

but Stapleton should note that a) ~~and~~ b) have gone before and form

1. Ambrose De Fide ad Gratianum (c. 379 AD) 1.5.42 (PL.16.537).

Stapleton accuses Whitaker of abusing the text for Ambrose is talking about divine things being incapable of demonstration, that 'ex nostris' applies to 'res creatae et exempla humana'; Whitaker replied that however 'ex nostris' is translated and allowing for the fact that Ambrose is talking about the divine generation of the Son, his point is a valid one, and in fact is strengthened by these extended exegeses viz. that 'divina simpliciter credenda sunt ubi humanum nihil invenitur'. Bishop Salvianus (De Providentia 3) wrote 'humana omnia dicta argumentis et testibus egent; Dei autem sermo ipse sibi testis est quia necesse est quicquid incorrupta veritas loquitur, incorruptum sit testimonium veritatis'; the Word of God does not rest for its authority on the testimony of the Church -- Pharoah knew the testimony of Moses but lacked the infused grace to know the Word.

the prior grounds of that approbation ; so Biel continues 'Ecclesia **eam recipit** quod eam (i.e. veritatem) invenit in Scripturis divinis et tunc iterum absque tali receptione est catholica ' . Melchior Canus ² wrote 'sine fide infusa nihil aut necessario credi aut certo nobis persuaderi posse ' and Cardinal Peter Alliacus wrote that 'theological principles are themselves the truths of Scripture ' --- 'quoniam ad ipsas sit ultima resolutio theologicis discursus et ex eis primo singulae conclusiones theologicae deducuntur ' not 'ex testimonio ecclesiae ' . Gerson wrote that Scripture is the 'Regula sufficiens et infallibilis pro regimine totius ecclesiastici corporis et membrorum usque in finem mundi . Est igitur talis ars, talis regula vel exemplar cui se non conformans alia doctrina vel abjicienda est ut heretica, aut ut suspecta et impertinens ad religionem prorsus est habenda ' . The Papal Librarian Bishop Eugubinus ³ wrote that he who believes the doctrine of the church 'propter auctoritatem Scripturae is rectum credendi ordinem servat ' .

-
1. Gabriel Biel . Sententia . 3.25.3. Biel was educated at Heidelberg and Erfurt , and joined the Brethren of the Common Life at Butzbach ; in 1479 AD he became Provost of the Church at Urach . A co-founder of the University of Tübingen (where he held the Professorial Chair of Theology) he was one of the last great scholastic thinkers , predominantly an Occamist of the Nominalist School he was tolerant of opposite systems. His works include the above mentioned 'Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard ' and an 'Exposition of the Canon of the Mass ' and 'De Potestate et Utilitate Monetarium'. Vide Uberweg Lists 2. pg. 604.
 2. Melchior Canus 'Common Places ' 2.8. Whitaker says he differed much from Melchior Danus but agrees on this point. Vide Canisius 'Catechism ' Chapter on 'The Precepts of the Church' sect. 16---- 'nos Scripturae propter testimonium divini Spiritus intus loquentis credere adhaerere ac tribuere maximam auctoritatem .' Bonaventura wrote 'auctoritas principaliter residet in Sacra Scriptura '(In Brev. 5.7.) -- he emphasised that human wisdom was folly when compared with the mystical illumination which God sheds upon the faithful Christian ; this essentially mystical theory of knowledge he wrote about in his 'Itinerarium Mentis in Deum '.
 3. Eugubinus 'On the Sentences ' 1.3.

Chapter 12
The Four General Councils.

Writing about 594 AD to John the Patriarch of Constantinople and other Patriarchs , Gregory the Great referred to the special prestige of the first four doctrine-defining General Councils , and equates their work with that of Holy Scripture -- 'I profess that as I receive and venerate the four books of the Gospels , so do I the four Councils ' which he lists as Nicea (325 AD) Constantinople (381 AD) Ephesus (431 AD) and Chalcedon (451 AD) . 'These ' , he says , ' are the four squared stone on which the structure of the Faith rises ' . Quoting this, Campion launches forth into what Whitaker calls his great hymn of praise of the Council of Trent , which the older it gets the more it flourishes and spreads , that ' valiant and picked garrison of all the Councils², equal in credit and authority with the first four General Councils ; whoever denies a General Council is an ass in divinity and void of discretion'; Campion continues ' O Good Lord , with what diversity of people out of all countries , with what choice of bishops throughout all Christendom , what excellence of Kings and Commonwealth , what profound divines , what devotion , what lamentations, abstinence and fasting, what flowers of the universities , what knowledge of strange tongues , sharp wits , study, endless reading , store of virtues and exercises with which that sacred place was replenished ' . Archbishop Anthony of Prague³ had greeted the delegates on their return with the words ' we have maintained you in a good school ' .

-
1. Rouet de Journal Enchiridion Patristicum 2291 -- 'quia in his (i.e. the Councils) velut in quadrato lapide sanctae fidei structura consurgit et cuiuslibet vitae atque actionis existat , quisquis eorum soliditatem non tenet , etiam si lapsis esse cernitur , tamen extra aedificium iacet ... cunctas vero quas praefata veneranda concilia personas respiciunt , respicio ; quas venerantur , amplector ; quia dum universali sunt consensu constituta , se et non illa destruit quisquis praesumit aut solvere quos religant aut ligare quos solvunt . Quisquis ergo aliud sapit anathema sit. ML. 77. 478.
 2. 'valido et exquisito praesidio ' . (Kemnitius who wrote an Examen of the Council of Trent is called 'another silly man with a giddy brain ' .
 3. Archbishop Anthony ordained Campion priest.

Campion now asks ' but where are the adversaries , those who croaked like toads out of their hiding places ? ' .

The point had been made that Queen Elizabeth I had been willing for delegates to go to Trent but there was no enthusiasm for the idea because of the fate of John Huss at the Council of Constance (July 1415 AD) ; Huss was promised a safe conduct by Sigismund the Emperor , as indeed was his supporter , Jerome of Prague though he had received no such imperial guarantee. Whitaker comments that the whole episode of Huss had filled the Reformers with a great deal of apprehension --- and what Campion was now saying only increased the fear that such apprehension was not without warrant. Campion argued that the Council itself made no promise of safe-conduct to Huss , who met his death because he attempted escape which the Emperor had forbidden on pain of death, and he also broke certain covenants which he had made with Sigismund. Whitaker replies that the stories of certain covenants which Huss was supposed to have broken , and that of his escape , were all highly suspect , but even if they were true , it is the words that Campion adds that confirm the fears of many --- 'The Emperor sealed him a safe conduct , but all Christendom , which is greater than the Emperor , unsealed it , and as the arch-heretic would not recant , he was burnt.'

Whitaker continues with the words of Gregory the Great and says that these could be offset by those of Gregory of Nazianzen who presided for a short time at the Council of Constantinople after the death of Meletius³ --- Gregory of Nazianzen wrote of the younger bishops , that they 'chattered like jays , buzzed

1. Mgr. Baudrillart argues in the Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique that this was solely against molestation en route --but Huss only received it on arrival at Constance , and E.I. Watkin's view ('The Church in Council' p. 158) is that it was intended to be general in its effect. Watkin comments that ' Huss as a man deserves our admiration ' . A spectator , the future Pope Pius 2nd. recalled that Huss went to the stake ' as gaily as a man invited to a banquet ' . A luminary of the Council , Bishop Robert of Salisbury , with others , opposed the death penalty for heresy.
2. Philip Hughes 'The Church in Crisis' p. 31 writes that Gregory (of Nazianzen) 'was discouraged by the revelation of what ecclesiastical politics could be at high level ' and resigned. His canonical position had certainly been weak , as the Bishop of Alexandria and his suffragans were quick to remind him on their arrival at the Council. Gregory had consented to become Bishop of Constantinople when he was already Bishop of Sasima though he could have pleaded a defence that he had never exercised his episcopate at Sasima. He had

angrily like a swarm of wasps , and their elders did nothing to check them ' , and in his work 'On the Futility of Councils ' (382 AD) he wrote ' for my part , if I am to write the truth , my inclination is to avoid all essemblies of bishops² because I have never seen any council come to a good end³ nor turn out to be a solution of evils ; on the contrary it usually increases them ' .

Whitaker also quotes Hilary's Second Letter to Constantius 360 AD in which Hilary complained ' we fight about words, enquire about novelties , take advantage of ambiguities , criticise authors , fight on party questions , have difficulties in agreeing , prepare to anathematise each other , there is scarce a man that belongs to Christ (prope iam nemo Christi est) . For we are wandering , blown by variable winds of doctrine , and either we cause confusion when we teach or when we are taught we go astray every year and month, we determine creeds . We change decrees , we prohibit our changes, and we anathematise our prohibitions. '

Campion had, however, betrayed his mind in

 contd. ~~disregarded~~ on this point the law enacted at Nicea . The Syrian bishops even refused him communion . Vide Watkin 'Church in Council ' p. 36.

3. Meletius Bishop of Antioch died out of communion with Rome , but was later canonised as a saint of the Roman Church !

1. Gregory Nazianzen Ep. 130 Ad Procopium , a high official ; Gregory grounds his retirement on the plea of ill-health ; for this reason he did not attend the council summoned for 382 AD the next year.

2. ὥστε πάντα συλλόγον φευγεῖν ἐπισκόπων .

Duraeus held the view (De Concil. 5 Whitaker Contra Duraeum) that what Gregory meant was that the fraud and malice of the heretics of his day brought about an impossible situation with regard to any lawful synod of bishops . Whitaker comments that Gregory's mind goes deeper than this -- he refers to any council, not merely to Nicea.

3. μήδεμις σύνδε τέλος εἶδον χρῆσον .

equating in authority and inspiration the Council of Trent with the 'Apostolic Council' of Acts 15 --- there are wide divergencies; the first point recognised by Gregory the Great, was that the first Four General Councils in matters of faith were grounded and settled by Scripture; the second point was that Campion was wrong in equating the later councils with the earlier ones just because they bear the title 'Ecumenical' (or General) , since councils carry distinctions. It is a common error to name a council or synod and because it bears this august title in common usage, to take the matter as settled. Whitaker agrees with, and follows, the Romanists in many synods but notice should be taken of Augustine's words in 'De Baptismo'² that provincial councils should yield to Plenary Councils of the whole Christian world, and that the authority, even of Plenary Councils held earlier are often corrected by later, and that all yield to Scripture³, whether they be episcopal writings or councils. It is true

-
1. In the margin are the words 'The Council of Trent was neither a full council nor lawfully held, and this both the Emperor and French King have judged'. Vide Sleidanus sub anno 1551 AD bk. 23 Conventus Quorundam. Whitaker comments that as it stands, this view has difficulties -- the Council of Constantinople was recognised as Ecumenical but only 186 bishops were present all oriental,³⁶ of whom denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit and they withdrew, leaving 150. Half had come from Thrace and Asia, the rest from the vast (civil) diocese called 'The East' (Oriens) whose chief See was Antioch and whose Bishop, Meletius, presided at the Council but who was rejected by Rome and the West which had never been invited. Whitaker says that there is no issue on the first Four General Councils, and there was an important codicil to the comment he had made on the Council of Constantinople, that the first stage of its recognition as Ecumenical was in the 4th. Session of the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) which took as the Regula Fidei 'that fixed by the Council of Nicea and which the 150 bishops of the Council assembled at Constantinople by Theodosius the Great confirmed'. Philip Hughes (op. cit. pg. 30) writes ' why the Council which met at Constantinople came in after years to be regarded as a General Council is something that may puzzle the legists and the theologians'.
 2. Augustine De Baptismo Contra Donat. 2.3. (ML.43.126)
 3. Augustine Contra Maxim. 3.14.

that Augustine writes ' saluberrimam esse in ecclesia plenariorem conciliorum auctoritatem ' !----- no one denies this , but though the conciliar activity of the church is continuous and reflects the defining nature and authority of the church in the face of a changing world , this does not make all councils either General or Provincial of equal authority.

The importance of the 6th. Canon of 1 Nicea looms large here in the controversy , and Whitaker commends Bellarmine for at least quoting only from those 20 recognised canons of this Council , and not from the disputed (Arabic) canons, a custom which prevailed among the Jesuits of the day . Some put forward the letter of Athanasius to Pope Marcus which stated that 1 Nicea had adopted 40 canons in Greek and subsequently added 20 Latin canons ,and claimed that the Council in one of its later sessions had put out 70 altogether. Marcus copied these 70 canons found at Rome and sent them to Athanasius . Whitaker regarded the letter as **spurious** and mentions that this letter to Marcus actually contained 80 canons. This is the number given in the Vatican MS which had been bought by the famous Asseman from the Coptic Patriarch John. This MS which was in Arabic was discovered by the Jesuit Romanus who first made its contents known and translated into Latin a copy he had made of it. In writing his history of the Nicene Council , the Jesuit Pisanus received the newly found 80 canons into his book ,and though out of respect for the Pseudo-Athanasian letter he at first cut down the number to 70 , he later followed the Vatican MS in adopting the 80 canons. In 1578 AD Turrianus , with

1. Augustine Ep. 118 ; Vide Ambrose Ep. 32 De Fide. In view of the Ecumenical authority granted to 1 Constantinople (i.e. its decrees had found acceptance by the church universal) it is difficult to see how Philip Hughes could write ' no member of the church has ever proposed that a General Council be summoned and the Pope left out or that he would ever be anything but President ' . The modern definition of an Ecumenical Council, as that to which bishops and others entitled to vote are convoked from the whole world under the Presidency of the Pope or his legates , the decrees of which having received Papal confirmation , bind all Christians (Addis-Arnold ; Catholic Dictionary s.v. Councils) runs into the difficulty that on this definition 1 Constantinople and possibly three others of the 7 undisputed Ecumenical Councils would cease to be such. It is not necessary for the whole world to be represented or great numbers, but that its findings receive final acceptance by the whole church--this alone gives a council its Ecumenical character in full. Contd.

Romanus's translation before him in MS , now issued an entirely new translation with a Pro^oemium containing a vast amount of information on the subject , setting up cogent reasons for assuming that the original canons were more than 20 in number . Whitaker , who had read Turrianus's work, held the view that only 20 canons could be regarded as genuine on the grounds that ;-

- a) Gratian had not quoted from the additional canons and Contius had fully examined this point. In general the Latin canonists had followed Gratian.
- b) Theodoret said¹ that 'the bishops assembled once more and decreed 20 canons on ecclesiastical discipline -- he mentioned no others .
- c) Rufinus had noted 22 canons but in fact they are no different in content from the 20 because he divided two canons (the 6th. and the 8th.) as did Isidore.²
- d) Pope Stephen followed Gratian's 20 canons , no more , no less.

The Romanists of Whitaker's day had made much of the view that Cyril of Alexandria did not in fact have the true exemplar of the Nicene Canons , basing their view on the Letter of Athanasius to Pope Marcus (336 - 337 AD)³ in which Athanasius is supposed to have sought an exemplar of the Nicene Canons from the Pontiff (ex Rom. Pontificis scrinio) and asserting that the

 contd. The difference between Bellarmine and Whitaker is that the former would bring all to the Pontiff's judgement , Whitaker , to that of canonical Scripture in matters of faith .(cp. the position of modern R.C. Canon Law ; CIC Cans. 222 - 9 --- where an Ecumenical Council must be convened by the Pope and its decrees are only binding if sanctioned and promulgated by the Holy See).

1. Theodoret H.E. 1.13
2. Gelasius , Bishop of Cyzicus (fl. 475 AD) the ecclesiastical historian , wrote a Syntagma or collection of the Acta of 1 Nicea , to refute the Monophysite claim that their faith was identical with the Nicene Faith ; he expressly stated that the Council only decreed 20 Canons.
3. Paris Edition (1626 AD) Vol. 2. 624 -- Ep. Athanasii et episcopi Aegypt. ad Marcum --- 'Papam pro exemplaribus Niceni Concilii quia Ariani eorum exemplaria incenderunt '.

exemplars that had been at Alexandria had been burnt by the Arians , and therefore , said the Jesuits , Cyril could not have had an independent copy of the Nicene Canons . Whitaker commends Bellarmine in that he had seen the essential flaw in this argument , because Athanasius in his Letter Ad Omnes Orthodoxos said that the burning of the books took place after the death of Marcus and this is supported by Jerome's Chronicon. The Letter of Athanasius to Marcus states that since there was no doubt that ' apud vos (i.e. at Rome) plenaria esse Concilii Niceni exemplaria ' a copy of such should be sent to Alexandria ' sub tuta stipulatione ' . Athanasius complained that ' nec libros nec vestimenta Ecclesiastica aliaque ornamenta nec reliqua utensilia nobis dimiserint. Libros vero nostros usque ad minimum incendentes nec iota unum reliquentes ' . In the Answer or Rescript De Missione Capitulorum Niceni Concilii -- after congratulating the Egyptian bishops for their constancy and that ' Sancta Romana Ecclesia quae semper immaculata mansit et domino providente et Beato Apostolo Petro opem ferente , in futuro manebit sine ulla haereticorum insultatione , firma et immobilis omni tempore persistet ' -- Marcus goes on to say that in the Papal Scrinium there had been found 70 Capitula.

Whitaker asks the very important question , never far below the surface , 'if the Nicene Canons at Alexandria were true copies of those at Rome, why did they not agree with those at Rome , when Sozimus claimed the right to hear appeals in the case of Apiarius ? Further, if Roman copies had been sent by Marcus to Athanasius as requested , Cyril would have had more canons than he did have.² Additional doubts are evident when the work of Alphonsus³

-
1. A further appeal had been made by the Jesuits Stapleton, Copus (1.7) and Lindanus (Panopl. 4.89) to the (spurious) Letter of Athanasius to Felix 2nd. (356 - 365 AD) where it is stated that Athanasius believed that the canons then at Alexandria had been invented by the Arians , the originals having been burnt. Pighius (Hierarch. 6.7.) held the view that no true exemplars of the canons remained at all except those at Rome , and in this he followed the view of a certain John at the Council of Florence . Bellarmine had also quoted this 'John of Florence ' as appearing in Session 20 but Whitaker says ' quis hic Johannes fuit, incertum est '.
 2. The Spanish collection (generally but erroneously attributed to Isidore , composed early 7th. Century had only 20 Nicene Canons, as did the collection of Adrian and Hincmar .

of Pisa in the Councils is read ; in this there are found certain canons alleged by the Romanists but in fact not even in the 80 . The habit, says Whitaker , of attributing to Nicea , canons which are wanting, is no new thing --- Augustine¹ quoted a 'Nicene Canon' which prohibits to a bishop the power to appoint (assignare) a successor ; this belonged to the Council of Antioch (sic).²

The formal discussion between the African bishops and the Pope on the subject of appeals to Rome indicates the true number of the Nicene Canons. The presbyter Apiarius of Sicca in Africa deposed for many crimes appealed to Rome. Pope Sozimus (417 - 418 AD) took up the appeal and sent legates to Africa , and to prove his right he quoted the Nicene Canons --- 'when a bishop thinks he has been unjustly deposed by his colleagues he may appeal to Rome and the Roman bishop shall have the business decided by 'judices in partibus ' . This in fact was not a Nicene Canon but the 5th. Canon of Sardica (7th. in the Latin version). In ancient times the Canons of Nicea and Sardica were copied consecutively and under the common title of 'The Canons of Nicea' --- Sozimus might 'optimā fide ' have fallen into error which he actually shared with contemporary Greek authors . The African bishops not finding the Pope's canon in the Greek or Latin copies , in vain also consulted Bishop Cecilian's copy ---Cecilian had been present at Nicea and brought a copy back to Carthage . Appeal was made to Alexandria and Constantinople for authentic copies . Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople sent faithful and exact copies of the Creed and Canons of Nicea and these were translated into Latin which has come to us in the Acta of the Sixth Council of Carthage and contains only 20 Canons.³ In their Letter to Pope Boniface (419 - 422 AD) the successor to Zosimus , the African bishops **declared their satisfaction that the spurious canons were not found in the Greek , and that they** contd.) 3. Alphonsus Pisanus De Concil. 3. Whitaker states that if canons 46 and 47 of Alphonsus's list be carefully read , they disposed of the papal claims to hear appeals !

1. Augustine Ep. 110.
2. It is in fact canon 48 of the Arabic canons.
3. It might appear at first sight that there are 21 but the 21st. canon is not a canon but an historical note appended to the Nicene Canons by the Fathers of Carthage.

now had (i.e. from Alexandria and Constantinople) 'exemplaria ex tam variis locis allata (ἐκ τῶν διαφόρου τόπων) ' and in their Letter to Pope Celestine (422 - 432 AD) they said that they had ' veteriores tabulas ex authenticis exemplaribus ' (τὰς ἀληθεστέρας ἀπογράφας ἐκ τῶν ἀύθεντικῶν) . Cyril of Alexandria in writing to the African Council wrote that he sent τὰ ἀληθέστατα καὶ τὰ πιστότατα ----- Whitaker translates ' verissima et fide dignissima exemplaria Niceae Concilii ' .

The interpretation and meaning of the Sixth Canon of 1 Nicea is of great moment in any discussion of the Roman Primacy . Bellarmine argued that this canon quite definitely asserted limits to the jurisdiction of other Patriarchates --- an assertion which confirmed custom (consuetudo) . The Letter of Nicholas I to the Emperor Michael (Sept. 865 AD) quite clearly states that the Roman Primacy was not affected by the Sixth Canon because ' potestas eius non ab hominibus sed a Deo ' . The words of the Letter are ' quoniam fundamentum quod Deus posuit , humanus non valet amovere conatus , et quod Deus statuit , firmum validumque consistit ista igitur privilegia huic sanctae Ecclesiae a Christo donata , a synodis non donata ' . Whitaker replies that Nicholas was in fact urging the Emperor to accept Papal Primacy but scum inanissimis ratiunculis ' ; there can be no defence for something that is not there and if there had been no doubts about the Primacy (before the time of the Sixth Canon) it would have been unnecessary to write such a spirited letter.

Bellarmino contends that the purpose of the Sixth Canon was to make the metropolitan jurisdiction of Rome the 'exemplar omnium aliorum patriarcharum ' --- ἐπειδὴ² καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τούτο συνήθες ἔστιν is the Greek of the Canon , but this did not interfere with the universal Primacy of Rome expressed by Paschasius at Chalcedon , that the 'Sixth Canon of the 318

1. Denzinger - Schönmetzer. Enchiridion Symbolorum 638 . The importance of assessing the date and authority of the Arabic Canons is seen in canon 39 --- ' of the care and power which a Patriarch has over the bishops and archbishops of his Patriarchate and the Primacy of the bishops of Rome over all ... the Head and Prince of all the Patriarchs. ' .
2. Whitaker comments , the text is ἐπειδὴ not διότι

Holy Fathers was 'The Roman Church has always had a Primacy ..let Egypt also retain one ... in like manner Antioch '. As Metropolitans and Patriarchs they were of equal strength (vis) said Duraeus, but the Sixth Canon limited the boundaries of the other Patriarchates reserving supreme Primacy (by custom) to Rome. Bellarmine had stressed the point that ' in common books ' the words 'Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum '² at the beginning of this canon had been omitted , but both Alan Copus and Abbot Dionysius have them in their translations from the Greek.

The statement raises problems , chiefly the use of 'Primatus' . In its Fourth Century use , it denoted no more than the office of a metropolitan bishop ; a possible motive for its introduction at this point may have been the loss of prestige suffered by the Roman See under Liberius and during the first 10 years of the Pontificate of Damasus . Add to this the increasing importance of the See of Milan and the comparative absence of any metropolitan organisation in Italy , it is quite possible that there were those who felt the need to reassert the customary but quite undefined metropolitan authority of the Roman See within the Italian peninsula. In the light of T.G.Jalland's remarks , the Letter of the Council of Arles to Silvester³ (314 AD) referring to Rome's possession of the 'greater dioceses ' (i.e. **extensive** civil divisions) acknowledging Rome as leader of the Western Church , is interesting . C.H.Turner,⁴ however, thought that the words of this Letter ' as also agreed to write first to you who hold the greater dioceses ' are doubtful, if not premature ! The basis of the Letter was that by 'the authority of God , our tradition , and rule of faith ' , by ' the judgement of God and of Mother Church ' , certain ~~trou~~blesome men had been rejected and

-
1. Paschasinus (c 440 AD) was Bishop of Lilybaeum (Marsala) in Sicily . Pope Leo the Great requested his opinion in the Paschal Controversy and he replied in favour of the Alexandrian as against the Roman usage. At Chalcedon (451 AD) he vigorously objected to the presence of Dioscorus , Patriarch of Alexandria , who in support of Eutyches had deposed Flavian Bishop of Constantinople at the Latrocinium at Ephesus (449 AD) ; at the Third Session of Chalcedon in 451 AD when Eutychianism was condemned , he was deposed , excommunicated , and banished by the civil authorities to Gangra in Paphlagonia . Duraeus called Paschasinus 'Vicar of the Apostolic See '.
 2. Vide T.G.Jalland 'Church and Papacy ' p. 308 ff.
 3. Letter of the Council of Arles to Silvester . CSEL. 26.206.

Rome should be informed , for the better information of all the churches (i.e. as a centre of communication). The same request was made by the Council of Sardica to Julius (342 AD) over its condemnation of Arius --- ' you, Julius , in your excellent wisdom, should provide that our brethren in Sicily, Sardinia, and Italy, may learn from you what has been done and decreed , that they accept not letters of communion in ignorance from men degraded by a just verdict '.

Whitaker replies that the beginning of this ^{Sixth} Canon had always been τὰ ἀρχαία ἔθνη κρατεῖται --- (antiquae consuetudines obtineant) --- at Chalcedon , Constantinus the 'secretarius consistorii' had read the Canon in this way from the Codex submitted by Aetius , Archdeacon of Constantinople. Gratian in quoting the canon does not have the words of Paschasinus 'Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum ' and Bellarmine should note the ' quod' which he had omitted in the use of Paschasinus's title . The words ' quoniam Episcopo Romano paritis mos est ' are capable of a variety of interpretations --Rufinus said that the Bishop of Alexandria held the cure of Egypt as the Bishop of Rome had the 'cura suburbanarum ecclesiarum ' , those churches in Italy, and its neighbouring parts (in locis propinquis) and Cardinal Cusanus followed Rufinus as did the 8th. Synod of Constantinople² (879 AD) , Theodore Balsamon³, Nilus Bishop of Thessalonica, who had incorporated this view in his work against the Roman Primacy , and Carranza, who in his Epitome of the Councils had said that Byzantium was still Byzantium at that time , not yet Roma Nova or Constantinople. Whitaker draws attention to the fact that the power of creating new metropolitans or confirming others contd. 4. C.H.Turner 'Eccl. Occident. Mon. Juris Antiqu.' Oxford 1899 AD Book 1. 383 B.

1. Council of Sardica to Julius ML. 10. 639.
2. Accepted as the 8th. Ecumenical Council in the East but a previous Council of Constantinople (869 AD) was accepted as the 8th. Ecumenical Council by the West , at which Photius of Constantinople had been anathematised , following a Synod of Rome in 869 AD which did the same thing.
3. Greek canonist (1140 - 95 AD) ; though made Patriarch of Antioch he remained at Constantinople since the Latins put in a Latin Patriarch at Antioch c. 1191 AD during the Crusades . His Scholia consist of
 - a) a Commentary on the Nomocanon of Photius
 - b) one of the principal collections of canon law of the East.

appears to have been an accepted custom in Justinian's day --- Justinian assigned metropolitan status to the Bishop of Carthage and to the bishops of his own birthplace (Taurescium or Salona) . Carranza even thought that the text of the Sixth Canon should read ' quoniam Metropolitano Episcopo paritis mos est ' and the Dominican Nicolinus followed the same thought , but the fact remained that the Greek text has 'Episcopo Romano '.

Whitaker remarks that Bellarmine was too easily following the views of Andradius² who asserted that before any Council had defined this matter , the Pontiff had permitted the Bishop of **Alex**andria the rule of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis ---- if such had been the case , the 8th. Arabic Canon would never have been written , the African bishops would have had no problem since all matters of moment must be submitted to Rome , and Photius could never have doubted the antiquity of Rome over Bulgaria . Whitaker notes ;-

a) Chalcedon refused to accept the Eutychian matter merely as settled by Rome's decision or to accept Leo's Tome without examination as to whether it was orthodox . This provided a doctrinal hegemony for Rome but not a necessary Primacy of jurisdiction. The Tome was accepted not because it was officially promulgated by Rome but because it conformed to the catholic creeds and dogmatic Letters of Cyril of Alexandria. This was the view of the Council of Chalcedon , of the Synod of Milan³, and the Synod of Arles⁴. Bellarmine was to recognise the point here -- he wrote ' Leo Epistolam suam miserat ad Concilium non ut continerem ultimam et definitivam sententiam sed ut instructionem quā adjuti melius episcopi judicarent ' .

b) The Second Council of Constantinople (553 AD) refused any doctrinal (written) communication from Pope Vigilius , removed his name from

1. Justinian Novellae 131.

2. Andradius De Defens. 2.

3. Synod of Milan .Dec. 451 AD . ML. 16. 817.

4. Letter from Ravennius , Bishop of Arles to Pope Leo . ML. 54. 966.

the Diptychs, and refused him communion.

- c) The Third Council of Constantinople (680/681 AD) anathematised Pope Honorius (though he had died in 638 AD) for holding the Monothelite heresy .
- d) The Pope had nothing to do with the calling of the 7th. Ecumenical Council (2 Nicea 787 AD) and this was presided over by Tarasius, not by the Papal legates . On the question of the Presidency of Ecumenical Councils , Felix 3rd. (483 - 492 AD) in his Letter to the Emperor Zeno² said that Eustathius , Bishop of Antioch^h , had presided over the First Council of Nicea (325 AD) and so the Presidency of Hosius of Cordova is not without some doubt.

In accepting 1 Constantinople as a Concilium Generale one or two points must be made clear which are important when considering the claim made by Duraeus that the authority of a Council is worthless without the Pope's authority. In spite of what Bellarmine had tried to cull out of the Synodical Letter of 1 Constantinople sent to Damasus³, the Council was summoned not by the Pope but by the Emperor and this is clear from Socrates⁴. The Fathers refer to a letter from Damasus to the Emperor Theodosius after the Synod of Aquileia (3rd. Sept. 381 AD) requesting that a council be called and Theodosius wrote to Damasus saying that he was anxious for such a synod. It was actually summoned by the Emperor -- on arrival at Constantinople the Eastern Bishops heard of the suggestion to hold the synod at Rome, but as they had arrived quite unprepared for the longer journey and being apprehensive for the state of their own dioceses during such a longer absence , they declined to go further to Rome but sent Cyriacus , Eusebius, and

-
1. Cross ODCC p. 1420 says that Vigilus was also excommunicated at a Synod of Carthage presided over by Reparatus , Bishop of Carthage . Vigilus was summoned by Justinian 1 to Constantinople but in 551 AD because he opposed the Imperial Edict , he fled to Chalcedon and refused two years later to preside at the above Council of Constantinople. Justinian refused to allow him to return to Rome unless he accepted the Council of Constantinople's decrees and so Vigilus consented after 6 month's consideration and left for Italy 555 AD , dying before he reached Rome.
2. 1st. August 484 AD .Denzinger-Schonmetzer Enchiridion 345.
3. Theodoret H.E. 5.9.
4. Socrates H.E. 5.8.

Priscarius to Rome with a synodical letter. Bellarmine had completely misconstrued the letter of the Eastern Bishops to Damasus when he said that they acknowledged the Pontiff as Head, they the members, of the Catholic Church ; indeed, they refer to Jerusalem as the Mother of all the churches. What they wrote was 'since you showed your brotherly love to us by inviting us (as though we were your own members --- *ἡμῶν ὡς οἰκεῖα μέλη προσεκαλέσασθε*) by the letters of our most religious Emperor to the synod which you are gathering by divine permission at Rome ' ---- Bellarmine spoke as if the Eastern Bishops were all members of , and subject to, the Roman Pontiff. A further point was that Canon 2 of 1 Constantinople was quite clear about Patriarchal independence in jurisdiction --- ' let the Bishop of Alexandria , according to the canons, alone administer the affairs of Egypt ' . This canon was renewed at the Council of Chalcedon (Canon 28) and reviewed , since there it is stated that the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and others mentioned in Canon 2 of 1 Constantinople should be ordained by the Patriarch of Constantinople and be subject to him --- and here *ἴσα προσβεία* (equal privileges) were given to Constantinople as were given to Old Rome. The expanded jurisdiction of Constantinople, says Whitaker, is not to be pressed too far , since the Patriarch of Constantinople was not to elect , but that ' election should be according to custom ' , the Patriarch to ordain. So previously the Patriarch may be said to have *προεδρία* ----- now he has *προστασία* . The attitude of Anatolius , Bishop of Constantinople, at the Council of Chalcedon, is interesting, comments Whitaker , on this point. It is more than probable that the Eastern Bishops aroused by the self-assertion of Rome under Leo , became jealous ² for the claims of a rival

-
1. Just over half way through this canon (28th.) of Chalcedon, we find the words *καὶ ὥστε* the inference being that what follows is implied in what preceded it viz. that the pre-eminence of honour becomes in fact one of jurisdiction.
 2. Ep. 105 to the Empress Pulcheria May 452 AD ML. 54. 998.

Constantinople . Pope Leo wrote to the Emperor Pulcheria and dismissed the 28th. Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, as 'invalid, and by the authority of Peter , the blessed Apostle, we absolutely disannul by a general decree in all ecclesiastical cases '. Anatolius had been 'inflamed with undue desires beyond the measure of his rank--- intemperate ambition advanced by the assertion that certain persons had signified their assent thereto by an extorted signature , in spite of the fact that my brethren and fellow bishops who represented me, faithfully and laudably expressed their dissent '.

Both the Emperor² and the Bishop of Constantinople³ were anxious that this 28th. Canon of Chalcedon should receive Papal approval --- but Leo, in the words of Anatolius, had 'scorned the Synod (i.e. Chalcedon) and without cause threw the assembly into confusion ,setting this See (i.e. Constantinople) at nought , and bringing much occasion of insolence on me and on this most Holy Church of Constantinople '. In his reply to the Emperor Marcian , Pope Leo states that caution should be exercised in raising a city in rank (eg. Constantinople) merely because of its secular dignity --- ' things secular stand on a different basis from things divine ,and there can be no sure building save on that rock which the Lord has laid for a foundation ' . It should be sufficient for Anatolius that he has reached episcopal dignity,without perpetrating 'this monstrous attack against Christian unity and peace ' and that the ' obnoxious greediness of brother Anatolius be curbed '. He could not make a royal city into an Apostolic See --- 'let it be sufficient for him (Anatolius) that by the aid of your piety and favour and my gracious approval he has obtained the bishopric of so great a city.' The 6th. Canon of Nicea had been violated at Chalcedon and without Papal approval --- Pope Leo was astonished that such a canon 'sanctioned by the Fathers and drawn up under the guidance of the Spirit of God at the Synod of Nicea for the government of the whole church ' had been so violated , that the wishes of a single

1. Gore 'St. Leo the Great ' (London 1880 AD) p. 114 (cp. Bright 'Age of the Fathers' 2. 496) made the point that Leo is attempting to use the legislation of the Council of Sardica (Canons 3 - 5 342 AD) as if it had Nicene authority , and this in spite of the fact that both Boniface and Celestine had had it brought home to them that the Sardican canons were not Nicene. Jalland 'Church and

brother have more weight than ' the common good of the Lord's whole house ' .

The significance of the 28th. Canon occupied most of the last years of Pope Leo's Pontificate ; the normative principle in the East was that the rank and jurisdiction of episcopal Sees should follow the importance of the cities to which they belonged --such was the view of the Emperor Leo , but it was ~~refuted~~ by the Roman See . The Roman Synod of 382 AD had declared that the precedence afforded to Rome , Alexandria, and Antioch , was due solely to their Petrine origin . ~~Refusing~~ the Chalcedon canons, Pope Leo took his stand on the canons of Nicea (Sardica) and this was unalterable.² Such a position however was as impossible in practice as it was irrational in theory. The Emperor Marcian's view was that the canons of Chalcedon had been approved by an imperial General Council and thus had the force of imperial law , being drawn up with the will of the 'most pious Emperor ' . There is the suggestion that Paschasinus , Lucentius, and Boniface representing Pope Leo , might reasonably have misunderstood Leo's mind on this matter . The facts however do not bear out this suggestion. It was hardly likely that they could misunderstand his mind, as he had made it clear in three letters to Constantinople in May 452 AD and his letter to Pulcheria mentioned above clinched the matter ^{by} formally cancelling out the 28th. Canon of Chalcedon by 'the authority of Peter ' . Leo, further, wrote to Anatolius³ ---- ' it seems that this time is opportune for the See of Alexandria to lose the privilege of second place, and Antioch that of third place ' . The Synod of Rome 382 AD had⁴ (contd.) and Papacy ' p. 312 softens the view by saying that Pope Leo was unconvinced by earlier correspondence and in the Roman MSS the Sardican canons still formed part of the Nicene collection.

2. The Emperor Marcian to Pope Leo. Leo Ep. 100 ML. 54. 974.

3. Anatolius , Bishop of Constantinople, to Pope Leo 451 AD Leo.Ep. 101 ML 54. 982.

4. Vide Pope Leo to the Emperor Julian, 22nd. May 452 AD.

5. Pope Leo wrote (Letter to members of the Council of Chalcedon March 21st. 453 AD) claiming to be 'the guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the Decrees of the Fathers ' --the former referring to the Tome (Letter to Flavian) the latter to his stand on the Nicene (Sardican) canons.

6. Leo Ep. 106. ML. 54. 1003.

7. ML. 13. 374.

8. See Appendix.

arranged the order of Patriarchal Sees in relation to their association with Peter --- Rome , the first See , Alexandria, the second See (consecrated by Mark ,disciple of Peter and directed there by Peter) and Antioch (because Peter lived there for a time before coming to Rome) . Canon 3 of 1 Constantinople gave 'Constantinople the next place after Rome ' . Pope Leo goes on to say that this will result in Alexandria and Antioch 'being subject to your law , all Metropolitan bishops are stripped of their rightful office ' . But Leo misrepresented the 28th. Canon of Chalcedon which carefully safeguarded the rights of metropolitan bishops , and he overstates the singularity of the position of Anatolius. Leo confessed in a letter, later to Pulcheria , that the bishops of Illyria had subscribed to the 28th. Canon and so it appears , comments Whitaker, that Leo's objection carried little weight in the East. Certainly the Papal rejection of the Canon was unreal in the Greek Empire.²

The gap was narrowed a little by a letter sometime later from Anatolius to Pope Leo³ in which he said that he disliked pride and covetousness and loved peace and quiet ,and what was done at Chalcedon was done by the ' eager clergy of Constantinople and those who agreed, but even so, the whole force and confirmation of the Acta were reserved for the authority of your blessedness ' -- a letter perhaps more of interest to a psychologist than to a theologian. The writing of it was delayed two years , and there is a note of insincerity in the statement about reserving confirmation to the Pope. Leo refused to confirm the Canon , but as Chapman points out,⁴ this refusal simply had no effect at all. Justinian⁵ accepted the 28th. Canon and the Quini-Sext Council of 692 AD in Canon 36 renewed both Canon 3 of 1 Constantinople and Canon 28 of Chalcedon ---that Constantinople have equal privileges with Rome, and thereafter, Alexandria , Antioch and Jerusalem.

On the Quini-Sext Council of 692 AD , Canon 13 , Whitaker comments that the Roman Church is taken to task for its

-
1. Ep. 116.
 2. Leo Ep. ad Julianum (of Cos) Ep. 127.
 3. Leo Ep. 132 ML. 54. 1084.
 4. Bishop Gore 'The Roman Catholic Claims ' London 1905 ed. p.88
 5. Novellae 131. cap. 21

tradition that those advanced to the diaconate or presbyterate should put away their wives ; such a tradition is 'contrary to the Apostolic Canons ' and 'injurious to marriage constituted by God '. The causes of fasting , prayer, and voluntary abstention apart, no such rule (of permanently putting away) should bind the church. This council said clearly that if any priest or deacon put away his wife on a **pretext of piety** he is excommunicate and if he persists , he is to be deposed. The grounds of this are genuine, that marriage is instituted and sanctified by God , and ~~son~~wives are not to be put away. The same Council condemned (in Canon 55) the Roman custom of fasting on Lenten Sabbaths , as a *σφάλμα* (failure) and reaffirmed Canon 66 of the Apostolic Canons. Bellarmine claimed immunity from Canon 55 because it affected things indifferent and was applicable to local custom not a universal canon and he further doubted whether there had been any such canons . Whitaker refers him to Gratian who edited the 66 Apostolic Canons as genuine -- it is true that this Council is held by some to have no Ecumenical authority , but Canon 55 was not 'de novo' since it reaffirmed one which already existed in the 66th. Canon of the Apostolic Canons as 'traditional ' and to be observed 'on pain of deposition ' .

In considering the renewal of Canon 3 of 1 Constantinople and Canon 28 of Chalcedon , by the Quini-Sext Council of 692 AD , Whitaker says that Canon 9 of Chalcedon actually gave more authority to Constantinople than to Rome --- ' if a bishop or cleric have a difference with the metropolitan of the Province , let him have recourse to the Exarch of the Diocese or to the throne (*Θρόνος*) of the imperial city of Constantinople. ' This appears to give more authority to the Patriarch of Constantinople than any Ecumenical Council even the Council of Sardica , had given to Rome, provided that *Θρόνος* is Patriarchal and not Imperial. The difficulty comes with the use of the word 'Exarch ' --- Justinian substituted the word Patriarch for 'Exarch' . It is unlikely , however, that the provisions of the 6th. Canon of Nicea would be so lightly set aside as to make it possible for appeals, for example, from the West , ignoring the Patriarchate of Rome. Probably what was intended was that this should

1. Similar appeals are allowed in Canon 17 of the Council of Chalcedon.

have an Eastern reference only --- that many bishops came to Constantinople from many places , to lay their cases before the Emperor , who frequently referred the decision to the Bishop of Constantinople , who, with other bishops available, held a 'domestic synod ' , and so bishops from other Patriarchates would have their grievances heard, setting aside the proper superior **metropolitans** , an example of which may be seen in the Synod of Constantinople in 448 AD which first brought forward the case of Eutyches.

The 7th. Ecumenical Council , that of 2 Nicea 787 AD , receives scant notice from Whitaker who recalls that its importance in his day was not great . It is more than probable that from Bellarmine's words on this Council that Thomas Aquinas, Alexander of Hales and other scholastic doctors had not seen the Second Synod of Nicea nor the Eighth General Synod (i.e. 4 Constantinople 869 - 870 AD) for ' they were long in obscurity and were first published in our own age as may be known from their not being extant in the older volumes of the Councils and the other ancient schoolmen never make mention of this Nicene Synod ' . Bellarmine, however, accepts the claim to ecumenicity on the part of 2 Nicea as being very strong because :-

- a) it was summoned by the Roman Emperor as the Letter of Tarasius indicates.
- b) it was called with the approval of the Pope (Hadrian) , two Papal Legates being present and signing its decrees.
- c) the Patriarch of Constantinople was present in person.
- d) other Patriarchs were represented , their personal presence being barred by Moslem tyranny.
- e) the decrees were unanimously accepted by the 350 bishops and were immediately received in all four Eastern Patriarchates and accepted by the Pope and by the Western Church with the exception of the Gallican Church .

Whitaker remarks that 2 Nicea touches nothing in the controversy -- this council merely confirmed the canons of the

1. Bellarmine De Imag. Sanct. 2.22.

six Ecumenical councils preceding it, and tended to be concerned with 'manners' more than faith' so much so that the general attitude of Whitaker's day was reflected by Richard Field¹ who held that 2 Nicea could really be rejected without loss to the Faith. The Fourth Lateran (1215 AD) and Fifth Lateran (1512-7 AD) really prove to be the 'antiquity' of Rome for Papal Primacy --it may even be designated really an Italian issue, says Whitaker, for the Council of Trent was packed³ with Italian bishops, and this doomed Trent in the eyes of Henry 2nd. of France. A strong case may be made out that at the Council of Florence (1438 - 45 AD) the Easterns were

-
1. 2 Nicea was chiefly concerned with resolving the Iconoclastic controversy and the veneration of holy images --- by 'manners', Whitaker means an attitude and behaviour towards pious objects -- a 'nova res' in conciliar theology.
 2. Richard Field became Chaplain in Ordinary to Elizabeth I in 1596 AD and Dean of Gloucester in 1610 AD. Vide his 'Book of the Church' 5. 51.
 3. From the lists (Mendham 'Council of Trent') it would appear that there were 187 Italian bishops, 26 French, 2 German, and 31 Spanish, the rest numbering 24 between 10 countries. The numerical fortunes changed during the 25 sessions (1545 - 1563 AD). In Dec. 1545 AD the Council was sparsely attended; the interests of the main parties were very varied. Clement VII th. was preoccupied with the Conciliar problem viz. whether a Council was superior to a Pope; the Emperor Charles Vth. wanted a 'Reform Council' taking action on practical matters, leaving matters of faith aside; Francis I st. was against it because of his fear that it might strengthen the power of the Emperor; the Lutherans wanted a non-Papal General Council including laymen. The numbers recorded by Mendham agree with the artists' impressions eg. the painting of the Council at St. Maria Maggiore, Trent, by Elia Maurizio (1633 AD) and the closing session of the Council in Trent Cathedral painted by Titian, in the Louvre, Paris. (Eспенcaeus, the theologian from Paris recorded that at the Council of Basle (1431 - 49 AD) Cardinal Ludovicus had made no headway because of the Italian 'bloc' of bishops, 'culled from every small Italian town'.)

under strong pressure (coacti) from John VIIIth. Paleologus, the Greek Emperor, 'qui rerum statum metuens, reconciliam quovis modo Ecclesias cupiebat' and that when commanded to elect a new Patriarch 'domum reversi mox omnia abrogaverunt quae vel concesserant vel **concedere** visi sunt'. The Plenary jurisdiction of the Papacy defined and promulgated at the Lateran Council (dissolved March 1517 AD²) had had no confirmation or grounds from any previous council and is not therefore binding on the whole church. Whitaker writes that this Lateran Council 'petered out a year or so before Luther emerged, before the gathering storm burst'. The Reforming party at this Council had sought for a basis for future activity in the restoration of episcopal authority, but the exclusive control of high offices by the Pope made it inevitable that reformation start outside³. Whitaker comments that it was a strange irony that

1. Runciman 'Fall of Constantinople' pg. 7 states that to Paleologus the political advantages of an East / West reunion far outweighed anything else in the face of the Ottoman threat; in 1369 AD the Emperor John Vth. made a personal submission to the Pope but he prudently refused to involve his subjects, though he tried, in vain, to persuade them. At the Second Synod of Lyons 1274 AD convoked by Gregory 10th. to effect union with the Greek Church, and reckoned the 14th. Ecumenical Council in the Roman List, held 29 years after the First Synod of Lyons 1245 AD which deposed the Emperor Frederick 2nd. --- the delegates of the Greek Emperor Michael VIIIth. Paleologus declared their allegiance to the Papal Chair (i.e. the Primacy, Filioque clause) but here again the political issues were to the fore, and the union was shattered in 1289 AD. Certainly the Emperor John VIIIth. was no friend of a union, as he explained in a Treatise for the Sorbonne c. 1399 AD.
2. Whitaker has the date 1516 AD -- this date highlights the time when there was least general interest in the Council now in its fourth year -- i.e. between the 10th. and Final Sessions. It became obvious to those with reforming hopes that the situation was becoming increasingly hopeless, the result being an almost certain victory for the Papal policy. Two years later, 1517 AD Luther produced his 95 Theses.
3. Vide Creighton 'History of the Papacy' Vol. 5. p. 268 (1901 AD ed) 'Leo 10th. might smile contentedly and congratulate himself that his lot had fallen in pleasant places'; his successor might tremble at the thought of a council, but Leo 10th. emerged relieved that such a council had proved itself tolerably easy to manage, with a little tact, skilful diplomacy, and a little of the spirit of compromise -- it recorded his signal victory over the Gallican Church, while it had been gratified by the passing of a few insignificant decrees, thus doing its work submissively, and so petered out. Creighton states that it is 'pleasant to be free from the demands of reform, but it is certainly dangerous'. The Lateran Council of 1512-7 AD is deserving of more general interest; it is rarely mentioned even in standard text books.

the Lateran Council of 1512 - 7 AD should have been dissolved with promises of peace and assurances of tranquillity at the very time when the greatest event in Medieval times was about to burst upon the Church..It was topical , however , on one point viz. the proposal for an episcopal college within the Curia , but this movement of the bishops is rather obscure , only being mentioned by Paris de Grassis. The idea seems to have been that the bishops should have power to communicate directly with the Pope and lay before him such questions that from time to time interested and concerned the bishops in their pastoral office. The Pope at first warmed to the idea and even assented but the Cardinals protested --- they were the Council of Popes, and as such had control of all business to lay before the Pope. The Cardinals were also protectors of national interests , quite often 'Legati ' , recognised, courted , and paid by kings. To have replaced the Curia of Cardinals with a College of Bishops would have been revolutionary , but it would have been salutary.'

Whitaker replies to Bellarmine² that although the Council of Trent Session 14 cap. 7. cited the Lateran Council of 1512-7 AD as a General Council³, note should be made of the strong opposition from the theologians of Paris to this term being used of this Council , as 'Lateran V ' . Ortvinus Gratius had written an

1. At Vatican 2 , Pope Paul VIth. proposed a reformation of the Curia making it more ecumenical , and setting up a Senate or Universal College of Bishops ; the draft Decree De Ecclesia cap. 3. makes it clear that episcopal consecration confers powers of teaching and government which can only be exercised with the Head of that College, the Pope , whose Primacy remains intact . The Draft Decree was passed 22nd. Sept. 1964 AD by 1,917 votes for , and 328 against.
2. Whitaker Contra Bell. Controv. 4. Quaestio 4.2.
3. The Romanists still do ; Vide Watkin 'The Church in Council ' pp. 176 - 183 --- here it is the 18th. Ecumenical Council . At this Council was decreed the 'Supreme authority of the See of Rome ' --- 'this same Holy Roman Church itself has over the whole Catholic Church the Supreme and Full Primacy and Sovereign authority which, it humbly and truthfully recalls to mind, (the Roman Church) received from the Lord Himself ,with all fullness of power through Blessed Peter , the Chief and Head of the Apostles , of whom the Bishop of Rome is the Successor ... whenever disputes arise about the Faith , they must be decided by the judgement of that church ' . Vide Hughes 'Church in Crisis ' p. 211 . Later in the Decree , appear the words, in connection with appeals, ' to this same (Roman) Church , all other churches are subject , and their bishops owe it obedience and reverence ' .

important work ' Fasciculus Rerum Expectandarum et Fugiendarum ' on this point ,and with the Council of Basle very much in mind --- that no such council could even claim to be General or Ecumenical , till at least accepted by the whole church .

Whitaker dismisses the 'Donation of Constantine' which was alleged to confer on Pope Silvester 1st. (314 - 335 AD) the Primacy over Antioch , Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, dominion over all Italy and the 'civitates' of the Western regions , as spurious. This 'Donation' had made the Pope the Supreme Judge of all the clergy , the chief of whom were to have the rank of 'Senators' . In dismissing the 'Donation ' together with the False Decretals,² Whitaker is surprised that Bellarmine had accepted them as genuine, particularly after the work of Peter Crabbe of Cologne³ . Apart from the

1. The 'Donation' which was embodied in the False Decretals and Collections of Canons , came to be treated as authoritative even by opponents of the Papacy ; it greatly strengthened Papal claims in the Medieval times , following Leo 1Xth.'s use of it in a Letter to Michael Cerularius , being subsequently used by his successors. Its genuineness began to be challenged in the 15th. Century and its falsity was demonstrated by such scholars as Nicholas of Cusa and L.Valla . Vide E.H.Davenport 'The False Decretals' (1916 ed.) who follows Fournier's dating in the latter's 'Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique ' Vol. 7. (1906) pp. 301 - 316. The approximate date for the False Decretals being 850 AD ; the Capitularies of Benedictus Levita from which the Pseudo-Isidore has largely drawn being after 847 AD and Hincmar of Rheims quotes the False Decretals in his 'Collectio de Ecclesiis et Capellis ' in 857 AD.
2. The False Decretals were a collection of documents attributed to Isidore of Seville (d. 636 AD) but really French mid-9th. Century ; they contained ;-
 - a) letters of Ante-Nicene Popes , all forgeries.
 - b) a collection of conciliar canons , mostly genuine.
 - c) Papal letters from Pope Silvester (d.335 AD) to the time of Gregory 2nd. (d. 731 AD) , 35 of which are spurious. Pope Nicholas 1st. used them in 865 AD and both Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher apparently regarded them as genuine . They were disproved by the Magdeburg Centuriators in 1558 AD.
3. Peter Crabbe in 'Admonit. ad Lectorem ' before his commentary on the Decretals.

historical questions raised , the matter of glaring anachronisms , there is the matter of the difficulties and differences in style, character and phrases ; the Latin , says Whitaker , is 'barbara, putida , squalida , indocta, et multis/ⁱⁿlocis ne Latinis quidem ' . Laurence Valla had already written a 'small work ' against the 'Donation of Constantine ' in which he condemned the many 'solecisms and barbarisms ' ! Elsewhere ², Whitaker writes of Augustinus Steuchus the opponent of Valla , 'Donationem Constantini in Vaticana Bibliotheca diligenter servatis ' , but in addition to Valla, writes Whitaker , there were many others who dubbed the 'Donation' as spurious ;-

- a) Antony , Cardinal of Florence ³, in his History said that it was not found in the old Greek exemplars of Gratian --such an important document would undoubtedly have been mentioned , affecting the universal government of the church ! .
- b) Nicholas of Cusa (c.1400 - 64 AD) in his 'De Concordantia Catholica ' ⁴ clearly refuted the Decretals and the 'Donation' on the following grounds ;-

1. they were not 'in authenticis libris nec in historiis approbatis nec in Patribus nec in Conciliis '
2. Pope Stephen 2nd. (d. 757 AD) petitioned the Lombard King that he should restore these parts to the Empire.
3. Pippin and Charles snatched these regions from the King of the Lombards and gave them to the Pope.
4. they conflict with the statements of Pope Agatho who in his Letter ⁵ to Constantine 1Vth. Pogonatum , some time later described the City of Rome as 'Imperatoris servilem urbem', and of Pope Boniface who in his Letter to the Emperor

-
1. Turrianus Pro Epist. Pontif. 3.2. defended the literary deficiency by saying that Gregory Nazianzen could deduce Παροχδ from παροχδιν (Serm. 2. De Paschate) Epiphanius the name of Jesus from ιδουις because Christ was ιδτρος (De Nazaraeis) and Anacletus deduced κηφας from κεφαλδ ; St. Paul may be said to lack the style of Isocrates , Demosthenes , Thucydides, or Plato !
 2. Whitaker De Author. Sacr. Script. 1. 4.
 3. Antony 'Historia' 8.2. sect. 8. Antony (1389 - 1459 AD) was a Dominican and founder of the Convent of San Marco at Florence, and with Cosimo de Medici built the adjoining church . In 1446 AD he was made Archbishop of Florence by Eugenius 1Vth. A wise and able man, he became the counsellor of Popes and statesmen, and as a scholar, was distinguished for his 'Summa Theologica Moralis ' , several

Honorius describes Rome as 'urbem suae mansuetudinis'.

5. no Pope before Stephen 2nd. mentions anything about this 'Donation' -- 'de jure Sancti Petri neque de patrimonio eius'.
6. the 'chaff' of the 'Donation' (Palea Donationis) was 'abstracted from the Legenda Apocrypha Silvestri'.
7. Gratian's Decretum ascribed to Miltiades (**Melchiades**) the view that Constantine abandoned Rome and bequeathed **it** to Peter and his successors, but that this was apocryphal. The 'Donation' was supposed to have been to Silvester who was Pope 314 - 335 AD whereas **Miltiades** died in 314 AD. **The** mention of Constantine's baptism by Silvester (or Eusebius of Nicomedia) was enough to make the Decretum suspect.
8. Pope Leo restored to Otto 1st. all places given by Pippin and **Charles** to Peter the Apostle , but there is no mention of any Donation by Constantine or even of Constantine at all.

c) Raphael Volaterranus in his Life of Constantine , Paul Cathalanus the cūbicularius of Alexander 2nd. , Otto Bishop of Freising (d.1058) and the canonist Felinus and Melchior Canus all repudiate the 'Donation' and the Decretals -- indeed Melchior reminds us of something that Nicholas of Cusa forgets to mention viz. that Constantine divided the whole Empire ' et omnem orbem Romanum ' into three parts , which he gave to his three sons -- Constantine received all Italy and the City of Rome which he placed under Leontius as Prefect.

Whitaker remarks that Stapleton does not appear to have defended the 'Donation' though he badly wanted to -- nevertheless there were Romanists that still did eg. Capistranus in his 'De Auctoritate Papae ' said that Constantine did not give, but restored what was the Pope's. Sanders had said that the 'Donation' was ably

contd. treatises on the Christian life, and a general history of the world . Vide 'Chronicles of St. Antoninus ' (Cath. Univ. of America . Studies in Medieval History VI. 1934).

4. In this work he outlined a comprehensive programme for the reform of Church and Empire ,originally favouring the Conciliar Movement, but the revolutionary proceedings of the Council of Basle and its failure to effect a union with the Greeks produced a change, and after 1437 AD he devoted himself entirely to the cause of the Pope,

defended by others , but he did not mention who the others were -- perhaps one was Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus ? The fact remained, says Whitaker , that the 'Donation' had been mortally wounded by Valla and there was no physician that could cure the wound.

At this point Bellarmine quotes Prospero of Aquitaine (390 - 463 AD) the follower of St. Augustine ;-

' Sedes Petri ; qua pastoralis honoris
Facta caput mundo ; quicquid non possidet armis
Religione tenet ' .

Whitaker has no quarrel with the words 'Facta caput mundo ' , provided that the phrase was not use ' de autoritate et dominatione universā ' , but it is not likely that Prospero used the words with this background . The word 'caput' was used by Cicero to describe Socrates ; the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus addressed Cyril of Alexandria as 'caput episcoporum congregatorum ' ; Rufinus called Athanasius 'Summum et Maximum Episcopum ' . Basil addressed the Church at Antioch as κεφάλον , a word which Chrysostom used to describe the Church at Constantinople , while Antioch was described by him as ' caput orbis totius ' . Prospero's meaning seems to be that the Faith planted by Peter at Rome now reached out to people not subjugated by Roman arms.

Whitaker refers to a Letter of Galla Placidia (daughter of Theodosius 1st. and supporter of Pope Leo in the Eutychian controversy) among the letters that formed a collection and preamble to the Acta of the Council of Chalcedon . The correspondence² of Galla

contd. being sent in 1437 AD by Eugenius IV to Constantinople in the interests of reunion . With considerable gifts as a critical historian he repudiated both the False Decretals and the 'Donation' .

5. Pope Agatho's Letter to Constantine IV Pogonatum ML. 87. 1165 c - 1168 b ; 1172 c.

Note 1 from p. 412 Gratian Dist. 19 In Canonicis and Dist. 20 Decretalia.

-
1. Galla Placidia (c.390 - 450 AD) carried off by Alaric the Goth during the capture of Rome in 410 AD ; in 414 AD she married his successor , but next year after his murder she rejoined Honorius her brother and in 425 AD on the accession of her son Valentinian 3rd she acted as Regent. She was an uncompromising catholic and built several churches at Ravenna ,among them her own mausoleum. Vide 'Galla Placidia Augusta ' S.J.Oost (1968)
 2. Leo Ep. 55 and Ep. 56 ; Vide Foakes-Jackson 'History of the Christian Church to 451 AD ' p. 534.

Placidia and her son Valentinian 3rd. with their relatives at Constantinople during the Eutychian controversy repeated the claims of Leo in asserting the highest position for the Roman See. In that Letter, Whitaker notes the words ' debemus ei primatum in omnibus tribuere quae totum mundum propriae virtutis dominatione complevit et nostro imperio orbem gubernandum servandumque commisit '--- and in Galla's Letter to Theodosius ' decet nos huic maxime civitati quae domina omnium est civitatum tuarum , in omnibus reverentiam conservare ' . Whitaker comments that Bellarmine should now see the grounds of the dignity afforded to Rome viz. ' quod esset vetus Roma ' for she had subjugated the whole world and was mistress of all. Bellarmine replied that this opinion was refuted by both Leo and Gelasius², but Whitaker insists that although they tried to sustain their refutation , they were not able to do so simply because they could not find grounds for their arguments , that the Primacy was ' de jure divino ' . Bellarmine remarks that other cities were seats of the Emperors --eg. Milan, Ravenna. Sirmium , Treves , and Nicomedia -- but none of these contained a Primacy therefore Rome must possess something more than secular honour ; Whitaker agrees that the Roman See has more than the splendour of (secular) Rome behind it ; the cities mentioned were imperial seats for only a short time . When Valentinian was at Ravenna³, Rome took her appeals there ,but there was no continuity , nor indeed the erudite witness and martyrdoms given to the Catholic Faith by Rome during the formative years of the early Councils . It was not until 404 AD that Honorius placed his imperial residence there (at Ravenna) and in 526 AD it fell to the Goths , was recaptured by Belisarius in 540 AD and became an Exarchate till 751 AD. Agreed, that the seat of Emperors did not constitute Rome's honour -- but if Justinian had known any other reason than that

-
1. Leo Ep. ad Marcian ; May 452 AD ; ML. 54. 993.
 2. Gelasius Ep. ad episcop. Dardan. Vide Decretum Gelasianum Denzinger-Schönmetzer 350 (De Primatu Romani Pontificis) and 352 (De Auctoritate Conciliorum Oecumenicorum).
 3. Platena on Leo 2nd. ; the growth of the power of Ravenna as a metropolitan church , with jurisdiction over Piacenza, Danna, Reggio, Modena, and Bologna, is mentioned under Paschal 2nd. (1099 -1118AD); the result of the Synod of Guardastallo was to restrict the claims of the Church at Ravenna made against Rome. Under Leo 2nd. (682 -3AD) Platena writes that Ravenna assumed the power of an Exarch owning submission to none ,but this was removed by Leo 2nd. and his

of being the imperial city, honoured by the martyrdom of Peter and Paul and for some centuries, with certain exceptions, a pillar of orthodoxy and an example to all of the flowering of Apostolic truth and splendour, he would not have used the words *ἐκ τῆς βασιλικῆς φιλοτιμίας*. If Justinian had known of any Primacy 'de jure divino' he would not have omitted to mention it. Whatever Primacy Rome has, comes from conciliar decrees, but this was not the Primacy that Rome claimed now. The authority of councils is 'venerabilis non divina' -- there would have been no need for conciliar decrees if the Primacy had been 'de jure divino' from the start.

Whitaker refers to ;-

2

a) Marsilius of Padua who in his 'Defensor Pacis' maintained;-

1. all bishops are equal 'de jure divino' and that the (Roman) Primacy as claimed in his day had its ground in imperial honours (and the abuse of them)
2. William of Occam who wrote 'Compendium Errorum Johannis Papae XXII (c. 1334 - 8 AD)', 'Dialogus super Dignitati Papali et Regia' (1338 - 42 AD), and the 'Tractatus de Imperatorum et Pontificum Potestate' (c.1347). His political theories played an important part in the development of the Conciliar Movement of the 14th. and 15th. Centuries; he advocated a radical separation of the church from the world, denied the Pope all temporal authority, and conceded large powers to the laity and their **representatives**. His ideal may perhaps be described as a modified Papal monarchy combined with a system of national churches.
3. Eutropius 'Appendix on Pope Silvester' -- Eutropius was a Roman Historian (fl. 363 - 378 AD); he dedicated his 'Breviarium Historiae Romanae' to Valens and had previously accompanied Julian on his expedition against the Persians (363 AD). His History of 10 books covered Roman History from the foundation of the city to the

contd. predecessor Agatha. Whitaker mentions that Ravenna chose its own cardinals, but there is no mention of this in Platena.

1. Novellae 131

2. Vide Marsilius of Padua 'The Defender of Peace' tr. Gewirth
Columbia University Press. 1956

reign of Valens. Generally impartial, it was compiled from the best accessible sources. It became a favourite school book; its Latin is clear. The Breviarium was enlarged by Paul the Deacon and Landolfus Sagax (c.1000 AD).

Whitaker quotes **Aeneas Sylvius** --- 'Romana Ecclesia ut canones aiunt, caput omnium esse quare non ait ut aiunt sacrae Scripturae, ut ait Paulus, ut ait Petrus, ut ait Christus '(sic) and at the beginning of this Letter of Aeneas, the authority of the Pontiff as Pontiff is described as neither necessary to the church nor instituted by Christ. Bellarmine had written off (diludere) this view of Aeneas as being that of a mere youth, but Whitaker reminds him that when these words were written he was not a mere youth but Cardinal Senensis.

Bellarmino claimed that Papal Primacy was proven in three ways, by which the Pope exercised authority over other bishops :-

- a) in their institution
- b) in their deposition
- c) in their restitution

to which Whitaker replies that this was an ancient discipline exercised by Patriarchs and Metropolitans and was not peculiar to Rome. Whitaker then cites the case of Sabinus --- the 'Spanish Appeal' --- where two Spanish bishops, Basilides and Martial, were accused of having denied the Faith under persecution and were deposed; the people of Merida chose Sabinus to be their bishop and the election was confirmed by neighbouring bishops in council and he was consecrated to fill the vacancy. Basilides went to Rome and asked Pope Stephen to restore him to his bishopric, and Stephen accepted his plea, and restored both the fallen bishops, This had the effect of creating a local schism since some of the Spanish bishops restored communion with Basilides and Martial, while others refused. Both sides went to Cyprian, putting the

1. Aeneas Sylvius in Ep. 301. Pope Pius 2nd. (1458 - 1464 AD). Vide Edition of his letters by R.Wolkan. Vienna 1909 -18 AD. Till 1442 AD Aeneas was a strong supporter of the Conciliar ideal, but on his departure for Basle in that year, in the Emperor's train, he changed his mind; like Nicholas of Cusa, and Cesarini, also originally strong supporters of the Conciliar Movement, he transferred his allegiance to become a Papal champion. Vide R.J.Mitchell 'The Laurels and the Tiara. Pope Pius 2nd. 1458 - 1464 AD' 1962 edition. Vide etiam 'De Gestis Concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum' Bk.2. tr. Hay and Smith. Oxford Medieval Texts. Intro. XXIII - XXIX (1967ed)

case before him and asking for his opinion . The Letters together with a Third Letter from Felix of Saragossa , were taken by Sabinus , the new bishop of Merida and a Bishop Felix (probably the **successor** to Martial) to Cyprian . 37 African bishops met in council in the autumn of 254 AD , which confirmed the removal of Basilides and the consecration of Sabinus. The appeal to Rome, in Cyprian's view, was of little importance because ' Stephen , through **negligence** , was imposed upon and he had only Basilides's side of the question ' . Cyprian believed himself **more** accurately informed by the two churches concerned and a third independent witness . The merits of the case apart , if the Papal power of restitution was ' de jure divino ' and final, Cyprian and the African Council would have acted quite differently , and at the worst, acquiesced under protest , but here the Papal restitution was set aside. A similar instance occurred under Gregory 1st. when the Bishop of Salonita (which was under Rome's jurisdiction , as Patriarch) was chosen , not only without the authority of Gregory but even without his knowledge! Theodoret² wrote 'ecclesiae orientes Flaviani praesidentiam (*προεδρία*) amplectuntur ' and all the churches of Illyria looked upon him as Primate of the East -- the mission to Rome under Acacius , Bishop of Beroea in Syria, restored peace to the church but there is no mention of a universal Primacy.³

In the case of Eudoxius of Antioch , as Sozomen records, having obtained permission from the Emperor Constantius to return to Syria because of the troubles caused by the heretic Aetius, Eudoxius installed himself as Bishop of Antioch without the sanction of George Bishop of Laodicea , or of Mark , Bishop of Arethusa , or of other Syrian bishops -- though this was not a happy example mentioned by Whitaker, it makes the point ; there is no reference to invalidity because the Pope did not appoint. Ambrose wrote that his election **had** the approval of Eastern and Western Bishops and his episcopate did not originate with the Pope. Whitaker could have gone on-- the very fact that

1. Giles 'Documents illustrating Papal authority 96 - 454 AD ' pp.64-6
(Letter of the African Council -- Cyprian Ep. 67. CSEL. 3. 735.)

2. Theodoret H.E. 5.23

3. Sozomen H.E. 4.14.

Eudoxius upheld the heresy of Aetius surely would have been grounds for the exercise of Roman Primacy in deposing him -- particularly as the Pope would have had a strong Anti-Arian and Anti-Anomaeian support in such a declaration. It was the Emperor Constantius who wrote that the heretics ' had the audacity to publish that we approve of their ordination ... it is not true ... eject them from communion and from the synod ' . These are the Emperor's words -- there was no appeal for the Pope to depose. Gregory the Presbyter in his 'Vita Nazianzeni' says that Gregory Nazianzen was elected bishop , though the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia had not given their confirmation. To confirm was not the sole prerogative of the Pope. Bellarmine's contentions lack the support of the Histories.

On the power of Papal deposition, Bellarmine had cited Cyprian's Letter to Pope Stephen, that the latter should formally depose Marcian , Bishop of Arles (who had adopted Novatianist teaching). The power of excommunication had already been exercised by the neighbouring bishops --- but the Bishop of Arles , being the Metropolitan , the bishops wrote to the two chief bishops of the Western Church , Cyprian and Stephen, to reinforce their authority. Whitaker comments that there is no appeal from Cyprian to Stephen to depose ' jure depositionis ' inherent in Rome alone. If this were so, Faustinus , Bishop of Lyons, need not have written to Cyprian but need only to have gone to Rome . It was the custom of the church at that time ' to give their counsel for the welfare of the Catholic Church ' and so Cyprian writes ' the body of bishops , united together by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity ' .² Furthermore , the successor to Marcian was not appointed by Stephen -- the bishops of that province , with the people of Arles , were to elect another bishop. Deference to Rome there may have been, but subservience to Rome , to Papal jurisdiction, none. The power of excommunication and deposition was common to the episcopate. Cardinal

-
1. Cyprian Ep. 68 to Stephen c. 254 AD Library of the Fathers.
 2. Cyprian asks Pope Stephen to write ' a very full letter ' to the bishops in Gaul i.e. one that would treat fully of the question of the lapsed ; a contrast between the ' *aditio per libellum* ' and ' *plenaria interpellatio* '. Cyprian's words were ' omnes episcopi sunt mutuae concordiae glutino copulati ut si quis haeresim teneat , subveniant caeteri ... fraterna societas requirit ut mutuo moneamus ' . ~~and cited in these same notes~~

Peter of Aliacus pleaded for the restoration of the ancient custom of deposing ' non per solum Papam sed per Concilia '.

In his Preface to his Lectures² on Bellarmine's 'De Romano Pontifice ' (Quaestio 4.) Whitaker summarises the development of Absolute Primacy claimed for the Papacy --that even after Gregory VII and Innocent III the alleged Papal Primacy over the Eastern Church (potestas deponendi) and over the West (in orbe et urbe) was not universally acknowledged. Taking Jerome's words ' in schismatis remedium factum est ut unus caeteris praeponeretur ' Whitaker comments that where primacy existed ,its origins were to be found in the resolving of schism and faction , but at the first the bishops showed an equality of majesty, power , and dignity --Jerome's words again 'erant omnes eiusdem meriti eiusdem sacerdotii et communi presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiae regebantur ' . In his Commentary on Titus 1.1. (c. 386-7 AD)³ Jerome's actual words are ' idem est ergo presbyter qui et episcopus et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent et dicerent in populis Ego sum Pauli, Ego Appollonis, Ego autem Cephae , communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur . Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat , suos putabat esse non Christi , in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris , ad quem omnis ecclesiae cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur ' ⁴.

Duraeus refers to a letter of Jerome to Evagrius (sic) in which Jerome asserts the greatest distinctions between the threefold office of bishop, priest and deacon , based upon the analogy of the three fold distinction between Aaron, his sons, and the Levites.

-
1. Peter of Aliacus; De Reformatione Ecclesiae ' 3 ; remarks that Dioscorus excommunicated Pope Leo -- true the former was 'amens' but none questioned his authority , only his wisdom . Nicephorus said that Menna , a Catholic Bishop of Constantinople , excommunicated Pope Vigilius.
 2. Published by John Allenson August 10th. 1608 AD with Dedicatory Preface to Tobias Matthew (Archbishop of York) and William James (Bishop of Durham). Allenson used some of Whitaker's notes and added to these some of his own taken in **lectures** in 1590 AD .
 3. **ML** 26. 562 .
 4. Jerome also quotes Phil.1.1. and 2 ; Acts 20.17 and 28 ; and 1 Peter 5. 1 and 2 .

Duraeus is probably referring to Jerome's Letter to Evangelus because he concludes by saying that in the same letter Jerome wrote 'quid potest episcopus quod non potest presbyter excepta ordinatione' which occurs in that letter. Duraeus is sensitive to the arguments for the parity of ministers on this text², and says that Jerome could not have been ignorant of the fact that Aerius had been condemned because he had said that there was no difference (discrimen) between a bishop and a presbyter. Our knowledge of Aerius is gained mainly from Epiphanius³. The year 386 AD probably saw a change in Jerome's attitude to the Papacy -- in the previous year (August 385 AD) he wrote to Asella on his departure from Rome by ship 'grieving and in tears' that he had been called 'an infamous and slippery turncoat, a liar, deceiving by the art of Satan ... one would attack my walk and my laugh, another objected to my expression, a woman would suspect something in my simplicity; with such people I have lived for nearly three years; pray that from Babylon I may return to Jerusalem... I was a fool who wished to sing the Lord's song in a strange land, and left Mount Zion to seek the help of Egypt.' In section 3 of this letter he does, however, say that before he became acquainted with the saintly Paula 'the whole city re-echoed my praises; almost everyone concurred in judging me worthy of the episcopate. My words were on the lips of the late Damasus (he died 384 AD) and I was called holy, humble, eloquent' --- the latter probably referred to the proceedings under Damasus of the Synod of Rome (382 AD) which under Jerome's influence promulgated a canon of Scripture.

Whitaker's conclusion is that Jerome's words mean that the jurisdiction of the Roman See rested on the variable i.e. custom and conciliar authority not on the invariable i.e. doctrinal authority. The bishops are equal in authority but differ in jurisdiction only-- if Jerome had argued that the Bishop of Tanis was not subject to the Bishop of Alexandria he would have been ~~contradicting~~ the Council of

1. Jerome Ep. 146 to Evangelus 386 AD (ML. 22.1192); his words are 'wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome or Gublio, Constantinople or Rhegium, Alexandria or Tanis, his worth is the same, and his priesthood the same--eiusdem meriti, eiusdem est et sacerdotii'.
2. eg. as used by Cartwright in his controversy with Archbp. Whitgift.
3. Epiphanius Haer. 75. Aerius was a 4th. Century presbyter; he had been ordained by Eustathius Bishop of Sebaste, whom he clearly followed till they quarrelled in 360 AD. Cross ODCC p.21 under Aerius comments 'Aerius has probably received from modern

Nicea which confirmed the Patriarchal rights of Alexandria and Antioch. Jerome regarded loyalty to the bishop as the best safeguard against schism, but the jurisdiction of metropolitans and Patriarchs is by ecclesiastical custom (or conciliar authority, arising from the demands of the situation) rather than by divine law, the purpose being to avoid schism. This theme loomed very large in Jerome's attitude to the episcopate --- On Titus 1.5. he wrote ' so let bishops remember that it is rather by custom than by the truth of the Lord's direction that they are greater than presbyters ; so for the avoidance of schism Peter was appointed by Christ as Head of the Apostles. ' In his letter Adversus Jovinianum² he wrote that a primate was necessary even among the Apostles, in Peter, so a bishop is found to be necessary for the avoidance of schism among priests. In his De Viris Illustribus³ Jerome commends Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, for standing up against the Roman Bishop of his day (i.e. Victor 190 AD). Whitaker continues⁴ that if Pope Victor could not impose his will (efficere) upon the Churches of Asia, it is clear that he was not regarded as Head of the Church with universal jurisdiction, and the fact that very many churches came to follow the same custom of Easter shows that in the primitive church, the decrees of councils and local synods, were of greater importance and authority than the Pope's judgement in settling issues. Similarly if Polycarp had known of a Papal Primacy, instituted by Christ, he would never have dared to dissent.

To Bellarmine's reply, quoting again the Letter of Jerome to **Evangelus**, that the Bishop of Constantinople was greater (major) than the Bishop of Caesarea, Whitaker comments that this is not really to the point -- the difference is of the nature of 'accidentaliter' because it was made by the authority of the canons 'non ipsius episcopatus ratione', Whitaker asks that Bellarmine look more closely at Justinian's words --- ' sancimus secundum canonum definitiones, sanctissimum senioris Romae Papatum, primum esse omnium ---
 contd. controversialists (Bellarmine and some 17th. Century Anglicans) more attention than his importance merits!

1. ML. 26. 562 (387 AD)
2. Adv. Jovin. 1. (392 AD) ML. 23. 247.
3. Jerome De Viris Illustribus (392 AD) ML. 23.657) sect. 45.
4. Whitaker Contra Duraeum 10.7.
5. Author. de Ecclesia. tit. collat. 9.

sacerdotum ' --- none disputes a Primacy of Order and Dignity , but it is clear here that the basis of such a Primacy lies in the **definitions** made in the canons i.e. it was not de jure divino. Whitaker readily agrees that the Pope has been acknowledged 'major omnibus' but there is a difference between 'major omnibus (greater to all) and 'major ab omnibus ' (greater by all) since a case has been made out by the Papal champions for the proposition that the Pope is greater to all --Whitaker has examined this claim and found it true in certain aspects eg. in the preservation of the Catholic Faith in the early centuries , steadfastness in numerous persecutions, bearing the 'aura' of the imperial city of old , but at no point have the full claims been acknowledged by all i.e. a universal jurisdiction de jure divino. What jurisdiction the Pope has collected is 'accidentaliter episcopo' . Logic is pressed into service here --- 'nam ut potest esse homo , qui plus potest quam singuli , nullus qui plus potest ,quam universi ' , but if the Pope has greater powers than singular bishops, it cannot be more than the sum totum of the episcopate.

The emergence of inequality among bishops is due to the desire to prevent schism and preserve the peace of the church but it had been lamented by many learned and saintly men as a 'remedium perniciosum ipso morbo ' for ambition burst in upon the church and bishops began to think more of their dignity than the care of their flocks , an ambition that resulted in the **birth** of antichrist --- in this process , Whitaker first cites the example of Pope Victor (189-198 AD) whom he describes as 'the first Roman Bishop to attempt a primacy of excommunication , by excommunicating the oriental churches (notably Polycrates and other Asian bishops) who refused to follow the Roman date of Easter . Previously Pius 1st. (c.150 AD) had taught that Easter be kept on the Lord's Day following Nisan 14 but he did not condemn the diverse rites of other churches. Victor, who according to Bellarmine² relied upon a 'principatus' already given , had authority to excommunicate the Asians --this was a fundamental plank in the platform of the Papal claims. Whitaker replies that if he had the authority, he ought not to have done this , but it is not certain that

1. Eusebius H.E. 5.24.

2. Bellarmine relies on Irenaeus Adv. Haeres. 3.2. ' ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem (or potiorem) princip^{al}itatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam ' preserved only in the Latin.

either that he had the authority or in fact that he did excommunicate the Asians. Eusebius wrote *πειράται* (tentavit excommunicare) --- he tried to excommunicate --- while Nicephorus said that he did so 'in the spirit' and threatened² so in his letters. But the fact that the churches in Asia Minor remained in communion with Rome would suggest that either the Pope retracted or his excommunication was not effective but remained a dead letter. The former idea may well arise from the fact that, as Eusebius records³, Irenaeus, writing in the name of the brethren of Gaul denounced such action and that Victor should 'not cut off whole churches of God for observing an ancient custom handed down to them; those in the past observed customs differently, yet all lived in peace, and we live in peace with one another. The differences concerning the fast (i.e. for one day, two days or 40 hours) enhances the unanimity of our faith' -----

ἡ διαφωρία τῆς νηστείας τῶν ἑθνικῶν τῆς πίστεως κυρίως

'None was ever cast out because of this course of action, but those very elders before you (Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, Sixtus, and Soter) though they did not observe it, would send the eucharist to members of those communities who observed it⁴. Socrates wrote⁵ that Victor was 'influenced by too ardent a zealbut Irenaeus severely censured Victor by letter for his immoderate heat, telling him that although the ancients differed in their celebration of Easter they did not depart from intercommunion'. It was Irenaeus, says

1. Nicephorus H.E. 4.38.

2. Victor summoned a synod at Rome and threatened Polycrates and others with excommunication. Eusebius H.E. 5. 24.9. after mentioning that Victor had tried to excommunicate Polycrates goes on to say 'and indeed he denounced them in letters proclaiming that the brethren in those parts were all wholly excommunicate'.

Presumably this followed the synod at Rome. Vide Letter of Constantine I on the Paschal Question 325 AD Coleman-Norton 'Roman State and the Christian Church' Vol.1. p. 142. The Emperor enjoins the Nicene Canon for the celebration of Easter on the Sunday, but controversy between Rome and Alexandria continued for another 300 years, though both kept a Sunday; the differences lay mainly in the cycle of years kept. Ambrose supported the Alexandrian computation (Vide his letter to the bishops of Aemilia)

3. Eusebius H.E. 5.24.11.

4. Eusebius H.E. 5.24.15.

5. Socrates H.E. 5.22

Whitaker, who denounced the heretics Blastus and Florinus, not by any appeal to a Papal 'principatus' but to the fact that he had himself early company with Polycarp who would tell of his intercourse with John and others who had seen the Lord'. The Asian custom continued till the Council of Nicea -- this, comments Whitaker, is sufficient answer to the claim for a Papal 'principatus', though Victor's arguments for the observance of Easter are not to be despised --- 'nolo ego detrahere quicquam illius prudentiae' --- and here it is relevant to quote Augustine, says Whitaker, 'there is nothing more serious than the sacrilege of schism; there is no just necessity for cutting up the unity'.²

Bellarmino urges the claim that Pope Innocent I had excommunicated the Emperor Arcadius and his wife Eudoxia because of their opposition to Chrysostom. At the Synod of Oak (403AD) carefully packed by Theophilus, Patriarch of Constantinople with the support of Eudoxia who was somewhat enraged by Chrysostom's attempts at reform as being a censure of her personal behaviour, both bent on working Chrysostom's ruin, Chrysostom was condemned on 29 charges and even the support of Pope Innocent I, and of the whole Western Church failed to save him; Bellarmine asserts that Innocent excommunicated the Emperor and his wife for their treatment of

1. Eusebius H.E. 5. 20. 6.

2. Augustine Contra Epistolam Parmeniani 2 (400 AD) ML.43.69. 'This is a remarkable chapter on the division of Judah and Israel' wrote Gore 'for here on 1 Kings 19.18 Augustine claims that in spite of the fact that the Kingdom of Israel set up rival shrines at Bethel and Dan (1 Kings 12. 29) they were by no means a heretical sect, for 60 or 70 years later they still had Yahweh's prophets and there were still 7,000 men who maintained the true faith'. It is interesting to note Dollinger's comment (The Pope and the Council E.T. 1870 p.89) 'there is not a word (i.e. in Augustine here) on the necessity of communion with Rome as the centre of unity. He (i.e. Augustine) urges all sorts of arguments to show that the Donatists are bound to return to the church but of the Papal Chair as one of them, he knows nothing'. Whitaker says that if Bellarmine based the Primatus upon the use of censure, the Emperor had as good a claim as the Pope to the title for in Theodoret H.E.1.26 Constantine censured the Nicomedians.

Chrysostom , and quotes Nicephorus for his authority. Whitaker agrees that Nicephorus mentions the excommunication , but feels that he would rather follow the general view on this , that this Letter of Excommunication was not in fact genuine . The grounds for this view are that it is not mentioned by Socrates , Theodoret , or Sozomen , who wrote a great deal about this altercation between Arcadius and Chrysostom . There was some uneasiness among scholars of Whitaker's day about Nicephorus (Callistus c.1256 - 1335 AD) as a historian ; Papal letters mentioned by him do not agree with other Histories and are not accepted as worthy of credit. To quote one example, says Whitaker , Socrates said that Eudoxia died the year of Chrysostom's exile (i.e. 404 AD) and that Chrysostom died in the third year of his exile (i.e. 407 AD) ; Sozomen said that Chrysostom was in exile for three years after the death of Eudoxia , and so these two historians agree . Nicephorus , however, says that Eudoxia was alive after the death of Chrysostom and was excommunicated then by Innocent -- yet she was already dead ! . Innocent must have known of her death because his legates were present when Atticus was chosen to succeed Arsacius at Constantinople , and Arsacius died after Eudoxia. Whitaker commends Nicephorus for much of his History but he cannot accept him on this particular point ; he writes of Nicephorus ' quicquid fama aut auditione acceperat in suos annales transtulit ' -- and since Nicephorus was writing 800 years after the event, a lapse is not surprising.

1. Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos , Byzantine historian , though little is known of his life. Apparently a native of Constantinople and a priest of Santa Sophia , the library of which he used for his work , he belonged to the party of the Emperor Andronicus 2nd. (reigned 1282 - 1328 AD) whose ecclesiastical policy in contrast to that of his father Michael Paleologus , supported Greek orthodoxy against the Latinizers . His principal work was his History in 18 books of events from the Birth of Christ to the death of Phokas (610 AD) . At the end of his introduction there is a schema for 5 more books , but probably never executed, to continue the narrative to Leo the Philosopher (912 AD) . An important source , it apparently rests mainly on an anonymous 10th. Century work but draws on Eusebius , Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret ,and Evagrius, so its value depends largely upon that of the earlier material used. In 1555 AD it was translated into Latin and published by J.Lange at Basle and became important in the controversies of the time, furnishing material for the defence of images and relics.

It was not, however, the habit of Popes only to excommunicate Emperors --- Ambrose of Milan is said to have excommunicated the Emperor Theodosius I for his part in the Massacre at Thessalonica (390 AD) ; at least, he made a penitent submission to Ambrose. But here again, writes Whitaker, there are some doubts about a formal and written excommunication by Ambrose ,though it had been deduced from the Histories dealing with the matter. Theodoret¹ said that/on his arrival at Milan , Theodosius is asked **by** Ambrose ' how could you lift up in prayer , hands steeped in the blood of the unjust massacre (i.e. at Thessalonica) ? How could you with such hands presume to receive the most Sacred Body of Our Lord ? How could you carry His precious Blood to a mouth whence the word of fury issued , commanding the wanton effusion of innocent blood ? Depart then, and do not by a second **crime** augment the guilt of the first '. After an absence of some eight months from church , Theodosius complained to Ruffin the controller of the Palace ' the church of God is open to servants and to mendicants ; they enter freely and pray to the Lord, but to me the church is closed , and so are the doors of heaven. The following words of our Lord dwell upon my memory --whatsoever you shall bind on earth , shall be bound in heaven ' . Ruffin runs to Ambrose but Theodosius says to him ' I see the justice of the sentence that he has pronounced against me and I know that respect for imperial power will never lead him to transgress divine law ' . When Ruffin arrives, Ambrose says ' I declare to you, Ruffin, that I forbid him from entering the gates of the holy church. If he change his empire into a tyranny I will gladly receive death '². Whitaker accepts the view that Theodosius was probably held to be excommunicated on this evidence , but whether the excommunication was formal or merely understood , the fact remains that if the authority to excommunicate lay with the Pope alone , he alone should have excommunicated Theodosius.

1. Theodoret H.E. 5.18

2. N.Q.King 'The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity ' p. 68-9 also notes that the letters of Ambrose to Theodosius contained no formal threat of excommunication. Judging by what Ambrose said in his funeral Oration (De Obitu Theodosii 34) the Emperor did penance and was received into communion.

It is to be noted, writes Whitaker, that Ambrose did not strip Theodosius of his empire, nor free his subjects from their natural oath of obedience and allegiance. The power of excommunication is a censure sanctioned by divine law but it pertains not only to the Pope but to bishops as well, as those to whom is committed the 'jurisdictio clavium' -- if the 'principatus' dwells with the Pope because of his power of excommunication, it necessarily rests with the other bishops too, on the same argument.

Whitaker refers to the title 'Ecumenical Bishop' used by Gregory of the Patriarch of Antioch, and by John IV Patriarch of Constantinople. Pope Pelagius 2nd. had protested vigorously against the use of the title and he had read of its use by Gregory from the Acta of a Synod forwarded to Rome in which Gregory had been examined and acquitted of Monophysite leanings. Pelagius objected to it as a 'proud and insolent title' presumably basing his objection on the interpretation of *οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης* as 'universal bishop' or 'universal Patriarch' whereas the probable meaning of the expression was 'Patriarcha imperialis' which was used by the Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople (471 - 489 AD) and from the mid-5th. Century onwards by the Pope himself. Pope Gregory had claimed that the persistent use of the title would 'disturb the peace of the church; even Peter himself had not called himself the Universal Apostle'.

Regarding Gregory I as the last of the good Popes --- the entry of the antichrist was with the Pontificate of Boniface 3 (607 - 608 AD), the Pontificate of Sabinian I coming between them but too short to be of any moment --- Whitaker writes that the controversy over the title 'Ecumenical Bishop' continued even after the death of John IV the Patriarch of Constantinople. The latter's successor, Cyriacus, continued its use not only at Constantinople but used it of the bishop of Rome, in spite of Gregory's protest. On the ~~other~~ hand, writes Whitaker, we have the humility of Gregory disowning the title for the dangers it contained,

-
1. 'Excommunicatio censura quaedam divino jure sancita'
 2. Gregory's words were 'qui cuncta Christi membra sibimet, conatur universalis appellatione supponere antichristianam potestatem' Ep. 38. 'Damasus upheld the catholic faith, suppressed heresy, but he needed no Papal Supremacy'.

and on the other hand the pride of Boniface 3 in claiming that it only applied to the See of Rome and accepting more than the title had meant in the Edict of the Emperor Phokas (602 - 610 AD) ; in this Edict , the See of Peter is described as 'Head of all the churches' while Constantinople is 'first of all the churches ' . Phokas is described by Whitaker , following the general trend of the day, as '~~parricidium~~ Mauricii ' 2 , ' hominem avarum , inertem, adulterum ' -- it was this man who decreed that 'Episcopum Romanum fore Ecumenicum et caput ac summum Pontificem totius Ecclesiae ' and the **grounds for this honour** ? ----- bribery and fear ! The Eastern Empire was in great danger from the Avars , Persians and Arabs ; to gain the support of the orthodox Lombards and to prevent Italy and Rome seceding from the Empire should the title be confirmed to Constantinople , the title was ascribed to Rome in return for support for the Imperial policy. It is debatable whether Phokas was in fact interested in Italy and titles come easy to the flatterer . For the **next** 150 years during which time the Popes realised there would be no help from the East in the Papal struggle with the Lombards (beginning with Agilulf , Duke of Turin d. 615 AD) the Popes turned more and more to the rising Franks of the West ; though Gregory's (Gregory 3rd.) initial advances to Charles Martel did not meet with any considerable success , yet the Popes had some success with Pippin and Charles , the former crossing the Alps and restoring lands to the Pope that had been taken by the Lombards , Ravenna , and the Pentapolis (754 - 756 AD) and in return the Pope transferred the crown from Clovis to Pippin . In return for this zeal on the part of the Pope , Charlemagne conferred many privileges on the Roman Church -- but the imperium had been snatched from the Greeks and given to the Franks. Whitaker comments that if the Pope could use the 'new nationalism' of the Franks against the imperial idea , however difficult the latter was working out, why was blame put upon the national reformations taking place in his day (i.e. in the 16th. Century) ? Surely the Papacy is in the van of blessing national aspirations !

-
1. Liber Pont. Vol.1. 316 Vide Jalland op. cit. p. 359 f.
 2. In the winter of 602 AD the army mutinied against the Emperor Maurice along the Danube-- the rather rough and brutal centurion Phokas was raised on a shield and proclaimed Exarch and he marched on Constantinople .Maurice fled but he and his five sons were captured and executed. In 603 AD Phokas executed Maurice's wife Constantina and all her daughters.

Pope Constantine 1 (708 - 716 AD) had been the last Pope to make the traditional visit to Constantinople -- his successor Gregory 2 and his immediate successors showed themselves more than willing to hasten the deliverance of Rome from this 'subjection' . The process of freeing Rome was hastened still further by the Edict in 726 AD issued by the Emperor Leo 3 against images , which Edict was condemned by a Roman Synod under Pope Gregory 3 . It was Gregory 3 who first asserted sovereign rights by the issue of a Papal coinage (viz. the square bronze tesserae²). Pope Zechariah (d. 752 AD) was the last Pope to send off the customary letter , announcing his election, to the Byzantine Emperor (Constantine V) and to the Patriarch of Constantinople . The election of Pope Paul 1 (d 767) was announced not to Constantine but to Pippin. Whitaker continues that Pope Hadrian 3 was not slow to take advantage of the Emperor Charles being forced to march out of Italy against the rebellious Normans , but took advantage of this and asked for a new law , that in the making of a new Pope the authority of the Emperor should not be asked for (expectaretur), but that the votes of the clergy and people of the city of Rome should be free in this matter. Otto 1 , the first Roman Emperor , a strong and active man, resumed the 'Ius Imperatorum' when he entered and subdued Rome and elected and instituted by his own authority Leo VIII as Pope . Whitaker may have read Otto's mind in this matter and concluded rightly , but he does not mention the occasion of this intervention . Leo VIII had already been made Pope by the clergy and people of Rome in accordance with the policy laid down by Hadrian 3 , but the clergy and people had second thoughts and began to change their minds about this election ; they deposed Leo VIII and elected Benedict V ; Platena says that Leo VIII's successor did in fact lead such a disreputable life that the Romans petitioned the Emperor to replace him . Otto replied that the election belonged to the Roman clergy and people -- let them chose a fit man and he would confirm him immediately ; thereupon they chose Leo VIII again and Otto

1. Whitaker notes that at this synod were ' nobles, consuls, and the people ' as well as those in ecclesiastical orders -- would that the Lateran synods and Trent had followed this example, exclaims Whitaker . For the synod vide Lib.Pont. 1. 416 f.

2. These have been described as only tokens -- the earliest Papal coins being the silver denarii of Hadrian 1 (d.795 AD)

duly confirmed him . A reaction, however, set in again ,and they once more deposed Leo VIII and elected Benedict V once more -- Otto compelled them to retract this election and restore Leo ; this was enforced by arms. Platena goes on to say that Otto had such a bad time at the hands of the Romans, that he transferred the power of election from the clergy and people of Rome to the Emperor himself.

A case may be made out for the Papacy being indebted to Otto for checking further degradation in these popular elections at a time when (i.e. the latter part of the 10th. Century) Rome was in a state of spiritual and moral decline , but this argument does not alter Whitaker's point that in fact Otto enforced the 'Ius Imperatorum' . If on the other hand Platena is right, then Whitaker is wrong --- Otto did not elect (elegit) Leo as Whitaker says because that had already been done by the clergy and people of Rome. Otto did however depose Benedict and enforce the acceptance of Leo again , and this bears out the truth of Whitaker's remark ,that the 'Ius Imperatorum' confirmandi et institutendi' was greater than the 'potestas electionis' -- the latter was also an imperial grant. It was Nicholas 2 who gave a larger voice to the cardinals in the election of the Pontiff and this arose from the Election Decree of 1059 AD¹ an early indication of a future independence , passed by the Lateran Council under Nicholas 2 , giving the 'potestas eligendi' to the cardinal bishops in co-operation with the clergy and laity of the Roman Church , leaving the Emperor's rights little more in practice than honorary. ²

Bellarmino put forward the view of Nilus of Thessalonica that the decrees of councils bind all bishops but that there is a distinction in respect of Rome , since the decrees can only

1. Vide Jalland op. cit. p. 395 --notes that this 'ius confirmandi' has been said to have been given personally to the Emperor Henry 3 in consideration for his services to the Roman See , and it could not be assumed that it applied as a matter of course to his successors. Gregory VII was elected by this Election Decree of 1059AD on April 22nd. 1073 AD.
2. Whitaker notes that Machiavelli whose patron was no less than Pope Clement VII held that at the time of the Lombard settlement (i.e. late 6th. Century) the Popes held the Emperors in much repute (in pretio habuerunt) -- by the 11th. Century the Popes claim to rule Emperors, so great had been the change in the Papacy.

bind ' quoad directionem non autem quoad coactionem ' --Bellarmine takes Matthias Flacius (Illyricus --1520 - 1575AD) to task because he had not translated the works of Nilus from the Greek into the Latin accurately and verbatim -- the force of Nilus's argument was that the Pope can be guided by decrees but not bound ; 'Papa omnes judicans , ipse a nullo judicetur ' . Whitaker replies that laws do not guide , they bind ; they do not instruct , they demand obedience . Particular synods may pass laws which touch the bishops of one region only, but General Councils (eg. Chalcedon) pass laws which touch all bishops with no exception , not even Rome. This was the view of Eusebius¹ and Justinian.² Whitaker defends Illyricus in his work on Nilus and says that Bellarmine should not build too much on Paul's rebuke of Peter (Gal. 2.11) as being 'fraternal and a secret correction of Peter ' ---it was more than a private **admonition** , since Paul's words were spoken *ἔτι προσθεν πάντων* . Augustine³ and Gregory⁴ gave the true estimate of this -- that while it was not a ' *judicium pro tribunali* ' in the later meaning of these words , it was certainly an Apostolic 'censura' .

Whitaker traces the next stage in the development of Papal power as when the Pontiffs assumed the power of annulling natural obedience due to Emperors and Kings . Pope Gregory VII had proved himself ' *omnium flagitiosissimus* ' in deposing⁵ and creating Emperors at will . Whitaker here presumably refers to Henry IV in Germany, who held two synods at Worms and Piacenza to depose Gregory VII but the latter replied by deposing and banning Henry IV and freeing his subjects from their oath of allegiance at the Lenten Synod of 1076 AD with the result that Henry submitted at Canossa in 1077 AD. From this time, comments Whitaker , the church suffered much misery through this Papal

1. Eusebius De Vita Constantini l. 17 and 18 ; Vide Socrates H.E.1.8.
2. Justinian Novellae 131 --Whitaker uses the Greek title *di vepai* .
3. Augustine Ep. 109.
4. Gregory Hom.18 on Ezekiel.
5. Vide Dom Cuthbert Butler 'Vatican Council 1869/70 AD' p. 21ff.
1757 AD regicide disavowed by the Papacy.
1871 AD Papal deposing powers abrogated.

usurpation of authority over Caesar , but it was not yet at its height. Eugenius 3 after his election at the Church of St. Caesarius , was forced to flee to Sabina because of the opposition of the Senate and magistrates of Rome and the want of citizen support -- at the Concordat of Worms in 1076 AD the Emperor had retained full control of elections in Germany . St. Bernard addressing his De Consideratione to the Cistercian Pope Eugenius 3 while acknowledging the fullness of Papal authority in the spiritual sphere was horrified at the possibility of the Popes becoming secular rulers . Admitting that both swords belong to the church, Bernard argued against the Pope using the temporal sword. Whitaker goes on to say that Alexander 3 (ille homo superbissimus qui pedem posuit in cervice Imperatoris i.e. Frederick 1 at Venice 1177 AD) could not even gain admittance to Rome though he promised that while he should take care of matters spiritual , the civil administration of the city should be left to the magistrates. It is, however, only fair to clarify this point --- Whitaker is right about the denial of entry and the agreement , but this took place after Alexander had been Pope for some months and he had already been in the city as Pope. That the Emperor should kiss the feet of a Pope whom he had so long refused to acknowledge was an act that had a dramatic effect upon the minds of everyone and gave rise to fables of a still more lowly submission -- it seems that Whitaker here is repeating one of these by saying that Alexander put his foot upon the neck of the Emperor , a literal interpretation of the phrase ' dare cervicem alicui ' = to submit. There are two events in the Pontificate of Alexander which illustrate the zenith of Papal power ;-

a) Henry 2 of England made the hazardous journey all the way from a war in Ireland to meet the two cardinals in Normandy who had plenary power to examine him on the accusation that he had conspired the death of Thomas Becket ; after oath , he was compelled to purge himself

1. Bernard De Consideratione 4. In Contra Duraeum 7.19 Whitaker returns to Bernard , who lamented not only the wealth and immorality of his age but also the ruin of the church and the destruction of good men ; there was much talk of Primacy , but primacy of what ? Was the Pope the heir of the Faith, labours, and sanctity of the Apostles -- certainly not . Even the claim to Primacy on the grounds of antiquity had worn a bit thin ; Cain was the older brother .

of the charge , and do penance for the murder , though he was neither guilty of it ~~now~~ conscious of it. Before he could enjoy his rights and titles , these had to be restored by the Pope.

- b) Alexander repudiated any claim on the part of the Emperor to summ-
-on a council , as **Frederick** had done at Pavia, or to judge a Pope . The principle of 'Prima Sedes a nemine judicatur' was vindicated.

Lucius 3 is the next Pope to be mentioned by Whitaker -- he was forced to abandon Rome and seek the safety of Venice because he tried to abolish the office of consul ; his friends in this affair had their eyes put out. Nicholas 3 seized the 'ius senatorum' for himself and Boniface IX seized the full powers of the magistracy and ruled the city himself! And so the Pontiff ruled alone 'in urbe et orbe ' claiming supremacy over the whole church, Ecumenical Councils,² and the whole civil power.

Whitaker agrees with Bellarmine's remarks in his Preface , that in fact the Primacy is the principal controversy--- 'Primatum Pontificis Romani esse summam rei Christianae ' and the definition of that Primacy lies at the centre of all controversy , at the very heart of the Romanist, and particularly Jesuit, theology ; it has become the *λίθον ἰσῦρα* beside which Scripture , the Fathers, the Councils, are found wanting in the scales . But let Bellarmine ponder for a moment -- Scripture mentions no Pope nor the need for one , and the Church for many years not only grew but flourished and 'conquered' the Roman State without a Pope , the Fathers and the Councils providing no grounds for a Supreme Pontiff.

1. Both of these references are from Platena Book 2.
2. Whitaker notes that this was still hotly disputed in Romanist circles.

Chapter 13

The Papacy.

The verdict of history, says Bellarmine, is that monarchy is the best form of government. Whitaker replies that it is also the verdict of history and the opinion of Aristotle and Plato that monarchy of its very nature can soon degenerate into tyranny; there is no single form of government of necessity laid upon any State. Though there has been in some way the development of a monarchical episcopate in the church through the ages, yet the bishops had no absolute and singular (simplicem) authority but were as the Ephors of Sparta²; a certain power of approval (suffragium) was granted to the people but not to allow any charge of ὄχλοκοπία (popular government) that the church be not συγκεχυμένη. Whitaker quotes Acts 19. 32; - ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἔκραζον ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη

So in respect of bishops the church has something of a monarchy, in respect of presbyters an aristocracy, in respect of the people a democracy by the 'ius suum suffragium'³. The rise of the Papal claims, a Visible Head of the Church Universal, an 'externum forum' to judge all controversies, the interpreter in doubtful matters, the sole infallible judge, has disturbed the peace, unity, and strength of the church -- the effect has not been to unite it, and there are fundamental matters which the Papacy has proved inadequate to decide.

De Torquemada in his 'Summa De Ecclesia' (1489AD) had postulated that while God ruled (praesidet) the Church Triumphant, and Christ was the Invisible Head of the Church Militant, the Pope ruled the latter -- even the angels had an hierarchy, and such is required of the Church on earth.⁴ To Bellarmine's quotation from

1. Bellarmine De Romano Pontifice 4.1. Whitaker admits that in his own view, monarchy is the best form of human government but this is not really the point at issue -- the government of the church does not rely upon the light of human wisdom and experience.
2. Ephors -- a board of 5 members at Sparta exercising almost sovereign power.
3. Whitaker does not define this; For these threefold elements, see the Anglican Ordination Service -- accepted by the bishop, with the approval of the church, and ordained by the bishop and presbyters.
4. Bellarmine had quoted Gregory Ep. 52; Bernard De Consideratione 3 and Hebrews 8.5. -- on the latter Whitaker comments that the

Gregory , Whitaker suggests that he read on further --Gregory says that **whoever** desires the 'nomen Monarchi' is as Lucifer , who did precisely that. What Gregory said was that there should be an 'ordo differentiae inter homines ' because among the angels ,one differed from another by reason of 'ordo et potestas' , but he never argued for one supreme angel . The example of the Archangel Michael was of no help to Bellarmine --- as 'princeps coelestis militum et Paradisi praepositus ' as ' princeps et caput ecclesiae' ² he wages war upon the Devil and defends the woman ; but in Apoc. 19. 12-16 the rider on the white horse has the Name *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* ,¹ Rex Regum et Dominus ² *Dominatium* ' --- this is Christ ,as Augustine ³ interprets it, and to transfer the victory , praise , and office of Christ to an angel is nothing short of blasphemy , though the term 'caput ministeriale' is used of the Archangel Michael and the term 'caput principale' is used of Christ ; the analogy breaks down when Bellarmine argues that the Pope is 'caput ministeriale' because Christ is absent corporeally from the earth though He is not absent from heaven ; these divine functions are incommunicable.

Necessity, writes Bellarmine, demands that the church have a Head -- Whitaker replies ' true, but not two ! ' To the objection that when Kings are absent from their kingdoms ,a 'generalis vicarius' is appointed, Whitaker remarks that this may be true in human affairs , but when is Christ absent from His church ? The mystical and spiritual government of the church hang upon Christ . Christ requires many vicars , not one. Christ is 'Dominus' of His House but there is not one *οἰκόνομος* (the Pope) but many --- 1 Cor. 4. 1 et 2 uses the plural , and Paul in Titus 1.7 calls each bishop the *οἰκονόμος Θεοῦ* . Writing to Rusticus , Jerome said that each should live not by his own will (arbitrium) but under the discipline of one man in a monastery (sub disciplina unius) which in Bellarmine's view asserted the necessity of a Papal Monarchy , but Whitaker urges him to read further --Jerome continues ' in nave unus gubernator , in domo

 contd. text applies to the fulfilment of earthly ceremonial and instruments in Christ -- there is no word of a hierarchy of angels or
 1. Apoc. 12.7. (men.

2. Daniel 10.13 ; 12.1.

3. Aug. Hom.9. on the Apoc.

unus Dominus , in quamvis grandi exercitu unus Imperator ' but he spoke not of one Roman bishop in the church but ' singulos monasteriorum rectores '. His words previous to this are ' singuli ecclesiarum episcopi , singuli archipresbyteri , singuli archidiaconi , omnis ordo ecclesiasticus suis rectoribus nititur ' . The hierarchy of metropolitans was brought in by the authority of the church not of Christ nor of the Apostles , and their superiority was not by 'potestas aut imperium' but of ' dignitas et honor' ; as bishops ' in collegio presbyterorum ' they summoned the synod, took counsel, asked for opinions, warned, advised, exhorted, rebuked, but there was no ' jus privatae autoritatis de jure divino ' . They conducted affairs by common council.

It has never been of the essence of the Christian bishop that he should exercise absolute authority and supremacy over presbyters --- Timothy was not a bishop among presbyters but an archbishop among bishops , though not in the later sense of the word. More than one bishop may well have lived at Ephesus -- the episcopal *ἡγεμονία* may well have been conferred on several men living within one city , particularly a place like Ephesus , but if bishop or presbyter offend , he must be summoned ' ad senatum ecclesiasticum et si dignus cum publico iudicio damnabant ' ! Monarchical rule , authority, jurisdiction granted to the episcopate as a matter of history and policy have not been altogether unbeneficial to the order and discipline of the church but the position of a bishop now is not the same thing as that of a bishop in the primitive church -- things can be added to the office , but it is necessary to discern what is peripheral to the office , however beneficial to the church, and what is essential to the office. Canon 12 of the Council of Antioch in Encaenis (341 AD) provided that a bishop condemning presbyters did so ' non sua unius autoritate sed ecclesiae clerique iudicio ' .

The titles afforded to Peter, writes Bellarmine, are surely formidable evidence when taken in their cumulative effect -- Eusebius describes him as a Pontifex Christianorum , Basil that he was

1. 1 Tim. 5. 18 - 19 .

2. Eusebius Chron. sub anno. 44.

3. Basil Serm. 'De Iudicio Dei' .

'Praelatus caeteris discipulis', Epiphanius that he was 'Dux ¹ **discipulorum**'², Cyril that he was Princeps Apostolorum', Cyril of Alexandria and others that he was 'Caput'³ and Cyprian⁴ says that he held a 'Primatus'. Whitaker replies that none of these titles are in question and he agrees with all, but the controversy hangs upon the definition of the word 'Primatus' and none of the Fathers whom Bellarmine mentions would supply the slightest ground for the current definition of the word viz. 'ius imperandi, praescribendi, cogendi, et alia huiusmodi'. Taking Basil as an example -- there is no evidence that to him the bishop ^{of} Rome was the only jurisdictional head of the universal church even though he assigns to him an authoritative position in all questions of dogma. Unity and agreement consist in a community of bishops of like minds, in contact with each other through constant communication by letter and messenger. The Bishop of Rome was one among others, and leader of the Western bishops, and this was the view of the Fathers mentioned. Varro describes certain fields as having a 'primatus' because of their quality or fertility and fruit-bearing, and so to Augustine there was a Primacy to Peter but a Primacy of confession and faith. It is possible to have a primacy without power or dominion. Similarly 'princeps' does not necessarily signify an inequality of authority --- Herod summoned 'omnes principes sacerdotium' and in Exodus 6.13 the 'principes familiarum' are summoned -- each first in his own family but nevertheless having no singular authority or jurisdiction over all the rest. Genesis 40.2. mentions a 'princeps pincernarum et pistorum'. Cicero⁵ called Eudoxius the 'princeps in astrologia' and Servius⁶ was the 'princeps omnium in jure civili'; Plato⁷ was 'princeps ingenii et doctrinae', Socrates was 'princeps Philosophorum', Zeno 'princeps Stoicorum' and ~~at~~ the other ~~end~~ of the scale we have a 'princeps Sceleris' in Simon Magus also called *ἀρχηγός πάντων* *dipercors* Peter was described by the

-
1. Epiphanius Advers. Haeres. 51.
 2. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 2.
 3. Cyril of Alexandria Bk. 12 on John 24; vide Chrysostom Hom XI on Matthew; Aug. Sermon. 124 qu. 75 De Temp. et De Quaest. Vet et Nov. Test.
 4. Cyprian Ep. ad Quint.
 5. Cicero De Divin. 2.
 6. Cicero De Claris Oratorib.
 7. ibid.

Fathers as Princeps because of the faith he declared , his zeal and other virtues ; he stood in a spiritual relationship with Christ but this did not give him power , authority , or jurisdiction over the rest . Chrysostom¹ described Peter as κορυφαίου , Dionysius the Areopagite² ὑπερχόντα τοῦ θεοπρεσβυτέρου χερσὶ τῶν μαθητῶν , Oecumenius³ τιμιωτάτου τῶν μαθητῶν Nazianzen⁴ ἑξάρχου τῶν μαθητῶν Eusebius⁴ προηγόρου Chrysostom⁵ also called Paul ἡγέμονα τῶν ἀποστόλων and indeed it was Pope Gregory I⁶ that wrote 'Paul sought for (petit) Rome that he might seize the world ' . Clement of Rome had called James the ἐπίσκοπος ἐπίσκοπων and the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus in their letter to the Emperor referred to Cyril as 'caput episcoporum' .

Gregory of Nazianzen⁷ wrote of the Church of Caesarea that it was from the beginning and now is the μητέρα σκέδον ἀποσῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν and Basil⁸ called the Church at Antioch the κεφαλή of all the churches , and for this reason he said that it should labour diligently that peace be preserved in it because by doing this the universal church would derive the greatest of benefits . Chrysostom⁹ called the Church at Antioch τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης ἀντίρροπον which Whitaker Latinizes to 'toti orbi aequipollentem ' ; it was also κεφαλή of the whole earth ; he described the Church at Constantinople as the κεφαλή and πηγὴ of other churches . Other churches beside Rome were addressed by these titles. Similarly the use of πάππα of the Bishop of Rome is neither confined to him nor is it any guarantee of any Primatus of jurisdiction --- in profane literature the title is used of kings and princes ; the title is used of Augustine by Jerome, of Cyprian by the presbyters of the

1. Chrysostom Hom. 21 on 1 Cor.
2. Pseudo-Dionysius De Divin. Nomin. 13.
3. Oecumenius on 1 Cor. 15.
4. Eusebius H.E. 2.14
5. Chrysostom Hom 85 on John . Vide etiam De Laude Pauli Hom.2. ; Hom. 18 on Romans ; Hom.33 on Matthew (where he joins Peter and John in what Whitaker calls an 'Apostolatus in apice '). Whitaker notes that Harding (op.cit. art. 4. sect. 32) had changed 'eorum' to 'omnium ' in Augustine's phrase 'Petrum constitutum caput eorum' Nilus of Ancyra (Ep. Ad Magnam c. 430 AD) said that Paul was προκριτὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων .
6. Gregory I on Job. 27. cap. 6. Vide his Comment. on 1 Kings. 4.4.

Roman Church , and of many bishops other than the Pontiff .
 Arsenius addressed Athanasius as ' Dilecte Papa' and the title is used
 of priests in the Eastern Church . Bellarmine does not question the
 use of the title by others in ancient times but all this has now
 ceased and the Primacy in the title is reserved for the Pontiff alone,
 through the process of *ὑποτάξις* i.e. the title becomes a
 ' pronominitio ' proper only to one person or office, exclusive of
 all others -- as at the Synod of Pavia in 998 AD the Archbishop of
 Milan was rebuked for calling himself 'Pope' and in 1073 AD
 Gregory VII at a Synod at Rome formally prohibited its use by any
 other bishop than the Bishop of Rome. Whitaker says that this
 process of *ὑποτάξις* is an interesting one , the discursive
 use of titles being ultimately lodged in one person -- but in
 theology it has no validity unless typology, precedence , continuity,
 and relevance apply. The real point here is that the Pope had in
 fact unlawfully appropriated to himself offices which did not, had
 not, and should not , be summed up in his **one person** . The same had
 applied to the term 'vicar' -- Eusebius¹, Bishop of Rome (310 AD) had
 addressed the priests as 'vicarii Christi' ; titles are not without
 inherent value but they must not be abused or seized , as the 39th.
 Canon of 3 Carthage² states --- 'Primae Sedis Episcopus non appelletur
 Princeps Sacerdotum aut Summus Sacerdos aut aliquid huiusmodi sed
 tantum Primae Sedis Episcopus ' . Albinus³ reflected the spirit of the
 age when he wrote ' Papa canonice electus est Deus in terris ' and ' Nec
 Deus es nec homo quasi neuter es inter utrumque.'

contd. 7. Gregory of Nazianzen Ep. 18.

8. Basil Ep. 20 Ad Athan. ----- 9. Chrysostom De Laude Ignatii.

1. Eusebius of Rome Ep. 3. Ad Romanos.
2. Bellarmine regarded this as only applying to the African Church,
 where there were several ' equal primates' ; Xantippus was addressed
 as 'Episcopus Primatus' and Tertullian, Optatus, and Augustine all
 used these titles of their own African bishops. The canon therefore
 was to suppress the vain pride and self-seeking of titles. Whitaker
 answers that Gratian regarded the canon as applicable to the whole
 church and the 8th. Canon of the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) confirms
 this view ' if anyone has violently taken and subjected (a Province)
 he shall give it up lest the vanities of worldly honour be brought
 in under the pretext of sacred office. ' The immediate cause of
 this canon was the Bishop of Antioch arrogating to himself the
 right of ordaining in Cyprus , in violation of former usage.
3. Albinus 'De Potestate Papae et Ecclesiae ' 1. 22.

/

Basil in his Letter to Athanasius , writes Bellarmine, gave the Pontiff the authority of visitation over the Eastern Churches and of rescinding the decrees of Councils. Whitaker replies that before too much is grounded on this text , Bellarmine should look to his history. Valens , the Arian , was Emperor in the East , while Valentinus , both pious and orthodox , was Emperor in the West. Basil was wrestling with the Arian heresy in the Eastern Church and he wrote to Athanasius saying that it would be a good thing (commodissimum) if some bishops were sent from Italy , who by their common opinion , might condemn the heresy , but since this was inconvenient (δύσκολον) he hoped that the Roman Bishop himself would send prudent men to refute the heresy . There is no suggestion of any obedience , but rather as one friend might write to another to visit the sick ' ---- it is clear from what Basil wrote , that the Pontiff did not demand any right or authority in this matter ; the Pontiff was asked διακροτῆσαι τίνες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας πρὸς τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν (ad nostri visitationem) and that he wishes the Pontiff ἀθροισθῆσαι περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα .

It is one thing to say that the decrees of the Council of Ariminum should be rescinded by the Pontiff as by all orthodox , and quite another thing to say that the Pontiff has authority to rescind the decrees of any council, with an authority above that of councils. If the latter had been true , Basil would have worded his letter very differently , and the Pontiff could have decided the matter in Rome and that would have been the end of the matter . In fact the request was that learned men should be sent to dispute , argue , and persuade those who had dealings in this council --- the request was not only for Italian bishops but for Western bishops . If the emissaries should achieve a common orthodox mind with the Arians in the East , the people would follow without contradiction (ἀναντιρρητως).

2

These conflicts against orthodoxy in the Eastern Church are brought to our notice also in Basil's Letter addressed to

1. Basil Ep. 52.

2. Basil Ep. 90 MG. 32. 473 .

the Bishops of the West (372 AD) and also in his De Spiritu Sancto (374 AD)¹ --- in the former he reflects the chaotic condition of the East and contrasts it to the unity of the Western Bishops . Chrysostom in his Letter to Innocent makes the request for Italian bishops to be joined together (congregatis) that they might understand his cause and pronounce those guilty (reos) who had condemned him in synod. Whitaker acknowledges the difficulty over reading the singular or the plural in the text --- whether it is addressed only to the Pontiff or to the bishops , but the whole letter strongly suggests it was written ' ad eum (i.e. Innocent) una cum suis collegis ' for Chrysostom often uses the words ΚΥΡΙΟΙ ΤΗΜΙΩΤΑΤΟΙ --- σπουδῆν ἐπιδείξατε ---- ταῦτα λογιζόμενοι. Whitaker draws Bellarmine's attention to the latter's quotation from a Letter of Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius -- the letter was in fact spurious and Thomas Aquinas (Opusculus Contra Graecos) was responsible for its inclusion in the Thesaurus of Cyril of Alexandria -- from which Bellarmine had taken this letter. The situation had arisen just prior to the Council of Ephesus ; Nestorius became Patriarch of Constantinople in 428 AD and Cyril saw in his criticism of the Θεοτόκος a threat to the catholic faith . He wrote to Celestine (c. April 430 AD)² giving him information about Nestorius' opinions and those of the Fathers and sent the Letter by Possidonius with the books and passages marked . A Synod of Rome later in the year (430 AD)³ condemned Nestorius and Celestine wrote to Cyril , Nestorius, and others, about this condemnation. In his Letter to Cyril , Celestine wrote⁴ ' and so appropriating to yourself the authority of our See and using our position , you shall with resolute severity carry out this sentence⁵ that within 10 days either Nestorius condemned in writing his heretical view , or be excommunicated , since he would not be holding ' the faith which the Romans and the Church of your Holiness (i.e. Alexandria) and the universal religion holds ' . Celestine also wrote to John of Antioch and others , and though he wrote to John in a vein of

1. Basil De Spiritu Sancto 30. MG. 32 . 212.

2. Cyril of Alexandria Ep. ad Celestinum MG. 77. 80.

3. ML 50. 457.

4. Celestine Ep. Ad Cyril. Ep. XI. (11th. Aug. 430 AD) ML.50.463.

5. 'auctoritate igitur tecum nostrae sedis ascita , nostrae vice usus ' .

brotherly kindness, Cyril of Alexandria sent John the famous 'Cum Salvator' in which he seemed to regard the condemnation as a joint affair of synods at Rome and Alexandria'. Whitaker comments that this is no support for Bellarmine's claim that a 'potestas hereticos refellendi' was vested in the Pontiff only.

On summary appeals to Rome, Calvin's judgement still stood --- that the **conception** of the Pontiff as the 'Judex **Supremus**'² over the whole church, Emperors and Kings, was of recent growth. Justinian³ had enjoined that all contentions between bishops should be referred to the metropolitan, thence to the Patriarch, and that decision should be made according to the canons and ecclesiastical laws, and that his judgement should stand and should end all controversies within his Province --- *παραχέτω πέρας*; there is no concession here to appeals beyond this point. Theodosius decreed that appeals made to Rome should thereafter be referred to Constantinople, and this referred to more than civil cases, as Jewel demonstrated to Harding, though Stapleton still seems to persist in Harding's view that this did only apply to civil cases. The Council of Chalcedon re-enforced this point, that appeals of bishops or clergy should be made to the *ἑξάρχον*⁴ τῆς διοικήσεως or to Constantinople. On this term *ἑξάρχον*, Nilus Bishop of Thessalonica in his book 'De Primatu' said of this canon that no mention is made of any appeals to Rome, and the view that 'Exarch' refers to the princeps (civil) not to the Primate, had Nicholas I for its author. The order of the words in this canon indicates an ascending superiority which leaves the *ἑπίσκοπος* at Constantinople, at least an equal to Rome if the Council be concerned with Greek appeals only.

1. Calvin Inst. 4.7.9.
2. Whitaker refers to 'Bartholomew Fumus' -- 'Aurea Armilla' 63, and Jerome Albanus 'De Potestate Papae'.
3. Vide Coleman-Norton 'Roman State and the Christian Church' Vol.3. p. 1069; Mandate of Justinian I on Episcopal Jurisdiction in Clerical Lawsuits' Oct. 530 AD (C.I.I. 4.29)
4. The Exarch would be the superior metropolitan. It appears here and in the 9th. canon of Chalcedon, that the Greeks have given some **grounds** for Whitaker's comment --- for as a General Council, it gave greater privileges to the See of Constantinople than was ever given by any council (including Sardica) to the Bishop of Rome. The causes are both civil and ecclesiastical, and the use of *πρότερον* (= at first) in the 9th. Canon does not exclude a reference to secular judges. This is clearly recognised in

Nilus again reminds us that Canon 36 of the Third Council of Constantinople (the Sixth Ecumenical Council 680/1 AD) confirmed the power of appeals to Constantinople ' iisdem privilegiis' -- **τῶν ἰσῶν ἀπολαβεῖν προσβέων** are the words of the Council , and the Fathers also renewed the decrees of 1 Constantinople and Chalcedon. Bellarmine commented that this argument had been refuted but Whitaker replies that he would like to know when and by whom ; much had been written about it , but the point remained , and Whitaker reminds Bellarmine that at 3 Constantinople all five Patriarchs were represented , and its title bore the words **ἡ ἀγία καὶ οἰκουμένη συνόδος** — which was more than could be said for the Lateran Councils.

Theodore Balsamon in his Commentaries , and Zonaras in his History , did not understand this 9th. canon as referring to the Pontiff at all¹, and Bellarmine had added ~~the~~ words to the canon which were not there --- he wrote ' a man who has a dispute with his metropolitan , if nearer to Constantinople and if contented with the judgement of that bishop (i.e. Constantinople) is permitted to take his appeal there ' --the underlined portions are not in the canon and as a gloss are inadmissible . The 17th. Canon should decide the matter --- appeals in any church (in unaquaque ecclesiā) may be lawfully taken to the Bishop of Constantinople , and not merely those of the neighbouring clergy. Canon 12 of the Eleventh Council ² of Carthage (407 AD) makes it clear that appeals made to the Emperor should be ratified either to the Bishop of Carthage or the Bishop of Rome (the Greek canon omits 'either' and ' or' , and substitutes ' and ' for 'or ') -- there is no tacit acceptance here of the development of a Primum Judicium , grounded upon the 28th. Canon of Chalcedon and the 9th. Canon of Sardica , leading to an 'Ultimum Judicium ' vested in the Bishop of Rome as Bellarmine claimed.

Bellarmino seems to have held the view that the Council of Sardica (343 - 4 AD) should be held as a General Council ³ and that it had always been received as such in the early Church ; he ⁴ contd. Justinian in Novellae 123. c. 21 --Justinian substituting Patriarch for Exarch.

1. cp. Turrianus Pro Epist. Decret. 34.

2. Whitaker wrongly dates it the Sixth.

3. Whitaker Contra Bellarm. 4.4. 4. Socrates H.E. 2.16

quotes Socrates who referred to it as a General Council , and he quotes from Athanasius¹ and Hilarius.² More than 300 bishops attended from more than 36 provinces and the Centuriators of Magdeburg had accepted the Council . Whitaker says that the support for this Council is by no means unanimous and though he was prepared to accept it as a 'pious and holy synod' Augustine³ regarded it as a Council of Arians. In this, says Whitaker , Augustine probably overstated the case , that at the outset there were heretics --the Eastern party were Eusebians i.e. semi-Arians and objected to the Western acceptance of Athanasius , but they withdrew to Philippopolis -- but the greater part was catholic. Athanasius had called it *μεγάλη σύνοδος* but this is not necessarily identical with 'Ecumenical ' . Justinian in his Edict of 346 AD on the Three Chapters called it Ecumenical but seemingly did not reckon it as among the General Councils of which he counted four . The title ' Universale Concilium' did not necessarily refer to a General Council . Gregory I and Isidore only knew of four General Councils . Nazianzen asserted that the issue of this Council of Sardica was *χριστόν τέλος*. The assessment of this council may be important because Bellarmine used it to prove his view of the ultimate appellant jurisdiction of Rome --- mutual excommunication between the Western and the Eastern bishops followed , when the required condemnation of Athanasius did not emerge during the proceedings , but those who passed the canons were catholic Fathers, the semi-Arians having departed. Canons 4 and 7, did approve of appeals to Rome as Bellarmine had said , but the reason is clear --- the Council was eager that catholics like Athanasius , Paul , and other bishops , should receive support (succurere) and Julius, the Bishop of Rome was both friendly and keen to help (patronus) , and he emerged as the champion of the catholic cause (caput catholicorum) ; in resisting the Arians he was held to be honouring the memory of Peter , but this is not the same thing as erecting a supreme monarchical tribunal.

-
1. Athanasius Apol. 2.
 2. Hilarius De Synod.
 3. Augustine Ep. 163.

The 17th. Canon of the 16th. Council of Carthage (418 AD) is clear that appeals from the lower clergy shall not be carried across the sea but should be settled by African councils or by the Primates of the African provinces ; any appeal ' transmarinam' would bring excommunication. Cyprian had held that a cause should be heard in the place in which it was raised , and to Bellarmine's comment that this was true but causes do not have a habit of always remaining local , Whitaker replies that Cyprian's words gave a clear indication to the situation --- ' singulis pastoribus portio gregis est ascripta , quam regat unusquisque et gubernet , rationem sui actus Domino redditurus ' and Dominus ~~did not mean the Pontiff~~ (sic) !²

On the African attitude to appeals, Whitaker mentions the view of Alan Copus³ who said that a private synod could not stand against the 'praejudicium ' of Rome and that the 17th. Canon of XI Carthage (407 AD) excludes any mention of appeals from bishops --- it forbids presbyters and other clergy appealing beyond the sea but there is no mention of bishops, since their appeals would be ultimately referred to Rome. Whitaker answers this by saying that he would support Calvin in his refutation of this view , though he himself was no Calvinist ; if the Pontiff was Summus Judex no African Council could ever forbid appeals from the lower clergy to be heard at Rome . The 28th. Canon (Greek) of this council makes it clear why bishops are not mentioned -- not because it was lawful for them to appeal to Rome , but because in the past it had been made abundantly clear to bishops that they should not do so , whereas this provision had not been clearly stated in the case of the inferior clergy --- ὡς καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν πολλάκις ἤρισται (quemadmodum etiam de episcopis saepe definitum est) . No Romanist had replied to this point , claims Whitaker , as far as he knew , except Remundus Rufus⁴ , who held that πρὸ signified ' ab ' not ' de ' --- but if ' ab ' had been meant , ἀπὸ would have been used . Actually πρὸ contained within itself the meaning of

-
1. ML¹ 67. 221.
 2. Whitaker says that Gratian should be castigated for adding to this canon ' nisi forte Romanam '.
 3. Alan Copus --the pseudonym used by N.Harpsfield for his 'Dialogi sex contra Summi Pontificis oppugnatores '(Antwerp 1566 AD). There is a reference to this work in Jewel Vol. 4. p. 938 note 6 (Parker Edition).
 4. Remundus Rufus . The British Museum Catalogue lists under

priority of time i.e. as had often been defined before in respect of bishops . In canon 139¹ in the Greek and 105 in the Latin, the Fathers at Carthage having the Letter of Celestine before them , defined ;-
 εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸ κατωτέρων κληρικών καὶ λαϊκῶν φαίνεται ἐκεῖ προφυλάττειν πῶς μᾶλλον τοῦτο πρὸ ἐπισκόπων βούλεται προφυλάττειν —
 i.e. si enim de inferioribus clericis et laicis apparet illic observari , quanto magis hoc de episcopis vult observari ? '

Whitaker mentions canon 125 (Greek 126) of the 17th. Council of Carthage (418 AD) -- though he refers to it as the Sixth Council of Carthage --- which forbad appeals 'ultra mare' and excommunicated those who did appeal ² . The dispute on this canon and the 17th. Canon of the 16th. Council of Carthage (May 418 AD) **continues still** ; Anglicans following Tillemont ³ and Van Espen ⁴ say that what had been decided about bishops not appealing ' ultra mare ' was now applied to the inferior clergy . But Romanists reply ⁵ that no canon is known that forbad bishops to appeal to Rome . But since in the next Council on the 31st. May 419 AD -- the 18th. Council of Carthage --- temporary permission was granted to African bishops to appeal to Rome ⁶ , it would seem that canonically speaking such appeals were irregular and not the normal practice. On the other hand the Letter of Augustine to Celestine ⁷ (423 AD) gives definite cases of Papal intervention in the affairs of the African Church and he gives no hint that they are unusual ; he actually implores the Pope to reverse ~~the~~ the decision of the Primate of Numidia , which was the Province concerned ⁸ , and the fact that the threat of civil intervention had to be used to give effect to the Pope's decision , suggests that Papal intervention was not accepted as 'de jure divino' by the African Church .

 contd. 'Rufus Raymundus'; In Molinaeum pro Pontifice Maximo , Cardinalibus , Episcopis , totoque ordine sacro defensio etc. ' (Paris 1553 AD) **Molinaeus** was Charles du Moulin .

1. Vide 'Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers ' Series 2. Vol.14 Decrees and Canons of the 7 Ecumenical Councils ' p. 509 ; canon 138 in the Latin Canons and not numbered in the Greek.
2. ML. 67. 192.
3. Tillemont . Memoires . 13. 1037 (1710 AD)
4. Van Espen 'Ius Ecclesiasticum' Tom 3. p. 300 (1753 AD)
5. eg. Ballerini ML. 55. 570.
6. Vide Council of Carthage 31st. May 419 AD to Boniface --- -- Quoniam Domino placuit --ML. 20. 752.

The Appeals of the three African bishops, Priscus , Victor , and Laurence , to Rome may have been permissible under the temporary agreement of 418 AD . The situation is made clearer in the Letter of the Council of Carthage (424 AD)¹ to Celestine , in which the African bishops emphasised that the Nicene Canons did not allow appeals to Rome (Canon 5 of the Council of 1 Nicea) ; they **censure** the Pope for using canons which were not genuine to support his claim to intervene , and they state that this 5th. Canon of Nicea meant that ' all business should be concluded in the place where it arose ' -- a phrase which looks back to Cyprian.² In this way, Africa indicated its right to remain ' sui generis ' while continuing in the unity of the Faith and without breach of communion ; the Primacy of honour, dignity , and order , of Rome was recognised , so long as Rome made no claim to a Primacy of Jurisdiction . Celestine accepted the situation.³

Whitaker notes that although the Council of Capua held in 391 AD had been described by Bellarmine as but a Provincial Synod, its importance in the present debate should not be underestimated as a reflection of custom and opinion. Capua at that time was the seat of the ' Consularis Campaniae ' and its chief town, though Ausenius placed it behind Milan and Aquileia . The Council of Capua condemned Bonosus but he refused its authority and founded his own sect. The earliest authority is that of Pope Siricius⁴ (385 - 399AD) --- in his Letter to Anysius , says Bellarmine, it was not said that Pope Damasus (367 - 384 AD) could not judge , but that he **could not** convene in order to judge -- the words were ' non convenire enim ut quando Concilium provinciāle aliquid statuit , ipse sine causā aliter judicaret ' . Whitaker replies that the words ' sine causā ' -----

contd. 7. Augustine Ep. 209 ML. 33 .955

8. Vide Giles 'Documents illustrating Papal Authority' p.232

1. Letter of the Council of Carthage (424 AD) sect. 4 to Celestine 'Optaremus ' ML. 50. 423 . Vide Giles op. cit. p. 234
2. Cyprian Ep. 59 (252 AD) CSEL 3. 666 ;vide Giles op. cit. Doc. 38.
3. Vide Kidd 'The Roman Primacy ' p. 105.
4. Siricius Ep. 9 Ad Anysium ; vide Cross ODCC p. 186 where the Letter is said to be falsely ascribed to Ambrose.

were not in the text and that Damasus was quite clear that he was not able to (competere) either adopt a form of judging (a court ?) or to judge ; as Summus Judex he would not have said that, and it must be recognised that this was only a provincial synod , and not a general one (from which it was not lawful to appeal) , and the geographical position of Capua makes the situation more interesting -- it stood at the junction of the Via Appia and the Via Poplilia and was the natural junction for the people on their way to Rome ;-

a) from Greece via Brundisium along the Via Appia.

b) from Africa via the Straits of Messina along the Via Poplilia .

Whitaker challenges the claim ' Prima sedes a nemine judicabitur ' which words were supposed to have been those of Miltiades when Marcellinus (Pope 295 - 304 AD) was **arraigned at a Synod of Sinuessa** for having fallen into idolatry and sacrificed to the gods during the Diocletian persecution . Pope **Mardellinus** together with a number of his clergy obtained immunity from further persecution by performing some outward gesture of conformity , but the offence was aggravated by the accusation that he had surrendered a number of sacred books to the imperial authorities . Marcellinus was encouraged to judge himself and declare himself guilty , whereupon Miltiades said ' rightly has he been condemned out of his own mouth for no - one has ever judged the Pope , since the First See can be judged by no man ' Whitaker dismisses the claim and the synod as fictitious² -- as he does the synods which were supposed to have been held under Popes Silvester (314 - 335 AD) and Sixtus 3 (432 - 440 AD) and quotes Peter Crabbe's words on the former ' ne lector subsannando caput moveat' . On the latter, he said that ' the same play is presented but with the

1. There was an abundance of Pseudonymous and apocryphal literature which emerged as a by-product of the Ennodian principle ; Ennodius c. 473 AD - 521 AD in the dispute about the succession to Pope Anastasius 2 (d. 496 AD) defended Symmachus and wrote a libellus against those who challenged the synod of 502 AD , maintaining that the Papal Office was ' de jure divino' and exempt from interference from the secular power. The literature included such works as the Gesta Xysti , Gesta Liberii , and the Gesta Polychronii ' giving the proceedings of an apocryphal synod of Sinuessa . A similar effect was produced in the contemporary supplement to the Silvestrian saga depicting another imaginary synod which 'inter alia' passed the significant canon ' no man shall judge the first See'. These belong to the era of the Symmachian forgeries c. 501 AD compiled by

names changed. For here it was Sixtus that was publicly accused by one Bassus, but in this synod of 57 bishops, Sixtus defended himself and was acquitted while Bassus was excommunicated and banished with the consent of Valentinian and his mother Placidia. These 'synods' turned upon the text quoted and gave explicit assertion to the claim that a distinction is to be made between the Pope as Pope, and the Pope merely as an **individual** --- as an individual he will be subject to the Judgement of the Last Day, but as Pope he is above judicial enquiry; this claim emerged in the celebrated 'Dictatus Papae' based upon the Ennodian view.

'Episcopatus unus est cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur' wrote Cyprian² --- Bellarmine, Harding and Dorman placing the 'unus' (in the sense of 'universus solusque') Episcopatus³ at Rome, and fairly and squarely on the Petrine text (Mt.16.18) and succession. Whitaker writes that Remundus Rufus had already written contd. Dionysius Exiguus who also edited the Latin canons. Vide ML. 6. 1-89; 8.822 - 840; and Liber Pontif. Intro. p. CXXII - CXXXIII ff. 2. Whitaker quotes from Sigonia 'De Occident. Imperio' 1.

1. T.G.Jalland 'Church and Papacy' p. 333 describes this as full of 'clever evasions, violent abuse, and based upon irrelevant quotations from Scripture'. The interesting thing here is that if the view was in fact a claim, it was being made by the holder of the See of Milan. If the fount however be not true, what truth can be put in the commentaries on these words? eg. by Hadrian, Gelasius, Gregory, Innocent, Boniface, and John XXI. ? Whitaker comments that **too much should not be put** on Canon 19 of the Council of Milevis, that 'clericos non debere ab Imperatore judicari' because it was Constantine's maxim that he did not wish to hear episcopal causes because he preferred that their contentions should be buried rather than heard. Vide Ambrose (Orat. De Tradend. Basilio) who wrote 'Bonus Imperator intra Ecclesiam est non supra Ecclesiam'.
2. Cyprian De Unitate IV (ML. 4.501) 251 AD. There are two separate versions of this treatise -- the one, the Primacy Text (PT) because it states that a Primatus was bestowed upon Peter (Primatus Petro datur) which was first published in 1563 AD; until then, the other version, the Textus Receptus (TR) had been received as the standard prior to that date. Vide M. Bevenot 'The Tradition of MSS' (1961 AD) and 'The Primacy Text in Cyprian's De Unitate' (Bellarmine Series No. 4. 1938 AD); G.S.M. Walker 'The Churchmanship of Cyprian' (Ecumenical Studies in Church History' (1968 AD) p. 21 f. (Bibliography p. 80) -- for the text, date, and circumstances of its composition, the PT being the original version.
3. Whitaker reiterates Luther's view here that the Apostolic 'cura' and the Holy Spirit as the 'Vicarius Christi' are abiding realities for the church -- the Papacy had gaps in it (eg. two years or more between Popes) which on the Papal argument makes the church **ἀκέφαλος**. The church's residual powers are in the episcopate not in the Papacy.

much to the effect that the words are difficult to explain , taken with the words 'Primatus Petro datur ' , but Whitaker's view was that the two texts were not incompatible , but are rather demanded in the situation , provided that 'Primatus' is not taken in its later sense . First, taking the words from De Unitate , that ' the beginning arises out of the one ' ¹ , Peter is recognised as the senior Apostle with (not ' of ') all ² , and when Cyprian's further words are noted ' Apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem' and the Apostles were ' pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis ' there emerges the picture of Peter as the accepted 'Primus ' by Cyprian ³ --- Peter is the source and ground original of obedient faith and his acceptance of the Messiahship of Jesus together with Him as the Son of God , two titles fundamental to true faith, and the fruit of revelation , guaranteed the primacy of the 'One' here --from this one man , unity comes , because it is unity in faith ; it is a natural

-
1. 'unitatis originem ab uno incipientem atque rationem sua (i.e. Christ) auctoritate disposuit ' (PT) -- the significant words 'ab uno ' are missing in the PT Family 1 (Vide Bevenot op.cit.) which has ' unam cathedram constituit et unitatis originem atque rationem sua auctoritate disposuit ' . The PT Family 1 conflates both readings ;-
 1. TR 'unitatem qui non tenet tenere se fidem credit ? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit in ecclesia se esse confidit ?'
 2. PT adds after ' resistit ' the words 'Cathedram Petri super quem fundata ecclesia est deserit ' .
 2. This distinction was emphasised at Vatican 2 (2nd. Oct. 1963) during the discussion on the draft decree De Ecclesia . Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht presented the official summary of the collegial approach which stated that the use of 'Peter and the Apostles ' should be avoided because it implied that Peter was not one of the Apostles . Peter was Prince of the Apostles because he was one of the Apostles --- ' if we speak of Peter with the Apostles , this clarifies the fact that Peter belonged to the Apostolic group and at the same time points out his unique place in that group. '
 3. Vide Hugo Koch ' Cathedra Petri ' 45 for quotations on this point. Cyprian Ep. 71.3. (c 255 AD) says that Christ chose Peter first and built the church upon him ; Ep. 73 ll (c.256AD) i.e. after the baptismal controversy , he repeats the same Petrine foundation.

corollary to **ask** that if the unity is broken does a man indeed keep faith, because it is the nature of faith to unite to such a fount? Whitaker, however, says that Cyprian's behaviour becomes inexplicable if what is said about Peter becomes transferred to the Pope with all the overtones of a sovereign supremacy and jurisdiction. This brings Whitaker to his second point --- that even Peter did not enjoy that position among the Apostles -- 'apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem' ; the Apostles were 'pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis' ; he had a primacy because he was the first to make that Confession of Faith, but it was not such a primacy that protected him against the criticism of Paul in Gal. 2.11 f.

Reference has been made to Cyprian's use of 'Primatus' ¹ to indicate the right of 'Primogeniture' i.e. of Jacob over Esau, and Christ in Colossians 1.18. ² In describing the Novatianists, he speaks of their assuming a 'Primatus' i.e. of seizing an episcopal chair for themselves and claiming the power to baptise and offer --- the schism is compared to the intrusion of Korah. Novatian was intruding into a See which already had a catholic bishop. ³ Cyprian also makes the interesting comment that in the argument between Paul and Peter in Galatians 2.11 Peter made no arrogant claim by claiming that he held the Primatus, though Jesus chose Peter first (primum) while all others were newcomers and juniors (novellis et posteris). Cyprian is the first to ascribe a Primatus to Peter, writes G.S.M.Walker, and Cyprian means that Peter was the first of the Apostles chosen -- his Primacy was a priority in time; we may, however, ask, whether this in fact is true -- was Peter the first called? In the Matthean tradition (Matthew 4.18) both Peter and Andrew are called together -- in the Johannine tradition (John 1. 40 ff.) Andrew brings Peter to Jesus. But by the time of the formal Apostolic lists, Peter stands without question at the head (Mark 3.16; Matthew 10.2. Luke 6.14) with Jesus having 'ordained' (ἐποίησεν δώδεκα) (Mark) the 12⁴ --- in modern terms

1. G.S.M.Walker op. cit. p. 26 writes of its use in Cyprian 'De Bono Patientiae 19 and Ep. 73. 25.

2. Cyprian Ep. 69.8

3. Cyprian Ep. 71. 3.

4. or chosen - ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα - Luke.

it may be said that this is a 'vaticinia ex eventu' and 'post ex facto' ¹ but this will make no substantial difference to Whitaker's point -- that such a Primacy was acknowledged in Apostolic circles -- it was a Primacy highlighted in John's account (John 1.42) where the Prologue leads into a summary of the Baptist's Ministry , Andrew's witness to it and bringing Peter to Jesus , who recognises at the very outset the Kephas . There is no Peter's Confession or Apostolic List in John ; there is no need for either because Kephas is recognised at the beginning , and his Confession was well known in Christian circles -- the Primacy (of Faith) is there . Simon Peter was the one to make a 'Primatus' , an intrusion of faith , that of recognising Jesus as Messiah and Son of God . This primogeniture is the effect of a revelation -- flesh and blood had not revealed it (ἀπεκάλυψεν) but ' My Father in heaven ' , and there begins knowledge by the Spirit (John 3).

When Cyprian speaks of ' honor' and 'potestas' he links all the Apostles together --there is no sole source of all ecclesiastical authority in Peter and this can only mean that they were not subject to Peter's power and jurisdiction . What is presented to us here is vastly more important than speaking of jurisdiction , 'potestas' --- Whitaker's mind works very much along the lines as did many of the Reformers , that these things were of secondary importance compared with the Faith that saves , the 'recognitio Christi ' giving new birth to the sons of men . Cyprian was right -- to put the unity of the church in the Faith, enshrined in the Cathedra Petri , but it was Peter's Confession that raised him to that chair . Rome is Peter's See¹ and the Principal Church (Ecclesia Principalis)² --- but it is the episcopate (episcopatus) that continues the Petrine Office which is not gathered exclusively to Rome ; the chair of Peter is perpetuated in all orthodox episcopacy and yet Rome , like Peter, enjoys the primogeniture of acknowledging , confessing , and propagating and defending the orthodox faith³ in all

1. Cyprian Ep. 55. 6.

2. Cyprian Ep. 69. 18

3. This was J.H.Newman's view in 1839 AD ; Vide Library of the Fathers 'Cyprian' p. 150 - 152.

the world and therefore in a very real sense , Rome was Peter's Chair. This affects the views of Siricius , Boniface 1 , and Pope Leo 1 , in the growing conception of Peter Redivivus in the Pope ; Rome is Peter's See because he was martyred there . The seal of blood may give Rome pre-eminence over Alexandria and Antioch, the other two Petrine Sees but does this give Rome more than a 'holy-site ' value, when considering the weightier matters of Faith and jurisdiction ? Whitaker continues, whether Peter was martyred at Rome or not, whether his remains are there or not , makes no difference to the point at issue viz. whether the Pope should claim by the right of local succession (occupation) a universal jurisdiction on the grounds of the Petrine claim.

Arguing for the restoration of the collegiality of bishops to replace the Papal Monarchy , Whitaker quotes first from Augustine¹ and then from Cyprian ' neque enim quisquam nostrum² episcopum se esse episcoporum³ constituit , aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit , quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium , tanquam judicari ab alio non possit , quomodo nec ipse potest alterum judicare '.⁴ There is no disapproval of a *πρωτοδικά* or as Cyprian says a 'praepositus '(prelate) or 'antistes'(president) --- indeed, comments Whitaker, this is most necessary , but what must be safeguarded is that the will (arbitrium) of each bishop shall be free , be given 'potestas' , and not merely hang upon the judgement or decision of another,

Severinus Binius , whose works were first published in Cologne in 1606 AD , and writing more or less contemporary with the publication of these notes of Whitaker at Geneva , wrote that the words of Cyprian have a direct reference to the decree of Pope Stephen ' who was wont to be styled Bishop of Bishops according to custom and because he had acrimoniously threatened excommunication to all not agreeing with him ' . Eck in his Reply to Luther had maintained that Cyprian's words referred to the pride and ambition of those who would propel themselves or others into the episcopate --

1. Augustine De Baptismo 3.3.

2. Omitted in Zonaras's Greek.

3. Omitted in Zonaras's Greek.

4. Cyprian's words at the Council of Carthage 257 AD.

Whitaker replies that Luther was right when he said that Cyprian here was referring to bishops already made (*episcopis iam constitutis*) ; Whitaker continues that when the letters of Jubaianus had been read at the Council of Bishops (i.e. Carthage 257 AD) Cyprian said ' *superest ut singuli proferamus , quid de hac re sentiamus , neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis amoventes si diversum senserit* ' -- bishops should **not** take upon themselves the judgement of other bishops or repel from communion those that differed in opinion.

Bellarmino claimed that the opinion of Cyprian only applied to the local synod and did not affect the Pope , but Whitaker reminds him that Cyprian did say ' *omnis episcopus* ' and the context of the words suggest that he was speaking about the episcopate in general not Carthage in particular. This is not to say that bishops are not to be examined , tried, and judged --- bishops in synod can and must enquire into causes ² , acquit the innocent , condemn the guilty , and the canons suffice to emphasise this solemn duty , but Cyprian puts the ' *licentia* ' for this procedure in the corporate episcopate not in the individual bishop. ³ The Apostolate like the episcopate reveals that all the Apostles ' *pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis* ' .

Sanders ⁴ had asked what ' *in solidum* ' really meant -- that there is a very real interest in the view that though we all share the same nature in Adam and are therefore ' *in solidum* ' yet within that nature , there emerges a divergency of relationships . Whitaker replies that the analogy is not an accurate one -- the episcopate is

-
1. Bellarmine De Pontifice Romano 2.16. Sanders and Alan Copus took the same view , as did Pamelius in his Annotations on Cyprian.
 2. Whitaker writes that a synod has a ' *jus et potestas ad examinandum et judicandum* ' . Cyprian had said ' *nullum episcopum posse ab alio judicari* ' --- N.B. ' *ab alio* ' not ' *ab aliis* ' for a synod of bishops can always judge a bishop.
 3. Dorman in his work against the Refutation of Dean Nowell carried the meaning of ' *licentia* ' to its full Papal conclusion -- that bishops only have such a ' *licentia* ' (' *licentia libertatis et potestatis*) because the Pope grants it ; without the Papal grant they would have neither ' *jus* ' nor ' *potestas* ' . Whitaker maintains that this is quite a misuse of Cyprian and quotes in connection with Cyprian's condemnation of Pupianus ' *episcopi habent divino jure aequalem libertatem ac potestatem* ' .
 4. Sanders De Visibili Monarch. 7. 45

not 'aliqua natura' but an office and work; if one king dominates other kings, there is a 'partem in solidum'; if the Pope is bishop of bishops 'divino jure et mandato Christi' then Cyprian's words 'singulos episcopos unius episcopatus partem in solidum tenere' cannot be true. Cyprian did not say 'unum esse episcopum' but 'episcopatum esse unum'.

Various views have been expressed about the meaning of 'in solidum'. Archbishop Benson¹ defined it as a 'tenure upon a totality like that of a shareholder in some joint property'; T.A.Lacey² as a 'co-partnership in joint possession'; E.H.Blakeney³ as a 'corporation i.e. when two parties have borrowed and guaranteed the same sum of money, both are responsible 'in solidum' for the whole'; the phrase is described as a 'legal one, referring to a right or duty of several persons which each has in entirety⁴ or 'a joint participation of every bishop in all the episcopal powers which gives importance to councils in Cyprian's ecclesiology'.⁵ From the Digest, Fr. Bevenot⁶ furnishes examples that while liability 'in solidum' can apply to several persons, ownership 'in solidum' can belong to only one. Ulpian, whom Whitaker quotes, stated⁷ that joint creditors or debtors may each be entitled or liable 'in solidum' which term can only apply if owned by a single person. Thus 'episcopatus' in Cyprian never refers to a body of bishops (Bevenot) but only to the episcopal power exercised through the church universal -- it is held in totality and therefore no rival bishop can be established. The part is always the whole.

Bellarmino wrote that though the 'episcopatus' is held 'a singulis' it is held neither equally nor in the same way. Whitaker replies that if it is not held equally or in the same way then it is not held 'in solidum'---'nam in solidum is tenet qui jus habet in totum'. Cyprian had made his mind clear when he wrote 'ecclesia

-
1. Archbishop Benson 'Cyprian' p. 182
 2. T.A.Lacey 'Unity and Schism' p. 35.
 3. E.H.Blakeney 'Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiae' (1928) p. 62
 4. Casel 'Revue Benedictine' (1913) p. 418
 5. Bardy 'La Theologie de l'Eglise' (1947) 2.201.
 6. Bevenot J.T.S. (1955) 244 - 248.
 7. Digest 45. 2.3.

not 'aliqua natura' but an office and work; if one king dominates other kings, there is a 'partem in solidum'; if the Pope is bishop of bishops 'divino jure et mandato Christi' then Cyprian's words 'singulos episcopos unius episcopatus partem in solidum tenere' cannot be true. Cyprian did not say 'unum esse episcopum' but 'episcopatum esse unum'.

Various views have been expressed about the meaning of 'in solidum'. Archbishop Benson¹ defined it as a 'tenure upon a totality like that of a shareholder in some joint property'; T.A.Lacey² as a 'co-partnership in joint possession'; E.H.Blakeney³ as a 'corporation i.e. when two parties have borrowed and guaranteed the same sum of money, both are responsible 'in solidum' for the whole'; the phrase is described as a 'legal one, referring to a right or duty of several persons which each has in entirety'⁴ or 'a joint participation of every bishop in all the episcopal powers which gives importance to councils in Cyprian's ecclesiology'.⁵ From the Digest, Fr. Bevenot⁶ furnishes examples that while liability 'in solidum' can apply to several persons, ownership 'in solidum' can belong to only one. Ulpian, whom Whitaker quotes, stated⁷ that joint creditors or debtors may each be entitled or liable 'in solidum' which term can only apply if owned by a single person. Thus 'episcopatus' in Cyprian never refers to a body of bishops (Bevenot) but only to the episcopal power exercised through the church universal -- it is held in totality and therefore no rival bishop can be established. The part is always the whole.

Bellarmino wrote that though the 'episcopatus' is held 'a singulis' it is held neither equally nor in the same way. Whitaker replies that if it is not held equally or in the same way then it is not held 'in solidum'---'nam in solidum is tenet qui jus habet in totum'. Cyprian had made his mind clear when he wrote 'ecclesia

-
1. Archbishop Benson 'Cyprian' p. 182
 2. T.A.Lacey 'Unity and Schism' p. 35.
 3. E.H.Blakeney 'Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiae' (1928) p. 62
 4. Casel 'Revue Benedictine' (1913) p. 418
 5. Bardy 'La Theologie de l'Eglise' (1947) 2.201.
 6. Bevenot J.T.S. (1955) 244 - 248.
 7. Digest 45. 2.3.

una est quae in multitudine latius extenditur et hanc unitatem episcopi tenere debemus ut episcopatum ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus --- quicquid ad episcopi munus et auctoritatem pertinet illud non magis uni quam alteri communicatur sed ab omnibus aequaliter tenetur ' . A bishop may be greater than another by occupation of a greater See , but his episcopate is not greater . Jerome in enquiring about authority wrote ;-

- a) the custom (consuetudo) of the world (i.e. of the whole church) is greater than that *of one* city (eg. Rome)
- b) all bishops, whoever they are , are ' eiusdem meriti atque sacerdotii '
- c) all bishops succeed to the Apostles ' ex aequo ' .

During Vatican 2 , notably on September 15th and 22nd. 1964 and on 12th. September 1965 , contributions were made advancing the idea of collegiality and the balance of Papal responsibility and episcopal powers . Paul VI emphasised the 'weight and delicacy' of the task and that Vatican 1 (1870 AD) after defining Papal Supremacy and Infallibility had not adequately discussed this question -- there remained the verbal dilemma that if the bishops received by virtue of episcopal consecration full and supreme power from Christ Himself, how could this be reconciled with Papal supremacy and power in co-government of the church ?

Vatican 1 had confirmed ' truly unique and supreme powers ' to the Papacy but there remained the description of the prerogatives of the episcopate . Reserving for himself the duty of heading the body of the episcopate , the unity and good of the church charged the Pope with imposing restrictions , defining terminology , prescribing modes of action , regulating the exercise of episcopal authority --- Pope Paul VI proposed a Senate of Bishops to sit in Rome to assist him in the government of the church (this would modify the powers of the Curia) but such a body or college of bishops has no authority unless simultaneously conceived of in terms of its head, the Pope ,who retains full , supreme, and universal power over the church ,and this he can always exercise freely. This collegial union is exercised in an 'Ecumenical Council' also ' in mutual relationships with individual bishops ' at all times and places since the Pope is the perpetual and visible source and foundation of the unity of the

bishops and all the faithful , and also 'in Curia' (or Senate--or both) . 85 % of this Senate or Apostolic Synod is to be elected by the episcopate (motu proprio Apostolica Sollicitudo)¹ and it is to be convoked by the Pope who will provide the agenda². Whitaker nearly 400 years before this had argued strongly for a modification of the Curia --its strong Italian and Papal collative and donative character should be offset by, if not replaced by, the episcopal college -- the 'collegium sacerdotale'³ of earlier days , when , for example, in the days of Cyprian⁴, Cornelius writes to Cyprian (251 AD) that he has summoned his presbyters with five visiting bishops to deal with the important matter of readmitting schismatics ; there was no thought of delegated authority ~~from~~ the Pope but rather that common counsel be taken for the peace and unity of the church -- the ' bond of common counsel '⁵. This 'licentia potestatis'⁶ of the episcopate as Cyprian wrote to a schismatic confessor Florentinus Puppianus (254 AD) is an important factor. The bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop ; if a man is not with the bishop he is not in the church , but behind all this is the Christo-centric value of the episcopate --- Christ acts through His bishops and their corporate unity depends upon their remaining in Christ . In this way they ~~hold~~ the episcopate ' in solidum' and exercise it.

Cyprian's ideal⁸ seems to have been clergy and people joining 'episcopal colleagues' in common synod , to express and discover the church's common mind -- this was more than a 'congregat-
-ionalist gathering ' since visiting bishops, priests,deacons and laypeople would make common counsel ; the output of letters between bishops suggested the importance of the fact that what was aspired to was not merely the mind of the local church but of the church

universal. Thus , Ecumenical Councils prescribe the Orthodox Faith

1. dated 15th. Sept. 1965 AD
2. Vide 'Documents of Vatican 2 ' p. 399, which in a footnote writes of the spirit of Pope Gregory the Great ' my honour is the honour of the universal church ; my honour is the stout energy of my brothers . When each is accorded the honour due unto him ,then I am honoured '.
3. Cyprian Ep. 55.1.
4. Cyprian Ep. 49.2.
5. Cyprian Ep. 17.3.
6. Whitaker Contra Bellarmin. 4 Quaest.1
7. Cyprian Ep. 66. 8-9.
8. Cyprian Ep. 17.

(in the light of dialectic heresy) which finds its expression in the Patriarchal and Diocesan Synods , while the function of each local synod allowed for the implementation of this Faith and a 'flexibility of local custom and theological discourse ' . Excommunication therefore became a matter of the expression of the episcopate more than the act of a single bishop -- the former belonged to Cyprian's mind, while a tendency to the latter belonged to the early Papacy (eg. Pope Stephen).

The serious question is then asked by Whitaker, whether there is such a thing as a continuing ecclesiastical monarchy (of the Pope) grounded in any way upon the Petrine foundation-- a question which ranges here over the Patristic and Scriptural fields to enquire if the term 'Cathedra Petri' does amount to a universal supremacy for the Pope in matters of faith , order, and discipline. First, Whitaker comments , there are simply no grounds that Peter or any other Apostle was made by Christ (i.e. de jure divino) a monarch of the whole church with universal jurisdiction --however exalted the language used of Peter eg. as Primus Apostolorum, or Princeps Ecclesiae , the fact remains that neither did he nor any other Apostle desire such a 'Monarchia Ecclesiae ' nor was it given , and Whitaker comments that it was thrust upon Peter by the Popes ' non amore Petri sed suae monarchiae studio ' . So on Matthew 16.18 Bellarmine said that the Pope's (present) powers were latent in the promise , that there was no particular tradition in Matthew 16.18 but it was a question of 'rex in regno ' i.e. the kingdom will emerge in the fullness of time , as will the splendour and power of the king. The power of kings will only properly emerge as it is administered by the Pontiff , the peace , unity, and faith of the church being guaranteed by Rome.² Whitaker replies that Jesuit circles seem to be at

1. This quotation, from Jerome, has recently been brought to the fore by Hans Küng in his ' The Council and Reunion ' ; he appeals to those outside the Roman obedience to consider Scriptural and theological arguments for the continuance of a Petrine Office in the Church . This raises one of the most acute issues for modern (as it was for medieval) controversy and discussion.
2. Dionysius Petavius (1583 - 1652 AD) the Jesuit historian and theologian, was among the first to formally accept the idea of **doctrinal development** ; he conceded the imperfections of much of Patristic teaching judged by (later) papal standards . Author of 'Opus de Doctrina Temporum (2 vols. publ.1627 AD) his vast and still valuable De Theologicis Dogmatibus (Vols.1-3 1644 AD Vol.4.1650AD) was unfinished at the time of his death . Though after Whitaker's time , the ideas of a progressive revelation appear to have been

variance here --- that there appears to be no oak tree in the acorn would seem to be the view of Turrianus who held that Christ's words refer ' ad proximum non remotius ' whereas Bellarmine had read Matthew 16.18 as 'Simon Jonae filius iam Petrus nondum Petra ' ---but it is clear from Paul that there is only one Rock and that is Christ. Christ said ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ not ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ the assimilation of name does not carry with it a full personal identity with what it signifies . Being feminine (πέτρα) it is an abstract², and to an abstract noun (viz. faith) it applies. Simon was Peter because he was ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας which alone makes sense of Peter's defection from faith and his restoration ; if he were πέτρος (κέφαλος) after Caesarea Philippi, then he soon became 'lapides dissoluti ' (loose stones) -- the church is built upon the Apostles and Prophets . The Patristic view was that Christ was the 'fundamentum in ministerio suo Apostolico ' and this was not in Peter alone. While the Council of Chalcedon and the hymns of Ambrose call Peter 'Petra et Crepido ' enquiry must be made what is meant by this-- whether Peter was made the Rock (i.e. fundamentum) not as an Apostle but by some special commission as Pastor, Princeps, and Monarcha of the Visible Church , an office, title, and dignity , which he could hand down to his successors . The Apostles never were in fact called the Rock, and they were the foundation in quite a different sense from Christ. The Apostles were ' petrae quod ipsorum ministerio ecclesiae aedificatio niteretur ' , but Christ was the Rock because the whole building (moles tota) rests upon the one foundation.³

 Origen called Peter ' magnum ecclesiae fundamentum

 contd. current in Jesuit circles before Petavius wrote.

1. Paul in 1 Cor. 3. 10-11 ; Vide 1 Cor. X 4.--the Fathers draw of that Rock, Christ.
2. A view commonly met in the Reformers . The Hebrew רֶכֶס = a rock (the Aramaic or Syriac , as Whitaker says, is רֶכֶס) does not appear in the singular ; רֶכֶס appears in Jeremiah 4.29 as a 'place of refuge' and in Job 30.6. as a 'dwelling place ' . The Aramaic רֶכֶס being feminine probably accounts for the feminine ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ
3. Ephesians 2.20 ; J.Ll.Davies 'Epistles of Paul' (1884 AD) under Ephesians 2.20 ; 3.5 ; 4.11 ; and H.B.Swete 'Apocalypse of John' (1907) XXI. defines 'prophets ' as not those of the O.T. but the prophets of the Christian church (eg.in Asia Minor) --it was not till the decline of the 'prophetic ministry' which was rapid and general ,and the emergence of writers eg. Ignatius (Magn.8.2. ; Philadelph. 5.2. ; 9.1-2) that 'the prophets are invariably those of the O.T. Canon.Even then,Polycarp could be remembered as

et petram solidissimam¹ ' and no one denies this, but Peter was not alone . Basil wrote that Peter , because of his *ὑπεροχή τῆς πίστεως* received the *οἰκοδομήν τῆς ἐκκλησίας* but here it may be noted that it is the pre-eminence of his faith that is the reason for his being part of the Apostolic foundation² . Nazianzen wrote that 'the foundations³ of the church were committed to Peter because Christ builds His church on that confession of Peter ' -- and what Epiphanius⁴ and Chrysostom say all add up to the point that what is ascribed to Peter is to Peter alone and is not communicable to Peter's successor merely by the fact of succession. Theophylact⁵ has the words ' post me ecclesiae petra es et fundamentum ' --Peter was indeed 'ecclesiae petra et fundamentum secundum Christum'⁶ but so were the rest of the Apostles , and when Euthymius says on Mt.16.18 'Te ponam fundamentum credentium aedificabo super te ecclesiam meam' he says nothing more than the rest and no-one denies these words, but there is no suggestion in Euthymius that 'Petrum solum esse petram aut successores'. Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian say nothing different from the Greek Fathers on this question. Ambrose wrote⁷ ' petra dicitur eo quod primus in actionibus fidei fundamenta posuerit et saxum immobile totius operis Christiani compagem molemq⁸ue contineat ' . Jerome wrote ' Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens Beatitudini tuae (i.e. Petri Cathedrae) communione consocior , super illam petram aedificatam ecclesiam scio , quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit , profanus est . Si quis in Noe arca non fuerit , periet regnante diluvio ' --- Jerome thought very highly of the Roman Church as he was an alumnus ;

his piety is seen in his desire to keep the precepts of his mother church
 contd. an 'Apostolic and Prophetic teacher '(Martyr.Polycarp.16)
 though here we may note that the word has become an adjective.

1. Origen Hom.5.4. on Exodus.
2. Vide Altaner 'Patrology' p.344 --writing on the Papal Primacy, Basil does not consider the Bishop of Rome as jurisdictional Head of the Church , though he assigns to him an authoritarian position in all questions of dogma . The unity and agreement is to consist in a community of 'like-minded bishops in contact with each other by letter or messenger '.
3. Epiphanius;Ancoratus.
4. Chrysostom Hom. 55 on Matthew ; Hom.4. on Isaiah 6.
5. Theophylact on Luke 22.32.
6. Euthymius Zigabenus, early 12th. Century Byzantine theologian of Constantinople ; in his *Πανορθία Δογματική* against all heresies, he uses Patristic texts at great length to confute old heresies ,and in the last 6 of the 28 chapters new heresies.
7. Ambrose Serm.47
8. Jerome Ep. 15 Ad Damasum.ML 22.355

and preserve the same form of Faith as she did -- were there three 'hypostases' he asked Damasus, for he had no wish to be numbered among the heretics? Christ first, then he joined himself to Peter's chair, but to Jerome it is the faith of the Roman Church, following the example of the illustrious Peter, that commends Rome to him-- so he writes not 'super hanc Petram' (i.e. Peter redivivus in Damasus through a sort of Petrine reincarnation, which begins to appear in Leo¹) but 'super illam Petram'.

Pope Leo I states that it is through the Pope that Peter exercises the wider scope and greater power of his authority and executes all parts of his obligations and responsibilities; Peter's power survived and his authority redounded in his See; Leo speaks to the clergy² 'in my humble self, he (i.e. Peter) is recognised when we utter our exhortations in your ears, holy brethren, believe that he is actually speaking whose vice-regent we are'. The ability of the Rock is conveyed to his successors. This view had its beginnings in Siricius³ and constantly reoccurs after Felix 3⁴. The weakness of the argument as Jalland points out is the lack of real historical evidence for the exercise of such powers which Leo describes either by Peter or by any Bishop of Rome for the first 300 years. Pope Leo really undertakes 'the process of rewriting history with what he felt was the Petrine privileges as his guiding principle'. The effort belongs to the romanticism that produced the Pseudo-Clementines, but perhaps the more attractive because it often faced the realities of new situations.

The use of the future tense in Matthew 16.18 (ὁικοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) refers to the future building upon the foundation already laid, which is not the Person of Peter but the Confession of Faith he made -- the foundation is one thing, the building another -- and it may be said that the foundation of that faith was not laid with Peter but existed already to a greater or lesser extent in the O.T. . Whereas 'fides dogmatum' may

~~1.~~ 1. Leo Serm. 3.3. ML. 54. 146.

2. Leo Serm. 3.4.

3. Siricius ep. 1.6.

4. Felix Ep. 8.2.

be handed down , 'fides formata' cannot , and Peter's faith as revealed by the Father belongs to the latter kind and therefore is incommunicable by succession alone -- the *χαρίσματα* are not dependent upon succession but the gift of God . Peter Lombard distinguished between them ;-

- a) 'unformed faith ' i.e. fides informis , pure intellectual assent to a proposition.
- b) 'faith formed by love (fides formata charitate)' the developed faith eg. Paul in Gal. 5.6.

Whitaker maintains that neither is guaranteed by the succession --the former because succession is of itself no guarantee of truth, the latter because of its origin ,because it is the gift of God.

Bellarmino puts forward the view ,popular among the Jesuits but by no means universally held by them², that there is a distinction between a Primary Foundation and a Secondary Foundation ; the distinction rests upon the idea that there are those properties which are proper to a person, and those virtues which are communicable³. Turrianus spoke of foundations which are ;-

- a) *θεοαρχικόν* i.e. proper to God.
- b) *ἱεραρχικόν* i.e. proper to the hierarchy.
- c) *ὑπεράρχικόν* i.e. 'ministeriale'.

Whitaker replies that as in philosophy , distinctions must rest upon reason , so in theology , distinctions must be approved and based upon Scripture , as 'distinctiones natae ' , and nowhere does Scripture (or the Fathers) admit a 'Fundamentum secundarium', whether *ἄλλον* or *ἕτερον* as Stapleton had tried to say . Paul declared himself *μηδὲν ὑπερῆδεναι* and he certainly did not build upon Peter as a 'fundamentum ministeriale' . What foundations were laid were Apostolic not peculiarly Petrine and they were Primary

1. Lombard Sentent. 3. dist. 23.3.

2. Turrianus Contra Sadeel. 1 and Pro Pontifice 2.1. held the distinction but Stapleton was not so confident.

3. Whitaker refers to the words of Pope Leo 1 in Sermo. 3. 'quae sunt propria Christo , sunt Petro participatione communia'-- this implies a foundation of faith with Christ which is inadequate without Peter.

4. 2 Cor. Xl.5. ; Xll. 11.

Foundations -- the 12 foundations of Apoc. 21.14 are the full Apostolic Faith and doctrine for the One City of God , but the imagery is different here , the text referring rather to foundation stones , each inscribed not with Peter's name but with the names of the 12 Apostles . Here the 'fundamentum principale est unum omnium et par ministerium' . Christ promised nothing to Peter 'singulariter' nor was Peter by the charge 'Pasce oves ' or the reception of the keys made the Pastor Ordinarius of the Universal Church , bringing with it the control of a perpetual Papacy ; the power of the keys ~~was~~ conveyed to the rest of the Apostles in Matthew 18.18 . When however it comes to the charge 'Pasce Oves' , Bellarmine writes that 'Pasce' when properly used , means not merely to administer food but to procure , prescribe, and provide food for another.² Whitaker summarises the pastoral office of the Apostolate as follows;-

- a) to bind and loose ; Basil said³ that every bishop had this , and each bishop has 'equalem potestatem ligandi et solvendi'
- b) to judge controversies -- this has been done well by episcopal synods and learned men long before Papal Monarchy was heard of.
- c) to give effect to the pastoral office of preaching and ordering and the calling of synods.

-
1. Vide Epiphanius Haeres. 39 ^{ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ}
Ἰσφιδίου πίστεως οἰκοδομήσω κτλ.
That the Rock is Peter's Faith not Person , appeared also in Hilary De Trinit. 3 and 6 ; August. Tract 124 on John ; Chrysostom Serm. De Pentecost. ; Cyril Hom.10 on Mark ; Ambrose on Ephes.1 and De Domin.Incarnat. 5 ; Jerome's Advers.Jovin.1 has 'super Petrum fundatur ecclesia ; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat et cuncti claves regni caelorum accipiant , et ex aequo super eos ecclesiae fortitudo solidetur , tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur ut capite constituto , schismatis tollatur occasio ' (ML. 23. 247). In his Letter to the Gallican Bishops and the Spanish Bishops , Hadrian 1 (d. 795 AD) clearly sees this 'fortitudo' as 'super hanc soliditatem fidei ecclesiam meam aedificabo ' -- this 'immovable foundation , this happy rock of faith ' designam firmitatem fidei et catholicae unitatis soliditatem manifeste ' as Jerome Albinus wrote (De Potestate Papae l. p. 35 in MS).
 2. eg. Luke 12.42 the 'dispensator fidelis ' , however, is not the Dominus.
 3. Basil De Monast. Constitut. 23

In his *De Pontifice Romano*, Bellarmine¹ gives the 24 Prerogatives of Peter approving a Primacy for Rome -- Pope Leo 1 (440-461 AD) had spoken² of the award to Peter of a position of peculiar authority and the Papacy as charged with the perpetuation within itself of those Apostolic Prerogatives of Peter ;-

1. The change of name from Simon to Kephas, as of Abram to Abraham Jacob to Israel, signified a change to external authority and position, the more so when it is realised that Simon was always henceforth known as Kephas-Petrus. It is true that Christ also changed other names eg. James and John to Boanerges, but this was not afterwards used of them, as was the name of Peter for Simon. Whitaker replies that Saul became Paul but he gathered no external authority merely as a result of this. Bellarmine's use of Leo's words -- 'Petrum assumptum esse in consortium individuae unitatis'³ --- would suggest a sense in which 'consortium' and 'assumptio' could be used viz. that Peter in his Confession achieved a unity with Christ which is essential to saving faith but his defection destroyed that unity and the words that Bellarmine added to Leo's text were more boastful than true -- 'quae Christo potestate propria sunt, Petro esse cum Christo participatione communia'
2. Peter always heads the Apostolic Lists (Matthew X.2. ;Mark.3.16) but Whitaker says that this primacy is a very different thing from a Monarchy or a Principatus. The Fathers had different views on these lists --- Jerome⁴ suggested that he was numbered first because of his age, Ambrose⁵ because of his priority of Confession, Augustine because 'in Christo amore proptissimus saepe unus pro omnibus respondit' --- 'saepe' not 'semper' ;

1. Bellarmine *De Pontifice Romano* 9 - 16.
 2. Pope Leo Serm. 2.1. ML. 54. 142
 3. Pope Leo 1 Ep. 89.
 4. Jerome Adv. Jovin. 1.
 5. Ambrose *De Dom. Incarnat.* 4.9.

Nazianzen because Peter was *θερμότερον τῶν ἄλλων*. Peter is not, however, always named first eg. Gal. 2.9. James comes first, and all the Greek versions have this order as does the Vulgate. ²

3. Peter walked alone upon the water with Christ and Bernard ³ interpreted the water to be the many peoples of the world, and Peter 'instar Domini gradiens super aquas unicum se Christi Vicarium designavit'. Whitaker answers that the allegory here, interesting though it is, is reduced to absurdity, when it is realised that to Bernard the sea is the world and the ship is the church -- did Peter leave the church to rule the world?

4. The internal revelation of Matthew 16.18 made the more remarkable because Peter calls Christ *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*; Whitaker replies that internal revelation does not necessarily lead to external dominion; Nathanael also used the definite article *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* and he also adds *σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*. Andrew had already used the word 'Messiah' of Christ -- and John the Baptist should also have a place because of the revelations given to him. The mystery or revelation was already known -- Peter replied,

5. Peter's chair is indestructible in the light of Matthew 16.18 but Whitaker states that this is a 'petitio principii'; at this point Bellarmine suggests that the Primacy arose 'de facto et in arbitrio Petri' i.e. that Peter by the very fact that he chose Rome as his seat, bequeathed a Primacy. Whitaker comments that Pope Marcellinus in his Letter to the Antiochenes said that the Primacy could not arise from the 'arbitrium vel voluntas' of Peter because he had come to Rome 'Domino jubente'. The deed and the will were therefore not of Peter's choice. The view of the Primacy as due to the 'Legatum aut Testimonium Petri' cannot be taken very seriously in the light of what Turrecremata ⁴ and Anacletus ⁵ said viz. that the Primacy was given from Christ 'immediate'

6. The tribute money (Matthew 17.27) was for Christ and Peter only -- but says Whitaker, this was in answer to Peter alone who had acknowledged

1. Nazianzen De Theolog. 2.10.

2. Bellarmine had challenged the order of the names in Gal. 2.9.; the 'ascending order' of 1 Cor. 1.12 offered by Bellarmine is offset by 1 Cor. 9.5. by Whitaker; in Acts 15 Bellarmine had said that James spoke last because the bishop in his See took precedence over the Apostles -- Whitaker remarks that if the Pope went outside Rome would the local bishop give precedence?

that Jesus paid $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$ (local taxes and customs) but Jesus reminded him that the sons (of the kingdom) are free . It was interesting to note here that Jesus addresses him as Simon ; Christ not only paid His own, but Peter's also.

Bellarmino quoted Augustine's Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamentorum (Quaest. 75) that the rest did not pay because they did not want to . Whitaker takes him to task for quoting this work as Augustine's --- Erasmus had already noted this as a spurious work , and 'it would be better ' writes Whitaker ' if these stigmatised authors were to be thrown into the baker's fire (in pistrinum) rather than be brought out for sale in the market place ; yet it was an old saying that when the Romans lacked citizens, they armed their slaves ! .

7. Christ taught from Peter's ship i.e. from **Peter's Church** ; again, Whitaker warns about the use of allegory --- to mention a ship is not to depict a church , and here it would simply imply that those on the shore were outside the church and Peter alone was inside the Church.
8. The change of pronoun in Luke 22. 31 'Simon, Simon, ecce Satanas expetivit vos ego autem rogavi te ut non deficiat fides tua et aliquando conversus confirma fratres suos ' . Whitaker replies that this argues the special peril for Peter not for a Primacy -- Paul confirmed the brethren of Asia Minor and in 1 Thessalonians 3.2. Timothy had this charge.
9. Peter was given a special Resurrection appearance of Christ -- but Jerome on Mark 16, and Gregory, give an adequate reason for this , that it was natural for one with so much zeal to enter the tomb first and who had denied Christ three times , to receive this ' gratia pristina' .
10. Christ washed Peter's feet first in John 13.6. -- this was the view of Augustine² but Whitaker comments that the text does not in fact suggest this ; Chrysostom³ and Theophylact⁴ thought Judas was first, and the previous verse implies that Christ had already started washing the other disciples ' feet.

contd. 3. Bernard De Consideratione 2.

4. Turrecremata De Ecclesia 38.

5. Anacletus Ep. Decret. 3.

1. Gregory Hom. 21 on the Gospels

2. Augustine Tract 56 on John

4. Theophylact on John 13.6.

3. Chrysostom Hom 69 on John

11. Christ predicted the death of Peter only and that of the cross. Whitaker denies the last part, that Peter's crucifixion could **not** be deducted from Jesus's words; on the former statement, James and John also received a 'prophecy'; such a contingency of martyrdom is no grounds for a universal primacy.
12. Peter convened the disciples to elect one in the place of Judas (Acts 1.15). Whitaker replies that the author of Acts does not in fact say that Peter convened the disciples -- he merely says that 'exurgens Petrus in medio fratrum'.
13. Peter preached first after Pentecost (Acts 2.) -- Whitaker comments that this is not so certain as Bellarmine thinks, for in Acts 2. verses 4, 8, and 11 all the Apostles had spoken with tongues and of the wonderful works of God; it was Peter that defended the Apostles against the charge of drunkenness and took this opportunity to follow up with an Apology of what had happened. Eusebius spoke of Peter as προήγορος of all the others, and the reason for this ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα. Peter was not such a lone speaker as Bellarmine claimed --- in Acts 4.1. we find λαλοῦντων δὲ αὐτῶν (as they spoke unto the people) and in Acts 4 19. Peter is joined by John in their refusal to refrain from preaching.
14. Peter did the first miracle (Acts 3.7.) as befits the foundation of the church as Ambrose said². Here again, Whitaker asserts that the working of miracles was common to all the Apostles, and in Acts 2.43 -- which is previous to the text Bellarmine quotes -- we find others working signs and wonders.
15. Peter as 'Summus Judex' recognised and condemned the hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira; the right to judge these matters did not, comments Whitaker, devolve upon Peter alone; Paul gave judgement on Elymas and there is no suggestion that Peter was judge of the Apostles though he was in this case for them.

1. Eusebius H.E. 2.14.6.

2. Ambrose Serm. 69

16. In Acts 9.32 Peter walked among the faithful as a leader ; Whitaker comments that this did not carry a 'principatus' , ' sed primus in labore ,perambulare, perigrinare , praedicare '.
17. Peter first preached to the Gentiles in Acts 10.13 where the vision was to Peter alone --- ' to eat is of the head, to pass into the stomach is to be incorporated into the body ' . Whitaker is 'astounded' by this allegory ,though it is often heard, as it indicates the mind of those who would press regradless for a complete Primacy of the Pope -- here, says Whitaker, is incorporation into Peter !
18. The church prayed for Peter as he lay in prison -- but this, says Whitaker, demonstrated the church's love for him not her fear of him.
19. Peter spoke first at the Council of Jerusalem and Paul came to hear his decision. Whitaker replies that before Peter πολλῆς δὲ στήσεως which is not possible without words ,~~and~~ and Paul already knew the solution, the definition being given by James and not Peter.
20. Paul went up to see Peter (Gal.1.18) --- ἱστορήσαι 'a word' says Chrysostom ' used by those who go to see great and famous cities '. There is no doubt ,agrees Whitaker, that Peter stood out as 'eximius Apostolus cuius apud omnes summa dignitas fuit' -- but if Peter had the jurisdiction that Bellarmine ascribed to the Pontiff , Paul would have had to submit , whereas the occasion of Paul's visit to Jerusalem in Acts 15 was to prove that Paul did not get his Gospel from Peter ,being charged with preaching a Gospel diverse from the rest , but that he had received the Gospel some three years before meeting Peter.
21. The tradition that Christ baptised Peter with His own hands -- Nicephorus records this in his History ; Whitaker comments that this tradition is as slender as it is late.
22. Turrecremata² had claimed that Christ actually ordained Peter first; Whitaker's reply was that the trouble with Turrecremata was that 'he suffered from isolation , that he first imagines something then thinks about it , then adds a few reasons with which he confirms his

1. Nicephorus 'History' 2.3.

2. Turrecremata De Ecclesia 2.32.

3. η 5ω

invention' . Whitaker criticises the view that the Apostolate should be thought of in terms of a 'donum reale' , to be received before it can be given -- the Apostolate was in fact a 'functio' the greater containing the lesser . The importance of the word 'functio' here is that it is the church that makes a bishop --if there was not a bishop in the whole world the church could create bishops ; the church would not cease to exist , but contains the residuum of all episcopal power and authority . None of the Apostles were made bishops ; the episcopate is by nature local and titular and grew out of the Apostolic nature of the church.

23. Peter, Prince of all the Apostles, condemned Simon Magus ,Prince of all heretics . **Early writers**¹ generally regarded Simon Magus as the great Heresiarch , and although Whitaker acknowledges the tradition that Simon Magus met his match in Peter , the authors varied² in their records ; in any case , comments Whitaker , in spite of Eusebius's claim that Simon Magus was the ' fons et origo' of all heresy , there seems little truth in the exaltation of Simon Magus to possess universal authority over all heretics to match Simon Peter's universal claims over all the faithful . Cyril of Jerusalem³ ascribed the defeat of the Magus to Peter and Paul at the same time --- ' par bonorum virorum Petrus et Paulus qui ecclesiae praefecti fuerunt , ruinam reparavit ' . Ambrose⁴ joined Paul also to Peter in this destruction of the Magus.

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 1.23.2 ; Eusebius H.E. 2.13.6. *ἀρχηγὸν ἠδὲν ἀπέσχευ* ; Justin Apol.1.26 ; Hippolytus Philosophumena 6.19 (ed Legge(1921 AD) AD SPCK Vol.2. p.15) .
 2. Whitaker refers to Hegesippus 3.2. --the reference occurs in Eusebius H.E. 2.14 but the passage Whitaker quotes from Hegesippus is not in Eusebius -- is Whitaker quoting from an extant MS of Hegesippus now lost ? Vide Apostolic Constitutions 2.14. 11 and 12 ; ibid.6.9. ; Arnobius Advers. Gent. 2.7. and Hippolytus (c.170 - 236 AD) Philosophumena 6.20 for the various Magus traditions ; vide etiam Lipsius (1830 - 92 AD) in Schenkel 5.p.301-321.
 3. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. 6.
 4. Ambrose Serm.66 . Whitaker also cites Sulpicius Severus (d.425AD) Chron. 2. The *Chronicae*, finished c.403 AD, and written in elegant and easy Latin, are a summary of sacred history to 400 AD intended as a text book for educated Christian readers.

24. Peter placed his chair at Rome ' jussu divino' -- Whitaker not only says that Peter was subject to the same universal commands of Christ as the rest of the Apostles , but also says that though Paul was known to go to Rome , it was never certain whether Peter was there ; a visit from Peter was not likely until after Paul's Letter to the Romans (c. 58 AD) and since Paul's release at Rome may be dated c.63 AD and Peter had not arrived , this narrows the possibility of a visit from Peter quite considerably.. Time must be allowed for the writing of 1 Peter which was written during the time of persecution (Nero) for no other book of the N.T. except for the Apocalypse , is so burdened with this subject -- this would suggest Peter's visit and stay c.63/4 to 67 AD . The earliest evidence for a visit from Peter occurs c.170 AD.

Bellarmino adds a final **Preogative** -- the 25th.² though he had only started out with 24 ---that, as Ambrose said, Christ was prepared to be crucified at Rome , if His Vicar was not. Whitaker's answer was that Bellarmino should read the text further for the words of Hegesippus are recorded --- 'Christus passurus videretur qui patitur in singulis' ; Christ was crucified in Peter, beheaded in Paul, stoned in Stephen , burned in others , but this argues no Primacy.

There remain the two problems -- the question of Peter's arrival and martyrdom at Rome, to establish his connection with the city at all , and the question of Peter's relationship with the church at Rome, whether he was the first bishop or not , a problem in which the succession lists figure largely. In his Reply to Duraeus on the arrival of Peter at Rome , Whitaker claims that the view that Peter

-
1. Dionysius of Corinth Eusebius H.E. 2.25.
 2. Ambrose Contra Auxent.; Vide Athan. Apol. Pro Fuga Sua ; Hegesippus 1.2.
 3. Whitaker lists his authorities (Contra Duraeum 7.22; vide Contra Bellarmin. 4. quaest. 3.2.) ;-
 - a) Orosius -- Peter arrived in Rome in the first year of Claudius i.e. 41/2 AD though Whitaker acknowledges that Orosius is not reliable for the early years , till after 360 AD.
 - b) Jerome -- Peter arrived in the second year of Claudius, i.e. 42/3 AD
 - c) Fasciculus Cortes Ad Persuas. Purriam. -- Peter arrives in the 4th. year , though Bellarmino and Cardinal Cortesius both condemned this work .Fasciculus followed Marianus Scotus who was an acknowledged author.
 - d. The Passionale of De Vitis Sanctis (sic) -Peter arrives in the

was at Rome for 25 years is simply untenable and the earliest date is the Ninth year of Claudius i.e. 50 AD . Bellarmine had claimed that Peter was in Rome long before that, but the Edict of Claudius against the Jews which ran from 44 AD to the first year of Nero (55AD) accounted for his absence from Rome. Whitaker doubts whether the Edict in fact lasted for so long , since in Romans 16 Paul greets many Jews . To overcome the lack of written evidence , the Annotators of the Rheims Version (of Romans 16) submitted that Paul wrote private letters (literas privatas) to Peter -- the salutations in Romans 16 were popular , those to Peter were ' Primarius' , the private letters going to Peter by the same messenger as the public letters , but the former had perished. Whitaker finds this suggestion a little short of fabrication since it would be unlikely to lose letters of Apostolic Primacy and not lose letters of general public salutation and import - Mark was a sufficient amanuensis to avoid that. The private letters never perished -- they were never born. If Paul arrived in Rome c.55AD (since Agrippa 2 returned to Palestine 53/4 AD) when he was met openly by the Jews, discussed freely with the Jews and had free access , why the silence over Peter ? Why had he not returned , asks Whitaker ? Because he had never been there in the first place , and there is no hint that the Jews had just returned 'breathless' after the Edict of Claudius had ceased to be operative. ! If Peter had been at Rome it would have been unlikely that the Jews would have been so ignorant of Paul's position. 2

There is also no agreement that Peter and Paul died on the same day -- it is true that Ambrose said³ they died 'uno die et loco et sub uno iudice' and the Latin hymn follows the same suggestion --- ' quomodo in vita se dilexerunt, ita in morte non

contd. in the 13th. Year

- e) Origen (Tom.3. on Genesis) Peter arrives at the end of his life.
- f) Damasus (In Pontifice) Peter arrives at the time of Nero i.e. after 54 AD. See Appendix 1.

1. Jerome (Catalogue on Luke) says that Luke's Histories (i.e. Acts) ran to the 4th. year of Nero i.e. 58 AD.
2. Acts. 28.21f. Whitaker also details the difficulties that such a stay at Rome would raise with the Pauline Epistles , and their silence (eg. Colossians 4. vv.10 and 11 ; Philemon 1. et 24 ; 2 Tim. 4.16 2 Tim. 1.21.) and the use of *ἰσοΨυχος* in Phil.2.20.
3. Ambrose Ep. 54. Ep. 113.14.

separati fuerunt ' --- but this may be no more than poetic licence recalling 2 Samuel 1.23 . Whitaker refers to Linus's 'De Passione Pauli' which denied that they died on the same day , in the same place and under the same tyrant . Bellarmine's reaction to this is that 'this Linus should be despatched' --- 'confictus' . Whitaker congratulates Bellarmine on writing this , since Linus was in fact dead before Peter, but he thought he would mention his work because Jacobus Faber Stapulensis² had not only translated this work from Greek into Latin but also thought it genuine. Whitaker finds no difficulty in accepting the tradition that Peter and Paul were both martyred at Rome in the reign of Nero , and that their remains may very well be still there , though claims had gone out that Treves had some of Peter's bones , Rome the martyrs' heads , Geneva Peter's brains, his teeth in various places, Paul's shoulder at Argenteus -- but all these add up to very little when it is considered that a Primacy such as is claimed for Peter requires more justification from primitive faith and doctrine and accurate contemporary history than can be furnished by a dusty sarcophagus.³

Turning now to the Succession Lists, Whitaker questions the view that Peter was in fact the first Bishop of Rome, providing a fount and origin for a strictly Petrine episcopal succession. Peter was an Apostle, not a local bishop -- was the lesser taken out of the residuum of the former ? The Apostles were distinguished from the first bishop of Rome in Irenaeus who traces the succession beginning with Linus , Anencletus , Clement, Evaristus,

1. Vide M.R. James 'Apocryphal N.T.' where Prof. James lists the 'Passion of Peter' and the 'Passion of Paul' both Latin works under Linus.
2. James Faber (surnamed Stapulensis) b. 1455 d. 1536 AD ordained priest and entered the University of Paris ; here Hermonyneus of Sparta was his master in Greek . He studied in Italy, Florence, and Rome and became Professor at Paris under Cardinal Lemoine. A Biblical scholar , he was influenced by Calvinism , but though protected by Francis 1 , his works were condemned 1525 AD.
3. Hegesippus 3.2. had said that Simon Magus was not vanquished till the last year of Nero (68 AD) and this was the cause of Peter's imprisonment and death, since he incurred Nero's hatred for his opposition to Magus ; but Whitaker's view is that he was content to allow the burning of Rome as the actual occasion of the martyrdoms , as Suetonius and Tacitus suggest.

Alexander¹, and then Xystus who was sixth from the Apostles.
 Epiphanius² has the same list with Cletus replacing Anencletus.
 Tertullian³ placed Clement at the head of the list as having been ordained by Peter; Jerome⁴ stated that this was the 'ordinary Latin opinion, that Clement was the second bishop following the Apostle Peter' -- no other extant writer places Clement the immediate successor of Peter. Eusebius⁵ followed Irenaeus, as did Rufinus⁶, who said that it was the prevailing opinion. The Apostolic Constitution⁷, and Augustine⁸, have Linus, Clement, Anacletus, Evaristus, putting Clement second. On the other hand Eusebius⁹ said that Linus held the Cathedra for 12 years after the death of Peter till the consulship of Capito and Rugus in the time of Vespasian¹⁰, while Turrianus¹¹ and others have claimed that Linus died before Peter. Bellarmine's view was that Cletus and Anencletus were the same man and therefore there was no discrepancy in the lists of Irenaeus and Epiphanius, and he tried to resolve the divergencies by saying that Peter knowing death to be imminent (morte imminente) committed the Cathedra to Clement; because of his humility, Clement did not wish to assume episcopal jurisdiction, and Linus and Cletus became 'adjutores in officio episcopi' or 'coadjutores in episcopatu Petro Vivo'. There was, therefore, comments Whitaker, an episcopal collegium with three bishops of Rome (or at least at Rome) at the same time. This is interesting, writes Whitaker, and not impossible, but it did not help the lineal succession lists and the aforementioned writers speak

-
1. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 3.3.3. Vide JTS April 1966 AD p. 98 for Fr Bevenot's article on 'Clement of Rome in Irenaeus's Succession List'.
 2. Epiphanius Haeres. 27.6. generally supposed to be that of Hegesippus compiled up to the time of Anicetus but this is doubted.
 3. Tertullian De Praescript. Haeres. 32. In De Pudicitia 21 Tertullian appears to censure Callistus 1 for describing himself as 'heir of the Petrine privileges'.
 4. Jerome De Viris Illustr. 15.
 5. Eusebius H.E. 5.6.3.
 6. Rufinus Praef. ad Recogn. (Cotelier 1. 486)
 7. Const. Apost. 7.46
 8. Augustine Ep. 53 Ad Gener.
 9. Eusebius in Chronic. 10 Platena sub Lino (68-78 AD)
 11. Turrianus (Annotat. on the Apost. Constit. 7.47) followed Sophronius (Hom. De Agon. Petri et Pauli) of Jerusalem (d. 638 AD) and Marinus Scotus, while Onuphurus the Romanist historian (in DE Rebus Gestis Papatum) said that Linus succeeded Peter but was killed (caesum) a month after Peter.

of succession.

The view of a collegium of bishops is expressed in E. Burton's 'Apostolic Fathers' ¹, that Paul appointed Linus over the Gentile Christians, and Clement was appointed over a church (or churches) of Jewish believers. The Eusebian List giving the order of Linus, Anencletus, Clement, and derived from Irenaeus and appearing in Eusebius's Chronicle and Ecclesiastical History alike, is open to question by Fr. Bevenot ² --- the question is raised as to whether Eusebius's interpretation of Irenaeus is the correct one i.e. he may have been mistaken into believing it to be a list of succeeding monarchical bishops ³. Tertullian placed Clement next to Peter and the Epistola Clementis ad Jacobum of the Pseudo-Clementines (not earlier than mid-2nd. Century and not later than the early 3rd. Century AD) ⁴ could not have been written with two bishops (i.e. Linus and Anencletus) and 22 years coming between Peter and Clement, since the Epistola Clementis described Clement's solemn investiture by Peter as Primus, with Peter as 'auctor et antecessor'. Not only is there a strong possibility that Tertullian had the Epistola Clementis before him, but we may have the interesting evidence of Jerome, who having translated Eusebius's Chronicle, and having the Eusebian Order before him, says ⁵ 'Clemens quartus post Petrum Romae Episcopus ... tametsi plerique Latinorum secundum post Apostolum putent fuisse Clementem' --- plerique would be more than Tertullian and Pseudo-Clement. Dr. Walter Ullmann ⁶ has drawn our attention to the use of κληροῦται (inherits) the ἐπισκοπή, used of Clement, and what is used of Linus to whom the Apostles τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχειρίσαν. If Irenaeus had intended a strictly lineal succession, he would have used 'in the third place' μετὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου and not as he does ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων --- in his mind, one and two Apostles were Peter and Paul, and Clement

1. E. Burton 'Apostolic Fathers' Vol.1. p. 151 (1909 AD ed.)

2. Fr. M. Bevenot SJ, JTS April 1966 . p.95.

3. Vide Caspar (Die Älteste römische Bischofsliste)

4. Vide Lightfoot 'Apostolic Fathers' l.p.414.

5. Jerome De Viris Illustr. 15

6. Walter Ullmann 'Significance of the Epistola Clementis in the Pseudo-Clementines' JTS (1960) p. 297

is linked directly with the Apostles. 'Από with an ordinal number means 'beginning with, inclusively' not 'from' in the sense of 'after'!. That Clement followed Peter is the historical basis for the legend enshrined in the Epistola Clementis addressed to James -- belonging to the Judaeo-Christian romances, the omission of Paul may be explained on an anti-Pauline bias; but Tertullian had no such bias, and in Rome he acquired evidence further to that of Irenaeus. Fr. Bevenot's suggestion is that there would be no difficulty in seeing Linus and (Anen)Cletus two of the *πρεσβύτεροι* of Rome acting as *ἐπίσκοποι* in the absence of the Apostles. For Eusebius who had never been to Rome the use of *ἀπό* and *μετά* were practically interchangeable, but not for Tertullian --- in the Epistola Clementis then we get the inheritance of the Apostolic Petrine powers, therefore Peter and Paul are co-commemorated. Siricius, Innocent and Leo were not breaking new ground in thinking in terms of the Petrine Privileges inherent in the See of Rome, and when the Council of Vaison (c.442 AD) accepted the Epistola Clementis as genuine, this indicated the popularity of the idea. Whitaker only mentions the Epistola Clementis once² -- the fact that it was the starting point of the Isidorian Decretals was sufficient to put it out of court.

But on Dr. Ullmann's points there may be noted;--

- a) the word *κλήρος* (*κληρώ*) is used by Irenaeus of Hyginus as ninth in succession³, and Eleutherus as tenth in succession⁴-- if a special and peculiar Petrine *κλήρος* as distinct from the common Apostolic *κλήρος* of Acts. 1. 17 be intended for Clement, Irenaeus would have changed the succession numbers. The problem turns upon the meaning of *κλήρος* --- the Epistola Clementis (sect. 2) reads *πρὸς αὐταῖς δὲ ταῖς ἡμεραῖς αἰς ἡμέλλεν τελευτᾶν: συνηθροισμένων τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀφνειδίως λαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔφη· ἀκούσατε μου ἀδελφοὶ καὶ σύνδουλοι... Κλήμεντα τούτον ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῖν χειροτονῶ.*

1. cp. LXX of Ezekiel 43. 27.

2. Whitaker Contra Bellarmin. Controv. 4 Quaest. 4.2.

3. Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 1.27.1.

4. ibid 3.3.3.

translated by Rufinus ' in ipsis autem diebus , quibus brevi moriturus erat, congregatis fratribus subito apprehensa mea manu , consurgens coram Ecclesiā dixit Audite me Clementem hunc episcopum vobis ordine , cui meam sermonum Cathedram credo qui mihi ab initio usque ad finem comes exstitit , sicque omnes sermones meos audivit -----

ὦ τὴν ἐμὴν τῶν λόγων πιστεύω καθεδρᾶν· τῷ ἀρχιεπίσκοπῳ μοι μέχρι τοῦ τέλους συνοδεύσαντι καὶ οὕτως πατρῶν μου τῶν ὁμιλιῶν ἐπακούσαντι.

The substance of the κλήρος would appear to be not universal Primacy and jurisdiction but the Apostolic Office , as devolves upon the presiding bishop in succession of the Cathedra.

- b) What is the real significance of the distinction between Clement inheriting (κληροῦται) the episcopate (from Peter) and Linus to whom the Apostles τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν ?
- In 1 Clement 44. 2-4 we find the author saying that our Apostles knew that strife would arise ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς and therefore they gave direction (ἐπιμονὴν δεδωκασιν) how, when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry --- διαδέξονται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν .

The words ἐπιμονὴν δεδωκασιν are translated 'gave permanence to the office' (eg. Tatian in his Oratio ad Graecos 32).

ἐπιμονή can mean:-

1. an 'injunction' issuing from an assignment of office proper to a person , or
2. giving it the meaning of ἐπιμόνις an after-enactment , a codicil.

Perhaps the most that can be said is that in 2nd. Century Rome , it was generally acknowledged that Clement stood in a special relationship to Peter (personal companion -- 'son of the Faith ') ; that the fullness of the emergent episcopate dwelt in

1. Bunsen translated it ' life-tenure' but this is probably mistaken.

Clement there was no doubt because the office was fully a κλήρος ἀπόστολων --- Linus and (Anen)Cletus stood in the succession-- διαδέξωνται τὴν λειτουργίαν --this could be true if it referred to a lineal succession, and it could be true if Linus and (Anen)Cletus were coadjutor bishops with Clement. The difference here is that we see Clement as the Bishop of Rome in synod with coadjutor bishops and the clergy (κλήρος) ---- the earliest instance of the use of κλήρος, meaning the clergy as distinct from the laity appears in Tertullian; what better to a lawyer like Tertullian than to say that the κληρονομία of the Petrine Apostolate certainly came through Clement and in his office lay the residuum of the whole episcopal-Apostolic office. Not that this did not apply to Linus and (Anen)Cletus, but their κλήρος came through the traditional way, but Clement's came through Peter. This, however, adds up to no more than a Presidency (absque Monarchia) or Primatial among local bishops ²-- the Epistola Clementis would require no less a standing for one who writes a Homily to another Apostolic Church. This theme of the Pope as heir of St. Peter was first struck in the first extant decretals issued by the Papacy, that of Siricius to Spain c.384 AD. From then on, the theme gathered rapid momentum till under Leo I, some 50 years later, it received its imprint in the designation of the Pope as the unworthy heir of Peter (indignus heres Beati Petri). This may well capture the imagination but it did not capture the theology of the Reformers -- Peter could only hand on what he had received i.e. the Apostolic Office; even the Primacy of honour and leadership among the Apostles was not necessarily communicable-- it depended upon the preservation of the orthodox faith. Whitaker uses the phrase ' usurpation and unlawful inheritance ' of the Papal claims -- to speak of Clement as the heir of Peter, the heir in law succeeding to the rights and duties, assets and liabilities, taking over all, poses no problem for Whitaker, since Clement was not heir to a universal Primacy of the whole church, only to a local Primacy at the most. In any case 1 Clement was written in the name of the church

1. Tertullian De Monog. 12.

2. A Diocesan Bishop among Suffragans.

of Rome, not of Peter or Clement.

- c. If Clement stood in direct succession to Peter, then Jerome would not have written 'tametsi plerique Latinorum secundum post Apostolum putent fuisse Clementem' --- 'secundum' would probably have given place to 'proximum'. 'Aliquem secundum heredem instituere' is to provide for a second heir, should the first die or refuse the inheritance.

Nicholas Sanders (c.1530 - 81 AD) had published his 'Rock of the Church' in 1567 AD and followed this with his 'De Visibili Monarchiā' in 1571 AD --- Whitaker's uncle, Fulke, published his answer 'A Discovery of the Dangerous Rock of the Papist Church' in 1580 AD, and it was probably very soon after this that Whitaker wrote his 'Response to the Demonstrations' of Sanders. Whitaker dedicated this work to William Cecil (Lord Burghley) and the Dedication has the date LX Kalens Januarius, but there is no year. From Whitaker's Dedication we learn that Sanders had just died and he is described as one who 'worked hard and strenuously and faithfully in the Papal cause'. As Whitaker's work also opens with a castigation of the faults of the Douai-Rheims Version (1582AD) the 'Response' probably belongs to the period 1583-4 AD. It consists

1. Jerome De Viris Illustr. 15.
2. Fulke referred to it as 'loose stones'; this scholastic humour reminds us of Dr. Eric Mascall's 'Up and Down the Adria' in reply to Dr. Alec Vidler's (et al.) 'Soundings'.
3. Whitaker Opera Geneva ed. Vol.2. 737 - 800.
4. eg. 1 Cor. 15.54 - Douai - Rheims versions omitted *ὅταν δε τοῖς φθαρτοῦν τούτο ἐνδυσθηται* because it was not in the Latin versions and Jerome. Whitaker comments that both the Greek and Syriac versions have the words as did Chrysostom and Ambrose. Romans 12. 19 *μη εἰς τούτους ἐκδικούντες* is translated 'non vosmetipsos dulciscetes' instead of the older 'non vosmetipsos defendentes' -- 'defendo' is to resort to justice to defend one's position; 'ulciscor' introduces the thought of revenge which may be outside the range of law and justice. Even so, Whitaker is pleased to see the translation of Matthew 4.16 as the 'people who sit in darkness (not walk)

of 40 chapters on the Pope as Antichrist , and a further nine on the same subject appear in Whitaker's work against Bellarmine. In the former section , appears the following definition of the number 666 of the beast , though Whitaker has no desire to add to ' haec levia' ;-

30	1	300	5	10	50	70	200							
5	20	20	30	8	200	10	1	10	300	1	30	10	20	1

Although Whitaker wrote at length on the questions raised by Bellarmine and Sanders , it is clear that this was a controversy in which he had no heart . Rather he handled his pen with a pronounced degree of studious boredom as though the whole question had been thrust upon him -- suffice it to say that reform must come to eradicate the ἀποστασία of Rome from primitive faith and order ; the effect would be a liberating one for Rome and a salutary one for the whole church , for the claims Rome was making , were thrusting her deeper along the path of the ἀποστασία ; it was not a question of putting the clock back but a question of reformation forward -- the house is much clearer for having the rubbish and alien material thrown out . To aid this purpose , there was no point in taking any great interest in the mutual mud-slinging that accompanied the heat of the Antichrist battle . The general lament was there , recorded many years before by Platena , on the condition of Rome ;-

O Roma , a Roma quantum mutata vetusta es !

Nunc caput es scelerum , quae caput orbis eras ! 3

Pope Hadrian VI (1459 - 1523 AD)⁴ confessed that the Curia was corrupt and that it should reform itself ' pedetentim' (cautiously) --- Luther's comment on this had been that he thought 'pedetentim' meant a 100 years between each foot! . Bernard had said

-
1. Whitaker Contra Bellarmin. Contro. 4. Quaest. 5. Bellarmine had taken his nine arguments against identifying the Pontiff with the Antichrist from Sanders' De Visibili Monarchia VIII^o, but he had in Whitaker's view handled them 'subtilius et pressius'.
 2. Section 39 . Vide Irenaeus Advers. Haeres. 5.25 ; H.B. Swete 'Apocalypse' CCCCVII et sub Apoc. 13.18 where Irenaeus' views are discussed.
 3. Hilderbert (1056 - 1133AD) Carmina Miscellanea -- a poet and canonist , and a powerful preacher , he became Archbp. of Tours.

to the clergy at the Council of Rheims ' haec sunt infelicissima tempora in quibus homines sanam doctrinam non sustinent ' and Anselm writing on 2 Thessalonians 2 said that there would **be** a 'discessio a Romana Ecclesia sed hoc forte propter iniquitatem Romanae Ecclesiae'. Cornelius Bitontinus spoke of the Council of Trent ' utinam non a religione ad superstitionem , a fide ad infidelitatem , a Christo ad Antichristum , a Deo ad Epicurum ' .

On the question whether the Pope can (possit) err, Whitaker says that he had been fully occupied for two years in an examination of this serious matter and both he and Bellarmine knew from the gravity of the controversies that neither wished to be mere 'obsonatores' (' purveyors of ideas') but 'theologi' , and so it is not a matter of taste (palatum) or fashion in ideas , but of wit (ingenium) . It was the more serious for Bellarmine since in a very real sense it could be said that the Romanist religion quite literally hung upon the Pope -- it was perhaps not so serious for Whitaker though he heartily agrees ' ego enim cuperem illius Ecclesiae alumnum esse , meque eidem adjungerem, quae numquam erraret ; ego illum episcopum libenter docentem audiam qui falli non possit ' but unfortunately the privilege ' non errare nec posse errare ' belongs absolutely to no church, no bishop, no Pope --it is the gift of the Spirit.

Bellarmino had said that the Pope must be considered in four ways -- as a person (a particular Doctor) , as Pontiff but alone , as Pontiff ' cum coetu solito conciliorum nempe collegio Cardinalium ' and lastly as 'Pontifex cum Concilio Generali' . Bellarmine notes that there are two further distinctions -- that concerning universals when the Pope decrees generally 'de fide et moralibus' , and that concerning particulars eg. Controversies and depositions of bishops . He concedes the Pope may err in the latter since judgement can depend upon the testimonies of men , and this principle applied to the Pope in Curia , but he cannot err in the former . Whitaker finds here that much of the Papal platform had

contd. 4. One of the principal aims of Hadrian VI was the reform of the Roman Curia and the check of Protestantism -- he struggled almost alone against the depravity ,luxury, and restlessness of his age.

1. ~~Vide Nilus Bishop of Thessalonica 'Contra Primatum' 2.23; Gerson De Potestate Ecclesiae ; Almainus De Ecclesiae Potestate~~

already been dismantled -- if it is conceded that the Pope can err in lesser details, what guarantee is there that he will not fail 'de fide' ? If the Pope merely acts as 'privatus' or as a particular doctor of the church then he is not Pope. The distinction is irrelevant. Where does the one end and the other begin ? By Papal definitions ? But they may err. The Pope is in 'predicamento Relationis et eius correlativum est Ecclesia atque adeo tota Ecclesia'. To speak with a General Council is no better, since there is the possibility of error here. Bellarmine admits that the Pope may be a heretic 'in se' (i.e. in his own person) and may as such teach heresy, but when he speaks 'e Cathedra et docens ecclesiam totam' he cannot err'.²

Whitaker agrees that in principle, the Roman See has had a remarkable record of orthodoxy for the period under review, but it is of little purpose quoting Rufinus 'in ecclesia urbis Romae, neque heresis ulla sumpsit exordium et mos ibi servatur antiquus' for he wrote of a period over which there is little controversy on this point -- it does not prove that the Pontiff could not err, only that in general he did not. Rufinus was dead (c.410AD) before the Pontificate of Sozimus (Pontiff 417-8AD). He had not heard of Sozimus's support of Pelagianism, which he was forced to retract, nor could he have mentioned the keeping of ancient customs if he had heard of Sozimus's attempt to establish a Papal Vicariate at Arles which already had metropolitan rights, which attempt his successor had to abandon. When Gregory Nazianzen wrote 'Vetus Roma ab antiquis temporibus habet rectam fidem et semper eam retinet, sicut decet urbem quae toti orbi praesidet, et semper de Deo integram fidem habere' --- Gregory is not talking about infallibility or an article of faith as inherent in Rome but of one article viz. the Trinity which Rome held 'integre' -- his words still stand. But Bellarmine should note that Gregory uses the words 'decet' and 'urbem' not 'ecclesia'; it becomes that city which ruled the world and the empire (and so often the source of idolatry) to preserve the orthodox faith. There was

-
1. Vide Nilus Bishop of Thessalonica Contra Primatum 2.23; Gerson De Potestate Ecclesiae; Almeinus De Ecclesiae Potestate.
 2. The Rheims Annotation on Luke 22.31 has 'the Pope would never define (numquam definiturum) anything false 'judicialiter in Consistoriis, Curiis, Conciliis, Decretis, Deliberationibus et Consultationibus'
 3. Greg. Naz. Carmen De Vita Sua.

no guarantee that it would , only praise that it had. Bellarmine had said that if the concept that the Pope cannot err is abandoned , this is tantamount to saying that Christ had abandoned His church and left it destitute in things necessary for salvation. Whitaker replies that if the Pope erred a thousand times , there are a thousand ways in which God could provide (prospicere) for His church. The Holy Spirit is always the author of truth , the Pope may be ---it is even possible of course , writes Whitaker, that the Pope may be like Balaam's ass --- 'Deus extorqueat ex corde heretico verae fidei confessionem' --- but this is hardly what Bellarmine means.

The charge of heresy , writes Bellarmine, could not be made against a Pope who defines new truth since he defines nothing contrary to what has already been defined by the church. Whitaker replies that he may be doing so ---if heresy is possible in the Pope it is possible whether the truth is 'de fide antiqua vel nova ' . Aeneas Sylvius ², the future Pius 2nd., had much to say on the possibility of a sick head of the church --- ' that there were those who would far extol the pre-eminence of the Pontiff, beyond Councils, Princes and the whole church , so that no-one should judge the First See³, though he leads countless peoples **with** him in crowds to hell and everlasting torture ' . Peter received the keys ' not as one Person but as the Oneness of the church '⁴ and ' not alone did the blessed Peter take charge of these sheep and this flock , but along with us he took it and all of us have taken it with him ' .⁵ Aeneas Sylvius concludes 'through these statements our wranglers have their premise shaken and completely overturned , and we should assign the force of these words not to Peter but rather to the church ' . It was argued that if the body be sick with ulcers and other diseases , the head must be kept safe though it be guilty ;it

-
1. Whitaker quotes Gratian (Caus. 24 qu.1. A Recta) Abbas 'Princeps Canonistarum ' and Peter de Paulde , that 'the Pope is not necessarily a fit peg for doctrine'
 2. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolominus De Gestis Concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum' Bk.1. Oxford Medieval Texts (1967ed) p.67-84.
 3. Boniface Decr. D.40.c.6 (Friedberg l.146 of Tierney p.57)
 4. Augustine Serm. 295 ML.38.1349.
 5. Pseudo-Ambrosius printed in Gerbert 'De Informatione episcoporum ' ML. 139. 171.

must be endured, Aeneas argued, that the analogy here breaks down, since Christ is the 'true Head, unchangeable, perpetual, eternal' while the Pope is the 'administrative Head (forsitan ministeriale) the lieutenant of the true Head (Pontifex Romanus nihil plus quam est quam veri capitis locum tenens)'. The church is the Body of Christ not the body of the Pope, who is also a member of the church. A Vicar of Christ, however, is 'not for the destruction but the edifying of the Body (Vicarius autem Jesu Christi non in destructionem sed in aedificationem corporis eiusdem Christi quod est ecclesia)'. If therefore, Aeneas continues, the Pope should be found to be harmful and destructive, he can be deposed and cast out (deponi et abiici queat) --- the Epistola Clementis had said 'it is very just for him who wishes to be saved, to be separated from him who is unwilling'.¹ John XXIII (d. 1419 AD) when he convoked the General Council to end the Western Schism in 1414 AD at Constance, was suspected as a Pontiff by the 'greater part of the Christian Faith' but a year later he was deposed because he caused offence not through heresy but through other crimes (simony was alleged) -- the fact remains, heresy being the greatest offence, he was deposed for a lesser. The church should not 'go along with the Pope to ruin in heresy'. Who, then, defines heresy? Whitaker replies that this can be done by anyone, since it is the Holy Spirit who is the author of truth, but orthodoxy is approved best in General Councils. Cusanus wrote² 'judicium fidei non est semper in nutu unius Pontificis **definibile**, quia hereticus esse potest'.

Alphonsus de Castro made the logical **conclusion** that if the Pope cannot err, when he does, he ceases to be Pope, and therefore the Papacy is held to be dependent upon infallibility, and not the other way round!³ Erasmus made the point that if

11 Pseudo-Clement Ep. ad Jacobum MG. 1.478 - 480. Vide Leo Ep. 145 Decr. C. 24 qu. 3 c. 34 (Friedberg 1.999).

Aeneas Sylvius refers to Jerome Ep. 14.9 (ML 22.353) Decr. C. 2. qu. 7. c. 29 (Friedberg 1.492) as far as 'regnantium', and to Peter Comestor 'Historia Scholastica' (ML. 198.1686) who says that though James was dead before Peter, the deposition of a worldly prelate, or as Jerome says the 'bad prelate as Peter's deputy', was an acknowledged principle. Aeneas also quotes Panormitanus 'Tractatus super Concilium Basiliensi' (here quoted from the Lyons version 1516 AD) who considers whether the Council had

infallibility rest with the Pope alone, then the calling of Councils and the use of learned men are a waste of time -- if, however, the Pope needs to **take** Counsel to resolve doubts, it is an admission that he does not decide alone and may be fallible. Bellarmine had said that the Pope in speaking 'ex cathedra' does not **dispense** with 'media humana et ordinaria' as channels of his opinions i.e. the Pope is taught 'immediate' by the Holy Spirit but nevertheless needs human **counsel** to arrive at the faith; there have been times when the Pontiff has arrived at a definition of faith without Councils and therefore the latter are not necessary. Whitaker replies that it is true that Popes have defined faith without recourse to General Councils but so have others, and it is not altogether true to say that the Pope has done this 'in solitudine' --- Pope Leo I consulted his synod of Rome. It has been a practice of the catholic and undivided church from Apostolic days that matters 'de fide' be generally decided and accepted in General Council --- the way is open for the Pope or any other person to speak of 'definitiones de fide' but to be accepted as such requires a General Council and they are not to be accepted merely because the Pope has said so. **Further criteria** must be applied.

What guarantee, then, can be given that the Pope cannot err? There is none --- since it has happened in the past. An error in confession arises not merely from insufficiency of faith but also deficiency of faith -- and here Whitaker quotes Erasmus who in his turn had recorded the Articles of Paris, 'Petrum erravisse in fide'², and Whitaker also gives three examples of Popes that had been judged guilty of error: ----- } Zephyrinus.
Anastasius 2nd.
Vigilius.

a) Zephyrinus (d. 217 AD) successor to Pope Victor.

In his De Viris Illustribus 53 Jerome spoke of Zephyrinus and the

contd. the right to try and depose Eugenius, and elect a new Pope and he concluded that it had. The General Council had a plenitude of power, which while the Council sits, the Pope does not have -- the moment the General Council begins to exist, the Pope begins to have a superior and can be deposed by it and further, the Council cannot be dissolved by the Pontiff against its own will.

2. Cusanus De Concord. Catholic. 1.15

3. Erasmus Annotations on 1 Cor. 7.

1. Erasmus Annotations on Gal. 2.11

2. At this point Whitaker launches into a spirited defence of

Roman clergy under him being responsible by their envy and abuse for the lapse of Tertullian to Montanism ; Whitaker says that Tertullian himself condemned Zephyrinus for ' being on the point of recognising the prophecies of Montanus , Prisca , and Maximilla , and as a result of that recognition offered peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia , but Praxeas by false assertions and insistence on the decisions of the Bishop's predecessors , forced him to 'recall the letters of peace already issued and to desist from his project of receiving the spiritual gifts '. The discipline of the Roman Church had proved too lax for Tertullian who, seven years later, c. 220AD in writing the De Pudicitia , wrote 'the sovereign Pontiff , that is the bishop of bishops , pronounces ' I remit the crimes of adultery and fornication to those who have done penance '. O Edict , on which cannot be inscribed Well Done ! ' --- though this probably applies to Pope Callistus , both he and Zephyrinus were accused of 'laxity' the latter also falling under the spell of Praxeas the Patripassian Monarchian , and Callistus whom Zephyrinus had recalled from Anzio.

Whitaker does not of course refer to the Philosophumena or 'Refutation of all Heresies' of Hippolytus² but this throws further light on Zephyrinus . In the 'Refutation'³ Hippolytus speaks of the heretic Cleomenes , one of the Noetic teachers, bribing Zephyrinus to tolerate and give official support to the development of his heretical school , and in his character study,⁴ the sole

 contd. Pope Clement 1 , that his memory and name should be cleared from the addition of the Pseudo-Clementines which had recently appeared , again , in the 'Tomes of the Councils ' published at Venice.

1. Tertullian Advers. Prax. 1 (c.213 AD) Vide Gaius 'Dialogue with Proclus '(Eusebius H.E. 6.20) ML. 2.64 ; l. 180 ; where Zephyrinus through the influence of Proclus was about to recognise Montanism , and of advising the Asiatics to do the same , and so reversing the 'authoritative acts of his predecessors '. Vide Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Eccles. Antiqu. Kirch (1941) 218.
2. Formerly ascribed to Origen , now to Hippolytus , the Editio Princeps was ^{published} in 1701 AD at Leipzig by Fabricius with notes by Grenovius.
3. Hippolytus 'Refutation of all Heresies ' 9.11. 1-3.
4. ibid.

authority for this , he describes Zephyrinus as ' an uneducated simpleton , unskilled in ecclesiastical definitions ' (*ἀνεπίστωτος* και *ἀπράγματος*) but how much credence can be given to Hippolytus's character sketch is open to question. In the controversy between the Dynamic Monarchianists (Adoptionists) headed by Theodotus the Younger and Artemas , on the one side, and the Modalists (disciples of Noetus and Sabellius) on the other , the worst that could be said of Zephyrinus is that he sat on the fence and came down against neither side . Hippolytus may be stating a fact when he said that Zephyrinus was ' unfamiliar with the divisions of the church ' for he certainly appeared to be no giant in controversy and probably found himself a victim of the tensions between the rising powerful African element in the church represented at Rome, and the waning influence of the Phrygian element there -- each making a bid for Papal support . Allowance must also be made for Hippolytus having been a rival candidate for the Papacy , with Callistus , on the death of Zephyrinus --- Hippolytus claimed to be canonically elected, but Callistus had majority opinion probably because he had adopted a more generous attitude in saying that no sin was too grave for absolution² against the rigorism of Hippolytus . Callistus is represented as the evil genius behind Zephyrinus whom he describes as 'accessible to bribes and covetousness and seduced by presents and illicit demands into whatever course of action he (i.e. Callistus) pleased ' . Zephyrinus is also accused of vacillation that ' at one time he would in private allege that they (i.e. those who entertained true opinions) held similar doctrines (with himself) and at other times he would act similarly towards those who embraced the tenets of Sabellius ' .³ The profession of Faith issued by Zephyrinus did not reassure Hippolytus.⁴

-
1. W.C.Frend 'Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church '(1965 ed) p. 378 .
 2. Using the text ' let both grow together ' i.e. the tares and the wheat (Mt. 13.30) ; the idea of the 'mixed church' .
 3. Hippolytus 'Refutation of all Heresies' 9.11.1.
 4. Denzinger-Schonmetzer Enchiridion Symbolorum 105.ML.2.981 a.

Bellarmino refused the evidence of Tertullian's 'De Pudicitia' saying that by the time of this work he had been for some years a Montanist. Whitaker answers that this was true, but surely this was an argument in favour of accepting its evidence --- that, as Pamelius had said, Zephyrinus knew ('agnoscere' used in the sense of 'approbasse') of the Montanist prophecies and still communicated with the Montanist churches. Whitaker mentions Rhenan's edition of Tertullian published in 1521 AD; Rhenan wrote in the margin 'Episcopus Romanus Montanizat'. Bellarmine also returned to a defence of Marcellinus (Pope 296 - 304 AD) that he had sacrificed to idols out of fear of death and this was an extenuating circumstance. Whitaker's answer to this was that on Marcellinus's defection there was really no issue --- 'adversarii ipsi hoc concedunt' --- but the view that he did so in fear of death had been recently challenged by Andradius, since the Acta of the Council of Sinuessa had recorded Marcellinus as 'auro corruptum'; mitigating circumstances there may have been, as for example when he confessed his fault after the pressure of witnesses and sometime later proved himself a martyr. Bellarmine had claimed that the act of sacrificing meant nothing to Marcellinus --- but the fact remains, says Whitaker, that this was a very serious issue and certainly meant very much to many Christians amounting to apostasy and defection; as Chrysostom said 'facile quidem est verbis docere, sed docere vitam est optimum genus docendi'.

Whitaker quotes Gratian as saying that

b) Anastasius 2nd. (Pope 496 - 498 AD) was a heretic -- a Monophysite; he was condemned as such by catholic bishops. Platena recalls the conciliatory mood of this Pope towards the See of Constantinople and says that Anastasius was seduced by Acacius, ~~because~~ His conciliatory attitude brought upon him the reproaches of the author of the Liber Pontificalis² ('voluit occulte recreare Acacium et non potuit, qui divino nutu percussus est' -- this probably gave the popular

1. Tertullian Advers. Praxeas l. 'nam idem tunc episcopum Romanum agnoscentem iam prophetias Montani, Priscae, Maximillae, et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiis Asiae'. Praxeas's action in persuading the Pope is described as 'coegit'.

2. Duschene Liber Pontificalis l. 258.

opinion) ; Dante placed him in Hell . Many of the Roman clergy of the time thought him too accommodating and separated from his communion ² . It is , however, possible to build too much on this --- the most that perhaps can be said is that the legate of Anastasius had relationships with the Monophysite Egyptians at Constantinople and received a dogmatic statement (Commonitorium) from their hands ; this was endorsed chiefly by Photinus , a deacon of Thessalonica, because it endorsed Papal Primacy. It did, however, differ little from the Henoticon sponsored by the Emperor Zeno and put forward in 482 to secure union between the Monophysites and the Orthodox , and made important concessions to the former . The legates signed , but how far Pope Anastasius was implicated is difficult to say . In any case by the time the legates had arrived back at Rome, Anastasius was dead .

c) Pope Vigilius (537 - 555 AD) is described by Whitaker as a heretic for in his 'Judicatum' of 548 AD he retracted support for, and condemned , the Three Chapters . Here too, there is a mitigating thought , that when Vigilius did this , he still declared his adherence to the Council of Chalcedon , and this could only have been on the doctrinal issues at Chalcedon. Furthermore his Constitution of 553 AD declared in favour of the Three Chapters , but this was countered by a declaration against the Three Chapters again in his Second Constitution of 554 AD. Whitaker supported the view of Liberatus³ who quotes the letter of Vigilius to the Empress Theodora , in which he definitely anathematizes the two natures . Whitaker gives credit to Bellarmine for not rushing into the opinion of some, that the letter was a forgery or corrupt ; he had however held to the view that he considered this letter the result of some ' sententia occulta ' , conciliatory , because of Vigilius's deep seated fear of schism and his weak character , overawed by the dominant Theodora , to whose support he owed his nomination as Pope.

1. Dante 'Inferno' 9.9.

2. Duschene Lib.Pont. l. 258 . Vide H.E.Symonds 'The Church Universal and the See of Rome ' p.156

3. Liberatus 'Breviar.' cap. 22 (sic) Vide H.E.Symonds op.cit. p.174-6

The condemnation of Honorius 1 (Pope 625 -638AD) in the 13th. **Actio** of the Council of Constantinople 681 AD --where the Letter of **Honorius** to Sergius containing the words 'one Will' in Christ was judged fit for burning --contains the words that the Letters of Honorius and Sergius were ' quite foreign to the Apostolic dogmas , to the declaration of the Holy Councils, and to all the accepted Fathers , and they followed the false teaching of the heretics ' . Sergius and Honorius were anathematised -- this is repeated in sessions 16 and 18 of the Council of Constantinople and in the Imperial Decree , that ' he (i.e. Honorius) agreed with them (i.e. the heretics) and went with them and strengthened their heresy ' . Pope Leo 2nd. confirmed this Council and its anathema against Honorius as did the Seventh Council (Nicaea 787AD) and Pope Agatho in his Letter to Constantius ; Leo 2nd. in his Letter to the Emperor said that 'Honorius has **contaminated** the Apostolic seat with his heresy ' . **Bellarmino** followed Harding in the view that the name of Honorius was inserted into the Roman copies by heretics at work at Rome and anxious to gain Papal support , but Whitaker reminds Bellarmine that the name also appeared in the Greek copies and it was of little use adding a mitigating thought here , that perhaps Honorius did not really understand the words *μία ἐκφύσις* ; the second Letter of Honorius explicitly rejected the two Wills , and he defended the heresiarch **Cyrus** against Sophronius of Jerusalem , and he knew the meaning of the words then. ²

³ Whitaker records the habit of the late 9th. Century Popes to rescind the decrees and acts of their predecessors and that Formosus (891-6AD) re-ordained those already in priest's orders, a practice condemned at Trent. Neither Bellarmine nor Whitaker make much of this ; it is difficult to see how they could because it was not till after Gregory VII that the validity of heretical sacraments became generally accepted , particularly after the teaching of Anselm.

1. Whitaker then lists many who confirmed the heresy of Honorius -- Nilus , Tharasius, (Ep. ad Patr^{arch}.) Theodorus, Psellus (Carmen de Sept. Synod.) Bede (Vita Constant. 4) Lib. Pontif. (Vita Leonis 2) .

2. Whitaker at this point quotes Platena on Stephen 6 and Sergius 3.
3. Platena on Stephen 6 (896-7) and Sergius (904-11).

of Lucca , and the wider acceptance of the Augustinian view of the validity of sacraments administered by excommunicated, schismatic or heretical priests , and the teaching of Thomas Aquinas on the indelibility of the *χαρακτήρ*² of Orders. Pope Formosus to whom Whitaker refers was particularly rigid against the Eastern Church , refusing to accept as priests those ordained by the Patriarch Photius. After his death he was charged with usurpation of the Holy See and a synod convened by Pope Stephen VI in January 897 AD exhumed, stripped, and mutilated his body and declared him deposed. Succeeding Popes did, however, reverse the decisions of this synod.³

Pope John XXI (d.1334 AD) had taught , contrary to the general opinion of the time, that the souls of the blessed did not enjoy the Beatific Vision till the Last Judgement, and that they would sleep till that time --- ' animae defunctorum subtus altare (Apoc. 6.9.) manebant , visione solummodo humanae naturae Christi recreatae , donec iudicio mundi peracto ad plenam beatitudinem admitterentur ' -- an opinion which had met with strong opposition from the University of Paris . Bellarmine does not deny that Pope John held this view , and Gerson⁴ had confirmed that he did , but Harding had expressed the view that when John promulgated this opinion, he was not Pope. Harding was , however, wrong ---it was promulgated on three separate occasions , the 1st. Nov. and the 15th. Dec. 1331AD and the 5th. Jan. 1332 AD , while in the year following , he wrote a book (libellum) in favour of the idea . Whitaker refers to the 'inquisitio huius causae fidei coepta ' held Dec. 1333 AD under Philip Valesius, King of France , when the view was condemned. Early in 1334 AD Pope John declared in a consistory of cardinals and theologians that he would retract the opinion if it ran counter to the common doctrine of the

-
1. Anselm of Lucca (c. 1036 - 1086AD) not to be confused with Anselm who became Pope Alexander 2 (d. 1073AD) ; his collection of canons were later incorporated into Gratian's 'Decretum'.
 2. Foreshadowed from primitive times by such expressions as *σφραγίς τοῦ Κυρίου* applied by Clement of Alexandria to Baptism, itself based on such N.T. passages as Ephes. 1.13.
 3. Whitaker here mentions Pope Celestine 3 (d. 1198AD) that he taught that marriage could be dissolved by heresy and that it was lawful to marry again if the partner had fallen into heresy. His successor Innocent 3 (d.1216AD) taught the contrary .Vide Denzinger-Schönmetzer 768'Quanto de divortiiis' and Trent declared the view heretical. Bellarmine thought Celestine's view was possible on the grounds of probabilism.

church (doctrinae communi Ecclesiae) and the day before his death (i.e. 3rd. Dec. 1334 AD) he solemnly revoked the opinion which is given in the Bull 'Ne Super his ' ¹. This required modification of Bellarmine's view that the opinion was a lawful one when John held it **for at that time** no definition had been made by the church , in which case the view could not be held as heretical.

To make heresy depend upon the judgement of the church, comments Whitaker , is to misunderstand the nature of heresy. The early martyrs were celebrated because it was believed that they possessed beatitude immediately upon death , and Eusebius ² had mentioned the 'Arabian dissension' which proclaimed that soul and body slept till the Resurrection --- this ' doctrine foreign to the truth (*δόγμα ἄλλοτριὸν τῆς ἀληθείας*) ' writes Eusebius, was rejected in his day as it was later by Augustine. ³ Gerson records that the matter was publicly debated ' ut totam Sorbonam ^m comoverit et fuisse damnatam cum sono buccinarum et tubarum coram Rege Philippo per Theologos Parisienses ' . It was not a new opinion because it is found condemned in Origen's day , and it was not merely a private opinion because it was taught publicly and promulgated officially as part of the faith that should be held by all. None could be admitted to the University of Paris unless he had consented to it and was prepared to defend it. ⁴

contd. 4. Gerson De Paschale . Whitaker notes that on this view of John XXII , that souls and bodies 'sleep'till the last Judgement, the Anabaptists had found a Papal champion. The Parallel is not an exact one.

1. Denzinger - Schonmetzer op. cit. 990.

2. Eusebius H.E. 6.37 . Origen addresses a synod on this matter 'with such power that he changed the opinions of those who had been formerly deluded '.

3. Augustine De Haeresibus.

4. Whitaker refers to the Chronicon of Paulus Longus and to the History of Marsaeus Bk.18 under 1332 AD where John XXII sends a Franciscan and a Dominican to Paris to defend and propagate his view ; they were opposed by Thomas the Englishman (Anglus) whom John imprisoned . Benedict XII , successor of John

condemned John for his opinion and act , as did the Council of Florence Session 12.

The question as to how far the conscience is bound to obey laws, human, political, Papal ,brings from Whitaker the statement that clearly there must be a definition . Romans 13.5. *Διό ἀνάγκη ὑποτασσέσθαι οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν* _____

--the conscience is not bound by the singular edicts of magistrates but by the general precept that we subject ourselves to the magistrate's authority as sacrosanct and 'quoad genus' i.e. particular laws do not necessarily bind the conscience because they must be referred to a further criterion, whether they are honest and just laws and in accordance with the Will of God. The liberty of the conscience shows itself sufficiently in weighing the laws of man --- divine laws on the other hand must be obeyed 'simpliciter' and are recognised as such by the conscience , enlightened by faith. Bellarmine refers to Deuteronomy 17.12 ' he that doeth presumptuously in not listening to the priest ... even that man shall die ' -- but this was no grounds, says Whitaker, for the Pope claiming to be Sacerdos Summus and binding the conscience by precept or law . The text will not take the strain , since ;-

- a) it deals with actions , controversies , and strifes (litibus)-- it is good to have a forum to which appeals can be made and we should stand by the judgement given , and
- b) the judge is coupled with the priest in deciding 'res de externo foro' . It is pious to acquiesce in an unjust sentence but such a sentence does not bind the conscience. Dt.17.12 referred to controversies within the Torah already defined -- it makes no reference to a ' jus condendi leges de novo ' . The judge does not make the law , he administers it. But disobedience is one thing, contempt of lawful authority (as this text says 'to act presumptuously = superbire / 777 / with insolence) is another. To make a precept or decree (which of its nature does not bind

1. Bellarmine Controv. 4.qu.7. claimed that the Pope had the right (jus) of making laws which bind the conscience -- ' jus condendi leges est primo et praecipue in Romano Pontifice , proximo in Conciliis, ultimo in Imperatoribus et Regibus ' .

for all times , places and peoples) does not provide a necessity which binds the conscience , and to use Dt. 17.12 in this way is to go beyond its relevance and scope ; here the sin lies in the contempt , not the disobedience.

The power of the keys is not the 'potestas leges condendi' but of absolving believers who have come to their senses (resipiscentes) and of binding the contumacious sinner --- it is not the power of binding the conscience by law .The power of the keys and of making precept is within the ministry and not confined to the Pope , and when Bellarmine appeals to Matthew 23. 9. that the Pharisees practiced the power of binding by a *ἰουγός* of their own precepts , not merely of the Torah , Whitaker feels that he has answered himself because in Acts 15.10 Peter refers to this very *ἰουγός* --- *ἰουγόν ὅν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βραδεῖν .*

The power of binding and loosing is contained within limits ,the limits of the Apostolic Ministry.

Acts 15. 28-29 in Bellarmine's opinion , constituted evidence for the Apostles establishing a new law viz₁ abstention from those things sacrificed (immolata) to idols, blood, things strangled and fornication --- Whitaker replies that there is nothing new here that was not common to ancient custom and the Mosaic tradition ;the point for such a text was precisely not to bind the conscience but to stress a liberty ;where there was necessity,it was not so much in refraining from these things as in avoiding giving offence to others . The ground of the precept was not merely Apostolic authority --- 'visum est enim Spiritu Sancto et nobis ' -- Paul argued for a freedom of conscience in meats except insofar as a brother is not offended (1 Cor. X. 27-29) --the Christian should eat the host's food 'sine scrupulo' --there is no law to bind the conscience except the law not to give offence. Tertullian refers to the abstention from all blood to avoid the scandal of identity with the pagans ,but he

makes no reference to this Apostolic Decree .We must realise the intensity of the situation ,writes Whitaker, now long since past, in these matters ----that a bear's paunch was counted a delicacy for the table , but Christians may well refuse it because it may contain the blood of gladiators , even of Christians! . Augustine says the precept was not universally observed --- Romans X makes it clear that no food is unclean of itself;² fornication is of course not a 'res indifferens' , but a sin condemned by divine law-- this does not affect the argument.

Bellarmino had claimed that Romans 13.5. and 1 Peter 2.13 (*πάση ἀνθρώπινη κτίσι διὰ τὸν Κύριον*) both argued for political and also ecclesiastical princes -- the meaning of κτίσις was generally accepted by the Scholastics as *θεσίν* (positio) and therefore κτίσιν ἀνθρώπινον (human ordinance) relates to ἀρχάς (Principatus) and κόσμικους ἀρχοντας (Seculares Principes) ; Paul and Peter are talking about the same thing. Whitaker answers that both texts are singularly inappropriate , or should be so , to the Pontiff , for Paul refers to ἐξουσίας, ὑπερεχούσας, ἀρχοντας and subjection to them in fear (*φοβέσθαι*) but there is no room for this fear towards pious bishops and pastors, who should not ' gestare gladium ' (*φορεῖν μάχαιραν*) or 'pondere tributa ' (*φόρους τελέειν*). That both texts refer to the secular power was the opinion of the School at Rheims and of the Emperor Henry VII --- as Chrysostom³ had written ' in the church one must be converted to better ways , not coerced , with acquiescence '.

The Pisan Constitution , which became a permanent part of imperial law⁴, was issued in Latin and French by the Emperor Henry VII who boldly applied to the Emperor himself the famous final definition of Unam Sanctam -- which declared that 'human and divine precepts commanded that every human spirit must be subject to the Roman Prince (i.e. Henry VII) ' . In 1312 AD Henry denied⁵

-
1. Augustine Contra Faust. 32
 2. Vide etiam Col.2.16 ; Tit.1.15.
 3. Chrysostom De Sacerdotio 2.3.
 4. Monumenta Germaniae Historica 929 - 930 (2nd. April 1313AD. Edictum de crimine laesae majestatis)
 5. M.G.H. 929 . pg.965 lines 26 f. 'Vide Henry VII in Italy' by W.M.Bowsky University of Nabrasca Press (1960AD) and M.Maccarrone 'Il terzo Libro della 'Monarchia' ' (Studi Danteschi XXXI11 (1955 AD) p.79.n.1.

the validity of the Donation of Constantine . In November 1312 AD the Pavian jurist John Branchazolus with a strong support from the Pavian Law School offered Henry the 'Opinion' --- ' on the beginning, origin, and power (potencie) of the Emperor and the Pope ' and claimed that the coronation of the Emperor by the Pope added nothing substantially to the Emperor's power since those who have the power to elect have the right to crown , and this was a pre-Christian right and power ; 'The Emperor dominates the Pope , the Pope follows the Emperor ' .!

The attempt of Bellarmine to use 1 Timothy 3.2. (a bishop having one wife) to prove how a 'lex positiva et ecclesiastica' comes to bind the conscience -- The ~~Quint~~-Sext Council (canon 3) deprived a bishop of his power to ordain if he violated this --- comes to grief, says Whitaker , on historical grounds. It is here we must distinguish between ' married clergy ' and 'marriage of the clergy ' ; on the latter, Henry VIII of England in his Letter of reply ² to the German ambassadors made the distinction quite clear , that though married men were admitted to the ministry , if an ~~un~~married priest took a wife , he was deposed from the priesthood ³ . Henry VIII wrote that neither the Apostolic Canons nor the Council of Nicea contained the ~~view~~ which the Germans asserted viz. that priests once ordained may or can later marry . He asserted the general principle that in no part of the ancient church was a priest allowed to contract marriage -- the reception of major orders was an 'impedimentum dirimens matrimonii ' ⁴ . Bellarmine uses this as an example of an ecclesiastical law binding the conscience -- the 26th.

1. Vide Marsilius of Padua 'Defensor Pacis' Discourse 2 cap. 5. 'that priests have no coercive power and must be subject to the coercive power of secular rulers --- proved by statements from the Apostles ' . ; the 'Defensor Pacis' was completed 1324 AD , condemned by the Pope 1326 AD , partially translated into French and Italian 1363 AD twenty years after Marsilius's death ; Discourses 2 and 3 were translated into German 1545 AD , 10 years after William Marshall's translation (all but one-fifth of it) in 1535 AD intended to be of help to Henry VIII of England . The 'merum imperium '(capital jurisdiction) belonged to the Emperor alone-- Christ was subject to the coercive jurisdiction of the secular ruler not only in property but also in person . Vide Peter Lombard Collectanea (ML. 191. 1503) Bernard de Moribus et Officio Episcoporum ' cap. 9. '(ML 182. 832)
2. Appendix to Vol. 7. of Burnet's 'History of the Reformation ' .
3. Council of Neocaesarea ; Council of Chalcedon canon 1.
4. Vide Library of the Fathers 'Tertullian' p.420 ff.

canon of the Apostolic Canons (renewed by Siricius in his Letter to the Bishop of Tarragona 385 AD , and by Innocent 1 and Pope Leo the Great) had forbidden such marriages .¹ Whitaker draws attention to the book ' Tentativa Theologica ² ' by Antonio Pereira who had examined this question and says that in spite of the 3rd. canon of the Quini-Sext Council which deposed those contracting marriages after ordination , it was well known from Theodoret , Bishop of Cyrus , that many bishops remarkable for their learning and sanctity frequently dispensed with this provision eg. Alexander of Antioch, Acacius of Berea , Praglius of Jerusalem , and Proclus of Constantinople . Durandus had argued that the power of dispensation lay with the Pope in this matter , and though a precedent for deacons to marry (provided they gave notice of intention to marry at the time of their ordination) was to be found at the Council of Ancyra (314 AD) , the efforts of the Emperor to obtain dispensations for the marriage of the clergy at the time of Trent had failed .³ Article 32 (composed by Archbishop Parker in 1563 AD) of the 39 Anglican Articles had gone beyond canon law ,decrees, conciliar acta , to Scriptural warrant --- that ' bishops , priests , and deacons, are not commanded by God's Law either to vow the estate of single life or to abstain from marriage ; therefore it is also lawful for them , as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion ' -- the conscience not being bound in the matter.⁴

There is undisputable evidence in the early church for the ordination of married men , but little if any for marriage after ordination. The Canon Law , which was consistent on this, and which operated in the pre-Reformation Western Church consisted of ;-

a) Gratian's Decretum (c. 1140 AD) representing the dividing line

1. Callistus was prepared to tolerate clergy who married twice and even three times , thus contravening Apost. Can. 17 and even those who contracted marriage after ordination. Vide Jalland 'Church and Papacy' p. 132 . Callistus was criticised by Hippolytus for this.
2. English translation . Principle 3. p. 79.
3. Vatican 2 Sept. 29th. 1964 AD discussed the restoration of the permanent diaconate for (older)married men ,and this was passed ,but those ordained to the permanent diaconate from the younger men must still observe the law of celibacy.
4. 1 Tim. 4.3. 'forbidding to marry' is classed among the 'doctrines of devils ' .
1 Cor. 9.5. Paul claims the right to lead about a wife as the rest of the Apostles, the brethren of the Lord, and Kephas

between the 'jus antiquum' and the 'jus novum'. In the Roman Church, post-Tridentine canon law came to be known as the 'jus novissimum'.

- b) Supplementation by the Corpus Juris Canonici which included the Decretals of Gregory IX, Boniface VIII, Clement V (the Clementine canons) and the 'Extravagantes' of John XXIII (1317AD) to which were added the Extravagantes Communes covering Papal Decrees from 1261 - 1471 AD.

In pre-Reformation England, in general, the Roman Canon Law was binding in the Middle Ages, but there was supplementation to a certain extent by the local Provincial Decrees of Canterbury --- in 1433 AD the Synodical Constitutions of this Province from Archbishop Langton (1222 AD) to Archbishop Chichele (1416 AD) were issued by William Lyndwood in his 'Provinciale', but Whitaker never refers to this. For the grounds of authoritative debate in England during the period 1539 - 1604 AD the following in descending order of importance were used in controversy :- the 39 Articles, Gratian's Decretum, the Corpus Juris Canonici, Acts of Parliament in this position, because they were not intended to serve as canon law but were only positive in a minimal sense and penal where the State required, and lastly Archbishop Parker's Advertisements which always seem to be hovering in Whitaker's background but are rarely if ever actually quoted -- probably for the very good reason that they were of the nature of injunctions and not part of the legal structure.

In the matter of jurisdiction, Bellarmine had maintained a threefold distinction in 'potestas' :-

- a) of Order -- in administering the sacraments.
- b) 'in foro conscientiae' -- an 'interior jurisdictio'
- c) in 'foro exteriore' ----- an 'exterior jurisdictio' but by the time he wrote the De Pontifice Romano he had modified his opinion as to their exercise --- in the earlier chapter he had maintained that all three devolved upon the Pontiff from Christ 'immediate', but later he made the first two dependent upon the

power of the keys , the third communicated to the Pontiff 'immediate' . The same distinction between the internal forum of conscience and the external forum of jurisdiction appeared in the later views of Cajetan¹ and Turrecremata² . Whitaker denied that there could be any such distinction -- the episcopate contained the fullness of 'potestas et jurisdictio' and this was not communicable into a residuum of one person, and indeed such an idea was quite foreign to the Fathers ; it is the episcopate that exists ' de/jure divino' and the conscience is only bound insofar as precepts accord with and are not repugnant to the Divine Will under any of the three headings above ; this applies not to the Pontiff but to the Episcopate --- Augustine wrote ' episcopum Christi imaginem habere , ut Rex Dei ' ; Ambrose⁴ wrote ' episcopum habere personam Christi et esse Vicarium Domini ' and Baronius⁵ wrote ' cum certum sit dignitatem Apostolicam esse a Christo , ideo etiam episcopus similiter a Christo esse qui Apostolis succedunt ' .

In defining the Royal Supremacy , Whitaker says that nothing is given to the Queen in supreme government (summa gubernatio)⁶ that was not to be seen in Theodosius I in his defence of orthodoxy and eradication of error . The Queen is not Head of the Church (Caput Ecclesiae) since Christ is that , and only He can be ----her office is to have supremacy in matters civil and ecclesiastic and in the latter to defend orthodoxy and protect from error , to stimulate , patronise, and promote unity⁷ in faith and order within the Ecclesia Anglicana as of the Church Catholic in this land , as best enjoyed in the first six centuries of the undivided church . Her office is unique , as befits one with these responsibilities but there is no question of legislation 'de nova fide' nor of

-
1. Cajetan¹ 'De Authoritate Pape'
 2. Turrecremata 'De Ecclesia ' 1.93.
 3. Augustine Quaest. in Vet. Test. 35.
 4. Ambrose on 1 Cor. XI.
 5. Baronius Annal. sub 58 anno.
 6. Articles 37 and 38 (39 Articles) -- in 1563 AD the opening paragraph of Art. 37 was entirely rewritten and the second paragraph added for the first time .The aim was
 - a) to explain and defend the Royal Supremacy
 - b) to repudiate all Papal jurisdiction
 - c) to condemn Anabaptist attacks on the authority of the magistrate.
 7. Vide Hooker Eccl. Polit. 8. cap. 8 (Works 3.431-2)--he stressed

jurisdiction which had not been exercised in the church by Christian Princes , which have no power of ministry, of teaching the people, of celebrating the sacraments¹, or of holding the keys , but are charged diligently by Coronation Oath and unction , to admonish, punish, and correct those charged with these duties if they neglect them.² The authority and jurisdiction of bishops , as spiritual ministers , are directly from Christ and not delegated from the Supremacy which allows no prince to decree how the Word should be taught , or the sacraments administered , to sit in episcopal consistory to hear and determine spiritual causes , to give judicial sentence in matters of faith , or to excommunicate or dispense in matters of faith. Within the godly Prince are the sum of the spiritual and temporal body , but there is a difference in the exercise of these two principal functions -- that whereas under God the temporal order derives its authority from the 'Prince in Consortio' (i.e. in Council and Parliament) , the spiritual order derives its authority from Christ , its defence and protection from the godly Prince. This is not to separate church and state but to maintain a diversity of ministerial function within the one body-politic.

contd. the need for a Royal Supremacy to foster unity and authority in the Anglican Church

1. No doubt Whitaker had heard the story of the Queen's Apron.
2. The Court of High Commission revived by Elizabeth I --- the Court was abolished in 1641 AD --- gave the Supremacy 'full power and authority to visit, repress, redress , reform, order, correct, restrain and amend all such errors , heresies , abuses , offences , contempts , and enormities whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed or amended '.

Chapter 14

Master of St. John's College, Cambridge.

The Lambeth Articles (1595); Whitaker's Death.

On the 17th. February 1587 , Burghley and Whitgift wrote to the President and Fellows of St. John's College, Cambridge, to recommend Whitaker as Master. He was to succeed Richard Howland who in February 1585 had been consecrated Bishop of Peterborough and since then had combined the double responsibility of Mastership and Bishopric. Whitgift was acting 'sede vacante' as Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely had died in 1581 and the See was not filled till 1600 by Martin Heaton. The Letter made it abundantly clear that the Visitors desired Whitaker to be appointed 'pursuing the ordinary manner and course of election' and that the Statutes of the College and former usages should be observed, but that he could be imposed by Royal authority. New statutes had been prepared and come into force in 1586 after the disturbances at the College under John Still in 1576. Whitaker's nomination could have been construed as a triumph for the conservatives.¹ It is clear that during those two years 1585-7 there had been a sharp increase in factions at the College and repercussions of these troubles were to outlast Whitaker's tenure of office,² and to consume many anxious hours, but for the moment he had the support of Andrew Downes , the new Regius Professor of Greek and eleven Fellows. The Letter was the result of their pressing for the appointment of Whitaker. There had been several candidates in the field -- Downes himself, John Palmer, Lawrence Stanton, and Anthony Watson.³ For the past 20 years St. John's had developed a 'proud tradition of faction ' and Whitaker was intended to spread a moderating influence.

1. Grindal to Burghley. Lansdowne MSS Vol. XXIII. No. 7. Vide Conyers Read 'Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth' pg. 28 where he notes the old cleavage in the College between the Northmen and Southmen (cp. controversies between the 'nations' which disturbed the peace of Continental Universities at that time). The cleavage was reflected in religious and political attitudes, the Trojans representing the conservatism of the Northmen with adherence to the older scholastic pattern, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and the 'Greeks' representing the radicals and supporters of new ideas with a somewhat slavish and keen eye on Geneva, reflected by Cartwright and Travers.

It is significant that on December 30th. 1591 there was a determination by Whitgift on the motion of Anthony Higgins (Senior Fellow before Whitaker's time) and Robert Hill (elected Fellow during Whitaker's time) that during the protracted vacancy of the See of Ely the right of interpreting the College Statutes belonged to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Within a year of becoming Master Whitaker was accused of exercising sovereign statutory power in an arbitrary way -- he had ignored the counsel of seniors in promoting John Allenson to the Lectureship in Greek and Richard Harris to the new Lectureship in Hebrew. Forty-three breaches of Statute were alleged against him, the charges including not imposing the surplice on Bernhere and Peachy, wastage in the kitchen, and forbidding the customary play on the Queen's Day. Whitaker also ran into trouble with his patronage of Henry Alvey who used his favour with Whitaker to increase his own influence to the point of becoming intolerable. Within a year of Whitaker becoming Master, Alvey had become his right hand man and maintained that 'any who cross the Master's government should be expelled, however honest, learned, sufficient soever'.

Whitaker's support of Alvey was unfortunate, the more so when he urged his election as President. Five of the eight Senior Fellows present in the Chapel for the election walked out with threats

From previous page
2. Whitaker made an unsuccessful attempt in 1593 for the Mastership of Trinity.

3. Baker. History of St. John's College. p.1,180 ; Strype Annals sub. Watson (Vol.5. 642-3). About the time of Whitaker's 'election' Downes left St. John's and became Greek Professor at Trinity, probably a compensation for losing the Mastership of St. John's, and a recognition of his leaving the field open. But Downes was a man of great intellect and his appointment was salutary at a time when, according to Baker, Greek studies 'were then almost forgotten and lost in this society'. With the fervent support of John Bois who delivered the Latin Oration when Whitaker's body was laid to rest in the College Chapel 10th. Dec. 1595, Downes led a great revival of Greek studies.

1. While John Still had been Master of St. John's, he had published (1575) 'A Right Pithy, Pleasaunt, and Merie Comedie, intytuled Gammer Gurton's Needle' played not long ago in Christ's College! where Still had been Fellow in 1565. Still was not the author, but probably William Stevenson. It was produced at Christ's College 1559/1560--the Puritans never forgot this rustic farce! Reference to it appears in the Marprelate tracts, where John Bridges is labelled as author.

that they would inform the Queen as to how the government of the College was being run. Alvey proved a truculent person. He was accused of being a 'Patron of Puritans' and of being the prime mover in allowing presbyterian conventicles to be held in the Master's House in 1589 during Whitaker's absence.¹ By 1591 Whitaker's conciliatory patronage had worn a bit thin and his support for Alvey cooled off; his offensive and aggressive pettiness was proving an unnecessary embarrassment to Whitaker in an already overcharged atmosphere and like the sons of Zeruah, Alvey had taken too much upon himself. Bancroft had complained² that scholarship was little served at St. John's where the Fathers were being given peremptory treatment or as was more the case ignored altogether in the Puritan group meetings. About this time when Alvey lost Whitaker's support we note Whitaker's acceptance by the Anti-Puritan party in the college as a scholar of

-
1. Alvey was subsequently removed from the Cambridge scene by being appointed Provost of Trinity College, Dublin in 1601, to succeed Walter Travers.
 2. Richard Bancroft 'Survey' (1593) 4.67.; Cooper 'Annals' 2.486 ff. Strype 'Whitgift' 4.4. ; Fuller 'Church History' (ed. Brewer) 5.150-2. Strype gives the fullest account of these Puritan meetings which covered the period 1589-1591. Vide etiam Bancroft 'Dangerous Positions' (1593) 104. Bancroft says that Barber (later examined by the Star Chamber) and Stone confirmed that Cartwright, Snape, Allen, Gifford, and Harris with others all met in the 'Assembly' and the Book of Discipline was fully discussed, corrected, altered, and amended, with all subscribing. The Dedham Classis Minute Book refers to the Cambridge meetings with Alvey attending. On the deposition of William Perkins (P.R.O. Star Chamber .5.A.49.34) reference is made to meetings on the Discipline held at St. John's by Cartwright, Snape and others. Alvey before the Star Chamber denied complicity but in 1595 the Anti-Puritan party expressly stated that in Sept. 1589 in the absence of Whitaker, Alvey did 'suffer a conventicle of Mr. Cartwright' and his accomplices to 'be gathered in our College', Whitaker was away in Lancashire and on his return was content to overlook Alvey's misdemeanours, though John Palmer, who had been made Dean by Whitaker in 1589, was not so willing. He undertook an enquiry of his own on the truth of the charge, but in view of the fact that 35 Fellows wrote to Burghley in Oct. that no such presbytery had been held, the matter was dropped; Whitaker was the more agreeable because of the ill-defined nature of such meetings, and because rumours were already circulating in high circles that the 'College is not at peace'. Even E. Knox with his almost pathological dislike of Whitaker, could not assert beyond all reasonable doubt that a presbytery had been held, in his letter to Burghley Oct. 1590. Whitaker had already had to defend himself in his expulsion of E. Digby against the wishes of Burghley and Whitgift.

wide interests, and not the narrow Precisianist they formerly thought him to be and on this ground had opposed his election as Master. The effect of Whitaker's own character, his conduct of the Roman controversy and his depth of scholarship and wide reading had relaxed much of the animosity that had hitherto been felt against him in the late 1580's, and the realisation of this coincided with the general decline in the Puritan causes and fortunes.

The question of Predestination and the interpretation of Article 17 of the 39 Anglican Articles continued to be hotly debated despite the attitude of Burghley and the Queen. In 1574 Peter Baro had been appointed Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge through the influence of Burghley. His earlier association with Calvin¹ produced a criticism of extreme Predestinarianism. While the Arminians in Holland had been assailing the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, episcopalians in England had been attacking the Calvinistic position on church order. Long before his appointment to a Professorship at Leyden, Jacob Arminius² began to contend the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, made the clearer now. Calvin's intention in the earlier editions of the Institutes had been to produce a broad exposition of Christian doctrine as a whole, a sort of Catechism as he later called it. The increasing reliance placed by very many on his work led him to make alterations and additions so that a manual emerged to provide

-
1. Baro had been admitted to the Genevan ministry by Calvin.
 2. Jacob Arminius after staying at Leyden, Geneva (under Beza), Padua, and Rome, returned to Holland to a pastorate at Amsterdam in 1587. To him, Francis Gomer, an inflexible Calvinist with a remarkable talent for putting the eternal decrees in the most lurid and repellent setting, represented a doctrine of Predestination quite irreconcilable to the N.T. doctrine of a loving God. In the 1580's under men like Arnoldt of Baderborn there was a move away from the despotic conception of God towards a mysticism of the work of Christ in the heart of man, and this developed into the concept of the Sovereignty of God in terms of dynamic redeeming love and a move away from the Divine Absolute Decrees ab initio. This 'pietism' was to be found in Lutheranism but found little expression in English Puritanism of the day. To the latter the Sovereignty of Will was supreme.

for the needs of theological instruction -- a manual of dogmatics. The Latin edition of 1560 was more exact with developed dogmatic convictions and with a re-arrangement of contents. From the time of Schweizer (1844) and Ferdinand Christian (1847) it was assumed that Predestination was the central doctrine of Calvin's theology and all the originality of his teaching proceeded from it. Historians and dogmaticians were content with the affirmation, and to work within its application so that verification was not sought for. It is true that Calvin regarded Predestination in both its forms, election and reprobation, as very important ; he did not share Melancthon's view that it was hardly a subject for theological discussion, a view somewhat influenced by Luther's attitude that the whole question lay in a mystery, and things that evade understanding either noetic or existential, defy any attempt to define. Up to 1554 Predestination for Calvin remained clearly involved with ecclesiology, and even as late at 1559 the great themes of the Sovereignty of God, the Divinity of Christ, are repeated in various discussions with rare mention of Predestination except in the four chapters devoted to it. In his earlier writings there had been little systematic statement. As Wernle has said ' it cannot be overemphasised; faith in predestination is a long way from being the centre of Calvinism ; much rather it is the last consequence of faith in the grace of Christ in the presence of the enigmas of experience'. Correlated to the great doctrine of Justification solā fide and to God's Sovereignty, Assurance was not allowed to get out of control because it involved plenal gratitude for God's Justification without merit, and obedience to His Absolute and Sovereign Will. The Puritan mind was sensitive to God's Sovereignty which gave many of their tenets the force of Divine Law. Predestination

1. When Calvin set out the fundamentals of his Creed for the Protector Somerset, he never mentioned Predestination (Calvin. Letters. 2. 189 - 190 . 22nd. Oct. 1548). He preached about it and like Luther counselled caution, but to enter the theological stage mid. 16th. Century was to have this controversy thrust upon you sooner or later, and in accumulated restatement, to Calvin, reprobation came to demonstrate the full exercise of God's Justice.

2. 'Zur Bekehrung Calvins' (1910) in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte' pg. 403.

could not be shelved -- it had had a long history and an integral part in the Christian scheme. In 1559 Calvin in the re-arrangement of his subjects gave Predestination a place with Providence, as the one decision of the Divine Will, an internal decision outside time. Augustine too had brought the two concepts together, and Aquinas¹ had regarded Predestination as a special application of Divine Providence, of which it was a particular case, concerned with each person individually.

Calvin however was careful to connect Predestination with the Work of Christ, that it is in Christ that election takes place. Predestination does not appear before the doctrine of Creation because it cannot properly be considered apart from the Christo-centric point of view. Calvin refused the view put forward by Pighius in his Treatise on Free Will, that Predestination depended upon a foreknowledge of merits because this was an external cause. To Calvin, Predestination and foreknowledge coincided in fact.² Luther³ and Bucer⁴ had already arrived at the same conclusion.

The doctrine of reprobation found in the 1559 edition of the Institutes was the result of Calvin's view that the issue of Predestination had to be faced with all its corollaries. But whereas Augustine had made the elect alone the object of God's special decisions, which withdrew them from the 'massa perditionis' and the rest are just abandoned to their ruin because of their sins, Calvin made the abandoned an object of special decision for its unthinkable that

¹. Summa l. qu. 23. a. 1 & 3. In Aquinas, Providence operates in Nature, Predestination is 'supernatural' and both are discussed before coming to Salvation in Christ. In Calvin, Providence is part of the doctrine of God, giving it a position similar to that in the Thomist Schema, but Predestination is considered as part of Soteriology (Inst. 3.21.) immediately preceding the discussion on the Resurrection. Predestination therefore is separated from the works of nature and made a matter of grace.. This is true of the final order of the Institutes but not of the earlier edition of 1548 when Providence is discussed after Predestination.

2. Augustine De Dono Perseverentiae 14.

3. Luther De Servo Arbitrio

4. Bucer Metaphr. Epist. Pauli, 1536

Christ is unable to attract any soul to Himself. The judgement cannot be unjust, for it is an expression of righteousness in itself, for to accept the unbeliever would be an act of unrighteousness, while to accept the sinner who believes is a manifestation of the righteous Power of God. Reprobation may manifest itself -- signs can never deceive the elect, since faith alone is able to recognise them and draw the conclusions that must necessarily follow. With Luther, a manifestation may be in the absence of sanctification, though the reprobate may show signs analogous to those of vocation and may be touched with like sentiments but they can never understand the true virtue of the Spirit. Any similarity between the elect and those of a transitory faith dissipates under the certitude of grace and salvation, but Whitaker concludes that there are no sure means of detection, since ultimately it is God alone that knows.

Like Keckermann of Danzig a few years later¹, and Francis Junius, Whitaker regarded Predestination as part of the doctrine of salvation, not a preliminary consideration. There were many able and scholarly men of the time, Romanist, Lutheran, Anglican, and Protestant, who were veering away from itemisation and looked for a wider context; at the Academy at Groningen, the work of Henry Altingius, virtually unknown at the present in this country, revealed the direction of the wind.

The Post-Tridentine Roman theologians formulated their idea of Predestination with particular emphasis on the freedom of the will and to effect a reconciliation of this with Predestination Luis de Molina (1535 - 1600), who had become a Jesuit in 1553, abandoned the principle of Divine predilection and taught Predestination 'post praevisa merita'. In 1588 he published his 'Concordia Liberi Arbitrii cum gratiae donis' which asserted that

1. Keckermann. Vol.1. of his *Systema SS Theologiae*, published in 1602. By what tests are the elect to be known, asks Whitaker? To Luther it was a mystery, but Muntzer, Zwingli and the Anabaptists had all produced their criteria. Muntzer rested squarely on Romans 8 and taught that Assurance was entire Spirit-possession. Zwingli had taught that the elect are known by faith, and the Anabaptists 'by the life'. Calvin had dropped Muntzer's test as being too subjective and variable, and typical of the Zwickau prophets, and rejected the Anabaptists' catalysm which separated the wheat and the tares long before the harvest. To Calvin, the test was profession of faith (i.e. profession of true faith, and true profession of faith) an upright life and share in the Sacraments.

the ultimate foundation of the efficacy of grace was not 'ab intrinseco' (the substance of the Divine gift of grace itself) but in the Divine foreknowledge of free human co-operation. He claimed that human free will was not adequately safeguarded by any other system. The Divine foreknowledge was peculiar to God Himself-- -- scientia conditionata (or media) is fundamental. This system widely adopted and supported by the Jesuits, was attacked by the more conservative theologians among them the Dominicans. Whitaker struggled with the concepts of free will and responsibility within the context of Predestination but emerged with a full recognition of the gratuity of Predestination and its priority to the prevision of merit. Suarez and Bellarmine actually came to the same conclusion but denied the intrinsic efficacy of the Divine Decree independently of human consent. To Whitaker, the latter point was academic, for who in possession of salvation would wish to surrender to the alternative? Calvin had maintained that Christ's atoning death was offered to the elect alone -- the word 'offered' is changed by Whitaker to 'efficacious' on the grounds that an event universal in intent became local in effect because of further considerations.

Peter Baro in his 'Summa Trium de Predestinatione Sententiarum' written in 1594¹ attempted an analysis of the position;-

- a) God decreed absolutely to elect or reprobate without respect to anything outside Himself (eg. sin, merit, free will) but solely because it pleased Him to display His own glory. This view Baro attributed to Calvin, Beza, Robert Some and to the mature Augustine and Luther.
- b) that the decrees of election and reprobation dated only from the Fall. The material cause of election was Christ, but the distinction between elect and reprobate still sprang from the Absolute Will of God. Only the elect receive 'efficacious grace'. This places upon the elect the necessity of being saved and conversely on the reprobate the necessity of perishing--Burghley's point to Whitaker. This was the view, said Baro, of Zanchi, of St. Augustine

1. But not published till 1613. Whitaker's last Sermon, the Cygnea Cantio, was printed in the same volume.

in his middle period and of Bellarmine.

- c) that God created man for good and invites all to repentance, faith and salvation in Christ. Christ is the stone of probation by which the elect were discerned from the reprobate. God's foreknowledge becomes the ground of election, and Baro used the distinction popularised by Hooker between the antecedent Will of God (that all may be saved) and His consequent Will (by which certain are damned through their own perverseness and depravity foreseen by God).

Baro did not regard faith or perseverance as the efficient or moving cause of election. In this the Lambeth Articles were correct, but they are the means by which we are made partakers of election and without faith, perseverance, and good works, no man can be saved. Perkins attacked the 'new Pelagianism' which placed the cause of Predestination in the free will, free either to reject or receive the grace offered. The cause of Predestination is God's Will and Pleasure.

The Annotations in the Geneva Bible of 1568 had declared that 'the only Will and Purpose of God is the chief cause of election and reprobation'. His free mercy in Christ is an inferior cause of salvation and the hardening of the heart an inferior cause of damnation. Samuel Harsnett in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross on Oct. 27th. 1584¹ described this opinion as that 'which speaks little better of our gracious God than this, that God should design many thousands to Hell before they were, not in eye to their faults but to His Absolute Will and Power'. Whitgift had said the same thing in his controversy with Cartwright, so we must look elsewhere for his displeasure with Harsnett. Fenner's² Sacra Theologia appeared in

1. Hardwick's 'History of the Articles of Religion' Lond. 3rd. ed. (1884) p.164. This future Archbishop of York, then but 23, almost blighted a growing career in this sermon. 40 years later in the House of Lords he described how he was commanded by Whitgift to preach no more of it, and he never did, though now (i.e. 1624) Abbott, later Bishop of Sarum, declared that there was no Popery in it. Harsnett in 1596 was one of Baro's supporters and became one of Bancroft's chaplains. In 1605 Master of Pembroke Hall, 1609 Bishop of Chichester, 1619 Bishop of Norwich, and 1628 Archbishop of York, he died 1631.
2. Fenner's reputation suffered because he renounced English ordination and was 'ordained' at Antwerp. He was a great champion of Cartwright who wrote a Preface to his Sacra Theologia. In 1591 Whitaker married Fenner's widow, Joan.

1585 but it only ran to 4 editions, being neither popular nor influential, whereas Perkins who was more interested in foreordination and free will than Fenner produced his *Armilla Aurea* which ran to 14 editions.

The teaching of William Perkins¹ was in high repute. Adam did not receive the grace of perseverance but only the grace to be able to will and do that which is good, so that God may show His mercy in the saving of the elect and His justice in the damnation of impenitent sinners. By the Fall man lost the image of God and became a limb of the devil, a rebel, traitor against God's majesty, so that all are by nature at enmity with God. Original sin is the corruption engendered in our first conception whereby every faculty of soul and body is prone and disposed to evil -- an impotency to good and a forcible proneness and disposition to evil as we can do nothing but sin.

Whitaker, in his *Praelectio*² before the Earls of Essex, Rutland and others on 27th. Feb. 1594, attempted an assessment of the situation under the text 1 Tim. 2.4. --- 'who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth', and was marked by an appreciable change in Whitaker's views. Though no solution offered itself after many years of dissensions, Whitaker asks whether God's *εὐδοκία* rests on all or only upon some? Both Occam and Scotus had affirmed that there is found in God no will of good pleasure (*beneplaciti*) which He does not fulfil. In Luke 12.32 there is a little flock. John Damascene³ had shown a certain distinction between the antecedent and consequent Will of God -- the former *φέλημα προηγούμενον* which wills all to salvation, the latter *θέλημα ἐπομένον*. God creates all to felicity and salvation and gives them every help to those ends but many abuse His gift and oppose

¹ In April 1591 there was published his 'Golden Chaine or the Description of Theology containing the order of the causes of Salvation and Damnation according to God's Word'. This was Robert Hill's translation of Perkin's *Armilla Aurea* first published 1590. God had ordained all men to a certain and everlasting state for His own glory. In his 'Exposition on the Creed' Perkins emerges as the first English casuist at one with the Medieval moralists and with the rising generation of men like Launcelot Andrewes, George Herbert, and Jerome Taylor who 'attempted an education of the individual conscience in justice' (T. Wood 'English Casuistical Divinity during the 17th. Century' cap. 10.

² Whitaker 'Opera' Geneva ed. Vol. 1. 627 - 629.

³ John Damascene *De Fide Orthodoxa* 2.29. (M.G. 94. 968)

their salvation (on God's terms) and so the antecedent Will is suspended. So Augustine¹ had said on this text of 1 Tim.2.4. that it could only refer to the elect and Anselm in his Commentary on Romans 5.18 had repeated this. God does not will our salvation less than we do ourselves. The ground of our salvation in Thomas Aquinas is the Immutable Will of God. If our salvation were conditional upon us then it must be accommodated to our will, but our will is not the cause of divine Predestination, but divine Predestination the cause of our will. So infants can be saved if sanctified by the Will of God -- their salvation is not 'a propria voluntate'. And since no knowledge lies outside God, Whitaker accepts both Augustine² and Aquinas³ on the fixed number. We are κτίσματα, πλάσματα, ποιήματα Θεοῦ, and none can aspire to salvation unless he has the divine faculty and will, for God has us in His Absolute power --- sine gratiā Dei, nemo currit ad gratiam⁴. God does not will the death of a sinner but wills all to be saved; yet though grace is offered to all, it can only be imparted to some. As Augustine wrote 'laudet misericordiam Dei qui liberatur, non cuppet iudicium qui punitur'.⁵

In his Tract on Original Sin -- a subject which both he and Stapleton agreed should receive more than the minimal treatment given to it by Trent -- Whitaker embroiders on the students of the day reacting strongly against the acceptance of Original Sin as guilt (reatus culpae). The more prominent scholastics et. Duns Scotus, William of Occam had a strong following. The consequences of the Fall amounted to a loss of original righteousness (caventia iustitiae originalis debitae) with only the punitive effects of the Fall. There is no inherited 'culpa' because what is called Original Sin is not committed with the will. Among the scholastics the works of William of Paris⁶ were being frequently quoted -- that the faculty or blemish brought upon human nature by the sin of Adam did not deserve

1. Aug. Ep. 107; Enchiridion 103; Hypognost. 4.; De Predest. Sanct. 8.

2. Aug. De Corrept. 13.

3. Thomas Aquinas Summa 1.23.7.

4. Prosper 'Responsiones ad Capitula objectionum Gallorum' 8.
ML. 51. 164 - 172. (c. 432 AD)

5. Aug. Ep. 106. Assurance is inseparable from election.

6. De Vitiis et Peccat. 7.

Whitaker's Tract on Original Sin was edited with a Preface by Allenson 26th. March 1600 and published posthumously.

the term 'culpa'. When Catharinus Compsanus came away from Trent he had agreed with Pighius that Trent had failed to define Original Sin; the council had been 'in the throes of a struggle between various parties' and the most it had done was to repeat the Second Council of Orange, that the Fall had brought about a change for the worse in body and soul; canon 3 of Trent had however suggested 'seminal identity' and canon 4 that infants have sin which needed expiation by Baptism, which abolished the 'reatus peccati originalis'. Luther had defined the effect of Original Sin as producing a 'living and moving hostility to God' -- the remedy therefore was not merely to release man from the chains of sin, but to revivify his whole nature, decaying in sin.

Whitaker recognised that Luther's attitude was more than forensic.

Whitaker denied that concupiscence was the formal cause of sin; it is rather the material cause, in *δουμμερία, ἔννοια* The Rheims Annotators on 1 John 3.4. had made concupiscence itself sin, but sin is not necessarily found with concupiscence, but rests on other factors. Though the term Original Sin occurs neither in Scripture nor in the very early Fathers, Whitaker accepts the term as underlying the *יָרַח גִּזְרֵי* of Gen. 6.5. which indicates not a fixed state but a dynamic force within man's nature. This is supported by a great number of rabbinic passages on this text.¹

τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἐχθρὰ εἰς θεόν indicates not merely an inclination to evil but a 'positiva infectio, vitium malae' -- the poison or *φάρμακον*² of the old serpent, the 'malitiae'³ pervading our whole nature, the 'vitium alii naturae',⁴ the 'inquinamentum (filth) originis et naturale contagium'⁵. And what does 'seminal identity' really mean, asks Whitaker? If we are in Adam by nature, are we in Adam by will -- is there a valid argument for an 'arbitrium concomitativé'?, so that whatever event activates in us the will to sin, the sin of Adam is inherent in that act, since nature and will are inseparable. Our will to do evil may therefore be said to be 'ex habitu'.

1. Vide N.P. Williams 'Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin' pg. 66f. It probably corresponds with 'libido'.

2. Cyprian Ep. 59.

3. Hilary on Mt. 7. and Ps. 118 (ML 9.960)

4. Aug. Contra Julian 1.2. (ML. 44. 660)

5. Ambrose Apol. Prophet. David 1.11. (ML. 14.873). Novatian (c. 250AD) in his 'Catechuminis' spoke of 'genitale solox or ancestral filth

Both Tapper and the Rheims Annotators on James 1.15 argued that concupiscence created by God 'ex se et sine consensu nostro peccatum non esse' and since there was no consent in infants, it cannot necessarily be sin. Both Whitaker and Stapleton in a discussion on this, agree that it is not the same thing as 'concupiscibilitas' nor 'carnalis libido' nor an evil faculty, a shrine of the devil. But the Fall vitiated our nature and concupiscence with it -- which was the more serious in the mind (cp. Chrysostom's use of *φύσις* in his Homily 17 on 1 Cor.) than in the flesh and produced an active state of *ἀταξία*. Sanctified, it can resist the disorder of nature, but in unregenerate man it has the vitiated voluntary element clinging to it from Adam. Whitaker questions Chemnitz's list of the testimonies of the Fathers on this subject in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*. In grace liberty of will is restored 'in actu' not 'in genere' as every saint will tell Stapleton. The will is 'liberum non liberatum'.

Mercy is not conferred without grace, nor is the will prepared without divine grace. This statement elicits a discussion on 'meritum de condigno' and 'meritum de congruo'. Whitaker repeats Biel's definition that the former is an act 'a voluntate elicited ad praemium alicui secundum debitum justitiae retribuendum' while the latter is 'anima bono motu in Deum ex arbitrii libertate elicito primam gratiam mereri potest de congruo'. Stapleton had said that there was an external obedience 'absque gratia' and an internal obedience 'cum gratia' so that a man may refrain from killing as an external act or keep the Decalogue 'sine gratia quoad substantiam operum'. Whitaker challenged this view on the grounds that there is no such thing as an external act wholly divorced from an inward motive

contd. washed away in baptism, though there is a variant reading. Instead of 'in baptismo tibi genitalia lavatur' is read 'in baptismo tibi genitalia sola donantur'; Aurelius Clemens Prudentius (c. 348-405) in his *Apotheosis* 909 - 931 expressed a 'twice born' theory of the Fall but rejected Traducianism. Paulinus had spoken of a 'virus paternum' -- original because all our sins flow from this fount, and perpetual by propagation and heredity, so our very nativity is stained. But though the virus lives, it is not activated into sin till the will moves it.

and the phrase 'quoad substantiam operum' is contained in the precept. The Gentiles are moved to keep the Decalogue by the testimony of conscience. Cajetan had said that both Aquinas and Durandus and Scotus agreed that a man by doing what was in himself could prepare himself for grace. Richard of Middleton¹ wrote that the man who used free will rightly disposed himself towards the reception of grace. Biel too had maintained that a man without infused grace could prepare himself for grace, and Bellarmine had followed with the view that a man not yet reconciled could through the works of penitence 'impetrare justificationem'. Whitaker comments--Pelagius would be pleased! --and goes on to say that grace is necessarily operative in both schemes of merit -- the 'meritum de condigno' which conferred a claim to reward due in justice to services rendered, and the 'meritum de congruo' which can only claim the reward on the grounds of fitness. Article 13 denied that works done before justification deserve the merit of congruity. From c. 1580 onwards congruous merit had been championed by the Jesuits, especially the Molinists, and in 1613 was imposed on all Jesuit schools by Aquaviva. To Whitaker condign merit demanded as its condition that the work must be morally good, be done freely, and be assisted by actual grace, performed with a spiritual and supernatural motive, and that God must have promised to reward it. Congruous merit has similar conditions but the dependence of human moral action upon Divine grace collateral with the freedom of the will is still required. To postulate an initial act without the prompting of grace is Pelagianism.

Whitaker's part in the Lambeth Articles of 1595 was more that of a Father of the Divinity Act than as an originator. He was not asked to prepare the articles, they were already to hand, but his own official and theological standing were sufficient for Whitgift to regard him as a sound advisor in these things, and particularly as

¹. Ricardus de Mediavilla (d.c.1305) a Franciscan scholastic philosopher. He abandoned much of the Augustinianism traditionally defended by his Order in favour of Aquinas. He rejected the thesis that there was an immediate bond of union between the human intellect and God the uncreated Light.

Whitaker had lived in the midst of the Predestinarian controversies for the past 20 years. Whitaker proved an informed intermediary between Whitgift and the Heads. In Sept. 1595 Whitgift had drawn up a list of questions to be used in the examination of Barrett. Whitaker made a commentary on Barrett's answers and this together with Whitaker's criticism of them were sent to Whitgift. Whitaker's mediatory role is brought out in Vice/Chancellor Goade's Letter to Burghley 29th. January 1596¹ and in the Heads' Letter to Whitgift 17th. Sept. 1595. 2

It is an indication of the essentially rear-guard nature of the Calvinist protest at Cambridge that it was not till mid-1595 that any combined stand was made against Baro and Barrett. Baro was summoned to Lambeth and Whitgift was deceived into believing that no further action was needed. Whitgift's tutor had been John Bradford so he was no stranger to rigid Predestinarianism -- his views are represented in his Theses et Determinationes, not yet published. Beza had rallied the forces to the cause of Calvinistic Predestinarianism in his Tractationes Theologicae (1570 - 82) which taught the necessity of all temporal events in a rigidly deterministic way. This received further and stronger treatment in his later work De Predestinatione published in 1590. Barrett had surrounded himself with an anti-Perkins following which produced Overall and Andrewes, while Baro had some official support in Whitgift and Burghley, though there must be some doubt as to how theological this support could be. Article 17 of the 39 Articles had avoided the burning issues of reprobation, the election of a fixed number, the necessity of perseverance in the elect, the vexed question ^{of the relationship} between prescience (whether of faith, good works, perseverance) and election by the sole Will of God. Reprobation is not mentioned, merely that Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, that election is in Christ, and that the faith of the elect in their eternal salvation is enjoyed through Christ. There is no mention of certitude nor Assurance though the latter is implied. Election is made the fount

1. Lansdowne MSS 80. 58.

2. Strype. Whitgift 2.266

of love, humility, and eternal gratitude in mercy. Much of the heat generated in the Cambridge controversy was in the vast hinterland of Predestination ideas surrounding Article 17 and the Calvinists felt strongly that Article 17 needed both revision and extension to abate the storms.

On the 5th. May Barrett was called before a Consistory Court sitting under the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Robert Some. The previous interview between the Vice-Chancellor John Dupont and Barrett had not been a success. After three long meetings, at which Chaderton of Emmanuel, Goade of King's, Clayton of Magdalene, Tyndall of Queen's and Whitaker of St. John's were present, a Retraction was drawn up and presented by Some to Barrett, and on the 10th May Barrett officially recanted, and much to Whitgift's annoyance, copies were printed and circulated.¹ This was to represent the triumph of the rigid Predestinarians, but this Retraction did anything but allay the situation for by mid-June tensions had become acute and reached explosive point. The situation was further complicated by attempts like that of Daniel Murray to publish Barrett's views by broadsheet, but Murray's version was an inaccurate report of what Barrett had actually said. Barrett was particularly concerned by the smear campaign conducted by Some and in a letter to Whitgift² he complained of Some's attitude. Encouraged by Whitgift's view³ that some of the points charged against Barrett were entertained by some of the 'best learned Protestants now living and varying in judgement', Barrett in mid-July revoked his recantation, after a particularly violent attack by Some, for which he was summoned to Lambeth and reprimanded, and forfeited Whitgift's sympathy.

The 'responsible, learned, and subtle theology'⁴ of Whitaker was, however, quite another thing. Being in London he was summoned to Lambeth to discuss the whole question with Whitgift, and the situation as it stood. Since February 1594 Whitaker had frequented

-
1. William Prynne wrote (1629) that copies were still extant ('Antiarminianism' 1630 ed. 66). For Barrett's examination in the Consistory Court see (Amb, Univ. Guard Books Vol. 6. (i) 29.
 2. Barrett complains of a 'little man called Perkins' !
 3. Strype. Whitgift. 2.246
 4. H.C. Porter 'Reformation & Reaction' (1958) p. 357

Lambeth and met Saravia (not a Cambridge man, and a strong opponent of Beza) who had just become Vicar of Lewisham. From these discussions Whitgift had despatched a questionnaire of 8 items upon which Barrett was to be examined on the 12th. Sept. before Tyndall, Barwell, Chaderton, and Dupont with Whitaker as chairman. The report was sent to Whitgift on the 29th. Sept. and he replied the day following, that none should preach or publicly deal on the disputed matters in the university. Whitgift still regarded the matter as an academic one, fit for academic dispute in the schools but not for public treatment. The advice, however, did not seem to apply to Whitaker, who on the 9th. October preached his sermon on Election and Reprobation, the loss of grace and Christian Assurance. Intended to be an official pointer, Whitaker felt it was time for the olive branch. Preaching on 1 Thess. 5.21 πάντα δοκιμάσετε τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε this was to be his Swan Song (Cygnea Cantio) and a copy was sent to Burghley with a covering letter¹ on 19th. Nov. 1595 from Nowell's house, the letter being headed 'Religious Controversies'. Whitaker thought the time opportune to bring Burghley up to date with affairs at Cambridge. But Burghley was rather bored with the whole business and rather testily replied that he was 'daily occupied in other matters concerning the public state of the realm'. Whitaker had taken this opportunity to ask for a more lucrative preferment, that he was by now willing to be 'relieved of this wearisome burden'. His Mastership had proved one of 'great toil and small profit' and he was most discouraged to see many preferred while he was forgotten and left to a 'noisy and turbulent place'. He wished for a place of quiet and peace to further his reading and studies of the Roman controversies. Bellarmine was powerfully in the field and likely to stay the course for many years.

An attempt at a 'peaceable order' was made in Nov. 1595 when the 9 Propositions, which had emerged as a result of the discussions among the Heads at Cambridge, were put to ~~ya~~ meeting

1. Lansdowne MSS 80. 10. ; Cecil Papers (Salisbury MSS) Vol. 136. 30.

at Lambeth. Whitaker brought the Propositions from Cambridge, and he was accompanied by Tyndall and Barrett. At Lambeth, there were also in attendance some of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, among them Richard Fletcher, a former Fellow of Corpus and now Bishop of London, and Richard Vaughan, Bishop-elect of Bangor. The original 9 Propositions came to be known as Whitaker's Articles but he was not the author of them. They had arisen in the discussions among the Heads, and Whitaker's part in the process was that of an amanuensis a view confirmed by Whitaker's biographer¹. The History of the Articles² describes Whitaker's stature as a 'man of extraordinary

-
1. Vera Descriptio Vitae et Mortis; 1601. in Opera. Geneva ed. 1610 Vol. 1. 698 - 704.
 2. Br. Mus. 4902 aaa 22.3. ; C.U.L. MS. G.g. /1/29 . 'Articuli Lambethani ; cura et impensis F.G. Ecclesiae Sancti Nicolae apud Trinobantes Ministri. Londinii. Typis G.D. 1631 . 55pp. 12^o with 5 sections ; -
 - a) A history of the making of the Articles, thought to be the work of John Cosin (J.S. Brewer's edition of Fuller's Church History 5.221. (footnote))
 - b) Whitaker's original draft presented at Lambeth
 - c) Whitaker's draft side by side with comments by other theologians at Lambeth . Reprinted 1846 in Anglo-Catholic Library edition of Andrewes's 'Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine' 289 - 294 and in Charles Bardwick 'History of the 39 Articles (1876 ed.) 364 - 7 .
 - d) 2 pieces by Andrewes
 - i) his judgement on the Lambeth Articles. A manuscript copy (1596) is also in Trinity College MSS B/14/9.
 - ii) his view and censure of Barrett's opinions. These were probably the documents referred to by Andrewes in 1617 as having been drawn up for Whitgift and lent to Hooker but never returned. Birch 'Court and Times of James I' 2, 47.
 - e) John Overall on Predestination.

Other copies are; -

- Br. Mus. MSS 1020 . h. 22. (4)
 G. 12008. (2)
 843 b. (19) which also has a defence of the 39 Articles dated 1696.
 3505 d. 39 (i) which is an English translation (12^o) dated 1700 ('newly translated') of the Latin Sloane MS 414.

learning and therefore his judgement was of great weight ; he had studied long in the Fathers '. Intended for circulation among the Heads to deal with disputed points ,the revised and amended articles were sent to Hutton, Archbishop of York, the author of a recent work on Predestination , who regarded them as sufficient and necessary deductions from Scripture and Augustine. **Whitgift's own full** convictions in the matter we shall never know, but we do know that he regarded the Lambeth Articles as counsels for peace 'lest private disputes break forth into public mischief' . By Dec. 8th. the date of Whitgift's letter to Neville requesting no further action in these matters , and that the copy of the Lambeth Articles held by Neville should not leave his possession or that it should be burnt, the whole effort had been scotched. The venture had proved a dangerous one -- censured by Burghley and the Queen as going beyond Article 17 and therefore constituting an attempt to define the doctrine of the Church of England in an unauthorised way.

Whitgift was summoned to the Queen who had just been given the revised draft by Burghley. Elizabeth with some amusement charged Whitgift with having fallen under Praemunire i.e. the prohibition to ecclesiastics to assume to themselves greater authority than is due by the laws of the realm, with punishment of imprisonment or confiscation during the Prince's pleasure. This story first appeared in the History of the Articles (1631) and was written in by Peter Heylyn in 1670.¹ Whitgift explained that it had not been the intention of the assembly to determine doctrine without Public Authority or to make ~~Art~~icles and canons but 'to interpose for peace sake between the Professors'.

Coppinger suggests that Burghley was further alarmed by Whitaker's jubilant manner, for on his return to Cambridge he 'boasted that he had obtained the victory' but the most that could be said was that Whitaker , who was now ailing, within a few days of his death, and was to take to his bed immediately on his arrival at Cambridge, was relieved that the whole matter was over, and that there was still a remarkable consensus of official opinion on issues that

¹. Aerius Redivivus 343-4; Vide Fuller. Church History. 5.226.

2. Coppinger W.A. 'A Treatise on Predestination, Election and Grace (1889) 62 f.

had rocked the university for more than a generation. The agreement neither allowed triumph to the Calvinist Puritans nor to the 'Arminians'. The friends that gathered round Whitaker's bed made no mention of this alleged 'jubilant triumph of Geneva over Canterbury' and as some were Calvinistic Puritans they would not have failed to hail the champion and to record their success. In fact, Whitaker was strangely silent about the whole affair at Lambeth. ^{1.}

The attempt to give authoritative status to those 9 Propositions making them interpretative of Article 17 was in fact not made by Whitgift but by Reynolds, who supported by Spark, Knewstubb, and Chatterton, proposed that those 'Nine Assertions Orthodoxal' should receive official sanction at the Hampton Court Conference, and be added to the 39 Articles. The effort was successful in that they found their way into the Irish Articles of 1615 but it failed in England being forestalled by Bancroft and Overall who explained to James I (who had until then never heard of the Lambeth Articles) that the original purpose of these assertions was to resolve academic debate, apparently with Whitgift's approval. James, well versed in the Scottish controversies on the same subject, was quick to remark that he was 'unwilling to stuff the book (i.e. the 39 Articles) with conclusions theological' and there was ample proof to suggest that the Cambridge scene had changed by that time. To have been met with a frown and shake of the head from Burghley and a chilling non-placet from Elizabeth was sufficient to have confirmed Whitgift in his sentiment that it might have been better to have been deaf to Barrett's plea for clarification. On the other hand the outcome had reflected changed opinions, the substitution of 'certus est plerophoriā fidei' for 'certus est certitudine fidei'. The change was largely Whitgift's prompted by Whitaker, for what was important was not the Calvinistic interpretation of certainty, which to Baro amounted to arrogance through a reduction of the meaning of

-
1. On the 28th. Nov. the date of Whitaker's arrival in Cambridge, he was so weak from the fever that he immediately took to his bed from which he never rose again. Coppinger's picture of him as a Chamberlain waving a piece of paper, 'peace in our time', was as much an overstatement as it was prophetic.

'faith' , but the Pauline doctrine of assurance arising from and dependent upon faith. Before we refer to Whitgift as a 'remorseless predestinarian' ¹ or a 'pronounced Calvinist' ² or to Whitaker under both terms ,we do well to consider that Aquinas had espoused half the propositions, and Calvin would have found Whitgift and Whitaker scarcely less subtle on these points. There is no trace of Supralapsarianism in Whitaker.

On Thursday Dec. 4th. at about 8 am. Whitaker died. He had rapidly deteriorated during the previous few days --like an expiring child he breathed out his spirit, and slept in the Lord'. On Wednesday Dec. 10th his funeral was an elaborate affair³, with town and gown in full procession. The coffin was carried into Great St. Mary's in full procession of the whole university, being met at the West door by the Mayor and Aldermen. Goade , the Vice-Chancellor and Provost of King's, preached the sermon amidst great emotion , particularly among the young men who 'bewailed a most dear father and most agreeable friend'. Whitaker's quiet enthusiasm and readiness to examine new ideas and assess them had an infectious quality among the young students whom he encouraged as only a dedicated scholar can. The College was considerably enlarged in his time. Taking the 1571 canons as his guide, he represented ^{is} a devotion to the Fathers not prompted by authority , since there not to be found among the 39 Articles any article on the authority of the Fathers in the church , but by a deep and extensive study of them as the Viva Vox Spiritus Sancti. At first for him, a laborious and stumbling study --the Patristic field was a large one,

-
1. F.W.Maitland 'Cambridge Modern History 2.597.
 2. F.L.Cross ODCC . 781 under 'Lambeth Articles' and 1456 under Whitgift.
 3. After the service in St. Mary's, the procession moved to St. John's where at the entrance to the court, John Bois gave the Latin Oration. The embalmed body was lowered into the vault at the west end of the chapel and then followed the 'splendid and elegant' funeral entertainment at the expense of the College. Finally the Cambridge Orator delivered a panegyric on Whitaker's life in full assembly in Great St. Mary's --Regius Professor 16 years, Master of St. John's for 9, he died at the age of 47. Thomas Dunham Whitaker 'History of Whalley'(1801) records the entry in the Bursar's Book for the funeral feast --included 36/8 for wine, 13/- for meat. Total cost £9-13-3. The inscribed marble tablet was erected on the west wall at a cost of £6-13-4. The inscription reads ;-

amorphous, complex, rich in ideas, and study demanded more than usual diligence, accuracy, and fairness and balance of judgement, qualities which became more marked in him as time went on--to the point of sporadic gravity and deadly seriousness in his personal behaviour and appearance. But he was neither austere nor dull. He was a ready controversialist but not oversensitive. He felt the need for long periods of quiet in the study, away from College and practical affairs for divinity is the most exacting of studies. His pensive mind faithfully harvested ideas, struggled with their meaning and relevance, with great skill, tenacity, and thoroughness, so that the force of the argument could be clearly seen. This process sometimes led to a verbage and even tediousness common to the age.

"We esteem the Fathers highly" Whitaker wrote in his answer to Campion's Ten Reasons, "we peruse them daily, we commend them to all that exactly and diligently study divinity". Beginning his academic career with a strong Biblical scholarship, this prodigious and erudite controversialist stands in direct succession to Jewel in his defence of the Ecclesia Anglicana. With the powerful patronage of Elizabeth, Burghley and Whitgift over a long period he soon became aware of the deep wisdom and learning of the early Fathers and like Launcelot Andrewes to follow, he found himself more and more absorbed in Patristic Theology, which enriched and deepened his theology. His controversies with Bellarmine, Duraeus, Campion and Stapleton -- in that order of importance for him--drove him to consider the place of the early Fathers of the undivided church in the thought and life of the Christian church as a whole, fragmented in his own century. He hoped for a unifying influence to come out of his Patristic work, but he was fully conscious that criteria for this must still be worked out. He also had no mean knowledge of the Scholastics. While the Holy Spirit spoke uniquely through Scripture

contd. Hic situs est Doctor Whitakerus regius olim
 Scripturae interpres, quem ornabat gratia linguae
 Judiciiue acies, et lucidus ordo, memorque
 Pectus, et invictus labor, et sanctissima vita;
 Una sed enituit virtus verissima tanta
 Ingenii inter opes, submissio candida mentis;
 Huius gymnasii super annos octo magister
 Providus, et recti defensor, et ultor iniqui. Opera 1.714.

for all time, the Fathers had an important place not merely in revealing a classical heritage, but as authoritative interpreters of that Revelation, and as supplying the background of Christian thought as it moved on to credal orthodoxy. His wide study of 15th. and 16th. authors -- many whose names are no longer remembered today and whose works still await examination -- gave him that European outlook common among the humanists, and brought into his field contemporary ideas which are slow to achieve recognition even today. But as to be expected the whole exercise was restricted by a dependency on secondary sources, late uncritical editions, and his own trusting nature led him to positions which he revised as the need showed itself, in his study of texts and exegetics. The subjects covered were numerous and extensive, almost encyclopaedic, and though he did in common with many others reproduce ideas and ascribe them to authors where they did not in fact belong, this proved to be more an occupational hazard than a demonstration of bad faith. Channels of verification were inadequate and this produced in him a tentative sensitiveness.

Whitaker reflected the authentic note of Anglicanism, the theological method combining the use of Scripture as a primary source of faith, antiquity as a guide of orthodox faith, and reason as the consenting process. Reverence for the ancient Fathers, reference to the ancient canons and decrees of councils general and provincial, and not a little deference to medieval writers and other Reformed Churches, provided a fertile commentary on Anglican thought at this time. Whitaker in the midst of Puritan Cambridge soon preferred the inheritance of incipient Anglicanism as forged by Elizabeth, Burghley and some of the bishops and their supporters which prevented the English Church from too narrow a confessionalism which the mere retention of episcopalianism would not have prevented without the preservation of other theological 'fundamenta'. The frontal attack of the Precisianists whether through the Lower House of Convocation or through the laity in Lords and Commons, was offset by convictions and practices that revealed another spirit, of which Whitaker became an enthusiastic participant.

No assessment of the religious changes in England

in the 16th. Century can ever be complete without the recognition and examination of the Reformers' use of the Fathers. However inadequate, incomplete, and biased this appears to the 20th. Century, the known texts of the early Fathers were increasingly used in varying degrees on all sides, and Whitaker was quick to see the importance of this development. Christian antiquity was transferred from unquestioned acceptance to the sphere of critical appraisal, and Whitaker readily took his place in the van of that stream of Patristic theology which was to swell out and flourish in the 17th. Century, a stream which derived great critical benefit from being a European exercise. The deeper study of the 'Consensus Quinquesecularis' by Jewel, Whitaker, and others was such that in the early years of the 17th. Century, Calixtus (Georg Callison 1586 - 1656) developed this as the basis of an irenicon among the churches. Balthazar Schupp wrote of him that it was not so much his contact with the Lutheran and Reformed Universities, and of Cologne (the 'German Rome') which led him to read the Fathers and Church History, as his meeting with Casaubon in England and above all the bishops in England who then possessed (and were beginning to appreciate) most splendid libraries. Lutheran, Reformed, Roman and Anglican theologians of the 16th. Century packed their systems of dogmatic theology with Patristic quotations and argued antiquity for their concepts. This necessitated a full assessment of the Fathers in an ever recurring process, and produced a variety of patrological behaviour patterns frequently interdependent and not altogether coterminous with credal boundaries. Whitaker, like Melanchthon, produced a honeycomb of patristic studies which served a life-long dialogue. Like Melanchthon, Whitaker set out with the principle that the whole question of the Reformation Corpus Doctrinae must be judged not from ancient usage but from Holy Writ.

The 'traditions' therefore must be looked at through the eyes of Scripture not independent of it. Catholic doctrine is identical with Scriptural doctrine. The Fathers were not merely Christian classics viewed within a classical canon, literary and historical, but primarily theological writings with no light but that of Scripture, the sun to their moon. Patristic study had become sterile because it had lacked this energising force of Scripture. The conventional giving way to the dynamically and truly theological

must be the grounds of the Reformation ' doctrina renovata', and ultimately makes it possible for the Fathers to be a witness to the faith regardless of cultus, whether classical in the narrow meaning of the word --since the Fathers flourished in a classical cultus of terms and thought --or technological and scientific. The effect of dialogue was to regard faith less as a deposit than as a quest, and this made for wide toleration and extensive research. Whitaker struggled to get away from the ipse dixit mentality of the age, but the circumstances of the time tended to confine him to it, in the attempt to break the single confession monopoly and to discover what the Fathers actually said (text) and in what circumstances they said it (context) and why --its relevance to the life, theology, and orthodoxy of the church in any age (semantic). These fundamental questions by their very nature required a repeated assessment of the Fathers in the living organism of the church.

In this conflict the Christian humanists also found a place -- Erasmus had proved himself a passionate promoter of 'restitution', 'reflorescence', 'rebirth', with the church reaching out to a 'prisca pietas'. In 1515 Luther indicated the movement of the time when he replaced the usual lectures with Peter Lombard as the Magister Studiorum with lectures on the Fathers. It was natural that the Patristic cultus should be strongly Augustinian at that stage for much of it was centred on Wittenberg, where Augustine was regarded as the norm of theological authority, the representative of the consensus of the ancients. So Melancthon championed Augustine against Origen and his whole school of exegesis. The Apostolic Canons were a set book at Wittenberg but took second place to Augustine's *De Spiritu et Littera*. By the time of the Magdeburg Colloquy the market began to fill up with studies and texts, particularly from Nürnberg -- Nonnus of Panopolis, Chrysostom, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paphnutius, Lucian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and there began to emerge a first rough draft of a 'canon' --the older are to be preferred to the more recent, but with caution to be exercised since reference must always be made to the analogy of faith. This normistic view, enunciated by Tertullian appeared in 1521 with Melancthon's

first edition of his *Commonplaces*, a view which he formed from his earlier studies of the Eucharist, the Trinity, and Christology. By 1543 he had amassed a vast quantity of Patristic cross-references historical studies, ancient texts, editions, and assertions, that displayed his judgement in definitive form, that all led to the ultimate source of theological truth, the Gospel. By this time, Melanchthon, by virtue of the intensive controversies of 1540/1 with their attendant colloquies, and his defence of Luther at the Sorbonne, was marked out as an eminent Patrologist, more so than Bullinger, who though he gave lucid and laboured expression to doctrines already received, with a scholarly and judicious mind, lacked any great originality of thought in his extensive writings. Bullinger looked upon the whole known area and treated his themes comprehensively as an able defender and expositor of existing teaching, without gouging out texts for use in wider polemic controversy.

The growth of the Patristic argument was matched by a growth of Patristic material to hand, though the *Tertia Aetas* was proving to be expansive rather than changing. The whole position was charged with Rome on the one side and the Radicals on the other, with frequent jostling for position within the intervening arena. Whitaker used the Patristic argument to support the use of 'est' in defending the 'functional' doctrine of the Eucharist, for the weight of Patristic opinion was beyond doubt in Melanchthon's Eucharistic teaching. Whitaker was much indebted to this, as also to the view that it was not necessary to rely upon councils and the Fathers for definitions 'de fide' on matters like the *ὁμοούσιον* because it can be proved out of Scripture ~~from~~ the Pre-existence of Christ and even the Baptismal formula. Testimonies, writes Whitaker, are useful commentaries but not the origin of doctrine.

Melanchthon's 'De Ecclesia et Autoritate Verbi Dei' evoked a certain following among Patrologists in England through his literary contact with Cranmer. With Melanchthon, Whitaker shared the view that the creation of the world is identical with the creation of the Church and so is proof against the notion that the church in some way precedes the Word. It was the function of tradition to conserve in spirit and writing the true faith, from which Cain was the first deviator, heretic, and schismatic. Truth is not identified

with the majority ; and Noah and his faithful in the Ark serve as a typical minority devoted to true tradition. As with Melanchthon the combination of church , true faith, (suffering)minority, is a recurrent theme in Whitaker's work , and it is preserved in Continuity which is more than a local succession of place or order, and reformation. But as will be seen in the thesis, having stated his axiom on continuity, he recognises the claims of historic succession , which even heresy of itself cannot unchurch. The minority becomes the controlling factor of continuity against defection, as with Elijah. Noah restored the church, Shem preserved the true faith till his descendents lost it ; Abraham was called to recover and preserve it. Faith and apostacy, corruption and restoration, like the Book of Judges, become recurrent themes true to the process. History reveals three factors;-

- i) the world hates the Gospel, and mankind in general is corrupt and apostate.
- ii) the minority of the faithful lies within the degeneracy and apostacy within the church --semper Ecclesia coetus est exiguus.
- iii) that of Reformation , and for this the true medium is true preaching and teaching.

This static factorisation activated against the 'progressive view' put forward for example by Pighius who held that the Promises of Christ were for expansion i.e. continuity in expansion and majority. To Bellarmine and Cochlaeus, teaching and preaching were of themselves not adequate catalyts --partial but not completely adequate to resolve all situations . Like Pighius they knew of only one remedy in the face of heresy --cling to the body of the church. Whitaker took up additional cudgels and maintained that this view was relative and could be dangerous.

Whitaker shows no paranoic disregard of the Aetas Origenica -- an infection which pervaded and brought a falling away from the Apostolic Age, an age reputed to be free from superstitions and unnecessary speculations, with a true Apostolic line through John -- Polycarp -- Irenaeus --resembling in function the work of the 16th. Century Reformers. Qualified assent is given to Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria but it was the Reformation due to Augustine that consisted of a true return (ad fontes'. Reformation

was equivalent to continuity , but it was a continuity not to be confined to the Patres Probati , a close group issuing in a Corpus Sententiarum Patrum , like the Councils issuing in a Corpus Juris. The Age of the Fathers like the Age of the Ecumenical Councils are both subject to critical evaluation . Agreement with Augustine, however, is still the sine qua non of orthodoxy. The process is the recovery of treasure without which there can be no truth, no religion, no church, but it was more than an exhumation.

The Roman theologians could conceive of no continuity that was not at least continuity with the ecclesiastical system of the (Roman) Church. At one time Whitaker experimented with the idea of orthodoxy not going through the channels of organisational continuity, but the actual verdict of the historical process discountenanced the idea of a magisterial succession by true doctrine only as replacing Apostolic succession by ordination, and Whitaker rested in the necessity of their conjunction for a true Apostolic succession. Visible succession must justify itself by doctrinal succession, but to take the latter out of context and postulate a magisterial succession alone, though falling easily on ears accustomed to Ephesians IV.11, nevertheless would reduce the whole process to a series of doctrinal jerks. Driedo substituted for the personal credibility of the Apostles the view that the truth of teaching depended upon the legitimacy of the institution, supported by the doctrine of implicit faith i.e. acceptance of doctrine because it comes from an accepted legitimate source. The later Jesuits extended this argument from the 'successio ordinaria' to the 'successio extraordinaria' of the Papacy and ramified it with Papal prerogatives peculiar to the Papacy grounded on Scriptural claims -- the Papacy is the ultimate guarantor of all orthodoxy, the source of inspiration, faith and truth. The thesis shows how Whitaker examined Bellarmine's views in support of the 24 Papal Prerogatives.

The 'Ministerium' (regarded as a verbal noun) as a doctrinal process must itself submit to a catholic consensus through the ages ; Whitaker saw that Melanchthon's classification on Ephesians IV.11 broke down on Melanchthon's own definition.

The Apostles had a correct functioning but no Order since the

Prophets were regarded by Melanchthon to be perpetuated in function in the Reformers and superior to the bishops . The former were normative but lacked succession to follow, the latter were interpretative and subject to succession. If the aim of a succession was to bring us down to the original Gospel then Ephes. IV. 11. could not be the pattern of a ministry since Melanchthon rejected the display of letters of Orders as a guarantee of orthodoxy (even if that were ever claimed) and substituted a pedigree of schools with a display of graduation . There can be no catholicity without antiquity. Melanchthon confuses 'ministerium' as the permanent teaching function in the church with 'magisterium'. The Patristic tradition has as its test of genuineness the application at any point along the line of a tapping the section to see if **what** is held is Scriptural. Whitaker however accepts Melanchthon's use of 'antiquity' which went beyond the humanist ideal of a classical normative age , to embrace an existential element of consolation , with a regress to antiquity becoming the qualifying principle. Patristic authority by itself is relative since only some of the Fathers or part of their teaching **expands** the full Evangel ; it is only absolute when we pass from them to Scripture and subject to the **criteria** of content, the right interpretation due to the text, and reason.

The 16th. Century saw a revolution in Patristic assessment -- for a thousand years Jerome's De Viris Illustribus had remained the static and conventional enumeration of lives with no theological assessment of their works. Luther's attitude had been dogmatic, Erasmus' more spiritual and less scholastic, but there emerged by the time of Bellarmine an evaluation based on literary, historical, and theological grounds. Texts ascribed to Ignatius were declared apocryphal , the Acts of Barnabas were rejected, parts of Athanasius were expurgated, works ascribed to Chrysostom were rejected -- errata , incommodé dicta , were noted. The search for a true Patristic position was on , and Chemnitz recognised in the Age of the Fathers a mixture of good and bad, and of true and spurious, and this recognition was supported by positive and negative **criteria**. There existed to hand a select group of Fathers that stand between an uncritical acceptance of all en bloc, because

antiquity must be accepted ; Tertullian's rule applied, 'Primum quodque verissimum esse ---- and the Biblicists' unmitigated rejection of the Fathers in toto as a faulty and mixed source. Whitaker appealed to a true Testimonium Patrum which is only reached by an intensive critical study of the text , historical situation, and meaning of their writings. Like Melanchthon, Whitaker wrote of the ideal theologian , who alone was able to understand this process , since he must be philologist, ^{historian} logician, a 'grammaticus dialecticus, denique testis' . This donum interpretationis is a gift verifying the true faith and has many aspects in faith, knowledge, piety, orthodoxy, Scriptural study , all the gifts of the Spirit. To avoid theological opportunism on the one hand and manipulation of Patristic evidence on the other, Whitaker had urged a doctrinal inhesion which presupposed the sufficiency and perspicuity of Scripture. Integral faith , the 'wholeness of Faith', is not a yardstick from outside but a permanent element within the Patristic process , approving, judging, evaluating, rejecting, which energises the whole process and this over-rides the dictum, antiquity for antiquity's sake. The Fathers, to Whitaker, evaluate by their own accepted measure, what was Scriptural and not ecclesiastical, and by reversing the latter Bellarmine and Stapleton had introduced novelty into the process . Ecclesiastical orthodoxy was relative and set in the historical process. Whitaker was also conscious of the historical contingency of theological statement and this has to be reconciled with the idea of a succession of non-variant statements in the light of the fact that theological language varies in time and place. Post-Patristic thought and theological controversies arising ex post scripto charges texts with far more systemic meaning than the Fathers originally intended and dogmatic progress produced a situation where the frontiers moved well away from the settlement and the foundations were discovered to be smaller than the cross section area of the building. It is possible with Patristic criteria to arrive at the Patristic depositum fidei , energised from the Regula Fidei , Scriptural in content, and soteriological in purpose.

In the early years of the 16th. Century, William Tyndale regarded the evidence of the Patristic writings as

'deviationst' ; Rome moved on to that fatal step of setting aside the Scriptures in favour of ecclesiastical authority and bringing 'gross darkness upon the land' . The only hope of dissipating this lie in the dissemination of the Scriptures. Tyndale allowed only the literal sense but it proved a literalism that was fundamentalist, an adequate platform for Travers later. Cranmer's frequent quotations from the Fathers revealed a different spirit , that the separation from Rome did not involve cutting the English Church off from the Primitive churches . Ridley made the same point, and Hutchinson (d. 1555) supported the Patristic argument with the comment that he regretted the Fathers had many critics but few students. Whitaker examines Hutchinson's argument on Cyprian's words on the Eucharist --- panis non effigie sed natura mutatur . To Jewel , the Fathers must be ^{er}re~~v~~enced and read for they were 'witnesses to the truth', pillars and ornaments of the church , and yet 'we may not build upon them nor make them the foundation and warrant of our own conscience' . There was nothing new here. To Jewel, the Apostles received revelation, the Fathers the Apostolic traditions arising from that revelation -- Whitaker adopted this and qualified it with the comment that the Apostles also differed from the Fathers in that they were 'immediate organs' designated by special office, to write, supervise, and publish, the sacred books, and this was peculiar to them.

Whitaker recognised that Scripture dominated the whole realm of thought and life of the Fathers to whom was given the responsibility of interpreting that truth within the society and environmental background in which they lived --to welcome, adopt, and gather into the Patristic witness the maturing conclusions of human reason painfully wrung out of the facts of the universe and human experience , and to throw light upon those conclusions through the Revelation of Scripture. This prompted the use of terms which were not Scriptural in origin , but Whitaker was no fundamentalist. He recognised the breadth and depth of learning that the Fathers brought to the Church and the renaissance of Patristic study at this time was in itself a deep and noble reaction to Scholastic remains and popular Calvinism and ~~enabled~~ an informed and just judgement and

assessment of the Papacy as it was, as it had been, and as it could or should be. To Whitaker the Patristic period fell into three categories which were interdependent on each other ;-

- a) chronological --the period which began with the sub-Apostolic Fathers , Irenaeus, Polycarp, Clement , could be regarded as ended with Gregory the Great. This was Jewell's position.
- b) dogmatic ; that in the faith-forming community of this period the Fathers have a special place ; in the Manuscript tradition , heterodox writers have tended to disappear. At Byzantium, the Patriarch Photius left in his Library Accounts lists of pagan-Christian , or heterodox Christian , writings now disappeared. But the term 'Fathers' also embraces historians like Eusebius , Evagrius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, and Jerome, though preferential distinctions are appearing.
- c) literary ; it indicated a certain type of theology different from scholastic theology , sometimes dependent in form on the environment eg. Origen and Augustine were influenced in their exegesis by the methods of literary criticism current among contemporary grammarians.

Antiquity as such is no criterion of authority ; Whitaker illustrates this by citing millenarianism popular at one time but not endorsed by later dogma . The great acknowledged teachers were Chrysostom , Augustine, Ambrose, Athanasius , the two Gregories, Basil, Jerome -- men of the 4th. and 5 th. Centuries. Allowing for a certain temporal primacy given to Irenaeus, Clement, Polycarp, and Justin/ Martyr, which marked them off from Tertullian , Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, it is clear that articulation of dogma has to be given some time before the Fathers emerge as a greater authority in matters of faith , since in the very early days doctrines and ideas eg, about the Trinity, were ~~well~~ expressed but without that confessional and dogmatic aura which they accrued later.

Their authority therefore lies in the fact that they were witnesses of tradition -- of the Regula Fidei --and often stood in an episcopal relationship with the church. Authority was bound up with function. Their authority cannot lie in the fact that they are nearer the origin , and Whitaker recognised that the criterion from Tertullian breaks down here. Some bishops eg.

Eunomius, Nestorius, held heterodox views or opinions abandoned, and so we must look for Patristic authority in that conjunction of antiquity with witness to the Regula Fidei , supported by the Analogy of Faith, with a synthesis of Biblical exegesis (placed squarely in the context of the Christian life) , reason and mystical reality, a fusion rarely if ever recaptured by the church ever since. The richness and diversity of the Patristic Age produced eras of ferment which in turn threw up ideas which invigorated the church -- this Patristic catalysm is no mould for the plaster-cast or stained-glass image given to the Fathers in the Middle Ages.

The Patristic argument was developed in Whitaker who received much encouragement from Saravia . In dealing with the innovation of presbyterianism , Saravia maintained ^{1.} a further rule, that no innovation can be introduced against the unanimous consent of the Fathers unless there is express warrant in Scripture , and Launcelot Andrewes used the appeal to antiquity to prove the innovation of separatism against Barrow and the Separatists. Overall acknowledged the only primary source of doctrine as Scripture but spoke of accepting the Fathers who speak dogmatically and with one voice -- he made antiquity a supplementary rule to test novel or speculative doctrine , and he used Whitaker's argument on 'doctrinal inhesion' or 'intrinsic orthodoxy'. These writers intended the appeal to the Fathers to be a stabiliser and to reduce the radical elements found in Reformers. Overall nominated Whitaker as the worthy successor of Jewel in this field. Whitaker, however, in his controversy with the Jesuits did not have to prove the validity of the Patristic appeal, and in the area of conflict both sides enjoyed a comparative freedom from those tensions that marked the Anglican-Presbyterian struggle, as reflected in the Whitgift-Cartwright controversy. Whitaker made the Patristic argument a native element within the theology of the Anglican church and prepared the way for Richard Field who demanded the testimony of the Fathers as an integral part of the church's faith, and for Patristic scholars like Lindsell of Clare ^{2.} and ^{later} Bishop of Peterborough , Bishop Williams,

1. De Diversis Gradibus

2. Lindsell stood for all that was best in Caroline churchmanship and in the Laud tradition of learning and piety ; he was an intimate friend of the Ferrar Family of Little Gidding.

Laud, Nicholas Ferrar, George Bull¹, Bishop of St. Davids, Richard Montague² Bishop of Chichester, Launcelot Andrewes³, Francis Mason, Herbert Thorndike, Richard Field, Henry Savile⁴, James Ussher, John Pearson, Patrick Young⁵, and Francis White Bishop of Ely. These scholars provided grounds for the statement that the 17th. Century saw the rise, eclipse, and resurrection of Anglicanism⁶.

The increasing interest shown in Patristics in the late 16th. Century with its wide variety of opinions and conclusions, released many of the narrow tensions of the former decades and opened up a wider vista for scholarship at depth. A self-conscious Anglicanism evident in Overall and Saravia grew out of the last decades of the 16th. Century. Extreme Puritanism like unbending recusancy, though held by Englishmen, was foreign in origin and unEnglish in practice. The referential terms of Scripture, Fathers, Councils, and Creeds, were in themselves stimulating an era that was activated by a hunger for critical editions -- as T. James in his Dedicatory Epistle to 'A Treatise of the Corruptions' (1611) states, the time has come for a scheme to publish critical editions of the

-
1. Author of *Harmonia Apostolica*
 2. Who claimed to 'stand in the gap against Puritanism and Popery' and adopted the now common line of separation between Anglicanism and Puritanism in his 'New Gag for an old Goose'.
 3. In his *Tortura Torti*, he used Whitaker's argument that the Supremacy oath did not amount to transferring all the implications of Papal oaths to the Prince, but was merely a restoration with adequate contemporary safeguards, of the initiatives, privileges, and authority that Christian Princes had enjoyed in earlier days for the wholesome benefit of the church. There was no question of Caesaropapism. Whitaker with Campion in mind also maintained that it has always been reserved to the Prince to define 'treason'.
 4. Best known for his 8 vol. edition of Chrysostom, based on a collation of the best available MSS. He died 1622 the year after Francis Mason.
 5. Who in 1633 published from the Codex Alexandrinus the *Editio Princeps* of the Clementine 1 Ep. to Corinthians -- a fraction of his erudition. He Latinised his name to Patricius Junius.
 6. In France, too, the period was one of intense Patristic activity (long before the Maurists began work in 1672, to be followed by the monumental work of Bernard de Montfaucon) ; -
 - eg. Marguerin de la Bigne (d. 1589) who published a vast number of Patristic texts, some for the first time; his chief work was 'Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum' (8 vols. 1575; Index 1579)
 - Fronto Ducaeus (d. 1624) who edited many texts eg. Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, and Chrysostom.

highest standard , and though the area covered had been largely determined by polemic , a place was found for Montague's assertion that within this field of enquiry there was to be found an area fertile for the ingathering of the churches into unions. Andrewes eagerly sought the latest editions of the Greek Councils, and more information on the thought of the Greek Church found its way into the writings of Field and Willett. The absence of rigid Predestinarianism , the presence of exulted eucharistic teaching, and the strong episcopal traditions, were all elements that made enquiry popular, in the opening years of the 17th. Century. Added to this was the strong conviction voiced by Whitaker that with the Greek Churches there was an ancient and authoritative witness which not being Romanised preserved the English Church against the charge of insularity.

The appeal to reason introduced a new assessment in English theology c. 1570 . Whitgift appealed to the gift of 'ratiocinatio' , and Whitaker releases himself from the medieval stricture of the literal meaning of Scripture as the only meaning acceptable in debate. The Socinian conception of faith had been intellectual -- 'assensus' rather than 'fiducia' -- and in this Sozini found a kindred spirit in the 'Praeceptor Germaniae ' , Melanchthon, whose conception of the primary function of the church and its ministry was that of Magister. But Melanchthon was too Lutheran to be identified with Sozini ; implicit faith was not to be a dominant concept. Propositional consent must abandon itself to the Lutheran motivation, which was to throw oneself on God. The Socinian concept of Scripture corresponded with their idea of faith, medieval in emphasis, primarily intellectual and propositional, while in Reformation thinking the grounds were experimental and personal. Whitaker combined both Scotist-Socinian ideas about Scripture being the divine source of doctrine and morals, with the Reformation idea of Scripture as a means

contd. Francois Feuardent (d.1610); produced editions of Irenaeus, Michael Psellus, Ephrem Syrus ; Arnobius. He also worked on Lactantius.

Jean Garnier, Manuel, Jacques Sirmond who assisted Baronius and Francois Combesis who published first editions of the Greek text of several of the Fathers eg. Amphilochius of Iconium , Methodius, (of Olympus), and Andrew of Crete -- all in one volume 1644--and editions of Basil and Maximus the Confessor.

of grace, the channel of personal communication and communion between God and His trusting people. But unlike Medieval predecessors he rejected the authority of the church (i.e. Papacy) as the sole interpreter and established the authority and dogmatic contents of Scripture by the use of right reason (rectae rationis) without which it was impossible to grasp with certainty the authority of Scripture or to understand those things contained in it or to deduce some things from other things or finally to recall them to put them to use. Faith is not opposed to reason but to sight. The Certitudo Sacrarum Literarum must satisfy the reasoning faculty of man. Whitaker does not, however, ground his system, like the Socinians, on reason but is at one with the Reformation conception of the Witness of the Spirit as an essential part of the doctrine of Scripture ¹. On the other hand the Scotist conception of God as Dominus Absolutus lies deeply embedded in his writings so that actions are right and moral because God wills to act in that way. The Atonement needs no rational justification for God willed to act in that way.

Erasmus, a man of strange contrasts ², had regarded the realm of the spiritual as that of Nous (mind, intelligence, reason, the substance of idea); there was a tendency in Erasmus to undercut the ideas of Christianity as essentially a religion of history by holding that it was possible for the inner light within man to communicate sufficient knowledge of salvation apart from Scripture -- in his controversy with Bellarmine, ^{whitaker} admits the possibility of this, in true deference to the Alexandrine tradition, but he criticises Bellarmine for substituting the church for reason and the light within man. In the latter, the Spirit is the 'fons et origo' of salvation, and so the process was essentially no different from the inspirational deposit of the Word of Scripture. In neither case can the church replace the Word or reason as the office of the Spirit. The use of reason in Luther, as with Lord Bacon ³, was as

-
- ¹ The Holy Spirit as Auctor Primarius, the human writer being Auctor Immediatus.
 2. Erasmus admired the Brethren of the Common Life whose Patron Saint was the Penitent Thief, because he was saved with so little theology.
 3. Lord Bacon wrote 'to philosophy we must go for God's works, but to divinity we must go for His Word. The heavens declare the glory of God, but Scripture reveals His Will. To use reason to aspire to the secrets of divinity was to wear the waxen wings of sense'

the handmaid of the Spirit to elucidate the meaning of Scripture -- the deductive use, and it had no independent life of its own in the realm of salvation. Erasmus admitted that if guided by the Spirit, reason must come to Baptism. Luther denied that reason could be a determinant factor, because there were some experiences that contain elements of irrationality eg. the experience of suffering belies the claim that God is love, unless you postulate a higher concept than reason. Salvation is by faith alone -- only faith can comprehend, interpret, and align all experience to the single reality of God.

Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh in the 14th, Century in his dialogue with John the Armenian had laid it down that the Holy Spirit was the Auctor Primarius of Scripture, the human writer being the Auctor Immediatus. After Trent, the theory of 'subsequent inspiration' came to the centre of the stage i.e. the subsequent approval of the church for a book was sufficient grounds for its acceptance as 'inspired' eg. 2 Maccabees. In 1566 Sixtus of Sienna defended the canonicity of 2 Maccabees on these grounds. Lessius in 1585 at Louvain, under pressure from the pupils of Baius, went even further and claimed that even a book written by human industry and without the current aid of the Spirit (sic), if the Holy Spirit gave testimony subsequently, it could be ranked as canonical. Great heat was generated at Louvain and Douay. Bellarmine did not defend the view though it was consonant with his doctrine of the church, and Lessius withdrew his reference to 2 Maccabees and resubmitted the view as a hypothetical case. The Vatican Council of 1870 came to deny that the church's approval constituted the grounds of inspiration and Lessius' view was expressly excluded, while Leo XIII set it aside in his Providentissimus Deus. Lessius rejected verbal inspiration as divine ventriloquism, while Cartwright claimed verbal inspiration for Scripture to the exclusion of the possibility of textual corruption. The Vatican Council of 1870 also condemned the view held by John of Vienna and Abbot Haneburg of Munich in the 19th. Century that the church did not merely guard the canon but made it and actually conferred inspirational character.

The Swiss Formula Consensus (1675) held the view that all vowel points and accents were due to direct inspiration and

that no barbarism of language could occur in Biblical Greek or Hebrew. Banez held this view -- Vatican I was silent. Whitaker dismissed the idea of the writer as an instrument -- an instrument is unintelligent and passive, a stilus only; the authors of Scripture were more than conduits for water to pass through. The sacred writer was an 'organon' a living, rational, means with faculties and powers to express the truth of the Holy Spirit. God spoke in the prophets not merely through them (*ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* Heb. 1.1). This precludes the view that the prophets did not understand all they wrote. Pius XII also condemned the view in his *Divino Afflante*, quoting Hagg. 1.3. and 1 Cor. XIV 32. The 'Analogy of Faith' must be used to discern the mystery of inspiration.

The ill-defined limits and unmeasurable overlap between the Puritans and the Anglicans is shown in Whitaker's position with regard to the place of reason. The effect of the Fall was to produce a defect, and impotency, in man, as well as a disorder. The *φρόνημα σαρκος* of Article 9 (39 Articles) was a reality of religious experience. Perkins¹ asserted that the impotency and disorder effected by the Fall infected all man's nature, reason included. Regeneration therefore is a spiritual birth of the whole man, reason, will, understanding and affections. Cranmer had approved Chrysostom's dictum that 'you shall find many which have not the true faith and be not of the flock of Christ, and yet flourish in good works of mercy, full of pity, compassion and given to justice, and yet they have not the fruit of their works because the chief work lacketh'. Cranmer took the view that man could act under the spur of his own nature though by this could never achieve everlasting life. Calvin submitted that reason be limited to a measure of direction in 'mechanical arts, liberal studies, civil order and honesty'.

The place of reason in the salvation process proved a battlefield -- Jewel acknowledged that the American Indians would by natural reason discern between the Romanist religion and the Anglican -- 'I doubt not/^{but} that nature herself would lead them to judge'. Whitaker affirmed that 'good' here was confined to a moral and social context; for a spiritual realisation, other factors

1. William Perkins 'Works' (Lond. 1616-1618) Vol.1. 18

would have to play their part. Cranmer, Whitaker, and Hooker all agree that reason has need of grace to be a constituent part of redemption, and Anglicanism defended the use of reason as a fit and necessary complement of faith, against the Puritan who ascribed its function to a deranged 'imago Dei'. Laud later reiterated Whitaker's position, that 'fundamental points of faith .. cannot be proved by reason but require other faculties and their perfection before those fundamental points of faith so necessary to salvation can be fully understood'. Human nature is vitiated in all parts, and saving grace is the redemptive act. There is distortion but not destruction. Laud's words are apposite to Whitaker's position -- 'man lost by sin the integrity of his nature and cannot have light enough to see the way to heaven but by grace; this grace was first merited, then given by Christ; this grace is kindled by faith'.

Like Hooker, Whitaker considered nature and grace contiguous extensions of God's purpose and the rationality of regenerate man is thoroughly demonstrated in Whitaker's attitude to Scripture -- the authority of God is inherent there, but that authority is rational in its sovereignty. Reason in the regenerate mind searches the past for truth relevant to the present and valid for the future, and this involves the whole communal aspect of religious experience, set in a dispensation by Covenant. This experience has an itemised continuity in the life of the church and in particular in the thought of the early Fathers. It was not merely historical proximity to the N.T. times that gave Patristic writings and thought this eminence but a theological priority giving foundation for later speculative theology. The absence of General Councils did not prevent Irenaeus and Tertullian from arriving at the mind of the church; they achieved this by a comparison of her traditions.

The instant exegesis common to Muntzer's circle succeeded in demolishing the church -- to Franck (and Denck) the essential way was neither 'ex Scriptura' nor 'ex ratione' but from the mystical union with God. This led to an optimistic universalism that the spark in every man was divine, and to those beyond the Christian fold, sufficient divine illumination to land them at the foot of God. The Christian drama of redemption was universalised and dedogmatised. The Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection

are not singular events in history but continually reviving experiences available to Turk and Jew and all will be gathered into the vineyard at the end of the day and be given the same wage. This was not the true line of the Reformation, which promoted neither dreams, visions, nor voices but the warming of the heart to the plenitude of Scripture. ¹

Whitaker was in the Anglican tradition which did not distinguish between church and state but he never went as far as Hooker so as to identify membership of the Commonwealth with membership of the church. There is no identity of birth with baptism. Against the Separatist views of church and state, the Two-Kingdom theory, Whitgift had asserted the necessity of conformity under the Godly Prince and Commonwealth, against Cartwright's false distinction within the body Politic -- 'except the church be linked with an heathenish and idolatrous commonwealth' adds Whitgift. The One-Kingdom theory must not surrender to the Two-Kingdom theory. So Whitgift could urge excommunication for the non-payment of fees, which Cartwright rejected as being merely a civil matter. For Anglicans, discipline meant outward conformity, for Puritans, the ferretting out of sin, Whitaker's view of excommunication was that it should be reserved for matters of faith, though his treatment of Digby adds credence to the view that he could follow Whitgift all the way in applying it to all cases of ecclesiastical and corporate discipline. Whitaker above all defended the ecclesiastical initiative of the Godly Prince -- Justinian and Theodosius are writ large in his writings-- against the Puritan assertion that religious settlement must be reserved to the consistory.

Generally speaking it is difficult to disassociate sacramental theologies into two groups, Anglican and Puritan. Their attitudes were very different because their expectations of grace were remote from each other. Both insisted upon frequent communion but for different reasons. It was not that the sacrament of the eucharist was peripheral to the Puritan as J.F.H. New suggests-- this would introduce an optional note. For the Puritan the sacrament was the seal of the Word preached. The Word could and did go without the sacrament but the sacrament could never go without the Word, for

-
1. Johannes Cocceius (Koch) of Bremen drew his inspiration direct from Scripture rather than from the Confessions, which gave a depth and freshness which appealed to Whitaker.
 2. 'There is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also

without preaching there is no valid sacrament. To the Anglican the sacrament was the central reality of Christ's work ; preaching, the verbal demonstration and explanation of that work. It is necessary frequently to receive the sacrament but it need not be tied to preaching for its validity, though the familiar pattern was to have altar, pulpit, and lectern within the same line of vision. The Calvinistic Puritans' weekly communion was a test of discipline , but for Anglicans , with their Saints Days and Holy Days, the corporate life was eucharistically orientated -- till Laud could claim a more dominant local position for the altar as the place of 'hoc est Corpus Meum' than for the pulpit as the place of 'huc est Verbum Meum' , as more reverence was due to the Body than to the Word.^{1.}

To Whitaker, the eucharist held a theological sense of mystery which exact definition could destroy --the Thesis reveals his struggle with terminology circulating round the problem as to whether the Words of Institution conferred a change of nature as well as a change of use. He clearly advocates a Real Presence , as Andrewes did in his controversy with Rome, and in much the same words -- 'as to the Real Presence we are agreed ; our controversy is as to the mode of it. As to the mode we do not investigate rashly any more than in Baptism we enquire how Christ's Blood washes us ' --- 'transmutari elementa damus. Substantialiorem vero (transmutationem) quaerimus nec reperimus usquam '. 'We allow' writes Andrewes ' ut panis iam consecratus non sit panis quem natura formavit, sed quem benedictio consecravit , et consecrando etiam immutavit' * 3
Whitaker attempts a collected appraisal, basically Patristic, as to

contd. a member of the commonwealth, nor any man a member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England'. Eccles. Polity VIII.1.2.

1. Laud. Works. Vol. 6. 57 (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology)
2. Andrewes. Responsio . p.13 (1610) cp. Sermo VII on the Resurrection . Vol. 2. p. 302.
3. Andrewes . Responsio. p. 262-3. 'Christum .. eucharistia vere praesentem , vere et adorandum ' (p.266). Andrewes follows Whitaker's view that there is a conjunction between the visible sacrament and the invisible reality of the sacrament, a conjunction which the theory of transubstantiation destroyed; the Humanity of Christ was not transubstantiated into His Divinity -- upon this, the reality of the elements remain.

the meaning of the Words of Institution and the relevance of the eucharist in the salvation process. Both inadequate theological approach and a faithless reception amount to a 'laesa majestatis'. The word 'adorari' appears in his eucharistic theology without any hint of self-consciousness and suggests that already there was at work that tendency to theological mysticism which found little expression in Puritanism where religious experience was simple and communicable, but which flourished in the days of Laud, Andrewes, and Donne. Whitaker never lost his logical acumen -- the view¹ that the eucharistic elements were of little worth unless like the crib they had Christ in them drew forth from Whitaker the castigation that this was devotional not theological language; the crib, like the tomb, was to demonstrate Christ's victory by His departure from them, whereas the eucharistic elements were only enriched if infused with His Presence.

In the tension that arose between the individual's immediate, intimate, and unique contact with God, and the constant externalised, regularising, and institutionalisation of such contacts, is there any hope of resolving this tension by allowing a development of doctrine? Vincent of Lerins² states that each limb of a child grows but no new limb is added or old ones removed. Passing on to doctrinal development, Vincent wrote 'The Church of Christ, the anxious and careful guardian of the truths committed to her, never changes anything in them, diminishes nothing, adds nothing, neither cuts off what is needful, nor appends what is superfluous; does not lose what is her own, nor incorporates what is not, but devotes all her pains to this one task -- by dealing faithfully and wisely with old truths, to give perfection and finish to whatever was of old left shapeless and inchoate; to consolidate and establish what had already been expressed and developed; to preserve what has been already established and defined -- for greater clarity, faced with novelties of heretics, the church has from time to time, as a result of this process, stamped with the speciality of a new term an article of faith which was not new'. A development in terminology covers an extension of the substance of faith and its existential

1. Andrewes op. cit. ibid.

2. Comm. cap. 23

application, not a change in its contents , and the guide lines are reason -- so Vincent excludes all that is contrary and all that is beside (praeter) the original deposit ; Whitaker discusses this point at length. Vincent made antiquity an additional test of truth as well as present consent.

In Whitaker we see collectively a stock-in-trade of ideas and questions shared by serious Christian thought for many centuries. Assessment led to conference rather than division, dialogue rather than polemic. Much of the intellectual background , ecclesiastical , political, social, cultural, and philosophical, which conditioned or restricted the Reformers and the Counter-Reformers has since been jettisoned and there arises the attempt at synthesis, at a spiritual unity which embraces the reality of religious experience without critically questioning its validity. The Reformation process shattered rigid thought structures and ecclesiastical patterns , and released a vigorous experience of spiritual life, and in this process Whitaker took a leading part in his own generation.

Appendix.The Apostle Peter and the Church at Antioch

- Whitaker allows a Primacy to Rome on two grounds;-
- a) that of honour as the first Imperial City --this the Council of Chalcedon acknowledged (as well as Nicea-Sardica) ;this was also the grounds for the canons acknowledged by the Emperors eg. Leo 1 (457-474 AD)
 - b) that of historical orthodoxy for the first 500 years allowing for Papal lapses which test the statement on the Primacy of Jurisdiction. It is true, acknowledges Whitaker , that the strength of orthodoxy was at Rome --- Alexandria in the mid-5th. Century and before was strongly Eutychnian , and Constantinople was also in schism and looked to Rome (eg. Leo's Tome) as the upholder of the Nicene Faith.

But the **Primacy** of Jurisdiction was not a self-evident fact ; as to Petrine origins, says Whitaker, Antioch was just as Petrine as Rome if not more so.

In the light of modern thought , the claim to a stronger Petrine tradition at Antioch than at Rome, asserted by Whitaker and bearing in mind the two points above ,it is interesting to examine the position particularly in the light of Mt. 16.18.

Matthew has a strong Petrine connection and in its canonical setting a stronger Petrine tradition than Rome. The fact that **P**eter was martyred there (Whitaker accepts this as a historical fact) is of little importance by itself as Paul was also martyred there --- taking the (Lucan) tradition of Acts , it is Paul that is made Universal Apostle eg. Acts 23.11 ' as in Jerusalem, so in Rome i.e. Paul is the Apostle of the world. In answer to the criticism that the Dominical Promise of Primacy lay with Peter not Paul , there may be a case for its application to the 'See of Peter' to Antioch rather than Rome --the reason why Antioch did not develop was fortuitously historical; Antioch did not distinguish itself in its orthodoxy but may be termed the mother of many heretics eg. Menander, Saturninus, Hermogenes -- and the Parthian invasions rubbed out any bid for a wider jurisdiction. The Canons of Nicea (Sardica) merely

1. Whitaker Contra Bellarmin. 4.4.3. Contra Duraeum. 7.22.

stated the obvious , the status quo, and this position was accepted in the matter of jurisdiction . The two points above stand , but the question needs the following further considerations.

Is there a case for an Antiochene Petrine Tradition ?

Gal. 2.11 suggests that Peter (Kephass) already enjoyed a strong leadership. According to Cullman ('Peter , Disciple, Apostle, Martyr' p. 232 ff.) a leadership was accorded to Peter at Jerusalem (Acts 1-12) but that this was resigned to James since the office was a local one and the Apostolic Office was universal in intention . What Primacy there had been was not transferable to Antioch or Rome , but Peter's connection with Antioch was stronger both by time spent there and the impact of the Petrine tradition , than in the case of Rome. That Peter founded the church at Antioch appears relatively early , in Origen (Homily on Luke 6) , Eusebius (H.E. 3.36.2 and 22) Chrysostom (Homily on Ignatius) and Jerome (on Gal. 2.1 and De Viris Illustr.) -- Antioch therefore can raise in principle the same claim as Rome since the Petrine tradition at Antioch is just as strongly attested.

In Matthew 16.18 we find the use of ἐκκλησία and again in Matthew 18.17 (Dic Ecclesiae) --- this raises problems which are best understood as being post-Resurrection statements (which alludes a strong Petrine tradition to Antioch better than Jerusalem or Rome. Kittel('The Church' ed. Schmidt p. 35) comments that the use of ἐκκλησία in these two texts poses problems not only in the Greek text but also by an original Aramaic -- the choice of ^a Semitic word , the idea behind it , the use of it here . The popular expositions of Matthew 16.18 that it refers to the universal church , and Matthew 18.17 to the local church , must reckon with the thought that in either case the view is strongly supported that as they stand they are unauthentic , though the MS tradition makes the text above suspicion. There is no Greek MS or translation that

1. Hegesippus (Eusebius H.E. 2.23.4) says 'James the brother of the Lord takes over the leadership of the church (at Jerusalem) with the Apostles ' -- though Eusebius (H.E. 2.23.1.) says that he received it 'from the Apostles' . Vide Acts 15. So in Gal.2.11f Peter withdraws from the Gentiles out of fear ' for those of the Circumcision' who had come from James . Vide 1 Clement where Peter's commission to him (i.e. Clement) is traced back to the commission that James gave Peter.

lacks them , but this locus classicus for the Roman Primacy forms part of a saying which is found neither in Mark nor Luke--- the Johannine tradition in John 1.42 though it has the ascription of the name Kephas lacks the rest. If there is interpolation here it must be from an otherwise unknown source and genuine tradition -- part of the Antiochene Petrine tradition ? ---the value of which must

be tested apart from the context , which is thoroughly Semitic. Its native place must be within the early Christian community in Palestine (Syria) . The saying is ex post facto but there are grounds for supposing that though the founding of an ἐκκλησιᾶ (for $\beta\eta\eta$ or συναγωγή) is not the theme of the Gospel , yet the use of synonyms like ποιμνῆ (flock -- Matthew 26.31. ; John 10.1. , while in 1 Cor. 9.7. it quite clearly means the church) or ποιμνιον (little flock --- Luke 12.32 ; Acts 20.28. 1 Peter 5.2f.) or $\alpha\upsilon\lambda\eta\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \pi\rho\sigma\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$ suggests it. N.B. the sheep are mine in John 21.16f. as the church is in Matthew 16.18. The $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ can no more be Christ without the ἐκκλησιᾶ than the ποιμνῆ can be shepherd without the ποιμνιον

The absence of any Pauline contacts in this Gospel (of Matthew) is not fatal to its associations with Antioch -- the Fourth Gospel arose from an area (Ephesus , Colossae, Philippi, and Philemon) impregnated with Pauline writings yet the Fourth Gospel continues in remarkable independence not to say ignorance of the Pauline corpus.

Can we then identify the community background of this text ? The language of Matthew is Greek, its way of life and thought is Jewish (strongly anti-Pharisee) and it is in close contact with Rabbinic Judaism. It is a fairly wealthy city community but with few signs of Hellenistic influence. The Evangelist's re-arrangement of the Marcan order shows that he lacks an intimate knowledge of Palestine and is working at second hand -- indeed there are no topographical details as occur in John . On the other hand the Gospel has contacts with Phoenicia and Syria --- in Matthew 4.24 (his fame went throughout Συρίαν) -- the latter has no equivalent in the Marcan parallels. The author has τὰ ὕδατα for the Sea of Galilee in 8.32 ; 14.28,29 -- he appears to reserve Θάλασσα for the Mediterranean . The author changes Mark 7.26 (the

Canaanite Woman) ⁵⁴⁷ Ἐλληνίς Συροφονικήσσις ^{τῷ γένει} to Χαναναία
which is a link with the Semitic world (Kilpatrick 'Origins of
St. Matthew's Gospel ' p.132)

The case for the Gospel being homiletic and liturgical in form is discussed by Kilpatrick -- this use, suggesting a strong local liturgical tradition or at least a strong catechetical one is supported by the emergence of a rigid church order as reflected by Ignatius --- to offset the early prophetic characteristics of the Antiochene church. Ignatius was the first to show any acquaintance with the Gospel of St. Matthew and that not long after it was written; its proximity in Syria, close to the Mediterranean, would hasten an ecclesiastical order and setting more so there, than in a less exposed church. Its relation to Alexandria generally displayed an independence of thought which accounts for the absence of similarities to Philo, which we find in the Fourth Gospel. The Antiochene tendency was to be Aristotelian and factual, which accords better with Matthew. The eschatological elements would also find great interest in a place where Celsus indicated strong ideas along those lines.

The Gospel according to Matthew shows peculiar interest in Peter -- the Scriptural references in Cullman's 'Peter' p.250 are sufficient indication here; the Gospel also shows a peculiar rehandling of the Petrine material, and the reason may only be that for Antioch and its early history, Peter proved an important figure cp. Gal. 2.11. --- Peter had sanctioned the eating together of Jews and Gentiles thus giving Apostolic approval to the cancellation of the Jewish dietary regulations; Paul heartily approves but when the 'embassy' from Jerusalem arrives from James, Peter returned to the dietary distinction between Jew and Gentile and it was with Peter that Paul quarrelled. In Gal. 2.15 and 16 note the 'we' --- 'even we Jews believed in Christ Jesus that we might be justified by faith in Christ'. With respect to Rome there is no Scriptural evidence for Peter's presence there, and whatever Rome built upon the martyrdom, the fact remains that Peter in Scripture becomes dwarfed by Paul though we must take into consideration the purpose of Luke in writing Acts. As has been mentioned, Acts 23.11 f. depicts Paul as the Universal Apostle -- that as Christ was crucified at Jerusalem, and this didn't matter to the

Romans because Christ was a Jew -- with Paul it was quite different for Paul was a Roman citizen and this did matter . We have already noticed that as far as Jerusalem was concerned Peter had no place of Primacy there, but at Antioch (though Kilpatrick favours Phoenicia) we find the author as a scribe , occupying an official position in the church of which he was so sympathetic a member (this would apply to Tyre or Sidon) and he was thoroughly acquainted with its traditions and outlook apparently by now reasonably well developed , and he possessed gifts of style and composition which are grounds for placing M Q and L in a liturgical/homiletic setting. If he did this with the official encouragement and support such as the church at Antioch would be capable of giving , this would account for a certain self-confidence shown in the work eg. in his treatment of quotations from the O.T. to be taken with what Kilpatrick calls ' a general lack of ostentation'.

The Matthean Confession of Mt. 16.18 'Thou art the Christ , the Son of the Living God' is a projection into the past of a Christology which could not have been formulated until the Apostolic age --- more striking is the long Matthean insertion (verses 17-19) in which Christ pronounced Peter ' blessed' and affirms that his perception of the Messiahship of Jesus has come to him by divine revelation and proceeds to explain the meaning of the name Kephas ---- this Christ-Confession theology would be a naturally central point in a place where disciples were first called Christ-ians . The Jesus of Acts 1.16 and 2.22 becomes in Acts 2.36 'Lord and Christ' and the text might perhaps be intended to confer a blessedness of faith on those who believed that Jesus is Lord and Christ after the fashion of a beatitude (cp. John 20.29).

The Church at Antioch being partly Gentile and partly Jewish , seeing that Jerusalem had James as its leader , would not be slow to form a Petrine tradition and foundation -- that a 'Peter party' existed even abroad can be seen in 1 Cor. 1. -- the use of ἐκκλησία as of a local community conceived as exercising judicial authority over its members as reflected in Matthew 18.17 may illuminate the use of ἐκκλησία in Matthew 16.18 , that here ,there is no claim to a universal church but that Peter was the Apostle Founder of the Antiochene church , though disciples were there before Peter

arrived. That Matthew 16.18 was not interpreted of the whole church is illustrated by the fact that Peter must answer to the Jerusalem church for his conduct in preaching to the Gentiles in Acts XI.2.ff ; he makes his contribution to the debate at Jerusalem on the admission of the Gentiles but the sentence is formulated by James, and at Antioch Paul resists Peter to the face because he had gone back on the question of eating with the Gentiles . The 12 may sit on 12 thrones (Matthew 19.28) but there is no Papal Gestatorium. The kind of claim that we have in Matthew 16.18 reflects the kind of claim that could have been made and pressed in the Fifties of the First Century AD and in 1 Cor.1 Paul is found resisting the 'party label'. The Church is Apostolic , not Petrine -- is Christ divided (I Cor.1.13) and in 1 Cor. 1.17 'and Christ sent me ' says Paul ' to preach the Gospel not with the wisdom of words lest the Cross of Christ (twice in one verse) should be made of none effect'; in 1 Cor. 1 23. 'we preach Christ crucified ' and in 1 Cor. 1.24 'Christ the power of God , the Wisdom of God '. The frequent use of the word 'Christ' by Paul here suggests that he wished to offset the Antiochene claim that the Christ-Confession belonged to the Antiochene-Petrine tradition, where Christ-ians are first found.

Cullman (op. cit. p.139) thinks that Peter's Confession was originally spoken in the context of the Passion Story --- that the author Matthew found the saying in an 'ancient oral tradition' and that he also saw the question of Jesus ' Whom do you say that I am ? ' ; the author slipped in Peter's Confession with the addition of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and the charge 'tell no man that He was the Christ ' ; then followed the Passion Prophecy with the rebuke to Peter which is followed by ' if a man will come after Me let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me'--- a text which would have greater significance here in view of the nature of Peter's martyrdom . The author expands the Marcan 'Whom do you say that I am ' by extending the question to ' whom do men say that I the Son of Man am ? (Matthew 16.13) -- the Son of Man title not appearing in Mark and Luke till after Peter's Confession --- Mark 8.31 'and He began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer '(cp. Luke 9.22) -- by this time the Christ-Confession is in the text and uttered by Peter as an anti-climax of the episode. The Son of Man

title is not used in the rest of Matthew 16 because Peter had gained a further confessional height --- Jesus is Son of Man and Christ and Peter made the identification. Luke lacks the text about the 'flesh and blood not revealing it unto Peter' and 'Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my church ; the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it ; I will give unto you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth etc. '

In this saying of Matthew , then , we are dealing with very ancient tradition (Bornkamm 'Jesus of Nazareth ' p.187) and this is indicated by the Semitic character of the language down to the last detail. The word play is better understood in the Aramaic . Bornkamm favours the view that the name was given by the Risen Lord; the tradition varies as to the occasion of naming -- Mark 13.16 at the calling of the 12 ; John 1.42 at the first meeting , and then Matthew 16.18 (Jesus uses this second name nowhere else in addressing Peter). Tradition has inserted the words in the Logia of Jesus and not a very widespread tradition at that , and only within the Antiochene tradition can the words be understood which otherwise could only with difficulty be made to agree with other information about Peter and the early church. R.C. and Protestant theology on this point , as the researches of Strathman show , may have been drawing together , leading to the deduction that the Rock is neither Christ (as stated by Augustine and followed by Luther) nor Peter's faith or his preaching office , as the Reformers thought, but Peter himself as the leader of the(local)church. Notice , however, should be taken of StrackBillerbeck's view that the Greek text was a mistranslation from an Aramaic original text -- the correct English translation of the original would read as follows ;-

' I say to you , yes to you, Peter ; On this Rock I will build my Church ' --therefore the rock is not Peter for Jesus did not say 'you are the rock ' but rather ' I say to you , Peter ; On this Rock' i.e. His Messiahship, His being the Son of God. In Jesus' Ministry before the Crucifixion Jesus failed to get these two claims over and had to fall back on the Son of Man -- but in truth, unless Jesus be accepted as Messiah and Son of God , the church could not be built. Both StrackBillerbeck (Commentary on the N.T. Vol.1.pp.732 ff) and

Gloege (Reich Gottes und Kirche pp. 274 ff) say that the words of Jesus were

גם אני אמר לך אתה כטרומ :

The translator by mistake understood ה' as the subject of a new sentence , whereas Jesus was only repeating the 2nd. Person Singular Pronoun already contained in לך .

The interpretation transferring this text of Matthew 16.18 to the Bishop of Rome does not appear till the early 3rd. Century -- it was not regularly used of Papal claims till the early Middle Ages. It is singularly strange that when we come to the era of exegesis influenced by ecclesiastical politics , that it was Tertullian who used it to oppose Callistus who had not appealed to Matthew 16.17 f. Similarly Cyprian gave the Roman See the weapons with which it would henceforth defend its Primacy viz. that though he saw no Primacy in Mt. 16.18 for the Bishop of Rome , yet he did consider that the whole body of bishops is addressed in Peter . (De Unitate 4-5 ; Ep. 33;59; 73 ;75 ;76 ; and 81) . Firmilian of Caesarea (Cappadocia) in a letter to Cyprian (Epi. 75.17) opposed Stephen's (254-7AD) use of the text and his view that the Roman Bishops claimed succession to the Cathedra of Peter. Chrysostom explained the Rock to be the faith of Confession and Augustine in his Retractions (1.21.1) says that earlier he had written under the influence of Ambrose when he

1. In Siricius we meet with the view that the Pope is a kind of re-incarnation of Peter , while the rest of the Apostles derived their commission from Christ through Peter -- therefore the episcopate generally owes its authority to papal delegation. Innocent 1 widened the local Roman Province Primacy to make the claim irrefutably universal . This was re-iterated by Boniface 1 who was the first to extend Innocent 1's use of the Pauline dictum (the care of all the churches) to justify Rome's intervention in the Eastern Churches. Therefore by the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) the legates of Celestine 1 could advance all these claims without being aware of their novelty or fear of arousing protest. The Roman Synod of 378 AD had made an explicit claim to the privilege -- that Rome is described as the Apostolic See because it was the See of Peter , though Damasus presiding did emphasise Paul's part in the foundation of Roman Christianity.
2. Callistus had described himself as heir to the Petrine privileges. Vide Tertullian De Pudicitia 21.

referred the Rock to Simon , but Augustine goes on to say that the text does not say 'you are the Rock ' but ' you are Peter' and the Rock is only mentioned in the following sentence, and then it seems to refer to Christ. Augustine leaves the decision to his readers --- a freedom he would never have allowed if there had been no doubt about a universal Primacy. The exegesis which the Reformers gave , though perhaps questionable , was not invented from their struggle with the Papacy ; it rests upon an older Patristic tradition . The true Rock is Christ , and Simon was surnamed Peter because of his faith in the Messiahship.

H.F.Holtzmann (Handkommentar I) at the end of the 19th. Century denied that the text was spoken by Jesus but represented ' the first stirring of Roman self-consciousness ' --- succeeding commentators have taken the same view on the lack of genuineness of the words as one of the Logia , while A Loisy commented 'Jesus announced the Kingdom of God but what appeared was the church ' . Harnack also pointed to Rome as the locus 'as it strove for the Primacy ' (sic.) . On the other hand Kattenbusch and K.L.Schmidt both took the view that the idea of the Son of Man leads to that of the 'People of the Saints' (collective meaning) and the Aramaic fits here in Matthew 16,18 ; so Jesus may well have used the ἐκκλησία text . Jeremias argues for the Cosmic Rock, and then there follows a strong plea for the genuineness of the text eg. Linton, Braun, Wendland, Michaelis etc. Bultmann however and Campenhausen take the view that it is not a genuine saying but arises from the ecclesia-tradition, and Cullman (op.cit. p.174) remarks that in a census made in 1950 AD among 34 scholars over the genuineness of this text , opinion was fairly equally divided.

Cullman remarks that it is generally agreed now that the quite Semitic character of this section indicates the great antiquity and Palestinian origin of the text -- Bultman agrees here. In the Greek, the Petra does not follow the Petrus -- in the Aramaic we have the same word in both sentences -- ' you are Kepha and upon this Kepha I will build my church ' -- here the name and the thing are identical. The original saying on this premise was Aramaic ; this is confirmed by bar-yona --- and we have a parallel in Rabbinic tradition in its explanation of Isaiah 51.1. where Abraham is the Rock of the World.

Cullman also argues that as the saying occurs in Mark 3.16 (call of the disciples) and John 1.42 (beginning of Ministry), the position in Matthew 16.18 may be entirely due to ^{the} local liturgical phrase 'The Christ, The Son of God' (the latter phrase does not appear elsewhere) as typical of Peter, being inserted here-- but it may well have occurred in the Passion narrative where the theme is of a new fellowship after His Death ---- the idea of **ἕθνος** (People of God -- New Israel) is there. The **ἐκκλησία** is to continue the Messianic time of preparation for the Parousia within the Covenant -- the **ἐκκλησία** is included in the function of Jesus, which consists of His Victory over death by His Resurrection. Hence the phrase 'the gates of Hades will not prevail against it'. The Apostles were first and foremost witnesses of the Resurrection. The power of the keys of the House of David (Isaiah 22.22) were given by the Lord to Eliakim, so Jesus commits the keys of His House to Peter. The Pharisees had closed the door into the Kingdom of Heaven (Matthew 23.13) -- it is interesting to note Mt. 16.19 ('and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven' -- as the first among all the Apostles the power of binding and loosing is given him, shared by all the Apostles in Mt. 18.18.).

To enter tentative territory, it is interesting to examine the possible 'localia' of apocryphal writings -- quite a number of well-known ones point to a Petrine-Antiochene area; the 'Petrine' Apocryphal writings as follows were all popular at Antioch as the writings of Theophilus and Serapion show;--

Apocalypse of Peter -- quoted by Clement of Alexandria and mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment

Preaching of Peter -- quoted by Clement of Alexandria, and like the Apocalypse of Peter is mentioned by Theophilus of Antioch c.170 AD.

First part of the Acts of Peter.

Antiochene Judaeo-Christianity thus appears closely linked to the Petrine tradition -- the Phoenician section of the apocryphal writings were especially dependent on Peter.

The position of Antioch appears quite prominent as a locale for the apocryphal writings up to c. 200 AD and the name of Peter figures very largely here. The Ascension of Isaiah (the

first to mention Peter's martyrdom) with its theme of Descensus and Ascensus (cp. 1 Peter 3.19) are extensions of Jewish apocalyptic imagery , and with the Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache show close affinity with Antioch even if they did not originate there. Westcott and Hort held the view that the Didache pointed to Antioch as its place of origin on three grounds;-

- a) the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer (Didache 8.2.) and the Baptismal formula , which is Trinitarian i.e. Matthew 28.19.
- b) the phrase 'scattered upon the mountains '(Didache 9.4.) does not fit Egypt where the corn is never sown on the mountains but on the plain.
- c) later history.
- d) the favourite Gospel of the writer of the Didache is Matthew -- the end of Matthew 28.19 and Acts 2.41 explain the title and form of the Didache.

Vide etiam 'Apocryphon of James ' (Van Unnick 'Origins') Epistle of the 12 Apostles -- related to it.

There was a flourishing Syrian theology with a strong catechetical tradition at the beginning of the 2nd. Century as witness the Odes of Solomon , the Gospel of Truth , and the writings of Ignatius . Antiochene Judaeo-Christianity thus appears as representing the Petrine ~~tradition~~ position and its links are noticeably (through the Kerygma of Peter) with the Phoenician sector which was especially dependent upon Peter.

Fr. Danielou (The Christian Centuries'Vol.1.p.50) writes that Eusebius tells us that Pontus, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Galatia were dependent upon Peter ----- 1 Peter was addressed to Christians of those regions 'though there is no other evidence of this link' . In the Paschal Controversy it may be significant that the Bishops of Pontus were in agreement with the Bishop of Rome while they remained in disagreement with the Bishops of Asia.

Over the first 150 years therefore we find an informative connection of Peter with Antioch -- the canonical Gospel of Matthew appears to be the echo of catecheses in Antiochene circles ' (Danielou op. cit. p.25) -- and Peter's place in it supports this hypothesis. The Didache was probably of Syrian origin and in its catechetical parts it belongs to a tradition parallel to that which we find in Matthew and the allusion to the prophets

put us in ^a context similar to that which Acts describes at Antioch.

The Length of Peter's stay at Antioch ?

Acts 12.17 . After Peter's imprisonment and deliverance , he instructs the church gathered in the house of John Mark ' go and show these things to James and to the brethren ' --- and ' he departed and went unto another place ' --the guards search everywhere ^{here} for him but he could not be found. This may be dated 42/3 at the latest for Fadus succeeded Herod (d. 44 AD)

'Another place' ; where ? In Gal. 2.11 Peter is at Antioch (when ?) but could he have gone to Rome in Claudius's reign ? Probably not, because in 44 AD (Danielou puts the expulsion at 50 AD) the Jews were expelled from Rome and Romans 15.20 seems against it (Paul did not preach where Christ was named lest ' I build on another man's foundation') . Acts 28.22 (if historical) implies that Peter was unknown there (i.e. 59-61 AD).

Peter only appears once again , at the so-called Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) c. 48/9 AD (?) after which Paul and Barnabas go to Antioch (with Peter ?).

There are two theories;-

- a) Brandon ('Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church ' (1951) p.221f) suggests Alexandria and Matthew who was connected with Alexandria magnified Peter for this reason, while Luke plays off Paul against Peter and Alexandria ; from Acts 13 onwards Peter disappears from the scene apart from Acts 15 -- he is ' pushed into the background ' .
- b) D.F.Robinson (Journ.Bibl. Lit. 1945. p.255 f) proposes that in fact $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$ means ' the place of glory ' and indicates that Peter was martyred at this time (in Jerusalem c. 42-44AD) ; this phrase is the seal to the historical section of Acts 12.1-19 and closes the Petrine Acta . But 1 Cor. 9.5. (Peter leading about a wife) is probably against this.

We can at least say that Acts 12.17 marks a transition of importance and place for Peter and would suggest that apart from the visit to Jerusalem (Acts 15) Peter's contact with Antioch may well have been 42 - 61 AD.

The only other place worthy of mention with regards to Peter is Corinth ;-

- a) there was a Kephas party there.

b) they appear to know about Peter leading about a wife
 c) c. 170 AD we find Dionysius of Corinth writing to all the
 Corinthians (Eusebius H.E. 2.25.8) and speaking of the close link
 between the trees planted at Corinth and Rome by Peter and Paul ' for
 both (Apostles) taught in the same way in what they planted in our
 Corinth and after they taught together in Italy they suffered
 martyrdom together '.

With reference to a) The Kephas party could quite well be taken
 as a proof of the absence of Peter.

b) Barnabas also led about a wife , and the other
 Apostles and Brethren of the Lord.

c) that Peter was at Corinth is supported by
 Eduard Meyer , Harnack, Lietzemann ,and Katzenmayer (Article 'War
 Petrus in Korinth' Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift 1943 p. 20f).
 The silence of Acts and the Pauline Epistles would suggest not ---
 though it must be admitted that Acts and the Pauline Epistles are
 also silent about Peter being in Rome -- it is an argumentum e
 silentio.

Books consulted

- Oscar Cullman ' Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr' S.C.M. Library of
 History and Christian Doctrine.
- Danielou and Marrou (tr. Cronin) 'The Christian Centuries'
 Vol.1. 'The first 600 years '. Darton, Longman and
 Todd, 1964.
- G.D.Kilpatrick 'The Origins of the Gospel according to Matthew '
 Clarendon Press 1946.
- Bornkamm, Barth, and Held 'Tradition and Interpretation in
 Matthew ' S.C.M. 1960.
- Kittel -Bible Key Words - 'The Church' K.L.Schmidt
 A. and C.Black 1950.
- Schlatter (Tr. Levertoff) 'The Church in the N.T.period'
 S.P.C.K. 1955
- F.W.Beare 'The earliest records of Jesus'
 Blackwell 1962.

Addenda

Beardslee J.W. 'Reformed Dogmatics' 1965

Bainton R.H. 'The Reformation of the 16th Century' 1953

Bibliography.

- Abba R. 'The Nature and Authority of the Bible ' 1958
- Abbott W.M. (ed.) 'Documents of Vatican 2 ' 1966
- Aeneas Sylvius Piccolominus (Pius 2nd.) 'De Gestis Concilii
Basiliensis Commentariorum ' ed. tr. Hay & Smith
Oxford Medieval Texts 1967
- Aland Kurt, 'The Problem of the New Testament Canon ' Mowbray 1962
- Aland Kurt 'Did the early Church baptize infants ?' S.C.M. 1961
- Alexander P.J. 'The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople ' 1958.
- Allen J.W. 'A History of Political Thought in the 16th. Century' 1957
- Altaner Berthold 'Patrology ' tr. Hilda Graef.
- Ammianus Marcellinus 'History ' tr. J.C.Rolfe. Loeb ed. 1963. 3 vols.
- Athanasius 'On the Incarnation ' tr. by a Religious of the CSMV 1963
- Athanasius 'Opera' Cologne ed. 1686
- Augustine 'Treatises' Library of the Fathers
'Confessions' tr. W.Watts Loeb ed. 1960 2 vols.
'City of God' tr. F.R.M. Hitchcock SPCK 1951
- Badcock F.J. 'The History of the Creeds' SPCK 1938
- Bede 'Ecclesiastical History ' tr. J.E.King (Loeb ed.) 1962 2 vols.
'Ecclesiastical History' Latin text . G.H.Moberly 1869
- Bellarmino Robert 'Opera' Erbermann ed. 4 vols. 1721.
- Bernard St. 'On Consideration' tr. G.Lewis 1908
'Opera Omnia ' Mabillon ed. Paris 1839
- Bettenson H. 'Documents of the Christian Church' 1943
- Bevenot M. 'The Primacy Text in Cyprian's De Unitate Cap. IV' in the
Bellarmino Series No. 4. 1938
'St. Cyprian's De Unitate IV in the Light of the MSS' 1939.
'Primatus Petro datur ' in JTS (1954) 19-35
'In Solidum and St. Cyprian; a correction' in JTS 1955.244-8.
- Bicknell E.J. 'The Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England' 1942
- Blackman E.C. 'Marcion and His Influence' 1948
- Booby J.E. 'John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England' SPCK 1963
- Bowsky W.M. 'Henry VII in Italy ' Univ. of Nebraska Press 1960
- Brodrick J 'Robert Bellarmine' 1961
- Brooks P. 'Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist' 1965
- Brown Peter 'Augustine of Hippo' Faber and Faber 1967
- Bruce F.F. 'The English Bible' 1963.

Chadwick. Owen "The Reformation" Pelican History of the Church III. 1964

Collinson P. 'The Elizabethan Puritan Movement' 1967

Danielou, Couratin, & Kent - 'Pelican Guide 1: Modern Theology'
Vol 2. ed. R.P.C. Hanson. 1969

Dickens A.G. { 'The Counter Reformation' 1969
'Reformation & Society in 16th Europe' Thomas Hudson 1966

Dix G. & Herbert A.G. 'Catholicity: a study in the conflict of Christian Traditions in the West' 1947

Drummond A.L. 'German Protestantism since Luther'

Domer. I.A. 'History of Protestant Theology'

- Burn A.E. 'The Council of Nicea' SPCK 1925
- Bury J.B. 'History of the Later Roman Empire 395-565 AD' 1958
- Butler Dom Cuthbert 'The Vatican Council 1869-1870' (Fontana ed.) 1962
- Calvin John 'Institutes' tr. H.Beveridge 1962
- Campbell T.J. 'The Jesuits - a History' 2 vols. 1921
- 'Canons of the First Four Councils' 3rd. ed. publ. J.Parker 1874
- Cayre F. 'Manual of Patrology' 2 vols. tr. H.Howitt 1936
- Chase F.H. 'Chrysostom; a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation' 1887.
- Churton 'Life of Alexander Nowell'
- Chrysostom 'Opera' Montfaucon ed. (Paris) 1834 . 13 vols.
'Six Books on the Priesthood' tr. G.Neville SPCK 1964
- Cirlot F.L. 'The Early Eucharist' 1939
- Clarke W.K.Lowther ed. 'Liturgy and Worship'
- Clement of Alexandria 'Opera' Sylburg ed. 1629
- Coleman- Norton P.R. 'Roman State and Christian Church' 3 vols. SPCK 1966
- Collins W.E. 'Queen Elizabeth's Defence of Her Proceedings in Church and State' SPCK 1958
- Cooper C.H. 'Athenae Cantabrigiensis' 1500-1609. 2 vols. 1858
- Cotelerius J.B. ed. 'Apostolic Fathers' 2 vols. 1724
- Councils 'The Seven Ecumenical Councils' in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers 2nd. Series Vol. 14. ed. Schaff & Wace.
- Cross F.L. (ed.) 'Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church' 1958
'The Early Christian Fathers' Vol.1. 1960
- Cyprian 'Treatises and Epistles' Library of the Fathers 1876
'Opera' ed. Marshall 1717
'Opera' in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum Vol. 3. Vienna 1868-71.
- Davenport E.H. 'The False Decretals' 1916
- Deanesly M. 'A History of Early Medieval Europe 476-911 AD' 1960
- D'Entreves A.P. 'The Medieval Contribution to Political Thought' 1939
- Dé Journal 'Enchiridion Patristicum' Herder 1959
- Denzinger-Schönmetzer 'Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum' ed. 32nd. Herder 1965
- Dickens A.G. 'Reformation and Society' 1966

Echlin E.P. (s.s) 'The Petrine office in Anglicanism' in
Theology Vol. LXXIII, April 1970

Fraenkel P. Testimonia Patrum: the function of the
Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon
Geneva 1961

George C.H. & G. The Protestant mind in the English Reformation 1570-
1640; U.S.A. 1961

- Ellis E.E. 'Paul's Use of the Old Testament' 1957
- Elton G.R. 'England under the Tudors' 1967
'The Tudor Constitution' 1960
- Eusebius 'Ecclesiastical History' tr. Lawlor & Oulton 2 vols. SPCK 1927
'Ecclesiastical History' (Burton's Greek Text) ed. W. Bright
1872
- Evans E. 'St. Augustine's Enchiridion' 1953
'Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas' 1949
'Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation' 1956
- Figgis J.N. 'From Gerson to Grotius 1414-1625 AD' 1907
- Foakes-Jackson F.J. 'History of the Christian Church to AD 461' 1909
- Frend W.H.C. 'Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church' 1965
- Fulke William 'Stapleton's Fortress overthrown; a Discourse of the
Dangerous Rock' Parker Society ed. 1848
'A Defence of Translations of the Bible' Parker
Society ed. 1843
- Fuller Thomas 'Church History of Britain' ed. Brewer Oxford 1845 6 vols.
in Abel Redivivus Vol. 2. p. 115 f. (1867 ed.)
- Gardiner Stephen 'De Vera Obedientia 1553' Scholar Press 1966
- Gibson E.C.S. 'Thirty Nine **Articles** of the Church of England' 1910
- Giles E. 'Documents Illustrating Papal Authority Ad 96-454' 1952
- Gill J. 'The Council of Florence' CUP 1961
- Gore C. 'Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation' 1907
'Roman Catholic Claims' 1892
- Grant F.C. 'Translating the Bible' 1961
- Grant R.M. 'The Interpretation of the Bible' 1965
Article '**Appeal** to the Early Fathers' in JTS 1960 pp.13-24
- Greenslade S.L. 'The English Reformers and the Fathers of
the Church' (Inaugural Lecture) 1960
- Gregory Nazianzen 'Opera' 2 vols. Paris ed. 1778
- Grimm H.J. 'The Reformation Era 1500-1650' 1964
- Groner J.F. 'Kardinal Cajetan. Eine Gestalt aus der Reformationszeit'
1951
- Guarducci M. 'The Tomb of St. Peter' Harrap 1960
- Gwatkin H.M. 'Selections from early Christian Writers' 1905

Baugaard W.P. 'Elizabeth & the English Reformation' 1968

Hildebrandt .F. 'Melancthon : alien or ally'

Hunt J. 'Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the end of the last Century' 3 vds. 1870

Leatherbarrow J.S. 'The Lancashire Elizabethan Recusants' Chetham Society (1947) vol 110.

Lindsay J.M. 'History of the Reformation' 2 Vols. 1906

- Haddan & Stubbs (ed) 'Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents' 3 vols. 1964
- Hamilton B. 'Political Thought in 16th. Century Spain' 1963
- Hanson R.P.C. 'Origen's Doctrine of Tradition' 1954
'Tradition in the Early Church' 1962
- Heywood & Wright 'Cambridge University Transactions' 1854
- Hippolytus 'Philosophumena or Refutation of Heresies' 2 vols. tr. F.Legge
SPCK 1921
'Apostolic Tradition' tr. and ed. B.S.Easton.Cambridge 1934
- Hughes Philip 'The Church in Crisis - the 20 Great Councils' 1961
- Huizinga J. 'Erasmus and the Age of Reformation' Harper 1957
- Ignatius 'Epistles' tr. J.H.Srawley SPCK 1919
- Irenaeus 'Five Books against Heresies' Library of the Fathers 1872
'Five Books against Heresies' Grabe ed. 1702
- Jalland T.G. 'The Church and the Papacy' 1944
- James M.R. 'The Apocryphal New Testament' 1950
- Jeremias Joachim 'Infant Baptism in the first Four Centuries' SCM 1960
- Jerome 'Letters' in Ancient Christian Writers Vol. XXXIII tr. Mierow 1963
- Justin Martyr 'Works' Library of the Fathers 1861
- Kidd B.,J. 'Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church'
'Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation' 1911
'The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice'
1898
- King N.,Q. 'The Emperor Theodosius and the establishment of Christianity'
SCM 1961
- Knappen M.M. 'Tudor Puritanism' Univ. of Chicago Press 1965
- Küng Hans 'The Council and Reunion'(ET 1961)
- Lactantius 'Epitome of the Divine Institutes' ed. & tr. E.H.Blakeney 1950
- Lamb H. 'Constantinople' 1958
- Lampe G.W.H. (ed) Patristic Greek Lexicon 5 Fasc. (1965-8)
- Lietzmann Hans 'A History of the Early Church' 4 vols. 1963
- Lightfoot J.B. 'Apostolic Fathers' 1889
- Lockton W. 'The Remains at the Eucharist' 1920
- Luther 'Early Theological Works' in the Library of Christian Classics
Vol. XVI. ed. Atkinson 1962

McGrath Patrick. 'Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I' Blandford Press 1967

McNeill J.T. 'History - character of Calvinism' New York 1954

Apollonia Tradition, tr. and ed. H.S. Easton. Cambridge 1961
Hughes Philip 'The Church in Crisis - the 20 Great Councils' 1961
Knutson J. 'Luther and the Age of Reformation' Harper 1957
Lignatus 'Bible' tr. J.H. Crawley BPC 1919
Luther 'Five Books against Heresies' Library of the Fathers 1972
Luther 'Five Books against Heresies' Grade 6. 1902
Luther T.G. 'The Church and the Papacy' 1964
Luther R.R. 'The Apostolic New Testament' 1950
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' in the First Four Centuries' 1961
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' in the First Four Centuries' 1961
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' in the First Four Centuries' 1961
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' in the First Four Centuries' 1961

New J.F.N. 'Anglican and Puritan' 1969

King J.E. 'The Emperor Theodosius and the establishment of Christianity' 1961
Knutson M.M. 'Luther's Puritanism' Univ. of Chicago Press 1965
King James 'The Council and Revision' (1961)
Luther 'Epistles of the Divine Justification' ed. & tr. H.H. Blakney 1958
Luther 'Catechism' 1958
Luther 'Catechism' (ed) Patristic Greek Lexicon 2 fasc. (1965-8)
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' A History of the Early Church, 4 vols. 1963
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' 1963
Luther 'Lectures on the Psalms' at the University, 1960
Luther 'Early Theological Works' in the Library of Christian Classics Vol. XVI. ed. Alanson 1965

- Macdonald A.J. 'Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine' 1930
- McDonnell M. 'Edmund Campion' in Notes and Queries CXCLV 1949 46-49
67-70
90-92.
- McLelland J.C. 'The Visible Words of God and a Study in the
Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr 1500-1562' 1957
- McNeile A.H. 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew' 1949
- Mansi 'Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio' Graz. 1960
- Marsilius of Padua 'The Defender of Peace' tr. A.Gewirth 1967
- Mayor ed. 'History of St. John's College, Cambridge, by T. Baker' 1869ed.
- Melito 'Homily of the Passion' ed. Campbell Bonner (Studies & Documents
12) 1940
- Mendham Joseph 'Memoirs of the Council of Trent' 1834
- Meyendorff J. 'A Study of Gregory Palamas' 1964
- Migne J.P. Patrologia Latina Paris 1844-55.
Patrologia Graeca
- Minucius Felix 'Octavius' tr. G.H.Rendall (Loeb ed.) 1960
- Mitchell R.J. 'The Laurels and the Tiara ; Pope Pius 2nd. 1458-64 '
Harvill Press 1962
- Mortimer A.G. 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice' 1901
- Moyle J.B. ed. 'Imperatoris Justiniani Institutionum IV Libri' 1955
- Mullinger 'The University of Cambridge from the Royal Injunctions
of 1535 to the Accession of Charles 1 '.
- Neale J.E. 'Elizabeth and her Parliaments' 1957
- Nicephorus Callistus 'Ecclesiastical History' 2 vols. Paris ed. 1630
- Origen 'Works' ed. Roberts and Donaldson in the Ante-Nicene Christian
Library 1869
- Phillips M.M. 'Erasmus' E.U.P. 1949
- Platena B. 'Lives of the Popes' ed. W. Benham 2 vols. Ancient and
Modern Library of Theological Literature.
- Pollen J.H. 'Nicholas Sanders . Report of Cardinal Moroni'
Catholic Record Society Misc.1. (1905) 1-46.
- Porter H.C. 'Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge' 1958
- Proclus 'Elements of Theology' ed. tr. E.R.Dodds 1963
- Prudentius 'Opera' tr. H.J.Thomson (Loeb ed.) 1962
- Psellus Michael 'Chronographia ' tr. E.R.A. Sewter 1966
- Pusey E.B. 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence' 1855

Macdonald A.J. 'Berenger and the Reform of Sacramental doctrine' 1930
McDonnell M. 'Stannard-Gambell' in Notes and Queries CXXIV 1949 48-49
67-70
90-92.

McLeland J.C. 'The Visible Words of God and a Study in the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr 1500-1562' 1937

McNeill A.H. 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew' 1949
Mansel 'Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Ampliata Collectio' Graec. 1960

Martinius of Padua 'The Preacher of Peace' tr. A. Gwirth 1967
Mayor ed. 'History of St. John's College, Cambridge' by T. Baker' 1899

Meijer 'Essays on the Passion' ed. Campbell Bonner (Studies in Documenta 12) 1940

Menahan Joseph 'Memoirs of the Council of Trent' 1834
Meyendorff J. 'A Study of Gregory Palamas' 1964

Migne J.P. 'Patrologia Latina Paris 1844-55' Patrologia Graeca

Minnicus Felix 'Octavianus' tr. G.H. Rendall (Loeb ed.) 1960
Mitchell R.J. 'The Lancelotti and the Wars' Pope Pius XII. 1458-64

Harvill Press 1965
Mortimer A.G. 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice' 1901

Moye J.B. ed. 'Liberation of Justus Justinianus IV Libri' 1922
Mullinger 'The University of Cambridge from the Royal Injunctions

of 1534 to the Accession of Charles I' 1927
Neale J.C. 'The History of the Reformation' Bles. 1950

Norman 'The Crisis of the Reformation' Bles. 1950
Oldmixon 'New Presbyter' CUP 1956

Sykes. Norman
Library 1869

Phillips M.M. 'Stannard' E.U.P. 1949
Platen B. 'Lives of the Popes' ed. W. Bertram 2 vols. Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature

Pollen J.E. 'Nicholas Sanders. Report of Cardinal Moran' Catholic Record Society Misc. I. (1905) 1-46.

Porter H.C. 'Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge' 1928
Proclus 'Elements of Theology' ed. tr. E.R. Rieu 1963

Prudentius 'Opera' tr. E.J. Thomson (Loeb ed.) 1963
Psalm Michael 'Chronographia' tr. E.R.A. Sewter 1966

Trimble W.R. 'The Catholic laity in Elizabethan England' Cambridge Mass. USA. 1964

- Read Conyers 'Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth' Jonathan Cape 1965
 'Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth' Jonathan Cape 1965
 'Reformed Confessions of the 16th. Century' ed. A. Cochrane SCM 1966
 Reid J.K.S. 'The Authority of Scripture' 1957
 Renold P. ed. 'The Wisbech Stirs' (Catholic Record Society) 1958
 Reynolds E.E. 'Thomas More and Erasmus' 1965
 Ridley Nicholas 'A Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper' ed.
 H.C.G. Moule 1895
 Runciman S. 'The Eastern Schism' 1963
 'The Fall of Constantinople 1453 AD' CUP 1965
 Selwyn E.G. 'The First Epistle of Peter' 1947
 Shotwell W.A. 'The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr' 1965
 Simpson R. 'Edmund Campion' London 1896
 Smalley Beryl 'The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages' 1952
 Smith P. 'Erasmus' Dover Publications 1962
 Socrates 'Ecclesiastical History 305 - 439 AD' Bohn ed. 1884
 Souter A. 'Novum Testamentum Graece' 1910
 Sozomen 'Ecclesiastical History 324 - 440 AD' Bohn ed. 1855
 Stevenson J. (ed.) 'A new Eusebius' 1963
 'Creeds Councils and Controversies' SPCK 1966
 Strype J. 'Life and Acts of John Whitgift' 3 vols. Oxford 1822
 'Annals' 7 vols. Oxford 1824
 Swete H.B. 'The Old Testament in Greek - the LXX' 3 vols. 1909
 'Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek' 1902
 'The Apocalypse of John' 1907
 Sylloge Confessionum. Oxford ed. 1827
 Symonds H.E. 'The Church Universal and the See of Rome' 1939
 'The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies' 1933
 Tertullian 'Apologetic and Practical Treatises' tr. Dodgson. Library of
 the Fathers 1854
 'Opera' ed. Oehler Leipsig 1853
 Textus Minores 'Some Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament' ed.
 Grosheide. Leiden 1948.
 Theodoret 'Ecclesiastical History; 431 - 594 AD' Bohn ed. 1854.
 Thomas Aquinas 'Summa Theologica' Dominican ed. 22 vols. 1920.
 Thompson J.V.P. 'Supreme Governor' SPCK.
 Trent. Council of. 'Canons and Decrees' (tr. J. Waterworth) 1848

Wendel, Francois 'Calvin: the origins & development of his Religious Thought
Paris 1950 E.T. 1963.

Whitney J.P. 'History of the Reformation' 1940

'Creeds Councils and Controversies', SICR 1966

Strype J. 'Life and Acts of John Whitgift', 3 vols. Oxford 1822

'Annals', 7 vols. Oxford 1824

Swete H.B. 'The Old Testament in Greek - the LXX', 3 vols. 1909

'Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek', 1905

'The Apocalypses of John', 1907

'Tylogie Constantinensium', Oxford ed. 1827

Snyder H.B. 'The Church Universal and the See of Rome', 1939

'The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies', 1933

Tertullian 'Apologetic and practical treatises', Fr. Dodgson, Library of the Fathers 1874

'Opera', ed. Geller Leipzig 1827

Textus Minor 'Some Early Lists of the Books of the New Testament', ed. Groscheide, Leiden 1948.

Theodoret 'Heclesiaical History', 491 - 594 AD, John ed. 1854.

Thomas Aquinas 'Summa Theologiae', Dominican ed. 25 vols. 1920.

Thompson J.V.P. 'Supreme Government', SICR.

Trent. Council of 'Canon and Decrees', (Fr. J. Waterworth) 1848

- Ullmann W. Article 'Significance of the Epistola Clementis in the Pseudo-Clementines' JTS 1960 295--317.
 'Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages' 1961
 'The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages' 1962
- Walker G.S.M. 'The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian' in Ecumenical Studies in History. Lutterworth Press. 1968.
- Watkin E.I. 'The Church in Council' 1960
- Waugh E. 'Edmund Campion' 1935
- Whitaker T.D. 'History of Whalley' 1801.
- Whitaker William 'Disputation on Scripture' Parker Society ed. 1849
 'Opera' Geneva ed. 1610 2 vols. (Aberdeen University Library)

British Museum.

MSS.

- Add. MS 34312 f. 7.
- Egerton MS 2262 f. 9.
- Sloane MS 414 ff. 1 - 4 ° Copies of Lambeth Articles 1595.
- Sloane MS 478 ff. 3 - 5 °; 21 °, 38 °, 52 ° - 54 °; - quaestiones theologicae in vespere Comitiorum apud Cantabrigiensi disputatae' 1570 AD.
- Harley MS 789 'De Sacra Scriptura'
- Add. MS 4276 f. 192 Autograph Letter to Burghley (Jan. 1st. 1594/5)
- Printed Books. Vol. 57 Edward Arbor (1946) Col. 204 - 206.
- 4902 aaa 22 (3) Lambeth Articles Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4. 55 pages (1631 AD) 12 °.
- 3505 b.50 The Lambeth Articles above, translated c. 1700 AD
- 226 a 9 Stocke's Translation of Whitaker's Answer to Campion's Ten Reasons with Duraeus' Defence and Whitaker's Reply c. 1606
- 860 f. 6 Rainold's Refutation of Sundry Reprehensions (on the Douai-Rheims Annotations) 1583. 8 °.
- G 14222 Translation of Whitaker's Cygnea Cantio (Swan Song) with an account of Whitaker's Life and Writings by 'A Presbyter of the Church of England' -- printed 1772
- 843 c 21 (2) Nowell's Latin 'Catechismus Parvus' translated into Greek by Whitaker 1574. 12 °. 48 pp.

- 1353 a 7 *Κατηχίσμος* 1573 . 8°. 663 pp.
Nowell's 'Prima Institutio' translated into Greek by
Whitaker .
- 3505 c 36 *Χριστιανισμου στοιχειώσις*
1575 . 8°. 254 pp.
- E. 1375 (4) . 'A Short Sum of Christianity' ed. J. Martin
London 1651 8° 36 pp.
- 698 c 24 Rainold's Antidote or Treatise of 30 Controversies. 1622
- 693 d. 22 A Sermon on 1 John IV.1. by Bancroft , preached at
Paul's Cross on 9th. Feb. 1588.
- 1491 i 1 An Account of the Life and Death of William Whitaker (by
A. Assheton) - text in Geneva edition of Whitaker's 'Opera'
Vol.1. 698 - 704.
- E 156 Rainold's Judgement of Bancroft's Sermon

Bodleian Library

- MS Bodl. 156 (S.C. 1983) Commentary on 1 Timothy with a fragment
of the Commentary on the Song of Solomon.
- MS Bodl. 59 (S.C. 2007) Commentary on the Song of Solomon.
- MS Rawl. E. 68 (S.C. 14302) Cygnea Cantio.
- Crynes 837 (S.C. 27705) William Hubbocke's Translation of
Whitaker's Response to Campion's Ten Reasons.
- MS Casaubon 15 The Real Presence.
- MS Rawl. C 753 f. 3. 11pp and MS Casaubon 25 f. 126^r 5pp. Notes on
Whitaker's Response to Campion's Ten Reasons.

Photostats-- British Museum

- ADD MS. 34312 f. 7^r and Egerton MS 2262 -- two copies of
Whitaker's Nine Propositions at Lambeth on November 20th.
1595 .
- ADD MS 34312 f. 7° Andrewe's Judgement of these Articles (in Latin).
- ADD MS 4276 f. 131 Letter to Burghley Jan. 1st. 1594 from Whitaker
written from Dean Nowell's house (St. Paul's Deanery)
With this is a note (not in Whitaker's writing) as follows:-
'Deanery of Windsor' (crossed out)
'In regard of his writings against the adversaries
of our church and his being 16 years Divinity Reader,

he desires some further preferment' .

Williams N.P. 'The Idea of the Fall and of Original Sin' Bampton Lectures
1924

Willis G.G. 'St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy ' SPCK 1950

Winter M. ' St. Peter and the Popes' 1960.

Winter E.F. 'Erasmus and Luther; Discourse on Free Will' 1961.

Wood A. Skevington 'Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation'
Tyndale Press 1960.

Wood Anthony 'Athenae Oxoniensis'

Index Nominum , Rerum, et Verborum.

- Aeneas Sylvius (Pius 2nd.) 209 ; 416 ; 482.
 Aerius 277 ; 420 .
 Agrapha of Jesus 138.
 Aldred 196.
 Alexander 3rd. (Pope) 432 .
 Allen Cardinal William **9; 12** ; 57 .
 Allenson John **6**, 419.
 Alphonsus de Castro 327 ; 348 ; 362 ; 483.
~~Altingius H.~~ ^{H.} **25**
 Alvey Henry **501 f.**
 Ambrose of Milan 380 ; De Fide ad Gratian on Scripture 170 ; 386 .
 De Mysteriis & De Sacramentis 239 ; 267 .
 Ambrose of Camaldoli 143.
 Ambroisus Catharinus 317.
 Ambrosius & Origen 174 .
 Analogy of Faith 220.
 Anastasius 2nd. (Pope) 241 ; 487.
 Anatolius of Constantinople 401 ; 404 .
 Andradius (Defence of the Council of Trent) 3.1. - 383.; 181 ; 393.
 Anointing in Baptism 355 f.
 Anselm of Lucca 490 .
 Anthony, Cardinal of Florence 411.
 Antichrist 244 ; 341 ; 439 ; 479.
 * Apollinaris on Scripture 169.
 Apostolate 463.
 Apostolic Canons 85 ; Canon 9 on the Eucharist 275.
 Apostolic Constitutions 8.13 on the Eucharist 255 .
 Appeals 446 ; to Rome 442 f. ; of the African Bishops 447 .
 Arius 285.
 Articles -- 39 of the Church of England ; No. 17 127 f. 370 .
 No. 37 and 38 498 .
 Association The **50 m.**
 Assumptio (Eucharist) 253

* ἀρετήματα 244
 ἀυτονομία 439

Athanasius Scripture the most exact source 344.

Contra Gentes (Chemnitz adds 'every' to the text) 167

History of the Arians 226.

De Incarnatione sect. 57 344

(Spurious) Letter to Felix 2nd. 394.

Augsburg -Confession of (1530 AD) on both kinds 271.

ΔΥΘΕΝΤΙΚΩΣ 384.

ΔΥΤΟΠΙΣΤΟΣ ε ΔΪΦΙΟΠΙΣΤΟΣ 342 and 346 .

Augustine of Hippo Ep. 98 to Boniface on the Eucharist 240;253.

Ep. 118 on Councils 392.

Ep. Contra Fundament. sect. 4. 303 ; 306.

sect. 5. 340 ; 349.

Contra Ep. Parmen. 2 on Schism and Unity 423 f.

Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagian. 1. 217.

Contra Faust. 20,21 on the Eucharist 261.

Contra Petilian. on Tradition 106.

on Ps. 33 (Eucharist) 252.

Sermo 181 (on Credo) 373.

Tract 35 on John 348.

De Agone Christi 20 297.

De Baptismo 2.3. 391 ; 2.7.(on Tradition) 116 ;

4.17 (on the Church) 283.

De Civitate Dei 11.3. (on Scripture) 342 ; 15.3(on

Translations)180 ; 17.20 and 18.16(on the

Canon) 86 ; 19.18 (on Scripture) 170 ; 22.8. (on

the Eucharist) 274.

Confessions 6.5. 381 ; 8.1. 525 .

De Doctr. Christ. 2.11 (on Scriptures) 176,194,376 ;

4.15 (Church as the Medium of

Faith) 351.

Enchiridion sect. 59 (on the angels) 144.

De Pastoribus 12 (where the true Church is to be
found) 168

Retractiones 1.20 197.

De Trinitate 3.4.10 (on the Eucharist) 240

De Utilitate Credendi 3.7. (on Scriptural Media) 380

Augustinianism 29.

16(on Eucharist) 240

Baius Michael at Trent 515

Balsamon Theodore 398 , 443.

Bancroft. R. 19

Baptism (Cyprian Ep. 70) Christm at 355 ; Infant 353 ; Luther and
Calvin on Infant Baptism 350 ; Thomas Aquinas on Infant

Baptism 353 .

Barclay. William 508.
Barker (Printer) 163

Baro Peter ~~25507~~

Baronius 360

Barrett William **515**

Basil De Spiritu Sancto 2.6. 180 ; 2.27 205 ; 7.16 102.
30. 441.

Ep. 52 and 90 440

Ep. 63 210

Ep. 93 on the Eucharist 270

on Psalm 115 385

Basilides (Spanish Bishop) 416

Bellarmino Robert, alterations from MS lectures to printed editions **49** ;
5 rules to discern genuine from spurious traditions 108 f. ;
on tradition 116 , 130 , 139 ; on Scriptures 119 ; all truth
contained in Scriptures 146 ; on Bishops 497 ; rational grounds
of tradition 157 ; De Eucharist. **Cap. V on the consecration** in
the Eucharist 273 ; on the 15 notes of the true church 303-319 ;
on the Papacy 416-9 ; 434 ; 480 ; on Appeals to Rome 439 .

Battifol 244.

Belief 381.

Berengar of Tours on the Eucharist 233 , 241 , 265 f.

Bernard De Consideratione 432.

Beza on the Vulgate 178 ; Life of Calvin 322.

Biel Gabriel 386-7.

Bilson. T. 19

Bishops parity of authority de jure Apostolico et Divino 497 ;
collegiality of 453 - 457 ; *Χριστιαν* 436 .

Bolsec 322

Boniface 1 (Pope) 581

Boniface 2nd. " Letter to Caesarius of Arles (531 AD) 366

Boniface 9th. " 433

Bonaventura 126

Bonosus 113 ; 447 .

Bombinus 53.

- Bosgrave **50. l.**
- Braccioli Antonio 93
- Branchazellus John 495
- Bucer on the Eucharist 253
- Bude William 384
- Burghley **50n**, 57, 500, 509.
- Burton E (Apostolic Fathers) 474
- Butler Cuthbert 204, 431.
- Caius 95
- Cajetanus on 1 Cor 14 208 f; on Hebrews 98,157; on the Church 318;
on Nicholas IV 362; on the Canon 335.
- Calixtines 269
- Calvin Institutes 4.1. 278; 4.16.1-24 272 f.; on Henry VIII of
England 65. *Predestination 503f.* *on the Church 3: on Ministry 18.*
- Campion **12:50j**; Sermon at Rheims 39; Brag **50m**; Ten Reasons **50o**;
Letter to the University 51; Tower Conferences 53; on
Trent 388, 391.
- Canisius on Tradition 118; on the Church 302.
- Canon of Scripture 75; Eusebius on 62; Trent 75; Jerome 80,86;
Rufinus 81; Melito of Sardis 82; Augustine 86; Cajetan 90,
335; Cosin 91; written 125; 'deuterocanonical' books 379.
- Canons (C. of E.) 1571 AD -- 541; 1603 AD--498.
- Canons Arabic 392 f.
- Canus Melchior 179, 387.
- Capernaitical (Capharnaitical) Presence in the Eucharist 234
- Carranza 399.
- Castellio 58, 78.
- Celestine 1 (Pope) Letter of Cyril of Alexandria on Nestorius 441.
Letter if African Bishops on Nicene Canons 395f.
- Celestine 3 (Pope) on marriage 361, 490.
- Chaderton **10:50**.
- Charke ~~#~~, 51.
- Chemnitz 146, 167, 388, **512**.
- Christopherson 122, 375.
- Chrometus 90.

Chrysostom & Eudoxia 425.

on Ps. 95 and Hom. 13 on 2 Cor. (Scripture as the sole source of sure doctrine and the exact balance and rule of all things) 168.

Hom. 10.8. on Genesis 345.

Hom. 55 on Matthew 299.

Hom. 76 on Matthew (Eucharist) 252.

Hom. 82 on Matthew (Eucharist) 251.

Hom. 9 on Colossians 202.

on 1 Tim. 3.15 328.

Hom 1 on Titus 342.

De Sacerdotio 3 and Hom . 24 on 1 Cor (Real Presence) 250

Letter to Caesarius of Nazianzus (d. 369 AD) 244.

Church 277 ; Luther 285 ; Arius 285 ; Cyprian 285 ; Cyril of Jerusalem 285 ; the term 'Catholic' 287 ; has two meanings 295 ; the catechumens 290 ; the excommunicated 292 ; holiness 298 ; complementum Petri 299 ; Spouse of Christ 300 ; Augustine 301,303 ; antiquity 305 f. ; Irenaeus 310 ; Tertullian 313 ; Bp. Gore 315 ; Jewel 316 ; Episcopal Succession 309 , 316 ; Whitaker's desire for unity 318 ; 'praeco' 342 ; *αὐτόπριος* & *ἐπίπριος* 346 ; miracles 319 ; Polycrates of Ephesus (the church a pure virgin during the time of the Apostles -- quoted by Thomas Müntzer as a quotation from Hegesippus in his Sermon 'Before the Princes' 1524 AD, possibly the first use of this in Reformation polemic) 325 ; errancy of 327 ; the pillar and ground of truth (1 Tim.3.15) 328 ; instar tabellionis 339.

Clement of Alexandria 61.

Clement(Pseudo) of Rome, Epistola Clementis 475

Clovis 428

Cochlaeus 322

Comestor Peter 483

Compsanus 515

Concupiscence 519 , 523 .

Constans (Emperor 648 AD) 230

Constantine (Emperor) at Nicea 166 ; 'Donation ' of 412.

- Constantine 1 (Pope) 429
- Copus Alan⁴⁵445
- Corpus Juris Canonici 497
- Cosin 91
- Councils Ecumenical 391 ; Acts 15 341 ; 1 Nicea (325AD) No. of
 Canons 390 ,the 5th. Canon 446 , 6th. Canon 396 , Arabic Canons
 392 f. ; Sinuessa 448 ; Rome (340AD) 224 ; Sardica (343/4AD)
 443 ; Rome (378 AD) 551 ; Laodicea 91, 141,334 ;
 1 Constantinople (381 AD) 400 ; Capua (391 AD) 447 ;
 3 Carthage 83 ; XI Carthage (407AD) 445 ; Milevis (416 AD) 218 ;
 16th. Carthage (418 AD) 445 ; 17th. Carthage (418 AD) 446 ;
 Chalcedon (451 AD) 9th. and 28th. Canons 401 f. ; Macon(585AD)
 on the Eucharist 253 ; Braga (675 AD) 269 ; 3 Constantinople
 (680 AD) 443 ; Quini-Sext (692 AD) 85 (Canon 55) , 405 ;
 2 Nicea (787 AD) Canon 1 341 , 400 , Canon 13 404, 406 ;
 Westminster (1175 AD) 269 ; Clermont (Canon 28) 270 ;
 Constance (1415 AD) on both kinds 264 , 269 ; 5th. Lateran
 (1512-7 AD) 409 ; Trent (1546-65AD) 236 , 274 ,388 , 407 ;;on the
 doctrine of intention 317 , 391 .
- Cranmer on the Eucharist 273
- Cyprian on the Primacy 451 ; Ep. 55 and Ep. 69 452 ; Ep. 66 Ad
 Puppianum on the episcopate 457 ; Ep. 68 to Pope Stephen 418 ;
 Ep. 70 on anointing 355 ; Ep. 74 Ad Pompeium 170 , 214 (fount-
 -ain Head of Scripture) ; De Oratione Dominica 207. ; on John 2.1
 (ἡ ἀνοστοιχεῖν) in Eusebius) 241 ; De Lapsis 6.16 on
 the Eucharist 268 ; De Unitate Eccles. IV 449 f.
- Cyril of Alexandria De Rectā Fide ad Reginas (on Scripture) 169
 Ep. Ad Calosyrium (on the Eucharist) 253
 Letter to African Bishops (on Nicene Canons) 393
 Letter to Pope Celestine on Nestorius 441.
- Cyril of Jerusalem on the Church 304 ; on Scripture 345 ; Catecheses
 Mystagogicae (i.e. Catecheses 19-23) 159 ; Myst. Cat. 3.3. on
 Eucharist 241 ; Myst. Cat. 4 on the Eucharist 248, 268 .
- Dante 487
- Darwell Stone on the Eucharist 234
- Day,Dean of Windsor at the Tower Conferences 52

- Deansley Margaret 197
 Decretals False 410
 Dedham Classis 505
 Descent into Hell 127 , 370 f.
 De Torquemada 434
 Digby Everard 507
 Didache 9.1. on the Eucharist 268
 Didymus of Alexandria on Ps. 36 (on the Eucharist) 268
 Didymus the Blind 113
 Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite 140 - 142.
 Dionysius of Alexandria 379
 Dionysius Petavius 458
 'Donation' of Constantine 412
 Duraeus 70, 72 ; on tradition 100 ; on descensus ad inferos 368 ; on
 Gregory Nazianzen 390 ; on Jerome 420 .
 Durandus 384.
- Ecumenical Bishop 388 , 427 .
 Ἐκ θεοῦ of Heraclius (Emperor) 230.
 Eliot George 57.
 Elizabeth (Queen of England) and Trent 389.
 Epiphanius the Deacon 234.
 Epiphanius of Salamis Haeres., 39; Scripture the true Anchor (Ἀγκυρωτός)
 463 ; on homoousios 126 ; on tradition 147 ; on the Eucharist
 (Ἀγκυρωτός 57) 249 ; on Jerome 420 .
 Epistle of James 55, 59 ; Origen on 61.
 Erasmus 93 , 223 , 318 (on dissension in the church) , 466 , 483.
 Ethiopian Enoch 22.1-14 369.
 Eucharist Capernaitical Presence 234 ; Eutychius of Constantinople 234;
 Transubstantiation 235 ; Tertullian 237; Ambrose 238, 249 ;
 Chrysostom 250 f.; Augustine 252 ; Justin Martyr 254 ;
 Remains 253 ; Guitmund 266 ; Article 28 259 ; unbloody
 sacrifice 259 ; John of Damascus 257 ; Whitaker's unpublished
 MS 261 ; the miraculous 266 ; Radbert, Berengar, Ratramn, and
 Peter Lombard 268 f.; Reservation 270 ; both kinds 271 ;
 Trent 272 ; sacrifice of the mass 272 ; Bellarmine 273 ;

Private masses 274 ; Calvin 274 ; Luther 276 ; children 362 .

Eudoxia (Empress) 425

Eudoxius of Antioch 417

Eugubinus Bishop 387

Εὐδοκία }
Εὐχαριστία } 238

Eusebius (Bishop of Rome 310AD) 439

Eusebius H.E. IV.8 325 ; IV. 24.4. 325 .

Demonstratio Evangeliaa 1.6. 203

1.10. 260

Eutropius, Appendix on Pope Sylvester 415.

Eutychianism 414

Evagrius H.E. 4.36. on the Eucharistic Remains 255

4.16 on Justinian the Elder 325

Evangelus 421.

Exarch 442.

Faber Stapulensis 246 , 472.

Fall of Adam 509

Felix 2nd. (Pope) 228

Felix 3rd. (Pope) 400

Fides informis }
Fides formata } 462

Field (notary) 53

Field Richard, Dean of Gloucester 407

Filioque Clause 339

Finde J. (1583) II.

Florinus 146

Formosus (Pope) 489 f.

Formula of Concord 13

Fulke William 478.

Galla Placidia 413

Gallican Confession - Article 36 on the Lord's Supper 263

Gardiner Bishop , on the Royal Supremacy 66

Gatacre Thomas 542

Gavin 236

Gelasius I (Pope) on the Eucharist 267, 269; Letters 414.

- Gelasius of Cyzicus 393
- Gerson 336
- Gore Bishop 402
- Grant F.C. 196
- Gregory 1 (Pope) 34th. Homily on the Gospels 190
on Ecumenical Bishop 388, 427 f.
- Gregory 2nd.(Pope) Letter to Boniface 361.
- Gregory 3rd. (Pope) 428
- Gregory 7th. (Pope) 431
- Gregory 13th. (Pope) **50 k.** ; 57.
- Gregory of Nazianzen De Gorgona Sorore 250,271.
Ep. 130 Ad Procepium 390
- Gregory of Nyssa Orat. Catech. 37 on the Eucharist 268; on the Baptism
of Christ 234 .
- Grindal Archbp. 500
- Guitmund of Aversa on the Eucharist 265 f.
- Gorgonia 250
- Hadrian VI th. (Pope) 479
- Hammer ~~44~~, 51.
- Harding 64
- Hebrews Epistle to (canonical) 95 ; Eusebius 96 ; Cappadocian Fathers
97 ; Cajetan 98 .
- Hegesippus 472 , 545 .
- Heliodorus 90.
- Helvidius 113
- Henry 2nd. of England 432 , 495.
- Henry VIIIth. of England - as Head of Church 66.
- Henry IVth. of Germany 431.
- Heresy, violation of the Regula Fidei not of a dogma of the church 361;
definition of 491.
- Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367 AD) De Trinitate 8.13-17 (on the Eucharist) 248
Letter to Constantius on Councils 390.
- Hilderbert 479.
- Hippolytus (Philosophumena) 485
- Honorius 1 (Pope) 229, 400, 489.

- Hooker ^{16:} 498
- Hooper Bishop 372
- Horace (**Art of Poetry**) 198
- Horantius 302
- Hosius Stanislaus 193
- Hosius of Cordova 226 f.
- Hughes 389 f.
- Huss John 389.
- Ignatius, the problem of the Letters 246 ; Ad Rom. 144 ; on the Eucharist 245 ; Ad **Magnes.** 370.
- Index of Prohibited Books 192
- Innocent 1 (Pope) infant communion 32 ; and the African Councils (416 AD) 218 ; alleged excommunication of the Emperor Arcadius 424 ; Papal Primacy 551.
- Innocent 3 (Pope) 361.
- Instar Tabellionis 339
- Irenaeus Adv. Haeres. 1.1.15 on heretics 382
 1.27.1. on Succession 475
 3.1. Scriptures 160
 3.3.3. Rome the Higher Original 310
 3.4.1. the Regula Fidei 381
 3.3.8. on Gen. 3.15 184
 4. 18.4. and 33.2. Eucharist 247
 4.21.2. Church 313
 4.55 370.
- Itala Version 176
- James, canonical Epistle of **55**
- James , Bishop of Jerusalem 544
- Jansen 131
- Jerome on the Canon 84 f. ; Letter to Duodanus 96 ; Letter to Vitalis 180 ; to Marcella (Ep. 74) 181 ; to Evangelus (Ep.146) 421 ; on 1 Cor. XI. 275 ; Helmeted Preface 378 ; De Viris Illustr. sect. 15 (Succession Lists) 423 ; ibid sect. 45 (Polycrates of Ephesus) 421 .

- Jerome of Prague 389
- Jerusalem Bible 183 f.
- Sevel. John. 15*
John of Damascus De Fide Orthodoxā, on the Eucharist, 257.
- John 22nd. (Pope) 490
- John 4th. Patriarch of Constantinople 426
- John 8th. Paleologus 408
- Jugg, Printer 163
- Justification by Faith 66 ; Basil on 70 f. ; Duraeus on 72 .
- Justin Martyr Apol. 1.66 on the Eucharist 241, 247, 254, 268.
Dialogue with Trypho 72. (Descent into Hell)
- Justinian Novellae 137 (audible prayer) 209
131 (the Old Rome) 415
- Keys, power of 493
- Κηρύγμα* 150 f. ; 366.
- Knox Eleazor 509
- Lambeth Articles 530 f.
- Lambeth, Synod of (1281 AD) on both kinds 269
Lancashire and the Recusants. 8.
- Lanfranc on the Eucharist 265
- Langdale 500
- Latomus 67
Laynes. 21
- Leo I (Pope) and the Papacy 461 ; Tome 399 ; 402 ; Sermo 3 462 .
- Leo VIII (Pope) 429
- Leo X Luther to Erasmus 93
- Liberius (Pope) 225 f.
- Lindanus 118, 302.
- Lombard Peter 461
- Lucianic Version of LXX 174
- Lucius 3rd. (Pope) 433
- Luther 55f. ; analogy of Faith 220 f ; 231 ; death 325.
- Lyndwood W. Provinciale of canons 496.
- Macarius of Egypt Hom 27 244
- Machiavelli 430
- Marcion , Emperor 400 f.
- Marriage of clergy 495

Marseus , History of 491
 Marsilius of Padua 415, 495
 Martin Gregory 164
 Mary BVM ,perpetual virginity 113
 Mathias Flaccus 431
 Mayne Cuthbert **12**
 Maurice Emperor 428
 Merit Condign and Congruous **512**
 Milan, seat of the Emperors 414
 Miltiades, 'prima sedes a nemine judicabitur' 448
 Montanus Arias 93

μεταμορφώσεις	Eucharist	234
μεταρρηθμίσεις	"	252
μετασκευάσεις	"	252
μεταστοιχειώσθαι	"	243
μετονομίας	"	238
μετουσίωσις	"	236

Müntzer 24.

Newman J.H. 452
 Nicene Creed 301
 Nicephorus, Byzantine Historian 117 , 425
 Nicholas of Cusa 411
 Nicholas of Lyra 231
 Nicholas IV (Pope) 362
 Nichols John 57
 Nicomedia 414
 Nilus 431
 Norton Thomas 54
 Novatian 517
 Nowell Alexander 5f; Prima Institutio Pietatis Christianae **40** ;
 Catechism **40** ; Tower Conferences 52.
 Oecumenius on 1 Cor. 13 68
 οἶκος formula 350 (note)
 ὁμοίως οὐσίας 227
 ὁμοούσιος 125, 182 , 317.

- Origen 3 methods of interpreting Scripture 232
 Hom. 20 on Joshua 208 (Philocalia 12)
 Hom 46 on Matthew (Traditions) 101
 De Princip. 4 223, 345 f.
 Tetrapla , Hexapla, Octapla 174
- Original Sin 126 , 510 , 511-2.
- Otto, Bishop of Freising 412
- Otto Emperor 429
- Pacian 305
- Palmer John 506
- Παύ^c ο^c in Gal.1.9. 151
- Parsons 'Brief Censure' 46
- Paschasius (440 AD) 397
- Paschasius Radbert on the Eucharist 267
- Paul's (St.) use of the Apocryphal Books 378
- Paul Cathalanus 412
- Paulus Longus (Chronicon) 491
- Paxentius 126
- Peiresius 112
- Perkins William 509 f.
- Peter of Aliacus 419
- Peter Damian (c. 1072 AD) -- use of 'transubstantio' 235
- Peter (St.) at Rome 470 ; Antioch 544 f ; Corinth 555 ; Alexandria 555;
 titles of 436 ; Rock 458 ; the 24 Petrine Prerogatives
 inherited in the Papacy 464 ; Paul 468 ; Simon Magus 469.
- Phoebadius of Agen 228
- Pippin 428
- Pisan Constitution 495
- Pius I (Pope) 422
- Pius IV (Pope) Publication of Index 192
- Pius V Bull Regnans in Excelsis (1570 AD) 50j
- Platena on Lucius 3rd. and Boniface 9th. 433
- πληροφόρια of Scripture 87, 364
- Polycrates of Ephesus 325

Pope power of deposition and confirmation 418
 power of excommunication 424 f.
 and councils 399 ; binding the conscience 494 ; errancy of
 popes 480 - 484 ; judged by none 448 .

Poude *Thomas 50^m* 52
Predestination 503f.
 Primatus 397 , 451

Probabilism 327

Proclūs 95

προεστία 417 , 401.
Progressive Revelation. 32
 Prosper of Aquitaine 413

προστασία 401

Prynne William **515**

Psalter , recensions of 177

Pseudo-Cyprian Adv. Judaeos 10 382

Puñcheria Empress , and Leo , 401

Quadriga , the fourfold sense of Scripture 230

Rainolds William 'Refutation' 1583 AD complains of Beza's
 corruption of Acts 3.21 263
 'Antidote' (on the Eucharist) 236

Ratramn on the Eucharist 266

Ravenna 414

Recusancy 13

Regula Fidei 381, 360.

Reparatus 400

Restitutus of Carthage 228

Ridley, Bishop, on the Eucharist 267

Royal Supremacy 498

Rufinus 368-71 ; 398 ; 413 .

Rufus Remundus 449

Runciman on John VIII Paleologus 408

Sabellicus 228

Sabinus Bishop of Merida (Spanish Appeal) 416

Sanders Nicholas 302 , 478

Saravia Adrian a. 20

- Scripture variations in Protestant texts 64 ; sufficiency of 150 ; not to be added to 151 f. ; perfection of 160 ; Luther 160 ; Origen 165, 174, 203, 232 ; Basil 167 ; Augustine 168, 170 ; Vincent of Lerins 171 ; Authentic Version (of Trent) 172 f. ; Versions of 173 ; Itala Version 176 ; Jerome's Vulgate 176 ; Recensions of 177 ; Defects of Vulgate 183 ; scriptures in the vernacular 192 ; Douai-Rheims version 193 ; Anglo-Saxon versions 195 f ; English versions 200 ; Chrysostom 202 ; right sense of scripture 211 ; audibility of 206 ; literal inspiration 234 ; interpretations 223, 230 ; obscurantism 223 ; Quadriga 230 ; Canon 331 ; private persuasion and the Canon (Luther and Calvin) 359 ; degrees of inspiration 363 ; Sixtus Senensis on the Canon 374 .
- Severinus Binius 453
- Sign of the Cross 104
- Simon Magus 469
- Sinuessa , Synod of 448
- Siricius 447, 496 , 551
- Sirmium 414
- Sleidanus 323
- Some Dr. 528
- Southwark Synod of 502
- Stapleton on *ἁποστόλιον* 125 ; the Church 303 f. ; infallibility 346 f ; misquotes Luther and Calvin 359 ; Canon 362 ; Original Sin 510 ; The Fall 518 .
- Star Chamber 499
- Stephen (Pope) and Cyprian 214
- Stoche R. --translation of Whitaker's Reply to the Ten Reasons 51
- Succession Apostolic 462
- Succession Lists (Bishops of Rome) 475
- Sulpicius Severus 469
- σύνα φη* 234
- σφραγίς* 354-5.
- Sylvester (Pope) 397

Scriptural References.

Gen. 3.15,17 ; 4.15 ; 6. 3,5,6, ; 9.6. ; 14,18 ; 21,9 ; 24,22 ;
 27,33 ; 37,2 ; 38,5 ; 39,6 ; 49,32 -----183 - 187
 Dt. 4,2 148 ; 4,6 201 ; 6,6-9 201 ; 12,32 148 ; 17,12 492 ;
 27,26 148 ; 31,11,12, 201 .
 PSS 16.10 369 ; 19.18 154 ; 22.17 180 ; 119.2. 155 .
 Nehem. 8. 193
 Ezra 9.8. 187
 Micah 5.2. 187
 Ecclus.25 198

Mt. 1.23 113	Luke 1.3-4 154	John 5.39 201
3.2. 189	1.28. 190	14.26. 189
4.10. 155	1.35. 113	16.12 130
6.7. 189	3.13. 190	21.25. 131
9.13. 187	6.11. 190	
13.52. 340	12.42. 463	
14.26. 189	15.8. 190	
16.18 461, 545, 548.	16.19. 154	
18.17 215	18.8. 326	
20.15 189	22.10. 162	
26.61. 189	22.19. 270	
	23.43. 369	

Acts. 2.42 190	Romans 7.25 190
2.47 289	11.6. 189
3.18 190	12.6. 220
12.17 555	12.19 478
15.1-22 341	13.1-5 492-4.
15.28-29 493	1 Cor. 3.5. 191
17.2-3 155	9. 133
18.5. 190	10.27-29 493
20.17-18 165	11.16 137
22.12. 190	11.25. 270
26.2. 155	14 208, 216.
Romans 1.4. 189	15.54 478

2 Cor.	1.24	348	1 Tim.	2.4.	512
Gal.	1.8-9	151		3.2.	495
	3.24.	191		6.3.	137
Ephes.	1.22	191		6.20	135
	6.13.	189	2 Tim.	1.13.	136
1 Thess.	2.17	343		3.15.	328
	5.21.	529		3.16-17	153,358
2 Thess.	2.15.	134	Philemon	9	191
			1 Peter	2.13.	494
				3.18 - 4.6.	368-371.
			1 John	1.4.	156
			Revn.	21.10.	285
				22.18.	150

Tarasius 400

Θείος 166

Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Eucharist 244

Theodoret of Cyrrihus on the sacrifice of the Eucharist 242,245 ;
Hist. 4.19 199 ; Therapeutic Discourses 5. 203.

Theodosian Code 339

Theodosius I and Ambrose of Milan (Massacre in Thessalonica) 426

Theophilus, Patriarch of Constantinople 424

Theophylact on Luke 1.2. 157

Θεόπρεπτος 167, 358

Tertullian De Corona Militis 4 on Tradition 68, 101 ;

De Praescriptione on tradition 101

De Praescriptione 21,32, and 36 on the Church 313 f.

De Praescriptione 29 on the Church 307

Adv. Prax. 1. 487

De Anima 55 370

Ad Uxor. 2.5. on the Eucharist 268

2nd. Prologue to the Commentary on Galatians (thundering
Amen) 206

Thomas Aquinas on Philip.3.1. 158 ; on 'Credo Deum' 373 ; on faith 357 ;
on Original Sin 503 ; Predestination 505.

Tower Conferences 52 f.

Tradition, secret 31, 100 f ; customs (signing the Cross; turning to the East, Triple Immersion , Renunciation of Satan,) 105; heretical 109 ; definition of 110 ; classification of 112; genuine and spurious 115 ; Epiphanius 147 .

Transubstantiation 235

Tremellius 39

506

Trent, Council of 21, 83, 93, 204, 236 , 274 , 372, 391, 511.

Treves 414.

Turrecremata John 362, 468.

Turrianus 285, 411, 473.

Tyconius 213.

Ullmann Dr. Walter 474

Uxbridge Conferences 41.

Valla Laurence on Pseudo-Dionysius 143 ; on the 'Donation' of Constantine 411.

Varinus on the Canon 383.

Vatican 2 206, 409, 456.

Victor , and Polycrates on the date of Easter 422 f.

Vigilius (Pope) 400 , 488.

Vincent of Lerins Comm. 2. 171 ; Comm 2.2. 192.

Volaterranus Raphael 412

Vox Ecclesiae 384, 338, 337, 363, 343.

Walsingham 34-5 ; 53; 57 .

Whitaker William Gatacre on 6:38: Bishop Hall on 38 ; Hartgrave School 6 ; translates Nowell's Catechism and Tremellius' Catechism 38 f. ; Short Sum of Christianity 41 ; marriage to Susan Culverwell 43 ; sons Samuel and Alexander 43-44; Regius Professor 50 ; on the Song of Songs 50g; Reply to the Ten Reasons 51 ; Tower Conferences 52 ; Canon of Scripture 76; on Tradition 100 ; on the Creed 367 ; on the Church 376; on the 'Donation of Constantine' and False Decretals 410; Master of St. John's 500 ; on Predestination 510 ; Lambeth Articles 513 f.; Swan Song 516 ; Death 520 ; Funeral 520 . Importance of 521 f.

Whitgift Archbishop John 26,246 ; Lambeth Articles 515 f. ; 500.
William of Occam 415
William of Paris 510
Zepherinus (Pope) 484
Zonaras 443
Zosimus 483.
