

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 2—April, 1906.

I.

TERTULLIAN AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

THIRD ARTICLE.

IN a discussion printed in the two immediately preceding numbers of this REVIEW * it has been pointed out that there is discoverable in Tertullian's modes of statement a rather distinct advance towards the conception of an immanent Trinity. We wish now to inquire how far this advance is to be credited to Tertullian himself, and how far it represents modes of thought and forms of statement current in his time, and particularly observable in Tertullian only because he chanced to be dealing with themes which invited a fuller expression than ordinary of this side of the faith of Christians.

We have already seen that there is a large traditional element in Tertullian's teaching; that even the terms, "Trinity" and "Economy," in which his doctrine of the distinctions within the Godhead is enshrined, are obviously used by him as old and well-known terms; and that he betrays no consciousness of enunciating new conceptions in his development of his doctrine, but rather writes like a man who is opposing old truth to new error.

* THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, October, 1905, pp. 529-557; January, 1906, pp. 1-36.

IV.

THE SACRAMENTAL THEORY OF THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

THE study of the sacraments introduces us to the theology of the Middle Ages at one of the two or three points where it was most busy and put forth its keenest speculative force. For the Latin Church, the results of this speculation continue to be of permanent authority. Against it the Reformers waged high war. It was here that Luther began his struggle. The four great constructions of the mediæval Church are the papal fabric, the sacramental system, the universities and the cathedrals. These all continue to move mankind profoundly. If Protestant Christendom rejects the two former, we may yet admire the patience and pious purpose with which the mediæval theologian labored to rear them. The critical questions with which Christian scholars of the present age are concerned he did not dream of. The integrity of the books of Scripture was assumed, and the superiority of the Christian system it did not enter into his head to question. He was living in another age. Metaphysics, not a critical apparatus, were his chief instrument of study. He knew nothing of negative criticism. His exegesis was not all sound and his conclusions were often at variance with apostolic teaching. This, however, he did: he attempted to construct something, and, as it proved, he constructed a vast doctrinal and ecclesiastical fabric fortified by arguments on every side. He confided in the powers of the human intellect to solve every possible question which may present itself from the heavens above or the earth beneath. His conclusions may be wrong, and at no point are they more wrong than in his teachings concerning the sacraments, but his high purpose deserves recognition, and his teachings deserve respectful study.*

* With the exception of Alexander of Hales, I have used and quoted the works of the Schoolmen at first hand. For Duns Scotus I have depended chiefly upon Seeberg's valuable volume, *Die Theologie des Johannes Duns Scotus*, Leip., 1900, as well as upon Schwane's *Dogmatik der mittlern Zeit*, Freiburg, 1882, and Stöckl's *Philosophie des Mittelalters*. Schwane's is the best work devoted specifically to the theology of the Middle Ages. Its learned author is a Catholic. The best Protestant works on the history of Christian doctrine are, in English, Prof. Fisher, and in German, Loofs, Harnack and Seeberg.

The period to which the construction of the mediæval sacramental system belongs covers 150 years, from 1150–1300, from Abælard to Duns Scotus. This leaves out Anselm, who contributed nothing to the discussion and touched upon the sacraments only in a passing way. Other great thinkers participating in the discussion were Hugo de St. Victor, d. 1141; Robert Pullen, d. 1155; Peter the Lombard, d. 1160; Alexander of Hales, d. 1145; Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, d. 1274, and Albertus Magnus, d. 1280—two Frenchmen, three Italians, one German and three Englishmen. To the narrower circle in this list belong Hugo de St. Victor, Alexander of Hales and Thomas Aquinas, and of these three the most eminent is Thomas Aquinas. Thomas, whom Leo XIII pronounced the chief authority for Catholic theology, gave to the doctrine of the sacraments its final theological statement. The substance of this statement was adopted by the Œcumenical Councils of Ferrara, 1439, and of Trent, a hundred years later, and thus became dogma for the Catholic Church.

Some idea of the importance ascribed to the sacraments by the mediæval theologian may be gotten from the amount of space he devoted to their discussion. Hugo de St. Victor devotes to it a special treatise of 440 pages.* Peter the Lombard gives 90 pages out of the 453 pages covered by his *System of Theology*, the *Sentences*;† Bonaventura 1003 pages out of the 3875 pages of his *System of Theology*;‡ and Thomas Aquinas 670 pages out of the 4854 pages of his *Summa*.§ These and other Schoolmen sought to exhaust the subject by answering every possible question that might suggest itself. In doing so, as in all their theological discussions, they freely quoted the Scriptures and, for the theological definitions, the Fathers, relied chiefly upon Augustine.|| Then by their own reasoning they elaborated and systematized the treatment.

* Migne's edition, Vol. 176.

† Migne's ed.

‡ Peltier's ed. The treatment of the sacraments is found in Vols. V, 241–709, VI, 1—535.

§ Migne's ed., Vol. IV, 543–1217. Thomas also treated the subject in his *Commentary on Peter the Lombard's Sentences*. More than 1000 pages of his *Summa* are devoted to the department of ethics, a subject omitted from our modern Protestant Systems of Theology. It is interesting to note the amount of space given to the treatment of the sacraments by some of our more recent works on theology. Dr. Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology* contains 2260 pages and devotes to them 207 pages; Dr. Shedd's *Dogmatic Theology*, 25 pages out of 1348; Dr. E. V. Gerhart's *Institutes*, 84 pages out of 1666, and Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*, 30 pages out of 600.

|| Ambrose and John of Damascus are the next favorites among the Fathers, after Thomas Aquinas on the sacraments.

The number of the sacraments, which had been a matter of uncertainty in the patristic church, came to be fixed at seven largely by the authority of Peter the Lombard and Thomas Aquinas. Augustine had called exorcism and the giving of salt to catechumens sacraments, and also marriage, but he nowhere fixed their number. Bernard spoke of ten sacraments, including footwashing among them. Abælard and Robert Pullen enumerated five. Hugo de St. Victor in his special treatise *de sacramentis*, using the term in the wider sense of a religious rite, spoke of no less than thirty sacraments.* In this list he placed the sprinkling with ashes on Ash Wednesday and the application of holy water to the person.† The Third Lateran Council, 1179, also used the term in a wide sense and included the investiture of bishops and burial among the sacraments.‡ Thomas Aquinas also ascribed a quasi-sacramental character to such rites as the use of holy water and exorcism which he calls *quædam sacramentalia*.§ But of sacraments this Schoolman knew only seven, the number afterwards adopted at Ferrara and Trent—baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders and marriage.

The indispensable mark of a Christian sacrament, according to Thomas Aquinas, is that it was instituted by Christ. All the Schoolmen were not agreed on this point, and Peter the Lombard expressly said that extreme unction was instituted by the apostles. Thomas replied that the unction with oil, commended by James, presupposes the prior ordinance of Christ.|| As for the sacrament of confirmation Thomas declared that, although no special command could be adduced in its favor, it was involved in the promise of the Holy Spirit. The command enjoining penance, as we shall see, the Schoolmen based upon a false translation of the Greek by Jerome.

* In his *System of Theology*, the *Summa sententiarum*, Migne, 176, p. 127 *sqq.*, Hugo seems to recognize only five—baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance and extreme unction. He follows up their treatment with a treatment of marriage, but I do not see that he calls it a sacrament at this point.

† Migne, p. 473: The *aqua aspersionis*, mixed with salt, Hugo derives from Alexander, fifth pope from Peter. The use of palm branches he also includes in the list of the sacraments. ‡ Canon 7.

§ *Summa*, III; 651, Migne, IV, 597; *Supplem.*, XXIX, 1, p. 1025. The *Sentences* of Rolandus (afterwards Alexander III), ed. by Gietl, preceded the Lombard in fixing the number at seven. The old view that it was fixed by Otto of Bamberg is untenable. At a later period, Durandus denied to marriage a sacramental character. See Schwane, p. 586. In 1479, Peter, professor at Salamanca, was tried for excluding penance from the list of the sacraments.

|| The Council of Trent asserted distinctly of extreme unction that it was instituted by Christ (Sess. XIV, 1).

There were sacraments under the old dispensation, such as circumcision and the paschal lamb, but, as Augustine had said, these differ from the sacraments of the Christian dispensation, in that they did no more than to prefigure and give promise of coming realities. They did not contain and confer grace.* In man's estate of innocence the sacraments were not needed. Marriage in that period had no sacramental character.

Ingenuous attempts were made to prove the necessity of seven sacraments, and no more. Their "congruity" was dwelt upon, that is their adaptation to meet all the wants and maladies of fallen man. As specific remedies are correlated to the diseases of the body, so these are correlated to all the defects and needs of the soul—baptism to the deficiency of spiritual life, confirmation to spiritual weakness in those recently born, the eucharist to the temptation to fall into sin, *labilitas animi ad peccandum*, penance to sins actually committed after baptism, extreme unction to sins not cleared away by penance, ordination to the lost condition of the race, marriage to concupiscence and the annihilation of the race by natural death. The seven correspond to the seven virtues—baptism, the eucharist and extreme unction to faith, love and hope, ordination to enlightenment, penance to righteousness, confirmation to endurance, and marriage to continence. Bonaventura elaborates at length a stimulating comparison drawn from the career of the soldier. The sacraments furnish grace for the spiritual struggle and strengthen the spiritual warrior at various stages of his conflict. Baptism equips him on entering the battle; confirmation encourages him in its progress; extreme unction helps him at the finish; the eucharist and penance renew his strength; orders introduce new recruits into the ranks and marriage furnishes men to be recruits.

In defining what constitutes a sacrament, *quid est sacramentum*, the Schoolmen all start from Augustine's definitions. A sacrament is a symbol of a sacred reality, the visible sign of an invisible grace.† They are visible signs of divine things and may be compared to uttered words, *quasi verba visibilia*. The African Father made a distinction between the sacramental symbol and the virtue residing in the sacrament, so that in his controversy with the

* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 62, 6; Migne, IV, p. 569: "sacramenta veteris legis non habebant in se aliquam virtutem qua operarentur ad conferendam gratiam justificantem," etc.

† Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura (*Breviloquium*, Peltier's ed., VII, p. 311) and other Schoolmen also quote Augustine's definition: "sacramentum est in quo sub tegumento visibilibus rerum divina virtus secretius operatur salutem."

Donatists he was able to declare that heretical baptism was valid baptism, and yet that the full virtue of baptism is not realized until the person so baptized has entered the true Church. The Schoolmen were right in claiming Augustine for the theory of inherent sacramental grace.

Beginning with Hugo de St. Victor, the Schoolmen in unmistakable language assert that the sacraments contain and confer grace. They have virtue in themselves. Thomas Aquinas states that a sacrament is a symbol of a sacred thing so far as it has sanctifying power.* They are more than visible channels and signs of grace. They do more than signify. They sanctify. They are the efficient cause of gracious operations.† Grace is so inevitably connected with the symbol that where the symbol is there grace operates. This theory was adopted with the use of the term, *ex opere operato*, by Thomas Aquinas, who in this followed Alexander of Hales. He said "the sacraments justify and confer grace *ex opere operato*."‡ The Councils of Ferrara and Trent both use the expression that the sacraments "contain and confer" grace.

The favorite illustration for the operation of the sacraments is medicine. Hugo de St. Victor said God is the physician, man the invalid, the priest the minister, grace the antidote, the sacrament the vase. The physician gives, the minister dispenses, the vase contains spiritual grace which cures the invalid. Bonaventura entitled his chapters on the sacraments in the *Breviloquium* "Sacramental Medicine." The sacraments are remedies which the great Samaritan provided for the wounds of original and actual sin.

It would be false to conclude that the Schoolmen taught that this gracious operation of the sacraments was effected apart from Christ or irrespective of the disposition of the recipient. High Churchmen as they were, these theologians made the distinction between the ultimate cause of this operation and its instrumental cause. The virtue of the latter, that is the virtue of the sacrament, depends upon God's appointment and working.§ Protestant writers have often gone too far when they have represented the Schoolmen as ascribing a magical virtue to the sacraments, if not

**Summa*, III, 60, 2; Migne, IV, p. 543: "signum rei in quantum est sanctificans homines."

† Hugo of St. Victor says, *Summa*, IV, 1: "sacramentum est visibilis forma invisibilis gratiæ in eo collatæ, quam, scilicet confert ipsum sacramentum."

‡ "sacramenta justificant et gratiam conferunt ex opere operato." Thomas repeats this again and again.

§ *Summa*, III, 62, 1; Migne, IV, p. 562: "causa vero instrumentalis non agit per virtutem suæ formæ sed solum per motum quo movetur a principali agente."

irrespective of the divine appointment, then irrespective of the attitude of the recipient. Thomas Aquinas declares that the interior operation is due to Christ,* or, as he says in another place, to the blessing of Christ and the administration of the priest combined. As to the attitude of the recipients, the presupposition is that they are in a religious condition. They possess the disposition of Catholic Christians, or desire to have it. Thomas even says that faith is an element required for their proper reception. The virtue "of Christ's passion passes over to us through faith and the sacraments."† That the disposition is a matter of importance is shown by the requirement for baptism. Children of unbelievers and Jews, arriving at mature years, if they would be baptized must have the desire for the rite. And no children were to be baptized without the consent of their parents. That is, faith in one of its stages was required. Duns Scotus alone forms an exception on this point and allowed the forcible baptism of the children of Jews and even of Jewish adults, on the ground that their descendants in the fourth and fifth generations often proved to be good Christians. It is true that it remained for the Reformers to present the meaning of faith as it is set forth by Paul. With the Schoolmen faith is chiefly either intellectual assent as opposed to unbelief, or it is the assurance of things unseen. Faith, according to Hugo de St. Victor, is itself a sacrament, the sacrament of future contemplation. Contemplation is the reality of which faith is the symbol or prefiguration. Bonaventura says the Church received the sacraments from Christ and dispenses them to the salvation of the faithful,‡ *ad fidelium salutem dispensat*, that is to those who have a Christian disposition. It is well to lay emphasis on such points in order that, as far as possible, all barriers to Christian fellowship may be removed out of the way.

Duns Scotus, whose opinions were set aside by the Council of Ferrara for those of Thomas Aquinas, insisted that God can impart grace apart from the sacraments, and that their efficacy is felt through an action of the will of the recipient. The sacraments involve a psychological process in the recipient. As symbols they remind the soul of God's grace and draw the soul to it. It is sufficient for the reception of the sacraments if there be no moral im-

* *Summa*, III, 64, 3; Migne, p. 583: "interiorem sacramentorum effectum operatur Christus."

† "virtus passionis Christi copulatur nobis per fidem et sacramenta" (Migne, IV, p. 568).

‡ *Breviloquium*, VI, 5; Peltier's ed., VII, p. 316.

pediment,* or, as Duns puts it in another place, no impeding indisposition.† It is the very excellency of the sacraments of the new law that the very reception of them is a sufficient disposition to grace.

The relation the priest sustains to the sacrament is a vital one and, except in extraordinary cases, it is an essential one. The efficacy of the sacrament, however, does not depend upon the moral character of the officiating priest. To use the mediæval illustration, pure water is conveyed through a leaden pipe as well as through a silver one. The priest, empowered by the Church, acts not in his own name, but in the name of the Church, and in using the appointed ritual he gives voice to the intention of the Church.‡ Even if the intention of conferring grace be absent from the priest's mind, the efficacy of the sacrament is not withheld on that account. This was Augustine's teaching, and the Schoolmen follow him also in insisting that ultimately it is Christ who works the effect of the sacrament. The priest, according to Thomas, does not confer grace by any power in himself, but this is wrought by Christ who exercises his power through his priestly instruments.§ What other answer than this can Protestants give when we are confronted with the cases of unworthy ministers who have administered baptism and the Lord's Supper? The good effect of their ministerial acts does not depend upon the minister but upon God. Duns Scotus, with his hair-splitting refinements, differed at least in appearance from the great Dominican Thomas by declaring that "a virtual intention" on the part of the celebrant is essential to the efficacy of the sacrament. He illustrates his position by a pilgrim on the way to the shrine, say, of St. James. The pilgrim may not think of the saint during the whole progress of the journey, but he starts out with a "virtual intention" to go to the shrine and keeps on the way. A priest during the progress of sacramental administration may allow his mind to wander and forget what he is doing, nevertheless he has the virtual intention of performing the rite.

With an eye, perhaps, to the heretical sects of their age, the Schoolmen allowed a certain "usefulness" to the sacraments when

* *obix* is the word used. See Schwane, p. 581.

† "nisi impediatur indispositio ejus cui adhibetur," quoted by Seeberg, p. 343.

‡ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 64, 8: "minister sacramenti agit in persona totius ecclesiæ," etc.

§ *Summa*, III, 64, 5; Migne, IV, p. 586: "minister non gratiam conferunt sua virtute, sed hoc facit Christus sua potestate per eos sicut per quædam instrumenta."

administered outside the pale of "holy mother Church," as Bonaventura put it. They do not inure to salvation unless the recipients afterwards enter within the fold of the Church, outside of which there is no salvation. This he illustrated by Augustine's comparison of the Church to the garden of Eden. The four rivers flowing through Eden passed into different lands. Neither to Mesopotamia nor to Egypt, whither their waters flowed, did they carry the felicity of life which was felt in Eden. Nevertheless they were useful. So it is with the sacraments when administered outside the pale of the true Church.*

A distinction was made between baptism and the eucharist on the one hand and the other five sacraments on the other. It was a question not of divine institution but of degree of excellency. The first two, to use the precise term, are "the mightiest" of the sacraments, and of them the eucharist is the "most mighty," *potissimum*.† It is the "crown" of the sacraments, and for three reasons: (1) It contains Christ Himself after a substantial manner; (2) the other sacraments are preparatory to it; (3) all may participate in it—those who are in orders as well as those who are baptized and not in orders. Three sacraments have an indelible character—baptism, orders and confirmation. Their gracious mark cannot be erased. They cannot be repeated. The other four can be repeated and, to follow Thomas Aquinas, are necessary to life only as a horse may be necessary to a journey.‡

One sacrament alone is indispensable as a condition of salvation, baptism. Not the defect of the other sacraments damns, but the contempt of them. Hugo de St. Victor no doubt expressed the view of the mediæval Church when he said that "God might have saved man without the sacraments, but no man can be saved who rejects them."§ There is no sufficient evidence that the Schoolmen were led to construct their sacramental system by the spread of the mediæval heretical sects. That system was the natural product of the impulse to construct a complete body of theology whose parts should be closely compacted together by dialectics. The mediæval *summa* was the impregnable citadel of Church doctrine. And the theory of the Church as an outward institution, which Augustine also had expounded, controlled the minds of the great

* *Breviloquium*, V; Peltier's ed., VII, p. 317. The illustration is carried out at length.

† Thomas Aquinas, III, 62, 5; Migne, IV, p. 568.

‡ *Summa*, III, 65, 4; Migne, IV, p. 601.

§ *de sacr.*, I, 9, 5; Migne, 176, p. 325: "potuit enim deus hominem salvare etiam si ista non instituisset, sed homo nullatenus salvari posset si ista contemneret."

thinkers of the Middle Ages as well of its great actors, like Hildebrand and Innocent III. In building up their system of the sacraments, they felt they were strengthening the Church, for that system was the Church's chief gift from above and its chief weapon on the earth. They went too far. Their specious argumentation was without warrant in Scripture. It fed the superstitious reverence for the visible Church and the person and sacerdotal acts of the priest. The importance of the immediate contact of the soul with Christ was dimmed or lost. The sacramental system became the Church's Babylonish Captivity, as Luther called it in his famous tract, in which the rights and liberty of the Christian soul was fettered by the traditions of men.

A succinct statement will set forth the fundamental views of the Schoolmen on each of the sacraments in detail.

Baptism was defined by Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura and others as "the door" to the other sacraments and to the kingdom of heaven. It is indispensable to salvation, except in the case of those who desire to be baptized and have no opportunity to receive the rite. The desire on the part of such persons to be regenerated by water and the Spirit is certain evidence that they have already been regenerated.* It is the sacrament of regeneration and removes the guilt and punishment of original sin † and incorporates the recipient into the passion of Christ. The ablution of water signifies the clearing away of all guilt, and the freezing of water the subtraction of all punishment.‡ Baptism confers grace, and this effect is symbolized by the clearness of water.§ It followed that the whole pagan world and all unbaptized children dying in infancy are lost.

The validity of the sacrament requires the full use of the triune name. Bernard had allowed the use of the formula, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the true and holy cross." Hugo of St. Victor confessed himself to be in doubt whether the name of God alone or of Christ alone were sufficient or not. The later Schoolmen took the positive ground that the full name of the Trinity is required. Bonaventura acknowledged that in early times the Church had often been satisfied with baptism into the name of Christ, but said that in such cases the Trinity was understood.

* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 68, 6; Migne, IV, p. 636.

† "omne peccatum per baptismum tollitur," Thomas Aquinas, III, 69, 1; Migne, p. 652; "ille qui baptizatus liberatur a reatu totius pœnæ," Thomas Aquinas, III, 69, 2.

‡ This strange figure is used by Thomas Aquinas, III, 69, 2, 4.

§ Thomas Aquinas, III, 69, 4; Migne, p. 656.

He declared that since the deliverance of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, the omission of a single syllable from the triune formula invalidated the baptism.

The proper administrator of baptism is the priest, but in case of necessity a layman may baptize, man or woman, for, as Thomas Aquinas said, "In the kingdom of heaven there is neither male nor female."* This theologian went so far as to affirm the validity of baptism administered by an unbaptized person, provided it be administered in the triune name and with the purpose of baptizing. The chief reason he gives for this judgment is that the benefits of salvation might be extended as far as possible.† The strictness with which the necessity of baptism was held is shown by the treatment which Hugo de St. Victor gave to the question whether the children of Christian parents are saved when the parents are put to death in a besieged city and the children themselves die unbaptized. After looking at it from different aspects, this reasonable theologian left the question unanswered, saying, "There is no authority for saying what will become of such children."‡ So there was at least one question which the Schoolmen left unsettled.

Children are proper subjects of baptism because they are under the curse of Adam. It is not a question of faith on their part, but of the sponsorial duty of the Church. As the mother nourishes her offspring in the womb before it can nourish itself, so in the bosom of mother Church infants are nourished and receive salvation through her act.§ There was no exception among the Schoolmen to the belief that all unbaptized dying children and adults are lost. "They cannot be saved," said Hugo de St. Victor, "because they have no faith." The other Schoolmen agree with him in assigning to unbaptized children dying in infancy the mildest of

* The Synod of Mainz, 1233, and other Synods allowed parents in case of necessity to baptize their children. Nothing could attest the high or superstitious regard in which baptism was held better than the act of the Synod of Treves, 1310, which ordered that a child taken from its mother after her death and itself unbaptized should be buried in unconsecrated ground. See Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*.

† *Summa*, III, 67, 5; Migne, IV, p. 628.

‡ *Summa*, V, 6; Migne, 176, 132. The perdition of infants dying before birth is also affirmed by the Schoolmen. Duns Scotus, *Sent.* IV : 4, 3, 3; Paris ed. XVI : 406, 410, makes it plain that children still unborn are under the law of sin not because they are connected with the bodies of their mothers but because of their own bodies. He excepts from the law of perdition unborn infants whose mothers suffer martyrdom. This is blood baptism, and applies to such children as well as to children outside of the womb who are put to death by violence.

§ Thomas Aquinas, III, 68, 9; Migne, p. 646; Bonaventura, *Breviloquium*, VII, Peltier's ed., VII, p. 320.

punishments, for to original sin they add no actual transgression. We will not be too severe on them for this view when we recall, to take a single instance, that that strong Calvinist, Isaac Watts, the author of the nursery songs for children, so late as 1740 elaborated the view that all unbaptized children outside of Christian households dying in infancy were annihilated. He espoused this view as a relief from the alternative view that they suffered conscious pain throughout eternity.* As has already been indicated, the most of the Schoolmen agreed with Thomas Aquinas that it was unlawful to baptize the children of Jews and infidels against the will of their parents.†

Water is essential to baptism. From Hugo de St. Victor and Peter the Lombard, the Schoolmen agreed that wine, oil or other liquid is no substitute.‡ Immersion was preferred by Thomas Aquinas, and he speaks of it as the more general practice in his day.§ Peter Lombardus, without qualification, declares it to be the proper mode. Thomas allowed aspersion or effusion where life might be jeopardized by the application of water to the entire body or where it was inconvenient to immerse, as in the case of the 5,000 and 3,000 mentioned as baptized at the same time in the Acts. Bonaventura held that water must be applied to the whole body or at any rate to its noblest part, the head.|| Both triune immersion and single immersion were allowed by Peter the Lombard, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas. Triune immersion symbolizes the trinity and the three days in which Christ lay in the tomb; single immersion the unity of the Godhead and the uniqueness of Christ's death.

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration was based by the Schoolmen especially upon John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." The doctrine follows the letter and misses the real meaning of Scripture. In extending the validity of baptism the Schoolmen seem to have been as tolerant as our own General Assembly. The Assembly of 1845 (Old School) denied the validity of Roman Catholic baptism,

* In his *Rise and Recovery of Mankind*.

† "non habet hoc ecclesiæ consuetudo quod filii infidelium invitis parentibus baptizentur," *Summa*, III, 68, 10; Migne, p. 648.

‡ Duns Scotus said in regard to baptism in beer that its validity would depend upon a scientific test whether the liquid continued to be a species of water or not. See Seeberg, p. 359.

§ "quamvis tutius sit baptizare per modum immersionis," etc. (*Summa*, III, 66, 7).

|| *Breviloquium*, VII; Peltier's ed., VII, p. 319: "requiritur mersio, vel ablutio per elementum aque in toto corpore vel saltem in digniore parte."

against the protest of Dr. Charles Hodge. The Assembly of 1875, without pronouncing a categorical decision on the question, left the question to each session to decide. If Roman Catholic priests rebaptize persons entering their communion, they use a hypothetical formula: "If this person has not been baptized, I baptize thee."

The sacrament of confirmation may be dismissed with a few words. The Schoolmen devote little space to it. They rest it upon no specific command. It was implied in the promise of the Holy Spirit. The consecrating element, oil, is to be applied to the forehead, where the shame shows itself which the fearful feel in making known their Christian profession. The sacrament confers hardihood, *robur*, and is, as it were, a consummation of baptism.* It is performed by the bishop, the successor of the apostles, through the imposition of whose hands the gift of the Spirit was conferred in the primitive Church.

In the celebration of the eucharist and in the worship of the Virgin Mary the piety of the Middle Ages found its chief expression. The feast of Corpus Christi, commemorating the assumed fact of transubstantiation, had its origin in the thirteenth century. The ritual, which Thomas Aquinas at the command of the Pope prepared for it, is one of the most solemn services of the Church and is used to this day. Who dare venture to deny the devotional element in this ritual when he reads Thomas' eucharistic hymns celebrating the change of the elements:

"Pange lingua gloriosa corporis mysterium."†

Albertus Magnus devoted to the eucharist a special treatise, in which allegory is given full rein. He and the other Schoolmen treat it at great length.

The Fathers did not work out a careful statement of the Lord's Supper. From their highly figurative language the doctrines of the real presence and the transmutation of the elements may easily be drawn. The controversies of Paschasius in the ninth and of Lanfranc in the eleventh centuries stated the doctrine of transubstantiation clearly, and prepared the way for the elaborate discussions of the Schoolmen and the dogmatic definition of the Fourth

* Thomas Aquinas, III, 72, 11; Migne, IV, p. 693; P. Lombard, IV, 7, etc. For the custom of anointing on the forehead, Thomas quotes Ezek. III, 8: "I have made thy forehead hard against their foreheads."

† See Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 465 *sqq.* The hymn is contained in the Presbyterian Hymnal, No. 329, omitting the verses depicting the transubstantiated elements.

Lateran Council, 1215. With the exception of Duns Scotus, the Schoolmen regarded the doctrine as susceptible of proof from Scripture. Duns Scotus took the ground that it cannot be so proved, but must be accepted on the authority of the Church. The doctrine was not foisted upon the Church by the Lateran Council. The Council simply gave authoritative statement to the belief already prevalent in the Church. The passages relied upon by Thomas Aquinas and others were the words of institution, "This is my body," and John vi. 53, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." The symbolical theory and the theory of impanation were discussed and set aside. Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135) seems to have been the only Schoolman of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries of any note who dissented from the doctrine of transubstantiation.* The change in transubstantiation occurs not by the annihilation of the bread and wine, as Duns contended, but by the transmutation of their substance. Thomas Aquinas found an illustration for this in the air from which fire is generated and which is thereby not necessarily annihilated.

The secondary characteristics of the bread and wine remain—the accidents so-called—weight, taste, color, dimensions. Luther declared there might as reasonably have been set up the theory of transaccidentation as of a change of substance. Thomas anticipated his objection and gave three reasons why the accidents remain: (1) because it is repugnant to the usual habit of Christians to partake of human flesh and blood; (2) in case the accidents were changed, Christians would in eating expose themselves to the charge of being cannibals and become a laughing stock to the scorner and the infidel;† (3) the bread retains its accidents that faith may have opportunity for exercise. Creation, this great Schoolman said, is less difficult to understand than transubstantiation; for creation is out of nothing, but in transubstantiation the accidents remain while the substance is changed. The body and blood of Christ are really on the altar, though they cannot be apprehended by the senses or by the mind. They are apprehended by faith only.‡ Though the substance of bread and wine disappear,

* His theory, according to Bellarmin and other Catholic writers as well as Neander and Schröckh, was the theory of impanation, or the existence of the body of Christ at the side of the elements. See Schwane, p. 641.

† Thomas Aquinas, III, 75, 5; Migne, IV, p. 724. Peter the Lombard dwells at length on this consideration.

‡ Thomas Aquinas, III, 75, 1; Migne, IV, p. 716.

the two elements continue to preserve the virtue of their substance.*

In the use of the wine, water is to be mixed. Thomas and Albertus Magnus rely in confirmation of this practice much upon the alleged custom in vogue in Palestine and the words of Proverbs ix. 5, "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled for you." Water symbolizes the people; wine Christ; their combination the union of Christ and the communicant. The mixture of the two elements is not essential, Thomas Aquinas said, to the validity of the sacrament.

The question seriously engaged the attention of the Schoolmen what it was that Christ held in His hands at the Last Supper, and they do not hesitate to say that it was His own body and blood. Thomas says he had "them in his hands and in his mouth." What Christ partook of Himself, He gave to the disciples. Hugo de St. Victor alone shrunk from discussing this question, stating that in the case of such mysteries reverence was more seeming than discussion.† This question involved the further question whether Judas partook of the true body and blood of the Lord. Leaning upon Augustine and by a manipulation of the accounts of Luke xxii and John xiii, the Schoolmen took the position that the bread and wine had been distributed before Judas took the sop. The sop was delusive. Judas was deceived.‡ Much time was also spent upon the question whether the disciples during the time of our Lord's entombment partook of His real body. Duns Scotus, falling back upon his theory that a body has several forms, answered the question in the affirmative.

The doctrine of "concomitance,"§ elaborated by Alexander of Hales, involved the presence of Christ's divinity wherever His body is. From this the conclusion was drawn that the properties of Christ's divinity are in the sacrament of the eucharist, as well as the properties of His body, flesh, bones, blood, nerves.|| It was necessary to make this doctrine plain, in view of the fact that in

* "quamvis non sint substantia, habent virtutem substantiæ," Thomas Aquinas, III, 76, 6; Migne, IV, p. 755.

† *Summa*, II, 8; Migne, 176, p. 462: "ego in ejusmodi secreta divina magis veneranda quam discutienda cerneo."

‡ So Hugo, P. Lombardus, Thomas Aquinas, etc. The expression "Judas communion" was current and used by the Synod of London, 1175, etc. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 81, 3, approves the lines:

"The King, seated with the Twelve at the table,
Holds Himself in His hands. He, the food, feeds upon Himself."

Schwane, p. 645, agrees that this conception was general among the Schoolmen

§ The Council of Trent adopted the word and the theory.

|| Thomas Aquinas, III, 76, I; Migne, IV, 732.

the words of institution the Lord mentioned His body only. The further doctrine that the whole Christ is in each of the elements was also fully elaborated for the first time by Alexander of Hales. Anselm had asserted it a hundred years* before Alexander, who was followed closely by Thomas Aquinas, who laid emphasis upon the doctrine in order to justify the withdrawal of the cup from the laity, a custom which came into vogue in the twelfth century. This that theologian flatly demanded, that the laity might be taught the doctrine that the whole Christ is in each of the elements. Thomas Aquinas observed that Christ distributed bread to the 5000, but not wine or water. How much reverence for the sacred elements had to do with developing the custom of withholding the cup it has been impossible to determine. It is fair to suppose that the fear of profanation by spilling the blood was the most prominent factor. The Council of Constance gave, among other reasons for the custom, the danger of defilement to the wine by coming into contact with the long beards of laymen, and the possibility of its turning sour or freezing while being carried to the sick. The custom, widely prevalent, of taking the wine through a tube or reed,† was also probably a product of undue reverence. The custom of taking a meal immediately after the eucharist was an ancient practice and arose from the feeling of reverence for the elements. In the Middle Ages it was a frequent custom to give to the communicant a rinsing cup which he used after he had partaken of the elements.‡ Mediæval Councils guarded carefully against the possible profanation of the blood, as did also Thomas Aquinas. Should a drop happen to fall on the priest's garment, the piece was to be cut out, burned and carefully thrown into the sacrary. Should a drop fall on the altar cloth or the *corporale*, the cloth was to be washed three times, the water being drunk by the priest. English Synods ordered the church bells to be rung every time the mass was celebrated, that the

* Ep., IV, 107; Migne, 159, p. 255: "in acceptatione sanguinis totum Christum, deum et hominem; et in acceptatione corporis similiter totum accipimus." Anselm, however, was having no reference to the withdrawal of the cup from the laity.

† The terms used are *fistula*, *canna*, *tuba*, *siphon*, etc. Some Lutheran Churches continued to follow this practice down into the eighteenth century. Smend, in his *Kelchversagung und Kelchspendung*, Göttingen, 1898, gives the interesting history of the custom.

‡ The object was to prevent the loss of any of the sacred element by vomiting. A Synod of Soissons of the twelfth century enjoined all to rinse the mouth after partaking of the elements. Archbishop Peckham in 1281 enjoined upon the priests to instruct the people that in partaking of the bread they were partaking of the whole Christ, and that the cup was given that they might the more easily swallow the sacred body.

workman in the field and the woman in the kitchen might bow in solemn adoration.

The sacrament of the eucharist confers grace, and it was very natural that the question should arise as to the effect the host consecrated would have upon a mouse which might happen to eat it. Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas and other Schoolmen devoted their talents to solve it.* Bonaventura concluded that under such circumstances the body of Christ was withdrawn. Not so his contemporary Thomas. It would not be withdrawn, said this theologian, even if the elements were to be cast into the mire. Such a statement involves no disparagement of Christ's body, which God allowed to be crucified by wicked hands. His solution of the question was that the mouse, not being created to eat bread as a sacrament, when it ate the host, ate not after a sacramental manner but through the accidents, *non sacramentaliter, sed per accidens*. This theological and metaphysical curiosity is presented with all gravity. Peter the Lombard, perhaps anticipating Bonaventura, had said: "An animal does not take the body of Christ in eating the consecrated bread. But what it does take and eat, God only knows." A similar question had been propounded by that subtlest of dialecticians, Duns Scotus:† "What effect would the baptismal water have upon an ass who might drink it?" He replied that the question was an asinine refinement, *subtilitas assinina*, for the virtue in such water no ass can drink. In the end the answers were the same.

The communion of children, practiced in the early Church and attested by Augustine, was still general in the time of Pope Paschal II, as a letter of his, 1118, bears witness. The *Supplement* of Thomas Aquinas justifies the abandonment of the practice on the ground that the eucharist, like extreme unction, requires "real devotion in the recipients."‡

As a sacrifice, the eucharist has a wider application than it has as a sacrament. As a sacrament it benefits only those who partake; as a sacrifice those who partake and others also. This teaching Thomas Aquinas confirms by a combination of the accounts of Matthew and Luke. In the one the blood is said to be "shed for

* Thomas Aquinas, III, 80, 3; Migne, IV, p. 789; Albertus Magnus, *In Sententias*, IV, 13, 38; Borgnet's ed., XXIX, p. 397; Bonaventura, *Sentenc.*, IV, 13, 2, 1; Peltier's ed., V, p. 550.

† *Sent.* IV, 6, 3, 2; Paris ed. XVI: 558. See Seeberg, p. 360.

‡ "exigit actualem devotionem," *Supplem.*, XXXII, 4; Migne, IV, p. 1038. The Council of Trent anathematized those who declare the communion of children necessary. See art. "Kinderkommunion" in *Wetzer-Welte*, VII, 459, and Herzog, 3d ed., X, 289.

you"; that is, those who were present. In the other it is said to be shed "for many": that is, for those present and others. Concurrently the doctrine was developed that the benefits of the eucharistic sacrifice accrue upon the consecration of the priest, and do not depend upon its use by the people.

That the belief in transubstantiation was adopted by the priestly as well as the popular mind, is evident not only from the teachings of the mediæval theological treatises and the decrees of Councils, but also from the stories related by such popular writers as Jacob of Voragine and Cæsar of Heisterbach. To give a single one. The intelligent German monk, Cæsar, asserts that he looked with his own eyes upon the bloody host of St. Thronð. The case happened in 1223. A woman, in the hope of inflaming the love of her lover, hurried from the altar, holding the host in her mouth, and kissed him. After imprinting the kiss, she was unable to swallow the sacred morsel and, wrapping it in cloths, carefully hid it away. Her mind was so troubled that she told the secret to a priest, who in turn communicated it to the bishop of Livland who happened to be in the town. Accompanied by the woman, they found the host and on it three drops of blood. The abbot was then called in and it appeared that one-half of the host was bread and one-half flesh. The good bishop, anxious to be possessed of so wonderful a relic, essayed to carry it away with him, but was prevented by sixty strong men, and the relic was carefully laid away in the Church of St. Thronð. Cæsar solemnly attests the story. He was not more credulous than his age, and wrote down the particulars, as he said, for the advantage of many ages then unborn.*

The sacrament of penance was elaborated at even greater length by the Schoolmen than the sacrament of the eucharist.† The virtue asserted of it was one of the most baneful teachings of the Middle Ages. Penance was placed in close connection with baptism.‡ Baptism serves for the deletion of original sin; penance for the deletion of mortal sins committed after baptism. Using the illustration of Tertullian, the Schoolmen called it "the second plank" thrown out after shipwreck to the sinner, as baptism is

* See A. Kaufmann's edition of *Cæsar of Heisterbach*, 2d Part, p. 203 sqq.

† The Lombard devotes two and a half times the space to penance that he devotes to the sacrament of the eucharist; Hugo St. Victor three times as much (Migne's ed., pp. 550-578, as against pp. 462-471 on the eucharist); Thomas Aquinas (Migne's ed.), pp. 852-1023, as against pp. 695-852 on the eucharist, and Bonaventura nearly four times as much space (Peltier's ed., V, 533-709, Vol. VI. 1-129, as against V, 415-533, on the eucharist).

‡ The Council of Trent, referring to the works of satisfaction, calls penance a sort of "laborious baptism."

the first.* Scriptural warrant enough was found for the doctrine of penance. Thomas Aquinas, tracing its institution to Christ, quoted Jerome's version of Luke xxiv. 47, that "penance and remission of sins should be preached from Jerusalem." The words of James (v, 14), calling upon Christians to confess their sins one to another, were appealed to. The Vulgate translates the Greek word *metanoëo* by *agere pœnitentiam*, and the Rheims Version perpetuates the mischievous mistake for English readers by usually translating the word "do penance," thus transferring the sphere of repentance from the heart to external performances. A strong proof was also found for penance in the interpretation the Schoolmen put upon the Lord's words, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." They were explained to confer upon the priest the authority to pronounce judicial sentence of forgiveness or condemnation over the sinner.

On several features of the sacrament of penance much light has been thrown by the recent researches of our own Dr. Henry C. Lea and the two German Protestant experts in Mediæval History, Karl Müller† and Brieger.‡

About the year, say, 1200 the mediæval doctrine of penance came to be fixed. Thereafter the Schoolmen invariably defined penance to consist of four parts—contrition of heart, confession to the priest, satisfaction by the performance of certain exercises prescribed by the priest, and absolution by the priest. These were all declared to be essential to a right standing before God. Before 1200 there was no uniformity in the teaching on this subject. Karl Müller, in his learned treatise, and Köhler, § in an admirable collection of documents, have shown conclusively that in the twelfth century a radical change took place in the Church's teaching and practice in the matter of penance. Peter the Lombard bears witness to the unsettled mind of the Church in his day, about 1160, on three questions, namely, whether contrition of heart is not all that is required in penance, whether confession to the priest is essential, and whether confession to a layman is not sufficient. This eminent theologian declared that the opinions on the subject, handed down from the

* Tertull, *de pœnitentiâ*, XII. So also Jerome. See the Lombard, *Sent.*, XIV, 1; Thomas Aquinas, III, 84; Bonaventura, *Sent.*, XIV, 1; *Breviloquium*, VI, 10, etc.

† *der Umschwung in der Lehre von der Busse während d. 12ten Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg, 1892.

‡ *D. Wesen des Ablasses am Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Leip., 1897.

§ *Dokumente zum Albasstreit vom 1517*, Tübingen, 1902.

Fathers, were diverse if not antagonistic,* and he himself denied that confession to the priest is essential to forgiveness. On the other hand, sixty years later, Alexander of Hales, in his *Summa universæ theologiæ*, positively affirmed that contrition of heart is not sufficient, and that confession to the priest and priestly absolution are essential. He was followed by the later Schoolmen. According to Thomas Aquinas, all mortal sins may be blotted out by penance except the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.†

Contrition, the first element of penance, was defined to be sorrow of the soul for its sins, an aversion from them and a purpose not to repeat them. Gratian joined Peter the Lombard in teaching that this state of the heart was a sufficient ground for the divine forgiveness, and needed not the supplement of confession to the priest or his absolution.‡ At the side of this doctrine Alexander of Hales introduced the dangerous doctrine of attrition which was further developed by Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas. It is the negative element of contrition, a sort of half-way repentance, or, as the Germans call it, *Galgenreue*, repentance induced by fear of being hung. It is servile fear, the dread of punishment. Thomas Aquinas defined it as a partial displeasure with one's sins.§ It is a sufficient preparation for confession to the priest and the other stages of penance. The feeling of attritio is likened to the feelings which the prodigal son had when he started to go to his father. Towards the close of the Middle Ages, Gabriel Biel took the position that attrition is changed by confession and priestly absolution into contrition. Harnack|| is very severe upon this mediæval fiction as the dry-rot in the Catholic system. According to it, as it would seem, a man may be forgiven who is actuated simply by the fear of hell and has neither faith nor filial love in his heart.

As for confession to the priest, its necessity was fully recognized by the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, when it demanded that it be made once a year by every true Catholic. Bonaventura argued

* *Sent.*, XVII. Migne, p. 880, in his docti diversa sentire inveniuntur quia super his varia ac pene diversa tradidisse videntur doctores. Albertus Magnus says the same thing (*In sent.*, IV, 17, A. Borgnet's ed., XXIX, p. 655).

† "omme peccatum in hac vita per pœnitentiam veram deleri potest" *Summa* III, 86, 1; Migne, p. 881.

‡ Schwane has strong words of condemnation for this opinion of the Lombard, p. 662.

§ "attritio significat quamdam displicentiam de peccatis commissis sed non perfectam" (*Supplem.*, I, 2; Migne, p. 919). He is much more moderate on the subject than Alexander, Bonaventura and Duns Scotus.

|| *Dogmengesch.*, II, pp. 482, 504 *sqq.* The Council of Trent adopted the theory of attrition and the word, and defined it as not sufficient in itself and requiring priestly aid (*Schaff's Creeds*, II, p. 145).

that subsequent to Council's decision the denial of its necessity was heresy, before the decision it was not. Thomas Aquinas said that confession is as necessary as baptism. Not even the Pope has the right to grant a dispensation from it, any more than he may offer salvation from original sin without baptism.* Confession is not required for venial sins. Such sins do not separate the soul from God or from the Church. The Church makes daily supplication for them, and that is enough.† In case of necessity a layman may hear confession. This will avail for the offender's reconciliation to God. To be reconciled to the Church, he must at the first opportunity repeat his confession to a priest who stands in Christ's stead.‡

The practice of satisfaction for sins by outward performances prescribed by the priest, the third element in penance, Thomas Aquinas and the other Schoolmen base upon the general theory which Anselm applied in his discussion of the doctrine of the atonement. A compensation must be made to the divine honor which is offended by sins. Quoting Anselm, Thomas declared that an act of satisfaction is something we deprive ourselves of, whether it be of the good things of the soul or of the body or of outward possession. The final teaching was that a payment of money was an acceptable compensation of this sort. Satisfaction has this advantage over contrition of heart and confession: The two latter the offender may perform only for himself. Satisfaction he may perform for others. For this view Thomas Aquinas quoted Gal. vi. 2, "Bear ye one another's burdens," where the apostle evidently has in mind not guilt and punishment for sin, but common needs and sufferings.

As for the fourth element in penance, absolution by the priest,§ here the change which the teachings of the Church underwent in the twelfth century is again apparent. Peter the Lombard declared the power of the keys to be a declarative function. Sixty years later Alexander of Hales defined it to be a judicial function, and the world of theologians swung around to Alexander's view. The priest's absolution, Thomas Aquinas said, was not an act like the priest's declaration of cleanness over the leper, who was already

* Thomas Aquinas, *Supplem.*, VI, 9; Migne, p. 939.

† "ad deletionem venialis peccati non requiritur infusio gratiæ," etc. (*Summa* III, 65, 1; Migne, IV, p. 597).

‡ "nullus est qui non habeat iudicem Christum, cui per suum vicarium confiteri debet" (*Supplem.*, VI, 3).

§ Schwane calls it the most important element in the sacrament of penance, p. 670.

healed, but a sacramental sentence effecting the pardon of sins. He vindicates against all other formulas the formula, "I absolve thee, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Hugo de St. Victor before him had pronounced the contrary form more laughable and frivolous than worthy of refutation.*

The two important questions arose how far the virtue of priestly absolution extends. Does it cover guilt as well as punishment, and does it extend to the punishments of purgatory as well as to the punishments due in this life? The answer to these questions was also positive and distinct from the time of Alexander of Hales. Richard of St. Victor had emphasized the distinction between the priest's right to remit the punishment of sin and God's sole prerogative which is to forgive its guilt.† Peter the Lombard shared this view, but he was opposed by the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century. With one consent they teach that the priest absolves from the guilt as well as the punishment of sin. This absolution extends also to purgatory. Thomas Aquinas argued that if the good offices of the Church do not avail for persons in purgatory, then the Church prays in vain for its dead.‡ Such souls are still within the jurisdiction of the Church, *de foro ecclesiæ*.

The sacrament of penance found its ultimate mediæval expression in the indulgence. This Thomas Aquinas called "one of the noblest and most efficacious" acts of the Church. An indulgence is the substitution of a lighter work of satisfaction for a heavier one. The first known historical case is that of the Archbishop of Arles in 1016. He gave indulgence for a year to those participating in the erection of a church building. The Crusades were a fruitful occasion for the Popes to dispense this form of spiritual gratuity as a means of raising armaments to break down the power of the Saracen in the holy places. In 1199 Innocent III promised to all who contributed toward the impending Crusade "remission according to the amount of their contribution." They then used it to attract and reward the courage of Crusaders against the heretical sects. And finally they resorted to it to put down Antipopes, as did Innocent II against Anacletus and Roger of Sicily. On what ground did the Church claim the right to grant indulgences? For ground there was, real or invented. The Schoolmen never accepted what, according to their own standard, they did first not

* Thomas said it was not sufficient to say "the omnipotent God absolve thee" (*Summa*, III, 84, 3; Migne, p. 857). See Hugo, *de sacram.*, II, 14, 8.

† See Schwane, p. 661, and Hergenröther-Kirsch., *Kirschengeschichte*, II, 690.

‡ *Summa*, IV, 83, 5: "suffragia eccles. valent illis qui sunt in purgatorio," etc.

prove. The invention must be accredited chiefly to Alexander of Hales, whom Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas followed, lights of the Franciscan and Dominican orders respectively. It is the *thesaurus meritorum*, or heap of merits. The teaching was that Christ, the Virgin Mary and the saints did more good works than was required of them. These supererogatory works constitute a fund of merit, a sort of savings bank account which stands in the name of the Church. Upon this account the Church may draw at pleasure to pay the debts of sinners. It is at the Church's disposal by reason of her nuptial unity with Christ, Col. i. 24. Thomas Aquinas declared that the merits of the saints, and especially those of Christ, are so superabundant that they would more than suffice to pay off the debts of all the living.* Christ relaxed the punishment due the woman taken in adultery, and she did no works of satisfaction. So likewise may the Pope.† Checks drawn on this fund are a substitute for works of satisfaction which otherwise would be required. And the best thing about it is, as Pope Clement VI announced in 1343, that the more the fund is drawn upon the more it grows.‡ It was like the wood of the holy cross: it had the faculty of self-expansion. The construction of bridges, the erection of churches, the building of roads were frequent grounds of granting the indulgence in England as well as on the Continent. The prelates of England in 1247 were so good as to announce a remission of all penances for six years and 140 days to all who would worship the Holy Blood at Westminster.§ As early as 1140 Abælard had condemned the lavish use of the prerogative by prelates who apparently were guided by motives of cupidity rather than of benevolence toward the people.||

The theory came to prevail that the indulgence directly absolved from the guilt and punishment of sins, *culpa et pœna peccatorum*. It set aside or remitted that which acts of penance had been designed to remove. Leaning upon the storehouse of merits, it was sufficient for the Church to pronounce the mortal offenses in a given case forgiven. Catholic theologians were inclined at one time to deny that Popes ever remitted the guilt of sins, and even declared the letters granting such remission spurious. But there can now be no doubt on this point. The chief dispenser of this boon was John XXIII. As early as 1294, Cœlestin V granted such an

* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 83, 1.

† Thomas Aquinas, *Supplem.*, XXV, 1; Migne, 1013.

‡ See Friedberg, *Corpus juris can.*, Vol. II, p. 1304 sq.

§ M. Paris, Luard's ed., IV, pp. 90, 643.

|| In the *Ethica*, XI, Köhler gives the passage, p. 8.

indulgence to all who on a given day of the year worshiped in the Church of St. Mary de Collemayo, the church in which he had been consecrated.* Boniface VIII, his successor, recalled this bull, but it is doubtful whether he meant to condemn the formula *a culpa et pœna peccatorum* which it contains. Boniface himself announced a "full pardon for all sins," which John Chappius, the editor of the *extravagantes communes*, speaks of as "that indulgence by which plenary indulgence was given for all guilt and punishment," *totalis culpæ et totius pœnæ*. Thirty years before, about 1263, Thomas of Chantimpre had declared that an indulgence absolves immediately from guilt and penalty. The popular belief on the subject is embodied in the lines of Peter the Ploughman's Crede:

"The power of the Apostells they posen in speche
For to sullen the synnes for silver or other mede
And pulyche a *pœna* the purple assoileth
And a *culpa* also, that they may catchen
Money other money wothe and mede to fonge."

The Council of Constance attempted to put some check upon this practice.† Tetzels a century later offered "remission and indulgence of guilt and penalty." Luther's references in a letter to the Archbishop of Mainz make it plain that the people expected to receive precisely what was offered.

There was one more step to which the Church in the later Middle Ages descended. The efficacy of the indulgence was independent of the person who brought it. In his bull of indulgence, 1476, granted to the Church of Xaintes, Sixtus IV announced that persons on earth, by the payment of a fixed sum to the papal collectors, may redeem their kindred from purgatorial pains. From the purchaser contrition and confession were not required.‡ The criminal as well as the saint was able for a stipulated sum to relieve the distress of the dead. The invention of man could scarcely further go to defeat the first principles of the Gospel. Wyclif spoke out clearly against many of the evils of the sacrament of penance, and the marvel is that the people should not have broken away from them till the voice of Luther was heard through Europe.

* See Köhler, *Dokumente*, p. 27. It is the merit of Dr. Lea to have brought out the significance of this document (III, p. 63).

† Alexander V, prior to the Council of Constance, had granted to the members of the Council of Pisa one of the most notable of these indulgences—"absolutio plenaria a pœna et culpa" (Von der Hardt, *Conc. Const.*, III, 688).

‡ See Lea, III, 595 *sq.*, and the instruction of Albert of Mainz quoted by Brieger: "*nec opus est quod contribuentes pro animabus in capsam sint corde contriti et ore confessi.*"

The fifth of the sacraments, extreme unction or unction of the sick, *unctio infirmorum*, is to be administered to those in peril of death. The earlier view that it was instituted by the apostles, represented by Peter the Lombard, was also held by Hugo de St. Victor and Bonaventura. Duns Scotus followed Thomas Aquinas in deriving it directly from Christ. In the absence of a specific precept, Thomas remarks that the Lord did many things which are not recorded in the Gospels.* It may be repeated, but it is to be denied to children, as is also the eucharist, on the ground that their bodily diseases are not caused by sin.† There was a difference of opinion among the Schoolmen as to the effects of the sacrament, whether it was to remit venial sins or the remainders of mortal sins left after penance.‡ Thomas distinctly mentions this difference of opinion.

Marriage, according to most of the Schoolmen, was not a sacrament till after the Fall.§ It is assigned the last place among the sacraments because it has the least of spirituality connected with it.|| The Vulgate is in part responsible for its being included among the sacraments, for it translates Eph. v. 32, "this is a great sacrament" (*hoc est magnum sacramentum*). The Rheims Version perpetuates the mistake for English readers. At first the bed was undefiled and parturition was without pain. Since the Fall marriage has become a remedy against lust and incontinence.¶ It is a cause of grace, the sacramental symbol lying chiefly in the words of consent between the contracting parties. Thomas Aquinas also adds that the priest's benediction has a certain sacramental character.** The angelic doctor was inclined to permit the marriage of boys after fourteen and of girls after twelve. The impediments of marriage were carefully discussed and listed. The children of persons married within the forbidden limits of consanguinity were to be

* *Supplem.*, XXIX, 3; Migne, IV, 1027.

† *Supplem.*, XXXII, 4; Bonaventura, *Brevil.*, VI, 11; Peltier's ed., VII, 326. The Synods of Cologne, 1279, Lambeth, 1330, etc., limit the age to fourteen.

‡ Bonaventura confines its effects to venial sins (*Brevil.*, VI, 11); Thomas Aquinas to mortal sins (*Summa*, III, 65, 2; Migne, IV, 597; *Supplem.*, XXIX, 1).

§ Bonaventura regarded marriage as a sacrament before as well as after the Fall (*Brevil.*, VI, 13).

|| "quia minimum habet de spirituale" (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, 65, 2; Migne, IV, 598; P. Lombardus, IV, 27, 2. So also Hugo de St. Victor, Bonaventura, etc.).

¶ Alanus de Insulis, *Reg. Theol.*, 114; Migne's ed., p. 681: "conjugium sacramentum remedii contra incontinentiam." Hugo de S. Victor, *de sacr.*, II, 11, 3; P. Lombardus, IV, 26, 2; Migne, p. 908, etc.

** "benedictio sacerdotis est quoddam sacramentale" (*Supplem.*, XLII, 1; Migne, p. 1083).

regarded as illegitimate, even though the marriage had been performed inside the church.

Death dissolves marriage and leaves the survivor free to remarry. Otherwise the marriage bond is perpetual, *vinculum matrimonii est perpetuum*. This follows from two considerations. Marriage involves the sacred duty of training children, and it is symbolical of the union between Christ and the Church which endures forever. Divorce, which is allowed for one cause only, fornication, is separation; not a release with license to marry again. Marriage cannot be annulled by the act of man. "What God has joined together let not man put asunder." Not even may the innocent party enter into another marriage contract till the other is dead. But either party, without the consent of the other, may enter a convent.* The Schoolmen might have been less severe had they not been monks. They based their regulation upon their interpretation of Matthew xix. 6. I have not found any of them expressing any abhorrence of second marriages or looking upon marriage as a spiritual tie extending beyond the present life, as did Tertullian.

Ordination, according to the emphatic teaching of the Schoolmen, confers an indelible character, an indestructible power. Once a priest always a priest. Sacramental grace is exhibited in its highest form in empowering the priest to celebrate the mass. The episcopate is a function, and consecration to it has no sacramental character. Thomas Aquinas says again and again that the episcopate is not a distinct order.† Consecration to it has no sacramental character. There is more reason for regarding ordination as a sacrament, said Thomas, than there is for ascribing a sacramental character to the other sacraments, for ordination confers the power of administering the rest. The question of the validity of the acts of priests receiving ordination from heretics and schismatics seemed to Gratian and Peter the Lombard to be well-nigh, if not altogether, insoluble.‡ The difficulty was increased by the acts of Councils which had condemned as invalid the ordinations of antipopes and the ordinations which bishops, appointed by antipopes, performed.§ The argument of Thomas Aquinas is difficult at this

* Thomas Aquinas, *Supplem.*, LXII, 5; Migne, IV, 1184.

† "episcopatus non est ordo" (*In Sent.*, IV, 24, 3; *Supplem.*, XL, 5; Migne, 1074, etc.). The Canon law has not yet settled whether the episcopate is a separate order or not (see Friedberg, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 150). The Council of Trent spoke of the "hierarchy of bishops, priests and deacons," but Innocent III included the subdeacon in the *ordines majores*.

‡ P. Lombard., IV, 25, 1; Migne, p. 905.

§ For example, the Ninth Œcumenical (see Hefele: *Conciliengeschichte*, V, 380) and the Eleventh Œcumenical Councils pronounced this judgment, naming the antipopes.

point to understand. He makes a distinction between the power, *potestas*, of ordination and the jurisdiction to administer ordination, *jurisdictio*. A bishop on becoming heretic or schismatic retains "the power of conferring orders" and the other sacraments; otherwise, when such a bishop returns to the Church, he would be ordained over again. But he does not "give grace with them, not because of the inefficacy of the sacraments, but because of the sins of the recipients who receive them in the face of the Church's prohibition." Such a bishop lacks jurisdiction. Thomas is emphatic in declaring that under no circumstances can the power or virtue given in his consecration be taken away from a bishop falling into heresy and cut off from the Church. Such a bishop, however, loses the power of conferring orders. The indelible character of the bishop imparted in consecration remains.* The right and ability to exercise his authority are forfeited.

The student misses the best use of Church History if his study has not a bearing on the problems of the present day. The mediæval system of the sacraments in all its leading features has entered into the dogmatic statements of the Roman Catholic communion, and the question arises what bearing the results of this study have upon the problems of Christian recognition and of cordial coöperation between the different branches of the Church. The general considerations most worthy of note are these:

1. We should remember that, if the greater mediæval theologians were mistaken, gravely mistaken, in some of their views on the sacraments, they were not so with any intention to injure the cause of the kingdom of Christ, but to promote it. The mediæval Church shows how capable theological thinkers are, while holding to the form of ecclesiastical institutions, to introduce theories and practices which go far in the way of subverting them. Protestant thinkers have done the same. And though the mediæval Church has erred, it is not to be treated as an institution apart from the Church of Christ. Our spiritual ancestors, as well as the ancestors of the Roman communion, lived in it and worked out their own salvation through it. We have our rights there; and we do, to say the least, unwisely in putting the great theologians of the Middle Ages into an apartment by themselves, to be, as it were, stared at as curiosities. They have their place, and not an unimportant one, in the development of the doctrine of the Church universal.

2. The fundamental religious principles underlying the sacra-

* *Supplem.*, XXXIX, 2; Migne, 1065.

ments are the same for Protestants and for the mediæval theology. With both, baptism signifies the washing away of sin through the sole merit of Jesus Christ. Penance implies the unholiness of sins and abhorrence for them. Confirmation implies the requirement of an open and steadfast Christian profession. The eucharist signifies union with Christ as the Head of the Church and the sacredness of the atonement. Orders involve the importance of the Christian ministry; extreme unction the solemnity of appearing before God in judgment. Marriage lays stress upon the divine institution of the family. These things are of infinitely more importance than the rituals which have been heaped around the seven ordinances, and the effort should be made to so emphasize the great truths for which they stand that we shall be ready to recognize the Christian character of persons who follow theories and forms very different from our own.

3. The most serious differences between the mediæval theory of the sacraments and our own seem to me to be the following: (1) that the eucharist is a sacrifice; (2) that penance is an obligatory series of outward performances; (3) the implications in ordination. Why is not transubstantiation included in the list? For this reason: Although the doctrine seems to myself to be unreasonable and unscriptural, there are passages of Scripture which, if taken alone and applied literally, can easily be made to yield the doctrine. There is the additional reason that Christians can worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, and through it come into communion with Christ, who hold the theory of transubstantiation.

With the three other questions the case is quite different. To say the least, the New Testament nowhere calls the eucharist a sacrifice and nowhere speaks of an altar in the ministries of the apostles or of a "victim of the altar." In regard to penance, the Lord seems to have set aside obligatory penitential performances and relegated repentance to the heart, leaving the outward expression to each individual soul. It is true Paul seems to have performed the Nazarite's vow, but his injunctions embrace patience, brotherly kindness and other virtues, but not penitential exercises. As for orders, the mediæval theory advocates a hierarchy, hedged about by an ecclesiastical ritual, outside of which there can be no valid ministry or dispensation of grace. It is essential to the Church. Where such ministry does not exist, there is no Church. I am inclined to believe that, of all the unscriptural theories of the Christian centuries, the theory of the priestly character of the ministry which was emphasized so much in the Middle Ages, but

did not by any means start there, offends most against the fundamental principles of the New Testament, and has wrought most harm by clouding the plain way of access to Christ, by creating bitter distinctions among Christian people, and by justifying offensive legislation by one part of the Christian body against others, even unto bloody inquisitions and religious wars.

In a recent article, Professor Briggs has dealt with this matter of clerical ordination and expressed the opinion that orders do not constitute the serious barrier to Church union they are usually supposed to be.* He speaks of the ease with which persons pass over from the Episcopal Church to the Roman communion, and from the non-Episcopal Churches to the Protestant Episcopal and Anglican Churches. Reordination is a comparatively little matter, he thinks, and there are not many who are deterred from making such changes by the requirement of reordination. Dr. Briggs lays stress upon the intention to ordain as determining a full, valid ordination. The ordination of the Anglican communion was rejected by Leo XIII on the ground that it was defective in the element of intention. But, Dr. Briggs argues, that while the intention in Anglican ordination may be defective, nevertheless there is a certain amount of intention, and that is good as far as it goes. As for the Lutheran, Reformed and other Protestant Churches, there is also intention in their ordination, though not so much as in the Anglican ordination. In other words, the amount of intention is less, howbeit what there is of it is good enough. And this amount ought to be recognized by the Roman Catholic and Anglican bishops when they reordain. The Roman Catholic and Anglican communions should adopt formulas recognizing these amounts of intention, while at the same time it is understood that the ordination which they give adds something more, so that when a man comes finally to be ordained by the Roman Catholic bishop he is recipient of full ordination.† By this method the cause of Church union would be furthered. I do not understand that in making this statement Dr. Briggs means that he himself holds to the theory of various degrees of difference in the measure of intention. He is presenting the views that hold in the Christian

* *The Independent*, August, 1905, pp. 197-200.

† Perhaps the expression "a more ample ordination" would cover fairly well what is meant. This is the expression which Bishop Stevens of Pennsylvania used when he reordained a Moravian presbyter in Philadelphia, September 30, 1881. The British Parliament had recognized the validity of Moravian ordination in 1749, and it had been customary for the Protestant Episcopal Church to accept the Moravian orders.

communions, and is suggesting a way to remove the barrier thus presented to the reunion of Christendom.

Dr. Briggs is engaged in the laudable attempt to promote the unity, or corporate union, of the Church universal. Sharing with him the desire for Church fellowship and Christian recognition, we are forced to express the hope that Church union may not be sought in any way which seems to involve the obscuration of a true principle and real distinctions. For the question of the ministry is an essential one with us in the non-Episcopal bodies. The Protestant Churches not only recognize the validity of the ministry of their sister body of the Reformation, the Anglican communion, but also the validity of the ministry of the Roman Catholic communion. But for their own ministry they want no further ordination at the hands of men. More ample ordination it certainly needs, and that is the added empowerment of the Holy Ghost. And God grant us that. But that is all. We stand upon the principle enunciated by Paul in the Galatians: "We have received our apostleship not of man nor by man, but of God." Luther's view, that the ordained ministry is a matter of expediency and nothing more, is quite tenable when we recall that the priesthood of all believers is enunciated in the New Testament. In that case ordination is simply a recognition. It confers no grace.

How, then, are we to expect the removal of these three greater differences which now interfere with hearty and full coöperation between those who hold to the so-called mediæval views of the sacraments and ourselves? So far as human agency is concerned, it seems to me we must look for such removal in ways such as these:

1. All parties must agree upon the Scriptures as the safe and all-sufficient guide to the teachings and mind of Christ concerning His Church. Here no compromise can be made. The teachings of "the Church" so-called, or of the "primitive Church"* so-called, and the decrees of Councils, however august, must yield before the plain teachings of the Greek New Testament. I presume that it is quite possible for our Protestant Churches to make some progress in this regard by abandoning dogmatic assertions on some questions. And we can only hope that the signs of a stronger emphasis being put upon the supreme authority of the Scriptures in the Catholic Church may come to yet more full expression.

2. Christ must be exalted. Devotion to His person must be

* The expression "primitive Church," as used by High Churchmen and also by Dr. Briggs in the article above referred to, includes customs which the New Testament has no record of. Customs which were introduced from 100-451 are included.

recognized as the chief unitive principle between Christian people, and the sufficient ground of the saving hope wherever it exists.

3. The removal of these barriers may be expected as the result of honest Christian living and of Christian love. Controversy is not apt to bring about this result. The practical fruits of Christianity are, I suppose, of more value than metaphysical articles of doctrine. When we come to estimate at their full value the moral precepts of the Gospel and to honor their practice in the state, in society and in the home, then Christians will come close together on the platform of a simple but devout submission to Christ. And as we come closer together in the activities of the Christian life and in Christian charity, we shall probably lose sight of the barriers which sacramental systems have raised up. The old terms may be retained, but in the genial atmosphere of Christian love the distinctions will melt away as between Christian man and Christian man, and into the old rituals will be poured a devotion common to them all. The importance of sound teaching is great. The importance of Christian love is also great. And love is the best panacea to break down differences and heal separations. It unifies where explanations divide. Other ways have been tried. It remains to try this new way, which follows the "new commandment." John, who insisted upon the confession of Christ as the Son of God, also said that "he who loveth dwelleth in God, and God in him." Not by self-confident and swelling comparisons of Church tenets, but by the cultivation of love can we expect to come most near Christ and most near those who love Him. Difficult as it may be, will we not do well to endeavor to recognize that under the ritual of the two, or the seven sacraments which others use, are commemorated the same great realities to which we also firmly hold? The realities are of the substance of our religion, and it is the substance which most concerns us, for the substance abides.

DAVID S. SCHAFF.

The Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny.