

XXII. BOTH KINDS IN THE SACRAMENT

¹ Among us **both kinds are given to laymen** in the sacrament. The reason is that there is a clear command and order of Christ, “**Drink of it, all of you**” (Matt. 26:27). ² Concerning the chalice Christ here commands with clear words that all should drink of it. ³ In order that no one might question these words and interpret them as if they apply only to priests, Paul shows in **1 Cor. 11:20ff.** that the whole assembly of the congregation in Corinth received both kinds.

⁴ This usage continued in the church for a long time, as can be demonstrated from history and from writings of the Fathers. ⁵ In several places Cyprian mentions that the cup was given to laymen in his time. ⁶ St. Jerome also states that the priests who administered the sacrament distributed the blood of Christ to the people. ⁷ Pope Gelasius himself ordered that the sacrament was not to be divided.⁹⁸ Not a single canon can be found which requires the reception of only one kind. Nobody knows when or through whom this custom of receiving only one kind was introduced, although Cardinal Cusanus mentions when the use was approved. ¹⁰ It is evident that such a **custom, introduced contrary to God’s command and also contrary to the ancient canons, is unjust.** ¹¹ Accordingly it is not proper to burden the consciences of those who desire to observe the sacrament according to Christ’s institution or to compel them to act contrary to the arrangement of our Lord Christ.

¹² Because the division of the sacrament is contrary to the institution of Christ, the customary **carrying about of the sacrament in processions** is also omitted by us.

ROMAN CHURCH

--"Communion under both kinds was the prevailing usage in Apostolic Times." (Catholic Encyclopedia, IV, 176)
--"Popes Leo (440-461) & Gelasius (492-496) emphatically condemned persons who abstained from the chalice." (Catholic Dictionary, 202)
--"Since the Twelfth Century: The final suppression of *intinctio* was followed in the thirteenth century by the gradual abolition for the laity of Communion under the species of wine. The disuse of the chalice by the laity was not yet universal in St. Thomas' time (d. 1274).
--The Council of Lambeth (1281) directs that wine is to be received by the priest alone, and non-consecrated wine is to be received by the faithful (Mansi, XXIV, 405).
--It is impossible to say exactly when the new custom became universal or when, by the Church's approval, it acquired the force of law." (New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia, Communion under Both Kinds)
--Communion "under both kinds ... abolished in 1416, by the Council of Constance" so that only the priests were allowed to have the blood. (Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs, I, 111)
--After about 900 years, the Roman catholic church restored the cup to the laity in 1970 under Vatican II.

“A eucharistic procession, therefore, is a public witness of **the veneration** toward the most holy Eucharist, conducted through public streets. It takes place in this way: **A consecrated host** – that is, the real and substantial presence of Jesus Christ: body, blood, soul and divinity – is placed within a monstrance, which is then lifted and carried by a priest who leads the faithful in procession. Like a pilgrimage, a eucharistic procession normally starts at one holy place and ends at another. This earthly journey reminds the Catholic faithful of their spiritual journey toward eternal life with God.

Eucharistic processions first became a popular practice in the life of the Church during the celebration of Corpus Christi, traditionally celebrated on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. The idea for this solemnity is attributed to St. Juliana, who lived in the 13th century” (<https://faithmag.com/what-eucharistic-procession>).



XXIII. THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS

¹ Among all people, both of high and of low degree, there has been loud complaint throughout the world concerning **the flagrant immorality and the dissolute life of priests** who were not able to remain continent and who went so far as to engage in abominable vices.

³ In order to avoid such unbecoming offense, adultery, and other lechery, **some of our priests have entered the married state.** They have given as their reason that they have been impelled and moved to take this step by the great distress of their consciences, especially since the Scriptures clearly assert that **the estate of marriage was instituted by the Lord God to avoid immorality,** ⁴ for Paul says, **“Because of the temptation to immorality, each man should have his own wife” (1 Cor. 7:2),** and again, **“It is better to marry than to be aflame with passion” (1 Cor. 7:9).**

⁵ Moreover, when Christ said in **Matt. 19:11, “Not all men can receive this precept,”** he indicated **that few people have the gift of living in celibacy,** and he certainly knew man’s nature. **God created man as male and female according to Gen. 1:27.**

⁶ Experience has made it all too manifest whether or not it lies **in human power and ability** to improve or change the creation of God, the supreme Majesty, by means of human resolutions or vows without a special gift or grace of God. What good has resulted? What honest and chaste manner of life, what Christian, upright, and honorable sort of conduct has resulted in many cases? It is well known what terrible torment and frightful disturbance of conscience many have experienced on their deathbeds on this account, and many have themselves acknowledged this. ⁸ **Since God’s Word and command cannot be altered by any human vows or laws,** ⁹ our priests and other clergy have taken wives to themselves for these and other reasons and causes.

It was not until the ecumenical meetings of the Catholic Church at the First and Second Lateran councils in 1123 and 1139 that priests were explicitly forbidden from marrying.

The tradition of clerical continence developed into a practice of clerical celibacy (ordaining only unmarried men) from the 11th century onward among Latin Church Catholics and became a formal part of canon law in 1917.

In 1563, the Council of Trent reaffirmed the tradition of celibacy.

¹⁰ It can be demonstrated from **history** and from the **writings of the Fathers** that it was customary for priests and deacons to marry in the Christian church of former times. ¹¹ Paul therefore said in **1 Tim. 3:2**, **“A bishop must be above reproach, married only once.”** ¹² It was only four hundred years ago that the priests in Germany were compelled by force to take the vows of celibacy. At that time there was such serious and strong resistance that an archbishop of Mayence who had published the new papal decree was almost killed during an uprising of the entire body of priests. The decree concerning celibacy was at once enforced so hastily and indecently that the pope at the time not only forbade future marriages of priests but also broke up the marriages which were of long standing. ¹³ This was of course not only **contrary to all divine, natural, and civil law, but was also utterly opposed and contrary to the canons** which the popes had themselves made and to the decisions of the most renowned councils

Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085) – “He renewed at a synod in Rome in 1074 the old laws of the Church which bound all the clergy, superior and inferior, to celibacy. By this means the clergy would be detached from dependence on temporal chiefs, to which a care for their families compelled them, and brought into more immediate connection with the head of the Church of Rome. Yet a full century elapsed before the celibacy of the clergy was thoroughly carried out in the Romish Church. The greater part of the inferior clergy in Lombardy and Germany was enraged at the severe renewal of the laws of" celibacy, but the mass of the lower classes of the Christian peoples was on the side of the Pope, who menaced with excommunication every spiritual person who retained a wife and discharged spiritual functions, and every layman who heard mass or confessed to a married priest ; **he demanded from every married priest the hard sacrifice, either, in obedience to the old Church law, to dismiss his wife and his children, or to give up his ecclesiastical position.** The priests for the most part lived either in actual wedlock or in concubinage, the number of the latter preponderating. The renewal of the rule of celibacy created in Germany, as elsewhere, an excitement among the clergy. Many preferred to give up their livings rather than their wives. In many parts of Germany an open revolt of the inferior clergy took place against the superiors who accepted the decision of the synod at Rome. **The archbishop of Mainz and the bishop of Passau nearly lost their lives by the attacks of their own clergy”** (A Popular History of Germany, Vol. 3, p.963).

Many devout and intelligent people in high station have expressed similar opinions and the misgiving that such **enforced celibacy and such prohibition of marriage** (which God himself instituted and left free to man) never produced any good but rather gave occasion for many great and evil vices and much scandal. ² As his biography shows, even one of the popes, Pius II, often said and allowed himself to be quoted as saying that while there may well have been some reasons for prohibiting the marriage of clergymen, there were now more important, better, and weightier reasons for permitting them to be married. There is no doubt that Pope Pius, as a prudent and intelligent man, made this statement because of grave misgivings.

“At the Councils of Constance(1414-1417) and Basle (1431) propositions were advanced to allow clergy legal marriage if the scourge of Concubinage could not be halted. **Pius II** said at Basle that the reasons for restoring the right of matrimony were now stronger than the reasons forbidding it {footnote: Schaff, v. 6, p.663}” (About Celibacy, I have No instructions from the Lord, p.28)

¹⁴ In loyalty to Your Imperial Majesty we therefore feel confident that, as a most renowned Christian emperor, Your Majesty will graciously take into account that fact that, **in these last times** of which the Scriptures prophesy, the world is growing worse and men are becoming weaker and more infirm.

Therefore it is most necessary, profitable, and Christian to recognize this fact in order that the prohibition of marriage may not cause worse and more disgraceful lewdness and vice to prevail in German lands. **No one is able to alter or arrange such matters in a better or wiser way than God himself,** ¹⁵ **who instituted marriage to aid human infirmity and prevent unchastity.**

¹⁶ **The old canons also state that it is sometimes necessary to relax severity and rigor for the sake of human weakness** and to prevent and avoid greater offense.

In this case relaxation would certainly be both Christian and very necessary. How would the marriage of priests and the clergy, and especially of the pastors and others who are to minister to the church, be of disadvantage to the Christian church as a whole? ¹⁷ If this hard prohibition of marriage is to continue longer, there may be a shortage of priests and pastors in the future.

¹⁸ As we have observed, **the assertion that priests and clergymen may marry is based on God's Word and command.** Besides, history demonstrates both that priests were married and that the vow of celibacy has been the cause of so much frightful and unchristian offense, so much adultery, and such terrible, shocking immorality and abominable vice that even some honest men among the cathedral clergy and some of the courtiers in Rome have often acknowledged this and have complained that such vices among the clergy would, on account of their abomination and prevalence, arouse the wrath of God. It is therefore deplorable that Christian marriage has not only been forbidden but has in many places been swiftly punished, as if it were a great crime, ¹⁹ in spite of that fact that **in the Holy Scriptures God commanded that marriage be held in honor.** ²⁰ Marriage has also been highly praised in the imperial laws and in all states in which there have been laws and justice. ²¹ Only in our time does one begin to persecute innocent people simply because they are married — and especially priests, who above all others should be spared — although this is done contrary not only to divine law but also to canon law. ²² In **1 Tim. 4:1, 3** the apostle Paul calls the teaching that forbids marriage a doctrine of the devil. ²³ Christ himself asserts that **the devil is a murderer from the beginning (John 8:44).** These two statements fit together well, for it must be **a doctrine of the devil to forbid marriage** and then to be so bold as to maintain such a teaching with the shedding of blood.

²⁴ However, just as **no human law can alter or abolish a command of God, neither can any vow alter a command of God.** ²⁵ St. Cyprian therefore offered the counsel that women who were unable to keep their vows of chastity should marry. He wrote in his eleventh letter, “If they are unwilling or unable to keep their chastity, it is better for them to marry than to fall into the fire through their lusts, and they should see to it that they do not give their brothers and sisters occasion for offense.”

²⁶ In addition, all the canons show great leniency and fairness toward those who have made vows in their youth — and most of the priests and monks entered into their estates ignorantly when they were young.