HISTORICAL MEMOIRS ON THE USE OF CHOCOLATE IN TIME OF FASTING

Daniele Concina, O.P.

1748 · In the public domain.
The English translation is our own, made from the Italian
for the Morals of the Church library, where the text may be read and searched online.

Contents

Title Page 3

To the Christian Reader Who Truly Believes 4

Contents (as printed) 5

Section One — Occasion of Writing 6

Section Two — Some Observations Set Forth Beforehand in Order to Make Clear the Importance and Precise State of the Question ... 13

Section Three — Origin of Chocolate in the Indies and Its Introduction into Europe ... 16

Section Four — Documents of the Theologians Who Champion the Use of Chocolate during a Time of Fasting ... 19

Section Five — The Strongest Reasons Alleged in Favor of Lawfully Taking the Drink during Lent outside Mealtime ... 22

Section Six — Collection of All the Other Reasons Produced by Father Hurtado in Defense of Chocolate ... 25

Section Seven — Two Cardinals, Brancacci and Cozza, Defend the Use of Chocolate Together with Fasting ... 30

Section Eight — Three Other Doctors Write in Defense of Drinking Chocolate during Lent ... 34

Section Nine — The Sacred Antiprobabilist and Probabilist Theologians Together Commonly Reprove the Drinking of Chocolate during a Fast. They Claim that Their Reasons Withstand Every Reply ... 49

Section Ten — Examination of the Reasons Recounted in Favor of the Indian Potion The Sacred Theologians Claim to Demonstrate That These Are Not Reasons but Illusions and Repugnant Quibbles and That They Wound Common Sense No Less Than the Discipline of the Roman Church ... 54

Section Eleven — Whether Parvity of Matter Renders Lawful the Modern Custom of Taking Chocolate during a Time of Fasting ... 67

Section Twelve — Conclusion of the Letter with a Few but Important Considerations ... 69

Printing Approbation 78

Title Page

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS
ON THE USE OF CHOCOLATE
DURING A TIME OF FASTING
SET FORTH IN A LETTER
TO HIS MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST REVEREND LORD
ARCHBISHOP N N
VENICE
At the press of Simone Occhi
1748
With the permission of the superiors and with privilege

To the Christian Reader Who Truly Believes

Pestilential books issue forth daily from every quarter: books that stain decency, corrupt virtue, pervert the maxims of good morals, and render belief in the Gospel unsteady. The public presses of Europe provide us with books that entice people to attend theatrical performances, festivities, and games; poetic compositions that delicately sharpen the appetites and enchant the passions with sweetness; filthy romances that soil the imagination and impress shameful images upon the mind; insidious controversialists who assail holy dogmas; and impious libertines who hold the divine Religion up to ridicule. Who complains of such books, which flood in from every side? Who murmurs against these books? Who raises his voice? Who cries out? No one. On the contrary, some receive them with applause, while others tolerate them with complete indifference and profound silence.

This little book appears in public, treating with every possible caution a point of ecclesiastical discipline; and behold, indifference has passed into furious frenzy, while the respectful silence shown toward the aforementioned pestilential books has changed into murmuring, uproar, and censures against an author because he explains a point of Christian morals. Some will say: And who appointed this man legislator and censor of modern customs? Others will cry: The Rigorist! The Misanthrope! The Fanatic! Others will shrug their shoulders and, with politic and skillful reserve, will say nothing. From this indifference and apathy in the first case, and from this resentful indignation in the second, you may conclude what the belief and the prevailing spirit are among many people of our century. Ex ungue leonem: from the claw, the lion. Farewell.

Contents (as printed)

Section One. Occasion of writing — p. i

Section Two. Some observations are set forth beforehand, in order to make clear the importance and the precise state of the question — p. xx

Section Three. Origin of chocolate in the Indies and its introduction into Europe — p. xxviii

Section Four. Documents of the theologians who champion the use of chocolate during a time of fasting — p. xxxvi

Section Five. The strongest reasons alleged in favor of lawfully taking the drink during Lent outside mealtime — p. xliii

Section Six. Collection of all the other reasons produced by Father Hurtado in defense of chocolate — p. li

Section Seven. Two cardinals, Brancaccio and Cozza, defend the use of chocolate together with fasting — p. lxv

Section Eight. Three other Doctors write in defense of drinking chocolate during Lent — p. lxxvi

Section Nine. The sacred theologians, Antiprobabilists and Probabilists alike, commonly reject drinking chocolate during a time of fasting and claim that their reasons withstand every reply — p. cxvi

Section Ten. Examination of the reasons recounted in favor of the Indian drink. The sacred theologians claim to demonstrate that these are not reasons but illusions and quibbles repugnant to common sense, and that they offend not only common sense but also the discipline of the Roman Church — p. cxxix

Section Eleven. Whether parvity of matter renders lawful the modern custom of taking chocolate during a time of fasting — p. clxvi

Section Twelve. Conclusion of the letter with a few but important considerations — p. clxx

Section One — Occasion of Writing

To the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lord, my most revered Lord and Father

I. The most esteemed letter that Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship sent me two ordinary posts ago, filled with your customary kindness toward me, has placed me under the unhappy necessity of replying upon a point into which I would never have entered of my own accord, since I know too well the war it makes upon one of the most delicate and most deeply felt passions, namely gluttony. You ask me whether the report spread through various cities of Italy is true: that a preacher, after condemning during the past Lent, in one of the principal ruling cities, the use of chocolate during a time of fasting, afterward publicly recanted from the same pulpit. I cannot give a precise and plain answer to this inquiry without setting before your eyes a sincere account of the event. This is so closely connected with the right involved that I can scarcely speak of the one without the other.

Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship therefore well understands the odious trial to which I expose myself. If a spirit of ancient severity were to impel me to condemn the use of the flavorful drink, I would thereby provoke against myself the whole rich, noble, refined, pleasure-loving world, and almost, I would nearly say, the religious world as well. For even in our times there are some of whom Saint Augustine speaks: 'There are certain observers of Lent who are delicate rather than religious, seeking out new pleasures.' It is true that Saint Augustine, Saint Jerome, and all the other Fathers spoke with complete freedom against such corruptions; but in our times there is less freedom to speak in proportion as there is a greater excess of vices and a greater number of the vicious. They wish not only to satisfy their appetites, but also to clothe their vices with the mantle of virtue, to maintain themselves in the peaceful possession of the customs most conformable to their passions, and to blaze with indignation against all who dare condemn those customs. I already seem to hear them, in their friendly conversations, speaking sweetly against the author of this writing in well-arranged syllables as follows.

> When will this good man ever cease deafening our ears with his fasts of ancient invention? He expects this man to lay down his purse; he wants that one to throw away his chocolate cups and to be robbed of his supper. Observe how far his courage extends. He even dares to call into question the custom of drinking chocolate during Lent. Is there any prudence in touching so delicate a point? Oh, how many imprudent men abound in the world! It seems that certain people make it their purpose to render themselves hateful and to expose themselves to public talk.

Caught between these two rocks, either committing an incivility toward you if I do not reply, or drawing upon myself a storm of reproaches if I snatch so pleasing a refreshment from concupiscence, I flatter myself that I have discovered a middle way by which both extremes may be avoided. I have therefore resolved to wear in this case neither the uniform of a benign Probabilist nor that of a severe theologian, but only that of a historian. I have therefore endeavored to collect all the reasons that have thus far been devised on either side, and I present them, joined together, to Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship. They may serve as MEMOIRS for the theological history of drinking chocolate during a time of fasting.

But before everything else, I must answer the question put to me. Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship should therefore know that I was present at both of the aforementioned sermons, and that everything the preacher said on this subject is vividly impressed upon my memory. In the second part of the first sermon, delivered on Ash Wednesday upon the commandment of the Lenten fast, he inculcated the following truths.

II.

> Revered hearers, until the thirteenth century the fast of the Roman Church was always observed with only one meal during the day, taken first toward evening, then around the hour of None, and finally around midday. After so many centuries the evening collation was introduced. It was so called because it was taken after the spiritual conferences called Collations. It consisted in the mere drinking of water. Later, either a little fruit or a little bread was added. In the time of Saint Charles Borromeo it was restricted to only one ounce of bread and two glasses of wine. Later casuists, more benign and gentler than Saint Charles, increased it, some to four ounces, some to six, some to eight, and some finally, without the commission of so much as a single venial sin, to ten ounces of every kind of Lenten food.
>
> For some years another collation has been introduced in the morning, consisting of a flavorful drink compounded from the drugs of the New World. Thus the fast of our learned and erudite century is the most charming, most benign, most pleasant fast in the world. It admits a flavorful and substantial refreshment in the morning, a sumptuous dinner at midday, and an evening collation of eight ounces which, when well distributed, forms a good little supper for a man of ordinary diet. Whether the true image of that penance and mortification which forms the spirit and true essence of the ecclesiastical fast can be recognized in a fast of this kind, I leave the decision to you, most esteemed gentlemen.

III. The preacher mentioned chocolate in these cautious terms. The supporters of gentle morality went about spreading word through the august capital city, especially in the houses of ladies and princesses where use of the delightful drink is familiar, that the Reverend Preacher had said from the pulpit that whoever drinks a cup of chocolate sins mortally. And in order to procure a more numerous audience for the Reverend Preacher, they added:

> Behold, ladies, the severe doctrines of certain zealots of our times. They oppress poor Christians with cruel yokes beyond human strength, contrary to the spirit of the gentle and sweet divine law and contrary to the intention of Holy Mother Church, most benign. They fill distressed souls with scruples and tear the innermost parts of conscience.
>
> Therefore, ladies, in order not to disturb the tranquil calm of your hearts and not to trouble your consciences, do not listen to such preachers; you will do very well if you keep far from them. Know that during Lent you may lawfully drink not only one cup of chocolate in the day, but two, four, and as many as you wish, because it is a pure drink, and liquids do not break the fast. Therefore, just like wine, you may drink chocolate as you please.

IV. These speeches were made in the presence of secular and religious persons who were serious, learned, and upright, and beyond every objection. They reported them exactly to the Reverend Preacher. Assured by several witnesses of the greatest gravity that the event was true, he judged it expedient, indeed necessary, to beat back from the pulpit the harmful imposture that had been

circulated. Therefore, on the second Sunday of Lent, after he had delivered the sermon on Paradise to a people so numerous that they filled the whole vast church, although elsewhere it was being said that they were banqueting, he delivered this second part.

V.

> I know for certain, my most beloved hearers, that a report has been spread through the city that in my first sermon I taught you that whoever drinks a cup of chocolate sins mortally. You are irrefragable witnesses to this most evident falsehood. In that first sermon on fasting, I told you nothing other than the following truths.

He recited the words narrated above and then resumed his discourse in this manner.

VI.

> On this occasion I am pleased to assure you that I renounce, especially in the pulpit, every school party. Here, although unworthily, I exercise the apostolic ministry of explaining the holy word to you according to the interpretations of the Fathers, the Councils, and this Roman Church. Know that if I represent to you the evangelical morality of Jesus Christ as more severe than it truly is in itself, I sin; if I make it gentler for you than is just, I sin. If I am in doubt between severity and condescension, I take the side of clemency, knowing that God is rich in mercy, Ephesians 2:4.
>
> Whoever teaches excessive rigor sins, and sins foolishly, because he does two evils: first, because he teaches falsehood; second, because he teaches a tormenting falsehood that renders Christian morality hateful to the world. Whoever teaches excessive benignity sins because he teaches what is false; but if he does one evil, he at least obtains for himself a certain kind of good, because he teaches a falsehood that pleases, that finds favor, and that wins him the numerous following of two-thirds of the world, the rich and noble world. The reported affair of the chocolate strongly confirms this truth. Those who proclaim that during a time of fasting each person may lawfully drink chocolate as often as he wishes meet the taste, applause, and acclamations of the greater part of the refined world, which is eager for doctrines accommodated to its own appetites. Now, for your instruction, know that just as I have never pronounced from this pulpit the aforementioned opinion that drinking a single cup of chocolate contains a mortal sin, so I do not judge it expedient to decide whether that doctrine is true. Know that from the pulpit I never employ the distinction between mortal sin and venial sin except in evident matters.
>
> I leave the familiar use of this distinction to certain casuists, who in their Summas are seen holding in their hands the scales of malice and continually intercalating: 'Whether it is a mortal or venial sin. Answer: More probably it is a venial sin.' If I wished to reveal to you what I think concerning the use of chocolate, I would tell you that this drink is repugnant to the precept of fasting; I would tell you that there is parvity of matter; and I will not decide from the pulpit what matter is grave and what is light. But setting aside for the present the position I maintain in this matter, I undertake to preserve you from the most serious error spread by the adversaries through this august city of yours. I therefore say frankly that the doctrine by which it is taught that during a time of fasting one may lawfully drink chocolate as often as one wishes is a false, erroneous, and scandalous doctrine; that the teachers of such a doctrine

are in this respect harmful to the Roman Church; that they discredit our holy Religion; and that they render the holy discipline of our fasts contemptible even among the heretics, who precisely because of such doctrines ridicule our fasts, saying both by voice and in print that among the Papists those people fast who have nothing to eat.

And therefore the teachers of such scandalous doctrines would deserve to be punished as harmful to the public good of our holy Catholic Religion.

VII.

Behold, my revered hearers, where modern Benignism ends, while it continually cries: 'The Rigorist! Rigorism!' I detest all those excessively austere doctrines devised beyond the mountains and condemned by the Church; I speak only of that practical moral Rigorism which is opposed to the lax opinions of so many casuists. I say that if an Eastern foreigner unfamiliar with our customs were to arrive here in Italy and hear it resounding everywhere: 'The Rigorist! The Rigorist! Beware of certain domineering Rigorists! The great evil, the grave disturbances that these Rigorists cause in good consciences!' that foreigner, if he listened to such cries with closed eyes, would come to believe that Catholics were a fierce and inhuman sect of Circumcellions and Flagellants, of emaciated misanthropes with their flesh torn by bloody disciplines and exhausted by the severest fasts. Is it not so? But if this foreigner were afterward to open his eyes and begin to consider...

...the sumptuousness of Lenten tables; the meat eaten during the sacred season on every slight pretext; the revelries, banquets, and delicacies, greater or lesser according as purses permit them, what idea, what conception would he form of the Catholic Religion? Would he not cry that the Rigorism proclaimed by the Benignists is a chimera that is not found in practice in Italy, a mask invented by the Devil in order to bring universal ruin upon the morality of Jesus Christ? Would he not cry that Laxism is the true and real vice, the dominant vice, which like an impetuous torrent floods everywhere and triumphs everywhere: in fasts; in frequent Communions, about which a whole volume might be written here; in acts of impurity; in comedies; and in games? You therefore, O Catholics, beware of those who tell you that you may satisfy your appetite by drinking, as often as you please, the flavorful drink of chocolate.

VIII. The Reverend Preacher recited all these things from the pulpit in a voice so clear and resonant that he was heard in every corner of that vast church, even by those who were half deaf. What does Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship now say?

So strong a declamation both against the abuse of the drink and against the enormity of the imposture is passed off as a withdrawal, even as a retraction. This is the century of retractions. Falsehoods are doubled in clusters. To render the preacher hateful, it is circulated that he condemned drinking a single cup of chocolate as a mortal sin, although he did not even mention this. Once this calumny is disproved, a worse one is invented by saying that after condemning the use of chocolate during a time of fasting he publicly retracted himself. The things, otherwise most certain, that are being spread in various cities of Italy are incredible. When certain Christian gentlemen and certain ladies who fear God doubt whether they violate the precept by drinking the pleasing refreshment, they are immediately told: 'Ah, Your Lordship must not allow yourself to be ruled by such melancholy scruples. In order that you may drink your fine chocolate in the morning, during the day, and

whenever you wish with greater tranquility of conscience, know that the preacher N. N., because he condemned use of this drink, was obliged by the Supreme Authority publicly to recant from the pulpit.' This is the newly invented balm now being used to heal the wounds caused by disciplines and hair shirts, and to restore the very strict Christians and emaciated ladies of our times after their exceedingly long fasts.

Before the two pontifical briefs against the supper of those dispensed to eat meat, a Christian who doubted that he sinned by eating supper was told: 'Your Lordship may eat a quarter of a capon in the evening upon my conscience.' Now that such an opinion has been disapproved, he is told: 'Drink chocolate, because the man who preached that it was incompatible with fasting recanted.' What do you say, Monsignor, about this concern and this universal commitment to morality, let us call it not broad but indulgent? Anyone may commit himself to some false opinion. But this deliberate readiness of mind to support and protect every opinion accommodating and agreeable to flesh and blood seems to me a very significant thing. It is disputed whether supper is lawful: Yes, sir. It is disputed whether chocolate is lawful: Yes, sir. It is disputed whether those ceremonies are lawful: Yes, sir. It is disputed whether Canons may play only the part of mute statues in choir, without singing: Yes, sir. It is disputed... But heavens, Monsignor, the matter goes too far, and so far that at the end of this letter I shall indicate to you the consequences that necessarily arise from a manner of opining that is always indulgent and always committed to positions favorable to pleasure-loving humanity.

Some complain and cry, 'The impostor! The calumniator!' when they hear themselves accused of Laxism and Benignism, and when they see certain strange opinions exposed from the proper point of view. Yet they do not perceive that by the visible daily practice of zealously defending the aforementioned opinions, they come to confess as incontestable truths those things which, because they know not what else to say, they call impostures. But for the present let us resume our argument. From the recantation proclaimed throughout Italy they infer that, even according to the Rigorist Reverend Preacher, one may lawfully savor and cheerfully drink the sweet refreshment in the morning during Lent.

IX. You therefore understand, Monsignor, that this imposture is directed not so much toward discrediting the Reverend Preacher's person as toward making the corruption of the drink triumphant and the sacred discipline of the Lenten fast ridiculous. If the same severe Reverend Preacher had to retract publicly the condemnation pronounced against the use of chocolate during Lent, who in the future will be able to oppose such a custom?

If so austere a Rigorist finally had to approve it, who will dare contradict it? These are the arguments by which they endeavor to canonize the corruption, to accommodate fasting to the palate, and to place a scandalous Laxism in peaceful possession.

X. And here, Monsignor, you have the compelling reason that has obliged me, on this occasion of answering your question, to collect the HISTORICAL MEMOIRS concerning the use of chocolate during a time of fasting. If the false report that was spread had ended only in discredit to the Reverend Preacher's person, I would have said nothing of the imposture, knowing well that he has already raised himself above the slanders of his adversaries. But the strict duty of defending Christian morality so far as my weakness permits, and zeal for maintaining in its vigor the sacred discipline of the Lenten fast, which in our times is attacked not only by the frequency of transgressions but, much

worse, by the depravity of opinions, were the true and sole motives that constrained me to publish in this letter the doctrines of the theologians upon this disputed point. Let anyone furnished with good sense tell me whether, without fault, one could have allowed the aforementioned falsehood to circulate through so many cities of Italy with such grave prejudice to Lenten observance.

XI. It is the common doctrine of the Fathers that the truth is betrayed not only by those who publish lies in place of the truth, but also by those who, because of a mask of foolish policy or a vain worldly fear of becoming subject to impostures and calumnies, do not make the truth known or omit to defend it when it is necessary to manifest and courageously uphold it. Thus Saint John Chrysostom teaches, or whoever may be the author of the Imperfect Work: 'The betrayer of the truth is not only the man who transgresses the truth and openly speaks falsehood in place of truth; but the man who does not freely pronounce the truth when it ought freely to be pronounced, or does not freely defend the truth when it is fitting freely to defend it, is also a betrayer of the truth.' The great worldly sages object that customs have advanced so far and have put down roots so deep that wishing to oppose the universal current is manifest imprudence, not to say madness. They approve this harmful error of theirs with the oracle of the Holy Spirit: 'Where there is no hearing, pour not out discourse,' Ecclesiasticus 32.

The legitimate sense of this divine oracle is that when it is prudently foreseen that this or that private individual is obstinate in wickedness, private correction should then be suspended. On the contrary, because of the scandalous contumacy of private persons, one must never omit explaining the truth to the public; for since the elect are also found among the multitude of obstinate reprobates, there is always then hope of fruit. This is the certain doctrine both of the theologians and of the Fathers. The great theologian and eminent Doctor, Father Suárez, expressly teaches that when public correction and doctrine are concerned, 'it must not be omitted even if many are going to make bad use of it, because in it there is always hope of fruit.' And what? Augustine argues, and I ask pardon if at the very beginning I extend myself a little in a digression that is nevertheless most important and necessary. Must one perhaps neglect to offer medicine to those who profit from it because of the obstinacy of those who, having gangrenous wounds, reject it? 'Is medicine therefore to be neglected because the disease of some is incurable? You attend only to those who are so hardened that they do not receive even this discipline...'

'...but you ought also to attend to the many whose salvation we rejoice in.' The medicine of the holy word is instituted not only to heal the sick, but equally to guard and preserve the healthy. 'Medicine has two offices,' Augustine continues: 'one by which infirmity is healed; the other by which health is preserved.' Of the seed scattered by the evangelical farmer, some fell among thorns, some among stones, and some outside the road; but some also fell upon fruitful and fertile ground. If we were to refrain from scattering the seed of Christian truths for fear that a great part of the grain should fall among thorns and stones, we would never cultivate the fruitful ground. 'If he had feared to cast the seed lest some fall upon the road, some among thorns, some in stony places, the seed could never have reached even the best ground.' Passing over for the present the divine teachings of Saint Thomas on this subject, let the great Prudentialists and Easygoing Men of the world therefore be at rest: this writing of mine is not directed to them, but only to Christians who truly believe and who sincerely desire to be saved. If the invincible reasons that I am about to relate against the modern custom were so many fierce legions of Hussars and Lika troops advancing with swords in hand to assail the

gentlemen drinkers and to tear the chocolate cups from their hands, they would justly have the right to protest against me and ask me:

> And who has ever conferred upon you the power to erect a tribunal and make yourself our legislator, subjecting us, sword in hand, to a capricious Rigorism and to an arbitrary abstinence? What temerity is this? A private man dares to give law to the whole Christian world?

They could justly make all these objections; indeed, they would have the right to defeat these legions, maltreat them, and sacrifice their mad temerity to the severity of a just punishment. But this modest and restrained writing remains shut up at home. It goes in search of no one, nor does it allow itself to be seen except by one who seeks it; and once seen, it does not complain even though it is rejected with contempt and scorn. What more can the liberty of thinking rightly demand? Will our polished century perhaps presume to take from theologians the faculty of explaining with complete clarity that holy morality which is judged most conformable to the Gospel? Will our century presume to prevent Christians from being persuaded to penance?

With pleasure people listen and acclaim the many who, entirely destitute of the necessary knowledge, spread in private conversations by word of mouth, and in writing through the public presses, opinions most repugnant to the sublime and most pure evangelical morality; while, on the contrary, they blaze with indignation against those who propose the holy maxims of that mortification which Jesus Christ has prescribed to his followers both by example and by law. But let these new scholars of free thought know that although Jesus Christ has always had against him a numerous party opposed to his morality, he has always had, and always will have, followers who with unconquered constancy will defend the immaculate purity of his divine doctrine.

Section Two — Some Observations Set Forth Beforehand in Order to Make Clear the Importance and Precise State of the Question

I. First of all, I am pleased to persuade Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship that the cause I am about to treat is not, as some may perhaps believe, of little consequence, but rather of grave importance, since it has the greatest influence upon the great affair of our eternal salvation.

Two are the sins through which Christians commonly plunge into hell, namely sensuality and self-interest. All other sins ordinarily accompany these two. Give me a Christian who is virtuously disinterested and chaste, and I will at once give him back to you humble, sincere, charitable, and a despiser of earthly greatness. Now know, Augustine says, that between lust, one of the two universal causes through which so many Catholics are damned, and gluttony there is always a most intimate reciprocal alliance. The one nourishes the other, and they defend one another in turn.

> For wantonness is always joined to satiety. The belly and the genitals are neighbors, and from the order of the members the order of the vices is understood. Did food therefore cast us out of Paradise? Let hunger bring us back; let fasting bring us back.

Gluttony, you see, is one of the capital vices by whose means the first sin entered the world imperceptibly. All the Christian saints, that is to say all those whom we know with certainty to be saved, applied the greatest care to mortifying it.

Bodily penance, consisting principally in fasting, is commanded by natural, divine, and ecclesiastical law, as is manifest to all who know the first elements of Christian theology. These things have been mentioned in passing so that it may be considered that the cause we have to treat is not slight but of grave importance.

II. To prepare you to understand well the controversy whose history I am about to sketch for you, I judge it necessary to set out clearly the exact state of the dispute. I hope that this simple and sincere declaration will gain half your mind. It must therefore be presupposed, first, that the present dispute is not whether a person who needs some refreshment in order to discharge an office, duty, or ministry may drink as much chocolate as he judges necessary to strengthen his weakness and render himself able to perform his duties punctually. Some are old, some infirm, some weak of stomach. They are obliged to study, to attend congregations, assemblies, and consultations. Others must manage affairs of grave importance requiring prompt and vigorous application. If their weakness or ailments are such as to render them incapable of their ministry, they may take the refreshment suited to their need.

Second, it must be considered that this refreshment, necessary to strengthen bodily weakness, is not so inseparably attached to chocolate that it excludes any other thing not forbidden by the Lenten law on account of its quality. Otherwise, woe to those who, being weak and infirm, cannot spend half a paolo on a cup of the drink. They may equally refresh themselves with a glass of wine, a ring-shaped roll, or another suitable thing, provided that they have a true and real need of refreshment to fulfill their duties. Third, I suppose that anyone may take the flavorful drink immediately after dinner to facilitate digestion. Finally, it is certain that, as in other matters, so also in this one there is parvity of matter.

III. The precise state of the controversy is therefore this: whether the use of chocolate during a time of fasting is absolutely lawful, apart from any particular need, in the same manner as drinking wine, rosolio, water, and other similar liquors is lawful; or whether parvity of matter can justify the present custom of such a morning drink.

I would be lacking in judgment if I set myself to combat so sweet a custom in open battle. As I indicated at the beginning, I would provoke against myself the indignation and sharpest satire not only of gluttons and lax casuists, but also of those who, while boasting of rigid doctrines for others, are accustomed during holy Lent to moisten their own throats with this liquor. Meanwhile, to avoid every odium and to render my courteous readers still more disposed to understand the truth, I have resolved to report only the opinions and doctrines of the theologians on either side, so that the readers themselves, having been made judges, may embrace the opinion they judge either true or nearer to the truth. I have given this little writing the title MEMOIRS for Theological History because in fact I shall do nothing but relate to you the doctrines and maxims that the theologians of either side have printed. If every smallest history of the most trivial religious customs of the pagans gives so much delight, how much more ought a history concerning a point that belongs to the discipline of our Religion to please? Are curiosity to know the most ridiculous ceremonies of the Gentiles and distaste for knowing well the force of the precepts of one's own Religion not marks of an excessively blind frenzy?

It is true that this will not be a complete and perfect history, both because, where I write, I lack the books of not a few authors, and because my purpose is not so much to fill my readers' minds with uncommon information and the most minute facts as to instruct them well in the spirit of Christian morality pertaining to this point. Nevertheless, I shall omit nothing that the theologians of both parties have thus far been able to devise for either side. It has seemed more expedient to instruct you well in this cause under the character of a historian, by recounting what the other theologians teach, than under that of a theologian, by deciding as a judge upon one of the two sides. Therefore, if the reasons that couple the use of chocolate with fasting should all seem inept, vain, and for the most part ridiculous, offending common sense, you will in no way be able to become indignant against me; you will only marvel at how far, and to what vain discourses, concern to accommodate human appetites with a good intention leads even the minds of theologians. And so that no one may dare to censure me as either too partial or less than sincere, I shall report the very words of the principal theologians.

For whenever certain Probabilists see the lax and scandalous opinions of their casuists exposed in their proper light, they immediately sing again into the ears of their devout tertiaries the usual most rancid song: that the passages of their authors have been altered and holy charity violated. If the passages had been altered, justice, charity, truth, and every rule of honesty would have been violated. I therefore advise my courteous readers, and assure them, that this brief theological history of what the moralist Doctors of either party teach will be written with the fullest sincerity. Therefore, whatever certain gentlemen Probabilists may tell you to the contrary on this point, hold it for certain falsehood, like the other falsehoods they have circulated on this point about altered texts. That truth will always be reproached to them for as long as the books of their casuists endure. But it is now time to approach the narration of the case. And to introduce you to it with some pleasure, I wish to give

you the following poetic composition to read, the production of a great theologian and suitable for encouraging you to read the historical controversy.

Concerning a sonnet that was reproduced in this little work as a historical document published several lustrums earlier: as soon as a very few copies had been distributed, some complained that in it the Fathers of a distinguished and illustrious religious order were indicated, as though they indiscriminately approved the use of chocolate and the other things mentioned there by poetic fancy. When this report reached the ear of the author of this letter, he judged it his duty to remove the said sonnet from it, professing every respect, esteem, and veneration toward those who were suspected of being designated; they have always been spoken of in all his other printed works with the just praises due to them. And all those who attribute to the aforementioned persons certain maxims and customs that are condemned in general in these Historical Memoirs, as the matter requires, form capricious judgments contrary to the author's intention. He never has persons in view, but only the truth to defend and the abuse to refute.

Section Three — Origin of Chocolate in the Indies and Its Introduction into Europe

I. In the West Indies the flavorful drink was invented. Agostino Padilla, Archbishop of La Española, in the second book of the History of the Provinces of Mexico, chapter 84, writes that the glory of so flavorful a discovery is owed to the Province of Chiapa; and writers commonly agree upon this fact. This historian, however, does not reveal the year of the invention; but, from what I have been able to gather from various authors, it occurred around the middle of the sixteenth century. For about half a century it did not depart, so far as it seems to me, from the New World. Lodovico Lopez, who lived in Spain, his homeland, in the year 1592, in his volume entitled Instructorium, etc., printed at Salamanca in the year 1585, writes in chapter 112 that such a drink was in use in the Indies; but he says nothing about its having yet been introduced into Spain. So far as one may prudently conjecture, around 1600 the custom of the liquor passed from the Indies into the Spains, and remained there for some time before advancing into other countries of Europe.

II. Father Tommaso Tamburini, who in treating casuistic questions takes the palm over the other casuists, and there is, so to speak, no one who equals him, much less anyone who surpasses him, writes in Book IV on the Decalogue, chapter 5, section 2, number 9, that for a long time chocolate had been used both in the Indies and in the Spains, and that only recently had it begun to be introduced into Italy.

> Chocolate has been used among the Indians and the Spaniards for a long time, but among the Italians only very recently.

Father Tamburini ceased to live in this world in the year 1675. Thus it was only around the middle of the past century that the new custom began to be introduced into our Italy. Among the first theologians who set themselves to dispute about the lawful or unlawful use of this drink was Antonio di Lion, who by a learned argument demonstrates that chocolate and fasting cannot be united, and reports the authority of the famous physician Cardano, with whom Trullenco and Diana joined.

III. Among the first Probabilist theologians who undertook to write entire treatises and to gather all the possible reasons by which to reconcile the Indian drink with the European fast was Father Tommaso Hurtado of the Order of Clerics Minor. He devotes the whole of the tenth treatise of the second volume of his Moral Resolutions, printed in the year 1651, to it, and adds as a supplement an appendix of several chapters. In the preface to the treatise he advises that few Doctors had until then worthily discussed this controversy, although its decision was greatly necessary, both for calming consciences and for removing sins from the world.

> Few Doctors who have sent their writings to the press have touched upon this controversy, although in these times its decision is very necessary, both for calming consciences and for avoiding many sins.

These significant words permit us, without violating the good rules of History, to make a brief observation to the reader. It could not be expressed with greater clarity that the purpose of this Probabilistic Theology is to put consciences to sleep and to remove sins from the world by exempting

Christians from the observance of the laws. Father Diana, although he was called by his Caramuel the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world, did not know how, as has been indicated and will be said further below, to find a reason that would quiet the consciences of those who drank chocolate during a time of fasting. This is one of those sins that the most benign Diana did not know how to take away from the world.

IV. Thus our Father Hurtado, at once more courageous and more benign than Diana, does not say that he writes his treatise in order to investigate whether the law and the nature of the fast admit the drink outside mealtime; rather, he affirms that the purpose of his writing is to calm consciences and to take away sins. Therefore consciences, without the aid of the casuists, are of themselves agitated and anguished when in Lent they empty the cups. He adds that he wishes to refute a learned Modern who has written too scrupulously in this cause, burdening consciences and multiplying in the world as many sins as cups of chocolate are drunk during a time of fasting without a particular need.

> Therefore I judged it worthwhile to unravel it exactly, attacking a certain sufficiently learned Modern who, in a question published on this matter, seems to have spoken too scrupulously.

Christians, regulated by those lights which God has spread upon their countenances, see the repugnance that exists between the fast and this flavorful drink.

But driven on the one side by the piercing goads of gluttony to moisten their throats, and reproached on the other by the light that they are violating the fast, they experience grave remorse of conscience; and, drinking the sweet liquor with these agitated and lacerated consciences, they sin. But just as the sick man, thirsty and eager to drink, seeks a compliant physician, so these Christians go in search of those theologians who study, advise, and print, both for calming consciences and for avoiding many sins. And under the guidance of these able theologians, after blunting the remorse aroused by natural and divine light, the Christians drink cheerfully; and, united with their theologians, they condemn as scrupulous men and rigorists those who think otherwise.

V. Having set forth the brief preface, Father Hurtado enters upon the case. In the first chapter he advises that, as everyone concedes, infirmity or parvity of matter excuses from violation of the precept. He maintains, however, that one or two ounces of chocolate do not pass beyond the limits of this parvity of matter.

> I judge, however, that one or TWO ounces is small matter.

And he alleges the authority of the most recent and learned Moderns: 'Thus the learned moderns teach.' In this manner, he continues, one who is invited by friends to honorable and amiable social circles may, by title of civility, eat one or two ounces of some edible thing, or of chocolate.

> Just as one who, invited by friends for the sake of civility, takes one or two ounces of some edible thing, or of the drink of which we are speaking.

VI. Having established this principle, he plants another one favorable to his cause, namely that although the ancient Christians, directed by those theologians who were instructed by the Holy Apostles and by the Holy Fathers who succeeded them, abstained from wine in their fasts, its use nevertheless became lawful in later times. Yet even this benign Probabilist concedes that those Christians who, during Lent, frequently drank outside mealtime not only to extinguish thirst but to

nourish the body and satisfy the appetite would sin not only against the virtue of temperance but also against the precept of the fast.

Footnote (a). In a treatise published in print I proved at very great length that, if wine is taken with the intention that it nourish, it breaks the fast, because it is taken in fraud of the law, and fraud ought to benefit no one. This doctrine of all the Ancients has, however, seemed too harsh to some Moderns; to me it appears most true. For this it suffices that Saint Thomas teaches it; twelve most weighty authors followed him, whose names I gave in the place cited, to whom I add the Archdeacon, Lodovico Lopez, Azor, Astensis, Samuel of Lublin, and Lessius. Treatise 2, final chapter.

And this opinion is certainly, as Father Hurtado himself affirms, maintained by Saint Thomas, Alensis, Saint Antoninus, Medina, Palazzo, Gabriel, Tabiena, Natale Alessandro, and Enrico di S. Ignazio; and Diana himself calls it probable. Father Tommaso Tamburini, although he condemns the use of chocolate in our case, nevertheless maintains that during Lent one may drink wine, must, beer, waters made from herbs or distilled in the same manner, for mere and pure pleasure, indeed in fraud of the law itself.

> But it is lawful to drink wine, must, beer, waters made from herbs or distilled in the same manner, even in the morning for SOLE PLEASURE, even many times in the day, even in FRAUD of the fast. Thus Laymann, Sánchez, Diana, Lezana, and Fagúndez.

This doctrine is condemned by the Church. Let this be said out of the true charity of warning readers of such an error, so that they may be able to flee from it; for that charity is deceitful which, in order to sustain the chimerical reputation of a casuist who has erred with good intention, does not wish Christians and confessors to be warned to guard themselves against similar scandalous doctrines.

VII. But let us resume the History. The point of the controversy therefore concerns, Father Hurtado continues, whether the

chocolate, as it is prepared today among us, is a true drink and is taken in the manner of a drink. For if it is a true drink, it certainly is not opposed to the fast. Accordingly, all agree that anyone who ate in morsels that portion of chocolate which, when diluted and well frothed in water over the heat of burning coals, does not in the least prejudice the observance of the fast, would violate the fast. This is a quite marvelous presupposition. A person who eats four ounces of exquisite roasted sturgeon breaks the fast; if he has it melted and prepared in an extract of substantial broth, he does not sin at all. Finally, Father Hurtado concludes his presuppositions by saying that if the chocolate were dissolved not in water but in milk, and if egg yolks were mixed into it, then it would certainly break the fast, because although milk is among liquids, it is not, however, commonly used as a drink.

Section Four — Documents of the Theologians Who Champion the Use of Chocolate during a Time of Fasting

I. Having explained in the first chapter the aforementioned presupposed principles as certain among all, in the second chapter he establishes the following proposition:

> I therefore judge it very probable, and safe in practice, that this drink of chocolate does not break the fast of the Church, but that the essence of the fast remains intact, even if a drink of this kind is taken several times and in a large quantity.

The opinion is set forth clearly with the aid of the new Probability. It is very probable, and safe in practice, that chocolate may be drunk not once but several times, and in a large quantity. Here the reader begins to feel a shudder at the consideration of so lax an opinion and forms no very good conception of theologians of this kind. But Father Hurtado, knowing that one of the principles of Probability is extrinsic authority, supports the opinion by the authority of the most weighty theologians: Saint Thomas, Saint Antoninus, Paludanus, Durandus, Sylvester, John of Tabia, Medina, and other ancients, who wrote several centuries before chocolate appeared in Europe.

In the time of Saint Thomas, after supper - the single meal still retained the name of supper because it was taken about three hours after midday - it was customary to take a little electuary, or preserve, solely to facilitate the digestion of the food and to strengthen the stomach so that it might digest it well. All those ancients expressly say that these preserves were taken after supper as medicines facilitating digestion; and the younger moderns, with Probabilistic sincerity, would have us understand that, according to the doctrine of Saint Thomas and the other weighty theologians, chocolate may also be taken early in the morning. Father Hurtado himself, however, confesses at number 48 that all the ancient theologians adduced by him speak of preserves taken in place of medicines, and they add that whoever took them to extinguish hunger and nourish the body violated the fast, and they would say the same of chocolate:

> All whom I have adduced say that electuaries - and they would say the same of chocolate - break the fast if they are taken with the intention of nourishing, in fraud of the law.

Thus chocolate may be drunk for two purposes: either to extinguish thirst and as a health-restoring medicine, or as a nutritive drink.

Whoever drinks it with the first intention does not violate the law; but whoever, with the second intention, puts the cup to his lips undoubtedly transgresses the commandment and sins.

> A certain drink is both medicinal and sweet and fit to nourish; and it can be taken for either purpose, both that it may heal and that it may nourish. If anyone takes it for the purpose that it may nourish, who doubts that he breaks the fast?

And he gives the reason: because then he sips the drink in order to nourish himself and eats in order to eat, not in order to be healed.

> Since he takes the thing insofar as it is nutritive and eats in order to eat, not in order that he may be healed.

Whoever therefore resolves to drink chocolate in Lent should arm himself with good intentions and should intend to take medicine in order to recover his health, not nourishment in order to fare better. Perhaps these reasons invented by Probabilistic Theology will seem excessively festive and merry to you, Monsignor. But when the cause is bad, the reasons cannot be better.

II. The aforementioned speculations, diffusely explained by him, seemed weak even to Father Hurtado himself; and therefore in the third chapter of his Treatise he brings forward others, which he wishes to have force, if not as a testament, at least as a codicil. This is a spirited Probabilist. He recalls that when Catholics are greatly inclined toward some custom that appears contrary to the law - as in fact they are toward this custom of drinking chocolate, which appears precisely to be contrary to the fast, and from which inclination they are with difficulty restrained - then it is the duty of the Doctors of Theology who govern the Tribunal of Consciences to interpret this law, so far as ever may be possible, in favor of and for the quiet of consciences, in order in this way to avoid many mortal sins. For to exempt men from a human law, a probable reason is sufficient; indeed, it is not required that it be probable, but it is sufficient that it be apprehended as probable by learned and God-fearing men. Let us produce the author's words:

> But in order that the very great practical probability of this opinion may be demonstrated, we must proceed by two other ways, so that it may have force, if not as a testament, at least as a codicil. For when the faithful are very greatly inclined to do something that appears to be contrary to some positive human law, from which inclination they are with difficulty turned away, it falls to Doctors, especially Theologians who attend to the tribunal of conscience, to explain that law and disclose its obligation, insofar as can be done, in favor of and for the quiet of conscience, so that mortal sins may thus be avoided. For in order that some human law not be observed, a probable reason is sufficient; and not only one that is probable, but one that is apprehended as probable by learned and God-fearing men.

III. This is a piece of Probabilistic Theology of the most refined and the most hidden kind. It casts into the air all laws, ecclesiastical and civil. Men pay taxes, duties, and debts to creditors with difficulty. They are exceedingly inclined to defraud them. Therefore, says Father Hurtado, with Father Tamburini consenting, the Doctors of Theology must employ all their study and every device to exempt men from the observance of laws of this kind that are difficult to practice. Behold the mysteries of Probabilism unveiled. When the Doctors of Theology defend this Probabilism in the abstract, they surround it with a numerous guard of distinctions so thick that they conceal its horror. But when they afterward make practical use of it, then it makes itself known as monstrous, as appears in the doctrine reported above and in a hundred others condemned by the Church. Thus do we reason it out; but Father Hurtado resumes his discourse and writes that we must strive with all our might to produce probable reasons, at least reasons of an extrinsic probability resting upon the authority of the Doctors, which may persuade that chocolate is not opposed to the fast:

> Therefore we MUST STRIVE to adduce reasons resting upon the authority of the Doctors, which will appear probable to every sensible man, in order to demonstrate that the drink of chocolate does not break the fast.

IV. The first reason invented by these laborious and forced studies of his is that chocolate is in itself a drink, is ordered in itself to be drunk, and is not in itself food, although accidentally it may nourish.

His conscience reproaches him, however, for having said that chocolate nourishes accidentally, since such a property belongs to it by its nature. For this reason, he continues:

> I said accidentally, not because it belongs accidentally to a drink of this kind to nourish; for it has this from its nature, since it is a compound capable of being converted into the substance of the one taking it. . . . But I said accidentally by comparing this drink with the intention of the one who instituted it, by which those taking it are regulated. For the one who instituted drinks of this kind does not primarily intend the nourishment that comes about through them in themselves, but either the pleasure that is acquired or the refreshment of nature.

Everyone is persuaded that the drinkers of chocolate think of anything rather than the intention of the one who instituted it. Our Hurtado produces the most learned Father Master Lopez as an approver of this doctrine of his; but Father Lopez expressly affirms the contrary.

He adds the authority of the most learned Masters of Salamanca, of the Supreme Pontiff Gregory XIII, of many Jesuit and Franciscan Masters, and of celebrated physicians, and he rejects Pinelli's replies. At the end of the chapter the objection is made that chocolate, by inflaming lust, is opposed to the mortification and maceration of the flesh, which is the end of fasting. But he replies that the end of the law does not fall under the law, without distinguishing the extrinsic end from the intrinsic:

> Nor does it stand in the way that chocolate with these ingredients incites to lust and solicits to intercourse, and is opposed to the mortification of the flesh which the fast intends. For although the end intended by the Church is the maceration of the flesh and the mortification of carnal passions, this end nevertheless does not fall under the law, as the common axiom of jurists holds.

I am continuing to place before the eyes of my readers some passages of Probabilistic Theology, so that they may remain ever more persuaded how pernicious and fatal to Christian Morality is that Probabilism which in our days all the learned men of Europe, Catholics as well as Lutherans and Calvinists, detest, and which the entire great Church of France has condemned

as a poisonous source of every evil. Yet in so enlightened a century, and amid so much light, there are still people who do not blush to parade the defense of such a chimera by geometrical method. But error has always had its numerous followers, and they must be left to delight in similar geometrical demonstrations. Meanwhile, let one reflect upon the oddity of this benign Probabilist. That chocolate excites and provokes to lust does not matter: it may be drunk, because the end of the law does not fall under the law. Many words are not needed against such a doctrine, which by its own nature renders itself detestable.

Section Five — The Strongest Reasons Alleged in Favor of Lawfully Taking the Drink during Lent outside Mealtime

I. The strongest reason by which Father Hurtado seeks to join chocolate with fasting is supplied to us in the fourth chapter of this Treatise of his. It is founded upon custom, which has established that chocolate is in itself a drink, like wine. And just as wine, drunk several times, does not break the precept, so neither does chocolate.

> And just as wine, drunk several times, does not break the fast, so neither does chocolate.

The difficulty is reduced to demonstrating whether this custom was rightly introduced and well established. He distinguishes two kinds of customs: one that derogates from a law already introduced; the other that by itself imposes a new obligation. In order that either the one or the other may have force, whether of a law that imposes a new duty or of a new law that abolishes the old law, it is required that those who introduce them have the intention of binding under fault. To this end the consent of the legislator and a fitting span of time are necessary. Some just title is also required. The custom of drinking chocolate is furnished with all these prerogatives. It therefore has the force to derogate from the law of fasting and to declare that this paste dissolved in water is essentially and in itself a drink. First, this custom was introduced with the belief of the multitude that it was, by its institution, a drink. In the second place, the express consent of Gregory XIII intervened. More than forty years have passed from its introduction to the present hour. And even if this pontifical consent had not been given, it is sufficient for the validity of the custom that for fifty years in Spain there has been this common error, that the Pope gave such consent with respect to the Indies.

And this custom must be supposed to have been introduced not only in the Indies but also in Spain, although here with some fear. But that fear deserves to be driven away, the testimony of the Most Illustrious Archbishop Padilla being sufficient that the Supreme Pontiff declared that chocolate does not break the fast.

> This custom indeed has been introduced not only in the regions of the Indies but also in our Spain, although here with some fear, which ought to be driven away.

To calm consciences, to drive sins from the world, and to repel the Devil, what is required is not fear but courage. And when some fear of fault arises in the conscience, it must immediately be driven away, because this fear of sinning disturbs consciences, afflicts the spirit, and does not allow one to savor the sweet drink with pleasure. It ought to be driven away. This is the language of our Probabilist, which causes horror in every good Christian.

II. Scarcely had Father Hurtado dictated the reasons described above to his amanuensis when there came into his hands, as he himself recounts in the immediately following fifth chapter, a certain writing by the most wise Father Rodrigo Manrique, very learned and erudite upon this question. The most religious Father Friar Gaspare de los Reyes, formerly a most observant Provincial and illustrious for learning and holiness, of the Royal Family of Santa Maria della Mercede of the Discalced Fathers, presented this writing to him. In it he found many weighty authorities for the confirmation and establishment of this reason founded upon custom.

Here it is read that Father Sebastiano di Oviedo, a Dominican of the Province of Guatemala, asked Doctor Martin Navarro, then in Rome, for his counsel upon this controversy. The original of Navarro's writing is preserved in the City of Chiapa, from which a copy was transcribed, as is attested by the Reverend Father Francesco dell'Olmo, Superior of the Convent of Saint Dominic in that city, on 22 April 1577; by Gabriel de Morales; by Ildefonso de Nurena; and by Friar Francesco Salzedo, Guardian of the Convent of Saint Francis Atitoense in the Province of Guatemala. And Father Raffaello de Luxan, Provincial of the Province of Saint Vincent of the Order of Preachers, affirms under oath that Father Friar Girolamo di San Vincenzo, Provincial of the same Province,

a religious man, and so forth, of singular virtue, told him that, finding himself in Rome and moved by apostolic zeal, he consulted Saint Pius V upon this case and informed him of the manner in which this drink was prepared in the Indies; and that he received this reply: 'Drink does not break the fast.' He held this declaration as an oracle delivered viva voce, as if he had been sent there by a Most Eminent Cardinal, since the aforesaid Friar Girolamo di San Vincenzo was a man of the greatest authority and distinguished holiness. Father Luxan summarily declared all this on 23 March 1619.

III. Hence Father Hurtado argues as follows. When the Pontiff is questioned about a doubt of the faithful concerning the observance of some commandment and ecclesiastical law, the pontifical reply makes a juridical declaration, as Panormitanus and Cardinal Paleotto teach. Nor does the reply of Covarruvias, Melchior Cano, Sanchez, and Suarez stand in the way. They say that the reply of a Prince given upon an inquiry made by private persons concerning a doubt that pertains to a universal law does not have the force of a juridical interpretation when the Prince does not intend his interpretation to be universal.

For this doctrine is true, our Hurtado replies, when the interpretation of the Prince is binding, not when it releases from the observance of the law. In our case the Pope declares that chocolate does not violate the fast, and this declaration is valid even if it were made by the Pope as a private Doctor.

> The Pontiff declares that chocolate does not break the fast; and this declaration, even if it were that of a private Doctor, would suffice for our purpose.

This acute Probabilist keeps certain unexpected replies ready at hand, by which he frees himself with marvelous dexterity from every most stringent argument.

IV. To the viva voce oracle of Saint Pius V, Father Hurtado adds another from Pope Paul V, reported by Father Manrique. Manrique relates that Father Diego di Sosa, Visitor of his Society in Mexico, told him how Father Niccola di Anaya, Procurator of that Province, presented this difficulty in 1614 to the Holy Father Paul V. The Pope commanded that chocolate be prepared in his presence and that a serving be made ready to drink; afterward His Holiness said: 'This does not break the fast.' Father Anaya sent this declaration to his Provincial in Mexico, and the senior Fathers recounted it to Father Diego de Sosa, their Visitor, as a thing certain and indubitable.

This declaration alone is sufficient for everyone lawfully to make use of the said drink, even if they know nothing of this declaration. For they have sufficient knowledge to act rightly when it is presumed that everyone knows notorious and public things, according to the teaching of Mascardo, Sordo, Menochio, and Barbosa.

V. Many other Fathers of the Society of Jesus confirm this opinion of ours, Father Hurtado adds. On 3 June 1630 they subscribed the Treatise just recounted, and they are Father Lodovico Ramirez, Father Cristoforo Ruyz, Father Marco del Castillo, Father Ferdinando de los Rios, Father Didaco Tello, and Father Ildefonso Fernandez de Cordova, all learned and very erudite men, as fame proclaims in this theater of ours in Seville.

VI. From all these matters our opinion, supported by a twofold ground, receives great reinforcement. First, because from the time of Saint Pius V and Gregory XIII the use of the probability of this opinion began; and this probability gains strength and increase day by day, because men enjoy this drink more and more.

Its probability day by day regains strength and increase.

But if someone too scrupulous should not trust his conscience to the foundation of probability that justifies the drink, let him use, if he wishes, the pontifical declaration.

But if anyone, under the title of using a probable opinion, does not wish to use this drink, let him use, if he wishes, the title of the pontifical declaration.

And if, finally, neither one nor the other of these two titles should suffice to induce you, O Christians, to drink this chocolate with tranquility of conscience, make free use of the title of custom derogating from the law of fasting.

But if he is not content with this, let him use the title of a derogating custom.

Our Probabilist is concerned that Christians in Lent, either by virtue of probability, or by force of the pontifical declaration, or finally by virtue of custom, without scruple and with a tranquil conscience, should refresh themselves several times a day with the use of the flavorful drink, because in this manner its probability acquires strength and increase day by day.

Its probability day by day regains strength and increase.

If some scruple arises, or some phantom of fear encumbers the spirit, it must be blunted: it ought to be driven away. Father Hurtado concludes his fifth chapter with a doubt that sends the alleged custom up into the air,

since the pontifical oracles produced were pronounced concerning the chocolate drunk in the Indies, which may be a true drink, as lemonade is among us. The custom may therefore have force in the Indies and may be a corruption in Spain.

This custom could exist in the Indies and not in Spain.

For this reason he reserves for the following chapters the production of stronger reasons.

Section Six — Collection of All the Other Reasons Produced by Father Hurtado in Defense of Chocolate

I. In all the countries of the world some drink pressed from certain edible things has been introduced, Father Hurtado says at the very beginning of his sixth chapter. In Spain aloja, among the Romans honeyed wine, among the Flemings beer, and among the Cantabrians cider were in use. And although these drinks were invented by Pagans, it does not therefore follow that we Catholics cannot make use of them, because according to theological principles we say that a drink, even one belonging to the Gentiles, does not break the fast. Nor ought it dismay us that idolatrous priests abstain from chocolate during their fasts,

because they practice such abstinence in order to fast more rigorously, and this rigor does not belong to the substance of the precept for us Christians.

> That Gentile priests abstain from chocolate during their fasts does not stand in the way, because they also abstained from wine; this they did in order to fast more rigorously, and this rigor is not of the substance of our precept.

The penance of us Christians is sweet and gentle; Rigorism does not enter into its substance, according to the probability of our Historian.

II. He founds a second reason upon the Civil Gloss, unic. verb. Sponsum, C. de raptu Virginis, and upon the Gloss of the Decree, Ad caput denique, where it reads: 'From the fact that one thing is granted, all similar things are understood to be granted.' From this principle, Father Hurtado says, Father Tommaso Sanchez deduces many things, as is his custom. Since wine is therefore permitted in the chapter just recalled, it follows by legitimate consequence that the other drinks similar to wine are likewise permitted. The drink of chocolate is similar to wine. Therefore it is understood to be approved equally with wine.

III. He forms the third reason by this parity. Hard sugar and honey alone, if eaten in a large quantity, break the fast; yet when liquefied in wine they do not break the precept, because they are truly a drink and are taken in the manner of a drink.

We ought therefore to conclude the same with respect to chocolate, which in itself is a drink and is taken in the manner of a drink.

IV. At the end of the Treatise our Probabilist alleges a counsel of Navarro in which two points are affirmed. The first is that in the Indies this drink is customary, with which laborers sustain themselves throughout the day. In the second it is resolved that this nourishment is not opposed to the fast. No such counsel is found in all the Works of Navarro. And even if it were found, what support would it bring to the European use of chocolate, if it speaks of the Indian use?

V. Father Leandro of Murcia, a Capuchin, valiantly refuted Father Hurtado's doctrine, censuring it as false and as contrary to Christian piety. Hurtado added a long Appendix to his Treatise, in which he in part defends his opinion and in part retracts it. In the first chapter of that Appendix, or Apology, he is inflamed against Father Leandro because the latter wrote that the benign opinion is opposed to

Christian piety; and he writes that 'in this the Reverend Father exceeded too greatly,' because the end of the precept does not fall under the precept.

He gives the following example. The end appointed by the Church in the precept of reciting the canonical hours and of hearing Holy Mass is the devotion of the faithful and the worship of God. Yet because this end does not fall under the precept, the cleric who recites the Divine Office with voluntary distractions does not sin against that precept. And we say the same of one who, voluntarily distracted on a feast day, assists at the Sacrifice of the Mass, as Cardinal de Lugo, Lessius, Laymann, and many others teach. Now who will say that these Doctors derogate from Christian piety? Whoever therefore teaches that the substance of the precept is observed, even though the manner is omitted, the merit of the observance is lost, and the end of the law is not attained, does not thereby derogate from Christian piety by teaching contrary to it.

God alone can know what idea of Christian piety existed in Father Hurtado's mind. From what he writes in the following chapters of his Appendix, it is gathered that every opinion, whether it is probable or is apprehended as probable, conforms to Christian piety. In the third chapter he assigns the grounds for the probability of his opinion. A single Doctor illustrious for learning and piety

suffices to render an opinion probable. Now not one but several Doctors defend our opinion. Who therefore can oppose its probability? And if it is probable, it is benign; if benign, therefore pious.

VI. In the fourth chapter he reproduces the principal argument for his opinion: that chocolate is a true drink. And in order to set this weighty argument in a better light, he proceeds to explain the definitions of food and drink, alleging the authorities of Bercorio, Celsus, Pliny, and renowned Physicians. He distinguishes three kinds of drink: natural, artificial, and medicinal. He places chocolate in the number of mixed artificial drinks. He copies the words of the Physician Ramirez, who says:

> This drink has a double nature: that of food and that of drink.

Fortunate are travelers, and all men, if this Physician's doctrine were valid. Everyone, with little inconvenience, could eat and drink and pass his life without so many burdens, with the sole provision of a quantity of chocolate. It is true that the Indies could not supply so much cacao; but human industry would endeavor to transplant similar plants elsewhere as well.

VII. Once again he sets before our eyes the papal oracles; and to those of Saint Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Paul V he adds another of Gregory XV. He becomes inflamed against Father Leandro the Capuchin, who frankly passes off these pontifical declarations as fables. And Father Hurtado replies that Father Leandro the Capuchin's answers

> are all futile;

because, although the papal declarations are not authentic in the external forum, they are nevertheless legitimate in the forum of conscience, one accredited witness being sufficient to render an opinion and the report of a fact probable in the forum of conscience, as Diana, Zambrana, Granado, and Salas, authoritative Probabilists, teach.

VIII. In the sixth chapter he reinforces the argument from custom, by virtue of which it remains declared that chocolate is a drink and not food. He cites many authors in his favor, especially Diana,

who proves that in the Kingdom of Sicily the use of pork fat, or lard, with which foods even in Lent are seasoned, is lawful. If custom makes the one lawful, why not the other? He writes very many other things concerning custom, which, without prejudice to the History, I pass over as useless to the point in controversy.

IX. In the seventh chapter he brings again into the field the parallel with electuaries, or preserves, practiced in past centuries after the meal taken on a fast day in order to facilitate digestion, as has been said. Father Hurtado opposes a Text of Saint Thomas, which he abuses enormously, as the Theologians of the contrary opinion demonstrate. In the eighth chapter he answers Father Leandro's arguments with all brevity.

X. Father Zaccaria Pasqualigo, although more than any other Probabilist he so greatly widened the law of fasting that his Volume on this subject was condemned by the Church, could not avoid the harsh censures of our Father Hurtado, who refutes him in the ninth chapter of his Appendix because he denied that the use of chocolate during a time of fasting was lawful. 'A great thing!' exclaims Father Hurtado. Scarcely was there a class of persons whom Father Zaccaria Pasqualigo did not exempt from the fast; and then was he capable of writing that this drink breaks the fast, resting upon frivolous grounds?

> And first I marvel at Zaccaria, who, although in the very large Volume already cited there is scarcely a state of men in the Church whom he does not exclude from the obligation of fasting, says that this drink breaks the fast.

He numbers about fifty states of persons whom Father Pasqualigo dispenses from fasting; and again he replies that he cannot understand how so acute a Probabilist, who knew how to find reasons for exempting from fasting the poor, servants, travelers, weak married persons, women who while fasting lose the complexion by which they render themselves pleasing to their husbands, betrothed virgins when there is danger of obscuring their beauty, all those who practice laborious trades, porters, shoemakers, cooks, bakers, weavers, millers, tanners, silversmiths, goldsmiths, sellers of merchandise through the streets, washerwomen, painters, sculptors, female servants who labor, printers, sailors, valiant soldiers, decorators of Churches, those who travel on foot, those who ride upon hired mules, players at ball or at some other laborious game, those who have become weak through intemperate lust, Preachers on three days each week, Lecturers, Professors, Confessors who labor greatly, those who study continually, Lawyers, Procurators, Judges who labor, Notaries who write for the greater part of the day, Secretaries of Princes on days when they labor greatly,

nurses, Bishops on days of numerous Ordinations, Flagellants in Holy Week, pilgrims who go to holy places, those who abound in heat of stomach, and others whom I omit.

XI. Having ended the long series, Father Hurtado concludes:

> I have marveled at this author, who, although he found probable reasons for exempting all those listed, did not think to say that chocolate does not break the fast, unless perhaps he says this for Italy and other regions in which the custom of drinking it has not prevailed, as it has prevailed in the Indies and in Spain.

Father Hurtado did not consider that, if Pasqualigo had found probability also for the chocolate drink, no one would have remained who truly fasted. Yet it must otherwise be confessed that Father

Hurtado does not without reason lament that this colleague of his did not know how to find, in the vast arsenal of Probabilism, a probable reason for the chocolate drinkers that would place them under cover of the precept, when he knew how to find probabilities for fifty states of persons in order to exempt them from fasting. But since Probabilism, according to me, has no other foundation than the caprice of men, it is no wonder that probable opinions multiply according to the variety of dispositions.

XII. Finally Father Hurtado brings his Treatise to an end by retracting in substance as much as he has said. He concludes that whoever drinks chocolate, as also wine, with the intention of nourishing himself violates the precept of fasting. The intention of men neither gives to nor takes away from the precious liquor virtue or force; and yet our Father Hurtado wishes the observance or transgression of the precept to depend upon this intention alone. I already see that readers here are moved perhaps against me, being unable to bring themselves to believe that a Theologian reduces either the violation or the fulfillment of the law to the intention of men. It is therefore fitting to transcribe his words:

> In a Treatise given to the press ... I proved at very great length that, if wine and chocolate are taken with the intention that they nourish, they break the fast.... Yet this doctrine, which belongs to almost all the Ancients, has seemed too harsh to some Moderns. To me, however, it appears most true: for which it suffices that Saint Thomas teaches it, whom twelve most weighty Authors have followed, whose names I gave in the place cited. To them I add the Archdeacon, Sylvester, Abulensis, Lopez, Medina, Azor, the Complutenses, Alensis, Lublin, and Lessius.

XIII. The first ground of this opinion is that chocolate and wine truly nourish. And who will dare deny it? Father Hurtado exclaims. Does not experience demonstrate it to us, although by their primary institution they are drinks? Whoever therefore takes them with the intention of extinguishing hunger and nourishing his body makes himself a transgressor of the law.

> The first ground is that both wine and the drink of chocolate truly nourish. And who denies this, since experience teaches it, although by their primary institution they are drinks? Therefore, if anyone takes them with the intention that they nourish and extinguish hunger, he sins against the precept of fasting and in fact breaks it.

Certain truths, evident by their nature, often extort from the adversaries themselves at least entangled assents. Here the nourishment inherent in chocolate is conceded; but at the same time recourse is had to the chimerical primary institution by which it was placed in the number of liquids. If its primary institution produces it in solid paste, fit to be chewed and eaten, how can it be said that by primary institution it is classed among liquids?

XIV. The other ground is that fraud is then committed against the law when, with the words of the law preserved, its meaning and spirit are circumvented: just as when a Regular does not put off the religious habit but wears lay dress over the religious habit, he circumvents the law; and if, thus dressed, he goes about outside the Cloisters, according to everyone he incurs the censures promulgated against Apostates. Since it is therefore a certain truth that chocolate furnishes nourishment to the body, although the person who drinks it does not materially eat (and by this part the words of the law are satisfied), in reality its meaning and spirit are nevertheless evaded, because against the law the body is nourished more than once in the day.

> Something is done in fraud of the law when anyone, preserving its words, circumvents its meaning, as is evident ... in the Religious who, not putting off the regular habit, puts lay dress on over it. For although he does not put off the habit secretly, if nevertheless he wanders outside the cloister, all agree that such a man is an Apostate and incurs the censures enacted against Apostates, because he has circumvented the meaning of the law while preserving its words.... Therefore, if anyone drinks wine or chocolate with the intention of sustaining and nourishing himself, since these drinks truly nourish although they were not instituted for this, even if he does not eat with his mouth but drinks, and thus preserves the words of the law, nevertheless he circumvents its meaning, and truly by intention,
>
> and by the deed itself he is fed several times and breaks the fast.

This fragment of doctrine makes a slaughter of Probabilism: it condemns as excommunicated all those Regulars who go about the City in disguise, although beneath the lay clothes they carry either the sacred scapular, or tunic, or cassock; it condemns as transgressors of the sacred fast all drinkers of chocolate, because no one drinks it in order to extinguish thirst, but in order to strengthen the stomach against the pangs of hunger.

XV. Up to this point we have concisely narrated everything most ingenious and dazzling that the Probabilist Hurtado, together with all the other Probabilists of his time, knew how to invent in order to couple chocolate and the Christian fast in familiar friendship. The good Probabilist also agrees that the fast of idolatrous Priests did not include such delicious drinks; but he recalls that such rigor of abstinence has nothing to do with the substance of the Christian fast. We must, however, render thanks to this Theologian on two counts. First, because, having set forth with all sincerity the principles of practical Probabilism, he made known how weak and ridiculous they are; he made us touch with our hands that, although in speculative abstraction an effort is made with the usual hedge of distinctions to defend it, when it afterward comes to be put into practical use it is immediately understood how pernicious it is to Christian Morals.

In the second place, Father Hurtado, unlike so many other Probabilists too steadfast in defense of their system and their opinions, if he does not fully retract his opinion, nevertheless circumscribes it in such a manner that no wise man will ever be found who in Lent drinks chocolate upon the grounds he produces. Of all those who drink chocolate in Lent, there is not one who attends to the intention with which he takes it. And what is relevant is that, among so many chocolate drinkers who take it, there is not one who drinks it with the intention of drinking and extinguishing thirst; rather, all sincerely confess that they drink it in order to strengthen the stomach and restore their powers. Thus Father Hurtado, having employed two, indeed three, long Treatises to demonstrate as lawful the morning custom of the tasty restorative, and having been unable to advance even a single sufficient reason capable of persuading a mind superior to the enticements of the throat, there follows as a legitimate consequence that the opinion favorable to the chocolate drink is improbable, by virtue of what Father Hurtado knew how to theologize.

Section Seven — Two Cardinals, Brancacci and Cozza, Defend the Use of Chocolate Together with Fasting

I. After Father Hurtado, two Cardinals wrote in defense of the use of chocolate: His Eminence Brancacci and His Eminence Cozza, who wrote diffusely upon this controversy. The first published an entire Dissertation. The second presents at length what the first wrote, with some reflections of his own, in his Volume on fasting, Part III, article 1, doubt 9, number 109 and following. Neither says anything beyond what Father Hurtado wrote. Only His Eminence Cozza attempts to found his opinion upon the authority of Holy Scripture, with the following reasoning. This drink is called sicera by Giovanni a Costa. Now this sicera, replies the Purple-clad Theologian, is not food but drink. Therefore it does not break the fast. That it is not food but drink he proves by a Text of Holy Scripture, which speaks in the same manner of wine and of sicera. These are the words recorded in Deuteronomy, chapter 29:

> You have not eaten bread; you have not drunk wine and sicera.

The same is affirmed in the Book of Judges, chapter 13:

> Take heed, therefore, that you drink neither wine nor sicera.

One of two things therefore follows: either the use of wine is opposed to the fast; or, if wine is lawful with the fast, chocolate must be said to be equally lawful. This argument is very merry and festive. Casuists do not ordinarily make use of Divine Scripture or of the Fathers to confirm the doctrines of the Decalogue and the most important truths of Evangelical Morals; and now, with the authority of Divine Scripture, an attempt is made to render plausible a custom most repugnant to those severe fasts which Holy Scripture commands? But let us continue the History.

II. His Eminence Cozza, before setting forth the reasons of Brancacci, separates certain things from controversial things. He establishes as a principle held certain by everyone that chocolate by its nature is a food, being composed of pure edibles. Let us hear him himself:

> For the exact discussion of this matter, certain things must be separated from uncertain ones, so that we may proceed more clearly. And first, in this all agree: that chocolate in itself and by its nature has the character of food; for it is composed of edible material: it is composed
>
> of cacao, cinnamon, sugar, and vanilla, all of which in themselves have the character of nutritive food.

Now who can deny that a compound of such ingredients is a true and substantial food? Therefore all agree that anyone who eats this chocolate in paste, and in its primary nature, breaks the precept of fasting. The controversy turns upon whether, when it is dissolved in water and well beaten over the fire, it is opposed to fasting. The learned Cardinal Cozza establishes another principle, and it is this: any drink pressed from Lenten foods is not contrary to fasting, but only that potion distilled from foods prohibited in Lent, such as broths extracted from meats.

> Drink, in everyone's opinion, is not opposed to the integrity of fasting unless it is extracted from material prohibited on fast days, as broths from meats and the like.

Thus broths extracted from almonds, from sturgeon, from trout, crayfish, and frogs, and from other choicer fish, by virtue of this principle do not make war upon the Christian fast. If this principle were certain, as the Lord Cardinal says, held certain by everyone, the question would be decided.

III. The learned Cardinal Brancacci, otherwise a defender of sound doctrines, champions this opinion, but with various limitations; and, himself recognizing the weakness of his arguments, he restricts his opinion to parvity of matter. The celebrated Father Master Giovanni Lorenzo Berti, an Augustinian, distinguished for doctrine, erudition, and probity, and at present Librarian of the illustrious Angelica Library through the efforts of the Most Reverend Father Master Gioja, his General, who takes pride in advancing to the best posts of the Order its most learned and most upright Religious, reports with elegant brevity and clarity all Brancacci's arguments together with his answers in the fourth Volume of his Theology, Book XXIV, final chapter, at proposition III.

IV. First of all I wish to report a sincere confession of this distinguished Cardinal, who in his Dissertation warns that he does not rest his opinion in any way upon the pontifical oracles alleged by Father Hurtado as foundations of the custom upon which he afterward bases his doctrine favorable to chocolate.

> I shall not enlist support for this assertion from the alleged declarations of the Supreme Pontiffs Pius V, Gregory XIII, Paul V, and Gregory XV, reported after others by Hurtado, or from the Bull of Urban VIII of happy memory, of which Henry Stubbe makes mention, and before him Pellicer, cited by Hurtado, as confirming our negative opinion.
>
> For I have no legitimate evidence concerning these things. I have neither seen those declarations nor heard of the matter from men whom knowledge of it surely could not have escaped. Indeed, although this controversy has often been proposed before the Pontiff in the examination of Bishops, in my presence, no mention has been made of the alleged Bulls.

Only to the Dominicans of Chiapa and to the Jesuits of Mexico were the oracles pronounced by the Supreme Pontiffs in Rome made manifest.

V. The first argument of this Cardinal is the usual one commonly produced by the others: that chocolate is drink, not food. And this potion is familiar and common to the Americans and the Spaniards. What by its nature is drink cannot have the character of food in any country of the world. And that which does not have the nature of food, but of liquid, is not opposed to the fast, because liquids do not break it.

This reasoning induced the celebrated Spanish Physician Caldera to retract the opinion that he had taught in the Treatise entitled Tribunal Medico-Magicum. This Physician Caldera must have possessed a very pliable mind if he remained persuaded by such arguments. The aforementioned Father Master Berti reports that the English Physician Stubbe demonstrated by experiment that from one ounce of cacao there is expressed more fatty substance and nutritive humor

than from one pound of beef. Thomas Gage recounts that he heard from the Americans themselves that those among them who are accustomed to drink chocolate are usually square-built, muscular, and fat; and he assigns the reason. For although there are many cold parts in cacao, there are far more buttery and nutritive parts. And the other ingredients are hot, such as cinnamon, to say nothing of vanilla, which does not always enter into it. The Lord Cardinal Brancacci asserts that he had

experienced more than once that an ordinary cup of chocolate strengthened his stomach and restored his powers for no more than seven hours. From this he infers that it is false that two ounces of chocolate furnish more nourishment than three ounces of meat. I can affirm that only for three or four hours does this drink, when on some occasion I take it, extinguish my hunger and strengthen my stomach and head; and after four hours I experience severe hunger. But if from this I wished to infer that this exquisite potion does not nourish and does not strengthen, I should utter a most manifest falsehood, contrary to sensible experience. Whether two ounces of chocolate then provide more nourishment than three or four ounces of meat is a question that I consider as difficult to decide as it is vain and useless. The point is that, according to the common opinion of Physicians, chocolate supplies excellent nourishment, as Giacomo Manget demonstrates in his Pharmaceutical-Medical Library. But this will be discussed when we narrate the doctrines of the Theologians who affirm that chocolate is repugnant to fasting.

VI. Brancacci's second argument is that wine and beer do not break the fast, although they are nutritive liquors; so much so that, according to Galen, some wines nourish equally with pork, for which reason in former times generous wines were furnished to Athletes before combats. Gumaro Huygens, an able Theologian of Louvain, maintains with strong arguments and vast erudition that wine and beer taken outside the meal are opposed to fasting. What the benign Probabilist Hurtado thinks upon this point was reported above. But let it be granted, in accord with the common opinion of the Theologians, that the ordinary wine customarily used at tables does not violate the fast: who will therefore couple with the fast the use of that rich and generous wine of which Galen makes mention and which was given

to the Athletes, or the use of a wine which, by means of dissolved edibles, was rendered thick and dense in the manner of chocolate?

VII. Parvity of matter is the third foundation of Brancacci's opinion. But this argument evidently demonstrates that the cause is desperate. No one denies that parvity of matter may also be found in this drink. But if what the most distinguished Physicians Manget, Pasquio, Zacchia, Stubbe, and others teach is true - that in a single ounce of chocolate there is so much nutritive virtue that it surpasses the nourishment furnished by the best foods - it will be a difficult thing to mark out the boundaries of this parvity, so as to couple it with a fast which we believe was prefigured in Moses and Elijah, consecrated by the example of Jesus Christ our Lord, and strengthened by apostolic and ancient Tradition.

VIII. The final argument of Cardinal Brancacci presents chocolate to us under the appearance of a medicine, which strengthens the natural heat, generates a purer blood, vivifies the substance of the heart, breaks up and dispels flatulence, and brings benefit to the stomach. The Cardinal's Latin words will explain with greater vividness these fine properties of the spirited drink:

> It strengthens the natural heat, generates purer blood, vivifies the substance of the heart, dispels flatulence, and is beneficial for strengthening the stomach.

I would add that it cheers the heart, awakens the spirits and sets them in gentle motion, comforts the head, supplies the mind with acute conceptions, and renders the tongue eloquent - not indeed for murmuring, but for rendering more pleasant and more brilliant the conversations of those circles where it is customarily drunk cheerfully. This medicine is adorned with so many prerogatives that it

is excellent both for the sick and for the healthy. The name of medicine that is attributed to it may serve as a sort of mask among the ignorant, so that during a time of fasting it may proceed unpunished. For the rest, it is clearly affirmed that this potion strengthens the natural heat, vivifies the substance of the heart, generates purer and more delicate blood, and strengthens the stomach; and then at the same time is there so much courage as to deny that it nourishes the body and breaks the fast? But what better effects do broths of capons, distillates of pigeons, and of partridges produce in the human body?

IX. These are all the arguments upon which Cardinal Brancacci rests his opinion: arguments,

the aforementioned Father Master Berti concludes, that will never satisfy any wise Theologian. And in order that the splendor of the Purple may not serve to dazzle, and that the learning of so learned a Cardinal may not be alleged as an authority that gives a degree of probability to this opinion among those who receive as probable everything that some Writer prints, it is well to recall what was noted above: namely, that the Cardinal reduces his opinion to parvity of matter and restricts this parvity to a single ounce of chocolate, clearly teaching that, when the chocolate is not diluted but thick, it breaks the precept of fasting. This is to be impressed especially upon those who, without having read the books, go about passing off as absolute the limited and circumscribed opinions of Authors.

X. To the arguments that His Eminence Cozza produces from Hurtado and Brancacci, he adds this reflection, likewise advanced by other Authors. When the quantity of water exceeds the quantity of edible matter placed within it, the mixture then has the character of drink and not of food. On the contrary, when the quantity of water in which it is mixed is less, the mixture has the character of

food, not drink. This same doctrine is produced by Father Leandro and Father Geribaldi, both very benign Casuists. Father Leandro, although most benign among the Probabilists, affirms absolutely in his Treatise V, dispute V, question 5, that chocolate breaks the fast; and he then teaches that it does not break it when the quantity of water surpasses that of the chocolate. It must be said that this Father was ignorant of the manner in which this potion is prepared in Europe. In every chocolate drink commonly used, the quantity of water surpasses the quantity of paste placed within it. The reason advanced by Leandro and adopted by Geribaldi and Cozza is a manifest illusion. Polenta, a food familiar to country people, will have to be placed among liquids and called water, because in this mixture three pounds of water correspond to every pound of flour. Rice soup, so common at tables, will have to be called water, because about six ounces of water correspond to every ounce of rice. If the opinion of Leandro, Geribaldi, and Cozza were true - that when the quantity of water surpasses the edible matter, the mixture is then denominated a drink, and that everyone may swallow it in great quantity and as often as he pleases - it would follow that everyone could drink

one or two pounds of chocolate a day tempered in three pounds of water.

Section Eight — Three Other Doctors Write in Defense of Drinking Chocolate during Lent

I. Three other Writers have treated this cause in these recent times. Father Domenico Viva, among the others, presents it to us in his own particular manner. I shall transcribe all his words, so that the usual refrain about my lack of sincerity in reporting his doctrine may not be sung again. Thus he writes in his first Volume, second part, at question ten, in the first article at number VIII. (a)

II. Concerning whether chocolate breaks the fast, various Authors say various things. Many affirm that it does, as found in Diana. Some deny it, as found in Tamburino, on account of parvity of matter. Others, as found in the same author, deny it because in Mexico it is a customary drink, just as beer is among the Germans and wine among us.

III. The same Tamburino and Diana, on account of the extrinsic authority of many Theologians and the practice of the conscientious, think it probable that it does not break the fast. Machado, in fact, in Tome I, Book II, part IV, treatise 3, says that in Spain it is so customary that scarcely anyone makes a scruple of taking it on a fast day. In truth, setting aside extrinsic authority, the opinion of the Most Eminent Brancacci together with Escobar pleases me: namely, that if we use chocolate in the manner in which it is a customary drink in Mexico [that is, if to seven or eight ounces of water one ounce of chocolate and half an ounce of sugar are added], it does not break the fast; but if a large quantity of chocolate is mixed with the water, so that it has the form of soup, then it breaks the fast, as we have said of sorbet. The reason is not that one ounce is parvity of matter; for in this way you could not take it several times without mortal sin, nor once without venial sin; but because, among those Nations, it is a customary drink, and thus it may be taken in any place as a customary drink.

IV. Nor should you object, first, that although such a drink is customary among the Indians, it is not customary among us. For if in some place it is a customary drink, by its very nature it is already destined to be taken as a vehicle of food and to extinguish thirst. What is such by its nature is such everywhere; and for this reason among us beer does not break the fast, although it is not customary here.

V. Nor should you object, second, that it truly nourishes. For the same could be said of wine and beer, and they nevertheless do not break the fast; because, as Laymann and Lessius note, they nourish accidentally: wine is taken more for the alteration of the body and the digestion of food than for nourishment, as St. Thomas says in question 147, article 6, reply 2, although it nourishes in some manner; and therefore it does not break the fast. For the rest, as I observed in the Trutina when expounding thesis 29 condemned by Alexander VII, in practice the reins ought not easily to be loosened for these opinions, especially by the conscientious, who strive to imitate Christ the Lord and to serve him, not the belly.

V. Everyone here will ask Father Viva why he wrote about the chocolate of the Indians and not the chocolate of the Italians. If chocolate is made in the manner of that of the Mexicans, does it not break the fast? Must one therefore go to Mexico to learn whether the chocolate of that country is similar to ours? No, because ours is then similar to that of the Indians when one ounce of chocolate and half an ounce of sugar are mixed into seven or eight ounces of water. But why is the sugar stated separately,

if this sugar is one of the ingredients of chocolate? Do you know why the half ounce of sugar is separated? Because, if you say one and a half ounces of chocolate in one breath, it appears to exceed parvity of matter. Yet in Italy chocolate is made into a paste with sugar. Thus, according to Father Viva, one and a half ounces of chocolate in seven ounces of water is in the American fashion. But as for the chocolate commonly drunk in Italy and throughout Europe, what do you decide? Is your Theology directed toward instructing the Americans or the Italians? I wished to inform myself among those most expert in this drink, and all say that one and a half ounces is the dose commonly used even when one wishes to drink a good cup of chocolate. Two ounces are for an excellent and almost extraordinary one.

VII. Now the Reverend Father Viva teaches that these cups containing one and a half ounces of chocolate diluted in seven ounces of water, well boiled, cooked, and whipped by a skillful hand, may be drained in Lent toties quoties, as often as one pleases, without violating the precept of fasting. Because, he says, the reason that justifies this drink is not parvity of matter. For if parvity of matter were the reason that renders this drink lawful, one would sin mortally by drinking it two or three times; and anyone who drank it only once would not escape a venial sin. Now this venial sin would render such a drink bitter and distasteful to especially conscientious souls. A doctrine must therefore be found that causes us to drink the flavorful potion with tranquility of conscience, without even venial fault intervening; and causes us to drink it not once, but as often as we wish, as we drink water and customary wine.

> The reason is not that an ounce is small matter.

And yet this is one of the chief reasons of the Most Eminent Brancacci. But however that may be, this reason does not suit delicate consciences, as has been said.

> For in this way you could not take it several times without mortal sin, nor once without venial sin.

It must therefore be said that in such a quantity it is a customary drink among those Nations, and thus it may be taken anywhere as a customary drink; that is to say, as many times as you wish, without sinning even venially against the precept of fasting, whatever may be the case regarding the virtue of temperance, which for the present, in order to speak with precision and clarity, is not under discussion.

> In such a quantity it is a customary drink among those Nations, and thus it may be taken anywhere as a customary drink.

Nor, becoming scrupulous, should you object to me that although this chocolate is a customary drink among the Americans, it is nevertheless not such in our countries. For these are scruples aroused by the hypochondriacal ill humor. Once it is admitted that this is a customary drink in some country, such by its nature it is in every other place in the world.

> For if somewhere it is a customary drink, by its nature it is such everywhere.

I also do not wish any scruple to disturb your conscience because this drink affords nourishment; for wine also nourishes, and beer, and yet you make no scruple about violating the precept even though you drink them several times. For the rest, Father Viva concludes his discourse, in practice the reins ought not, as was warned in the Trutina, easily to be loosened for these opinions.

The reins ought not easily to be loosened for these opinions.

Especially by the conscientious imitators of Christ our Lord, who wish to serve him, not the belly and the throat.

But what ought those do who are not conscientious, and who are not disposed to imitate Christ by mortifying the throat and concupiscence with true fasts, but instead truly wish to serve the belly and the throat? What more ought these gluttons do than drink as many cups of this chocolate per day as they wish, as Father Viva allows? He teaches that during a time of fasting Christians may outside the meal, not only to extinguish thirst but also to restore their strength, drink as much as they please of wine and of every other customary drink.

It is lawful to drink both at table and outside it, and to restore one's strength with wine, just as also with any other customary drink.

Chocolate, when one and a half ounces of it are placed in seven ounces of water, is a customary drink.

In such a quantity it is a customary drink among those Nations, and thus it may be taken anywhere as a customary drink.

Nor should you object that one who drinks outside the meal, not to extinguish thirst but to satisfy hunger, drinks in fraud of the fast and of the law.

Nor should you say ... One who drinks outside the meal to restore his strength drinks in fraud of the fast and in fraud of the law. Therefore he sins.

This is a vain objection, suggested by a gloomy, scrupulous humor. But I clear away this scruple with Father Reginald. For he does not act in fraud of the law who makes use of his right. By virtue of custom everyone has the right to drink in order to extinguish thirst. Therefore, even though he drinks to restore his strength, he makes use of his right.

I answer, however, with Reginald by denying the minor. For he does not act in fraud of the law who uses his own right. Now everyone by custom has the right to drink to allay thirst. Therefore, if he drinks also to restore his strength, he uses his own right.

Should this reasoning not fully persuade you, hear the radical reason, which is alleged from Abulensis by Monsignor Martin Bonacina. He does not act in fraud of the law who acts contrary to the end of the law, but only he who acts contrary to the express intention of the law.

And the radical reason is assigned by Abulensis, as cited by Bonacina at point 2: namely, that he does not act in fraud of the law who acts contrary to the end of the law, but he who acts contrary to the express intention of the law.

The express intention of a law and the end of a law are two things so different that they render the drink lawful toties quoties, as often as one wishes, says Father Viva. Shortly we shall see how the opposing Theologians make sport of such a distinction, because the intrinsic end of the law forms the soul and essence of the law, whatever may be the case regarding the extrinsic end.

VIII. A celebrated Preacher, not in Latin, as some would wish these moral Questions to be written, but in the Italian language, by way of a dialogue among Silvio, Lucrezio, and the Preacher, in the third part of the first Sermon of his Lenten collection - a part which he calls familiar and for the chamber -

reports the various opinions of the Authors upon this point and then forms his own. I flatter myself that the complete reading of this Father's entire Discourse will not prove disagreeable to the reader. He therefore writes thus:

IX. Silvio. Tell me: if I wish to fast, may I freely take chocolate?

Lucrezio. Oh! I too can free you from this scruple. I have read the entire long Treatise that Father Bonapace writes upon it; and I was so convinced by his discourse, whereas before reading it I was of the contrary opinion. He supposes what is certain: that the ecclesiastical fast is not broken by something that is not nutritive. Having supposed this, he reasons thus. That compound cannot be nutritive none of whose

parts is nutritive; this proposition appears certain to me. He states the minor and says: no part of chocolate is nutritive; and he proves it. Sugar is a sweet salt and, according to the Physicians, does not nourish. Spices do not nourish. Cacao remains; but this, he says, is of a most cold nature, and according to the doctrine of the Physicians whom he cites, things of a most cold nature are indigestible and not nutritive.

Preacher. This Theologian proceeds along a most difficult road, full of scrupulosity. Cacao, left in its coldness, may be indigestible; but from this it cannot be proved that it does not possess nutritive principles within itself, most capable of nourishing when they are freed from excessive coldness. By its preparation, by the evaporation of the superabundant moisture during its roasting and grinding, and by the addition of sugar and hot spices, it is brought to a tempering after which it cannot be proved that it is not nutritive.

Silvio. There is at least always parvity of matter to which one may have recourse.

Preacher. Nor does this road please me. First, because parvity of matter taken without a just cause that renders it lawful does not free one from venial fault; and I do not wish, my dear Signor Silvio, that we should make little account of

venial sins. Second, because in reality it is not so easy to reduce it to parvity of matter. Chocolate, when boiled and incorporated with water, forms a third species which produces different effects, and in moral estimation it is judged a third substance, as is a little rice or a little bread boiled and incorporated with some liquor.

Lucrezio. When chocolate is incorporated with water, it is a liquid thing; and liquids do not break the fast.

Preacher. Nor do I admit this doctrine. With Cardinal Toledo and other Theologians I distinguish two classes of liquids. One is ordered to remove thirst; and although it is nutritive, it does not break the ecclesiastical fast. Wine, aqua vitae, and beer are digested by the human stomach; therefore they are liquors that nourish. But of themselves they are not ordered to nourish or to remove hunger, but only to extinguish thirst. Thus the ordinary almond-milk drinks customarily made by sorbet makers, although they contain crushed almonds or other nutritive seeds, do not break the ecclesiastical fast, because of themselves they are ordered merely to extinguish thirst. On the contrary, milk, broth of frogs or of other fatty fish, and even barley drinks or almond-milk drinks, if egg yolks are added to them, or if the hand is more

liberal with seeds or almonds in order to render them nutritive, break the fast; for they are liquids of another class, ordered not to extinguish thirst but to remove hunger and to nourish. Nor do I see that chocolate is commonly drunk to extinguish thirst.

Silvio. Therefore you, Father, judge that chocolate is contrary to the fast?

Preacher. No, my Lord; but I make use of other principles. Speaking speculatively, I say: such a drink is not ordered to extinguish thirst or to remove hunger, but to comfort the head and the stomach. Therefore it is properly neither food nor a customary drink, but a medicine taken as a beverage. And medicines, although they may nourish accidentally, as sweet-almond oil and other such liquors do, are nevertheless not opposed to the ecclesiastical fast. The chocolate drink is a medicinal drink, of itself ordered to the health of the head and the stomach. If someone uses it for pure delight and sins against temperance, he does not for that reason alone come to sin against the fast ordained by Holy Church. Thus many drink bitter-orange sorbets for pure delight; they may commit another sin, but they do not sin against this precept.

Lucrezio. This discourse pleases me greatly.

Preacher. The practical discourse, which concludes with complete certainty, will please you still more. The ecclesiastical fast, says the cited Cardinal Toledo, is a voluntary abstinence from food according to the rite of the Church. Therefore, what is not contrary to the rite and will of the Church is not contrary to her precept.

I explain myself. The collation taken in the evening certainly is food and nourishes, and it is separated from dinner by many hours of time; nor do we have a positive canon that permits it. Nevertheless, it is certain that it does not break the ecclesiastical fast, since the Church sees this collation practiced by the faithful and has never prohibited it. Reason in the same manner concerning the chocolate drink. Call it drink, or food, or medicine, as you wish; let it nourish or not nourish, as you wish. Today it is not a new thing: for a long time it has been used in Rome and outside Rome by learned and pious men, in public gatherings, at public refreshments, in the sight of Prelates and Pontiffs; neither they nor the Congregations have ever protested. And because this is a matter belonging to positive law, no edict against such a drink has ever been issued by public ecclesiastical authority. Therefore its use is not

contrary to the ecclesiastical rite; therefore it does not break the fast.

Lucrezio. Thus it may also be used during the fasts of a Jubilee and of other Indulgences?

Preacher. When the Pontiff prescribes some fast for a Jubilee or another Indulgence, he does not intend a fast different in nature from that which the Church prescribes in the other fasts commanded by her. In the others she does not prescribe abstinence from this drink; therefore the Pontiff does not intend such abstinence in the fasts of a Jubilee or of other Indulgences.

X. We cannot dispense ourselves from making a few brief annotations upon so ingenious a discourse, in which one recognizes the fecundity of the human intellect in inventing reasons that second the urgent concerns of its friend, the body. Father Bonapace, superior to all the reproaches of experience, is not frightened to put before the public the claim that chocolate does not nourish. Father Calino rightly says that this Theologian proceeds along a most difficult road, full of scrupulosity. To tell the

truth, there is no small scruple in opposing the universal judgment of the human race and the intimate sense experienced by the very person who speaks thus.

XI. I likewise approve the opinion of the Father Preacher in rejecting the other principle of parvity of matter. First, for the reason already indicated by Father Viva: this parvity does not free one from venial fault.

> And I do not wish, my dear Signor Silvio, that we should make little account of venial sins.

Most fortunate Silvio! This time you have found a Theology hidden for so many centuries: namely, the power to practice the most exquisite and costly delights on those same holy days of penance, without even venial fault and with a most delicate conscience. But, in the second place, it is difficult to reduce the present custom of chocolate to parvity of matter.

> Chocolate, when boiled and incorporated with water, forms a third species which produces different effects, and in moral estimation it is judged a third substance.

This is a sound discourse, in comparison with which Lucrezio's objection that liquids do not break the fast proves vain and ridiculous. Father Calino excellently distinguishes two classes of liquids: those for extinguishing thirst, and those destined to remove hunger and to nourish.

> Nor do I see that chocolate is drunk to extinguish thirst.

This is a reflection that universal experience suggests to anyone who has not closed the door to natural reason.

XII. Silvio, inflamed with indignation on seeing rejected all the principal reasons which the supposedly benign Theologians produce in favor of the lawful potion, cries:

> Therefore you, Father, judge that chocolate is contrary to the fast?

XIII. No, my Lord; but I make use of other principles. Speaking speculatively, I say: such a drink is not ordered to extinguish thirst or to remove hunger, but to comfort the head and the stomach. Therefore it is properly neither food nor a customary drink, but a medicine taken as a beverage.

If I did not fear making certain Gentlemen fly into a rage, who have fixed in their heads a most troublesome maxim: that Theologians must be prevented from calling things by their proper names - that is, from calling serious things serious and passing off ridiculous things as ridiculous - I would certainly say that this passage of Theology, which the Father Preacher calls for the chamber, is for the theater. But to avoid their indignation, I shall leave the readers, who know that chocolate is not drunk speculatively but most practically and that it cannot properly be called either food or a customary drink, but a medicine taken as a beverage, to make the obvious and natural reflections upon such a most delightful doctrine. They will know better than I how

to ask the Father Preacher whether this medicine, when taken in morsels, breaks the fast. And everyone says that it does. Many, either for lack of convenience, or because they are traveling, or because it pleases them so, take such medicine in solid morsels and not as a beverage. They will reply to that sentence:

> The chocolate drink is a medicinal drink, of itself ordered to the health of the head and the stomach.

Is not the distillate of a capon, a pigeon, or a sturgeon likewise ordered to the health of the head and the stomach?

XIV. Many will then be kindled with just and holy indignation against that reason in which the Holy See is represented as approving such a custom.

> It is used in Rome, in public gatherings, at public refreshments, in the sight of Prelates and Pontiffs; neither they nor the Sacred Congregations have ever protested.

This argument will be called below, with the most profound respect toward the Authors who propose it and with the most just zeal in defense of the Holy Roman See, an insidious sophism, not to say an imposture, which discredits that same Holy Roman See among the Heretics, to whom our holy fasts are represented as ridiculous and as playthings. The Heretics themselves are precisely those who make use

of such a sophism to defame the Holy See. If everything used in public gatherings and at public refreshments in Rome and outside Rome had to be called lawful and approved by the Holy See because Rome does not thunder excommunications and does not publish edicts, what would follow? In Rome many people publicly gamble who, by reason of their profession, cannot gamble; many keep open giro banks which they cannot keep; and many, precisely in public gatherings and at public refreshments, do very many things which they cannot do. Yet no edict has ever been issued against such things. Are they therefore lawful? Does Rome therefore approve them? It will be demonstrated below that those who make use of so scandalous an argument do not know what the Church of Jesus Christ is. He assures us that in this Church of his there will be until the end both wheat and tares; indeed, he says:

> Allow both to grow until the harvest.

A great thing! If Rome issues edicts, they are evaded through capricious interpretations. It is said that in such questions there is no infallibility. It is spread abroad that the Popes, having repented of publishing the constitutions and edicts, have declared the contrary by an oral oracle. And in this manner Rome is represented as teaching one thing through printed and promulgated edicts, briefs, and constitutions, and another through an oracle

of the living voice. No one here will cry that charity is being torn to pieces; for since no one is named, no one will wish to confess himself guilty of so great an evil. Yet will someone perhaps claim the right to print lax opinions injurious to the Holy See, even in Lenten Sermons in the vernacular, and at the same time have the courage to demand that no one dare refute them? If many things were done and at the same time silence were kept about them, they might sometimes be allowed to pass for various considerations. But to do them and then print them? To practice them and then justify them in public print? This is a combination of things that cannot be allowed to pass without refutation. Indeed, according to the doctrine both of the Fathers and of the Theologians, anyone who, being able, did not refute the indicated laxities would sin. And God has promised that if in his Church there will always be cultivators of the tares, there will likewise always be farmers who preserve the wheat from the tares. But let us return to the argument. If, on the other hand, Rome does not issue edicts, then everything is lawful; then Rome approves everything by her silence. And behold Christ's oracle verified, that the wheat and the tares are together. I know that these

arguments will be received with laughter by some; but let them know that, just as Jesus Christ foretold that there would never be lacking those who in his Church cultivate the tares with the good intention and belief that they are cultivating the wheat, so there will likewise never be lacking others who, with invincible breast and holy zeal, truly cultivate the wheat of heavenly doctrine, preserving it from being choked by the tares.

XV. The final doubt raised by Signor Lucrezio is truly worthy of one who wishes to ascend to Paradise by a road wholly contrary to the road of that bodily penance which crucifies the flesh and mortifies the appetite. The pleasant potion has been established as lawful, says Signor Silvio, in Lent, on the Ember Days, and on vigils. It remained to decide whether the use of the delightful beverage is also permitted during the fasts of the sacred Jubilee, at which time humiliation, mortification, and penance are customarily more visible. Once the favorable decision is supposed, Christians are assured upon this point also that throughout all their pilgrimage they will not remain even one day without the medicine that comforts the head and the stomach, provided their purse does not fail. Nor must one omit spending money upon

so pleasing a refreshment, not even in order to give alms during the Jubilee. Only those Christians who, being without money, cannot provide themselves with so costly a comfort will remain deprived of this potion and unable to take it daily even during that time of Jubilee in which it seemed that every delight repugnant to true penance and humiliation ought to be banished by the sacred fasts. But it must be confessed that the reason assigned by the Father Preacher is not, once his principles are supposed, so contemptible:

> The fast which the holy Pope imposes in the Jubilee is not of a nature different from that which the Church prescribes in the other fasts commanded by her. In the others she does not prescribe abstinence from this beverage. Therefore, the Pontiff does not intend such abstinence in the fasts of the Jubilee or of other Indulgences.

This is a syllogism that, upon Signor Lucrezio's principles, admits no reply. The first proposition is certain. The second is indeed false in itself, but he supposes it to be true by virtue of what he has determined above. He therefore concludes that there is no day on which the stomach and head may not be comforted with the delightful medicine. One other doubt alone seems to remain for decision: whether, in the supposition that a Confessor

should impose a fast on bread and water - although in our times the supposition is exceedingly rare that a Confessor should impose upon those penitents who drink chocolate fasts on bread and water as penance for fornications, adulteries, and sensualities - chocolate might be used. But according to those who say that it is a customary beverage, there is already no question, because it is a beverage not of wine but of water, in which it is prepared. Then, according to the opinion of the Father Preacher, the matter is beyond controversy, because this chocolate, according to him, is neither food nor drink, but a medicine that comforts the belly and the head. Now who will say that medicine is incompatible with a fast on bread and water? It is enough to have displayed this chamber discourse from its proper point of view, so that Christians who fear God may see how conformable it is to that penance which Jesus Christ and the Church command their faithful. Those, moreover, who declaim so loudly against anyone who prints moral questions in the vernacular will feel shame and pain upon seeing, within a Lenten collection of printed Sermons, not moral points that edify, but doubts - may I

be permitted to say it - that are ridiculous and offend good sense. In those same printed Sermons it is disputed whether, during the Jubilee no less than during Lent, one may

early in the morning comfort the head and the stomach. These are the maxims, these the Sermons, these the opinions that acquire a numerous following.

XVI. Until now we have related the reasons of the Probabilists favorable to chocolate; and where do we leave those of the Antiprobabilists? Shall we render ourselves guilty of partiality toward the former? God forbid so great an evil. Here, therefore, is an Antiprobabilist, the Very Reverend Father Tommaso Pio Millante, who likewise wished to bring the celebrated controversy to the touchstone of Theology - not Casuistic, but purified and noble - in his Exercise XXIII upon the propositions condemned by Alexander VII. He begins his discourse by marveling at the different ways in which the Casuists opine:

> It is astonishing how various is the answer and opinion of the Casuists.

The patrons of the milder discipline defend it as lawful no less than the drinking of water and wine:

> For some patrons of the milder discipline absolutely permit chocolate on a fast day, no otherwise than wine and water, because it is taken in the manner of a drink.

On the other side, the Rigorists banish it altogether from fast days; and among these Rigorists are Diana, Sanchez, Trullench, Azor, Macado, Castropalao, and Leandro.

Pasqualigo and so many others of the milder discipline are among them as well. Others reduce the controversy to parvity of matter consisting in an ounce and a half. Others, finally, allege fictitious Pontifical privileges.

XVII. Father Millante reproves all these opinions:

> First, I assert that none of the aforesaid modes of speaking can stand, and that a certain moderation must be added, by which a MORE PROBABLE definitive judgment may be pronounced.

Here we are better off than ever: a definitive and also more probable judgment assures each and every party. In admitting the first opinion, he says, nothing else is done than

> to evade the most sacred law of fasting by fraud and to ruin it by a deceitful invention.

Those who take refuge in the shelter of parvity of matter do, it is true, diminish the fault, but they do not remove it. The drinkers would always commit innumerable venial faults; and anyone who defended even a single venial fault as lawful would disseminate a heresy.

XVIII. On the other hand, to determine that this famous beverage is sinful on a fast day is to wound the reputation of men eminent in learning and probity, who today take it without scruple and persuade others, rather than merely permit them, that it is lawful.

But what matters above all is that innumerable members of that body of drinkers sweat and perspire to cultivate the nobler and more purified Theology:

> To assert that the aforesaid chocolate drink is wholly incompatible with fasting days is to censure men distinguished alike in learning and in probity, who today use it without scruple

and commend it to others as lawful; especially since innumerable among them belong to the body of those who devote themselves to a nobler and purer Theology.

Here the Probabilist gentlemen rightly grow heated, and they cannot comprehend the character of this Theology, nobler and purer. Nobler and purer? This Theology of Father Millante grants more than all the most renowned Probabilists together. The Theology of the Probabilists is called Casuistic and relaxed; and that of the Antiprobabilist is called nobler and purer. That Father Millante grants more in this matter of fasting than the most renowned Probabilists is evident. Let his doctrines be transcribed with sincerity and without partiality, and it will be seen whether we speak the truth.

XIX. It is fitting to obey the Probabilist gentlemen, which is quite just. Let us therefore transcribe the definitive judgment of this nobler and purer Theology:

I say, therefore, that at present

the drinking of chocolate is absolutely lawful in the moderate quantity of an ounce and a half, because parvity of matter introduced by custom and tolerated by the Church excuses entirely from fault; although of itself, without such permission, it would in no way excuse.

Thus far it has nothing definitive, singular, or distinctive. He adds that this custom triumphs

everywhere, especially in the Alma Urbs, with the Roman Pontiff knowing, able to prevent it, and in no way preventing it.

What follows possesses some prerogative of singularity. By virtue of this principle he concludes that one may drink, on a Lenten day, a cup of an ounce and a half without any fault, not even venial. Anyone who then drank a second cup of another ounce and a half would stain the whiteness of his conscience with venial fault because of parvity of matter. For the first ounce and a half is approved by custom; the other ounce and a half is parvity of matter not approved, and therefore venial fault could not be escaped. But one who, from excessive gluttony, drank it a third time would then sin mortally:

From this principle it follows that anyone who, on the same fast day, after drinking an ounce and a half of chocolate, wished to take another as well, would sin venially because of parvity of matter not permitted by the tolerance of the Church.

But if anyone moreover did this a third time, he would sin mortally.

These men have their scales ready, by which to determine, also more probably: This is mortal; this is venial. If you ask why an ounce and a half of chocolate must be confined within the limits of parvity of matter, they answer: Because the Theologians who drink it decide thus. But is an ounce and a half of meat parvity of matter? An ounce and a half of cheese? An ounce and a half of sturgeon? But let us set aside such questions, to which they would perhaps more probably answer yes.

XX. The complaints of the Probabilists, patrons of the milder discipline, appear to me in one respect most just. Here, they cry, is where the rigor of so many Antiprobabilist Theologians ends! Those things which they practice are the more probable. They drink chocolate, and that is the more probable opinion. They keep a large peculium, and that is the more probable opinion. They wish to live sumptuously, and that is the more probable opinion. Certain of our Antiprobabilists, certain of our Rigorists cry: To Laxism, to the Probabilism of our century! But meanwhile they make more

probable whatever pleases them. Let us hear the most fervent declamations of the same Father Millante in the cited Exercise, at page 257:

> But alas for the deplorable laxity of the age and the corruption of Christian ethics! It is shameful here even to point with a finger to what is taught by laxists against divine and human law and, what is worse, is reduced to practice not without scandal.

And yet this most austere Antiprobabilist, on the same page, after granting Christians a morning collation during Lent and a good dinner at midday, grants in the evening a collation of eight ounces. Here are his words:

> In order, therefore, that this little supper may be harmless, it must be moderate: namely, so that the quantity taken as refreshment ordinarily does not exceed the weight of eight ounces. Thus, indeed, men everywhere who excel alike in piety and in learning teach and reduce it to practice.

If these men who shine here and there in learning and in piety had a good appetite, could they exceed the allowance of eight ounces? Who doubts it? Our Author answers there, explaining the above-written word ordinarily, which was not inserted by chance:

> I said ordinarily, because for a just cause it may be of greater weight, whenever, that is, someone needs greater nourishment.

Let us proceed, and we shall find something better. He does not doubt that salted little fish may be material for this little supper. He goes on to ask

> whether little fish, and those fresh and not at all seasoned with salt, may be allowed.

He answers that this is so certainly lawful that

> not even a scrupulous Theologian dares deny it, especially because prudent and learned men, indeed Communities of Regulars, have been accustomed to feed upon the same even during the pre-Easter fast.

And what can these Communities of Regulars be, which during Lent serve small fresh fish at the evening collation? Father Millante answers that these Communities of Regulars are not, indeed, the reformed ones that aspire to the better heavenly gifts, but the unreformed ones:

> In reformed Religious Institutes, however, and those which emulate the better gifts, nothing but dry eating is observed at the evening collation. Yet it is not right to infer from stricter Monastic observance a common precept binding others who are not bound by the Monastic Rule.

It is true that monastic observance must not impose a binding precept upon Christians; nor shall I say for now that the law of Lent equally obliges everyone, Regulars and seculars. What surprises me is how Father Millante affirms that the use of small fresh fish is lawful in unreformed Communities of Regulars when it is not lawful in reformed ones. Ordinarily the reformed and unreformed Communities of Regulars

profess the same Rule and the very same Constitutions; nor is there any other difference except that in the reformed communities the laws are observed, and in the unreformed they are not observed.

Some ignorantly call a Community of regular observance one of stricter observance, as though in the other Communities the continual and opposite irregular transgression of the professed laws were an observance that was not stricter, but nonetheless strict or exact. Let this be said in passing and for the undeceiving of the ignorant, because such phrases are both deceptive and pernicious, since they confound a lamentable corruption with a mitigated observance. For the rest, I am persuaded that Father Millante innocently believes that within a Religious Order in which the profession is the same, it may be possible in some houses to eat small fresh fish at the evening collation during Lent, while in the other houses it may not. What this Theologian immediately adds surprises me more than anything. He teaches further, therefore, that not only fresh little fish but also fish of the greatest size and, to remove every scruple, all those fish that may be eaten at dinner may also be eaten at collation, provided that the allowance of eight ounces is ordinarily observed:

> To state my opinion candidly in this matter,
>
> in view of the present discipline, I judge that even large fish may be permitted in the same quantity without any scruple.... Hence, just as today it is lawful to eat large fish at dinner, it is likewise lawful to eat them at the little supper with due moderation.

Now indeed I believe what Father Niccolo Ghezzi writes in one of his Dialogues: namely, that a Rigorist, one of those excelling alike in learning and in probity, when invited to a villa on an evening of fasting, ate a good portion of sturgeon. Father Millante grants him, upon good terms, half a pound with two ounces of bread. And if there were a greater appetite, the dose may be increased:

> I said ordinarily, because for a just cause it may be of greater weight.

XXI. I would judge myself guilty of scandal if I had related such doctrines without refuting them. Father Don Antonino Diana and Father Leandro, Princes of the Benignists at the head of a numerous troop of the mildest Probabilists, are kindled with just zeal against so scandalous a doctrine and condemn as guilty of mortal sin anyone who reduces it to practice:

> I assert that, in the said collation, a lawful quantity cannot be taken in fish under pain of mortal sin.

Father Leandro resolves the matter more strictly:

> Whether at least it is lawful at collation to use fish dried by smoke
>
> and seasoned with salt.... To answer you with certainty: it cannot be done; for neither reason nor the usage of prudent men of timorous conscience compels one to maintain the contrary, as is evident, since it is wholly contrary.

The celebrated Salmanticensian College of the Discalced Fathers affirms that not only small and large fresh fish, but also dried and smoked fish, are forbidden by the common consent of the Doctors:

> The common opinion of the Doctors teaches that little fish are not material for collation, whether they are fresh or dried by smoke.

The Probabilists whom they cite in confirmation of this opinion are Azor, Reginald, Filiucci, Laymann, Fagundez, Sanchez, Angles, Vivaldo, Berarducci, Grassi, Molfesi, Villalobos, Castropalao, Trullench, and others. Let this be said in passing and by way of a certain digression. Before ending it,

I answer the Probabilists that they cry most justly against certain Antiprobabilists who foully abuse the better systems and, through an evil practice, discredit a holy theory. But from this the Probabilist gentlemen cannot take occasion to declaim against sound doctrines and the opinions nearest to the truth because of the abuse of certain private persons.

The journalists of Trevoux and those who have printed among the Swiss ought rather to reflect upon the dangerous consequences that may derive from the praises paid to the false doctrine published by the aforesaid Author in favor of the monastic peculium. Fathers Lecchi and Sanvitale printed panegyrics in praise of the two books Vita Claustralis and Vindiciae Regularium. And then do they complain if they are shown to be approvers of scandalous doctrines? Let them read the book entitled Defensio Decretorum Concilii, etc., and they will find their disillusionment and their duty to retract the praises bestowed upon error. But let us end the digression, from which they may understand with evidence that we write from a spirit of truth, not from party commitment and not from affection for one Order more than another. Let us therefore repeat Father Millante's words:

> But alas for the deplorable laxity of the age and the corruption of Christian ethics! It is shameful here even to point with a finger to what is taught by laxists against divine and human law and, what is worse, is reduced to practice not without scandal.

Upon whom these solemn exclamations fall, I leave the readers to judge.

XXII. In the last place, I wish to report the manner in which

Father Claude La Croix, commentator on Father Busenbaum, instructs his Confessors upon this controversy. I shall transcribe all his words upon this point in order to forestall the customary accusation of little sincerity. He therefore writes thus:

> Concerning chocolate, Thomas Hurtado Lopez and others teach that it does not break the fast. Henriquez holds the same under the word fasting, relating that Urban VIII, after the ingredients had been offered and chocolate had been made in his presence, tasted it and said that it was, and remained, a drink. Several Doctors testify, says Ills. T. IV, d. 1, n. 39, that the same response was given by Gregory XIII, Saint Pius V, and Paul V. Cardinal Brancati defends the same in his Dissertation on Chocolate. Diana, p. II, t. vi, Res. 84, and Tamburini, n. 7, say that this opinion is absolutely probable. On the contrary, very many others, with Lezana and Castro cited above, teach that it breaks the fast; and Tamburini cited above and Boudart, Part II, question xvii, prove this at length by considering its ingredients and nutritive power. Nevertheless, Leandro and Diana think that, if not much of its material is mixed in but it is drunk thin, it does not break the fast; otherwise if much is mixed in and it is cooked like thick porridge. They add that at least it never gravely breaks the fast unless more than two ounces are mixed in.

XXIII. All wise men exalt the study of Criticism, which flourishes in our century.

One of its principal duties is to pronounce judgment upon the works of Authors, giving the reader a sincere and natural portrait of them. To do this requires a mind free from passions, parties, and commitments. The transcribed passage of Father La Croix is an image of his entire work. If in the transcribed passage you, Monsignor, discover a pure and simple Pyrrhonism, the legitimate son of Probabilism, judge the same of almost the whole work. This Author gathers the opinions of both

parties, although they are filled with manifest fables, and leaves them to the judgment of his readers, so that by virtue of Probabilism they may choose the opinion that pleases them most. Whether this is the manner of duplicating the Morality of Jesus Christ, let others judge. Can there be a more solemn fable than to represent Urban VIII as a spectator at the preparation of chocolate and as having pronounced, after tasting it, that it was and remained a drink? Is not a small spark of natural light enough to prevent such idle tales from being produced in public? For my part, I shall not cease to inculcate in students of Christian Morality that they abstain from such books and read instead the two celebrated Jesuits, Father Gabriel Antoine and

Father Paul Comitoli, Pontas, Natalis Alexander, Besombes, Abert, and Paul of Lyons. Now finding myself at the end of the historical account, I see myself under the necessity of resolving an objection that has been exaggerated for a century and a half: namely, that I have exposed the reasons favorable to the beverage under a ridiculous appearance. For a century and a half, when some see certain Casuistic opinions painted to the life, they complain in exceedingly artful ways that the opinions of Moralists have been subjected to ridicule, in violation of holy charity. But such persons, by similar complaints, show that they know neither what charity is nor what justice is. The opinions refuted have been publicly printed. Therefore, either one who refutes them sins against justice by failing in sincerity when aggravating them; or, if he represents them sincerely, he can never sin against charity, provided that he otherwise endeavors to justify the Authors of such opinions by the pious intention of having believed and taught them as true. The Historian would indeed sin both against justice and against charity toward the human race if, being able, he omitted to refute the said opinions pernicious to salvation, or rendered himself suspected of falsehood when

describing them. And the Historian certainly falls under suspicion of falsehood when he does not represent things as they are in themselves: namely, grave things as grave and ridiculous things as ridiculous. Words were instituted to signify things, of which the proper notions must be expressed. One who represents a grave thing as ridiculous is as false as one who paints a vain and frivolous thing with the lineaments of gravity. Do they complain that lax opinions are subjected to ridicule? Then it is evident that they are ridiculous in themselves. For anyone who attempted to pass off as ridiculous a grave judgment supported by valid reasons would render himself ridiculous. Therefore, in order not to fail in sincerity, the Historian must represent vain and inept opinions with words corresponding to such opinions, so as not to lend them credit through gravity of style, according to the teaching of Tertullian so many times repeated:

> If laughter is used anywhere, the matters themselves will be satisfied. Many things deserve to be refuted thus, lest they be adorned with gravity. Wit properly yields to vanity. It befits truth to laugh, because it rejoices, and to jest about its rivals, because it is secure.

But the Authors of such opinions are held in esteem and credit. So much the worse. They are therefore all the more capable

of imposing upon others and of rendering those same false and scandalous opinions probable by their authority. When Jesus Christ says in Saint Matthew, chapter xxiv,

> so as to lead into error, if possible, even the elect,

does he not perhaps speak of learned, accredited, and authoritative Doctors? The elect are not in danger of being deceived by commonplace Theologians of no credit. The authority only of renowned,

accredited, and applauded Theologians can place good Catholics in danger of falling into error. Therefore, if lax opinions pernicious to morals are taught by learned and esteemed Theologians, they must be exposed with greater diligence - always supposing that they are such, for otherwise one would sin against justice - under their ridiculous and monstrous appearance, so that esteem for the Authors may not render them probable. It is a fatal illusion and a species of lamentable seduction that possesses so many who go about proclaiming that charity is violated when they see false and scandalous opinions painted in their natural colors, under the erroneous pretext that the Authors are thereby prejudiced. Those Authors admit no other defense than the pious intention and good faith of having believed those opinions true. The Authors of these opinions are already at their end, above the vicissitudes

of the world. When we have justified their pious intention of believing as true the opinions discovered and judged false by others, the whole duty toward them has been satisfied. But the truth is that under the mantle of an imaginary charity toward the Authors, people would wish to maintain the lax opinions in credit. If this erroneous pretext of charity held good, one could not even say that a certain Book contained condemned opinions. In a few words, these illusions and very real seductions keep in vogue a deadly Pyrrhonism that overturns the foundations of Christian Theology. A hundred times such illusions, which have reigned in the world for a century and a half, have been dispelled; and this will be the hundred and first. And with this I put an end to the historical account of the theological doctrines advanced by certain Casuists in order to join the potion of chocolate with the fast of the Roman Church.

Section Nine — The Sacred Antiprobabilist and Probabilist Theologians Together Commonly Reprove the Drinking of Chocolate during a Fast. They Claim that Their Reasons Withstand Every Reply

I. Now at last, Monsignor, we enter into the account of the contrary opinion, defended not only by all the sacred Theologians but also by the greater part of those benign Probabilists who are most intent upon accommodating the observance of the holy Law to miserable humanity as much as they can. This second part of my Letter will be written in a style altogether contrary to that in which I wrote the first. This difference of style is a necessary offspring of the diversity of the things narrated. The doctrines invented by those Theologians who favor drinkers of chocolate during a fast are, as Your Lordship has observed, vain, inept, and puerile. In order sincerely to present a living image of those doctrines, ought I perhaps to have distorted their nature by raising them to a higher rank through gravity of style? Ought I perhaps to have adorned them with elegance of discourse? No, says Tertullian:

> lest they be adorned with gravity.

Ought I even, without violating the duties of a sincere Historian, to have covered over their inept subtleties? Certainly not, whatever some learned Moderns may say, who go about proclaiming that charity is torn to pieces when ridiculous opinions are depicted from the fitting point of view of a just examination. Rather, the laws of truth, charity, and justice are violated when false coins are passed off as true, and when laughable and playful things are represented with an air of gravity and majesty so that they may gain approval and followers. But enough has already been said about this above. Let us begin.

II. The first foundations of the opinion which I am about to describe are established upon the very nature of the fast commanded by Holy Church. The character and essence of this fast is to mortify the appetite, to macerate the flesh, to bridle the senses, to subject rebellious appetites to the will, and to humble man before the throne of the divine Majesty. In the Old Testament, when men were more uncultivated, in order to render these truths sensible, those who fasted clothed themselves in sackcloth and hair shirts and, covered with ashes, showed themselves to be true penitents. Their abstinences were very long.

Our Christian forefathers, through a long series of centuries, observed approximately the austerity of those fasts. Delicate foods, choice fish, elaborate seasonings, wines, and liquors of every kind were banished from their tables. In recent centuries the discipline has been somewhat mitigated. Because both modern Casuists and Christians generally do not understand the nature of this mitigation, they fall into grave errors and abolish the true fast from the Church. It is therefore necessary, with all the Fathers and with Theologians who understand Christian Morality, to distinguish two grave and important things: the spirit, the soul, and the essence of the fast from the exterior rind of the fast; the spirit of the law from the letter of the law. The spirit of the fast is a spirit of bodily penance which has as its purpose, in the first place, to make satisfaction to divine justice for sins committed; and, in the second place, in order to avoid sins in the future, it macerates the flesh and afflicts the senses, which are the obstinate enemies that are always devising new betrayals and new snares to seduce

souls and cast them down eternally. A fast of such a nature, which mortifies the flesh, bridles concupiscence, and afflicts gluttony, a capital vice, is as necessary to man as

a strong bridle is necessary properly to govern an unbridled horse.

III. The discipline can vary, and in fact has varied, with respect to the letter of the law and the exterior rind of the fast; but the spirit of the fast is invariable, nor is there any power in the world that can dispense from it. The same exterior austerities may be considered under two aspects: with respect to the positive law of the Church that prescribes them, under which consideration they are certainly subject to diversity, alteration, and mitigation; and with respect to the natural law that commands them according to the greater or lesser need to macerate the flesh and subject the senses to the spirit. Now, with respect to this law, neither a prescription nor a contrary derogation can be established. But just as one who is dominated by greater bodily thirst indispensably needs a more abundant drink, so those Christians who are tyrannized by more ardent concupiscence and by more stubborn rebellions need more severe fasts, abstinences, and mortifications; and under this consideration neither dispensations nor mitigated disciplines have any place. If the infirmity of the senses, of the appetite, and of concupiscence is slight in you; if your sins are few and small,

let your uncommanded fasts be few and very mild. But if the passions are vigorous in you, the flesh recalcitrant, and concupiscence unbridled, you may boast of as many mitigated disciplines as you please, yet without mortifications, abstinences, fasts, and penalties you will fall eternally. This is the doctrine of all the Fathers, and Saint Thomas confirms it for us in a few words:

> Everyone, however, is bound by natural reason to employ fasting to the extent that it is necessary for him for the aforesaid purposes. And therefore fasting in general falls under the precept of the NATURAL LAW; but the determination of the time and manner of fasting falls under the precept of positive law, which has been instituted by the Prelates of the Church; and this is the fast of the Church, whereas the other is the fast of nature.

IV. When this uncontested Christian Morality is placed beside it, you immediately comprehend the falsity of that distinction according to which the end of the law does not fall under the law. The Casuists, as we have seen above, make perpetual abuse of such a distinction, with which they abolish true fasts from the world. All Theologians distinguish two ends of the law: the one extrinsic, which regards not the act but the agent; the other intrinsic, which is the object and forms the very essence of the law. The nature of the

fast is to mortify the flesh, to torment the appetite, and moderately to weaken concupiscence. This is the end; this is the essence of the fast. Hence Saint Thomas concludes:

> It has been established that those who fast eat once in the day.

It can happen that there are constitutions so robust that they do not experience the aforesaid effects from this single meal; but that is an accident. It is enough that the fast is by its nature capable of producing them when it is observed according to the rules prescribed by the Church. On the contrary, when so many meals and so many restoratives are used during a fast that the fast becomes unfit to mortify the flesh and diminish concupiscence, this fast is ridiculous; it is not a fast but the mask of a fast, because through the fault of one who multiplies the meals it is deprived of its intrinsic, essential end. When it is said that the end of the fast is to mortify the appetite and bridle

concupiscence, the benign Probabilists reply that the end of the law does not fall under the law. To set out the application of this doctrine under a fitting comparison: what is the end of a horse's bridle? The direction and regulation of the horse. The craftsman forms the bridle from a very slender ribbon, so as not to afflict the poor steed too much. Mocking that elegant ribbon, the horse

runs furiously according to its own inclination and soon throws the rider, who complains to the craftsman; and the latter replies that the end of the law does not fall under the law, and that the end of restraining the horse is not the concern of his craft. Would not this man be condemned as mad? The fast is the bridle of the body and of human passions. If the subtleties of the appetite and the speculations of certain Casuists so sweeten this fast and adorn it with so many delicacies that, instead of serving as a bridle to subdue concupiscence, it serves as a stimulus to make concupiscence rebel against the spirit, is this not a ridiculous fast, a theatrical fast, a fast made for play and mockery?

V. Those, therefore, who so attenuate, sweeten, and mitigate the fast that they remove from it the power to afflict the body, crucify the flesh, and bridle concupiscence abolish the true fasts from the Church. To say that these aforesaid effects are the end of the fast and that the end of the fast does not fall under the precept of the fast is to make sport of the laws, of men, and of God himself. This is to disgrace the discipline of our Church; this is to render our holy fasts objects of mockery and derision to the Heretics themselves. From these monstrous laxities Daillé, Chemnitz, Calvin, and so many others have taken occasion

to calumniate our fasts as superstitious and to pass them off as masks by which we make sport of God. To the confusion of those who defend and practice the scandalous opinions, I wish to report the reproaches that the Heresiarch Calvin hurls against the masks of so many fasts that are observed among us:

> Under the most foolish pretext of abstinence they began to make sport of God. For amid every most exquisite delicacy praise for fasting is sought. No sumptuous fare then suffices. Never is there a greater abundance, variety, or pleasantness of foods. In such and so splendid a preparation they think that they duly serve God. In sum, for them the highest worship of God consists in abstaining from meats and, with those excepted, overflowing with every kind of sumptuous fare.... Today it is common among all the rich that they fast for no other end than to feast more sumptuously and more elegantly. But I do not wish to pour out many words upon a matter not so doubtful. I say only this: in fasts as in all other parts of discipline, the Papists have nothing so right, nothing sincere, nothing well composed and ordered, that they may have any occasion for boasting.

But let us leave aside Calvin, who with excessive effrontery casts back upon the Roman Church the dissoluteness and gluttony of so many unbridled Catholics.

Saint Augustine himself sharpens his invectives against such fasts and derides those who, while abstaining from meats, set out other foods of greater price prepared with more exquisite seasonings. For this is not fasting, but rather changing the luxury of one food into the luxury of another:

> Those who so abstain from meats that they seek other foods more difficult to prepare and of greater price greatly err. For this is not to undertake abstinence, but to change luxury.

VI. These are the general principles that the sacred Theologians lay down first, in order then to infer that those fasts in which one drinks early in the morning one cup of chocolate according to some, and even two according to others; at midday a sumptuous dinner, more or less sumptuous according as the purse is more or less plentiful; and in the evening a collation of eight ounces of exquisite foods, are theatrical fasts and plaything penances, more capable of provoking than of appeasing divine vengeance. There is no heresy and no sect that does not practice its own fasts. In none of these sects, whether of Turks, Jews, or Protestants, will it be found that fasts practiced in order to humble oneself before God and to appease divine vengeance

admit three meals a day and the most exquisite delicacies. Only the fasts consecrated by so many Prophets, by the holy Apostles, and by Jesus Christ himself; only the fasts of the Catholic Church, which professes the most perfect penance, are profaned by so many meals and so many delicacies. But it is now time to enter into the account of the reasons closer to the point that are advanced by the Theologians who reprove chocolate during a fast.

VII. The common authority of the Theologians who have written against chocolate is the first argument by which the guilty custom is condemned. I shall report some of the principal Probabilists and of the most benign: [a] Father Don Antonino Diana; [b] Father Zaccaria Pasqualigo; [c] Father Ferdinando de Castropalao; [d] Trullench; [e] Villalobos; [f] Francesco Silvio; [g] Father Giovanni Azorio; [h] Father Giovanni of Saint Thomas; [i] Father Tommaso Sanchez; [k] Antonio de León; [l] Solórzano; [m] Pinello; [n] Leandro of Murcia; [o] Lezana; [p] Turriano;

[a] Corella; [b] Laymann; [c] Tamburini; [d] Leandro of the Most Holy Sacrament; [e] Fagundez; [f] Geribaldi; [g] Escobar; [h] Cardano. These are Probabilists and the leaders of that party. It is true that some of those mentioned, prejudiced by their Probabilism, judge the contrary opinion also probable. This indifferentism, so frequent among the Probabilists, ought at last to make known that this fatal Probabilism is a pure Pyrrhonism which overturns from its foundations the system of Christian Morality. The Antiprobabilists, for their part, commonly and unanimously reprove the new custom: Lorenzo Berti, Pietro Ballerini, Enrico of Saint Ignatius, Giovanni Pontas, Martin Wigandt, Natalis Alexander, Honoré Tournély, and the Salmanticensian College. The last four of these renowned Theologians, excellently printed several times at the distinguished press of the illustrious Signor Pezzana, now have that circulation which the Escobars, the Dianas, the Castropalaos, the Tamburinis, and the like once had. Thus it is beyond doubt that the greater authority

of the Theologians, both Probabilists and Antiprobabilists, and of the Physicians condemns the use of the beverage during a fast. Father Viva also confessed this truth; hence, as we have seen, he writes:

> But setting aside extrinsic authority, the opinion pleases me, etc.

The most wise reigning Pontiff BENEDICT XIV, who through so many immortal works of his has by now exhausted all ecclesiastical erudition, to the study of which he has been so accustomed throughout the whole course of his life that, amid the immense cares of the supreme government of the universal Church, he goes on publishing voluminous Tomes for the universal benefit of the faithful, consisting of most learned Pastoral Letters, Constitutions, Bulls, and Dissertations, in NOTIFICATION XV of his first volume, which as Archbishop of Bologna he published in the year 1733, at number 7, observes that only some defend the use of chocolate. Here are his words:

> It is being disputed among the Theologians whether the new beverage of chocolate, taken outside the hour of the meal, breaks the fast, SOME maintaining the negative opinion.

From this it plainly results that, if some defend the negative opinion, the other Theologians commonly maintain the contrary affirmative opinion. Then at number 10 he recalls that whoever wishes to make use

of the more benign opinion, which on account of parvity of matter justifies the use of one ordinary cup, ought not to exceed that measure.

> Let one proceed, if one wishes (continues the most learned Cardinal), with the more benign opinion that drinking chocolate does not break the fast; but who will be able to excuse from the fault of intemperance, and perhaps also from transgression of the fast, one who should take a cup much larger than usual, described by Saint Jerome in the letter to Nepotian: 'to sip delicate little draughts, crushed vegetables, and the juice of berries, not from a cup but from a bowl'; or one who should take it several times on fast days? For the weightier Authors who have taught that the fast is not broken by chocolate have, for the reasons stated above, reproved repeated drinks on fast days, as may be seen in the cited Dissertation of Cardinal Brancacci and in Cardinal Cozza's Treatise de jejunio.

The most learned Cardinal, finding himself Superior of a vast Diocese, according to the customary rules of his incomparable prudence did not judge it expedient to offer an opinion and decide upon this controversy; but with refined judgment and circumspection he makes known to his Diocesans that only some defend this opinion. Then he warns that the more learned among these

few reduce the controversy to parvity of matter. An Archbishop who for just reasons does not wish to pronounce his definitive judgment could not, with greater prudence or greater learning, have warned his faithful to keep far from the danger of sinning mortally, because of the difficulty of knowing how to contain themselves within the bounds of this parvity of matter.

Section Ten — Examination of the Reasons Recounted in Favor of the Indian Potion The Sacred Theologians Claim to Demonstrate That These Are Not Reasons but Illusions and Repugnant Quibbles and That They Wound Common Sense No Less Than the Discipline of the Roman Church

I. From the extrinsic authority of the Theologians and Physicians, we now pass to recount the reasons that the aforementioned Theologians advance against the opposite opinion. And so that our History may proceed with the necessary clarity, it is well for me to recall the two opinions just indicated by Our Reigning Great Pope BENEDICT XIV. The first absolutely defends the lawfulness, as often as one pleases, of the beverage of chocolate; the second restricts its lawful use to one small cup on account of parvity of matter.

In the first place I shall present the reasons that absolutely condemn the first opinion. Afterward I shall relate what they commonly say about the second.

II. The first and only reason of the Theologians who absolutely condemn the beverage of chocolate is founded upon the nourishment that chocolate by its nature provides. Those who defend the broad opinion, which they call benign, deny nourishment to chocolate diluted in water, although they concede it when it is eaten in solid morsels. Against so ridiculous a sophism the sacred Theologians form the following most evident demonstration. Chocolate breaks the fast when taken in morsels. Therefore it breaks it more gravely when taken as a beverage. Eaten in morsels, it is repugnant to the fast because it is substantial and nutritive. But diluted in water, cooked over the fire, and well beaten, not only does it not lose its substance but gains it, and it becomes more flavorful and more pleasing to the palate. The first proposition belongs to the Adversaries. The second

is reaffirmed by every one of those who drink chocolate. The consequence is necessary. Bread chewed in morsels breaks the fast; yet when ground and diluted in water, mixed with sugar, cinnamon, and vanilla, well prepared and cooked over the fire, and then sipped, will it not break the fast? Must we hear such monstrous things from men, from Casuists endowed with reason?

III. Father Tommaso Tamburini, who surpasses all the Casuists in elegance of writing, order, and clarity, ordinarily adorns his reasonings with some pleasant account. I now wish to render in the vernacular for you the incident that he relates for this purpose:

> One morning, quite early, I went to visit a nobleman familiar to me, in order to confer with him about certain business; and, upon first entering, having observed his face suffused with an unusual pallor, emaciated and exceedingly like a corpse, I asked him, as is customary, how his health was. In an almost
>
> trembling voice he answered that he was quite ill, and most affectionately begged me to return after half an hour. I obeyed, went away, and returned. A marvelous thing! I saw his face restored to its former color, his eyes cheerful, and his voice strong, so that with reason you would have believed him returned from death to life. Therefore I could not refrain from exclaiming: Thanks be rendered to the Lord God and to the Saints. I rejoice to see Your Lordship not only in good but in excellent health. And whence so immediate and so great a restoration of strength? Smiling, my friend replied: Do not marvel, most loving Father, for just

> now I have taken the potion of chocolate, which, in the manner of a miracle and almost in an instant, is accustomed to restore my color, strength, and life. Immortal God! Will you call this a pure drink and not a substantial refection diametrically opposed to the end of the fast?

IV. I have inserted here Father Tamburini's agreeable account as a certain diversion for the reader, not because I believed it necessary to prove the substantial nourishment of chocolate. All the most celebrated Physicians affirm for us this abundant nourishment of the chocolate potion. Jacques Spon, a celebrated Physician of Lyons, caused three Treatises composed by excellent Physicians upon the potions of Coffee, Tea, and Chocolate to be published. In the third Treatise it is written at chapter 2, page 174:

> Moreover, chocolate not only nourishes very well, but also fattens.

The testimony of all those who sip this potion is produced:

> Whoever drink chocolate acknowledge that it supplies much nourishment to the body, so that meat broth neither nourishes for so long nor so strongly, nor sustains the strength.... A certain friend of mine, unable because of illness to tolerate ordinary foods, while being carried by carriage from Paris to Lyons for eleven days drank only three cups each day, and he remained well.

He produces the experience of all Preachers, who take this potion to strengthen the chest, to render the voice more sonorous, and their powers more vigorous:

> Almost all preachers fare excellently from the use of it, that is, of chocolate, whether before or after the sermon. Before the sermon it sustains the powers of the chest and voice longer than broth does; afterward it restores the exhausted powers of the body.

He produces likewise the experience of travelers:

> It is suitable also for those making a journey.

This potion serves as dinner for many who travel. For my part, I am so certain of the nourishment of this beverage that, even if all these testimonies of the human race were lacking, I would not therefore doubt it at all; and everyone knows this truth by intimate sensation while making use of this beverage.

V. Who now will not marvel, I do not know whether I ought to say at the courage or the simplicity, of those Casuists, among whom is Father Buonapace, who, in the face of the whole, so to speak, human race that drinks chocolate, deny nourishment to it? Does their answer, that although it breaks the fast when taken in morsels, it does not do so when diluted in water, not wound common sense? Who does not confess that the paste of chocolate, worked with water and cooked and labored over the fire, passes into a mixture which forms almost a third substance, incomparably more effective at expelling hunger, delighting

the palate, appeasing the stomach, strengthening the stomach, satisfying the sense of smell, and comforting the head than when it is eaten completely dry in morsels?

VI. This single reason advanced is enough to decide the controversy, say the Theologians who defend this opinion. For certain truths manifest and evident by their nature lose, and do not acquire, light from a multiplicity of words. Omitting every other reason, therefore, they set themselves to refuting

the reasons of the contrary party, and claim to make them appear such gross sophisms that they wound common sense.

VII. It is true, say the benign Casuists, that chocolate nourishes, but by its secondary and not by its primary intention. And here at once is the reason. Chocolate diluted in water is a customary drink in the West Indies. Therefore it is a customary drink also in Europe and in every place in the world, says Father Domenico Viva with the others:

> If somewhere it is a customary drink, everywhere it is such.

They suppose as certain that it is a common drink in America. And, this fact being admitted, the consequence is legitimate. For although customary drinks such as water, wine, and beer nourish, nevertheless, because by their nature they are not destined to nourish

man, but to distribute food, facilitate digestion, and extinguish thirst, they are therefore not repugnant to the fast.

VIII. Here the sacred Theologians are inflamed with zeal against the Casuists and cry out that sincerity and good faith are lacking in this captious argument, while by means of this word beverage the ear of a people inclined to satisfy its appetites is enchanted. What? Is chocolate a customary drink in Italy? And at what table has it ever been seen drunk in the manner of wine or water? And who has ever drunk it to extinguish thirst, either at table or outside the table? And what renders the sophistical illusion more monstrous and intolerable is the following fact. Is it not true that commonly, together with the chocolate, a large glass of water is served, which some drink beforehand, others halfway through, and others after emptying the cup, in order to temper the heat and so that it may serve as a vehicle to distribute the thick and dense mixture of chocolate through the veins? This is a fact evident to all. And in the face of truths so evident, is there courage to pass off chocolate as a customary drink? But in the West Indies it is a common potion. Therefore is it such everywhere? Either the antecedent is true or it is

false. If true, American chocolate is altogether different from ours, because if it is drunk in the manner of ours and as ours is drunk, it is as repugnant that it should be a customary drink as it is repugnant that, as it is drunk among us, it should be suitable for extinguishing thirst. If, however, the antecedent is false, the argument is an imposture. It may be called a customary drink in the Indies in two ways: either because some small quantity of chocolate is infused in water, just as among us also a little cinnamon and some drops of rosolio are infused in water to take away its rawness and give it flavor, and it is thus employed to extinguish thirst both at table and outside the table (and it is conceded that in this manner it does not break the fast); or it is called customary because, given the abundance of it there and its good price, its use is more common and more frequent. Thus, also in Europe, chocolate is more customary in Spain than in Italy; more in Rome, Naples, and Milan than in Venice, Padua, and Verona. Thus milk is more customary in Germany than in Italy. But on this account no wise man will infer that either milk or chocolate is a customary drink compatible with the fast. And to bring many words into few: if chocolate in America is prepared and drunk as in Europe, it breaks the fast there

as much as here. If the chocolate is different, the sophism falls of itself. Casuistic Theology lacked nothing else but to go into America to fish out among those Pagans a gluttonous custom, and then to draw from it a reason by which to establish a point of Christian Morality. Thus, full of zeal, the

Theologians who defend sound Morality reprove this most vain quibble. Wine and water nourish more or less; but because these liquids are by their nature instituted to extinguish thirst, facilitate digestion, and distribute food through the parts of the body, they are for this reason compatible with the fast. No one has ever yet been seen taking chocolate either outside the meal to extinguish thirst or at the table in the midst of food, as either wine or water is drunk; and yet men are found of such a temper that they have the courage publicly to defend that the use of chocolate in Lent is no less lawful than that of wine? And will these men complain, the aforementioned Theologians resume, if we say that the practical use of Probabilism renders lawful the use of things most opposed to the holy Law of God?

IX. The defenders of the morning beverage recover their breath and raise their voice once again. Is it not true that beer, or cervisia, is pressed from

barley and wheat? Barley and wheat are edible and highly nutritive, and it is not therefore inferred that beer extracted from these grains is contrary to the fast, although this cervisia also nourishes. And because this beer is a customary drink in northern countries, it may be drunk during a fast in every country in the world. Therefore, although chocolate is in itself a nutritive edible, nevertheless, when it is distilled in water after the manner of grain and barley, it becomes a beverage. Thus grapes when eaten break the fast; wine pressed from grapes does not break it.

X. This discourse is worse than the first, because it plainly deceives the credulity of drinkers through an analogy that is the most disparate and the most inept. For the analogy to hold, it ought to be formed in this manner: wine pressed from edible grapes and beer distilled from grain do not break the fast; therefore the liquor pressed from the cacao bean is not opposed to the fast. Under this hypothesis we shall grant the consequence. Let the cacao beans therefore be taken, and let a liquor be pressed from those same beans, just as beer and wine are distilled from the grains of wheat or barley or from the grape; and every dispute will cease. It is one thing that from solid and

edible materials liquors can be pressed which serve as beverages; and it is an altogether different thing that these same edible materials are joined with a liquid of either water or milk, and that from these two ingredients, worked and prepared with the aid of fire and art, a mixture is formed, a third substance adorned with all the most delicate requisites for pleasing the palate, the belly, and the sense of smell. But to close the mouths of the adversaries without reply, I ask: if the grains of barley and wheat were roasted like cacao and then, mixed with sugar, vanilla, and cinnamon, a paste were formed by art (and say the same of dried and prepared grapes), and then from this paste joined with water or another liquid a flavorful and nutritive mixture were formed, would it be compatible with the fast? Thus grains of barley, wheat, and chestnuts reduced to flour and then to paste, even though they are diluted in water in the aforesaid manner, certainly break the fast when sipped. Cacao beans are reduced to flour mixed with sugar, cinnamon, and vanilla. By this means a solid and excellent paste is formed, which is then divided into many small cakes, just as the paste of wheat flour is divided into small cakes. And the small cakes of wheat and barley, although diluted in

water in the aforesaid manner, are opposed to the fast when sipped; and then are the small cakes of chocolate worked with water said to be compatible with the fast? What man who boasts of common sense will not henceforth be ashamed to produce the analogy of wine or beer in order to demonstrate the lawful use of chocolate?

XI. Until about the twelfth century and the centuries following, the use of electuaries, or preserves, was lawful. Why, then, can chocolate not be lawful in our times? The fashions of foods and dishes, like the fashions of dress, change. If, therefore, in the times when the discipline of fasting was more severe, the use of preserves was not repugnant to the fast, why shall the use of chocolate be forbidden during a fast?

XII. It must be confessed that the art of satisfying the appetite is full of cunning and deceptions. Who narrates the use of these electuaries? Who? Saint Thomas, Saint Bonaventure, and all the Writers of those centuries. It is therefore necessary to admit the electuaries in the very form in which they are represented to us by the aforesaid Doctors. Now these Doctors attest that these preserves called electuaries were taken after supper to facilitate the digestion of food. In those centuries the fast was not broken until three hours after midday, that is, at None; nor was there a collation

of edible things as in our times, but only drink was taken. All the Writers attest that these preserves were taken as medicines facilitating the digestion of food. On the contrary, whoever had taken them fraudulently to extinguish hunger and nourish himself would have transgressed the precept, as Saint Thomas among others expressly teaches. Are the chocolate drinks of our times perhaps taken as medicine after supper to aid digestion in one who has need of it? Is it not true that they are taken early in the morning to appease and blunt the pangs of the stomach, to warm the stomach, and to delight the fauces? At present the fast is broken at midday; in the evening a collation is taken of bread and fruit, and by some even of fish; good wine is drunk by whoever has it; and then there is the audacity to publish in print that in the morning also a more substantial and flavorful restorative may be taken? And why? Because, when the severe discipline of fasting was in force, under which the fast was not broken until None, after supper the medicine of the electuary was taken in order to facilitate digestion. Can stranger things be heard? If these quibbles had been invented by a people tyrannized by appetite, it would be an object of compassion. But that such paralogisms

should be invented by those very men who are chosen by God as defenders of his laws and as promoters of the observance of ecclesiastical commandments excites not so much compassion as zeal to reproach them with the words of Ezekiel:

> Woe to the foolish prophets, who follow their own spirit and see nothing. Your prophets are like foxes in the deserts. They see vain things and divine falsehood.

XIII. The anchor to which the defenders of the beverage now cling most firmly is the custom that has by now prevailed and spread everywhere. Custom justifies the evening collation; therefore it can likewise render the morning collation honorable and lawful. The custom of chocolate in Lent is furnished with all the prerogatives of a true custom. It has in its favor the practice of the multitude, the honest end of refreshing the poor body, and the consent of the legislator. In Rome, the holy See of our Religion, whence laws, precepts, and constitutions issue, this chocolate is drunk and is sold in the shops under the eyes of Prelates, Cardinals, and Popes, without anyone protesting against it. Indeed, Gregory XIII, Saint Pius V, Paul V, and Urban VIII have positively praised such a custom by oral oracles.

Therefore the custom is legitimate and the practice is lawful.

XIV. The sacred Theologians ask these reasoners whether it is possible to introduce into the Roman Catholic Church a custom that renders her sacred fasts ridiculous and objects of mockery, derision,

and scandal: fasts consecrated by Jesus Christ through his example, strengthened by the holy Apostles through severe observance, and authorized by so many Councils and by the universal Church through express commandments. Up to now it has been demonstrated with evidence that chocolate is a most flavorful food that fattens the body and a savory beverage that pleases the palate. It has been shown that a fast which admits three refections a day - that is, a good cup of chocolate in the morning, or rather, according to the common opinion of these Casuists, two or three cups, and as many as anyone wishes, because 'liquids do not break the fast'; a sumptuous dinner at midday; and in the evening a collation of eight ounces, according to some of bread and fruits, according to others of small fish, and according to still others of trout, sturgeon, and soles - it has been shown, I say, that this is a phantom of a fast, a mask of a fast, a stage fast, which brings infamy upon the discipline of the Roman Church and discredits our holy Religion.

And yet all the things recounted are canonized by our Casuists through the authority of custom. Custom for the collation absolutely; custom for the eight ounces; custom for smoked and salted little fish; custom for fresh but small fish; custom for large, thick, and delicate fresh fish; and finally custom for the morning collation of chocolate. And are Doctors capable of advancing such fine doctrines to serve as a rule for assuring Christian consciences?

XV. This is the preface that the sacred Theologians place before their precise solution, whereupon they directly rebut the opposing sophism. First they desire to know whether the alleged custom favors chocolate alone or every equivalent Lenten food whatsoever. They wish to know whether chocolate alone is a heavenly food privileged by custom above all other Lenten foods. What is answered? Chocolate nourishes, fattens, and delights more than a ring-cake and a cup of wine; more than an ounce of cheese and an ounce of bread. Now why may Christians who commonly cannot spend half a paolo for one cup, nor a whole paolo for two cups of chocolate, not take an ounce of bread and an ounce of almonds in the morning?

Because they are solid foods? But the almonds will be pounded, they will be dissolved in milk, they will be boiled in a little pot with crumbled bread, sugar, and cinnamon, and the cordial will be taken piping hot in a cup after the fashion of chocolate. What is answered? Is there any difference between the one beverage and the other as regards substance? And if there is no substantial difference, why may poor Christians also not refresh themselves? Is there perhaps one Gospel for the rich and for the Nobles, and another for merchants, artisans, and plebeians? Is there perhaps one custom for the Brahmins and another for the Pariahs? The custom of the evening collation is universal for all Christians. Therefore the custom of the morning collation must favor either all Catholics or none. Gently now, for here we have fallen into the snare. Our Casuist adversaries will answer very well that custom favors all and that all may take their little morning snack.

XVI. But here the Christians join the sacred Theologians and, as heirs of the sacred fasts observed by their forefathers, declare and publicly protest that the vaunted custom is a manifest abuse, a most evident corruption injurious to the holy discipline of the Roman Church. All the sacred Doctors and

Theologians, Canonists, and Jurists teach that the practice of the greater part of the people is required for a true custom. Now not only do the greater part of the Christians bound to the sacred fast not take chocolate, but of the Christians of all Italy there are certainly not eight in a hundred who do so - and I say too many. For, excepting the rich, the wealthy nobles, and some Religious distinguished both for doctrine and probity, as Father Millante says, all the great multitude of

Christians does not know, so to speak, what chocolate is. Nor do those Christians, apart from particular need, make it lawful for themselves to take any refreshment in the morning. What more? The Theologians, both Probabilists and Antiprobabilists, certainly in the greater number, cry out that this is not custom but corruption. And in the face of the greater number of Theologians and of the Physicians most distinguished for learning and reputation, will anyone dare to baptize a scandalous abuse as custom? Thus it is evident that the first and principal necessary condition is lacking. Therefore the vaunted custom is a manifest corruption.

XVII. Another prerogative for a true custom that derogates from the law is that it be reasonable, that it promote the common good, or that at least it not be repugnant to it. The origin of the evening collation

could not be more reasonable. It began in the monastic fasts, which were broken at the hour of None; and it was restricted to a determined measure of water, which the Monks, wearied by laborious exertions, drank. In the ninth century it passed into the Lenten fasts, which were broken at Vespers. Amid the conferences and spiritual readings called Collations, a little water was drunk. For several centuries this collation was restricted to the beverage of water alone, and afterward of wine. Tostatus was among the first to dispute whether one might take a small piece of bread or some fruit, so that drinking would not cause harm. The anticipation of dinner from Vespers to None, and from None to midday, opened the door to taking bread and fruit in the evening to induce sleep and, with the beverage, to aid digestion. In the time of Saint Charles Borromeo this was the measure of such a collation:

> Let them take food only once in the day after midday. But if anyone should have need of anything more, let it be permitted in the evening to take only an ounce and a half of bread and a cup of wine.

Here one sees the innocence both of the origin and of the progress of this collation, approved by custom as a remedy to induce sleep, given the anticipation of dinner, and to assist nature. Yet it should never occur to anyone to think that the lax

and scandalous opinions of certain Casuists mentioned above are approved by the Church. Thus in this evening collation we have both the universal practice of Christians and its agreement with the principal end of the fast, which is indeed to mortify, not to destroy, the body; finally, we have a tacit consent of the Church. All these conditions are lacking in the morning collation; rather, they are all contrary to it. The universal practice of Christians condemns this collation; the nature of the Christian fast detests so delicious and costly a beverage. The sole reason why common custom has established that dinner be deferred until midday is to afflict the flesh with the hunger suffered in such a delay. Now if in the morning a substantial refreshment is taken, is this not to make sport of the law? I know that the Casuists Filiucci, Viva, and others have also printed this laxity: that one may at pleasure anticipate dinner with only a venial fault. These Casuists erect a tribunal above the custom of the Church, or decide according to their whim. But this lax opinion will be discussed elsewhere. Finally, so that it may be seen how gross is the ignorance of those who claim to infer from the evening collation that the morning collation

of chocolate is lawful, I ask: in what century have the Theologians opposed the evening collation? They have indeed disputed, and still dispute, concerning its quantity and quality; but, as the Author

of the work entitled Ancient and Modern Discipline concerning the Fast of the Roman Church has observed, they never disputed about, or opposed, the introduction or continuation of such a collation considered absolutely. On the contrary, the most benign Probabilist Theologians - that is, the Tamburinis, Sanchezes, Castropalaos, Dianas, Pasqualigos, Leandros, Azors, Villaloboses, and so many other Casuists united with the Theologians of greater authority - have opposed the custom of chocolate on a fast day and condemn it as a corruption repugnant to the precept of the Church. And will an abuse condemned by the most benign Probabilists and by the most renowned Theologians be dared to be passed off as custom? I do not wish to place this vain sophism in greater view, lest I confound still more anyone who does not blush to oppose it. I add only that among the many reasons that induced me to publish these Historical Memoirs, one is to strip away this phantom of fantastic custom by warning the unskilled that this is by no means custom,

but a culpable abuse and a pernicious corruption.

XVIII. The oral Papal oracles boasted of by the Friars and the American Fathers cited above are more than fabulous. Nothing is more familiar to certain Casuists than to invent oral oracles at whim. Let the celebrated Bull Omnium sollicitudinum, and so forth, be read, and examples will be seen. But those who are capable of producing arguments that wound common sense in favor of the opinion mentioned can readily circulate in Europe Pontifical oracles published for the first time in Chiapa and Mexico. We have already mentioned above the testimony of Cardinal Brancacci himself against the falsehood of these oracles injurious to the Holy See. It would be to give credit to the most manifest fables if time were lost in refuting the chimera of such oracles.

XIX. But because the benign Doctors, with studied eloquence, place the practice of Rome in view, it is necessary to defend the Capital of our holy Religion. In Rome, say the Probabilist Gentlemen, chocolate is dispensed in Lent in public gatherings, at public refreshments, in the sight of Prelates and Pontiffs; neither they nor the sacred

> Congregations have ever protested; and since this is a matter belonging to positive law, no EDICT against such a beverage has ever been issued by public ecclesiastical authority. Therefore its use is not contrary to the ecclesiastical rite.

To understand how prejudicial such reasonings are to the Holy See, according to my weak judgment, one must reflect that those who reason thus wish the beverage of chocolate throughout the whole day and at public gatherings and public refreshments to be compatible with the precept of fasting; and they wish this custom to be approved by the Holy See because it is practiced in the sight of Prelates and Pontiffs and because no Edict against such a beverage has been issued. The Protestants who have written so much against the sacred fasts of our Roman Church, upon reading such things, go about declaiming with derision and contempt:

> Behold how many of the things Chemnitz, Calvin, and Daillé have written against the fasts of the Papists are true by the admission of the very Preachers of the Roman Church. From the very pulpits of Italy, from the very Lenten sermons printed for the edification of the faithful, it is confessed, indeed boasted, that the delicious chocolates which on the holy days of Lent, days of humiliation
>
> and penance, are dispensed at public gatherings and public refreshments are approved by their Church and by their Pontiffs. And then they do not wish us to say that their fasts are fasts for

sport, for the stage, for comedy? Where in such fasts is suffering, mortification, humiliation? Where does an air of sincere contrition and evangelical penance breathe through them?

There is no need for me to represent the declamations of the Protestants at greater length. The doctrine recounted speaks for itself.

XX. Now, for the undeceiving both of the Protestants and of ignorant Catholics, it must first be considered that in Rome and outside Rome so many Cardinals, Prelates, Religious, and Christians of every condition abstain from such a beverage on a fast day; and of these our most Benign say nothing. Yet the example of these should in every respect prevail over the custom of those who drink it at public gatherings and public refreshments. In the second place it must be considered that sickly old age, grave occupations and labors, weaknesses, and personal infirmities can render a cup of chocolate lawful for many Christians. Now in Rome especially so many

Cardinals, Prelates, and Ministers, some advanced in age, others oppressed by necessary occupations, must attend Congregations and meetings where affairs of the greatest gravity are handled. Now who will deny that the refreshment of chocolate is lawful for these in order to render them capable of exercising their ministry and their office? Therefore is this chocolate lawful at public gatherings and public refreshments for gallants and ladies? And is such a custom approved by the holy Roman See? These are consequences that cause horror and press tears from the eyes. The Supreme Pontiffs prudently do not make EDICTS against such a beverage because, since it is lawful for many for the reasons mentioned, they do not wish to promulgate a universal prohibition for all. An unheard-of and astonishing extravagance! These benign Doctors do nothing but exaggerate in a most false sense the sweetness of the evangelical yoke - 'my yoke is sweet' - and at the same time that they boast that the evangelical yoke is sweet, they would make it burdensome with more precepts and anathemas than the Mosaic yoke was. An EDICT from the Vatican is demanded against chocolate; otherwise it is lawful. An EDICT against eight ounces of sturgeon, trout, or sole; otherwise they are lawful. An EDICT against the anticipation of

dinner several hours before midday; otherwise it is lawful to dine at Terce and whenever one pleases. Three edicts for those dispensed from meat, so that they abstain from supping. But if so many edicts are required for the observance of fasting alone, how many thousands upon thousands of edicts will be required for the observance of all the other commandments? According to these Gentlemen, the Holy See ought to do nothing else than promulgate edicts and anathemas every day against the lax opinions of the Casuists. But even if it were to promulgate all these EDICTS - against the abuses of admitting to the most holy Communion the young ladies, the gallants, the spectators of theaters and comedies, the followers of luxury and pomp; against so many games pernicious to the public and to private persons; against so much scandalous immodesty in dress; against so many commercial frauds and usuries; against so much freedom of social intercourse - even if, I repeat, the Holy See were to promulgate all these EDICTS, would it then be obeyed at once and exactly, without distinctions, interpretations, and evasions being invented? Would the humble head then at once bow with full resignation?

XXI. Those who do not wish to practice Christian penance, nor to fulfill the divine law, nor to abandon the delights, softnesses, pomps, and

customs of a corrupt age, except by force of Edicts, Anathemas, Decrees, Constitutions, Briefs, and Bulls, are at the final edge of the precipice; they are on the road to hell. God imposes difficult commandments upon us and assigns us the suitable means for observing them; but, in order not to oppress us with a multitude of precepts, he does not impose under a particular commandment those suitable means for observing the law. Our modern Casuists, because the means mentioned are not imposed by a particular precept, separate them from the law. What follows? That the observance of the law becomes impracticable. Those who justify customs as universal because they are not prohibited by particular edicts are ignorant, as was indicated above, of what the Church of Jesus Christ is. Augustine says:

> The Church of God, established amid much chaff and many tares, tolerates many things.

The Church of God is surrounded here by much chaff and there by many tares; and our divine Redeemer has ordained that the evil plants grow together with the wheat. And our benign Doctors would wish the Vicars of Jesus Christ continually to stand

with sickle in hand to cut away all the tares and all the chaff. But do they not see that in this case innumerable volumes filled with scandalous opinions would have to be consigned to the flames? So long as this Church militant endures, there will always be both good and bad, true and false doctrines, true and false Prophets, true and false Doctors, as God himself says in Ecclesiasticus, chapter thirty-three:

> Against good is evil, and against death life; so also against a just man, a sinner. And thus look upon all the works of the Most High: two and two, and one against another.

He warns us that those very customs which appear upright and just to us lead us to death:

> There is a way that seems just to a man, but its end leads to death.

Know that if the Church of God, Augustine continues, tolerates false doctrines, she never approves them. In this Church there will always be men of God who not only will not follow error or do evil, but moreover will not keep silent and will cry out, not against the Doctors, but against false doctrines:

> Things contrary to the faith she does not approve, nor is she silent about them, nor does she do them.

XXII. The defenders of the potion wish to speak once again, and with a loud voice they again magnify the authority of Religious, of Regulars distinguished both for doctrine and probity, innumerable of whom, Father Millante says, devote their labor to a nobler and purer Theology. This authority of pious men, of upright Regulars who sip this sweet beverage, makes a very great impression not only upon the minds of the ignorant but even upon the more alert minds. Father Tommaso Tamburini, after refuting the false opinion with all his force, attests that reason convinces him of the opposition between chocolate and the fast, but the authority of pious, religious, and learned men does not permit him to exclude the contrary negative opinion from the bounds of probability:

> What I have hitherto disputed concerning chocolate seems true to me on account of the intrinsic reasons; nevertheless, because I see pious, religious, and learned men judge that it, as it is now in use in Spain and Rome, is a customary drink and does not violate the fast, I do not

wish - and this on account of extrinsic authority - to exclude this opinion from the bounds of probability and security.

Behold once again how the fatal leaven of

Probabilism spreads throughout all Theology and everywhere corrupts the best doctrines. The reasons demonstrate the truth to Father Tamburini, but the authority of pious and learned Religious renders probable to him that very opinion which he judges false by virtue both of authority and of reason. But let us listen once again to Father Tamburini, who continues thus:

A man of our Society entirely worthy of trust related to me that the Most Eminent Giovanni de Lugo, before he was raised to the sacred Purple, namely while he professed Theology in the Roman College, replied thus wittily to a certain Priest who asked him whether chocolate broke the fast: 'Those who use it affirm that it by no means breaks the fast; those who abstain from it contend that it breaks the fast. But since I am among those who use it, I pronounce that it by no means violates the fast.' Thus he. If therefore a man so very learned, so pious, and preeminent in such authority declared in such express words, by what reason can anyone suspect that he speaks and acts without probability?

XXIII. To tell the truth, I am one of those who not only suspect, but frankly judge that this Theologian speaks precisely by probabilizing - speaking probably - but I add that this probable

speech of his ought not only not to serve as authority that renders the action lawful, but ought to serve as a motive for abhorring it. What? A Religious Theologian, asked about a point of Christian Morality in which the question is whether or not one sins mortally, answers with a jest? He replied wittily? And will this witty man render probable that opinion which Father Tamburini himself judges false? May God always preserve us from this probabilizing. Speaking seriously, if we were to call the authority of this Theologian to examination in evangelical Morality, we would say, according to our weak judgment, that, given the many lax opinions printed by him, he ought not to serve as a rule for anyone. I have read a manuscript of his on the distribution of ecclesiastical goods which surprised me; and his moral little works printed with the other moral works are enough for one not to surrender to his authority alone, separated from reason, as Father Tamburini surrenders. But now is not the time to exercise just and reverent criticism upon the moral works of Cardinal de Lugo, but rather to answer the argument.

XXIV. Not only in this matter, but in every moral controversy, so to speak, there is opposed this authority of pious and learned men, of Religious, of Regulars distinguished both for doctrine and probity,

who also devote their labor to a purer Theology. And because this is an argument that even secular Christians continually oppose in every controversy, always interjecting, 'Is it possible that those Religious wish to damn themselves after having abandoned comforts and liberty?' Father Sporer sometimes, in order to render an opinion plausible, is accustomed to say:

Thus I practiced in the Confessional.

And now it is said: the grave, pious, and learned cloistered Religious themselves drink chocolate in Lent. And then will it be said that it is not lawful?

XXV. For the present I shall not answer according to that dreadful and formidable doctrine of truly celebrated Authors, that in every greater or large Religious Order the number of the reprobate is greater; but I wish to relate the discourses by which the sacred Theologians press these adversaries who so greatly oppose to them the probity and learning of the cloistered Religious. They reason thus. First, were not the hundreds of false, erroneous, and scandalous propositions already condemned perhaps invented, taught, and bitterly defended by pious and learned men? How many heresies have been invented by most learned men who, in the eyes of the world, appeared pious and learned? Secondly, is it not true that for a man to have authority in an art he must

be practiced and expert in that art? To decide a point of navigation, will a learned and upright painter perhaps be cited? And to pass judgment upon a painting, will a pious and upright pilot perhaps be cited? Thus, to decide upon a point of Christian bodily penance, it is necessary to cite those expert in that art, such as the Hilarions, the Pachomiuses, the Francises of Assisi, the Peters of Alcantara, the Charleses Borromeo, and so many other excellent Doctors and luminous examples of Christian penance. If these, or others like these, drank chocolate in Lent, I confess that their practice would be great authority for me. On the contrary, I do not recognize as examples of Christian bodily penance, nor as Doctors who have authority in such a matter, those Religious who on the holy days of penance every morning, without particular need, bathe their throats with chocolate. Will these render such a custom probable and lawful? But do they not themselves say:

> Those who use it affirm that it by no means breaks the fast; those who abstain from it contend that it breaks the fast.

And it is most true. Who are those who wish publicly to practice an action which they judge culpable? Do these Religious distinguished both for doctrine and probity take chocolate in Lent? Therefore they are unfit and incapable of having authority in the matter of bodily penance. And why? Because

in that art they are inexperienced; they are ignorant. If they do not practice bodily penance, they do not know that this is necessary, either in desire or in effect when possible, for Paradise. And being ignorant of this, they are incapable of having authority in this kind. Many Religious oppressed by grave labors and filled with infirmities may lawfully refresh themselves with such a beverage, or with something else, even during a fast; and these can have authority, because they are penitents in desire, if not in effect on account of their weakness.

XXVI. For the rest, it is asked of these boasters of the probity, gravity, and learning of these Religious what they understand by probity, gravity, and learning. Will they perhaps be upright, grave, and pious because they live far from those sins which dishonor them before the world? But this piety and probity is found everywhere, more or less, even in the Sects of the Pagans, the Heretics, and the Jews. Perhaps because they observe the Decalogue? But in order not to lose time in superfluous questions, let us report the reasoning of the sacred Theologians. Religious, they say, who profess evangelical perfection, who ought to be examples of abstinence to Christians, sip so delicious a beverage daily during holy Lent without particular necessity?

How much this consideration ought to conclude, we do not know. We have mentioned it only in order to decide irrefragably that these vaunted learned, upright, and pious Theologians, who without particular need drink chocolate during Lent, in which they ought to edify the world through the

practice of true penance, are not in such a situation of probity, piety, or authority that they ought to acquire any degree of probability for the use of the beverage during a fast, if, by the confession of the most benign Father Tamburini, the reasons prove that such a refreshment is repugnant to the fast.

XXVII. The sacred Theologians, on the other hand, blunt the most pernicious sophism which deceives and seduces so many people. You oppose to us, they resume, the probity and piety of so many Cloistered Religious who drink chocolate during a fast and who devote their labor to a purer Theology; and where do you leave the probity and learning of those who labor at a more benign Theology? Where, where do you leave the authority, learning, probity, and piety of Sanchez, Castropalao, Diana, Tamburini, Azor, Villalobos, Trullench, Lezana, and Leandro? And in what degree of esteem do you hold the piety, probity, and learning of the Antiprobabilists? Is it not

evident that the Theologians, both Probabilists and Antiprobabilists, more commonly condemn chocolate on a fast day? With what courage, then, is the probity, learning, and authority of the Religious drinkers opposed? These cause scandal rather than credibility among wise Christians. But to close off every means of escape: let us concede, by way of superabundance, that the controversy has on the one side and on the other equal extrinsic probability from Authors and intrinsic probability from reasons. Not even under this hypothesis, otherwise most false, can a custom that derogates from the law be alleged, according to the principles of the Probabilists. For under this hypothesis the cause would be doubtful, while the law of the fast is certain and in possession. Now a doubtful and contested custom cannot derogate from a certain law established in possession for so many centuries, since the common maxim is:

The position of the possessor is better.

From all the reasons adduced, does it not evidently result that the vaunted custom is a manifest sinful abuse and a scandalous corruption?

Section Eleven — Whether Parvity of Matter Renders Lawful the Modern Custom of Taking Chocolate during a Time of Fasting

I. Up to now I have faithfully recounted to you the reasons on the one side and on the other. All the reasons that absolutely unite chocolate with fasting are these. 1. Chocolate is not substantial; it does not nourish. 2. Chocolate is a drink in America; therefore, although it nourishes per accidens, it may also be taken in Europe. 3. Beer, although pressed from grain, may be drunk. 4. Custom favors it. 5. Pious and learned Religious practice it. 6. Chocolate is neither food nor drink, but medicine taken as a beverage. The sacred Theologians demonstrate with the fullest evidence that these are not reasons but illusions; not discourses but quibbles and sophisms so gross and ridiculous that they are repugnant to right reason, wound common sense itself, and are rejected by their own Authors, who do not agree among themselves; rather, that reason which appears probable to some proves ridiculous and improbable to others.

II. It remains now that, in the last place, we recount the variety of opinions concerning parvity of matter. It is most certain among all that parvity of matter is admitted in the precept of fasting. The whole difficulty is reduced to marking out the narrow boundaries of this parvity. I continue to act as Historian. The Most Eminent Cardinal Brancacci establishes in his Dissertation that one ounce of chocolate is parvity of matter:

> This conclusion greatly pleases me: namely, that a drink of chocolate not exceeding the quantity of one ounce, with five ounces of plain or distilled water, does not injure the fast.

III. Father Domenico Viva writes, as has been seen, that he follows the judgment of Cardinal Brancacci:

> External authority being set aside, the opinion of the Most Eminent Brancacci pleases me.

And he adds to it two ounces of water and half an ounce of sugar, which, kneaded with the chocolate, makes one ounce and a half of paste. To this half-ounce of paste he duly adds two of water; and hence he concludes that you may drink it several times a day, even without venial sin:

> The reason is not that an ounce is small matter; for then you could not take it SEVERAL TIMES without mortal sin, nor once without venial sin; but because in such a quantity it is a customary drink among those Nations, and thus everywhere.

Thus, according to Father Domenico Viva, as was already observed above, you may take even a pound of chocolate a day, provided that to every ounce and a half of paste you add seven of water. What greatly displeases me in Father Viva is that he publishes so lax an opinion as the judgment of the Most Eminent Brancacci. For upon unlearned readers who cannot read the Authors at the source, the authority of so great a Cardinal makes a great impression. And then these are the very men who cry out against sincerity in reporting the judgments of others. But let us continue the History.

IV. Father Escobar likewise restricts parvity of matter to one ounce; Cardinal Cozza to one ounce, and at most to two. Father Zaccaria Pasqualigo, most benign in enlarging the law of fasting, restricts this parvity to an eighth, or at most to a sixth part of an ounce. Antonio de Leon restricts it to half an ounce. I transcribe the words of Pasqualigo, decision 141:

> Only parvity of matter could excuse from mortal sin. But the difficulty is what must be judged small matter. For since such a drink nourishes and strengthens so much, its case differs from that of other foods. Antonio de Leon, in the place cited, thinks that half an ounce of chocolate may be mixed into a drink as small matter. But I consider this excessive, because, proportionally speaking, half an ounce of chocolate nourishes and strengthens more than six ounces of another highly nutritive food. Hence, since what must be considered here is the formal quantity, namely the nutritive power, seeing that in fasting abstinence from food is prescribed insofar as it is nutritive, that must be regarded as small matter which can nourish little. Hence I think it cannot exceed an eighth part of an ounce, or at most a sixth part; otherwise it always brings notable nourishment.

It must be said that the chocolate which Father Pasqualigo took was of singular exquisiteness and more substantial than that which is commonly taken.

V. Father Tommaso Tamburini likewise judges that half an ounce is grave matter and is repugnant to the fast. Thus he writes in the place cited:

> To discern whether a thing is slight in some matter, one must always have recourse to the end of the prohibition.... But certainly half an ounce of chocolate greatly harms the end intended by the Church in fasting, since half an ounce of such a drink nourishes much and greatly, and, as I hear, more than six ounces of another highly nutritive food. Therefore you do not measure parvity correctly in this matter. In the same way you could mix one or two ounces of egg yolks, with a very small bit of sugar, into boiling water [for thus you will make a porridge not unpleasant to the palate], and consume it during the day without mortal sin while fasting, because you enjoy the Bull of the Crusade.... Away with these things.

VI. Father Millante, as a cultivator of a Theology more purified than that of Father Tamburini, grants sesquiunciam, one ounce and a half; and he claims that this ounce and a half is justified by custom, already demonstrated to be a pernicious corruption. He adds that you may drink another ounce and a half with a venial sin:

> After drinking an ounce and a half of chocolate, if one should wish to take another as well, he would sin venially because of parvity of matter.

If finally gluttony should drive you to drink it for the third time, you would then sin mortally:

> But if anyone moreover should do this a third time, he would sin mortally.

Here end the Memoirs pertaining to the History of chocolate.

Section Twelve — Conclusion of the Letter with a Few but Important Considerations

I. Having finished the account, I add a few brief considerations. And to begin with what was mentioned last, who does not remain astonished

and filled with horror at seeing men of that learning which their discourses hitherto recounted reveal, with scales in hand weighing mortal and venial sins with as much ease as they count cups of chocolate? If you drink two ounces, says one, you sin only venially. Indeed, if you take even a single half-ounce, you are damned, cries another. No, says this one, an ounce and a half is free from every fault; another ounce and a half carries with it only one venial fault; the third sesquiuncia, or ounce and a half, contains the sin that sends you eternally to hell.

II. If you ask who placed these scales in their hands for weighing with such ease the degrees of malice, and for sending one man with a cup and a half to hell, and another with two, with four, with eight to Paradise, they will become mute as fish. I know, and I grant it, that Theologians can with due caution distinguish grave matter from slight, and mortal sin from venial. All this I admit. I reprove and detest only the excessive ease and excessive boldness of enlarging, increasing, and diminishing this matter at whim, according to whatever comes into each one's head. Saint Thomas says that:

> Every question in which mortal sin is at issue is decided perilously unless the truth is expressly known.

III. Two things, it seems, we may draw with moral certainty from this whole History. The first is that the use of chocolate is repugnant to the precept of fasting. The second is that, although parvity of matter is admitted, it is nevertheless difficult to define its precise boundaries. If a Pasqualigo and a Tamburini restrict it to the eighth or the sixth part of an ounce, what ought we to say? Ought we, for half a cup more or less, to judge a soul eternally damned or blessed? But on the contrary, will you, O Christian, be so cowardly, so blind, as to wish to risk your eternal salvation worse than Esau did, for a cup of chocolate? If I would be imprudent to define these boundaries because of the danger of error, will you not be a thousand times more imprudent in venturing your eternal salvation upon such uncertainty for so slight a thing? If among Physicians there were as many disagreements about whether or not there is mortal poison in the cup you must drink as there are among Theologians about whether or not mortal sin is in it, would you dare put your lips to it? If the most accredited Physicians commonly maintained the existence of the poison, just as the Theologians superior in number, benignity, and learning maintain the existence of mortal sin, who would not abstain from such a beverage?

IV. For my part, I shall never fix the limits of this matter. I know that the precept does not bind those who have true need of it; and I know with equal certainty that all those who drink it without need sin. What the degrees of malice of this sin may be, I do not know. I know likewise that the motive of feeling better does not establish a title of particular need, just as it is certain that true fasting is not commonly possible without suffering. The experience of all Christians who before a century ago fasted without chocolate, and the present experience of five parts of Christians who live without chocolate both in a time of fasting and outside fasting, are just reproaches to the many who,

bewitched either by the illusions of gluttony or by an immoderate love of ease and comforts, believe they cannot observe holy Lent without this beverage. I am certain that, excepting some sickly persons and setting aside certain particular circumstances of grave labor or extraordinary weakness, those who drink it would commonly observe the holy fast with a little inconvenience and suffering. An obligation, a point of honor, or an accident would be enough to make them most abstinent.

I have observed that the occasion of an office or employment has made vigilant, strong, and abstinent those who for so many years declared themselves incapable of everything. If I could obtain from some reader of this writing that he would, if for no other reason, at least through some such commitment bring himself to try one week of Lent without drinking chocolate, I would be certain of obtaining the desired end, which is to render at least one of my readers abstinent from the sinful beverage.

V. I therefore do not admit the opinion that chocolate may be drunk by reason of parvity of matter. First, because venial sin is not avoided, nor is it abolished by custom, as Millante falsely supposes when he claims that parvity of matter has become established by prescription; his capricious conception has already been rejected with evidence as chimerical. Second, because it is most difficult to assign the precise boundaries of this parvity, as appears from the variety among those very men who defend it. Third, because in practice it is most difficult for those who drink it to make so exact a use of it. Fourth, because once the use of parvity of matter is admitted, the abuse is irreparable, as is in fact seen.

Many of those who are produced as examples to authorize the scandalous corruption either take it from need or take it in a small quantity. But the Public sees that chocolate is taken, and by Religious of credit and probity; it goes no further to examine whether such a beverage is taken because of infirmity, the feebleness of age, some particular need, or finally greediness and gluttony. All corruptions begin little by little, and woe to those who open the door to them; but those who foster, maintain, and promote them are no less guilty on that account.

VI. The most important consideration, then, is this: if Christians, whether Religious or lay, do not practice some true bodily penance in Lent, when will they practice it? Either they care nothing for eternal salvation, or they are wholly ignorant of the evangelical law. Saint Paul makes known to us that if we wish to have a share in the glory of the Redeemer, we must be participants in his sufferings:

> If we suffer with him, we shall also be glorified with him.

It is not possible that I should see glorious in heaven one who does not seek to resemble him crucified on earth. Open your eyes, the Apostle exclaims, and fix them upon this most luminous exemplar, Jesus

Christ, through whose merits God has chosen and predestined you, so that, mortified and humbled, renouncing the works of the flesh and of sin, you may render yourselves conformed to him:

> Those whom he foreknew and predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son.

Holy David, with a tone of voice proper to a Sovereign, cries: Hardened and obstinate men, how long will you be idolaters of vanity, falsehood, and error?

> Sons of men, how long will you be heavy of heart? Why do you love vanity and seek falsehood?

Penance, both internal and external, is so necessary for all who have sinned that without it salvation is impossible.

Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish, says Jesus in Saint Luke.

This penance is like a plant which, if it does not produce the exterior fruits of fasts, alms, and prayers, is sterile, unfruitful, destined for eternal fire.

Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish.

VII. I well foresee that, however effective the reasons thus far adduced are in convincing the intellect, they will be equally feeble in turning drinkers away from the sinful custom. The reasons produced

in defense of the custom of the beverage have been shown to be false, vain, ridiculous, repugnant to right reason, common sense, and universal experience. Therefore one of two things must be done: either one must show oneself so much an idolater of the belly and of gluttony that one no longer wishes to listen to the voice of truth, or one must renounce the corruption; either one must enter the number of those who, contrary to all reason, wish to satisfy their own appetites, or one must surrender to the truth. I hope at least that such strong reasons and such venerable authorities will serve to make the good persevere, to strengthen the wavering, and to preserve the innocent, so that they do not fall into the vicious custom. These are the ones I wish to encourage, not with my words, but with those of the Holy Fathers.

VIII. In every age there have been the vicious, the gluttonous, and the gourmands, who have tried to evade true fasts, effective remedies against the vices of gluttony and lust. Even in Saint Augustine's time many substituted other delicious foods and exquisite liquors for the privation of meats and wines. They change pleasures, says the Holy Father; they do not diminish them. In place of wine they pressed unusual liquors from fruits. Yet they had not gone to the excess of drinking them outside the meal. Let us recite the Saint's words:

Care must be taken

lest you change pleasures rather than diminish them. For you may see some seeking unusual liquors in place of customary wine, and compensating much more sweetly, by the pressing of other fruits, for that which they deny themselves from the grape; seeking foods apart from meats in manifold variety and pleasantness; and gathering for this season, as if opportunely, delicacies which at another time they are ashamed to pursue; so that, it is evident, the observance of Lent becomes not the repression of old concupiscences but the occasion of new delights. Brothers, take as much vigilant care as you can that these things do not creep upon you under persuasion. Let frugality be joined to fasts. Just as satiety of the belly must be chastised, so the enticements of the palate must be guarded against.

IX. In another discourse the Holy Father represents to us the vain speech of certain little Doctors, who even at that time seduced simple Christians with masks of customs and with sophisms invented in the school of concupiscence. There are certain observers of Lent, he says, more fond of delicacies than religious, who always go in search of new delights:

Because of the errors of men, who through empty-speaking

> seductions and depraved customs do not cease to impose upon us a troublesome care for you, I cannot keep silent. There are certain observers of Lent more fond of delicacies than religious, seeking new pleasures rather than chastising old concupiscences.... They fear as unclean the vessels in which meats have been cooked, and in their own flesh they do not fear the luxury of belly and throat.... There are also some who seek other liquors not for the sake of health but of pleasure, as though Lent were not an observance of pious humility but an occasion of new pleasure.... What, however, is more absurd than, at the time when the flesh must be more strictly chastised, to procure such great delights for the flesh?

X. Saint Jerome also declaims strongly against the delicacies that some practiced in his time. And yet they are as inferior to those of our times as their fasts were more severe than ours. The Saint's very declamation reveals to us what the delights were that inflamed the zeal of the Holy Fathers:

> What profit is there in not eating oil, and in seeking certain hardships and difficulties in foods: dried figs, pepper, nuts,
>
> dates, fine flour - behold the delicacies of those times - honey, pistachios?.... I hear moreover that some, contrary to the nature of things and of men, do not drink water and do not eat bread, but sip delicate broths, crushed vegetables, and the juice of berries, not from a cup but from a shell. For shame! Are we not ashamed of follies of this kind, nor weary of superstition?

And yet they practiced those beverages only at the single meal, and never outside a meal.

XI. But let us pass from the ancients to our Most Holy Father Benedict XIV, who, just as in every Bull, Constitution, or Pastoral of his he offers his Catholic flock divine teachings for the reform of morals and for restoring ecclesiastical discipline, so in the Brief by which he has lately exalted to public veneration upon the sacred altars Blessed Jerome Emiliani, Founder of the illustrious Congregation of Somasca and luminous ornament of the immortal Venetian Republic, of which he was an illustrious Patrician, he supplies us two most weighty teachings most fitting to our purpose. He

reminds us first that truly Christian penance, capable of appeasing the indignation of provoked divine justice and reforming corrupt morals, is a mortifying, laborious penance, fertile in bitter tears and severe fasts. Secondly, he makes us know that we live in an age, not rigorist, as some seek to suggest, but MOST INDULGENT, in which Christian penance, practiced by the true servants of God and especially by Blessed Jerome Emiliani, is softened and mollified with embellishments of words and with such blandishments of opinions that it can scarcely be called penance.

> In this MOST INDULGENT age, soothed by so many blandishments of words.

But let us transcribe entire the pontifical admonition, expressed with elegance of words no less than with sublimity of sentiments:

> Let the fallen, upon whom it is incumbent to amend a wicked habit of life and corrupt morals, not trust that any sort of penance, softened in this MOST INDULGENT age by so many blandishments of words, suffices for them; but let them be moved by the example of this servant of God, since, in expiating grave offenses, bending the wrath of the Almighty, and restoring that newness of spirit which Blessed Jerome Emiliani

attained and which produced such glory for him, we can by no means succeed without great tears and labors of our own, divine justice requiring it.

XII. I have wished to report these few passages, omitting innumerable others, so that those who may perhaps say that I could have omitted writing on this subject may see to their confusion that our Holy Fathers employed their pens against such abuses, indeed lesser ones, and hurled the darts of their heavenly zeal. If in our times worse abuses and more scandalous corruptions triumph and overflow, ought we not exercise our pens and oppose the impetuous torrent of dissoluteness? Shall we deserve reproof because at least in something we strive to tread the footsteps of those holy Doctors whom the Church sets before us as our Teachers? But the truth is that some would not wish to see their own shameful idleness, sluggish life, and most wicked, culpable squandering of their talents on vain curiosities reproved; other gluttons would not wish to feel their gluttony offended and combated; others finally will answer that discipline has changed, that the law of fasting, being positive, is subject to changes, to mitigation. I grant it. But is

this law perhaps subject to mitigation:

Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish?

Is this other law perhaps subject to prescription:

Therefore bring forth fruits worthy of penance.... Every tree that does not bear good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire?

Is the way to Paradise perhaps easier in our times than in the times of Jerome and Augustine? Was God perhaps more severe at that time than at present? This is all that of greater importance I have been able to gather, Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor, concerning the beverage of chocolate during a time of fasting. May these Memoirs, which with all obsequious respect I submit to you, serve at least so that certain persons more fond of delicacies than religious, to use Augustine's words, may not boast of a custom authenticated by tacit consent, because in the Holy Church there will always be one who does not approve it, does not keep silent, and does not practice it.

XIII. Before bringing the Letter to an end, I adduce a teaching of Saint Augustine. This Holy Father, among others, anticipated in great part the cavils of certain

modern Theologies. The opinions invented in the school of concupiscence have always been nearly the same. The only difference is that in Saint Augustine's time lax opinions remained in the minds of Christians who transgressed ecclesiastical discipline, whereas for some time now they have passed into the books of many Casuists and been authenticated by their authority. In Saint Augustine's time, gluttonous and voluptuous Christians, to cover their repugnance to fasts and penance, went about repeating the evangelical oracle:

My yoke is sweet, and my burden is light.

At present, not only ignorant Christians but many Casuists abuse this divine oracle; and although their books are entirely empty of Holy Scripture, they all nevertheless make a display of the aforesaid oracle; and they couple the sweetness of the yoke with the sweetness of chocolate.

XIV. Now the great Holy Father, in a hundred places of his works, explains both the sweetness of the yoke and the lightness of the burden of the evangelical law with a doctrine directly opposed to the

modern casuistical interpretation. Certain moderns, when they hear some doctrine that promotes the sincere observance of penance and chastity, reply: My yoke

is sweet. These men claim the yoke is sweet because it conforms to the flesh, to sense, and to delicacies. Saint Augustine, with all the other Fathers, teaches that the yoke is most bitter if one considers the very grave contrariety between it and human nature; the burden of the law is most heavy if regard is had to man's powers. But God, with ineffable wisdom, has provided man with most suitable means to carry this yoke and sustain this burden. Observe, says the Holy Father: the bodies of birds by their nature are heavy and weighty; but to make them fit for flight, God has provided them with wings. The keeper of birds, seeing in the heat of summer that so many feathers warm them, cuts off their wings, seduced by a false kindness to make the weight of their body lighter; and the poor birds, in the act of taking flight, lie upon the ground. God, to render his yoke sweet and light to man, has given him as many wings as are his divine virtues. Temperance, abstinence, fasting, chastity, justice, faith, hope, and charity are the wings that carry man to God with sublime flights. Not a few modern Casuists, through a lamentable illusion, believing that the wings of

these virtues burden the yoke of the law, either cut off altogether part of these wings, such as the Theological virtues, saying that they bind only per accidens and in rare cases; or so clip these wings that they not only do not serve for flight, but burden the yoke all the more, the more they fatten the body. The yoke is sweet, say so many Probabilists. Therefore sweet chocolate may be drunk; therefore at the evening collation half a pound of sturgeon may be eaten. The yoke is sweet: therefore it must not be burdened by forbidding Christians comedies, theaters, games, and promiscuous conversations. The language of divine Scripture is directly opposed:

> I chastise my body and bring it into servitude, says Saint Paul.

And the Holy Spirit warns:

> Do not gaze upon a virgin, lest perhaps you be scandalized by her beauty.

True penance, custody of the senses, and vigilance are the wings that render the yoke nimble. Let us listen to Saint Augustine:

> See that you will not be burdened if you listen to him. For my yoke is light. What does it mean, it is light? What if it has weight, but less?....
>
> This burden is not the weight of one laden, but the wings of one about to fly. Birds too have the burdens of their feathers. And what if we say: They carry their wings, and are carried. They carry them on earth, and are carried by them in heaven. If you should wish to show mercy to a bird, especially in summer, and should say: Its feathers burden this poor little bird; and you take away this burden, the one you wished to help will remain on the ground. Therefore bear the feathers of peace. Take up the wings of charity. This is the burden: thus the law of Christ will be fulfilled.

XV. Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship knows that all men of God lament and remain astonished to see that morals have relaxed to the extreme in our age and that wicked deeds flood everywhere. But I reply that this is no object of wonder if we are in an age in which not a few of the Theologians themselves teach, approve, and impel. Whither? To sin? I shall say. No one teaches that

fornications, adulteries, and effeminacies are lawful; but they teach and defend as lawful those practices which, with a species of moral necessity, lead to such sins. They grant

man the most sumptuous foods and the most exquisite delights in Lent itself; they render fasts sugared and penance powdered, coupling in the same Lent Communions and social gatherings, exercises of piety and exercises of gallantry. And will it be claimed that these bodies, destitute of fasts and penance, indeed full, fattened, and brawny, placed in friendly conversation, are pure, chaste, and modest? Would not these pretensions be foolish and chimerical? Here, then. These men do not directly teach that adulteries and fornications are lawful; but they teach that those customs which with moral certainty lead to fornications and adulteries are lawful. They do not teach that theft is lawful; but they throw open the door for the thief and open the strongbox: they say it is lawful to touch the doubloons, kiss them, and gaze fondly upon them; and then will they claim that the thief does not steal? They set a sumptuous table for the hungry man; they place cups in the thirsty man's hand; and then will they claim that he does not eat, that he does not drink? Ah, he who grants the antecedent must also grant the consequent.

XVI. Now, if you please, Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor, let us make another most important practical consideration. In this our

age morals are not only corrupted to the highest degree; but we see the last portentous monster of this corruption, which is unbelief, misbelief, and impiety. To form a just idea of the manner in which this practical atheism is generated, recall the maxim of the Probabilist Father Hurtado reported above at Section Three, number III. It teaches one to invent opinions which placate consciences and remove sins from the world:

> Both to placate consciences and to avoid many sins.

This doctrine is inculcated more clearly in Section Four, number III. It is an uncontested truth that lax doctrines, no less than vices, are the true source of unbelief. This unbelief has for its father the heart corrupted in vice, and for its mother the mind disordered in thought. False opinion in a matter of faith is a legitimate offspring of false opinion in a matter of morals. The people first sin with remorse and knowledge of guilt. This light of guilt shoots sharp darts that tear the conscience. To enjoy fully the pleasure of sin, they go in search of opinions

> both to placate consciences and to avoid many sins.

They go in search of Theologians who clothe vices with colors of honesty and transform faults

into virtues. Once faults are changed into virtues, behold faith changed into unbelief, Religion into impiety. Is it not true, Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor, that all see and confess that unbelief and irreligion creep about with most deadly slaughter? Yet afterward, I know not by what fatal destiny, few are those who wish to open their eyes to recognize the true sources of the poisonous contagion. The smoke is seen; indeed it is so dense that it squeezes tears from the eyes. But no one, or very few, has the courage to pour on the water to extinguish the fire that produces the smoke. Indeed, as the final punishment of our sins, some, preoccupied by a false Moral Theology, and others, agitated either by base envy or by other most hidden passions, oppose those who with intrepidity defend sound doctrine. But let us restrict the argument. Unbelief comes from libertinism, libertinism from freedom of thought in matters of morals, and freedom of thought in matters of

morals proceeds from the freedom to probabilize exercised by those Casuists who invent opinions to placate consciences and to avoid sins. Until the axe is applied to the poisonous roots of those novel opinions which approve those things that impel

with moral necessity to the most monstrous vices, and finally to unbelief, no reform whatever will ever be seen. It is said that Probabilism is a mere question of words, about which one ought no longer dispute or break holy peace, when both the authority of the sacred Theologians and the most sensible experience make us touch with our hand that this Probabilism is the universal source of all systematic laxities. For by virtue of this Probabilism, concerning every, so to speak, moral matter, opinion is held for the one side and the other. And although on one side the malice is almost evident, yet if a very few Casuists, of as much learning as their books reveal, defend the contrary side, it is immediately argued: This opinion is defended by some Theologians; therefore it is probable. If probable, therefore lawful. Let us make this truth evident by applying it to our case. The authorities and reasons which demonstrate that, apart from circumstances of particular need, the beverage of chocolate during a time of fasting is sinful, are evident; or, to abound in generous courtesy, let us say they are incomparably stronger than the reasons adduced by the opposite party; and this should suffice, and in fact, before Probabilism, sufficed to conclude

the beverage culpable. But at present the discourse proceeds thus: Although the contrary opinion is more probable, our own nevertheless does not cease also to be probable, although less than the other. Therefore it is lawful and safe. In fact, how many are those Catholics who drink chocolate in Lent persuaded that they sin? Very few. Commonly, in defiance of all that has been said, the young gentlemen and young ladies in the morning, even before rising from bed, will warm their stomachs with the sweet beverage; and afterward they will communicate several times in holy Lent, reasoning in this fashion. Our Confessors assure us that this beverage is lawful. The Confessors add: It is true, because many learned Theologians probably teach it. And just as under the guidance of probability the culpable custom of the beverage continues, so under the same guidance continue games, social gatherings, suppers when there is a dispensation from meat, comedies, theaters, and love affairs. Therefore it is more than evident that Probabilism is the poisonous source of systematic laxities. I say systematic because it is true that without Probabilism there can be abuse of the best doctrines, and without Probabilism there have been, are, and will be sins of every kind; but these are at least

recognized as sins and as monstrous offspring of human weakness. Whereas the indicated culpable customs, and a hundred others, are justified by Probabilism. And because the described customs, with moral necessity, impel, as has been said, to graver and more enormous sins, and these plunge people into wavering over the truths of the faith itself, it thus results with evidence that probabilistic opinion is the infected source of all systematic laxities, and consequently of unbelief itself. Men endowed with acute discernment and good natural judgment, but otherwise slaves of worldly pleasures, see on one side the evident repugnance between the holy commandments of the sublime Christian Religion and the dissolute life of so many Christian gentlemen and Christian ladies. On the other side they see that this dissolute life, this conduct, is approved by not a few Theologians and Confessors, who hold the foremost rank in the Catholic world. Therefore they infer: What must we believe? We may as well continue our course. Who knows how the affair will end? Therefore.... This reasoning will be made clearer in another Work, in which modern practical unbelief will be treated deliberately. Here, Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor,

are the HISTORICAL MEMOIRS which, on the occasion of replying to your Letter, I have gathered concerning the use of chocolate. If these meet with your authoritative approval, it will not be long before I submit to you another Letter on INDIFFERENTISM, or the indolence of so many Catholics in matters both of Religion and of morals, seduced by a species of Fatalism and Politicism to accommodate themselves to the current. I shall paint for you with just strokes the portraits of so many wretched petty politicians, who, although persuaded that many seek both to adulterate sound doctrine and to promote a pernicious Indulgentism, nevertheless refuse to reveal themselves as manifest followers of truth, and endeavor to walk with one foot on land and the other in the sea, after the manner of the Angel of the Apocalypse. The self-interested and most base worldly fear either of ruining or of delaying their own advancement closes their tongue in their mouth and makes them, in encounters in which there is the precept to reveal the truth, mute as statues. Others, either to acquire a reputation for wisdom and prudence, or because of certain other secret passions and most hidden folds of the human heart, parade a certain Suavism, a certain Indifferentism, from which the most pernicious

consequences derive. All these images I shall delineate for you, Monsignor, with the most natural strokes. For now I humbly offer you my service, and I kiss your sacred vestment.

Of Your Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship

Your Most Humble, Devoted, and Most Obliged Servant

N. N.

Printing Approbation

WE REFORMERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PADUA

Having seen by the Certificate of Revision and approval of Father Friar Paolo Tommaso Mannelli, Inquisitor, that in the Book entitled Historical Memoirs on the Use of Chocolate, Set Forth in a Letter there is nothing against the Holy Catholic Faith, and likewise by attestation of our Secretary nothing against Princes and good morals, we grant license to Simone Occhi, Printer of Venice, that it may be printed, observing the orders in matters of printing and presenting the customary copies to the Public Libraries of Venice and Padua.

Dated the 2nd of January 1747 M. V.

Daniel Bragadin, Knight, Procurator, Reformer

Barbon Morosini, Knight, Procurator, Reformer

Registered in the Book at folio 16, no. 122.

Michel Angelo Marino, Secretary