

The translation that follows is of the first controversy in the first volume of St. Robert Bellarmine's famous Disputations about Controversies of the Christian Faith against the Heretics of this Age, first published at Ingolstadt in 1581-1593 and republished several times thereafter.

The Latin text can be downloaded from Google books:

[http://books.google.com/books?id=vqJaa8h\\_teQC&pg=PP22&dq=bellarmini+controverbiae&hl=en&sa=X&ei=5ZGvUcO9HtS44APBqoHgAg&ved=0CDkQ6AEwAjgU](http://books.google.com/books?id=vqJaa8h_teQC&pg=PP22&dq=bellarmini+controverbiae&hl=en&sa=X&ei=5ZGvUcO9HtS44APBqoHgAg&ved=0CDkQ6AEwAjgU)

Peter L P Simpson  
June 2013.

Robert Bellarmine's *Disputations about Controversies of the  
Christian Faith*

Volume One

First General Controversy: On the Word of God, Written and  
Unwritten  
In Four Books

Book One: On the Sacred and Apocryphal Books. Page 5

*Chapter One: Is Scripture the Word of God?*

*Chapter Two: In the Books called Canonical the Word of God is Contained*

*Chapter Three: The Objection from the Words of St. Paul is Refuted, that the Letter kills  
and the Spirit gives Life.*

*Chapter Four: Which are the Sacred Books*

*Chapter Five: About the Heretics who Opposed the books of the Old Testament of the  
First Order*

*Chapter Six: On the Heretics who Attack the Books of the New Testament Enumerated  
Above*

*Chapter Seven: On the Book of Esther*

*Chapter Eight: On the Book of Baruch*

*Chapter Nine: On Certain Chapters in Daniel*

*Chapter Ten: On the Books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Maccabees*

*Chapter Eleven: On the Book of Tobit*

*Chapter Twelve: On the Book of Judith*

*Chapter Thirteen: On the Book of Wisdom*

*Chapter Fourteen: On Ecclesiasticus*

*Chapter Fifteen: On the Books of the Maccabees*

*Chapter Sixteen: On Certain Parts of the Books of Mark, Luke, and John*

*Chapter Seventeen: On the Epistle to the Hebrews*

*Chapter Eighteen: On the Epistles of James, of Jude, of Second Peter, of Second and  
Third John*

*Chapter Nineteen: On the Apocalypse*

*Chapter Twenty: On the Apocryphal Books*

Book Two: On the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latin Vulgate Editions.  
Page 73

*Chapter One: It is Shown that the Hebrew Edition of Moses and the Prophets has never  
Perished*

*Chapter Two: Whether the Hebrew Edition has been Corrupted*

*Chapter Three: On the Chaldee Edition*

*Chapter Four: On the Syriac Edition*

*Chapter Five: On the Various Greek Editions*

*Chapter Six: On the Septuagint*

*Chapter Seven: On the Greek Edition of the New Testament*

*Chapter Eight: On the Latin Editions*

*Chapter Nine: On the Author of the Vulgate Edition*

*Chapter Ten: On the Authority of the Latin Vulgate Edition*

*Chapter Eleven: The Objections of the Heretics against the Vulgate Edition are Solved*

*Chapter Twelve: The Places are Defended that Chemnitz says are Distorted in the Vulgate*

*Chapter Thirteen: The Places in the Psalms are Defended that Calvin Contends were Badly Translated by the Latin Translator*

*Chapter Fourteen: The Places are Defended that the Heretics say are Corrupt in the Latin Edition of the New Testament*

*Chapter Fifteen: On Vernacular Editions*

*Chapter Sixteen: The Objections of the Heretics are Solved*

### Book Three: On the Interpretation of the Word of God. Page 137

*Chapter One: Scripture is not so per se Open that it Suffices without Explanation for the Settling of Controversies of the Faith*

*Chapter Two: The Objections of the Adversaries are Solved*

*Chapter Three: A Question is Posed about the Judge of Controversies, and Discussion is given at the same time about the Senses of the Scriptures*

*Chapter Four: Testimonies are Adduced from the Old Testament for the Opinion of Catholics*

*Chapter Five: The Same is Proved from the New Testament*

*Chapter Six: The Same is Proved from the Custom of the Church*

*Chapter Seven: the Same is proved by the Testimonies of Pontiffs and Emperors*

*Chapter Eight: the Same is Proved by the Testimony of the Fathers*

*Chapter Nine: the Same is Proved by Reason*

*Chapter Ten: the Objections are Solved*

### Book Four: On the Unwritten Word of God. Page 172

*Chapter One: Those who have most of all Defended or Attacked Unwritten Traditions*

*Chapter Two: What and How Multiple Tradition is*

*Chapter Three: the State of the Question is Explained, and certain Falsehoods of the Adversaries are Uncovered*

*Chapter Four: the Necessity for Traditions is Shown*

*Chapter Five: That there are True Traditions is Demonstrated from the Scriptures*

*Chapter Six: The Same is Shown by the Testimonies of the Pontiffs and the Councils*

*Chapter Seven: The Same is Proved from the Fathers*

*Chapter Eight: The Same is Proved by Four Other Arguments*

*Chapter Nine: Five Rules are Explained by which we Come to Knowledge of True Traditions*

*Chapter Ten: The Objections of the Adversaries Taken from the Scriptures are Solved*

*Chapter Eleven: The Objections from the Fathers are Solved*

*Chapter Twelve: The Reasonings of the Adversaries are Solved*

*END OF FIRST CONTROVERSY*

## Book One: On the Sacred and Apocryphal Books

### *Chapter One: Is Scripture the Word of God?*

In my resolve to dispute of the sacred books, this question first offers itself: is the Prophetic and Apostolic Scripture to be received as the word of God, or is that only to be held for the word of God which the Holy Spirit speaks to each privately in his heart? Which question, otherwise unworthy of treatment among Christian theologians, has been brought forth for us at the present time in part by the ravings of Schwenckfeld and the Libertines. Gaspar Schwenckfeld (as is reported by Frederick Staphilus in his book on the agreement among the disciples of Luther and by Petrus Palladius in his book on the heresies of the present age) repulses the written word as the letter that killeth, and bids us to be content with the internal spirit alone. About the Libertines, who arose from their founders Coppinus and Quintinus, John Calvin writes in this way in his instructions against the Libertines ch.9: "We have stated already," he says, "that they were accustomed from the beginning openly to laugh if anyone appealed to the Scriptures, and that they did not hide the fact they held the Scriptures for fables. In the meantime nevertheless they did not cease, if there was ever occasion, to use them in any sense of their own to which they were able to twist them. Not that they put faith in that sense, but only to perturb the ignorant and so to trouble them that they could at length draw them to themselves. If any passage was objected against them, they would reply that we are not at all beholden to the letter but that we should follow the spirit that vivifies. Indeed that pig Quintinus branded some of the Apostles in a mocking poem, in his own speech of Picardy, calling Paul a broken vessel, John a foolish youth, Peter a denier of God, Matthew a usurer." So Calvin.

Further, Martin Luther and John Calvin, and all the many followers and disciples of them that there are, do not fear, by a most impudent lie, to ascribe this very error of Schwenckfeld and the Libertines to the Roman Pontiff and to the whole Catholic Church. The words of Luther in his book on the Councils and the Church near the end are as follows: "The Pope has on this matter filled almost the whole world with an enormous mass of commentaries and books, and has changed the name of sin and justice into pure snares of conscience, rules, exactions, divine and human rights, articles of faith; so that he should deserve again to have his decretals consigned to the flames; for the Church could easily do without such a book, which has inflicted horrible and irreparable damage on a great part of the human race, has buried the Sacred Scripture in dust, and almost totally destroyed Christian doctrine." So the words of Luther, to which like words are found in his book against the King of England and his book on the false state of the Clergy and elsewhere. Calvin's words at the beginning of his book or instruction against the Anabaptists are as follows: "For we do not, in the manner of Papists, say that the sacrosanct Scriptures must be let alone so that we may rest on the authority of men, for we consider this shunning to be an execrable blasphemy." Wherefore, so that we may in brief refute the error of the former and the lie of the latter, this point will have to be established first: that the Prophetic and Apostolical books according to the mind of the Catholic Church, made clear both long ago in the Third Council of Carthage ch.47

and recently in the Council of Trent sess.4, are the true word of God and the certain and stable rule of faith. Therefore we will prove it with the arguments the follow.

*Chapter Two: In the Books called Canonical the Word of God is Contained*

At the beginning Moses, the Prophets, Christ himself, John, and the Apostles either themselves confirmed divine dogmas from the Scriptures or they certainly encouraged others to read the Scriptures, and they never referred anyone to the judgment of internal spirit to the neglect of the Scriptures. These testimonies are not adduced by us for the reason that we consider they are made much of by our adversaries, but so that the Scriptures, whose authority our adversaries from time to time misuse against us who rightly venerate them, may not seem to support their opinion.

Moses then in *Deuteronomy* 17 says: "If you discern that a judgment is difficult and ambiguous for you etc." and later: "Whatever you do, let them speak who are over the place which the Lord chooses, and let them teach you according to his law." Here Moses sufficiently plainly teaches that controversies, when they arise among the people of God, are to be judged from the law of the Lord. In the same way too Isaiah exclaims ch.8: "Rather to the law and the testimony." And *Malachi* ch.8: "The lips of the priest will keep knowledge, and they will seek the law from his mouth; because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts." David also in *Psalms* 118: "Blessed are they that examine his testimonies."

But Christ confirms first his mission from the testimony of Scripture, when he brings these words to the fore: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me etc." Then in *Mark* 12 he confutes the Sadducees from the divine writings when he says: "Do ye not therefore greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures?" And later: "But about the dead, that they rise, have you not read in the book of Moses etc." Further *Matthew* 22 he silences the Pharisees with another argument besides that one which he fetched from David. And again he throws the same Pharisees onto the Scriptures, not merely onto some internal spirit, when he says *John* 5: "Examine the Scriptures."

Indeed John the Baptist already used in evidence of his mission, not the judgment of internal spirit, but the Prophet Isaiah. Because when someone asked him he said, *John* 1: "I am a voice crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as the Prophet Isaiah said." Of the Beroenians not without praise is it related in *Acts* 17 that when they had heard Paul the Apostle they daily examined the Scriptures to see if these things were true. But the Apostles themselves, Peter, Paul, John, James not only frequently use in their individual epistles the testimonies of the law and the Prophets, which it would be too long to review in this place, but even sometimes universally preach the authority of the Scriptures: "We have," says St. Peter *II Peter* 1, "a more sure word of prophecy, to which you do well to attend, as to a light shining in a dark place." And St. Paul *II Timothy* 3: "From infancy," he says, "you have known the sacred writings, which are able to instruct you for salvation. All Scripture divinely inspired is useful for teaching, for refutation, for reproof, for educating in justice, so that a man instructed might be perfect for every good work." Lastly God himself in *Joshua* ch.1 says: "The volume of this law shall not depart from your mouth, but you will meditate on it day and night." They fight then with Moses,

with the Prophets, with the Apostles, with Christ himself and God the Father and Holy Spirit, who despise the sacred writings and the divine oracles.

Next, the rule of the Catholic faith should be certain and known; for if the rule is not known it will not be a rule for us; if it is not certain it will not even be a rule. Further, the private revelation of spirit, though it be certain in itself, yet cannot in any way be known to us unless it perchance be confirmed by divine testimonies, that is, by true miracles, an extreme poverty of which they especially labor under who in this our age no less boast of their spirit than others do. For who will assure me that the Anabaptist is not lying when he says he is inspired by the spirit? But let it be that he is not lying; in what way will I know that that spirit is the spirit of light and not the spirit of darkness? And since so many in this age glory that they have the Holy Spirit as guide and teacher, and yet they differ among themselves in mind and opinions just as other heretics do among each other, certainly it cannot be that they all think rightly. But as either they are all deceived or, which is altogether necessary, some of them are, who will dare affirm that he is not of the number of those who are deluded by the Spirit of Satan?

But there is nothing more known or more certain than the Sacred Scriptures that are contained in the prophetic and Apostolic writings, so that he must be very foolish who denies that faith is to be placed in them. For that they are very well known is witnessed by the whole Christian world and by the consent of all the nations, among whom these writings have now for many centuries gained always the highest authority; as well as that they are most certain and most true and contain, not human inventions, but divine oracles.

The first witness is the truth of the prophetic predictions, of which Saint Augustine says *City of God* 12 ch.9: "The faith of Scripture has not undeservedly a marvelous authority in the world, and it has, among other true things it has said, divinely predicted among all nations which ones were going to believe it." And again ch.10: "How much less," he says, "should those writings, full of fables, be believed which men have wanted to present as full of antiquities against the authority of the most known and most divine books, which authority predicted that the whole world would believe in it, and in which the whole world, as it predicted, has believed. From the true things of the past that it has narrated it shows that the future things it has foretold will with great truth be fulfilled."

Second, there is witness the incredible and plainly divine agreement and concord among so many men who at diverse places and times and tongues and occasions wrote the sacred volumes, so that they do not so much seem to be many diverse writers as many diverse pens of one writer. Therefore rightly did Theodoret in his preface to the *Psalms* and Saint Gregory in his preface to *Job* judge that the tongues and hands of the sacred writers should be called nothing other than the pens of the Holy Spirit.

And Saint Augustine in *City of God* bk. 18 ch.41, when speaking of this marvelous concord of the Scriptures, says: "As to our authors, in whom the Canon of the sacred writings is fixed and completed, far be it that they differ in any way among themselves. Hence not undeservedly has the fact that God spoke by them or through them, when they wrote, been believed, not by the few people in the schools and the gymnasia, garrulous in their litigious disputes, but by so many and so

numerous peoples in the fields and cities, both learned and unlearned. Those writers did, to be sure, have to be few, lest what should be clear in religion be made cheap by their multitude, and yet not so few that their agreement should not be marvelous. For neither could one easily find among the multitude of the philosophers, who have by their literary labor left monuments of their doctrines, any who agree in everything they thought.”

Third there is witness God himself who has sometimes by celestial warning defended this his Scripture from human profanation. When King Ptolemy indeed was marveling why none of the historians or old poets had made mention of the divine books, Demetrius of Phaleron responded, as is reported from Aristaeus by Josephus *Antiquities* bk.12 ch. 2 and Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* bk.8 ch.1, that this Scripture is divine and given by God himself, for which reason, if any profane man wished to touch it, they immediately fell back struck by God. And he affirmed that a certain Theopompus, because he wanted to adorn with Greek speech something from the divine volumes, suddenly received a certain trouble of mind divinely sent and, greatly disturbed, was compelled to desist from the work he had begun; but Theodorus, a writer of tragedies, because he decided to put into one of his stories something or other from the divine Scripture, was seized and deprived of lights; and so by the sudden calamity his signal rashness was immediately repressed.

Fourth there is witness the Scripture itself, for if it has true predictions of future things, as the event has afterwards proved, why are its evidences of present things not true? Therefore is true what David said *Kings* bk.2 ch.23: “The Spirit of the Lord spoke through me, and his word through my tongue.” True what Zachariah said *Luke* 1: “Blessed be the God of Israel etc., as he spoke through the mouth of the saints, his prophets.” True what Peter said *I Peter* ch.1: “Holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Spirit.” And Paul *I Timothy* ch.3: “All Scripture is divinely inspired.” True finally what all the Prophets repeatedly say: “Thus saith the Lord.”

Lastly is witness almost an infinite number of divine miracles which have been performed in all ages to prove the dogmas that are contained in the writings.

Wherefore, since the Sacred Scripture is the most certain and most safe rule of believing, he certainly will not be sane who neglects it and commits himself to the judgment of an often fallacious, always uncertain, internal spirit. And rightly does St. Augustine in the prologue to *Christian Doctrine* admonish Christians with these words: “Beware of such most proud and dangerous temptations, and let us more think that even Paul the Apostle himself, although prostrated by a divine and heavenly voice, was yet sent to a man in order to receive the sacraments and to be joined to the Church; and let us think of the centurion Cornelius who, although an angel announced to him that his prayers were heard and his works of mercy accepted, was yet handed over to Peter to be instructed, through whom he not only received the sacraments but also heard what he should believe, what he should hope, what love.”

Add to this that the providence of God rules and moderates each thing as its nature requires; but the nature of men requires that, since we are endued with soul and body and grasp bodily things more easily than spiritual, we are led to spiritual and celestial things, as by sure steps, through the things that are perceived by the sense of the body. God therefore does not teach everyone through internal



inspiration what to believe about him or what he wishes his own to do, but has wished to instruct us through corporeal writings that we may see and read: "From that city, whence we wander," says Augustine sermon 2 on *Psalm* 90, "have these writings come to us; these are the Scriptures that exhort us to live well."

Nor indeed if David, Moses, Isaiah, Peter, Paul, John and a few others, admitted by the fount itself of truth in some way into the band of the Angels, have drunk wisdom of itself, will the rest of men also immediately have no need of divine writings or other teachers. There should indeed be one nature for the foundations, another for the walls, one for mountains, another for hills. Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are all foundations? Are all mountains? And if all are mountains, where are the hills? If all foundations, where is the house? If all Apostles and Prophets, where is the assembly of the peoples, about which is written in *Psalm* 7: "And the assembly of the peoples will surround thee." We then (as the Apostle says in *Ephesians* ch.2) are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, by whose teaching and writings we are taught; but they who themselves saw and were ministers of the word are sustained and supported on the supreme corner stone itself, Jesus Christ."

When the sun rises, the heights of the mountains are illumined, and then the rays of light flow down to the hills and the lowest valleys. So according to *Psalm* 71 the mountains take up peace for the people and the hills justice: "The mountains," says St. Augustine tract 5 on *John*, "are high souls, and the hills small souls; but for this reason the mountains receive peace that the hills may receive justice. What is the justice the hills receive? Faith: because the just man lives by faith. But the lesser souls would not receive faith if the greater souls, which are called mountains, were not illumined by wisdom itself, so that they might transmit to little ones what little ones can grasp." And later: "When we raise our eyes to the Scriptures, because the Scriptures have been delivered through men, we raise our eyes to the mountains whence comes our help."

Lastly, if in any human republic the laws and the teachings of ancestors were taken away, and that were permitted to each which he judged right and just by his own natural prudence, how great a disturbance of things, how great a confusion would follow? In how short a time would the whole republic perish to its foundations? And yet there is no one who does not understand something of human things, no one who altogether lacks all judgment. What then would happen in the republic which is divine rather than human, and in which many things must necessarily be believed above natural reason, many things done above natural strength, if sacred words divinely inspired were taken out of the way and only an internal spirit were to be waited for and followed? What of the fact that the greatest part of men is made of the uneducated and unskilled, who have never sensed anything to be divinely shown to them, not even in dreams, as to what are they to do? Will they wait for ever? Will they believe nothing in the meantime? Will they perish for all eternity? Or will they attain justice without faith, or beatitude without justice? But they have the arguments of Swinkfeldians and Libertines to confirm their opinion by and keep it, namely so that they should not seem to rave without reason. Let us then examine of what sort these arguments are.

*Chapter Three: The Objection from the Words of St. Paul is Refuted, that the Letter kills and the Spirit gives Life.*

The Apostle Paul, they say, "in expressive words distinguishes the letter from the spirit, and openly casts the former back on the Old Testament, which he even says kills, and the latter he confirms is proper to the New Testament, and says it gives life. "Not the letter," he says *II Corinthians* ch.3, "has made us fitting ministers of the New Testament, but the spirit. For the letter kills but the spirit makes alive." Therefore just as the Old Testament belongs to the Jews and pertains not at all to Christian men, so neither will the divine Scriptures, which are nothing other than letters, pertain to Christian men."

To this argument we will easily make reply, and first that if things are so and nothing of the sacred letter pertains to us, why does Christ himself say *John* ch.5 "Search the Scriptures"? Why did Paul write so many letters? Why in *I Timothy* ch.4 does he admonish his disciple to pay attention to reading? But no doubt the Apostle Paul did not wish the Sacred Scripture to be understood by the letter that kills, nor an internal locution of the Spirit to be understood by the spirit that makes alive. The letter and spirit of Paul are nothing other than the law and grace of John. The letter, says John ch.1, was given by Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. And St. Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.15 ch.8 says: "The same law that was given by Moses was made grace and truth by Jesus Christ when spirit was added to the letter, so that the justice of the law might begin to be fulfilled, which unfulfilled was making them also guilty of sin." But that Paul meant the law by the letter can be understood from his following words. For when he had said, "not the letter but the spirit has made us fitting ministers of the New Testament, for the letter kills but the spirit makes alive", he immediately adds, "What if the ministry of death, set down in letters of stone, was for glory, so that the children of Israel could not look upon the face of Moses, because of the glory of his face, which shone forth; how will the ministry of the spirit not more be for glory?" In which words he has left no place for doubt but that by the letter that kills is to be understood the law written on stone.

But it will be worthwhile to explain briefly why the law given by Moses, why the letter, why what kills, is said to be proper to the Old Testament, lest, while we are refuting the Libertines and Schwenckfeldians, we seem to concede something to the Lutherans.

And a first very easy doubt indeed and almost nothing will be if Moses is compared with Christ and the law with grace. For when Moses brought down to the people the law given by God, he brought down nothing else than letters incised on stone; but Christ neither wrote any letters nor brought letters written by another, but he breathed the spirit of love and grace, which cannot even be written, into the hearts of his own. Therefore rightly is the law of Christ called spirit and grace, the law of Moses the letter.

But as to why the law is said to kill not everyone has the same opinion. Origen *Against Celsus* bk6, near the end, seems to mean that the letter that kills is the scripture itself when it is expounded according to the proper meaning of the words; but the same is spirit that makes alive if it is expounded mystically and spiritually. "He calls it letter," he says, "when we receive the divine letters according to the sense, but spirit when according to the understanding." And more clearly in

bk.7 before the middle: "We assert," he says, "that the law is double, namely one according to the letter and one according to opinion, as our ancestors have taught. Already the one that is taken as it is written is called not so much by us as by God through one of the Prophets a law that is not good and precepts that are not good. Which our own Paul imitates when he said that the letter kills, which is the same as if he had said that the words kill. Besides, the Spirit, he says, gives life, which means the same as if he had written that we attain life by understanding them." So Origen, whose opinion, if it is so taken that nothing at all in the divine Scriptures can be expounded as letter contains a refuted error, and the error has long been refuted by the Fathers. See Epiphanius epistle to John and on the heresy of Origen, Chrysostom hom.13 on *Genesis*, Jerome epistle to Pammachius about the errors of John of Jerusalem and on ch.10 of *Daniel*. Augustine, *City of God* bk.13 ch.21, on *Genesis* bk.8 ch.1. But if Origen's opinion is taken to be that things figuratively said are not to be explained according to the proper signification of the words, it is indeed true, but does not well fit this place of Paul. For the Apostle, when he says that the letter kills, is not speaking of the figures of the Scriptures, but of those well known precepts that were written on the two stone tables. For he speaks thus: "The letter kills, but the spirit makes alive. But if the ministry of death set down in letters of stone was for glory, etc." And again in the epistle to the *Romans*, where he often says that the law kills, he brings no other law forward than this one: "thou shalt not covet". "And indeed," if I may use the words of Augustine, book on the *Spirit and the Letter*, ch. 4, "a thing is not said figuratively on the ground that, when "thou shalt not covet" is said, it is not to be taken according to the sense of the letter. But this is a most open and most healthy precept, which if anyone fulfills, he will have altogether no sin."

But also St. John Chrysostom on *II Corinthians* 3 and those who followed him, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, a certain commentary attributed to St. Ambrose, and some others teach that the letter that kills is the law that punishes, the spirit that makes alive is the grace that frees from sins. For the law commanded not only adulterers and thieves to be killed but also him who collected wood on the Sabbath, *Numbers* ch.15. But grace absolved even the most wicked of men, and those contaminated by every kind of offense, through the water of regeneration or the word of reconciliation.

However, this explanation is not altogether satisfying, for the divine law established rewards for the good as well as punishments for the bad, and as is written in *Deuteronomy* 27: "Cursed be he who does not abide by the words of this law nor completes them in deed." So is it written also in *Leviticus* ch.18: "Keep my laws and judgments, which the man will live in who does them." Why then is the law said to kill and not also to bring life? For if the letter that kills can for this reason deservedly be so called because it kills its transgressors, by parity of reason it can be called the letter that makes alive because it bestows life on those who cultivate it.

Most true, then, and most in harmony with the words of the Apostle is the opinion of St. Augustine, namely that the law without grace is called by the Apostle Paul the letter that kills for two reasons. First that, since it cannot be fulfilled, it in some way makes him to whom it is given a sinner. The law, says the same Apostle in *Romans* ch.4, works wrath; for where there is no law there is no sin. Second that by its prohibition it increases concupiscence; for as the Apostle rightly says: We strive

always for what is forbidden, and we desire what is denied: "Sin," says the Apostle, "taking occasion by the law worked in me all concupiscence," *Romans* ch.7, and St. Augustine *On the Spirit and the Letter* ch.4 says: "The doctrine which it prescribes, do not covet, is a good and praiseworthy law, but where the Holy Spirit does not help, inspiring good desire in place of bad, that is, pouring forth charity in our hearts, assuredly the law, although good, increases bad desire by prohibiting it, just as a rush of water, if it does not cease to flow into a certain part, is made more vehement by the opposing obstacle, whose mass the water, when it conquers flowing headlong with a greater volume, more violently propels forward. And this is sin deceiving through the law and killing by it when offense too is added, which was no offense where there was no law."

Wherefore, neither of itself nor by any viciousness proper to itself, but by occasion only, and the occasion taken, not given, does the law kill. For sin, as the Apostle says *Romans* ch.7, "taking occasion by the law seduced me and by that killed me." So, is a law that is indeed holy and a command that is holy, just, and good to be made death for me because it is good? "God forbid. But sin, so that it might appear sin, worked death for me through what is good."

There remains the final question why the law without the proper letter is said to belong to the Old Testament. For the law in the Old Testament did not flourish without grace, without letter, without spirit, since so many at that time flourished as most just men, walking, as *Luke* ch.1 says of Zachariah and Elizabeth, in all the commands and justifications of God without complaint, nor in the New Testament does the spirit resist without the letter, without grace, without the law, since Christ said in *Matthew* ch.5, you have heard that it was said by those of old time "thou shalt not kill and he who kills will be liable to judgment. But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment," and the rest that follows; and again *John* ch.3, "unless a man be reborn by water and the Holy Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God;" and *Matthew* ch.28, "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you."

What is it then that the Apostle says, not the letter but the spirit has made us fitting ministers of the New Testament? By what reason does he exclude the law from the New Testament in which we see so many laws prescribed by Christ himself? But this question is easily solved if we differentiate between what pertains per se and properly to each Testament and what is the proper end of each Testament. The proper end of the Old testament was to bring it about that the human race, corrupted as it were in its root in its first parent, might be admonished about the sickness of its vices and its wounds, and thence conceiving fear and sorrow seek a healer. The law leads to this end. Through the law is the knowledge of sin, says the Apostle *Romans* ch.3. And again, "I did not know sin save through the law," *Romans* ch.7. And St. Augustine says, letter 200 to Asellicus, "it is the mark of law that it convict man of his weakness and compel him to implore the medicine of grace which is in Christ."

Wherefore per se and properly the Old Testament is contained in laws and letters, and brings in fear and generates to servitude, as Paul says *Romans* ch.8, *Galatians* ch.4. But those who are said to have been just and free under the Old

Testament were not such by the letter of the Old Testament but by the spirit of the New Testament. "Those holy men," says St. Augustine, letter 120 to Honoratus, "are in the dispensation of the Old Testament for harmony with the time, but they belonged to the New Testament." And *On Merits and Remission of Sins* bk.1 ch.11 he says: "The reign of death was only destroyed in any man by the grace of the Savior, which worked in the ancient saints, who, before Christ came in the flesh, nevertheless pertained to his assisting grace, not to the letter of the law, which could only command and not help." But the end of the New Testament is not other than to heal, to cure, to set free. But all this is provided by grace. "Unhappy man that I am," says St. Paul *Romans* ch.7, "who will deliver me from the body of this death? The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord." And St. Augustine in *On the Spirit and the Letter* bk.1 ch.29 says: "Through the law was the knowledge of sin, through grace the curing of the soul from the vice of sin."

Therefore the New Testament per se and properly does not bring the law but grace, and is minister not of the letter but of the spirit alone, and is nothing else than the charity of God diffused in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given to us, as was so much foretold by the Prophet when Jeremiah in ch.31 says, "Behold the days shall come, says the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant I made with your fathers, in the day I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, a covenant which they made void and I was lord over them, says the Lord. But this will be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord; I will give my law in their belly and I will write it in their heart." Therefore if it is a question of that which per se and properly pertains to each Testament, most truly did Paul say *II Corinthians* ch.3: "Not the letter but the spirit made us fitting ministers of the New Testament." Nor did John speak less truly in ch.1: "The law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."

But although the New Testament per se and properly does not bring laws, yet it contains laws in a double way. For first all those laws that are referred to living well and blessedly are not destroyed by the grace of the New Testament but confirmed; indeed the grace brings strength to human weakness to fulfill them: "Do we destroy the law through faith?" says the Apostle *Romans* ch.3. "God forbid, but we establish the law." And later ch.8: "For what was impossible for the law, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and without sin, destroyed sin in the flesh so that the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us." And St. Augustine *On the Spirit and Letter* ch.19 says: "The law then was given so that grace might be looked for; grace was given so that the law might be fulfilled. For the law failed to be fulfilled, not by its own vice, but by the vice of the prudence of the flesh. The vice that had to be shown up by the law had to be healed by grace."

Next Christ also made certain new laws, as about providing and receiving baptism, the Eucharist, and the other sacraments; because although Christ did not for this reason come to us, to burden us as a new Moses with the weight of a new law, but to unburden us who lay under the weight of the law with the help of grace; yet he thought that to the old moral precepts those very salutary laws should be added that, while they lead us to the sacrament and to grace through the

sacraments, they not only do not burden us with their weight but lift us up as on wings, as Augustine says in his book *On Perfect Justice*. But enough has been said about the first objection.

The other objections, that are common to the Schwenkfeldians and Libertines along with the Lutherans and Calvinists, will be more suitably dissolved in the disputation in which we will, with the help of God, discourse of the interpretation of Scripture and the judge of controversies.

#### *Chapter Four: Which are the Sacred Books*

That the Prophetic and Apostolic Scripture is sacred and divine has, as I think, been sufficiently shown by the above disputation. It follows that we now explain which books truly are Prophetic and Apostolic. Now this whole disputation about the number of the sacred books is divided into three parts. For first we must deal with the books about whose authority there was never dispute among Catholics. Next about those which although truly Prophetic or Apostolic have not always had their authority certain and confirmed. Lastly about those that although they have by some very famous and learned men sometimes been held to be in the number of the divine volumes yet have never been approved by the public authority of the whole Church.

The names of the first order of books are: the Pentateuch of Moses, *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, four books of *Kings*, two of *Chronicles*, two of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, *Job*, 150 *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Song of Songs*, four major Prophets, twelve minor Prophets, four books of *Gospels*, *Acts*, thirteen epistles of Paul, namely with the whole of *Hebrews* omitted, two Canonical Epistles, one of Peter, the other of John.

The second order of books contains *Esther*, *Baruch*, part of *Daniel*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, first and second *Maccabees*, certain parts of *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, the epistle to the *Hebrews*, the epistle of *James*, the second of *Peter*, part of the first of *John*, the second and third of *John*, the epistle of *Jude*, *Apocalypse*.

The third order contains all those that were reviewed by Innocent in epistle 3 to Exuperimus, by Gelasius in distinct.15, holy Roman canon, Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, Eusebius in the third book of his *History* ch.25, of which these few seem to be extant: the prayer of *Manassas*, the third and fourth books of *Ezra*, the third and fourth again of *Maccabees*, *Psalms 151*, the appendix to the book of *Job*, the book of *Hermas* which has the title of *Shepherd*.

That the books of the first order indeed have always had divine authority in the Catholic Church is testified by all the Supreme Pontiffs, all the Councils, all the Fathers, who for whatever reason have studied to enumerate the books. See among the Pontiffs Innocent I epistle 3 to Exuperius last chapter, Gelasius I in his decree on the sacred books, which is extant in the second volume of Councils. Among the Councils, Laodicea ch.59, the Third of Carthage can.47, Florence in the instruction on the Armenians, according to the evidence of the summa of Councils, Trent sess.4

See among the Greek Fathers Origen in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.18; Eusebius himself bk.3 ch.25. Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, Gregory Nazianzen in his *Hymn* written about the genuine scriptures, Epiphanius in his book on *Measures and Weights*, the same again against the *Heresy of the Anomeans*, Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechesis* 4, John Damascene in book 4 *On the Faith* ch.18.

See among the Latins, Jerome, both in his *Galeatic Prologue*, and in his epistle to Paulina about the study of the sacred scriptures, Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed, Augustine in the second book of *Christian Doctrine* ch.8, Isidore in the sixth book of *Etymologies* ch.1. Add to these three other writers who review only the books of the Old Testament, Josephus bk.1 *Against Appion*, Melito of Sardis in Eusebius *Histories* bk.4 ch.6, Hilary in his preface on *Psalms*.

Further certain Fathers, Justin, Irenaeus, Basil, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, all the others both Greek and Latin, although they do not describe the series of the divine books, yet do everywhere so use their testimonies that they give not obscure evidence that these were all held by them among the divine books.

*Chapter Five: About the Heretics who Opposed the books of the Old Testament of the First Order*

But although in the Catholic Church, with the consent of all the Orthodox, the authority of the numbered books was always in vigor, there have yet not been lacking heretics who strove to detract all authority whatever from the same books. But since their heresies, which have already long ago been buried by the diligence of our ancestors, have again been pursued in our own age by Sixtus Senensis in his *Sacred Library*, I will as briefly as possible get rid myself of these ancient shadows of enemies rather than enemies. So eighteen heresies against the books that we have reviewed in the first order have existed at various times.

The first of them is of those who wholly rejected the books of the Old Testament because they reckoned they were dictated by a certain evil God. So thought first the Simonians, the Basilidians, the Marcionites in Irenaeus bk.1 chs.20, 22, 29, then the Manichees in Epiphanius, *Heresy* 66, the Bogomils in Eutymius *Panopliae* p.2 tit.23 ch.1, the Albigenses in Antoninurnus part.4 tit.11 ch.7. Also in our age the fifteen preachers of the Anabaptists, in Franckental's *Colloquy*, reckoned that the Old Testament was not otherwise to be admitted into disputation of the faith than to the extent it agrees with the New Testament.

This heresy is refuted by Epiphanius in his *Heresy of the Manichees*, by Augustine in his book *Against Faustus* the Manichean, and in two other books against the adversaries of the law and Prophets, and Peter of Cluny in his epistle against the Petrobusians.

And it is surely remarkable that heretics who venerated the books of the New Testament could condemn the books of the Old Testament, since the latter have from the former many and very plain testimonies of authority. "It is necessary," says our Lord *Luke* last chapter, "that all things be fulfilled that are written in the Law and Prophets and Psalms about me." The Apostle in *Romans* 1 says, "Paul an Apostle, separated for the gospel of God which was before promised by the Prophets in the holy Scriptures," and again *Galatians* 4: "It is written that Abraham had two sons, one of the maidservant the other of the free woman, which things were said by allegory; for these are two Testaments;" again elsewhere in *Hebrews* 1, "In many and various ways God who aforetime spoke to the Fathers through the prophets has now spoken through his Son etc."

A second heresy was that of a certain Ptolemy who, as Epiphanius reports *Heresy* 33, divided the law of Moses into three parts, and of one part made the

maker of the world the author, of another Moses, of the third the elders of the Synagogue. Nor was the maker of the world the true God for Ptolemy but a certain spirit between God and the devil. Therefore he thought not only the whole law but even any part of it not to be divine and sacred.

This heresy was refuted by Zachariah in *Luke* ch.1 where he testifies that the Lord God of Israel spoke through the mouth of the saints who are from old time, that is, of all the Prophets. The same heresy was refuted by the Apostle Paul when he affirmed that all Scripture was inspired by God, *Timothy* ch.3.

The third heresy is that of Theodore Bishop of Mopsuestia, who does not indeed openly reject all the Prophets but as he impudently affirms that they foretold nothing about Christ (as can be understood from the fragments of his writings) he too much minimizes the utility and authority of the Prophets and makes Christ himself and the Apostles guilty of very public lies. For what else than a lie will be what Truth itself says of himself when, after reading the testimony of Isaiah, he adds *Luke* ch.4 "Today is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears"? What else than a lie will be what Peter says in *Acts* ch.10, "To this all the Prophets bear witness."

I omit the rest of the testimonies of the Prophets, which are everywhere explained by Christ and the Evangelists and the Apologists in the New Testament. For they are so many that they cannot be briefly numbered: *Matthew*, 1, 2, 3, 12, 21, 27, *Mark* 12, 15, *Luke* 11, *John* 2, 12, 19, *Acts* 2, 4, 12, *Ephesians* 4, *Hebrews* 1, 10.

The fourth heresy repudiates the *Psalms* of David as human or rather profane hymns written without any divine inspiration. As authors of this error Philasterius in the *Catalogue of Heresies* ch.127 makes Nicolaitans, Gnostics. Eusebius *Histories* bk.7 ch.25, preserves a writing that Paul of Samosata removed the *Psalms* that are about Christ as recently invented by the Church.

But perhaps that Paul did not so much remove the *Psalms* of David as some Ecclesiastical hymns from the Church. For it is not credible that the *Psalms* of David after so many centuries could seem to Paul to have been recently invented. Certainly this absurdity is refuted in very clear words by David himself, by Christ, and by the Apostles. "These are the last words," says the author of the book of *II Kings* ch.23, "which David spoke to the sons of Isa: the man spoke, for whom was established the Christ of the God of Jacob, the outstanding Psalmist of Israel: the Spirit of the Lord spoke through me, and his words through my tongue;" and the Lord in *Matthew* ch.22 says: "How then did David in the spirit call him Lord, saying: 'The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand?'" which words are found written in Psalm 109. And the Apostles all say with one voice, *Acts* ch.4: "Thou O Lord, who by the Holy Spirit said through the mouth of our father David, your son, 'Why do the nations rage?'" Psalm 2. Lastly the Apostle Paul in his epistle to the *Hebrews* ch.2, says: "As the Holy Spirit says: today if you will hear his voice," which are the words of Psalm 94.

The fifth heresy is of the Hebrews who in the *Talmud* ord.4 tract.3 do not hold the book of *Job* among the divine volumes, nor think that Job ever lived among men. Later Rabbis, as R. Salomon, R. Levi ben Gerson, and some others seem to accept the book, since they tried to compose commentaries on it; but they blame Job neither once only nor lightly. Indeed R. Salomon boldly affirms that Job, impatient of the calamity that befell him, sinned in his heart, not his words. R. Levi went further



and wrote that this blessed man suffered most punishments for denying divine providence and the resurrection of the dead.

Martin Luther, too, in his table talk, about the Patriarchs and Prophets, affirms that he does not believe that everything that is narrated in the book of *Job* really happened. And again in his writing on the books of the Old and New Testament he says the book of *Job* is the statement of a fable for purpose of proposing to us an example of patience.

But that indeed the history of Job is not made up and that Job was really a holy and perfect man is richly testified against the Hebrews by *Ezekiel*, ch.14... to omit what is said of St. Job by *Tobit* ch.2 and *James* ch.5, and also what from ch.5 of this book the Apostle adduces as from the rest of divine Scripture, *I Corinthians* ch.3. For the Talmudists do not accept the testimony of these books.

The sixth heresy is of the heretics who, on the evidence of Philastrius and Jacob Christopolitano in the preface to his commentary on the *Song of Songs*, repudiate the book of Solomon that is called *Ecclesiastes* because that book Solomon seems to have composed in extreme old age when, depraved by love of women, he placed the supreme good in bodily pleasures and prepared the way for the philosophy of Epicurus and Aristippus.

And Martin Luther in his table talk says the book seems lacking greaves and spurs and seems to advance in socks, as one would while still in the dining room.

But so far is Solomon's *Ecclesiastes* from preaching about pleasure that rather as a stern and forceful master of morals he exhorts everyone with most grave speech to despise human things and to fear God. What an opening it has! "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities, everything is vanity," *Eccl.*1. With what a peroration does it end! "Let us then hear the end of the whole matter: fear God and observe his commandments, for this is the whole man," *Eccl.*12. Nor are the middle parts any different. *Eccl.*2: "I reputed laughter an error, and said in joy, Why are you deceived in vain?" *Eccl.*3: "I said in my heart, God will judge the just and the impious." *Eccl.*4: "Guard your foot when you enter the house of God, and approach that you may hear. For better is obedience than the offerings of the foolish." *Eccl.*5: "Say nothing rashly, nor let your heart be quick to utter a word." *Eccl.*7: "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of rejoicing." *Eccl.*8: "Because the sentence against the wicked is not quickly given, so the sons of men do evil without any fear." *Eccl.*9: "Wisdom is better than the weapons of war, and he who sins in one thing will lose many goods." *Eccl.*10: "Woe to you, O land, when thy king is a child and thy princes eat in the morning. Blessed is the land whose king is noble and whose princes eat in their proper time, for restoration and not for luxury." Lastly *Eccl.*11: "Know that for all these things god will bring thee to judgment. Take anger from your heart, and remove malice from your flesh. For youth and pleasure are vain." Do these remarks smack of Aristippus? Have such stern precepts ever proceeded from the workshop of Epicurus?

But if *Ecclesiastes* sometimes bids the pleasure of eating and drinking not to be despised, he does not do so on the ground that everything is to be measured by pleasure, but in order to restrain certain of the greedy and sordid who prefer to deprive themselves of the necessary and lawful advantages and pleasures of human life than to take away even a little from their piles of money.

Moreover there are not a few things that are said in this book, not by the judgment of Solomon, but in accord with the opinion of the crowd and of foolish and voluptuous men, as St. Gregory fully and elegantly proves *Dialogues* 4 ch.4.

Next in this very book of which we are treating, Ecclesiastes repeatedly asserts that his wisdom, namely which he had once received by divine gift, remained with him right up to that time: "Wisdom also remained with me," *Eccl.*2. It is not likely that the light of heavenly wisdom could live together with that depravity of heart of which Scripture speaks when it say *III Kings* 11: "And women turned away his heart. And when he was already an old man his heart was depraved by women so as to follow alien gods."

Then, in the second chapter of this book Solomon enumerates all his delights, his palaces, his pools, his orchards, his servants, his maidservants, his songs, his tunings, his golden and silver vessels, and many other things of that sort, but of so many concubines and wives, for whom he readily despised all his other delights, and who alone were able to soften and corrupt his heart, he does not even make mention. Therefore he had not yet begun to love them at the time he was completing this book.

Lastly, who would believe that from so soft and effeminate a heart as Solomon's was when he was slave to the loves of seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, there could have proceeded such grave judgments of the sort we have just above quoted?

I am not ignorant that it was the opinion of the old Jews, as St. Jerome avers on *Eccl.*1, that this book was composed by Solomon after he had performed penance for his sins; and this opinion Jerome also seems to approve in his commentary on *Ezekiel* ch.43, but I have always considered St. Augustine's opinion more probable, who, on Psalm 126 and often elsewhere, writes that Solomon was reprobated by God, because divine Scripture severely blames his old age and does not ever add anything about repentance. But if anyone prefers to follow the former opinion, I do not in any way prevent him, since either opinion serves for what we are now dealing with. And so much about *Ecclesiastes*.

The seventh heresy is not dissimilar to the previous one, for as was written in the place noted by Philastrius ch.133 and Jacobus Christopolitanus, there were not lacking among the ancient heretics those who reckoned the *Song of Songs* to have been written, not by the spirit of the true God but by the breath of Cupid, and that nothing else is contained in the *Song of Songs* than the amatory sayings of King Solomon and of his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh. Wherefore they said it was a profane Song and that for this reason no name of God is found in the whole book, which same view is attributed to Castalio by Beza in his preface on *Joshua*.

But if the spouse, who is so greatly praised in this Song, were the daughter of Pharaoh, that is, of the most powerful king, how many things would be most stupidly said by the wisest of men? For could this remark from *Song of Songs* 1 agree with the daughter of the King: "The sons of my mother fought against me, they put a guard on my vineyard: I did not guard my vineyard"? Or could this one in the same place: "Go follow the footsteps of your flocks and feed your kid goats"? And what of that from ch.5: "The guards found me who go round the city, they beat me and wounded me"? What again of that from ch.8: "Who will give you to me, my brother,

fleeing the breasts of my mother, so that I might find you outside and kiss you”? Who would believe that the daughter of the King of Egypt was either a country girl or sister of Solomon, or could have been wounded by the guardians of the walls?

But the same woman who in some places is described as a country girl is elsewhere called the daughter of the Prince: “How beautiful,” says ch.7, “are your goings in the Prince’s daughter’s shoes.” And again, she is said in ch.5 to have been wounded by the guardians of the walls, and the same woman is introduced in ch.6 as terrible, like the ordered battle array of armed camps. She is surely the prudence of the Holy Spirit, so that God may explain his benevolence toward the human race and how Christ with ardent charity has, through the mystery of the Incarnation, joined the Church as a spouse to himself, and that long before he wanted the nuptial song to be sung.

But lest any occasion be given for suspecting that the daughter of Pharaoh or any particular woman is praised by this Song, he wanted things to be written about his spouse that could be made to fit no single woman.

For which reason too we believe that, when the beauty of the spouse is commended and depicted as it were in her own colors, those things are said that agree indeed most fitly with the Church, but that could rather defile than adorn a particular woman. For what would be the beauty of a woman whose head was as great as Carmel, her nose as a tower, her eyes as pools, her teeth as flocks of shorn sheep, but she herself all black like a tabernacle of Cedar?

Nor indeed is alien the fact that among the ten names of God, which are everywhere found in the divine books of the Old Testament, and which are briefly explained in Jerome’s letter to Marcella, and which is numbered letter 136, none of them have a place in this spiritual epithalamium. But if indeed in the other books of the Old Testament, because he was dealing with the Synagogue, that is, with the handmaid, God called himself God, Lord, mighty, omnipotent, yet in the Songs of love, where the Son of God speaks with the Church, that is, as spouse to spouse, he rightly omits those names, which were adapted to inspire fear, and calls himself only spouse, father, friend, lover, and beloved; for these names pertain to fostering and exciting love.

The eighth heresy is that of Porphyry, of which Jerome thus writes, in his preface to his commentary on *Daniel*: “Porphyry writes a twelfth book against the Prophet Daniel, denying the book to have been written by him whose name it bears but by someone who lived in Judea at the time of Antiochus called Epiphanes; and that it was not so much Daniel stating future things but this other stating past things. Finally, that whatever he said up to Antiochus was true history but that whatever he opined about beyond that, because he did not know the future, was lies.”

However, to pass over the divine witness of Christ about the book of *Daniel*, from *Matthew* ch.24, which is not accepted by Porphyry, Josephus writes in *Antiquities* 11 ch.8 that when Alexander the Great came to Jerusalem, the volume of *Daniel* was offered to him by the priests, and the place in the eighth chapter was shown to him, where Daniel foretold and explained that the ram of a goat, that is the King of the Persians, was going to be overcome and put to flight by the King of the Greeks. But since Alexander preceded Antiochus by more than 150 years, how could

that book, which was shown so long before to Alexander, have been written at the time of Antiochus? But as to the prophecies of Daniel that follow the age of Antiochus, that they are not lies, as Porphyry wishes, but most true oracles, will be understood by him who diligently reads over those books that Jerome in the preface to his commentary on *Daniel* bids should be read.

*Chapter Six: On the Heretics who Attack the Books of the New Testament Enumerated Above*

A ninth heresy universally repudiates the books of the *Gospels*. The authors of this error are divided into two. For some are in the error of thinking that the *Gospels* were not written by the Apostles nor by other disciples of the Lord but by certain imposters who mixed many false things in with the true and advertised their treatises as the writings of the Apostles. So did Faustus the Manichean think, according to Augustine. Some do not deny that the *Gospels* were written by the Apostles but say that in many places they are in conflict with each other or with the truth; wherefore they do not doubt that the Apostles partly erred as men and partly adorned things with invented stories to glorify their master.

And this opinion has many supporters; first the pagans, as Augustine testifies in *Retract.* 2 ch.16; then Julian the Apostate, as Cyril testifies in bk.10 to Julian; then Mohammed, the false prophet, on the evidence of John Damascene in his book on *100 Heresies*; finally also in our days Otho Brunfelsius, on the evidence of John Cochlaeus in his book on the *Authority of Scripture and the Church* chs.3-4.

The former heresy, which is that of the Manichees, is refuted with two arguments by St. Augustine in his book *Against Faustus* bk.32 chs.16, 21, and bk.33 ch.7. First that when the Manichees try to confirm their own errors from the *Gospels*, and yet also claim that the same *Gospels* were written by certain imposters, they seem surely to be acting like someone who first declares that his witness is corrupted by falsehood and then brings him forward as supporting evidence.

Second, since if so clear a continuous attestation by so many centuries succeeding each other does not sufficiently prove that those writings belong to the Apostles which the Church, propagated by those very Apostles and diffused far and wide among all nations, says and holds belong to the Apostles, then faith in all writings and books must necessarily perish. For how is it agreed that the books of Hippocrates, of Plato, of Aristotle, of Cicero, of Varro, and of other authors of this sort, belong to them? How is it that if anyone denies this he is not surely refuted but laughed at? Only because from their time up to the present a continued succession has affirmed that such those books are, so that to doubt of the matter is plainly the mark of a madman.

Next, the second heresy is refuted no less briefly than keenly by the same Augustine in the first book of the *Harmony of the Gospels*, chs.7-8, with the following arguments: first if about Pythagoras and Socrates, who wrote nothing of their own, we believe the writings of their disciples, what cause is there for not trusting what the Apostles wrote about their master? Or were the former perhaps, since they were wise, able to make true disciples, but Christ could not make true disciples – Christ who, as even they themselves agree, endowed all with wisdom?

Next, since they themselves, who proclaim that the Apostles wrote falsehoods, reckon Christ to have been the wisest of men, and since they were not able to learn of this from anywhere else but from the writings of the Apostles, are they not clearly convicted of sometimes believing, and sometimes disbelieving, the books of the Apostles, not by judgment of reason, but by choice of will? Besides if the disciples had striven too eagerly to magnify in their writings the glory of their master, certainly they should have passed over the shame of the cross in silence, or at least touched on it with extreme brevity, while they should have set down a very long discourse explaining his return from the nether world and his ascension into heaven. For what reason then do all the Evangelists scarcely mention the resurrection and ascension, while they dwell as long as possible on expounding the bonds, the scourgings, the cross, the abuse, the shame, the torments? Surely their intention was not to promote with false stories the praises of their master, but to commend in writing simply and truly the words of Christ and the things he did.

The tenth heresy accepts the three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke in order to repudiate John as contrary to them. This heresy is related by Philastrius ch.60 without a name for the author of it. But Epiphanius in his *Heresy* 51, who is followed by Augustine in his *30 Heresies*, thinks it can be attributed to the Alogiani or the Ali.

The eleventh heresy approves of Matthew only among the Evangelists; Irenaeus writes bk.1 ch.26 that the author of this heresy was Ebion. See also Epiphanius *Heresy* 30, Eusebius *Histories* 3 ch.21.

The twelfth heresy, that of Cerinthus, uses, on the evidence of the same Irenaeus bk.3 ch.11, only the *Gospel of Mark*.

The thirteenth heresy is that of Marcion, as Irenaeus *ibid.* and Tertullian *Prescription against Heretics* have written, and it only holds *Luke* in value; although not as whole but mutilated and corrupted, as is plain from Tertullian *Against Marcion* bk.4 and Epiphanius *Heresy* 42.

The fourteenth heresy acknowledges no Evangelist save John, of which heresy Irenaeus *ibid.* makes Valentinus author. And Martin Luther seems to have wanted this heresy to be vigorous and flourish, although since he understood the thing to be too difficult in our times, he did not think much work or labor should be put into it. Certainly in his preface to the New Testament, as even John Cochlaeus noted in his book on the *Authority of Scripture and the Church*, in the third chapter, Luther says that the false opinion needs to be abolished, that there are only four *Gospels*. Again he says that the *Gospel of John* is the only, beautiful, true, and principal Gospel, and by far to be preferred to the other three, so that even the epistles of Paul and Peter far exceed the *Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*.

In order to refute these last five heresies the ancient Fathers tried to show by many reasons that not just four Gospels but neither more nor fewer should have been put together. See Irenaeus bk.3 ch.11, Tertullian bk.4 *Against Marcion*, Ambrose in the preface to his commentaries on *Luke* and bk.10 ch.101, Eucherius on *Genesis* bk.1 ch.14, Jerome in the preface to his commentary on *Matthew*, Augustine *On the Harmony of the Gospels* bk.1 ch.6, Gregory in homily 4 on *Ezekiel*. And certainly, to pass over other reasons for the present, what should those four living animals be thought to signify which were divinely shown to Ezekiel and John, the

Man, the Lion, the Calf, the Eagle, save the four Evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? For this is evidenced not only by the writings and the sayings of the people everywhere, but even the walls themselves proclaim it in signs and images.

The fifteenth heresy removes the book of *Acts* from the number of the divine volumes. We have many authors of this heresy: Cerinthus in Philastrius ch.36, Cerdo in Tertullian *On Prescription*, Tatian in Eusebius *Histories* bk.4 ch.29, Manichaeus in Augustine on the *Utility of Believing* ch.3.

The sixteenth heresy is that of the Ebionites who reject all the writings of the Apostle Paul, and call Paul himself a Greek and an apostate. The witnesses are Irenaeus bk.1 ch.26, Epiphanius *Heresy* 30, and the same error was a little later accepted by the Helcheseites as Eusebius writes in his *History* bk.6 ch.17.

The seventeenth heresy, which belongs to Marcion, on the evidence of Epiphanius *heresy* 42 and Jerome preface to *Titus*, rejects the entire letters of Timothy and Titus. These three heresies are rightly refuted by Abbott Peter of Cluny in his first letter against the Henricians and Petrobusians. Nor is there need to waste time on a matter so clear.

The last heresy is that of those who do not wish everything in the letters of St. Paul and in the other sacred and divine writings to have been written at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, but that some things were sometimes written under the guidance only of human prudence and reason. Wherefore they despised the whole letter to *Philemon* as written in human manner. The Anomoeans once labored under this error, see Epiphanius *Heresy* 76, and also certain others, see Jerome on *Micah* ch.5 and preface to *Philemon*, and Augustine bk.2 ch.2 *Against the Adversary of the law and Prophets*.

In our century Erasmus has renewed the same heresy, since in his notes to *Matthew* chs.2 and 27 he not obscurely writes that one need not fear that the authority of the whole of Scripture would be destroyed if some slight error is detected in it, especially since Augustine concedes that the Evangelists sometimes suffered lapses of memory, bk.3 ch.7 on the *Harmony of the Gospels*, and the thing seems impossible to deny.

This heresy is refuted by Epiphanius and Jerome and Augustine in the places just cited above. But because Erasmus misuses the testimony of Augustine, it will be worthwhile to bring forward the words of this doctor. He speaks therefore like this in bk.2 ch.12 on the *Harmony of the Gospels*: "It is fitting that all falsity be absent from the Evangelists, not only that which is due to lying but also that which is due to forgetfulness." Augustine did not, therefore, as Erasmus wished, attribute error from lapse of memory to the Evangelists.

Again in letter 8 to Jerome he says: "If any lie is admitted to exist in so high an authority, no part of these books will remain that could not be brought into doubt." Which reasoning of Augustine is very strong, for if any error in Scripture could have been committed by the authors through lack of skill, or forgetfulness, or any other human weakness, then the question can be raised about any place that is brought forward whether in writing it the author did not err.

What then, you will say, does Augustine intend when in bk.3 ch.7 on the *Harmony of the Gospels* he attributes the error that in *Matthew* the name Jeremiah is put in place of that of Zechariah to a lapse of memory? I reply that I have not in

Augustine read of an error or a lapse, as Erasmus says, but of the Evangelist's mind being marvelously governed by the Holy Spirit without error and without lapse. This alone does Augustine say, that when the Evangelist was writing, the name of one prophet occurred by divine providence in place of the other; in which matter if there was lapse or error, it was certainly that of the Holy Spirit, but no one of sane mind ever said that the Holy Spirit could err or lapse. But let us hear the words of St. Augustine.

"What," he says, "must we understand other than that this was done by the more secret counsel of the providence of God by which the minds of the Evangelists were governed? For it could have happened that to the mind of Matthew, as he was writing his Gospel, Jeremiah occurred in place of Zachariah, as is wont to happen, which however he would without any hesitation correct, at any rate when advised by others who could have read it while he was still alive in the flesh, unless he was thinking in his memory, which was ruled by the Holy Spirit, that not in vain had one name of a Prophet occurred in place of another, unless because thus the Lord determined it to be written. But as to why the Lord determined thus, first this most useful cause should most easily be thought on, that even thus was it insinuated that all the holy Prophets, having spoken with one spirit, stand together with a marvelous agreement among themselves, so that thereby it may become much more complete than if everything from the Prophets was said by the one voice of one man; and therefore all the things the Holy Spirit said through them should be received without hesitation, and each saying individually should belong to all of them and all the sayings should belong to each of them individually. Since therefore what was said through Jeremiah is as much Zechariah's as Jeremiah's, and what was said through Zechariah is as much Jeremiah's as Zechariah's, what need for Matthew to make correction when, with one name occurring to him in place of another, he re-read what he had written, and not instead, by following the authority of the Holy Spirit by whom he felt more than us that his mind was ruled, leave it as thus written as the Lord had decided for him by advising him? For purpose of informing us that there was so great agreement of words among the Prophets that not absurdly, nay with great appropriateness, we should attribute also to Jeremiah what we found said through Zechariah."

The arguments that Melchior Canus in his book on *Theology* chs.16-18 adduces for this heresy and then dissolves I have thought I should pass over, both because I have not read them in any of the heretics and because they can easily be got from Canus himself.

#### *Chapter Seven: On the Book of Esther*

Hitherto we have disputed of the first order of sacred books; now we will discourse separately of the individual books of the second order about which there is greater difficulty. And first the book of *Esther* presents itself to us, which three most grave authors have placed outside the canon. Melito Asianus in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.4 ch.16, Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, and Gregory Nazianzen in the *Song* he wrote about the genuine Scriptures. There were not lacking also those who thought indeed that *Esther* should be numbered among the sacred books but denied that the last seven chapters, which are not contained in the Hebrew texts, were genuine parts of it and

thought should be cut off from the rest of the body as adulterated and foreign. St. Jerome was of this opinion as is collected from his preface. St. Jerome was followed not only before the Council of Trent by Nicholas of Lyra, Dionysius the Carthusian, Cardinals Hugo and Thomas de Vio, in their commentaries on this book, but also after the Council by Sixtus Senensis in bks.1 and 8 of the *Holy Library*.

But that this book is sacred and divine is proved with sufficient certainty by all the decrees of the Pontiffs and Councils; and also by the many testimonies of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Fathers which we noted above in the fourth chapter of this book. For if you take away Melito, Athanasius, and Gregory, all the rest agree about the divine authority of this book. But as to what concerns the chapters which are not contained in the Hebrew codices, we confirm that they too pertain to the sacred Canon with the following reasons.

For first it cannot be denied but that the ancient Councils of Laodicea and the Third of Carthage, and the old Greek Fathers, Origen on the first Psalm, Eusebius *Hist.* 3 ch.25, Cyril *Catechesis* 4 and Damascence 4 ch.18, and certain Latin Fathers, Hilary on the first Psalm, Innocent epist.3, Ruffinus on the Creed, and Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* 2 ch.8, when they number the volume of *Esther* among the sacred books, spoke of the volume which both they themselves and the universal Church were at that time using. But at that time the universal Church was using the sacred books in the edition which St. Jerome in his preface to *Esther*, and often elsewhere, is wont to call the vulgate, which, as he himself says, was contained in the tongue and letters of the Greeks; and that in this edition those seven chapters, which we are now dealing with, of the book of *Esther* were not lacking is evidenced first by the Greek texts themselves, which are carried abroad under the name of the *Septuagint*, and also by St. Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, where he writes out a summary and the first sentences of the individual books; evidenced also by St. Jerome who notes in several places in his translation that those seven chapters are not contained in the Hebrew texts but have been taken by himself from the vulgate edition. Wherefore, if the Councils and Fathers retained in the sacred Canon the book of *Esther* that they had been accustomed to read, then certainly they retained the whole book, including these seven adjoined chapters.

What of the fact that the Fathers not only number the book itself among the sacred books but also not seldom seek their testimony from the seven last chapters? See Chrysostom homil.3 to the people of Antioch, and Augustine epist.199 to Edicia? What of the fact that Origen in epist. to Julius Africanus shows this very part of the book of *Esther*, that is not contained in the Hebrew volumes, to be sacred and canonical? "In the book of *Esther*," he says, "neither the prayers of Mardocho nor those of Esther, which are able to edify readers, are found among the Hebrews, nor even the letters, neither the one written by Aman about the overthrow of the nation of the Jews, nor that of Mardocho freeing the nation from death in the name of king Artaxerxes. These things are found in the *Septuagint* and in Theodotion." And later: "See then that we do not imprudently and unknowingly remove the exemplars that are possessed everywhere in the Churches, and have a law of fraternity to set aside the sacred books that are in use in them and instead agree with the Hebrews and persuade them to endow us with pure versions and ones that have nothing of invention in them. Has not providence in the holy scriptures given edification to all



the churches of Christ? Did it have no care for those who were bought at the price at which Christ died?"

Add to this lastly the decree of the Council of Trent, session 4, in which all the books numbered a little before in the decree itself are approved along with all their parts, in the way they are accustomed to be read in the Church and are contained in the Latin vulgate edition. And although the authority of this Council is held in no regard by the heretics, but it is very ancient for Sixtus and the rest of the Catholics.

But the Council, said Sixtus bk.1, speaks of true parts of the books, not of additions, such as are the last chapters of the book of *Esther*. But if the response of Sixtus were thus true, many other parts of the sacred books of *Daniel*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *John* would be called into doubt among Catholics. For what would Sixtus have to say if, when he puts up the decree of the Council as a wall for preserving those parts of the sacred volumes, the response is made by adversaries that the Council spoke of true parts, but that the parts in question are additions and not parts?

Next who could have doubted that when certain books were approved by the Council all true parts too of those books were approved. Wherefore does the Council add those words ("with all their parts") save that all may understand that those parts too, about which there had once been controversy, pertain to the canon of the sacred books?

Lastly the Council of Trent so clearly explained its opinion in the following words that no place is left for subterfuge. For when it said: "if anyone [not accept] the complete books along with all their parts" it always added "in the way they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church." But who does not know that in the fourth day after the second Sunday of the 40 days of Lent, a reading from *Esther* ch.13 is intoned publicly in the Church among the solemn liturgies? And again that from the same chapter a reading is proclaimed in the Mass that is wont to be said against the Pagans? And lastly that the prayer of Esther is recited from ch.14 of the same book, on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Sunday after Pentecost, when the Gospel and Creed are intoned? But it will be worth while to resolve the arguments of adversaries.

They say first, since the book of *Esther* was written in the Hebrew tongue, that those seven chapters, which are not possessed by the Hebrews, must without doubt be considered spurious. We reply with Origen in the cited place that it is probable those chapters were once in the Hebrew text and then by some chance fell out. Certainly Josephus *Antiquities* 11 ch.6 tells two stories of Esther, and does not omit the two letters of Assuerus, and the oration of Mardoch, although none of these is now contained in the Hebrew codices; nor is it credible that these were made up by Josephus, since he himself in bk.10 ch.12 says this about himself: "At the beginning of my history," he says, "on account of those who raise questions or strive to blame me in something, I set out saying that I will translate the Hebrew books into the Greek tongue, and promising that for those who wish to open them I will neither add anything separately nor take anything away."

It can also be replied that the first author of this book, who undertook to write the history of Esther in Hebrew, wrote only the sum of the story; then at another time the same history was written more copiously and translated into Greek by Lysimachus, when Ptolemy Epiphanes and Cleopatra were reigning in Egypt, as is show in this very book in ch.11. Further the Hebrew book of the first

author but not the book but only the translation of the second author has come down to us.

Secondly, they object that the later chapters do not cohere with the earlier ones. For in chapter 2 are narrated the plots of the two Eunuchs and the detection of the same by the efforts of Mardoch. Next again the same things are narrated in chs.11-12, but in the prior place the plots are said to have happened in the seventh year of Assuerus, and in ch.6 is added that Mardoch, who exposed them, did not receive any reward; but in the later place they are said to have happened in the second year of Assuerus, and it is added that money was given for revealing them.

I reply that those seven chapters of *Esther* that are last in the Latin vulgate are not really last but some of them pertain to the beginning of the book, as chs.11 and 12. Some to the middle as chs.13-16. Some to the end as ch.10, as is plain both from the Greek codices, where they are all collected in their proper order, and from the note of Jerome, inserted in chs.10-11 and following of this book in Latin Bibles. But the Church allows the chapters to stay together at the end of the book, where St. Jerome placed them, so that we may understand what of this book is in the Hebrew codices and what is not.

The story of the plots, then, that are in ch.12 in Latin Bibles, pertain to the beginning of the book and there by way of anticipation the plots are narrated which are again narrated later in their own place, ch.2, but not in the second year, as seems to be collected from ch.11 if indeed the words of ch.11 are in the second year of Artaxerxes and should not be extended up to the narration of the plots, but only to the things that are said in ch.11 itself, that is to the dream that Mardoch saw before Esther married Assuerus.

As to the objection about reward for revealing the plots, there is no difficulty. For although Mardoch did not have a reward for revealing them, when the King ordered the annals to be read to him, as is said in ch.6, yet he did afterwards have a most ample reward, which is described in the same ch.6 and it is indicated in ch.12 in the words "reward given for revelation".

You will say perhaps that if these things are narrated by way of anticipation, why in the Greek texts do the words follow "And it happened after this in the days of Artaxerxes etc." for it is narrated that the banquet of King Assuerus was in the third year of his reign, and Scripture indicates that it happened after the discovery of the plot, which we said above happened in the seventh year. We reply that the words "after this" are not referred to what is narrated by way of anticipation but to the dream of Mardoch, which had been narrated in its proper place.

Objection is made third that the last chapters are in conflict with other parts of this book and make the whole book suspect. Since indeed in the letter of Assuerus, which is contained in ch.16, it is said that Aman was in race and mind a Macedonian and wanted to transfer the kingdom to the Macedonians, from these words is collected that the history of Esther happened in the last years of the Persian Kings, for Assuerus could not have been afraid that the kingdom of the Persians would be transferred to the Macedonians unless that kingdom were already of some renown. But the kingdom of the Macedonians was most obscure right up to the time of Philip, father of Alexander the Great, as Justin testifies at the end of bk.6; and not at the beginning of Philip's reign but not until the 20<sup>th</sup> year did

the strength of his kingdom begin to be suspicious for the Persians, as Diodorus says in bk.6. But the 20<sup>th</sup> year of Philip happened in the 23<sup>rd</sup> year of King Artaxerxes Ochus, as can be seen from Eusebius' *Chronicle*. But in no way could it happen that the history of Esther took place after the 23<sup>rd</sup> year of Ochus, for I ask, who was the king of Persians how had Esther as wife? Ochus? But this story was completed not after the 23<sup>rd</sup> year but after the 12<sup>th</sup> year of king Assuerus, as is seen in Esther ch.3. Was Arses the successor of Ochus? But he reigned only four years; for which reason neither could Darius, Arses' successor, and last king of Persians have been spouse of Esther; since he had the kingdom for only six years.

Add the fact that if the story of Esther belongs to the end of the Persian kingdom, Mardocho would have lived almost 300 years. For Mardocho was taken along with Jechoniah from Jerusalem to Babylon by Nabuchodonosor, king of the Chaldees, *Esther* chs.2, 11, and certainly he was then of some age. He then remained in captivity 70 years. He would have survived afterwards from the beginning of the reign of Cyrus to the end of that of Ochus, which are 220 years. Join 70 years with 220 and add still the few other years before the captivity and you will find almost 300 years; and the difficulty is increased because of Esther; for since she was the granddaughter of Mardocho, according to Jerome's version, or cousin, according to the Greek and Hebrew codices, she was either Mardocho's equal or not much younger; and even if she was 100 years later she would have been at least 200 years old when she married Assuerus. But who can believe that an old woman of 200 was that most beautiful virgin whom the King of the Persians loved before all women?

We reply that there are many opinions of writers about the time when Esther lived, and although they are not all equally probable, yet none is so improbable that, if we follow it, we can dissolve the proposed objection.

Some therefore set the story of Esther before the end of the Babylonian captivity, and they want Assuerus, father of Darius the Mede, of whom mention is made in *Daniel* ch.9, to be spouse of Esther. This opinion seems to have pleased Melchior Cano *On Places* bk.11 ch.6, and Gerard Mercator in his *Chronology*; these authors, in response to the objection about Anan, who wanted to transfer the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians, would reply that Anan did not want to do this because then the kingdom of the Macedonians was so flourishing that it was in contention for the empire of the earth; but on the contrary, rather, because he was, an together with his race, a Macedoni, he wanted to make his race, then obscure, most illustrious, by transfer of the noblest kingdom to himself and to his men.

However this opinion is improbable. First because the husband of Esther is everywhere said to be Artaxerxes, which name does not agree with the Medes, since it is proper to the kings of the Persians.

Second because Esther's husband ruled from India up to Ethiopia, *Esther* ch.1. But the Medes never possessed so ample an empire. We are speaking of the times of the kings of the Medes before the monarchy of Cyrus. For although at that time the reign of the Medes was greater than that of the Persians, as St. Jerome testifies on *Daniel* ch.5, yet that kingdom of the Medes was not as ample as was afterwards the monarchy of the Persians, or the kingdom of Esther's husband.

Third because Esther's husband expressively calls himself a Persian and King of the Persians, *Esther* last ch. But Assuerus, of whom *Daniel* 9 treats, was of the seed of the Medes.

Fourth because Esther's husband acknowledged his kingdom from the God of the Hebrews, *Esther* last ch. But we never read that the Medes worshipped the God of the Jews; but of Cyrus and his successors we do read this. For in *I Chronicles* last ch. and in *Ezra* 1.1, Cyrus says: "the God of heaven has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has commanded me to build a house in Jerusalem," and *Ezra* 1.6-7 letters are read from Darius and Artaxerxes, kings of the Persians, in which these kings acknowledge the God of the Jews, and order sacrifices to him for themselves and their kingdom.

Fifth, because Esther's husband had his palace in Susa, *Esther* ch.1. But Susa was not the seat of the Medes but of the Persians, as Solinus writes ch.58 and Diodorus bk.11 and Plutarch on *Artaxerxes*. Nor is Justin bk.1 contrary to this or Quintus Curtius bk.4 who write that the palace of the Persians was at Persepolis. For as Strabo reports, bk.15, Persepolis and Susa were the royal cities of the Persians. But Persepolis was called royal because in it were the treasures and tombs of the kings; but Susa was where the kings themselves dwelled. Cyrus established his seat at Susa, because since the city there was located on the borders of Assyria, Persia and Media, the whole kingdom could be more easily defended and ruled. So Assuerus the husband of Esther was not a Mede but a Persian.

The opinion of others is that the husband of Esther can be no other than Cambyses, who is also called Assuerus, *Ezra* 1.4. Which opinion of the Jews is found in their Chronology, and Gilbert Genebrardus follows it in his chronology.

Further the Jews number only three kings of the Persians, Cyrus, Assuerus, and Darius, who was conquered by Alexander the Great. Wherefore no question remains about the age of Mardocheus and Esther, or about Aman and the kingdom of Macedon. But that there were only three kings of the Persians is proved by two testimonies of Scripture. One is *Daniel* 11 where Daniel, after he has said that there will be three kings in Persia after Darius the Mede, immediately continues about Alexander: "But a strong king will arise and will dominate etc." The second is in *Ezra* 2.12 where Nehemiah numbers the great priests from Joshua the son of Josedech to Iaddus who it is clear performed his priesthood in the times of Alexander the Great. From which it seems to follow that there were rather few kings of the Persians, since Nehemiah, who was scarcely mature at the time of Cyrus the first king, reached the times of Alexander the Great who destroyed the monarchy of the Persians.

But we do not at all approve of this opinion of the Jews. For Assuerus the husband of Esther reigned 12 years, *Esther* 3. But Cambyses lived only in a reign of seven years and five months, according to Herodotus bk.3, and only for six years, if we believe the Hebrew Josephus, *Antiquities* 2.2, with whom all other writers agree. Nor can the Jews say that there many years besides in which Cambyses ruled with his father Cyrus, although the same Jews want Cyrus to have ruled for three years.

Next Cambyses in the whole of his rule pursued the Jews with hatred, nor did he ever permit the temple to be built at Jerusalem, as is plainly collected from *Ezra* 1.4. Who then would believe that Cambyses was the Assuerus who, after the death of

Aman, was most friendly to the Jews? What of the fact that our Assuerus in *Esther* last ch. indicates that he is far distant by a long interval from the times of Cyrus, when he says that by the kindness of God was the kingdom given to his ancestors and has been preserved to his own times, which words certainly do not fit Cambyses who was next after Cyrus.

Nor is the foundation of the Jews about the three kings of the Persians a solid one, since it is not only contradicted by all the Greek and Latin histories and by Josephus himself, a Hebrew by nation and religion, but also by *Daniel* and *Ezra*. For *Daniel* ch.11 after the words "Behold still three kings will stand in Persia" there follows, "And a fourth will be wealthy with riches beyond all others; and when he is strong with his riches he will stir up everyone against the kingdom of the Greeks." In these words is Xerxes openly described, who came to Greece with an innumerable army.

But in *Ezra* 1 ch.4 mention is made of Cyrus, who ordered the temple to be built; of Assuerus or Artaxerxes who prohibited it; and of Darius who again commanded the temple to be built. Next, ch.6, after Darius is put another Artaxerxes who is also named in *Ezra* 2 ch.2. But the reason that Daniel immediately passes after Xerxes to Alexander the Great is, as St. Jerome writes on that place, because Daniel had not proposed to put together a history of kings, but to foretell the changes of kingdoms. Therefore he numbered the kings of the Persians up to Xerxes, who waged war against the Greeks, to indicate that thence afterwards occasion was taken for the Greeks to be armed against the Persians and ultimately to despoil them of the kingdom under the leadership of Alexander.

The other argument about the number of the High Priests is dissolved by Beda bk.3 on *Ezra* ch.32, where he says Nehemiah enumerated the genealogy of the High Priest Joshua up to Iaddus, because he reached the infancy of Iaddus. For as we have it in 2 *Ezra* last ch. at the time of Nehemiah the supreme Pontiff was Eliasib, grandson of Joshua and great grandfather of Iaddus, who at the time of Alexander was already an old man bearing the high priestly office; but between the end of Artaxerxes Longimanus and the beginning of Alexander there are 95 years. Therefore it could very well happen that Iaddus who was an old man at the time of Alexander was an infant at the time of Nehemiah.

The opinion of others is that the husband of Esther was Darius Hystaspes, who succeeded Cambyses. Which is the opinion of John Cario in his *Chronicle* and of John Benedict in his marginal notes to the book of *Esther*; and although it is more probable than the two previous, yet it seems to me it must be rejected for the very reasons that they themselves bring in its favor.

They say that they consider Darius Hystaspes to be our Assuerus, both because he had two wives, Atossa and Artystona, and also because he dwelt in the city of Susa, which two things are reported about our Assuerus in the book of *Esther*. But Herodotus bk.3 says that Atossa and Artystona, the wives of Darius, were the daughters of Cyrus, which certainly does not fit our Esther. But living in Susa is not peculiar to Darius but common to the kings of the Persians, as we said above from Strabo.

Another and indeed very celebrated opinion is that Artaxerxes Memnon was the husband of Esther; so Eusebius teaches in his *Chronicle*, whom Beda follows in his book *On the Six aAges* and many other writers.

But against this opinion there are two serious arguments. First, Josephus writes in his first book *Against Appion* that the books which were written after the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus are not held among Hebrews in the canon of sacred books. Since *Ezra* composed the canon of the sacred books, whose life did not extend beyond the time of Longimanus, while the book of *Esther* was always in the canon of the Hebrews, as is gathered from Josephus in *Antiquities* II ch.6 and in book 1 *Against Appion*, then the history of this book is not to be referred to the times of Memnon.

Second, Plutarch carefully wrote the life of Artaxerxes Memnon and yet he found none of the things contained in the book of *Esther*, but rather the opposite is got from him. For Plutarch narrates that Artaxerxes Memnon had two wives, Statira and Atossa, neither of whom can be Vathi or Esther who were the wives of our Assuerus. For Vathi was repudiated, *Esther* 1, while Statira was killed by poison while still queen, and to the great grief of the king. But Atossa was never repudiated but lived with Artaxerxes up to his death. But Esther was of Hebrew race and was taken by Artaxerxes in marriage in the seventh year of his reign, *Esther* 2. But Atossa was not Hebrew but Persian, and was daughter of Artaxerxes, while Statira was not taken for wife in the seventh year of the reign but was married by Artaxerxes before he began to reign.

The last opinion therefore, and in my opinion the most probable, is that of Josephus bk.2 ch.6, and of Sulpicius bk.2 of the *Sacred History*, and of Nicephorus of Constantinople in his *Chronicle*, and of many others whom Eusebius reports without their names in his *Chronicle*, who teach that Assuerus the husband of Esther can be no other than Artaxerxes called Longimanus, which opinion we also follow, both because the arguments which we used to refute the other opinions have no force against this opinion, and also because if one should trust anyone in the matter of this story it should most of all be Josephus, who was both Hebrew and a priest most skilled in Hebrew affairs. It is also likely that Nehemiah the Hebrew could for this reason have been official of so great a king, because Queen Esther was Hebrew and Mardoeh, the prefect of the palace, was also Hebrew.

But, they say, if Mardoeh was carried with King Joachim from Jerusalem to Babylon, how could it come about that he survived to the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus? I reply that it is not altogether incredible; for from the beginning of the Babylonian captivity up to Longimanus there were about 165 years. But it is not incredible that Mardoeh at that time had passed 165 when long afterwards St. Paul the Hermit attained to the age of 115, on the evidence of Jerome, and we ourselves saw an old man of 105 as robust and vigorous that he seemed he was going to survive many more years.

Next, that the Scripture says that Mardoeh was carried to Babylon with King Joachim can rightly be understood even if Mardoeh was not yet born. Since he could have been carried there, not in himself, but in his parents or his ancestors, the way Zorobabel and Joshua are said to have returned to Jerusalem from captivity which Nabuchodonosor carried out, 1 *Ezra* ch.7, and yet Zorobabel was born in captivity,

*Matthew* 1, and the same is likely true of Joshua, son of Josedech. And in *Genesis* 4.6 and *Deuteronomy* 10 we read that seventy souls entered Egypt with Jacob, in which number are included the two sons of Joseph who were born in Egypt; not can they be said to have entered Egypt for any reason other than that Joseph, in whose loins they were, had entered Egypt.

*Chapter Eight: On the Book of Baruch*

About the book of *Baruch* there was and is controversy, both because it is not found in the Hebrew codices, and because neither the ancient Councils nor the Pontiffs nor the Fathers, whom we cited above and who put together the catalogue of books, have in their expressive words made mention of this book. So for this reason John Driedo among Catholics denies that this book is canonical, in his first book on *Scripture and Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, last chapter at the last argument; among the heretics John Calvin 3 *Institutes* ch.20 sect.8 and Chemnitz in *Exam. of Sess.4 of the Council of Trent*.

For the rest, we are persuaded of the contrary by the authority of the Catholic Church, which in the Council of Trent sess.4 numbers the Prophet Baruch among the sacred books; and for the feast of Pentecost openly bids a reading to be read from the book of *Baruch* along with readings of other sacred books.

Nor are there lacking witnesses from the ancient Fathers for us to oppose to adversaries. Cyprian bk.2 *Against the Jews* ch.5 says, "Again *Baruch*, "this is our Lord" etc." and in his sermon on the Lord's prayer, citing the epistle of Jeremiah which is the last chapter of *Baruch*, he says: "Through Jeremiah the Holy Spirit suggests and teaches, saying God must be adored by you in sense." St. Hilary in his preface to his commentary on the *Psalms* puts by name in the canon the letter of Jeremiah. Blessed Cyril bk.10 *Against Julian* cites *Baruch* by name. Clement of Alexandria bk.2 *Pedagogy* ch.3 says, "The divine Scripture beautifully says somewhere" and cites *Baruch* ch.3, and Ambrose bk.1 *On the Faith* ch.2 cites the words of *Baruch* ch.3. "This is our Lord and another will not be compared with him." He says, "There is one God, states Scripture" and later: "Why do we destroy him of whom so great a Prophet says "The Holy Spirit declares that another cannot be compared to him"?" Theodoret expounds the whole book and, when writing on ch.2, openly calls it divine Scripture. Eusebius bk.6 *On the Demonstration of the Gospel* ch.19 cites *Baruch* ch.3 and later says, "Nothing needs to be added to the divine words".

Next, the old Fathers everywhere cite this book under the name of Jeremiah, for the reason that Baruch was secretary and disciple of Jeremiah, ch.36, which was the reason that the Ancient Councils and Fathers did not put *Baruch* by name in the canon, namely because they judged this book to be part of the prophecies of Jeremiah. Clement of Alexandria, bk.1 *Pedagogy*, ch.10, cites in the name of Jeremiah the verse of *Baruch* 4: "Blessed are we Israel, because what pleases God is manifest to us". Blessed Ambrose in bk.1 on *Penance* ch.8 recites in the name of Jeremiah certain verses from ch.3 and from ch.5 of this book, and in bk.3 of *Hexaemer.* ch.14 he sets down other things from ch.4. St. Basil bk.4 *Against Eunomius*, not far from the end, and St. John Chrysostom in his *Sermon* that Christ is God, against the gentiles, adduce the place from *Baruch* ch.3, "this is our God" in the name of Jeremiah. St.

Augustine *On the City of God* bk.18 ch.33 says that the same place is cited by others in the name of Baruch, but by many in the name of Jeremiah. Finally the same place is cited in the name of Jeremiah by Pope Sixtus I in his epistle to all the faithful, Pope Felix IV in his epistle to Peter of Antioch, and Pope Pelagius I in his epistle to Vigilius.

Since this is so, *Baruch* certainly cannot be repudiated without repudiating *Jeremiah* as well. For as there was never any controversy among the ancient Fathers about the book of *Jeremiah*, so must one think also that no controversy existed among them about the book of *Baruch*.

#### *Chapter Nine: on Certain Chapters in Daniel*

The Jews, on the evidence of Blessed Jerome in his preface to *Daniel*, take no account of the hymn of the three youths which is contained in *Daniel* ch.3, nor of the history of Susannah, which is contained in ch.13, and the history of the dragon which Daniel slew, which is contained in ch.14. For like reason Porphyry in bk.12 of the 15 he wrote against the Christians, on the evidence of the same Jerome in the preface to his commentary on *Daniel*, and some of the heretics of our own day, as Chemnitz in his *Exam. of Sess.4 of the Council of Trent*, and especially the Anabaptists, are involved in the same error.

Not only heretics, pagans, and Jews but also once Julius Africanus, from among the Catholic Christians, repudiated the story of Susannah as adulterated and novel, on the evidence of Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.23. Among recent thinkers John Driedo bk.1 on *Scripture and Ecclesiastical Dogmas* last ch., and among semi-Christians Erasmus in his *Scholia* to the preface of Jerome on Daniel, have thought the same.

But nevertheless it is certain that all these parts of *Daniel* are truly canonical, as is proved first by the Council of Trent and the use of the Church, which argument should have great force with Driedo and other Catholics. The Council in sess.4 bids the sacred books with all their parts to be received the way they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church. But the hymn of the three boys is read with the mass on the Saturday of the four times, and on all feast days in the prayers of the morning office. The story of Susannah is read whole in the mass on the Saturday before the fourth Sunday of Lent; finally the story of the slain dragon is read in the mass of the third feast after the fifth Sunday of Lent. Nor only at this time but also before the year 1200 all these parts of *Daniel* were in the Church, as Ruffinus testifies bk.2 against Jerome.

Second it is proved by the testimonies of the ancients. Blessed Ignatius in his epistle to the Magnesians cites the story of Susannah from *Daniel* ch.13; the same is cited by Tertullian in his book on the *Crown of the Soldier*. Blessed Cyprian in his *Sermon* on the Lord's prayer brings forward the hymn of the three boys, and he says the Scripture is divine in which the hymn is contained. The same in his *Sermon* on the lapsed, "Divine Scripture says etc." and he cites the words of the same boys in the fire. In bk.1 epist.8 he adduces the story of Susannah, bk.4 epist.6 the story of the dragon, and the same in bk.3 epist.1, bk.1 epist.4. Again in his *Sermon* on the Lord's prayer and his *Sermon* on almsgiving he cites the story of the meal of Habbakuk brought in for Daniel. Blessed Basil in his book on *the Holy Spirit* ch.30, Epiphanius



in his *Anchorite*, and Blessed John Chrysostom in *Homily 4* to the people, all cite the hymn, or the story of the three boys; and in his *Sermon* on the three boys and his *Sermon* on Susannah, which are contained in the first volume, he explains the same stories and calls them divine. Theodoret in his commentary on *Daniel* also expounds the hymn of the three boys with the other parts of the same Prophet. Blessed Ambrose bk.3 on *the Holy Spirit* ch.7, when treating of the story of Susannah, openly teaches that the Scripture is divine, as are the other parts of the same prophet.

Blessed Augustine in his book on the *Nature of the Good* ch.16 proves against the Manichees that corporeal things are good from the hymn of the three boys, where light and darkness etc. praise the God. And in epist.122 to Victorianus he cites the prayer of Azariah which he poured forth in the burning fiery furnace. And in tract.36 on *John* he adduces the story of Susannah. Origen carefully defends these parts of *Daniel* and contends especially that the story of Susannah is canonical Scripture, both in his *Homily 1* on Leviticus and in his epistle to Julius Africanus. Blessed Athanasius in his *Synopsis* when he comes to *Daniel* and briefly explains the argument of the whole book, makes mention in expressive words of Susannah, of the hymn of the three boys, and of the slain dragon; and he openly declares that all of them pertain to the body of Divine Scripture.

Lastly it is credible that the old Councils, of Laodicea and the Third of Carthage, and the primitive Fathers, who used the Greek edition, when they reported *Daniel* in the number of the holy Scriptures, spoke about the book of *Daniel* that is contained in the Greek vulgate codices. But in the Greek vulgate codices all these parts without doubt are contained, as is openly collected from the *Synopsis* of Athanasius and the commentary of Theodoret, and also from the preface of Jerome on *Daniel*, where he testifies that the Church of Christ reads *Daniel* in the edition of Theodotion, in which edition all these parts are contained.

But adversaries raise objections. First, the opinion of Blessed Jerome who both in his preface to *Daniel*, translated by himself into Latin, and in the preface to his commentary on *Daniel* makes sufficiently clear that those chapters are not of any authority. Jerome himself responds in *Apology 2 against Ruffinus*, near the end, that he did not expound what he thought in those prologues but pointed out what the Jews said.

But Jerome also there calls the story of Susannah and the dragon fables. I reply: when he calls them fables he means to call those things histories which the Jews call fables; I add too that the ancients sometimes call, not fictions, but true narrations by the name of fables. The way it is in *Luke* last chapter, "and as they were talking (fabularentur) and asking among themselves etc.", and Minucius Felis at the beginning of his dialogue, which he entitled *Octavius*, calls a certain true narration of some sea journey or other a fable. Clement of Alexandria too in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.23 when about to narrate a very true story about St. John says, "hear a fable not a fable etc." as if he were to say, hear a fable, not however a fictional and false one, but a certain and true one.

Secondly the adversaries object that in the story of Susannah Daniel is introduced as a boy. "The Lord," he says, "stirred up the holy spirit of a young boy". But this cannot be true, for earlier in ch.6 Daniel is said to have been one of the

satraps of the kingdom of Darius the Mede, at which time he was certainly not a boy; how then later in ch.13 is he said to be a boy?

Suppose you say that Scripture does not tell everything in order but tells first what was done later, and for this reason in the codices of the Greeks, where the order is kept, the whole book begins from the story of Susannah. On the contrary, for in this ch.13 it is made sufficiently plain that the story of Susannah happened at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus king of the Persians. For thus does the chapter conclude: "And king Astyages was laid with his fathers, and Cyrus the Persian took up the kingdom". Therefore from this chapter we have that Daniel was a boy at the time of Cyrus; but this is false. For Daniel was taken as a boy along with king Jochaniah by Nebuchodonosor from Jerusalem to Babylon, as is said in *Daniel* 1. Further from that time up to Cyrus seventy years went by, as is plain in 1 *Ezra* ch.1. Therefore at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus Daniel was about 80 or 90 years old; how then was he a boy of 90 years?

Add the fact that even at the time of Nabuchodonosor Daniel does not seem to have been a boy, but now already dead, since Ezekiel, who prophesied at the time of Nabuchodonosor, in the fifth year of the return, as is said in *Ezekiel* 1, makes mention of Daniel as already dead. For thus he says in ch.14, "If those three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job stood before me, as I live, says the Lord, they will not set free their son or daughter". Daniel at that time therefore already had sons and was dead as were Noah and Job.

I reply that the story of Susannah happened long before the time of Cyrus when Daniel was truly a boy and it rightly deserves to be put by the Greeks at the beginning of the book; however it is not badly placed by the Latins at the end of the book, so that we might learn that it is not possessed by the Hebrews. But as to what is said at the end of ch.13 after the story of Susannah, "And Astyages was laid with his fathers, and Cyrus the Persian took up his kingdom", this does not refer to the story of Susannah just narrated but is the beginning of another story that happened under Cyrus. Therefore in the Greek codices the story of Susannah is ch.1 of the whole book, but the words "And King Astyages was laid with his fathers" are put at the beginning of the last chapter, where the story of the destruction of Bel and the slaying of the dragon is told.

Now as to the point from *Ezekiel*, Blessed Jerome replies in bk.1 *Against Jovinian* that mention is made by Ezekiel of Daniel not as already dead but as still living in the age of boyhood; but he is counted among those very grave men Noah and Job because he was known to the people because of the liberation of Susannah and his interpretations of dreams; or, as the same Jerome says on ch.14 of *Ezekiel*, that as Noah saw the happiness of the world before the flood, the calamity afterwards at the time of the flood, and again the happiness after the flood, and as Job saw his own happiness before his testing, afterwards his misery under testing, and again his happiness after testing, so Daniel saw himself happy in the kingdom of the Jews before the captivity, afterwards as captive and wretched, finally as again happy when he was placed by Darius among the chief princes. Nor is it necessary that Daniel then had sons and daughters, because *Ezekiel* is speaking by way of hypothesis, as if he were to say that even if those three were there and had sons and daughters, they could not free them from imminent evil.

The adversaries object third that the things said in ch.14 about Daniel sent into the lions' den are in conflict with what is said in ch.6. For in ch.6 he is said to have been only one night in the lions' den, and in ch.14 six days.

I reply that Daniel was sent twice into the lions' den, once by Darius the Mede, since he prayed to God against the precept of the king, and then he was there only one night; and this is narrated in ch.6; but he was again sent into the lions' den by Cyrus because of the killing of the dragon, and then he was there six days, as is said in ch.14. Add that it is not improbable that the Daniel who freed Susannah and destroyed Bel and killed the dragon and was six days in the lions' den is not the same as the Daniel who is treated of in the earlier chapters. That there are many who once thought this is evidenced by Jerome in his commentary on *Daniel* and the Greek *Septuagint* says openly that the latter Daniel was of the tribe of Levi, as Jerome there notes, while it is certain that the former was of the tribe of Judah. And if this is how things stand, the two arguments just made pose no difficulty.

The adversaries object fourth that the story of Susannah seems altogether made up by some Greek. For where we read, "Say under what tree you saw them talking to each other? He said, under a terebinth [*schinus*]. But Daniel said, you have rightly lied against your own head; for behold the angel of the Lord will split [*scindo*] you in the middle", a certain elegant allusion is made in the Greek from the tree *Schinus* to the action *Scindo*; for the Greek words are similar; and when the other said he saw them under an oak, allusion is made by Daniel from the tree to the action of cutting, for the Greek words are similar. Just as if one were to say, where did you see them? under a holm oak [*ilice*]; therefore you will at once [*illico*] be killed. But in Hebrew no such allusion can be made for there is no similarity in the case of the Hebrew words for these things.

Origen replies in his epistle to Julius Africanus. Daniel did not say holm oak, nor evergreen, but something else unknown to us, to which, however, according to the properties of the Hebrew or Chaldaic tongue, which Daniel used, some word for cutting would correspond. For the Hebrews have many words to signify splitting or cutting. Further, the Greek translator did not translate to the letter but to the sense, and in order to keep the allusion took other similar trees to which in Greek an allusion to a verb of splitting would correspond.

*Chapter Ten: On the Books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Maccabees*  
 These books are all rejected together by the Hebrews as Jerome testifies in his *Galeatic Prologue*. Then the heretics of this age almost all follow the opinion of the Hebrews. The Magdeburgians, bk.2 cent.1 ch.4 fol.51, receive only those books which the Jews received. Martin Chemnitz does the same in his *Exam. of Sess.4 of the Council of Trent*. Again John Brentius in the *Confession of Wittemberg* in the chapter on sacred Scripture, wants to receive those books only about which there was never any doubt, and these are only those that are received by the Jews. Calvin in *Institutes* bk.2 ch.11 sect.8 accuses the book of *Wisdom* of lying, so far is he from accepting it. In bk.2 ch.5 sect.18 he does not want the book of *Ecclesiasticus* to be of solid authority. In bk.3 ch.5 sect.8 he judges the same of the books of the *Maccabees*. But in his *Antidote* to the Council of Trent sess.4 he seems to repudiate *Tobit* also and *Judith*. Calvin is followed by those ministers who published the confession of faith at

Pissy. Finally the Lutherans and Zwinglians in the prefaces to the books translated by them remove these five books in fact from the canon, and Luther especially contends that the books of the *Maccabees* are of no authority, in assert. art.37 which is about purgatory.

But the Catholic Church holds these books like the rest for sacred and canonical. But before proving it, one must note that the heretics, and especially Chemnitz, do not deny that these books are good and holy and deserving of being read; but yet that they are not such that from them firm arguments may be drawn. In this way they try to elude the witness of the ancients in which these books are called sacred or Ecclesiastical. Wherefore we must prove that these books are holy in such way that they are of infallible truth. It is proved first about all of them in general, and then separately about each of them individually.

First then these books together with the rest are placed in the canon by the third Council of Carthage can.47, by Trent ses.4, by the Pontiffs, by Innocent I in his epistle to Exuperius, by Gelasius I in his decree about the sacred and Ecclesiastical books, along with 70 bishops. Then the Fathers, Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.8, Isidore *Etymologies* bk.6 ch.1, Cassiodorus bk.1 of *Divine Readings*, and Rabanus bk.2 on *Institutes of Clerics*. And the fact they are put in these places as books of infallible truth is collected from this, that they are numbered and put in the same order as the others that are of infallible truth.

Besides as to the Council of Carthage, from which the other Councils have taken the canon, it calls these books not only canonical but also divine. But that a book is divine, what else is it than that it has divine authority? Again the fact that in the aforesaid places they are called canonical books and pertain to the canon; further, for a book to be canonical is for it to be of infallible authority.

And certainly most vain is the distinction of Chemnitz who says that some canonical books are of infallible authority and that some are not. For as he rightly deduces from Blessed Augustine bk.2 *Against Faustus* ch.5 and bk.2 *Against Cresconius* ch.32, books are called canonical because they are a sort of norm and rule whereby the infirmity of our lack of skill is ruled, and from which judgment is made about all other books. How then will those books that are not of infallible authority be a norm and a rule?

But against this Chemnitz first objects in the following way: "Blessed Augustine bk.2 *On Christian Doctrine* ch.8 says that in the canonical books this is to be observed, that those which are received by all the Churches are to be preferred to those which are not received by them all, and these are held to be of greater authority. But if they were all of infallible truth one should not be preferred to another, but all would have the same authority". Add that Blessed Jerome in his *Galeatic Prologue* says that the canonical books are divided into the law, the prophets, and the hagiographa, and he himself in the preface to *Tobit* and in the preface to *Judith* says that these books are also numbered by the Jews among the hagiographa, and yet they are not suitable for confirming dogmas of the faith.

I reply that Blessed Augustine was most certain that all the canonical books are of infallible authority; but he was not equally certain about whether all the books he had enumerated were canonical. For although he himself thought so, yet he knew the thing was not yet defined by a general Council, and that therefore it was

possible without lapse of heresy for some books to be received apart from others. This then is what he says must be observed in the case of the books called canonical, that those which are received by all are put before those which are not received by all. Because, to be sure, there was then greater certitude about the former than about the latter, that they were canonical; but now because general Councils have defined the whole matter, we are equally certain about the authority of all the books, nor should we prefer one to another.

But that Blessed Augustine really thought all those books which he calls canonical were of infallible truth is made plain both by the third Council of Carthage, to which he subscribed, and also because not one place can be produced from Augustine where he calls any book canonical and yet says one can doubt of its truth; but on the contrary infinite places can be produced where he says that all books called canonical are of infallible truth. Epist.19 to Jerome, "Only to those books already called canonical have I been taught to attribute this fear and honor, that I should most firmly believe that in writing them none of their authors erred in anything". He speaks in the same in epists.8, 9, 48, 112, bk.2 on Baptism ch.3, on Psalm 67, bk.2 *Against Cresconius* chs.31, 32, bk.2 *Against Faustus* ch.5 and everywhere in other places.

To the place from Jerome I say that the Jews had two kinds of hagiographa, some within the arc and some outside it, as Epiphanius teaches in his book of *Measures and Weights*. Those that were in the arc were called hagiographa to distinguish them from the historical and prophetic volumes, and these were held to be canonical and about them Jerome was speaking in his *Galeatic Prologue*; but those that were outside the arc were called hagiographa to distinguish them from the canonical and sacred books, and about these Jerome is speaking in his prefaces to *Tobit* and *Judith*, from which is plain that never are those books about which one could doubt called by Jerome canonical.

Second, the same Chemnitz and other adversaries give this reason as objection: the Church that existed at the time when these books were produced was doubtful about their authority, so necessarily the later Church too should be doubtful about the same books. For there is a double way of knowing whether any book is truly divine: one from the testimony of someone who was clearly a Prophet or an Apostle, to whom God was wont to reveal his mysteries, the other, as Augustine teaches in bk.3 *Against Faustus* ch.6, by the sure testimonies of those who were living when the book was produced, who might testify that those books were produced by a Prophet or an Apostle, and whose testimony, by the succession of men using those books, has come down to us. For thus do we judge not only about sacred books but also about profane ones.

At this time the first way no longer has place. For now there are no Prophets or Apostles living on the earth. Therefore we must proceed by the second way, and we must decide about the canonical books from the testimonies of the first Church. Therefore if the first Church was doubtful, much more do we have cause to doubt. But that the synagogue of the Jews doubted about these books is plain from Josephus bk.1 *Against Appion*. That the first Church of Christians was in similar doubt is plain from Origen, Athanasius, Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Jerome, and the

other Fathers cited above, who do not put these books in the canon, and who openly say that among learned men there was always question about these books.

I reply that the fact the old Church doubted of these books can be understood in two ways. In one way because the doubt was such that there were no men of that time who could testify that the books were produced by Prophets or Apostles, and in this way the argument has its force. For therefore is the book of *Enoch* not received by the Church, because the Church had no testimonies from the time when the book was written, nor even from the immediately following times, as Augustine teaches in bk.18 *City of God* ch.38. But we deny that the primitive Church was doubtful in this way. For it is clear that there were always some worthy of trust who thought those books were canonical.

In another way it can be understood that the Church doubted because some doubted, and yet the Church did not then wish to define the thing; and this is most true, as the testimonies adduced rightly prove; but one cannot collect from this that the later Church should be doubtful, and we prove this as follows. About the book of *Judith* there was doubt at the beginning, and yet the Synod of Nicea received that book in the canon, on the evidence of Jerome in his preface to *Judith*, which Synod is accepted, along with the other three, by the heretics, and they value it highly; we are not therefore compelled always to doubt even if at some point there was doubt.

Besides if these books of the Old Testament cannot now be received as canonical because the first Church doubted of them, for the same reason neither can be received as canonical the epistles of *James* and *Jude*, the *Apocalypse*, the second letter of *Peter*, the second and third of *John*, and the epistle to the *Hebrews*, because there was doubt about these in the first Church. But the Calvinists receive these books as truly canonical, as is plain from the books of Calvin in which these books are everywhere quoted, from the confession of the Calvinist ministers art.3 which they offered at Pissy in the year 1561. But although the Lutherans think variously about these books, the Magdeburgians receive the *Apocalypse* as truly canonical, cent.1 bk.1 ch.4 col.56.

But as to the objection they make, about the two ways of tracking down the authority of books, I admit that there are those two ways, and that now there are no Prophets or Apostles, and that we must proceed by the second way etc. But I affirm in addition that in order for the later Church to be able to decree some book to be canonical, it is enough if it has some testimonies of men worthy of trust from that time, or certainly from the immediately following time.

Therefore we do not say, as Chemnitz most impudently misrepresents, that the Church, that is the Pope, can by his own arbitrary decision, without any testimonies from the ancients, make a book canonical from not being canonical, and not canonical from being canonical; or that if the Pope wishes, the divine Scripture would have no more authority than the fables of Aesop; for that is not what we assert but is a lie of their own. For we confess that the Church can in no way make a book canonical from not being canonical, nor the reverse, but only that it can declare which book is to be held as canonical, and this not rashly or by arbitrary decision, but from the testimonies of the ancients and by the likeness of the books about which there is dispute with books about which there is no dispute, and finally from the common consent and as it were the taste of the Christian people, in the way that

Blessed Jerome in his book about the *Famous Men* in James says that the epistle of *James* merited authority little by little as time progressed.

The following three things has the Church already observed in declaring canonical books. For first it had testimonies from individuals among the ancients. For although it did not have testimonies from the synagogue of the Jews, yet it had them from the Apostolic Church, and this was enough. For the Apostles could without other testimonies declare these books to be canonical, and in fact they did so; otherwise never would Cyprian and Clement and others whom we will cite have so constantly said that the books were divine. Next they saw that they were in conformity with the others. Finally they observed that these books were little by little received by all Christians as canonical, which argument could not have been had by those who were in the first Church.

The final objection of this sort is: the Church receives those books which Jerome receives, and rejects those books which he rejects, as is plain from dist.15 in the Sacred Roman canon. But Blessed Jerome in the *Galeatic Prologue*, and in the prologue to *Proverbs*, asserts that these five books are not canonical, as Cajetan, an otherwise Catholic and pious doctor, argues at the end of his commentary on *Esther*.

Some reply that Blessed Jerome only says that they are not canonical among the Jews, but certainly in the *Galeatic Prologue* he numbers together with these books of the Old Testament also the book of the *Shepherd*, which is from the New Testament, and he says that all of them together are not in the canon; he is not therefore speaking only of the canon of the Jews. Besides in the prologue to *Proverbs* he says, "As therefore the Church does indeed read *Tobit*, *Judith*, the books of the *Maccabees*, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so also it may read these two volumes *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of Ecclesiastical dogmas".

I admit then that Jerome was of this opinion, because a General Council had not yet decided anything about these books, except the book of *Judith*, which Jerome afterwards accepted. But as to what Gelasius says in that dist.15 of the Sacred Roman canon, it is understood about the books of the doctors, as of Origen, Ruffinus, and the like, not about the sacred books, as is manifestly deduced from the canon itself.

#### *Chapter Eleven: On the Book of Tobit*

Now we will deal with the individual books separately, and we will both reinforce them with arguments proper to them and briefly solve the special objections that are made against them. Already then the book of *Tobit* has, besides the common testimonies of the Councils and Fathers adduced a little before, the signal testimony of St. Cyprian who in his *Sermon* on almsgiving says, "The Holy Spirit speaks in Scripture, and says that sins are purged by almsgiving and faith". Pope Calixtus I in epist.2 cites *Tobit* and says, "Sacred Scripture speaks well"; and St. Ambrose in his book on *Tobit* ch.1 says this book is prophetic Scripture. Again St. Basil in his *Sermon* on avarice calls the opinion just described from *Tobit* a divine precept. Also St. Augustine says in the *Mirror* that he will collect opinions from the canonical books and yet he does not omit *Tobit*.

But there is wont to be objected against this that this book seems to be in conflict with itself in other places. For in ch.3 Sarah, whom young Tobit was going to have as wife, lived in Rages a city of the Medes, where we also have it that Gabelus was, *Tobit* 4. But afterwards in ch.9, when Tobit had come to the place where Sarah was, he sent thence the Angel to Gabelus in Rages; it is false then that the house of Sarah was in Rages.

Michael Medina bk.6 on *Right Faith in God* ch.14 thinks that "in Rages" is read in ch.3 by the vice of the scribes, since in the Greek there is "in Ecbatana". But it is scarcely credible that a mistake could have been made since there is no likeness between "Rages" and "Ecbatana". Others, as Lyrus, say that either there were two Rages in Media, or certainly in ch.3 Rages is not called the city itself but some individual place; for he is said to live at Rome who lives in Tusculum or dwells elsewhere in the Roman countryside. This opinion is more common and truer.

#### *Chapter Twelve: On the Book of Judith*

That the book of *Judith* has outstanding testimony from the first Synod of Nicea, the first and most famous of all the general Synods, is witnessed by St. Jerome in his preface to *Judith*. And lest perhaps Chemnitz say the book of *Judith* is holy but not of full authority for confirming dogmas of the faith, the words of St. Jerome need to be noted. For the most holy doctor asserts that among the Hebrew the book of *Judith* is numbered among the holy books which, however, are not suitable for approving dogmas of faith; then to this opinion of the Hebrews he opposes the authority of the Synod of Nicea; therefore on the evidence of Jerome the Synod of Nicea so retained the book of *Judith* in the number of the sacred books that it judged it suitable for confirming dogmas of the faith. In addition to this Julius Africanus bk.1 on the *Parts of the Divine Law* and Isidore bk.6 *Etymologies* ch.1 testify that the Church of Christ honors this book among the divine books and teaches it.

But there is against this book a certain very difficult objection. For it seems the history is altogether invented, since in ch.5 it is said to have happened after the return of the people from the Babylonian captivity, and yet in ch.1 it is said to have been at the time Nabuchodonosor king of the Assyrians fought against Arphaxat king of the Medes, who built Ecbatana, and these things do not cohere. For when the people returned from captivity the monarchy of the Assyrians had been overthrown and not Nabuchodonosor but Cyrus or Darius ruled over the Assyrians, Persians, and Medes.

This supreme difficulty has marvelously exercised the minds of erudite men, but there are two principal opinions. One is of those who want the history of Judith to have happened after the Babylonian captivity, some of whom refer it to the time of Cambyses whom they want Nabuchodonosor to be, as Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, Augustine *City of God* bk.18 ch.26, Bede in his book on the *Six Ages*, Lyranus on *Judith* bk.1, John Driedo on *Ecclesiastical Scriptures and Dogmas* bk.1 ch.2 par.2 and bk.3 ch.5 par.3. Some refer it to the time of Darius Hystaspes, as Gerard Mercator in his *Chronology*, and some others. Severus Sulpicius *Sacred History* bk.2 reckons it belongs to the time of Artaxerxes Ochus.

The second opinion is of others who teach that the history of Judith happened before the Babylonian captivity. But some of these refer it to the time of



king Zedechiah, as Gilbert Genebard in the second book of his *Chronology*; others to the time of king Josiah, as John Benedict in his marginal notes to *Judith* ch.4.

But none of these opinions seems sufficiently probable, and indeed the first three are refuted by manifest reasons. First, Arphaxat, with whom Nabuchodonosor fought, built Ecbatana, *Judith* ch.1. But he who built Ecbatana, according to Herodotus bk.1 and Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, was Diocles V king of the Medes, who is very far distant from Cambyses and Darius Hystaspes and Ochus. Nor should one remove what Pliny bk.6 ch.14 writes, that Ecbatana was built by Seleucus, a long time after Diocles, or what Diodorus bk.2 ch.7 writes, that at the time of Arbax, fifth from whom was Diocles, Ecbatana already existed. For it can easily happen that that most ancient city was sometimes overthrown and was rebuilt, now by Diocles, now by Seleucus, now perhaps by some other.

Second, nowhere do we read, either in sacred or profane history, that the kings of the Persians were called Nabuchodonosor, but only the Babylonian kings. It was not Cambyses, then, or Darius who is that Nabuchodonosor of whom the history of Judith treats.

Third, Nabuchodonosor of whom the book of Judith treats ruled in Nineveh, *Judith* ch.1. But at the time of Cambyses and Darius and Ochus Nineveh did not exist, for Nabuchodonosor king of the Chaldeans had overthrown it in the first year of his reign, as Genebrard noted in his *Chronicle*, or at any rate Cyaxares king of the Medes overthrew it, as Herodotus bk.1 and Eusebius in his *Chronicle* wish. Certainly Nahum, who prophesied at the time of Ezekiel, openly predicted that the overthrow of Nineveh would shortly happen. See the commentary of St. Jerome. Add that the kings of the Persians did not rule in Nineveh but in Susa or Babylon, as can be learnt from the book of *Daniel* and of *Esther* and from all the profane histories.

Fourth Nabuchodonosor in the book of Judith tried to seize Cilicia, Damascus, and Palestine, *Judith* ch.1. But there was no reason for Cambyses and Darius to try that since they possessed those regions peaceably, as is clear from I *Ezra* chs.4 and 5.

Fifth, the children of Israel prepared themselves to fight against Nabuchodonosor, *Judith* ch.4. But at the time of Cambyses and Darius the children of Israel were not able to resist any kings of the Persians, to whom they were so subjected that at their will they began or desisted from building the temple, as is seen in I and II *Ezra*.

Sixth, at the time of Judith the high priest was Eliachim, who is also called Joachim, *Judith* chs.4 and 12. But at the time of Cambyses and Darius Hystaspes it was Jesus Josedech, as is plain from bk.2 and from *Zachariah* ch.3, and at the time of Ochus the high priest was Iaddus, who met Alexander the Great, or at any rate his father Jonathan, as is collected from II *Ezra* ch.12.

Seventh, the children of Israel were afraid that Nabuchodonosor would overthrow Jerusalem and the temple of the Lord, *Judith* ch.4. But at the time of Cambyses neither Jerusalem nor the temple existed, since they had been overthrown and burnt by the Chaldeans, and at the time of Darius Hystaspes the temple was indeed rebuilt but not the city of Jerusalem. Besides since on this Darius' order the temple was rebuilt, I *Ezra* ch.6, how is it credible that the Jews feared that it would again be overthrown by him?

Eighth, Holofernes asked, *Judith* ch.5, who the people were who inhabited Judea, what its power was, who was king, what was its multitude. But certainly the king of the Persians and his princes could be ignorant of none of these things, since they had a little before sent the Jews away from themselves.

Ninth, the children of Israel, when they were preparing for war against Holofernes, surrounded their towns with walls through all Samaria up to Jericho, *Judith* ch.4. But at the time of Cambyses and Darius Jews were not living in Samaria but gentiles, as is contained in I *Ezra* ch.4, and the Jews were not able to surround Jerusalem itself with walls, so how much less all the towns?

Tenth, it is written at the end of the book of *Judith* that there was peace in Israel during the whole time Judith lived, and for many years afterwards, and Judith lived 105 years, as is said there. But from the thirteenth year of Ochus, when Sulpicius wants the war against Holofernes to have been waged, up to Ptolemy Lagus, who again fought the Jews, there are only 30 years; Judith then would have been only 80 or 90.

Eleventh, Nabuchodonosor, in the thirteenth year of his reign, waged war against the children of Israel, *Judith* ch.2. But Cambyses only reigned eight years, Herodotus bk.3; he was not then that Nabuchodonosor.

Twelfth, add the probable conjecture from the number of the ancestors of Judith herself. For in *Judith* ch.8 are numbered her fathers and grandfathers and other ancestors of Judith up to Simeon son of Ruben, or as the Greek codices seem to have more correctly, son of Israel, and there are only fifteen generations; but in I *Ezra* ch.7 are numbered the ancestors of Ezra, who flourished at the time of Cambyses and Darius, up to Aaron, and there are found seventeen generations, to whom if you add others up to Levi brother of Simeon, there will be twenty. Since therefore from the patriarch Jacob up to Judith there are many fewer generations than from the same Jacob up to Ezra, rightly do we conjecture that Judith was much older than Ezra who however, as we said, flourished especially at the time of Cambyses and Darius.

But now the other opinions, that refer the history of Judith to the times of Zedekiah or Josiah, are refuted by two reasons. The first reason is as follows. In *Judith* ch.5 we read that there was no one who vexed Israel in the whole period of Judith's life and for many years afterwards. But Judith lived, as we read there to be 105, nor was she an old woman but a girl when she killed Holofernes, as is collected from the fact she is called a girl, *Judith* ch.12. Therefore there was peace in the land of Israel for 80 or 90 years. But from the beginning of the reign of Josiah up to the war that the king of Egypt brought upon Joachaz king of Juda there were only 30 years, 4 *Kings* ch.23, and from the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah up to the war that Nabuchodonosor waged there are only 9 years, 4 *Kings* ch.24. Therefore unless Judith, when she killed Holofernes, was about 80 or 100, what Scripture says cannot be true that in the whole time of her life and for many years after there was no one to perturb Israel.

The second reason is that at the time of Judith the high priest was Eliachim, who is also called Joachim, as is plain in *Judith* chs.4 and 15. But at the time of Josiah the high priest was Helkiah, 4 *Kings* ch.23, and at the time of Zedekiah it was Saraia, 4 *Kings* ch.25.

It seems to us then that one must say that the history of Judith happened in the time of Manasseh king of Judah, since at that time Diocles, who built Ecbatana, was ruling the Medes, on the evidence of Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, and him our Scripture calls Arphaxat. Again at that time the kings of the Assyrians were ruling in Nineveh, as is plain from *4 Kings* 19 and from *Tobit* ch.1. But it is credible that he who is called Nabuchodonosor in the book of *Judith*, was by another name called Merodach Baladan, who was also king of Babylon. For after Sennacherib there ruled, at the end of the reign of Hezekiah, father of Manassah, Assar Addon, *4 Kings* ch.19, and after Assar Addon ruled Merodach Baladan, of whom mention is made in *4 Kings* ch.20 and *Jeremiah* 50 and *Isaiah* 39, who indeed was king of Babylon but transferred to himself also the kingdom of the Assyrians, and for that reason no mention is thereafter made in Scripture of the kings of the Assyrians but only of Babylon.

But he began to reign in the third year of Manasseh, as is probable and as we collect from conjectures (for we are able to get no sure beginning of his reign from any approved author), and therefore his thirteenth year, when he started war against the Jews under the leadership of Holofernes, coincided with the 16<sup>th</sup> year of Manasseh, which Manasseh he had taken a little before as a captive to Babylon.

Also at that time Jerusalem and the temple of the Lord existed, of which mention is made in the history of *Judith* ch.4. At that time too the high priest Eliachim was living, as is plain from the *Chronicle* of Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who when enumerating the high priests of the Jews puts Eliachim between Sobonah, who was high priest in the time of Hezekiah, and Helkiah, who was high priest at the time of Josiah. But it is clear that between Hezekiah and Josiah came Manasseh; this also agrees with *4 Kings* ch.19 where Eliachim is named among the chief priests, and it squares even more with the prophecy of *Isaiah* ch.22, where the deposition of the impure high priest Sobonah is predicted and the raising up of Eliachim in his place.

Further, it is easy in this way to find the time of that very long peace which existed in the whole time of Judith's life, and thereafter for many years. For Manasseh was most wicked at the beginning of his reign and therefore by the permission of God he was conquered by the king of Babylon, who devastated the land of Judah, and led the king himself away bound to Babylon; however he then acknowledge his sin and, being returned to his fatherland, lived most peaceably, as is contained in *2 Chronicles* ch.33.

From this captivity of Manasseh up to the reign of Joachaz son of Josiah there was supreme peace in the land of Judah. How long this time was is not indicated by Scripture, but 72 years are easily gathered. For Manasseh reigned 55 years, of which I take 39 for after his captivity. For it is clear that the captivity happened at the beginning of his reign, as Josephus also noted in *Antiquities* bk.10 ch.5, and, as we said a little before, the thirteenth year of the King of the Assyrians and Babylonians happened in the sixteenth year of Manasseh. To the 39 years must be added the two in which after Manasseh his son Ammon ruled, *4 Kings* ch.21. Thus there will be 41 years. To these are added the 31 years in which after Ammon Josiah ruled, *4 Kings* ch.22, and they will make 72 years.

Now this same time we will show was after the death of Holofernes up to the end of the life of Judith. For Judith lived to 105 (for thus must one understand what is said of the number of the years of Judith at the end of the book, as is more clearly taken from the Greek text), from which years must be taken away those which she lived before the killing of Holofernes, which I posit to have been 40. For although I cannot posit a definite time, since no author hands it down, yet it could be so. For at that age she could still be very beautiful, and to be judged a girl by the Assyrians because of her incredible beauty, especially because, as is said in *Judith* ch.10, the Lord bestowed on her, not without a new miracle, a certain outstanding splendor, so that she might appear to the eyes of all to have incredible beauty, although too some women naturally preserve their beauty of form so that although they are of great age yet they are judged to be young. Certainly Sarah at 65 or even 90 seemed so young and beautiful that wherever she went she was loved and seized by kings. See *Genesis* chs.12 and 20. So now if from 105 years 40 are taken away, 65 years of continuous peace are left up to the death of Judith, to which I add another seven, so that that also may be true which is added in the book of *Judith*, that after her death there was for many years no one who disturbed Israel, then we have the 72 years we were looking for.

You will say perhaps, if this story happened at the time of king Manasseh, why in the preparation for the war that is narrated in this book is no mention made of the king? Why is this whole business attributed to the high priest?

I reply that perhaps this war happened during the captivity of Manasseh, and therefore while the king was absent the business of the kingdom was looked after by the high priest; perhaps also no mention was made of the king because the war did not reach the city of Jerusalem itself where the king was.

But as to the fact that in *Judith* ch.4 it is said that the priest Eliachim wrote to all the Hebrews and then went round all Israel to exhort them to constancy, this is not to be marveled at. For even in the time of Ezekiel the same Eliachim, while he was not yet high priest, did many things in the name of the king, as is plain from 4 *Kings* ch.18, and *Isaiah* foretold, ch.22, that Eliachim would be as it were the father of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And then it is particularly credible that supreme and perilous business was carried out by the high priest, when the king had returned from captivity and was not thoroughly converted to God. For although it is not improbable that the war was waged while the king was captive, it yet seems more probable that it was waged after he had already returned.

But you will again object that it is collected from the fifth chapter of Judith that this war of Holofernes was waged against the Jews a little after the return from the Babylonian captivity, for thus do we read: "For also before these years, when they had departed from the way which God had given them so as to walk in it, they were exterminated in battles by many nations, and many of them were taken away captive to a land not their own. But now they returned to the Lord their God from their dispersion by which they had been dispersed, and were united and ascended all these mountains and again they possessed Jerusalem where was the Holy of Holies".

I reply that this place is not to be understood of the Babylonian captivity but about various preceding afflictions. For if the discourse was about the Babylonian

captivity the Jews would not be said to have been exterminated by many nations but by one, that is by the nation of the Chaldeans; nor would many be said to have been taken away captive but all of them would be; for the Babylonian captivity was general; for very few were left behind by Nabuchodonosor, and they themselves a little later fled into Egypt, 4 *Kings* ch.25. So their dispersion and desolation was very complete.

Therefore Scripture speaks of various afflictions of the people of the Jews which they suffered at various times from various nations, but especially about the last one which happened when Manasseh was captured; for then the whole region was devastated and the king himself with many others was captured and taken to Babylon; and many were dispersed and fled to many places. But as to what is added "but now they returned from their dispersion etc." is understood either of the return of king Manasseh with his own people from Babylon, or (if this war was waged when the king was absent) it can be understood of return from the places they had reached in their flight, when the king of Assyria was wasting their region.

Nor should anyone raise the fact that in the Greek text there is added that the temple too was leveled with the ground when the Jews were dispersed. For those words seem spurious, since St. Jerome, who very faithfully translated this book from the Chaldean into Latin, put in his edition nothing about the overthrow of the temple. And perhaps this addition in the Greek text was the reason why so many very grave writers, Eusebius, Augustine, Sulpicius, Bede were deceived when placing the time of this history.

#### *Chapter Thirteen: On the Book of Wisdom*

The book of *Wisdom* has testimony from the ancient Councils and Fathers. The Council of Sardica in the epistle to all the bishops, which Theodoret mentions in *Hist.* bk.2 ch.8, proves from ch.7 of this book that the Son of God is the maker of all things and is true God; again the Second Council of Toledo ch.1 names the book of *Wisdom* as sacred Scripture.

Next the Fathers teach the same. For Dionysius *Divine Names* ch.4 cites it as a book of sacred Scripture. Melito Asianus in epist. to Onesimus puts *Wisdom* in the Catalogue of sacred Scriptures. Cyprian in his book on the *Habit of Virgins* says, "When divine Scripture says, What advantage was pride to us etc." Likewise Cyril bk.2 against Julian, beyond the middle, calls it divine Scripture. Blessed Augustine expressly teaches and proves that dogmas can be confirmed from this book and that it is canonical, bk.1 *On Predestination* ch.14.

And since Chemnitz with incredible impudence quotes this place of Augustine in truncated fashion and openly asserts that from this place is collected that this book was not for Augustine divine and of infallible truth, let us hear the whole passage: "What I set down, namely the testimony about the book of *Wisdom*, you say that the brothers have thus rejected as not making use of a canonical book. As if, even when the attestation of this book is removed, the thing itself were not clear which we wish to teach from this book". This is cited by Chemnitz.

But lest us hear what is put later in the same chapter: "The opinion of the book of *Wisdom* should not be repudiated, which has deserved to be recited in the Church of Christ, from among the ranks of the Readers of the Church of Christ, and is

heard with divine reverence of its authority by all Christian bishops right up to complete laymen, faithful, penitent, Catechumens". And later, "This book of *Wisdom* should be put first by all expositors, since the outstanding expositors put it first for themselves in the times immediately following the Apostles, who when they used its evidence believed they were making use of nothing but divine testimony". Add that all the ancients assert that this book is Solomon's, whereby it manifestly follows that it is canonical. Eusebius *Hist.* bk.4 ch.22 says that Hegesippus, Irenaeus, and the whole choir of the ancients reckoned this book to be Solomon's. For like reason Tertullian *On Prescription*, Cyprian *Sermon* on morality, Hilary on *Psalms* 127, Ambrose *Sermon* 8 on *Psalms* 118, Basil bk.5 *Against Eunomius*, Eusebius the *Heresy of the Anomoeans*, all cite this book under the name of Solomon. But as to the fact that Blessed Jerome in his preface to the book of Solomon says this book was thought by many to be Philo's the Jew, and Blessed Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* bk.1 ch.8 says that it is of Jesus son of Sirach, this is not contrary to the common opinion of the Doctors. For the opinions indeed are Solomon's, not Philo's, as the ancients say, and it is very clear from ch.9 where the author of the book says, "You have chosen me king for your people, and you told me to build the temple on the holy mount, etc."; yet these remarks were collected by someone else whom many think was Philo, not the Philo who was after Christ but another older one who indeed clothed the opinions of Solomon in Greek words, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, as is said in *Proverbs* 25 that the parables of Solomon were translated into a book by men of Ezekiel king of Judah, when before they were contained in notebooks. But divine Augustine retracted this opinion in *Retract.* bk.2 ch.4.

John Calvin *Institutes* bk.1 ch.11 sect.8 argues that the book of *Wisdom* is guilty of falsehood. "About the origin of idols," he says, "it is received almost by public consent that it is contained in the book of *Wisdom*; namely that the first authors of them were those who gave this honor to the dead, so that they might superstitiously worship their memory; and indeed I confess that this perverse custom was most ancient, nor do I deny that it was the stimulus whereby the ignited madness of men flared up into idolatry; however I do not concede that this was the first fount of the evil. For that idols were already in use first before this ambition for consecrating images to the dead grew strong, of which there is much mention among profane authors, is clear from Moses, that when he narrates that Rachel stole the idols from her father he is speaking only of a common vice". So Calvin who sufficiently openly contends that what is contained in the fourteenth chapter of *Wisdom* about the origin of idols is false. But Calvin assumes something false and then concludes something else false. For he assumes that before the time of Rachel there were no idols that bore the figure of men; and since it is clear that idols then existed, he deduces that the first idols were not images of men, as the book of *Wisdom* teaches. But he assumes something false; for at the beginning those very idols that Rachel stole were images of men; or rather the image of a man. For there was only one image, but Scripture uses the name of many, because that noun in Hebrew does not have a singular form. For the Hebrew word does indeed signify an idol representing the figure of a man, and that it spoke by the art of the devil and gave responses. That it is a figure of a man is plain from I *Kings* ch.19 where Michal, when she wanted to rescue David from the hands of Saul, let him out through a

window and put an image in the bed in his place, which image represented a man, and the Hebrew word stands for what we mean by statue or image. Now that those idols would speak is plain from *Ezekiel* ch.21, for where we read “he asked the idols”, the word in Hebrew is similar to that in *Zachariah* ch.10 where we read that images speak vanities. Next it is certain that Belus, first king of Assyrians, who was before Rachel, nay even before Abraham, was held for a God after his death, as Eusebius testifies at the beginning of his *Chronicle*; and that a statue to him set up by his son Nilus was the first idol proposed publicly for worship is taught by Ambrose on the first chapter of *Romans*, or whoever was the author of those commentaries, and by Blessed Cyril bk.3 *Against Julian*, not far from the end. Finally that the beginning of idols was the making of human images in memory of the dead, as the book of *Wisdom* teaches, is witnessed by Cyprian at the beginning of his book on the *Vanity of idols*, by Chrysostom *Homily* 87 on *Matthew*, by Hegesippus in Jerome in his book on *Famous Men*, and others *passim*.

But you will object that if a statue erected to Belus by Ninus his son was the first idol, how is that true which the book of *Wisdom* says, that the first idol was made by the father in memory of the son? I reply that the statue of Belus was the first idol proposed publicly for worship; but the first idol absolutely was an image of a dead son made by the parent and honored privately. For thence as the depraved custom grew strong (as is said in the same ch.14 of *Wisdom*), figments began to be honored publicly by the command of tyrants.

#### *Chapter Fourteen: On Ecclesiasticus*

The book of *Ecclesiasticus*, because from it many dogmas of the faith are clearly proved, is vehemently hated by Calvin: “Whence,” he says in his *Antidote*, “would they better derive their stimulus?” But he has nothing to object to it. We however on the contrary can confirm the authority of the book by many testimonies of the ancients. Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.7 near the end, citing *Ecclesiasticus* ch.4, speaks thus: “But following the Scriptures we confirm what has been said”. St. Cyprian bk.3 epist.9 citing ch.7 says, “But Solomon too, established in the Holy Spirit, testifies and says”. Epiphanius in the *Heresy of the Anomoeans* numbers among the sacred and divine books the *Wisdom* of Solomon and of Sirach, that is, *Ecclesiasticus*. From which we understand that the same Epiphanius, when he says in his book on *Measures and Weights*, that these books are not received, is speaking of the opinion of the Jews. Divine Ambrose *On the Faith* bk.4 ch.4 calls the words of *Ecclesiasticus* in ch.24 divine oracles. Blessed Augustine in his book to Orosius *Against the Priscillianists* says, “Divine Scripture calls out: seek not what is too high for you, which is the opinion of our *Ecclesiasticus*”. Finally Clement and Cyprian in the cited places, Sixtus II in epist. to Gratus, Damasus in epist. to the bishops of Italy, Basil bk.4 *Against Eunomius*, Ambrose on ch.7 of *I Corinthians*, Jerome on ch.10 of *Ecclesiastes*, and Gregory *Moralia* bk.10 ch.14 not only cite this book but even attribute it to Solomon; now there never was any doubt but that the books of Solomon are to be held as canonical and divine. But Epiphanius in his *Heresy of the Anomoeans* and some other authors want Jesus Sirach to be the author of this book. I reply that it could easily have been the case that Jesus Sirach reduced to a single

volume the opinions of Solomon he had diligently collected, so that both can be said to be the author.

*Chapter Fifteen: On the Books of the Maccabees*

The books of the *Maccabees* have a testimony in addition to the common testimonies, and are brought forward with honor by St. Cyprian in his book on *Exhortation to Martyrdom* ch.11, by St. Gregory Nazianzen in his oration on the *Maccabees*, by St. Ambrose in bk.2 on Jacob chs.10-12, and by others passim. The same books are called divine Scripture in expressive words by St. Cyprian bk.1 epist.3 to Cornelius, and by Isidore *Etymologies* bk.6 ch.1, and St. Augustine (to whom Calvin often attributes much authority) in *City of God* bk.18 ch.36 says, "The books of the *Maccabees* are held as canonical not by the Jews but by the Church". And in bk.2 ch.23 *Against the Epistles of Gaudentius* he carefully defends the authority of the same books, calling them holy Scripture. But let us look at the arguments of the adversaries.

First Calvin objects *Institutes* bk.3 ch.5 sect.8 that the author of these books praises the preposterous zeal and superstitious deed of Judas Maccabaeus who ordered sacrificed to be offered for the dead, *Maccabees* bk.2 ch.12. For besides its being superstitious to pray for any of the dead, he adds also that those for whom Judas bids prayers to be said had died guilty of mortal crime, for whom not even Catholics say one should pray. And that they did thus die is plain for, as is said in the same place, there were found under the clothes of all the dead certain things from offerings to idols against the prohibition of the Lord that is contained in *Deuteronomy* 7.

I reply: to pray for the dead whom it is not certain are in heaven, or in hell, is pious and religious, as we will show in its place; now it is enough to oppose to Calvin Augustine who from this very place proves that it is pious to pray for the dead, in epist.61 to Dulcitus, bk.1 on the *Morals of the Church* ch.23, and in book for the *Care of the Dead* ch.1. Therefore there is so much difference between the spirit of Augustine and Calvin that Augustine, because he believes the books of the *Maccabees* to be canonical, collects therefrom that it is good to pray for the dead; while Calvin, because he thinks it evil to pray for the dead, deduces therefrom that the books of the *Maccabees* are not canonical. But as to the objection that is made I reply that Judas piously reckoned that they, in the moment of death, had conceived sorrow for their sin before God, and had found mercy with God, which is signified by the words, "Because he considered that those who had with piety accepted dormition, would have the best grace placed on them".

Secondly Calvin objects in his *Antidote* to the Council that the author of this book cannot be held to be canonical, since in bk.2 last chapter he asks pardon for errors. Add that in ch.2 he says, "And for us ourselves, who undertook this work for the sake of brevity, have assumed no light labor, nay rather a business full of vigils and sweat". By which words he indicates that he composed this book in the human manner. For authors truly sacred wrote not by their genius and labor but by the revelation of the Holy Spirit, as is plain from Jerome 36 on *Jeremiah* who dictated with very great ease to his secretary Baruch what things God was revealing to him, so that he seemed to be reading from some book.



I reply that God indeed is the author of all the divine Scriptures, but yet he is wont to be present in one way to Prophets, in another way to others, especially to historians. For to Prophets he revealed future things and he assisted them at the same time from adding anything false in their writing, and therefore Prophets had no other labor than that of writing or dictating; but to other writers God did not always reveal the things that they were to write, but excited them to write those things they had seen or heard which they remembered, and at the same time he assisted them from writing anything false; which assistance did not bring it about that they did not labor in thinking and seeking what and how they should write. Wherefore St. Luke in his preface to the *Gospel* he wrote gives witness that he pursued all things diligently that pertained to the writing of the *Gospel*, and that from those who themselves heard and saw and were ministers of the word. But as to what concerns pardon, this author [of *Maccabees*] did not seek pardon for errors, since indeed he made none, but for the lack of polish of his words, the way that even Blessed Paul confesses, *2 Corinthians* ch.11, that he is unskilled in speech.

A third objection from others is that in *Maccabees* bk.2 ch.1 it is said, "When our fathers were led away captive to Persia", but it is certain that the Jews were not led captive to Persia but to Babylon; the author of this book therefore is not narrating a true history. There are some who labor mightily to show when the Jews were led captive to Persia, but I think the thing is very easy. For the author of this book calls Persia not only the region which is properly called Persia but also the other ones bordering on it; this is plain from *Maccabees* bk.1 ch.6 where a messenger, who came to Babylon to Antiochus, is said to have come to him in Persia. Nor is this way of speaking foreign to other writers, since Chrysostom *Homily 6* on *Matthew* says that the Jews were liberated from the Persian captivity.

A fourth objection is that in *Maccabees* bk.2 ch.2 it is said that when Jerusalem and the temple were ransacked and burnt by the Chaldeans Jeremiah hid the tabernacle and the arc of the covenant in a certain cave on mount Nebo, and he said that the place would be hidden until God would again gather his people. But this contains two falsehoods. One that Jeremiah did it, for before the city was taken by the Chaldeans Jeremiah was always in prison and was hated by almost all in Jerusalem, as is said in *Jeremiah* chs.37-38, wherefore neither could he do it by himself or by others; but after the city was captured the Chaldeans broke up everything, as is said in *4 Kings* last chapter, and therefore nothing remained for Jeremiah to be able to hide. The other falsehood is that when they returned from captivity they were to have the arc and the tabernacle; for they never had it afterwards.

I reply that it could very well have been done, and before the spoliation of the city and temple (as Epiphanius thinks in his *Life of Jeremiah*), and even afterwards, as others wish. Before indeed, not in the time of Zedekiah but in that of Joachim. For Nabuchodonosor came three times to Judea and took captive thence the king and the people. First in the time of Joachim, as is said in *2 Chronicles* last chapter. Second in the time of Joachim, as is said in *4 Kings* ch.24, and third in the time of Zedekiah, *4 Kings* ch.25. But although at the time of Zedekiah Jeremiah was almost always in prison and hated by all, yet in the time of Joachim he was free and of great authority, so that it is credible that on his persuasion Joachim gave himself of his own accord

to the king of Babylon. For it is clear that Jeremiah persuaded this, *Jeremiah* ch.27, and it is also clear that Joachim did it, *Jeremiah* ch.29. He could then, with the consent of the king, carry away the arc and the tabernacle. He could also have done it after the city was captured; for Jeremiah was made much of by Nabuchodonosor, as is plain in *Jeremiah* ch.39. But that the arc and the tabernacle were not taken away by the soldiers who pillaged the city of Jerusalem is sufficiently plain from *Jeremiah* ch.52, where are numbered all the things that the Chaldeans took away from the temple of the Lord, right up to the phials and the mortars; and no mention is made of the arc and the tabernacle. But neither is the other thing a falsehood that the arc was again to be found when the people were congregated again. For Jeremiah did not speak of the congregation that was at the time of Cyrus, but either of the very last time, which will next precede the day of judgment, as Epiphanius wishes in his *Life of Jeremiah*, or it is to be mystically understood, that the arc will reappear, that is, that Christ will come in the flesh in a new congregation of the people, as Rupert expounds bk.10 on the *Victory of the Word* ch.21.

A fifth objection is that in *Maccabees* bk.1 ch.1 Alexander the Great is said to have first ruled in Greece, and this seems false, since Alexander was not first but before him there were many kings of the Spartans, of the Macedonians, of the Corinthians, of the Athenians, etc., as is plain from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. Besides it is said in the same place that Antiochus Epiphanes reigned in the 137<sup>th</sup> year of the kingdom of the Greeks, although however it is plain from the same Eusebius that Antiochus reigned in the 156<sup>th</sup> year. For so many are the years from the first year of the monarchy of the Greeks up to the Antiochus.

Finally in bk.1 ch.8 the Romans are said each year to commit their magistracy to one man, and that all obey one man; but this is false, for two consuls were created at that time.

I reply that when Scripture says that Alexander reigned first in Greece it is speaking not of any kingdom but of the monarchy of the Greeks; and when it says that Antiochus Epiphanes reigned in the 137<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of the Greeks, it is not numbering the years from Alexander but from Seleucus, who first reigned in Syria after Alexander, as Eusebius advises in his *Chronicle*. For because Judea was part of Syria, the Jews numbered the years from the first king of Syria, and from Seleucus to Antiochus there are 137 years, to which, if you add 19 years, which are from Alexander to Seleucus, there will be 156 years. But to the point about the Romans I reply that mention is made of only one consul, because it was the custom of the Romans that the consuls would command on alternate days. Evidence for this can be the unhappy result of the battle of Cannae, the cause of which was the rashness of the other consul, with whom on that day the command was. Therefore although there were two consuls, yet to one of them did the Republic seem to have been committed. And this was instituted from the first beginning of the consular dignity, namely lest (as Livy says bk.2), if two consuls commanded at the same time, the expulsion of the kings would not seem to have removed terror but doubled it.

The sixth objection is that in *Maccabees* bk.1 ch.4 Judas is said to have purged the temple in the 148<sup>th</sup> year, that is, one year before the death of Antiochus, who died in the 149<sup>th</sup> year as is said in *Maccabees* bk.1. But this opposes *Maccabees* bk.2 ch.10 where it is said that Judas purged the temple two years after the death of

Antiochus. Besides in bk.1 ch.6 Antiochus Epiphanes is said to have died in Babylon in his bed, through grief of soul, because his affairs had not succeeded as he had wanted; but in bk.2 ch.1 it is said he was slain limb from limb with many of his men in the temple of Nannes; and again in bk.2 ch.9 it is said he died with pain in his internal organs, because he fell from the chariot on the journey. Finally bk.2 ch.9 Judas is said to have died in the year 152, but in bk.2 ch.1 he is said to have written a letter in the year 188 which, if it were true, he would have written it in the 36<sup>th</sup> year after his death. Since all these things badly cohere with each other, they provide manifest signs of falsehood.

In order to reply to the first part of this argument Sixtus Senensis writes in bk.8 of the *Sacred Library* that the purgation of the temple was done twice; but this seems neither to be true, nor to be necessary to solve the argument. And indeed that it is not true is sufficiently indicated by Scripture since everything it reports about this purgation in one place it reports also in the other. That it is not necessary is proved from this that when one purgation alone is posited there is still in this book no repugnance in either place. For although the purgation of the temple in bk.1 ch.4 is narrated before the death of Antiochus and in bk.2 ch.10 it is narrated after the death of Antiochus, yet in the latter place, while it is narrated after the death of Antiochus, yet it does not assert that it was done after the death of Antiochus. For the author wanted to finish what he was going to say about Antiochus, and then finally to return to Judas and the purgation of the temple. And as to its being said to have been done after two years, this does not signify two years after the death of Antiochus, but two years after the profanation. For the temple was profaned in the year 145, as is said in bk.1 ch.1, and after the end of two years in the 148<sup>th</sup> year it was purged, as is said in bk.1 ch.5. Wherefore rightly do Eusebius in his *Chronicle* and Josephus *Antiquities* bk.12 ch.10 write that the temple was purged in the third year from the profanation, that is, after the end of two years.

As to what concerns the second part of the argument, almost all agree that it is the same Antiochus, namely Epiphanes, whose death is described in bk.1 ch.6 and bk.2 ch.9. For he could during the journey have been seized by internal pains and fall from the chariot, as is said in bk.2 ch.9, and afterwards reach Babylon thus sick and there, with the added pain of soul from the message brought to him about how badly things had gone for his men in Judea, finally die. But about the Antiochus whose death is described in bk.2 ch.1 there is very great question. Some want it to be Antiochus the Great, as Lyranus and certain others do on this place. But this is not possible. For Antiochus the Great died before Judas, who wrote this letter, was leader of the Jews, nor was there any war between the Jews and Antiochus the Great. Others want it to be Antiochus the son of Demetrius, who is also called Triphon or Griphus by Eusebius. So Rupert in bk.20 on the *Victory of the Word* ch.6. But this is not possible either. For in the time of this Antiochus not Judas but John Hircanus was leader of the Jews, and yet Judas writes the letter. Besides the letter is written to Aristobulus, master of Ptolemy Philometor, who it is clear from Eusebius existed in the time of Judas, that is, long before the time of Antiochus Griphus.

Therefore one must say that this Antiochus is Antiochus Epiphanes, that very man who is treated of in bk.1 ch.6 and bk.2 ch.9. For then Judas was alive, who wrote the letter, and also Aristobulus to whom it was written. Besides he first and

supremely among the kings of Syria was enemy of the Jews, so that there was deservedly very great happiness in Judah about this death.

Then as to what is said in bk.2 ch.9 about Antiochus Epiphanes, that he wanted to despoil the temple in Persia and was basely put to flight, agrees completely with what is said of this Antiochus, that he fell in the temple of Nannes and was pierced through and that many of soldiers were cut limb from limb. But it is not necessary to affirm that he died there when it is said that he fell; for he can be said to have fallen since his army was routed and put to flight. Just as in *Genesis* 14 the king of Sodom is said by divine Scripture to have fallen in battle, and yet a little after he is introduced as living and meeting Abraham. Therefore in this sense is Antiochus said to have fallen, since his army was cut and struck down, and he himself escaped by a base flight, was even perhaps wounded, fell from the chariot on the journey itself, and died a little later.

To the third proof some reply that it was not Judas Maccabaeus but some other Judas who wrote the letter. So Rupert bk.10 on the *Victory of the Word* ch.15. But this does not seem to be true. For in the 188<sup>th</sup> year not Judas but John Hircanus was leader of the Jews; nor was there any among the leaders of Jews who was called Judas besides Judas Maccabaeus; nor is it likely that, along with the senate and the people at the head of the letter, some other was named besides the prince. Others want this Judas indeed to be Maccabaeus, but that the years which are put at the beginning of the letter are counted, not in the manner of the Greeks from Seleucus, but in the manner of the Hebrews from the twelfth year of Assuerus, when all the Jews were liberated from slaughter by the work of Esther the queen. So Lyranus and Cardinal Hugo on this place, whom almost all the more recent authors follow. But first it does not seem credible that in these books the years are always counted in the manner of the Greeks save in this one place; second, even when numbering from the twelfth year of Assuerus, one cannot reach the year 188 in the times of Judas Maccabaeus. For Lyranus, whom the rest follow, thus computes, that from the twelfth year of Assuerus up to the end of his reign there are 29 years. To these the 6 are added during which Darius, son of Assuerus, reigned, and they make 35. To which if the 148 are added that are from the beginning of the reign of the Greeks up to Judas, there will be 188 years.

But in this calculation there are three very grave errors. First that from 29 and 6 and 148 are not made 188 but 183, as is plain. Second, that these authors omit the 19 years that are from the beginning of the Monarchy of Alexander up to the reign of Seleucus; for those 148 years of the Greeks, which are counted in *Maccabees* bk.1 ch.4 up to the victory of Judas, are counted from Seleucus, not from Alexander, as we said above. If therefore you add the 19 years that are from Alexander to Seleucus, all the years from the twelfth year of Assuerus will be 202 and not 188 as the authors themselves wish. The third error is that in this calculation they make Assuerus the penultimate king of the Persians, having followed the fancy of the Jews against the opinion of all the Latins and Greeks. Eusebius in his *Chronicle* puts three more kings of the Persians after Assuerus; Josephus, whom I followed above, numbers seven kings after Assuerus; from which it follows that from the twelfth year of Assuerus up to Judas not 188 but far more than 200 years flowed by.

Therefore with Melchior Cano and certain others I reckon that the question is to be solved thus, that we should say the words “in the 188<sup>th</sup> year” are not the beginning of the letter that follows and which Judas wrote, but the end of the preceding letter, which was written by the whole people of the Jews when John Hircanus was leader. This is plainly indicated by the Greek codices, which after the words “in the 188<sup>th</sup> year” mark a distinct stop. And reason certainly requires it, so that, since those words come between the beginning of one letter and the end of another, and since the number of years is wont to be placed at the end rather than at the beginning, we may refer the words to the preceding letter and not to the following one.

The seventh objection is taken from the fact that the first book of the *Maccabees* seems to conflict with the *Gospel*. For in bk.1 ch.1 the author of this book affirms that the prophecy of *Daniel* about the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place was fulfilled when Antiochus Epiphanes placed an idol in the temple of the Lord. But Christ in *Matthew* 24 asserts that the prophecy is to be fulfilled in the last days. I reply that in the books of the *Maccabees* no mention is made of the prophecy of *Daniel*, but the idol of Antiochus is only called an abominable idol of desolation, as indeed it was.

The last objection that some assert is from the fact that in these letters those seem to be commended who killed themselves, of which sort was Eleazar in bk.1 ch.6 and Razias in bk.2 ch.14. St. Augustine long ago solved this problem in epist.61 to Dulcitus, and in bk.2 *Against the Epistle of Gaudentius* ch.23, and the sum of the response is that the deaths of these men are told in Scripture but are not praised; or certainly they are not so praised as if what they did they did with piety and holiness, although they did it with bravery and manliness, and in the judgment of men it cannot be denied that they acted bravely.

*Chapter Sixteen: On Certain Parts of the Books of Mark, Luke, and John.*

That the last chapter of *Mark* was, at the time of Blessed Jerome, not received by all as canonical is plain from epistle to Hedibias q.3. The reason for doubt was because of certain apocryphal words which were inserted in that final chapter, as is plain from Jerome bk.2 *Against the Pelagians*, before the middle. For these words were inserted, which are sufficiently clearly redolent of Manicheism: “And they made satisfaction, saying that this world of iniquity and unbelief is a substance which does not permit the true virtue of God to be perceived by impure spirits; therefore now already reveal your justice”. We are not now permitted to doubt, for the Council of Trent sess.4 bids the entire books to be received with all their parts as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church; now this chapter was completed in the most famous days of the Resurrection and Ascension, and the same is the exposition of Bede and Blessed Gregory in *Homilies* 21 and 29 on the *Gospels*. Athanasius too in his *Synopsis*, in his summary of the Gospel according to *Mark*, recognizes this chapter as truly from *Mark*, and likewise Augustine bk.3 on the *Harmony of the Gospels* ch.24. Lastly it is incredible that the Gospel of *Mark* is so mutilated and truncated that it contains nothing of the resurrection. Add that even Calvin *Institutes* ch.17 sect.47 admits this last chapter of *Mark* to be part of the Gospel, so that there is no need to labor longer in proving it.

As to *Luke* ch.22, some bring into doubt the story about the bloody sweat of Christ, and the angelic apparition and consolation, as Hilary witnesses bk.10 *On the Trinity*, and Jerome bk.2 *Against the Pelagians*. The reason that moved these people to this was that they might not seem to attribute infirmity and grief of soul to Christ. For which reason too certain Catholics, with preposterous zeal, erased from the words of *Luke* ch.19 “seeing the city he wept over it” the words “he wept”, as Epiphanius testifies in his *Anchorite*. But they certainly feared where there was no fear. For if Christ as man could shake with fear at his imminent passion and be weary, as even *Matthew* ch.26 and *Mark* ch.16 testify, why could he not for the same reason sweat and receive angelic consolation? And if he had a body capable of suffering and a feeling soul, why could he not grieve and weep? Therefore Athanasius bk.6 to *Theophilus*, which is about the blessedness of the son of God, declares anathema on those who deny Christ sweated blood. Epiphanius too in his *Anchorite* and Augustine bk.3 on the *Harmony of the Gospels* ch.4 acknowledge this chapter of *Luke* as Evangelical; nor do Jerome and Hilary teach the opposite in the cited places, but only advise that it was not in all the codices at their time, and therefore it was not held with such certain faith.

That the beginning of ch.8 of *John*, in which is contained the story of the adulteress, was once not of certain faith is taught by Erasmus in his note on this place, from Eusebius *Histories* bk.3 ch.39 where he speaks thus about Papias: “He adjoins a certain story about an adulterous woman, who was accused to the Lord by the Jews, but this parable is contained in the Gospel which is called according to the *Hebrews*”. By which words he plainly indicates that he did not see the story in the Gospel of *John*, and that it seemed to him not so much a history as a parable. But nevertheless there should be no doubt but that the story took place and is Evangelical, since it is read in the Church on the Saturday after the third Sunday of Lent, and it is acknowledged by the gravest of the Greek and Latin Fathers, by Ammonius of Alexandria in his *Gospel Treasure*, by Athanasius in his *Synopsis* in his summary of the Gospel of *John*, by Chrysostom *Homily* 60 on *John*, Ambrose in epist.58 bk.7 to Studius, by Jerome bk.2 *Against the Pelagians*, and by Augustine tract.33 on *John*. Also the same Augustine bk.2 about *Adulterous Marriages* ch.7 says that the story was erased from some codices by enemies of the true faith.

Nor does it injure our cause but rather benefits it that Eusebius writes that Papias the disciple of *John* made mention of this story; for this is a sign that the thing is true. But that Eusebius did not have it in his codex of the Gospel matters little, for perhaps it was erased by someone. Add that it is probable that Eusebius is not speaking of the story of the adulteress but about another truly apocryphal story; for in the Greek text of Eusebius is not contained the name of “adulteress” but the words “about a woman accused of many sins”.

As to the words that are contained in the last chapter of the first epistle of *John*, “there are three that give witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one”, doubt has sometimes existed, and that there ought also to be doubt now is maintained by Erasmus in a long discussion in his note on the place. But certainly these words are publicly read in the Church on the Sunday in Albs. The same place is acknowledged by Cyprian his book about the *Simplicity of Prelates*, by Athanasius in bk.1 to *Theophilus*, which is about the united Deity, by

Pope John II in his epistle to Valerius, by Jerome in his prologue to the canonical epistles, by Eugenius of Carthage in *Victor* bk.2 about the Wandalic persecution. Wherefore there is no doubt that those words are a true part of divine Scripture.

*Chapter Seventeen: On the Epistle to the Hebrews*

There was a double doubt about this epistle, one about the author, another about its authority, which two are however so connected that there are few who have doubted about one and not the other. First then from among the ancient heretics Marcion, on the evidence of Jerome in his preface to the epistle to *Titus*, and Arius, on the evidence of Theodoret in his preface to the epistle to the *Hebrews*, taught that the epistle to the *Hebrews* was neither Paul's nor sacred. From among the new heretics, Luther in his prologue to the epistle to the *Hebrews* maintains that this epistle is neither from Paul nor from any Apostle, since it contains certain things against Evangelical and Apostolic doctrine. Brentius agreed with Luther in the *Wirtemberg Confession* ch. on sacred Scripture, and Chemnitz in his examination of the Council of Trent sess.4, the Magdeburgians also cent.1 bk.2 ch.4 col.55, and other heretics of this time, save for the Calvinists. For Calvin in his *Institutes* printed in the year 1554 ch.8 sect.216 maintains that this epistle is truly Apostolic, and that the Lutherans err in this regard; yet Calvin doubts whether it is from Paul or from another Apostle, as Barnabas or Luke, as is plain from the same *Institutes* ch.10 sect.83 and ch.16 sect.25, wherefore the Calvinist ministers in the Confession which they presented at Pissy in article 3 place this epistle in the number of divine Scriptures, but as from an uncertain author.

Beside these manifest heretics, some Catholics too, and especially Latin ones, doubted of this epistle, and therefore they held it of less value, as Eusebius witnesses *History* bk.3 ch.3 and Jerome in his book on the *Illustrious Men* on Paul, where he says that this epistle is denied by certain of the Latins to be Paul's but is either from Barnabas or Luke or Clement the Roman Pontiff. Sixtus Senensis adds in bk.7 of the *Sacred Library* that it was also by some attributed to Tertullian. In our time Erasmus at the end of his notes on this epistle and Cajetan at the beginning of his commentaries on this epistle, have recalled the question, already almost put to sleep, again into the light.

But that this epistle is canonical and from Paul the Apostle can easily be proved. First, since it is read in the name of Paul in the Church on the birthday of the Lord and frequently elsewhere. Second, because it has been produced as testimony and accepted as Paul's by many most ancient Pontiffs, as Clement I in his epistle to the *Corinthians* in Eusebius bk.3 ch.38, by Innocent I in epistle 3 to Exuperius, by Gelasius I in the Council of 70 bishops. Third, because it is placed in the canon of sacred Scriptures in the name of Paul by the Council of Laodicea can.59, by the Third of Carthage can.47, and by Trent sess.4, and it is also acknowledged as Paul's by the First Council of Nicea, on the evidence of Blessed Thomas on this epistle, and by the First Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon when they approve the twelve chapters of Cyril, the tenth of which is as follows: "Divine Scripture relates that Christ was made High Priest and Apostle of our confession etc.", and also by the Second Council of Arausicanus, the last canon, where the epistle is said to be the Apostle's and to be divine Scripture.

Fourth, since it was always received by all the Greek Fathers, as is plain, both because all cite it as the Apostle's, and because Jerome in epistle to Dardanus affirms it, and also because all who expound the canon number this epistle along with the rest of the Pauline epistles, as Origen in Eusebius *History* bk.6 ch.18, and Eusebius himself bk.3 ch.3, Gregory Nazianzen in his *Song* on the canon of Scripture, Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, Epiphanius *Heresy* 76, Damascene bk.4 ch.18.

Fifth, it was received also by all the Latins after Lactantius. For only Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius do not seem to acknowledge this epistle; for neither do they ever cite it, as I know. But Hilary *On the Trinity* bk.12, Ambrose on *Cain* bk.2 ch.2, Jerome in his epistle to Dardanus about the land of promise, Augustine on *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.8, and Ruffinus on the Creed, and all the rest thereafter acknowledge it as Pauline and frequently cite it. But Philastrius in his *Catalogue of Heresies* does not doubt to number among the heretics those who reject this epistle and deny that it is Pauline. But the doubt of two or three Latins should not be preferred to the most certain confession of all the others.

Sixth, Blessed Peter seems to make mention of this epistle; for Peter wrote his first letter to Hebrews dispersed among the Gentiles, as is plain from the title, and as Oecumenius teaches, and Erasmus too himself maintains it at the beginning of his notes on this epistle; Peter wrote the second to the same, as is gathered from the words of ch.3: "This second letter, most beloved, I write to you." But in the same chapter later he subjoins: "As also our beloved brother Paul wrote to you." Therefore Paul, on the witness of Peter, wrote some letter to the Hebrews.

Lastly, this epistle by the consent of all Catholics is Paul's, or Luke's, or Barnabas', or Clement's of Rome, or certainly Tertullian's; but it cannot be Tertullian's, since Clement of Alexandria, who was somewhat older than Tertullian, affirms that this epistle is Paul's, in Eusebius *History* bk.6 ch.11. What of the fact that Tertullian thought this letter to be Barnabas', as Jerome teaches in his book about the *Illustrious Men* on Paul? Nor can it be Clement's of Rome either, since Clement himself cited it as the Apostle Paul's, in one of his letters to the Corinthians, as Eusebius relates *History* bk.3 ch.38, and lastly since at the end of this epistle the author says, "Now I pray you further to do this, so that I may more quickly be restored to you." For these words can in no way fit Clement, who since he was Bishop of Rome will have lived, not in Judea, but in Rome. From which it appears how ineptly Erasmus tries at the end of his notes on this epistle to make Clement the author of it. Lastly, that the epistle is not Luke's or Barnabas', nor of any one at all other than Paul, is sufficiently proved by the arguments adduced above; but even if it were Luke's or Barnabas', it would be from an Apostolic man, and would not lack Apostolic authority.

But against this epistle five arguments are brought forward by the Magdeburgians, with which the arguments of Luther and Erasmus will be taken together. The first is that a prudent antiquity doubted of this epistle. I reply that it is ineptly said that antiquity doubted of this epistle, since they can put forward one alone among the Greeks, Gaius, and two or three among the Latins, while we have on our side so many Pontiffs, so many Councils, all the Greeks save one, and all the Latins save two or three. And if it is a question of antiquity and not of numbers, Clement of Rome is older than Gaius, and Clement of Alexandria is older than



Tertullian, and Dionysius the Areopagite older than both, who however cites the epistle in the name of Paul in the epistle to *Titus*.

The second argument is that the epistle does not have the name of Paul added at the beginning, as all the other epistles do; although they themselves indeed in the same place confess that this argument is not very serious. I reply with Jerome in his preface to the epistles of Blessed Paul: "If therefore it is not Paul's, because it does not have the name of Paul prefixed, then it is no one's, because it has no one's name". What of the fact that the first epistle of *John* does not have his name prefixed, and yet there is no doubt it is John's? And on the contrary, certain gospels have the names of Thomas, of Bartholomew, of James, of Nicodemus, and yet they are by everyone deservedly rejected.

I add besides that Paul for just causes did not add his name to the epistle. For either he did it, as Jerome teaches in the same place, because he knew his name was hateful to the Hebrews, although they were already converts to the faith, on account of the very fact that he disputed very fiercely more than the rest that the old law was abrogated, of which law they were themselves still imitators, *Acts* ch.21. Or, as the same Jerome teaches on *Galatians* ch.1, that because in this epistle to the *Hebrews* ch.3 he was going to say that Christ is the Apostle of our confession, he did not wish in his accustomed manner to name himself at the beginning as Paul the Apostle, lest it should seem that he was comparing himself in any way with Christ. Or finally (as Theodoret teaches in the preface to his commentary on this epistle), because Paul was not Apostle to the Hebrews but to the Gentiles, as he himself confesses in *Galatians* ch.2, he did not wish in his accustomed manner to begin "Paul the Apostle," but to expound the doctrine bare, not as an Apostle and Master, but as a friend and associate. Wherefore at the end of the epistle he puts down: "But I ask you, brothers, that you suffer the word of consolation, even if I have written in few words to you etc.," as if he wished to say, do not take it badly if I, who am not your proper Apostle, have wished to advise and exhort you through letters. For I did it to console you, not to command you. All these reasons are touched on by Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius *History* bk.6 ch.11

The third argument they take from the diversity of the style, since the speech in this epistle is far graver, more copious, more ornate than in the rest. Nor would he say sufficient who replied that this epistle was written in Hebrew, and that the Apostle could have spoken better in his own tongue than in a foreign one, that is, in Greek. For that this epistle was written not in Hebrew but in Greek is plain from the fact that the testimonies in this epistle are cited according to the *Septuagint* version, and also because the author of the epistle, in ch.7, translates the Hebrew name Melchizedek, that is, King of Justice, and King of Salem, that is, King of Peace, which he would not do if he was writing in Hebrew.

Some reply that this epistle was first written, not in Hebrew, but in Greek, and that indeed the opinions are Paul's but the words Luke's or Clement's, whom Paul used as interpreter and scribe. And that therefore this epistle is more ornate than the rest because the speech of this epistle was not composed by Paul, as it was in the case of the rest, but by someone else more eloquent. So Origen in Eusebius bk.6 ch.18. Others reckon that this epistle was first written in Hebrew and then translated into Greek speech by Luke or by Clement. So does Eusebius reply, *History*

bk.3 ch.38, and Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius bk.6 ch.11. Nor do the translations [of Hebrew names] conflict with this response. For the Apostle did not translate the Hebrew name Melchizedek into Greek but into Hebrew, so that he might prove something from the etymology and the force of the name. Just as if someone were to say that homicide in Latin is the slaying of a man (*hominis caedes*), and likewise in the case of interpreting certain Greek words or Hebrew ones. For it is like “phase” in *Exodus* 12, that is, “the passage of the Lord,” which interpretation is not contained in the Hebrew, and *Matthew* 27 has “Eli, Eli”, etc., that is “My God, my God”. Nor is the point about the Scriptures being cited according to the *Septuagint* an obstacle. For the Apostle, if he wrote in Hebrew, produced his testimonies from the Hebrew source, but the Greek translator wanted to translate those words cited by Paul as they were already translated by the *Septuagint*, lest anything novel be introduced to Greek ears. Nor is this new, for how many testimonies in the Hebrew tongue did the same Apostle bring forward in the speech which he gave in the synagogue at Antioch? And yet Luke reported them all, *Acts* 13, according to the *Septuagint* version. Of these two solutions, although each is probable, yet the first seems simpler and also freer.

The fourth argument, on which the Magdeburgians most of all rely, is of this sort: the author of this epistle ch.2 puts himself in the number of those who were converted to the faith by the Apostles, for he says: “How shall we escape if we have neglected so great a salvation, which, when it began first to be announced through the Lord by those who heard him, was confirmed in us, God giving witness through signs and power etc.” But Paul in *Galatians* ch.1 gravely affirms that he learnt the Gospel through revelation not from man or through man but from Christ; therefore Paul was not the author of this epistle.

I reply first that Blessed Paul says these things, not about himself, but about the men of his time, the way that *Isaiah* ch.64 says in the person of the people, “We have all become impure and all our justice is as filthy rags; there is none who calls on your name, who rises and clings to you, etc.”, in which place it is plain that Isaiah is not speaking of himself, because he calls upon God in the same place in a long prayer. I add further that it is not absurd if Paul puts himself in the number of those who were confirmed by the Apostles. For here he is dealing not with confirmation through doctrine but through miracles; for he says that salvation, that is, the preaching of salvation was confirmed through the Apostles, God giving witness through signs and power. But who can deny that Paul, after he was converted, even if through revelation he most fully taught the Gospel, was yet confirmed in the faith by hearing the miracles of Peter and the other Apostles, and especially by that miracle by which he himself by the hands of Ananias received the sight of his eyes.

The fifth argument is that the author of this epistle is in conflict with the doctrine of the Lord. For the Lord says, *Matthew* 11, “come to me all of you”, but here he excludes those who have once sinned; for he speaks as follows in ch.6, “It is impossible for them who have once been enlightened to be again renewed to repentance”. And in ch.10 he affirms that there is left no sacrifice for sin for those who voluntarily sin after receiving the knowledge of the truth, and in ch.12 that Esau did not find place for repentance.

I reply that these places no more conflict with the verse “come to me all of you” than do the words of the Lord, *Matthew 32*, where he says that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not remitted either in this world or in the next. For the Apostle is not speaking of any sinner whatever, but of him who sins against the Holy Spirit, that is, who willingly opposes the known and examined truth.

Further such sins are said to be unforgivable for three reasons. First, because for the most part men of this sort are not converted, and sins of this sort are not remitted, although absolutely the contrary can happen and sometimes does happen in fact; just as in the case of bodily sicknesses we call those incurable that, for the most part, are not cured, although sometimes they are cured; and we call those curable that are for the most part cured, although sometimes they are not cured. Second, since those who sin against the Holy Spirit directly resist the grace by which alone they can be cured; in the same way that the doctor says about him who cannot be healed save by the cutting of the vein, and who in no way accepts this remedy, that it is not possible for him to be healed; yet not for this reason is it denied that some very wise doctor could persuade the sick man to accept the cutting of the vein. Third, he who sins from malice has not in himself whereby he deserves remission, and for this reason his sin is said to be unforgivable, although absolutely it could be remitted. But he who sins from ignorance or weakness has something whereby he may provoke the mercy of God, according to the word of the Apostle in *I Timothy ch.1*, “I found mercy because I acted ignorantly in unbelief”.

And this response indeed seems to be sufficient to take away the difficulty that arose from the earlier places. But another response can be applied. For many expound the earlier place from *Hebrews 6*, and almost all, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Anslem, Sedulius, and others on this place, and also Augustine at the end of the exposition he began on the epistle to the *Romans*, expound it of the renovation to repentance that happens in baptism, not of the renovation to the repentance that happens in reconciliation after baptism. For that Blessed Paul is speaking here of baptism is sufficiently indicated by the words, “not laying again the foundation or repentance, of faith, of baptisms, etc.” and by these, “those who have once been enlightened”. For in Dionysius on the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy ch.2* and in others of the ancients baptism is called enlightenment, because it is the sacrament of faith. And the words, “to be again renewed” mean the same, for (as Augustine teaches in the place cited) we are properly renewed by baptism, and cured by reconciliation. Lastly too the words, “crucifying again the Son of God”, for in baptism we represent the death and burial of Christ, as is said in *Romans 6*, and as Christ died only once, so we too can be baptized only once. Blessed Paul therefore is disputing against deserters from the faith, and he teaches that none should hope that after receiving baptism in the Church he can lay another foundation anywhere else and find another baptism; for that is impossible since there is only one true baptism, and it cannot be repeated. The second place has the same sense. For truly “to those who voluntarily sin”, that is, depart from the already known and received truth of the faith, “there is left no sacrifice for sin”; not because there is no place for repentance, but because there is no truly efficacious sacrifice save the death of Christ, which they despise by apostasy. For neither can another Christ be found, nor another baptism in which his death is represented.

To the words from ch.12 I say that Esau in two ways did not find place for repentance; in one way with his father, because the thing lost was irrecoverable; in another way with God, because he did not rightly do penance, as Chrysostom expounds on this place. The Apostle, therefore, wishing to deter men from lapse, puts forward the uncertain success of repentance. For as Esau could not recover the inheritance, because it was irrecoverable, so the sinner cannot recover innocence, virginity, and the like; and in the way that Esau did not rightly do penance, although he wept, and therefore did not appease God, so sinners often seem to do penance, and yet do not appease God, because they do not do penance as they ought.

The sixth argument is from Cajetan in his commentary on this epistle. The author of this epistle proves in ch.1 that Christ is the Son of God, from the words in *2 Kings* ch.7, "Therefore I will be to him as a Father", and these words are understood literally of Solomon, and only from the literal sense are firm arguments drawn; therefore either this author is not Paul, or Paul is not arguing solidly.

I reply that the Apostle argues similarly in *Romans* 10 and *I Corinthians* 9, and yet it cannot be said that these letters are not Paul's or that Paul is not arguing solidly; the argument therefore of the Apostle is very strong, since those to whom he writes admitted that Solomon bore the figure of Christ, nor could they deny this, as Divine Augustine proves in his book on the *Unity of the Church* ch.8. For both *2 Kings* ch.7 and *Psalms* 71 say many things about Solomon that do not fit him save as he was a figure of Christ. As the words, "I will establish your kingdom for ever", and these, "he will dominate from sea to sea, and all the kings of the earth will adore him, all the nations will serve him, etc."

The seventh argument is from the same Cajetan. In *Hebrews* 9 the author says that there was in the arc an urn containing manna, and the rod of Aaron which flowered, and the tables of the law; but in *3 Kings* ch.8 only the tables of the law are related as having been in the arc; therefore either Paul is lying or the author of this epistle is not Paul.

I reply that in the time of Solomon there was in the arc only the tables of the law, as is said in *3 Kings* ch.8; yet afterwards the Jews put in it also the urn and the rod. That fact Paul could know from tradition. Thus did Theophylact solve the problem, who also advises that the Jews of his own time thought this. Add that the author of the book of *Kings*, when he says that in the arc was only the two tables, seems to insinuate that in his time there was something else that was not there in the time of Solomon; for he seems to have wished to say that although now certain other things are in the arc besides the tables of the law, yet in the time when the arc was brought into the temple by Solomon, there was nothing in it besides the two tables. What too if, as some wish, the urn and the rod were in some exterior part of the arc, and not within the arc itself?

The last argument is that of Erasmus and Cajetan. The author of this epistle ch.9, when speaking of a Testament properly speaking, which is confirmed by the death of the testator, cites the words of *Exodus* 24, "Here is the blood of the Testament, which the Lord commanded us", but in *Exodus* according to the Hebraic truth there is no mention of a Testament but of a pact. For the Hebrew words of *Exodus* 24 have no other sense than this, "behold the blood of the league which the

Lord has pledged with you in all these words;" therefore either Paul did not know the Hebrew tongue or the author of this epistle was not Paul.

I reply that the question is either about the thing or the name; if about the name, then Erasmus unjustly makes accusation against this author. For not only this author but the *Septuagint* too always translate the Hebrew word as "testament", as is plain from the *Psalms* that we have in the *Septuagint* version, and from Jerome on *Malachi* ch.2, where he affirms that the *Septuagint* almost always translated it as "testament". And the Apostle Paul in *Romans* ch.9 and *Galatians* chs.3 and 4, speaking of the old law, always spoke of Testament where the Hebrew was used; indeed so common in the Church is the word Testament for that Hebrew word that we say and hear nothing more frequently than Old Testament and New Testament.

But if the question is not about the name but the thing, as if the author of this epistle twisted this place of *Exodus*, in which a league is being dealt with, to Testament properly speaking, one must reply that the promise of eternal life, which is treated in the Old Testament through figures and in the New Testament openly, is at the same time a Testament and a pact: a Testament because it contains a disposition about giving eternal life to the sons of God, which was not ratified before the death of the testator. For a Testament is a disposition of an inheritance, which is not ratified before the testator dies. But the promise of God is at the same time a pact, because it has a condition annexed. For the testator God did not wish to give eternal life save to those who observed his laws, and for this reason it is called a league and a pact. Therefore Moses and Paul are already speaking about the same thing in *Exodus* ch.24 and *Hebrews* ch.9, and Moses indeed calls it a pact but understands, not any pact at all, but a pact about giving an inheritance after the death of the testator, and therefore he scattered blood on the people, which is a figure of the blood of Christ to be poured out for us; but Paul calls it a Testament but understands it, not of any sort of testament, but of a conditional one, that is, one that is at the same time a pact.

#### *Chapter Eighteen: On the Epistles of James, of Jude, of Second Peter, of Second and Third John*

That some once doubted of these epistles, whether they were really Apostolic, is evidenced by Eusebius *History* bk.3 ch.25 and Divine Jerome, book on *Illustrious Men* on James, Jude, Peter, and John. Of more recent writers Luther in his prologues to these epistles, Brentius, Chemnitz, and the Centuriators in the places cited in the previous chapter altogether condemn the epistles of *James* and *Jude*, remain dubious about the rest, although Luther in his prologue to the epistle to the *Hebrews* puts the second letter of *Peter* into the canon. Erasmus in his notes on these epistles says that the epistle of *James* is not redolent of Apostolic gravity, doubts of *Second Peter*, and asserts of *Second* and *Third John* that they are not from John the Apostle; about the epistle of *Jude* he says nothing. Cajetan doubts of the authors of the epistles of *James*, *Jude*, and *Second* and *Third John*, and for that reason wants them to be of lesser authority than the rest. Calvin receives them all and also the Calvinists in their confession at *Pissy* art.3

For us it is not licit to think other than that these epistles are Apostolic and divine. First there is proof about all of them together, since they are put in the

catalogue under the names of the Apostles Peter, James, John, and Jude by the Council of Laodicea, the Third of Carthage, of Florence, and of Trent above cited; again by Innocent I in epist.3 to Exuperius, and by Gelasius in the Council of 70 bishops. Further, by Origen *Homily 7 on Joshua*, Epiphanius *Heresy 76*, by Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, by Jerome in his epistle to Paulina on the *Study of the Scriptures*, by Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.8, by Ruffinus in his exposition of the Creed, by Isidore *Etymologies* bk.6 ch.1, by Damascene in bk.4 ch.18.

Next about individual ones separately. For the Council of Milevis can.7 brings in the epistle of *James* to prove Ecclesiastical dogma; the same letter is cited by Dionysius on *Divine Names* ch.4, by Cyprian in his book to *Novatian*, by Augustine in epistle 29 to Jerome, and by others passim. It is also frequently read in the Church under the name of the Apostle James.

The second epistle of *Peter* is cited under the name of Peter by Hyginus epistle 2, by St. Gregory *Homily 18 on Ezekiel*, and by others passim. It is read in the Church on the feast of the Transfiguration. Besides one should either confess that this epistle is Peter's or that it contains an intolerable error, which no one hitherto has dared to assert. For in ch.2 the author says, "this voice we heard when we were with him on the holy mount etc." But it is certain that when the Lord was transfigured there with the Lord only Peter, James, and John, as the Gospel says, *Matthew 17*. Therefore the author of this epistle was either some signal impostor or is one of the three chief Apostles of Christ. And although it matter little as far as authority is concerned which of the three it is, yet it is sufficiently clear that the epistle is not James' of John's, both because no one has ever said this and also because the author at the beginning of the epistle openly calls himself Simon Peter, Apostle of Jesus Christ. Bede, persuaded by this argument, marvels in his commentary on this epistle by what reason there could have been doubt about the author of this epistle.

The epistle of *Jude* is cited as Jude's the Apostle by Dionysius on *Divine Names* ch.4, by Tertullian in his book on the *Female Habit*, by Cyprian in his book to *Novatian*, and very frequently by later writers. The same epistle also has testimony from Origen bk.5 on *Romans* ch.5, by Epiphanius *Heresy 76*, and by Jerome on *Titus* ch.1, and in his *Catalogue of Scriptures*.

The second epistle of *John* is cited by Cyprian in bk.2 on the *Opinions of the Council of Carthage*, near the end.

The third epistle of *John* is cited by Dionysius in *Celestial Hierarchy* ch.3.

But there are not lacking arguments to the contrary. And the first indeed is from Erasmus against the epistle of *James*. This epistle, if it is from any James, is certainly from him who was the first bishop of Jerusalem, and about whom much is said in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and in the epistle to *Galatians*. But that this James is not truly one of the twelve Apostles is plain from Jerome in his commentary on *Galatians* ch.1, where he says that they greatly err who say that this James was one of the twelve.

I reply that this argument of Erasmus manifestly rests on an error. For Jerome does not say that they err who think that this James was one of the twelve, but that they err who say that this James was the brother of John and was he whom Herod ordered punished with death. But that this our James was one of the twelve is

taught by the same Jerome, and he proves it in his book *Against Helvidius* in these words: "There is no doubt that there were two Apostles called by the name of James, James son of Zebedee and James son of Alphaeus; as to that lesser James or other, whom the Scripture relates was the son of Mary, though not of Mary the mother of the Lord, do you want him to be an Apostle or not? If he is an Apostle he will be the son of Alphaeus; if he is not an Apostle but some third James or other, how is he supposed to be the brother of the Lord? And how will this third be called lesser to distinguish him from the greater, since greater and lesser are wont to put a distance not between three but between two; and the brother of the Lord is an Apostle, on the saying of Paul, 'I saw no other Apostle save James the brother of the Lord'." Besides the same thing can be proved by many reasons; but because it is not necessary in this place and I am aiming at brevity, I will say only this. If this our James here is not one of the twelve Apostles, then no mention is made in the Church of one of the Apostles; for it is clear from the Gospel of *Matthew* ch.10 that there were two Jameses among the twelve: James the son of Zebedee and James the son of Alphaeus. But in the Church, memorial is made only of James the brother of John, on July 25<sup>th</sup>, and of this James who wrote this epistle and was first bishop of Jerusalem, on May 1<sup>st</sup>. Therefore, if this James is not James son of Alphaeus, it follows that there is altogether no memorial of him, which is certainly most absurd.

The second argument. The author of this epistle does not use the accustomed salutation of the Apostles, but only says in a profane manner: "James servant of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes that are in the diaspora, greeting." Therefore it is not likely that it is from James the Apostle. I reply to this argument, which is Cajetan's on that place, that if this salutation is to be reckoned profane, that salutation is to be held more profane that is contained in *Acts* ch.15, "The Apostles and Elders brothers, to those who are in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia brothers from the Gentiles, greeting." But no Catholic would dare to blame this salutation as profane; therefore neither should anyone blame that one of James as profane.

A third argument against the same epistle is from the Magdeburgians, cent.1 bk.2 ch.4 col.54, as are also the rest that follow. Eusebius asserts, *History* bk.2 ch.25, that this epistle and that of *Jude* are adulterated, therefore they are not of firm authority. I reply that this is a lie and not an argument; for these are the words of Eusebius in the place cited by the adversaries: "One must know," he says, "that they are not received by some". And he adds: "we however know that these too along with the rest are received by almost all in the Church."

A fourth argument. This epistle errs much from the analogy of Apostolic doctrine. For in ch.2 justification is ascribed not to faith alone but to works, although Paul in *Romans* 2 says that man is justified by faith without works. I reply that with this argument the Lutherans confess that they are sons of those ancient heretics against whom this epistle was written. For hear what Augustine says in his book *On Faith and works* ch.14: "Let us know see," he says, "what must be cut out from religious hearts so that they do not by an evil security lose their salvation, if for obtaining it they should think faith alone sufficient but should neglect to live well and hold the way of God in good works. For even in the times of the Apostles, because certain rather obscure opinions of the Apostle Paul were not understood, some thought that this is what he said etc." and later: "Since then this opinion had

then arisen, the other Apostolic epistles of *Peter*, of *John*, of *James*, and of *Jude* most of all direct their meaning against it, so as vehemently to lay down that faith without works profits nothing; just as even Paul himself did not define as salvific and plainly Evangelical any faith at all by which one believes in God, but that faith whose works proceed from charity.”

Now to the argument we reply with Augustine in his preface to *Psalms* 31, that the Apostles are not in conflict with themselves. For Paul speaks about the first justification, by which a man becomes just from being unjust, and under the name of works he understands works that are done without faith and grace and with the strength alone of free choice; but James speaks of the second justification, by which someone just becomes more just, according to that verse of *Apocalypse* last chapter, “He who is just, let him be justified still;” and under the name of works he understands works that are done with faith and the help of the grace of God. For just as a man cannot procreate himself or raise himself from the dead, although after he is born he can nourish and increase himself by his own work, so the sinner cannot make himself just, though he can, when he is just, increase justice by his works. But we will dispute of this question fully in its place.

A fifth argument. This epistle is silent about the work of Christ and the doctrine of faith, and only speaks of works; the Apostles however are wont always to insert something about the doctrine of faith; therefore this epistle is not Apostolic. I reply that the Apostle James is purposely all involved in commending works, as we showed above from Augustine, for this reason, that the Evangelists and Paul had sufficiently explained the doctrine of faith, and those against whom he is writing were extolling too much the doctrine of faith and were neglecting good works. I add further that if this epistle is judged for this reason to be adulterated, that it is also all taken up in commending good works, then *Proverbs* too and *Ecclesiastes* of Solomon must be reckoned adulterated books, since nothing is read in them besides speeches about morals; or if *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* are to be held among the sacred books, even with the consent of our adversaries, certainly there is no reason for us to reject an epistle of *James* that is very similar to them.

A sixth argument. This author in chs.1 and 2 calls the law of the Old Testament a law of liberty, and the Apostle Paul in *Galatians* 4 calls it a law of servitude. Therefore it is not possible for both epistles to be Apostolic; but it is clear that the epistle to the *Galatians* is Apostolic, therefore the letter that goes under the name of *James* is not Apostolic but contrary to Apostolic. I reply that James is not speaking of the old law but of the new when he calls it a law of liberty. But for this reason it seems to them that James is speaking of the old law because he makes mention of the Precepts of the Decalogue, and they foolishly imagine that the new law does not contain any precepts but only promises of grace and preaching of faith. But without any doubt they are deceived, since the precepts of the Decalogue pertain no less to Christians than to the Hebrews, as is collected from *Matthew* ch.5 and other places. But there is this difference between the New and the Old Testament, that the Old introduces laws but does not supply the strength to fulfill the laws; consequently it was called and was a law of fear and servitude. But the New Testament together with the laws provides grace whereby men are aided and fulfill the precepts easily and freely and gladly, and for this reason Christians are



said not to be under the law, and the law is said not to have been imposed on the just; not because they should not observe it, but because the law does not oppress them or weigh them down, since they keep it most gladly and freely.

But let us hear Augustine teaching these very things, in his book on *Nature and Grace* ch.57: "If you are led by the spirit," he says, "you are not under the law, namely the law which inspires fear and does not bestow charity, whereby the love of God is diffused in our hearts not by the letter of the law but by the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us. This is a law of liberty, not of servitude, because it is a law of charity and not of fear; about this the Apostle James says: But he who has looked in the law of liberty etc." And Augustine on *Galatians* ch.6 says, "The same Scripture and the same command, when it weighs on slaves gaping after earthly goods, is called the Old Testament, but when it raises up the free who are on fire for eternal goods, it is called the New Testament". And in his book on *Contenance* ch.1 he says, "We are not under a law that bids the good and does not give it, but we are under grace, which, by making us love what the law commands, is able to command the free."

The seventh argument is that the author of this epistle brings forward testimony from the epistles of Peter and Paul, so he is not himself an Apostle, but was one of the Apostles' disciples. I reply that no places from Peter and Paul are cited in this epistle, but the adversaries are hereby deceived by the fact that they saw on the margin of the book, set apart from the words of James, certain places noted from Peter and Paul. But even in the margins of the epistles of Paul we see noted certain places from the epistles of Peter and of other Apostles; and in the margins of the first epistle of Peter and of first John are noted several places from Paul; yet these epistles of Peter, Paul, and John are not called into doubt. For notes of this sort do not signify that one Apostle is cited by another, but that like opinions are found in the Apostles; which thing the Holy Spirit did for this reason, so as to show that he is one and the same author of them all. This same thing we also see in the Prophets; for Isaiah and Micah lived at one and the same time, since each at the beginning of his book records that he wrote in the days of Joatham and Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and yet we find in *Isaiah 2* and *Micah 4* a signal prophecy about Christ described, not only in the same sense, but also in the same words.

An eighth argument. The author of this epistle does not call himself an Apostle of Christ, as Paul does, so it is not credible that he is an Apostle but some disciple of inferior note. I reply that if we are to trust to these sort of petty reasonings then not only the epistle of James but also some other epistles of Paul and John will have to be rejected, since Paul in the epistle to the *Philippians*, in the two to *Thessalonians*, and to *Philemon* does not call himself an Apostle of Christ but either a servant, as James does, or he adds nothing; John too does not call himself an Apostle either in his epistles or in the *Apocalypse*.

Against the epistle of *Jude* the same Magdeburgians bring forward four arguments. The first is that he does not call himself an Apostle, but this has already been solved.

The second is that Jude asserts that he lived after the Apostles when he says, "Be mindful of the words that were preached by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said to you how in the last times will come deceivers etc." citing openly

certain things from the second epistle of *Peter*. I reply that Jude lived at the same time as the Apostles but yet he wrote his epistle later than Peter and Paul, and therefore rightly could he cite their epistles; in the way that even Peter in his second epistle makes mention of the epistles of Paul, although however they lived at the same time and were crowned on the same day.

The third argument. Jude preached not in Greece but in Persia, therefore if he wrote anything he would have written not in Greek but in Persian. I reply that although Jude preached in Persia, yet he wrote his epistle not to the Persians but to the Jews dispersed through the whole earth, to whom Peter and James had also written. Rightly therefore did he wish to write in the Greek tongue, which was then most common. Further, who does not see how inept the argument is that since Jude preached in Persia, therefore he had to write in the Persian tongue? For if an argument of this sort had any validity, we would by parity of reasoning collect that Peter, who taught at Rome and wrote two epistles from that city, ought to have written in Latin and not Greek; and Matthew, who preached in Ethiopia, ought to have written his Gospel in Ethiopic; Paul too, who was preaching in Italy when he wrote to Timothy, to Philemon, and to the Hebrews ought to have written in Latin and not Greek or Hebrew.

The fourth argument. Jude relates the story of the dispute between the Archangel Michael and the Devil about the body of Moses, and a certain prophecy of Enoch. But neither of these is read in approved Scripture. Therefore this epistle is to be numbered among the apocryphal books. I reply that although Tertullian maintains in his book on *Female Habit* that the book of *Enoch* is canonical, and Bede on this epistle says that in the time of Jude a true and canonical book of *Enoch* was in the hands of men, although now it is not extant, yet it seems more probable that the book is apocryphal. Besides, as Jerome on *Titus* ch.1 and Augustine on the *City of God* bk.15 ch.23 and bk.18 ch.38 say that even in apocryphal books there can be something of the truth, and that Jude put it forward, yet not for this reason did they approve the whole book; just as even Paul in *Acts* ch.17, *I Corinthians* ch.15 and *Titus* ch.1 produces evidence from national poets, from Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, yet not for this reason did he consecrate those poets.

But Jude, says Cajetan, quotes the book of *Enoch* not as apocryphal but as prophetic. I reply with Augustine *ibid.* that we must without any doubt believe that Enoch wrote something prophetic and divine, and that his prophecy was inserted in the book which Jude cites, but that that book is for this reason apocryphal because it contains many uncertain and fabulous things along with this true prophecy that Jude cites.

Against the second epistle of *Peter* there is only objected the diversity of its style from the first epistle, which it is certainly clear is Peter's; this objection is from Erasmus from whom the Magdeburgians not a little dissent, since they write that the style of this epistle seems very similar to the style of the first epistle. Blessed Jerome replies, question 11 to Hedibias, that the diversity of style, if there is any, arises from diversity of translator. For Peter did not always use one and the same translator.

Against the second and third epistles of *John* they only object the authority of Papias in Eusebius *History* bk.3 ch.39, and in Jerome on the *Illustrious Men* on John. For Papias hands down that there were two Johns, one the Apostle and a second

who was called John the Elder; and since the author of these epistles names himself not an Apostle but an Elder, it seems very likely that these two very short epistles were written by John the Elder, not by John the Apostle. But this is too flimsy a conjecture to deserve to be opposed, not to say to be preferred to the authority of so many Councils, Pontiffs, and Fathers who attribute these epistles to the Apostle John; especially since Papias does not say that these epistles are not from John the Apostle (for he only says that there were two Johns, but is silent about which of them wrote the epistles), and John the Apostle could rightly be called Elder, because he lived beyond all the Apostles and reached an extreme old age. Further St. Jerome doubted so little of these epistles that when about to cite them in epist.85 to Evagrius he begins thus: "The Gospel trumpet sounds, the son of thunder, whom Jesus loved most, who drank the streams of doctrine from the breast of the Savior."

#### *Chapter Nineteen: On the Apocalypse*

The *Apocalypse* of John was rejected among ancient heretics by the Marcionists, on the evidence of Tertullian in bk.4 *Against Marcion*, and also by the Alogians and the Theodotians, on the evidence of Epiphanius *Heresy* 51 and 54. Among the new heretics Luther in his prologue says that he misses something in it, since the *Apocalypse* asserts that those will be blessed who keep the things written in the book, although no one knows what those things are. But in his older preface to the New Testament he says that he does not accept the *Apocalypse* as either a Prophetic or as an Apostolic book, but judges it to be like *Ezra* bk.4. Brentius and Kemnita in the places cited agree with Luther; but the Magdeburgians cent.1 bk.2 ch.4 col.56 abandon Luther for Calvin and along with him fight fiercely for the *Apocalypse* against the other Lutherans. Erasmus at the end of his notes on the *Apocalypse* anxiously raises various conjectures from which he proves that this book is not from the Apostle John.

Nor were there once lacking Catholics who doubted about the authority and author of this book. For a certain old author, Gaius, asserts that this book is from the heretic Cherinthus, as witnessed by Eusebius ch.7 ch.23 when he rejects this opinion of Gaius and asserts that the *Apocalypse* is divine and canonical; yet he adds a doubt whether it is from John the Apostle or the other John. Finally Blessed Jerome in his epistle to Dardanus testifies that the Greeks doubted of the *Apocalypse* against the common consent of the Latins in just the way that the Latins doubted of the epistle to the *Hebrews* against the common opinion of the Greeks.

However we can easily prove that the *Apocalypse* is the true offspring of the Apostle John and is an admirable and divine book. First from the Councils: for in the Council of Ancyra, 1200 years ago, in the final canon, it is cited under the name of John; in the Third of Carthage canon 47 and in the Council of Rome under Gelasius I it is numbered among the sacred and canonical books; again in the Fourth Council of Toledo canon 16, and in the sanctions of many Councils and Pontiffs, it is confirmed that the *Apocalypse* is from John the Apostle and is truly canonical and divine.

Next from the Greek and Latin Fathers the same thing can be proved. For Dionysius *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* ch.3 calls the *Apocalypse* a secret and mystical vision of the beloved disciple. Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, beyond the middle, says the *Apocalypse* is from John the Apostle and he honored it with a commentary,

as Divine Jerome witnesses in his book about *Illustrious Men* on John. Irenaeus bk.5 near the end asserts that the *Apocalypse* is from the Apostle John and was written near his own century at the end of the reign of Domitian; he also produced a commentary on it, as Jerome writes in his book on *Illustrious Men* on John. Theophilus of Antioch, Melito of Sardis, and Dionysius of Alexandria, most ancient and learned Greek bishops, accepted the *Apocalypse* as divinely written, on the evidence of Eusebius bk.4 chs.24, 26, and bk.7 ch.23. Clement of Alexandria *Pedagogy* bk.2 ch.12 cites the *Apocalypse*. Origen in *Homily 7* on *Joshua* and on the first *Psalms* attributes the *Apocalypse* to the Apostle John, as also Eusebius did in his *Chronicle* for the year 96. Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, Epiphanius *Heresy* 51 and 76, Chrysostom in *Homily 3* on *Psalms* 91, and Damascene bk.4 ch.18 acknowledge the *Apocalypse* to be sacred and John's. Wherefore the Greeks who, on the evidence of Jerome, did not accept the *Apocalypse*, must have been few and obscure.

The final proof is from the common consent of the Latins; for Tertullian bk.4 *Against Marcion* affirms that the *Apocalypse* is from John the Apostle. Cyprian in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom* chs.3, 8, 11, 12 everywhere cites the *Apocalypse* as he cites the rest of the divine Scriptures; which also Hilary did in his preface to the *Psalms*. Ambrose on *Psalms* 40 says that the *Apocalypse* is from John the Evangelist. Blessed Augustine in tract.36 on *John* says the *Apocalypse* is from the same John as wrote the Gospel, and in *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.8 reports it among the sacred and divine books, which also Innocent I did in epistle 3 to Exuperius, and Ruffinus in his exposition of the Creed, and Isidore *Etymologies* bk.6 ch.1. St. Jerome not only teaches in his epistle to Paulinus, on the *Study of the Scriptures*, that the *Apocalypse* is from John, but also in his epistle to Dardanus, about the *Land of Promise*, affirms the same opinion of all the Latins. Lastly Sulpicius *Sacred History* bk.2 says that the *Apocalypse* is stupidly or impiously rejected by some.

Now to the argument of Luther, who proves that the *Apocalypse* is not of equal authority with the other sacred books from the fact that in the first and last chapters of this book it is said, "Blessed is he who keeps the prophetic words of this book," although no one knows what this prophecy means. I reply that although there are many very obscure prophecies in this book, yet there are also very many most clear precepts for life, as about constancy in persecutions, and hating heretics, and about fleeing false prophets etc., and that the argument and aim of the whole book are not other than exhortations to us for perseverance and patience in time of persecutions. Which fact indeed is very clear and very open.

But let us see what also Erasmus asserts. He objects first that there are some authors who did not mention this book, as Dorotheus and Anastasius, and some who doubted whether it was of John the Apostle, as Dionysius and Eusebius. Second the fact that the author everywhere imposes his name by saying "I John, I John", and he says "therefore he is writing as it were a legal agreement not a book, since in other respects, when John is narrating rather modest things about himself, he never in the Gospel states his name". Lastly as to what is in the Greek codices, the title is not that of John the Apostle but of John the Theologian.

But these objections are very slight, since for the two authors who do not mention this book, and for the two who doubt of its author, we have cited four Councils and many Fathers who constantly attribute this book to John the Apostle.

And yet further Eusebius, whom Erasmus numbers among the doubters, openly declares in his *Chronicle* that he has no doubts at all about the author or the authority of this book. In the second objection we rightly miss the modesty of Erasmus, who dares to accuse the author of this book of audacity whom the whole Church has always venerated as sacrosanct. Nor is it true that 'I John' is so often repeated in this book, since it is found at most three times in the whole thing. But neither is it a new thing in Prophets for them often to repeat their own name; certainly Daniel says at least eight times 'I Daniel'. Lastly, that the author of the *Apocalypse* is called John the Theologian does not at all stand in the way of our opinion. For there is no other John who had the cognomen Theologian besides the Apostle and Evangelist John, and rightly. For, as Augustine notes in tract.36 on *John*, it is for this reason that John is compared to a flying eagle, while the other Evangelists are compared to animals that walk on the ground; because these others wrote of the humanity of Christ, but he especially of the divinity. Wherefore Dionysius the Areopagite in his epistle to John the Apostle salutes him as Theologian and Apostle; and Athanasius in his *Synopsis* and other ancient authors call him Theologian.

#### *Chapter Twenty: On Apocryphal Books*

Having explained the canon of the sacred books and having defended it, with the brevity suitable to intention of this work, from the arguments of the adversaries, there remains for us to say a little about those books that, although they have seemed canonical to some, are yet rightly and deservedly named not canonical but apocryphal.

So, the term 'Apocrypha' is Greek and signifies a thing that is concealed and hidden, since 'apocryptein' means to hide, and 'apocrypha' means a hiding place. Further, Ecclesiastical writers do not always use this name in the same way. For sometimes they call those Scriptures apocryphal of which it is not certain whether they are canonical and divine, although it is sufficiently clear that no errors are found in them. Thus Jerome in his *Galeatic Prologue* wants all the books that are not in the canon to be numbered among the apocryphal ones. But sometimes they call apocryphal the books that have errors admixed. Thus does Origen use the word in his *Homily 1* on the *Song of Songs*, and Jerome in his letter to Laeta, about the education of her daughter, and Augustine in *City of God* bk.15 ch.23. This meaning is followed by Gelasius in his decree on the Ecclesiastical books and he calls the books apocryphal that were produced by heretical authors, or certainly by suspect ones.

But as to what the gloss on the Holy Roman canon dist.15 says, that those books are called apocryphal whose author is unknown, this is not probable, for then many sacred books would be apocryphal, as the book of *Judges*, of *Ruth*, of *Job*, of *First Maccabees* and many others whose authors are unknown, which however is contrary to the Church's way of speaking. For whoever heard that a canonical book was apocryphal?

Several apocryphal books are enumerated by Gelasius, as is contained in Holy Roman canon 15, and by Innocent I epist.3, by Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, and by Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.25, but for the most part they are not extant. Those that are extant are these: the *Prayer of Manassas*, which is usually annexed to *Chronicles*, and

which for this reason we seem able to call apocryphal, or not certainly canonical, because it is not part of any sacred book nor placed by name in the canon by any Council, or Pontiff, or Father above cited; nor is it contained in the Hebrew or Greek edition but only in the Latin one. Apocryphal also is the *151<sup>st</sup> Psalm* of David, which Athanasius mentions in his *Synopsis* and it is found in the Greek Psalters. But I call this psalm apocryphal because the Council of Laodicea canon 59, and the Roman Council under Gelasius, and the Council of Trent sess.4, by name place 150 psalms in the canon.

Again there is an appendix to the book of *Job*, which is only contained in the Greek codices. For the Council of Trent sess.4 wanted only those books to be held as canonical that were contained in the Latin Vulgate edition. Besides Blessed Jerome in his *Questions on Genesis* showed that what is contained in that appendix, that Job was of the stock of Esau, is false, since he was of the stock of Hus, who was son of Nachor, brother of Abraham, as is said in *Genesis* ch.22. Add that the appendix rests for support most of all on ch.36 of the book of *Genesis*, where Jobab is numbered in the posterity of Esau; but the Hebrew name proper to Job is far other than the Hebrew name found in *Genesis* ch.36. Apocryphal too seem to be the short preface that is prefixed to the *Lamentations* of Jeremiah; for it is not in the Hebrew codices, nor in all the Latin ones, and it is not touched on by the expositors.

Nor should the book of Hermas, which is called the *Shepherd*, be reckoned any less apocryphal. For although Origen thought it was divinely inspired, bk.10 on the epistle to the *Romans*, and although testimony from the same book is brought forward by Tertullian, book on *Prayer*, by Irenaeus bk.4 ch.37, by Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.6, by Athanasius in his book on the *Decrees of the Synod of Nicea*, by Cassianus coll.3 ch.12, and although Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.3 judged the same book to be useful, as did Ruffinus on the *Creed* and Jerome in his book on *Ecclesiastical Writers* on Hermas; yet nevertheless it is not reported in the canon by any Synod, and Gelasius rejected it from the canon with expressive words in his decree on Ecclesiastical books; and Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, and the same Athanasius in his book on the *Decrees of the Synod of Nicea*, and Theodoret *Hist.* bk.1 ch.18 say that the Arians, who sought testimony from this book, sought testimonies from a non-canonical book.

Lastly are apocryphal the third and fourth books of *Maccabees*, and the third and fourth books of *Ezra*. And indeed about the fourth book of *Maccabees* the thing is plain, since it is only mentioned by name by Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, and he put it outside the canon. But the fourth book of *Ezra* is indeed cited by Ambrose in his book on the *Good of Death*, and in book two on *Luke*, and in epist.21 to Horatianus; yet without doubt it is not canonical, since it is reported in the canon by no Synod, and is not found either in Hebrew or in Greek, and finally it contains in ch.6 certain fables about the fish of Enoch and Leviathan, which the seas could not contain, and which are the foolishness of the Talmudist Rabbis. Therefore one has to wonder what came into the mind of Genebrard, in his *Chronology* p.90, that he should want this book too to belong to the canon.

But about the third book of *Maccabees* there is greater difficulty, since Clement in the *Canons of the Apostles* canon 84 reports in the canon three books of *Maccabees*. Nor is there less difficulty about the third book of *Ezra*; for there is in the

Greek codices a book which is called *First Ezra*, and the books that are called by us *First* and *Second Ezra* are called *Second Ezra* in Greek. Wherefore it is likely that the ancient Councils and Fathers, since they place in the canon two books of *Ezra*, understand all three under the name of two books. For they were following the *Septuagint* version, by which our three books are called the two books of *Ezra*. Add too that this third book of *Ezra* is cited by Athanasius in oration 3 *Against the Arians*, by Augustine *City of God* bk.18 ch.36, by Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.1, by the author of the incomplete work of the *Homily on Matthew*, and by St. Cyprian in his epistle to Pompeius.

As far as the first difficulty is concerned, it seems probable that the canon is not Clement's. For Pope Zepherinus, fifteenth from Peter, in epist.1 hands down that there were only 70 canons of the Apostles, or, as other codices say, 60. But Humbert in his book *Against Nicetas* only recognizes 50, while this canon is the 84<sup>th</sup>. And certainly Zepherinus knew better how many were the canons of the Apostles than any later authors. Wherefore not without cause did Gelasius in Holy Roman canon dist.15 put the *Canons of the Apostles* among the apocrypha, which he seems to have done because some of the books were corrupted or added by heretics. Nor is it an obstacle that in canon 2 of the canons called those of the Sixth Synod, 85 canons of the Apostles are approved; for those canons are not from the true Sixth Synod but from some other Council celebrated later, which the Supreme Pontiff Sergius, who was then seated [on the Roman see], not only did not approve but even rejected, as is clear in Bede in his book on the *Six Ages*, on Justinian.

Next in this canon 84 the canonical books are enumerated and some are omitted that are certainly canonical, as the books of *Ezra*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, the *Apocalypse*, which seems to be a thing of no little moment. For the Church, which existed after the Apostles, did not learn which books were canonical and which were not from anywhere else than from the tradition of the Apostles. Further, the fact that Clement very exactly held to the Apostolic traditions, since indeed he had lived a long time with the Apostles Peter and Paul, is testified to by Irenaeus bk.3 ch.3 and by Eusebius *Hist.* bk.5 ch.6; therefore the books that are not put by Clement in the canon seem absolutely not to be canonical. Therefore either the books of *Ezra*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, the *Apocalypse* are not canonical, or that decree is not Clement's. But as to what some say, that the *Apocalypse* was omitted by Clement because it had not yet been written at his time, they cannot prove this. For John wrote the *Apocalypse* at the end of the rule of Domitian, as Irenaeus teaches bk. 5 at the end; but Clement died in the third year of Trajan, as Jerome teaches in this book on *Illustrious Men*. Clement therefore could have seen the *Apocalypse*.

Next, is not the *Gospel of John* put in this canon 84? But that the *Apocalypse* was written before the *Gospel* is testified to by several very grave authors. Eusebius *Hist.* bk.5 ch.24 says, "They say that John, almost up to the last age of his life, preached, without anyone's Scripture, the Gospel evidence." Athanasius in his *Synopsis* says, "The *Gospel according to John* was preached by John the Beloved Apostle when he was an exile on the island of Patmos, and afterwards it was published by him at Ephesus." Epiphanius in *Heresy* 51, which is of the Alogi, writes in expressive words that the *Gospel* was published by John after he was 90 years old and after his return from Patmos.

Theophylact, Euthymius, Bede, and Rupert in the preface to their commentaries on *John* teach with common consent that the *Gospel of John* was written and published by John either in Patmos or after his return from Patmos. Nor is repugnant to this what Dionysius the Areopagite writes in his epistle to John living in exile; for Dionysius calls John the Sun of the Gospel and his Theology heavenly, not because of any writing which was then extant under the name of John, but because of John's divine and admirable preaching.

Besides in this same canon 84 are numbered among the sacred books not only the third of *Maccabees* but also two epistles of Clement and the *Apostolic Constitutions* of the same Clement; which books, however, the Church has never recognized as sacred. But if the canon truly were Clement's the Church could not, without great temerity, fail to receive those books, since Clement was Supreme Pontiff and either he himself composed the canons of the Apostles or, as is truer, committed to writing canons composed by the Apostles; but it is not lawful for the Church to refuse Apostolic or even Pontifical laws, save only those that, because they served the time rather than the truth of dogmas, are now certainly agreed to have been abrogated, as is the law about not eating blood and suffocated animals.

To the other difficulty I reply that although in the Greek codices the two books of *Ezra* are our three, yet not for this reason do the old Councils and the ancient Fathers, who put two books of *Ezra* in the canon, understand our three by the name of the two. For many of the ancients, as Melito, Epiphanius, Hilary, Jerome, Ruffinus, when expounding the books of the Old Testament, openly followed the Hebrews, not the Greeks, but the Hebrews do not have the third book of *Ezra*. Next, nothing from this third book is ever read in an Ecclesiastical service; which is an argument that already for a long time the book has not been held in the number of the sacred books. Further Gelasius in the Roman Council of seventy bishops puts only one book of *Ezra* in the canon. By which one book he without doubt understands our two, since, as Jerome testifies in his preface to *Ezra*, they were contained in one volume. Therefore Gelasius in expressive words rejected the first book that is found among the Greeks.

Finally, Jerome in his preface to *Ezra* openly indicates that the third and fourth books of *Ezra* are not only not possessed by the Hebrews but are not even contained in the *Septuagint*. Wherefore although certain Greek codices had three volumes of *Ezra* in two books, the more correct codices did not. Further the old Fathers sometimes use testimonies taken from this book, which we too do not confess to be a useless book, but they do it rarely and they never call it sacred and divine.



## Book Two: On the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latin Vulgate Editions

*Chapter One: It is Shown that the Hebrew Edition of Moses and the Prophets has never Perished.*

We discoursed in the previous book about the sacred books themselves, so as to vindicate their number and authority from the calumnies of the heretics. What follows is for us briefly to discourse of the various editions of the same books, that is, the Hebrew, the Chaldee, the Greek, the Latin, the German, the Gallic, and the like, which are called vulgates. For it would profit little to know the number of the divine books if we do not know to which among such various editions as are now extant we should attribute authority.

To begin then from the Hebrew edition, there are two things that come into question. One, whether the Scripture itself, which was put together by Moses and the Prophets, has come down to us. The second, whether the Scripture, which is contained in the Hebrew codices, has become so corrupted and disfigured by the perverse zeal of the Jews that it deserves no authority in the Church.

On the first question there is a twofold opinion. One is of those who teach that the whole of sacred Scripture perished at the time of the Babylonian captivity, when the city was overthrown and the temple burnt, and that it was then restored again by Ezra, the Holy Spirit suggesting and dictating to him everything as it had been before. So Basil seems to think in his epistle to Chilon: "This is the field where retreat was made and where Ezra brought forth, by command of God, all the divine books." So Basil. Some add to the same opinion Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, but they do not openly teach this.

This opinion seems to us improbable. For it rests on no other foundation than the witness of an apocryphal book, that is, of the fourth book of *Ezra*, in the fourteenth chapter, where it is written in expressive words that Ezra, inspired by the Holy Spirit for a whole forty days, dictated to fifteen men who, with supreme speed, received what was said by him and in this way the whole Scripture, which had plainly perished, was restored. But this book is not only apocryphal and never received by the Catholic Church, but is also in many places redolent of Jewish fables, and in this very fourteenth chapter it speaks no otherwise of certain occult and more perfect books than all the Talmudists do of their Cabala. Wherefore the testimony of this book rather takes faith away from this opinion than confers faith upon it; but nothing of this sort is gathered from the canonical books.

But as to what some say, that this is gathered from the second book of *Ezra* ch.8, it is so far from being true that the contrary may rather be collected therefrom. For thus we read: "The scribes said to Ezra that he should bring forward the book of the law of Moses. Therefore Ezra brought it forward etc." They did not say that he should again compose the book of the law, but that he should bring it forward, because they knew that it was still found. Besides, although the Scripture that was kept publicly was burned in the temple and perished, yet it is not incredible that there were also other examples, or at least certain parts of them, in the hands of private men, and especially in the hands of Ezekiel, Daniel, Jeremiah, Haggai,

Zachariah, Mardoeh, and Ezra himself, who were then living and who without doubt cared for the law of the Lord.

There is therefore a second opinion, that Ezra was indeed the restorer of the holy books, not by dictating them all again, but by collecting and arranging the Scriptures in one body, whose parts he had found in various places, and even by emending them if anything had been distorted by the negligence of the scribes, since the law was carelessly observed during the whole time of the captivity, for the Jews had neither temple nor tabernacle.

So do the most grave authors seem to have thought. For Chrysostom *Homily* 8 on the epistle to the *Hebrews* teaches that Ezra put it together again from the remains of the Scriptures. Hilary in his preface to the *Psalms* says that Ezra collected all the psalms and made one book out of them. Theodoret in his preface to the *Psalms* says that the old Scripture, which was corrupted in the time of the captivity, was restored by Ezra. Which same thing seems to me to have been indicated by Irenaeus bk.3 ch.25, by Tertullian in his book on the *Female Habit*, and by Clement in his first book of *Stromateis*. For they say that Ezra reviewed and restored all the books of the Old Testament, but they do not from memory add, nor do they make mention of, the story that is contained in the fourth book of *Ezra*.

Blessed Jerome in the *Galeatic Prologue* says that Ezra invented new Hebrew letters and the old ones indeed he left to the Samaritans but the new ones he handed over to the Jews, and they use them even now. For, as the same Jerome testifies on ch.9 of *Ezekiel*, the last letter of the ancient Hebrew alphabet was similar to the ‘T’ of the Greeks and carried the shape of a cross, since the end of the law is Christ crucified; but now the last letter of the alphabet seems to have no likeness to the cross. Therefore without doubt we have new letters. But about the new edition of the sacred books made by Ezra, Jerome says nothing, although however that was most especially the place to say it.

Lastly, if Ezra had dictated the sacred books again, it is very likely that he would have done it, not in the Hebrew tongue, but the Chaldaic, or one mixed of Hebrew and Chaldaic, which was then in us and in which we see that the books of *Ezra* and *Daniel* were written; and it is certain that the sacred books besides these of *Ezra* and *Daniel* were written in the Hebrew tongue, and the very tongue with which Adam and Eve and all the Patriarchs spoke. This is manifestly collected from the etymology of the proper names, which are often not found in any other tongue.

But to produce a few examples from many: Adam said of his wife just created, “she shall be called woman [using a certain Hebrew word], because she was taken from man” [using a similar Hebrew word], *Genesis* 2. But in no other tongue do ‘man’ and ‘woman’ have this likeness of name. For in the Chaldaic tongue, which is akin to Hebrew, man and woman are referred to by words that have no one letter in common. In like manner the Greek and Latin words for man and woman have no likeness of letters between them. Either then Adam did not say those words which we set down above, and he will be an exceptional liar among the Prophets, or let us confess that the divine books must needs have been written in the tongue that the

first humans used.<sup>1</sup> Similar are the things that are said in Scripture about the nature of the name of Esau, Cain, Abel, Seth, Noah, Phaleg, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and of all this sons, and also of mountains, rivers, cities, and many other things, since in the Hebrew tongue allusions of similar words are always found, but in the other languages either none or rarely.

Lastly that the Hebrew tongue, in which we see the sacred books to have been written, is very ancient and, what is more, the first of all tongues, is testified both by its brevity and simplicity and by the authority of the most learned men. See Eusebius *Praep. Evangel.* bk.10 ch.2, Ambrose on the third chapter of *Philippians*, Jerome in his epistle to Damasus on the vision of Isaiah, Augustine *City of God* bk.16 ch.11. Nor is it repugnant to these things that Augustine *City of God* bk.16 last chapter says that the Hebrew tongue was invented after the times of Noah. For Augustine did not wish to indicate that the language did not exist before, but that it only then first begin to be called the Hebrew tongue. For, as Eucherius rightly explains on *Genesis* ch.11, before the division of languages the Hebrew tongue was common to all men, and therefore it did not have a definite name. But at the time of Heber, since many tongues had begun to exist, the common tongue, to distinguish it from the others, was called Hebrew because it remained in the house of Heber from whom Hebrews are called.

Since therefore it is plain that the books of *Ezra* are full of Chaldaic words, but the books of the law and the Prophets are written in the pure Hebrew idiom, it should also seem plain that the books of the law and the Prophets that we have were not written down by Ezra but by Moses and the ancient Prophets.

#### *Chapter Two: Whether the Hebrew Edition has been Corrupted*

Now follows the second question, whether the Hebrew edition is complete or has been corrupted and vitiated. And first the heretics of this age, from hatred of the Vulgate edition, attribute too much to the Hebrew edition. For Calvin in his *Antidote* to the Council of Trent, and Chemnitz in his *Examination* of the same Council, and George Major in his preface to the *Psalms*, wanted to test and emend everything by reference to the Hebrew text, which they not seldom call the most pure source.

This opinion is very plainly false. For in the first place Calvin in his *Institutes* ch.6 sect.11 contends that in *Isaiah* ch.9 one should read “and he will be called wonderful etc.”, but the Hebrew text now does not have “he will be called” but “he will call,” nor was Calvin ignorant that the Vulgate edition is in this place better than the Hebrew. For thus he speaks: “Nor may the Jews bark at this and so invert the reading: ‘this is the name that God, strong, father of the coming age, will call him’, and then this only do they leave to the son, that he should be ‘prince of peace’; for why should so many epithets be in this place heaped upon God?” Therefore by the confession of Calvin the source, which he himself wanted to seem everywhere to be pure, flows in places with muddy turbulence. For the same reason Calvin in the same place wants *Jeremiah* 23 to be read, “and this is the name they will call him, the

---

<sup>1</sup> This argument does not seem very convincing, since Adam could have spoken another language where the several words were similar, as indeed ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are in English.

Lord our justice.” But the Hebrew source has “he will call him” and not “they will call him.”

Further in *Psalms* 22 there is no Christian who does not read, “they pierced my hands and my feet,” but the Hebrew texts read, “as a lion” and not “they pierced”. Again in *Psalms* 18 the Hebrew codices read “their line (or their perpendicular) has gone out through all the earth,” although however the *Septuagint* translates “their voice has gone out...”, and this version Blessed Paul has approved of when in *Romans* ch.10 he cites this psalm. What of the fact that Jerome renders the letters: “their sound has gone out”? So that it is altogether necessary either to blame Paul and Jerome or at least to confess that the source in this place is not pure. But it is likely that a different Hebrew word should be read, for with only one letter added the word changes from this noun to that. Add that sometimes whole sentences are lacking in the Hebrew, although they are not lacking in the *Septuagint* nor in Jerome’s translation. We have an example in Exodus ch.2 where this whole sentence is lacking: “He begot also another son, and called his name Eliazer, saying, ‘the God of my father is my help’, and ‘he has freed me from the hand of Pharaoh’.”

Passing over these authors then, who falsely attribute too much purity to the Hebrew source, it seems we must also confront others who, with a zeal indeed good, but I do not know whether according to knowledge, claim that the Jews, through hatred of the Christian faith, have deliberately distorted and corrupted many places of Scripture. So teach Jacob, Bishop of Chirstopolitanus, in his preface to the *Psalms*, and Canus bk.2 ch.13 on *Theological Places*.

But very weighty arguments conflict with this opinion. First is Origen on *Isaiah* ch.8, as Jerome reports on *Isaiah* ch.6, and Jerome himself in the same place, who argue in this way: If the Hebrews sometimes corrupted the Scriptures, either they did it before the advent of Christ or afterwards. If before, why do Christ and the Apostles never reprove them for so signal a crime, especially since they were not silent about lesser ones. Wherefore the Lord says in *John* 5: “you search the Scriptures,” and *Matthew* 23: “The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat, therefore whatever they say to you, that keep and do;” who will find it credible that Christ invited men, without any warning, to read corrupted Scriptures? Or that he sent them off to hear and follow corrupters? But if the corruption happened after the coming of Christ, how is it that the testimonies that are cited by Christ and the Apostles are almost all found now in Moses and the Prophets as Christ and the Apostles cited them? Would they perhaps thus have quoted them when they knew by the Spirit that they were soon to be distorted by the Jews? Therefore if neither before nor after the coming of the Savior the sacred letters were vitiated by the Hebrews, it certainly follows that they were never vitiated. And this is the argument of Jerome and Origen.

A second argument is from St. Augustine in *City of God* bk.15 ch.13, who proves it from this, that it does not seem in any way credible that the Jews wanted to rip the truth from their own codices so as to take away authority from us, and, even if they had wanted to, it is not likely they could have done it. But let us hear his own words: “If I ask,” he says, “which is more credible, that the nation of the Jews, diffused so far and wide, were able with one counsel to conspire in writing down this lie, and, while they envied authority in others, took truth away from themselves;

or that seventy men [sc. the *Septuagint*], who were even themselves Jews, located in one place, begrudged the truth itself to foreign nations and then did it by common counsel? Who does not see which is more readily, more easily believed? But far be it that any prudent man believe either that the Jews were capable of so much perversity and malice in codices so many and so far and wide dispersed, or that those seventy remarkable men could have communicated this one counsel to each other about begrudging truth to the Gentiles." So Augustine.

Someone will say that this corruption of the Hebrew codices happened after the times of Augustine and Jerome; therefore their testimony makes little for the present point. But Augustine's reasons have place at all times. Next, if the corruption took place after the time of those Fathers, what reason can be given that Jerome's translation of the *Psalms* so agrees in everything with the Hebrew text now extant? And yet the chief complaint is about the corruption of the *Psalms*. Surely Jerome did not translate them the way the Jews were going to falsify them? Nor in conflict with this is the place in *Psalms* 22 where Jerome translates "they pierced." For in the Masoretic text, which the Rabbis wrote after the time of Jerome, they advise that in *Psalms* 22 "they pierced" should be written and not "as a lion", whence is evidently collected that "as a lion" is now read by error of the scribes.

A third argument can be taken from the incredible reverence of the Jews toward the sacred books. Philo writes in his book about the *Departure of the Children of Israel* from Egypt, and it is also cited by Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* bk.8 ch.2, that up to his own times for a space of more than 2,000 years not even a word was ever changed in the law of the Hebrews, and that any Jew would rather die 100 times than let the law be changed in any respect. But as to the superstition of more recent Jews, who adore the law almost as a divine spirit, and if ever it falls on the ground decree a public fast, see John Isaac in his response to the books of Lindanus on the best sort of interpretation of the Scriptures.

A fourth argument: if the Jews had wanted to falsify the divine Scriptures in hatred of Christians, without doubt they would have taken away the chief prophecies. But that they did not do at all; since the things in which the Hebrew differs from the Greek and Latin are often of no moment as far as faith and religion are concerned, and often the Hebrew codices vex the Jews more than do the Greek and Latin ones. Certainly in the second *Psalms* the Latin and Greek have: "Learn discipline, lest the Lord be angry," from which nothing openly against the Jews can be deduced; but in the Hebrew it is: "kiss the Son, lest he be angry," that is, show reverence to the Son of God, lest he himself be angry, and this place is most invincible against the Jews. Will it therefore be credible that the Jews changed Scripture so it might more clearly give testimony to the Son of God? Again in *Isaiah* 53 where we have: "And we thought him as one leprous, and smitten by God, and humbled," in the Hebrew can be read "and a God smitten, and humbled," which certainly gives much trouble to the Jews who do not believe that Christ will be God.

A fifth and final argument is taken from the providence by which God has always cared for his Church. For it is not likely that God would have allowed that the words of so many illustrious Prophets should be generally falsified, especially since he dispersed the Jews through the whole earth, and wished them to carry about the books of the law and the Prophets, for this end, that our enemies should provide

witness to Christian truth. Justin noted this fact in his speech of exhortation, and St. Augustine in his *City of God* bk.18 ch.46, and from *Psalms* 58 is manifestly deduced: "Do not kill them, lest ever my people forget; scatter them in your strength etc." For that is why the Jews were dispersed carrying round the Sacred Books, so that when the Pagans do not believe what we say was predicted about Christ but say that prophecies of this sort were made up by us, we may send them to our enemies the Jews, who carry the prophecies with them.

But there are objections to the contrary. First are the testimonies of the Fathers, as of Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, of Eusebius in *Hist.* bk.4 ch.18, of Origen in *Homily 12 on Jeremiah*, of Chrysostom in *Homily 5 on Matthew*, and of Jerome in epist.89 to Augustine on *Micah* ch.5 and on *Galatians* ch.3, who suspect that the Jews erased certain things from the Hebrew codices and certain things corrupted in hatred of the Christians.

I reply that Justin and Eusebius never wrote that the Hebrew text was corrupted by the Hebrews, but that the Greek text of the *Septuagint* was. These are the words of Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*: "And I wish you to know," he says, "that they took away many and whole places from the translation made by those old men who were with Ptolemy, in which places is clearly shown that he himself the crucified one is God and man and that it was foretold he would hang on a cross and die." Thus Justin. Nor does he ever anywhere write anything about the corruption of the Hebrew text. But Eusebius says nothing other than that Trypho was convicted by Justin that his ancestors took away many chapters from the Scriptures. And this is not to be otherwise understood than as Justin himself expounded in his own words.

Origen also openly speaks of the corruption of the *Septuagint* version; for he says that the Jews took away from the *Septuagint* version the word 'Judah' in that verse of *Jeremiah* ch.17: "the sin of Judah is written with an iron pen," and put in its place, "the sin of them is written with an iron pen." For thus does Origen speak: "Then follows another prophecy which, not finding – I do not know why – in the *Septuagint*, I found in the remaining versions that agree with what the Hebrew says." And later: "The Jews, who have falsified some of the exemplars, also in this place produce, instead of the 'sin of Judah', 'the sin of them'." Which corruption Jerome also makes mention of on this place of *Jeremiah*.

Further, Chrysostom speaks of the Jewish translators, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, who in their translations from Hebrew to Greek produced many things falsely in hatred of the Christian faith and in censure of the *Septuagint*. About which Blessed Jerome speaks in his epistle to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine, where he says that he wanted to translate the divine books from Hebrew so as to restore what the Jews had left out or corrupted. Now the same Jerome in the commentaries cited doubts and does not assert, but in his commentary on *Isaiah*, which he wrote later, as is plain from the preface to his commentary on *Isaiah* and from the last book about *Illustrious Men*, he openly mocks those who think that the Hebrew codices are false.

Second the objection is made that by the confession of the Jews, which they openly assert, many things have been changed in the sacred books by certain of their wise men; and those changes they call the correction of the Scribes.

I reply in two ways. First, perhaps it is not true that any edition of the Bible was made by the Scribes. For the origin of this opinion is the *Talmud*, which is a book very full of fables. Wherefore neither Epiphanius nor Jerome, who are older than the *Talmud*, ever make mention of this *Tikkun Sophrim*.

I add next that, if the *Tikkun Sophrim* is not a fable, it is not a corruption but a true emendation, not made by any of the Scribes but by Ezra and the other holy Prophets who, after the return from captivity, restored the sacred books and who, as the Jews relate, celebrated the Council which they themselves call the Great Synagogue, because great men were present at it; and in that Council they restored to their integrity the sacred books that had been dispersed and distorted in the time of the captivity. Certainly in our Vulgate edition those places are contained in the way the Scribes are said to have corrected them; and Blessed Jerome in his commentaries on the Prophets indicates that he read those places in the same way.

They say that in *Genesis* ch.18, where we now have, "Abraham was still standing in the presence of the Lord," there was once, "the Lord was still standing in the presence of Abraham," but that the place was changed by the Scribes. But the Vulgate edition retains the former reading. Again *Numbers* ch.11, where we now have, "may I find grace in your eyes, and may I not see my evil," they say is a correction of the Scribes, and that beforehand it read, "may I not see your evil." However, the Vulgate edition reads in the former way.

They say besides that in *Hosea* ch.9 there was once "in my flesh from them;" but the Scribes corrected it to "when I will go back from them." But the Vulgate edition has "when I will go back from them;" and thus did even Blessed Jerome read. Again they say that *Habbakuk* ch.1 was before: "Surely from the beginning Lord my God, my holy one, thou shalt not die?" But the Scribes corrected it to "we shall not die." But the Vulgate edition reads this in the last way, and Blessed Jerome too read it thus. They say also that *Malachi* ch.1 was, "And they have blown me out," but the Scribes corrected it to, "And you have blown it out." But certainly the Vulgate edition, along with Jerome and the *Septuagint* does not have 'me' but 'it' or 'them'. I say the same about the other corrections of the Scribes that are collected by Procherus in his first book on *Victory against the Jews*, and Figuerola Valentinus in ch.3 of the first part of his book *Against the Jews*.

From this is apparent that certain people, when they believe they are attacking the Hebrews, are impudently attacking the Church itself. For if those corrections of the Scribes are corruptions of the Hebrew text, then it follows openly that the Vulgate edition too is most corrupt, which edition, however, the Church has handed down to us as an authentic version.

Third they object that in *Psalms* 13 eight lines are missing in all the printed Hebrew codices, namely the following:

"Their mouth is an open sepulcher,  
 With their tongues they act deceitfully.  
 The poison of asps is under their tongues.  
 Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.  
 Their feet are swift to shed blood.  
 And they have not known the way of peace.  
 There is no fear of God before their eyes."

These lines, however, are cited by the Apostle in *Romans* ch.3, and are contained in the *Septuagint*. But this does not seem to have been capable of being done by the negligence of the writers, but from the pure malice of the Jews, who took these lines away from the Hebrew to show that our Apostle did not faithfully put forward the testimony of the *Psalm*.

Blessed Jerome responds to this objection, which had once been made by himself, in his preface to bk.16 on *Isaiah*, that these lines do not pertain properly to *Psalm* 13 but are cited by the Apostle from various places of Scripture; then they were transferred into the *Psalter* by one of the other Apostles. For the first and second lines are found in *Psalm* 5, the third in *Psalm* 139, the fourth in *Psalm* 9, the fifth, sixth, and seventh are found in *Isaiah* ch.59, the last one in *Psalm* 35. And in the same place Jerome adds that these lines are not in the *Septuagint* nor has any Greek author wished to expound them in his commentaries. Origen also in his commentaries on *Romans* ch.3 says that the Apostle took these lines from various parts of Scripture. By which words he manifestly indicates that these lines are not found in the Hebrew text or in the *Septuagint*.

But they make objection and prove that these lines were once in the Hebrew, because now they are found in a certain very ancient English codex. I reply that those lines of the English codes are manifestly additions. For neither are all the words Hebrew, as the word for 'fate', nor even is the phrasing, especially in the line "their mouth is deceit, and bitterness has filled it." For the Hebrews are not wont to place the verb at the end. See many things about this matter in the book of notes on various readings of the Vulgate edition by Francisco Luca of Bruges.

You will say that if things are so why does the Church allow these lines to be in the Vulgate edition? Surely for this cause, that they are also themselves certain parts of sacred Scripture, and that they could not be removed without disturbance and scandal for the people, since they have been there for a long time, just as too the Church allows some errors of typography.

Finally Canus objects that it is evident the divine codices have been corrupted by the Hebrews because *Genesis* ch.8 in Hebrew reads: "the raven departed and returned," while in the Vulgate edition and the *Septuagint* and all the Fathers read, "did not return." I reply that this is not read in the Hebrew but that the raven went out in going and returning until the waters dried up, which does not signify that the raven returned to the Ark, but that it flew around the Ark going and returning as birds are wont to do, and perhaps also by returning to the roof of the Ark and then departing, and doing so often until the waters dried up; with which well coheres that it departed and did not return, namely within the Ark. Add that there are also not lacking Latin codices that have that it departed and returned, as can be learnt from various readings in the notes to the Louvain Bible.

So, with these two opinions refuted, the third remains, which I think to be most true, and it is from Driedo in bk.2 of *Ecclesiastical Dogmas and Scriptures* ch.1 and from others who teach that the Hebrew Scriptures have not been wholly distorted by the industry or malice of the Jews; nor yet are they altogether whole and pure but have some errors that have crept in partly through the negligence or ignorance of the copyists, especially since in Hebrew it is easy to go wrong because of certain letters that are very similar; partly too by the ignorance of the Rabbis who



added the pointings. For since Hebrew words could be read in various ways if they lack pointings, it is not remarkable if sometimes they themselves also in marking the pointings erred from the truth. It can also happen that from corrupt feeling and hatred for Christ the reading sometimes was more approved by them which favored Christians less.

Besides, these sorts of errors are not of so great moment that in what pertains to faith and good morals the integrity of the sacred Scripture is deficient. For to a great extent the discrepancy in the various readings is found in certain words that do not much or at all change the sense. But the errors that happen from the addition of pointings, do not at all damage the truth; for the pointings are extrinsic additions and do not change the text. Therefore we can, if we wish, remove the pointings and read differently.

### *Chapter Three: On the Chaldee Edition*

In the Chaldee tongue were edited the books of *Tobit* and *Judith*, and in part the books of *Ezra* and *Daniel*. Further, the whole of ancient Scripture was translated from Hebrew into a Chaldee paraphrase, which paraphrase the Hebrews call the Targum. And in fact Rabbi Aquila is said to have translated the *Pentateuch* which in Chaldee is called *Onkelus*. The earlier and later Prophets, that is, *Joshua*, *Judges*, and the books of *Kings*, also *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* and the other Prophets were translated by Rabbi Jonathan son of Uziel, and *Psalms*, *Job*, *Ruth*, *Esther* and the works of Solomon by Rabbi Joseph the blind.

These paraphrastic translations are of great authority among the Hebrews, and for that reason are useful also for us, so that from them we may convict the Hebrews. In other respects they are not made much of by the Church, nor can a firm argument be drawn from them. Since (as Francis Cardinal Ximenes says in his preface to the *Complutensian Bible*) the Chaldee paraphrases, with the exception of the one on the *Pentateuch*, are sprinkled with Jewish fables and the nonsense of Talmudists. That this is very true anyone will prove by experience who wants to read the paraphrase on *Lamentations*, the *Song of Songs*, *Job*, *Psalms*, and all the Prophets.

Certainly the whole of *Isaiah* ch.53, where the Prophet very openly prophesies the passion of Christ, is twisted by the paraphrase into the calamities of the people of the Jews. But in the paraphrase on *Song of Songs* and *Lamentations* there are everywhere read books of the *Talmud*, the third temple, two Messiahs, liberation from the captivity of Titus and Vespasian, threats against the Christians and Mohammedans, whom the Hebrews signify, in their accustomed fashion, by the names of Esau and Ishmael. Finally there are very many fables about the lamentation of God, about the ascension of Moses to heaven, about the tables of the law cut from the sapphire of the divine throne, and about other things of the same sort. But neither should the paraphrase of Aquila on the *Pentateuch* be reckoned wholly complete and uncorrupted. For it too has its errors, although fewer and slighter than the other paraphrases of Jonathan and Joseph have.

And to put forward something by way of example from the individual books: in *Genesis* ch.4 v.23, where the Hebrew text has "because I have killed a man", the Greek and Latin texts agree with it; but the Chaldee paraphrase adds a negation, "I

have not killed a man,” and produces a contrary sense. Again in *Genesis* ch.22 v.18 and ch.26 v.4 and ch.28 v.14 the Hebrew text has, “All the nations of the earth will be blessed in your seed,” and the Greek and Latin texts agree. The Apostle Paul in *Galatians* ch.3 bids one notice that the promises were made to Abraham and to his seed, and that it is not said “and to his seeds” as to many but as to one, “and to your seed, which is Christ.” But the Chaldee paraphrase in all these places makes the number plural, “all the peoples of the earth will be blessed because of your sons.”

In *Exodus* ch.12 v.44, where we read in the Hebrew text, “No son of a foreign nation shall eat of it,” and where the Greek and Latin texts agree, the Chaldee paraphrase put, in hatred of the Neophytes, “No destroyed son of Israel”, for thus do the Jews call those who, abandoning Judaism, convert to the Christian faith.

In *Leviticus* ch.10 v.6 and ch.21 v.10, where the Hebrew text has “You shall not shave or make bare your heads,” and the Greek and Latin texts too, the Chaldee paraphrase rendered the contrary, “you shall not multiply the hair of your head.”

In *Numbers* ch.21 v.19 there is put a fable about a well, which the Hebrews imagined they descended with the sons of Israel down to torrents, and from the torrents ascended with them to the hills, and from the hills again descended to the valleys; and in ch.18 v.9 where the Hebrew text has, “The people alone will inhabit it,” that is, they will not mix with other nations, the Chaldee paraphrase rendered it, in the Jewish manner, “Behold only the people will possess the age,” for they expect that they alone will dominate in the world.

Finally in *Deuteronomy* ch.4 v.28 and ch.28 v.64, where the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Scripture predict that the Hebrews will serve foreign Gods, which prediction we also know was often fulfilled, the Chaldee paraphrase diverts this crime from the Hebrews to the Gentiles. For it translates, “You will serve the peoples who serve idols.”

Now a few things must be added about the Syriac edition.

#### *Chapter Four: On the Syriac Edition*

On the Syriac edition three things need to be said. First what the difference is between the Syriac and Chaldee tongues. Next, which Sacred Books are possessed in the Syriac tongue. Lastly, how much authority this edition has.

As regards the first point, the Syriac tongue is a sort of offspring of the Hebrew and Chaldee tongues. The Hebrews, indeed, who up to the Babylonian captivity were accustomed only to speak Hebrew, that is, their own tongue, began, when they were in Babylon, to forget their own tongue and to learn a foreign one, that is, the Chaldee; but because they were not able to pronounce it perfectly and always retained something from Hebrew, the result was that a certain third tongue was born, mixed of Hebrew and Chaldee, and this is the one the Hebrews thereafter had for their common and mother tongue.

But it is called Syriac from the region where it was most in vigor, or Jerusalemic, from the chief city of the Hebrews, just as the Chaldee tongue, which gets this name from the region of Chaldea, is also called Babylonian, from the most noble city of Chaldea. Further, these two languages are distinguished by their characters, their verb conjugations, their affixes, the notation of the pointings, the

sound of the vowels, the idioms, and in almost the whole structure of the language, and also in many particular words.

But as to the second point, first it is certain that no book of the Old Testament was written by its first author in this tongue, save perhaps the first book of *Maccabees* and *Ecclesiasticus*, the first of which Jerome writes in the *Galeatic Prologue* that he saw in Hebrew, and he writes the same about the second in his prologue to *Proverbs*. For it is credible that these books were written in the vulgar tongue of the Hebrews, that is, in Syriac, although these books are not extant at the present time save in Greek. About the remaining books it is clear that they were written by their first authors either in Hebrew or Chaldee or Greek.

About the New Testament there is greater doubt. It is indeed very probable that the *Gospel of St. Matthew* and the epistle of St. Paul to the *Hebrews* were written in the Syriac tongue; for it is proved with very effective arguments by Albert Widmestadius, Chancellor to the Emperor Ferdinand, who was the first in Europe to see to the printing of the Syriac New Testament; and also by Guido Fabricius, whose Latin translation of the Syriac New Testament is in the royal Bibles.

Nor are in conflict with this the ancient writers, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, who say that these books, and especially the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, were written in Hebrew; for they are speaking of the Hebrew tongue that was common at the time of the Apostles, just as everywhere in the Gospel itself we read something said in Hebrew, which however it is clear was said in the common tongue, that is, Syriac, as is that verse of *John* ch.19: "He went out to the place called Calvary, or in Hebrew Golgotha." On which words see St. Jerome in his book on *Hebrew Names*, where he has carefully noted all the words that are Syriac, although however they are called Hebraic by the Evangelists. In addition to these two books, the whole New Testament was translated from Greek to Syriac by St. Mark the Evangelist (as the Syrians themselves think).

If this is true, there would be no reason to doubt of the authority of this edition (to come now to the last chapter). But I cannot easily be induced to believe that the Syriac edition of the whole New Testament was handed over by St. Mark to the Churches of Syria and Egypt; and altogether no mention of the edition is extant in Clement of Alexandria, in Origen, in Eusebius, Athanasius, Theophilus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, and other Fathers who were either bishops or priests in Syria or in Egypt, and who either disputed accurately of the various editions of the Scriptures, or certainly left many writings about the Holy Scriptures to posterity.

But if the Syriac edition is posterior to the time of these Fathers, as I indeed am certainly persuaded, its authority cannot be so great that it can rightly be compared with the Greek and Latin editions, to pass over for the time being that there are also not lacking certain things in this edition that do not much please learned and pious men. There is, however, one signal advantage among others in this edition that, since in its titles and chapter sections mention is made of fasts, veneration of the cross, prayers for the dead, vigils, memorials of the saints, and other things of this sort, which the Lutherans detest as the traditions of the Roman Pontiff, this edition itself very openly convicts the Lutherans of a lie. But about the

Chaldee and Syriac editions sufficiently much has been said for the brevity of the intention of this work. Now let us come to the Greek edition.

*Chapter Five: On the Various Greek Editions*

Nine editions altogether are numbered of the Greek New Testament, in addition to the one mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* bk.1, which was produced, it is unclear by which author, before Alexander the Great got possession of affairs, and from which Plato and other philosophers imbibed not a little; but since this edition, when the very celebrated *Septuagint* translation afterwards succeeded to it, began first to be neglected and then also to be lost, the result was that now for a long time scarcely the memory of it has been preserved.

The first of all Greek translations that is wont to be counted by writers is the one that was edited by the Seventy elders [sc. the *Septuagint*] by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, of which we will say much in the next chapter. See Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.13, Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, and Epiphanius in his book on *Measures and Weights*, who review the translations in order.

The second translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew to Greek was made by Aquila of Pontus, in the twelfth year of the Emperor Hadrian, as Epiphanius says in the place noted. But Aquila was first a Gentile, then a Christian, then, after being expelled from the Church because he devoted himself to judicial Astrology, betook himself to the Jews, and, since he translated the Scriptures in this last period, he is believed not to have behaved with good faith in the work.

The third translation was made while Commodus was Emperor by Theodotion; which author, although he became a proselyte of the Jews from being a Marcionist heretic, yet, on the evidence of Epiphanius, was more faithful in his translation than others like him. Wherefore the Church always reads *Daniel* from the translation of Theodotion, as Jerome testifies in his preface to *Daniel*.

The fourth is the edition of Symmachus who in the time of Severus Augustus translated the Sacred Books from Hebrew to Greek. But I do not know by what error it has happened that, although Athanasius and Epiphanius in expressive words write that Symmachus did his translation under Severus and Theodotion under Commodus, son of Marcus Aurelius, and although there is no doubt but that Commodus preceded Severus, yet the same authors make Symmachus first and Theodotion second.

But as far as Symmachus is concerned, he was first an Ebionite, if we believe Eusebius, or a Samaritan, if we follow Athanasius and Epiphanius; and since he could not obtain the primacy among his own people he joined himself to the Jews and was circumcised a second time. Where Epiphanius advises by the by that it is not remarkable that Symmachus could be circumcised twice, since by the medical art and by certain instruments the Jews were accustomed again to superinduce or to draw down a remade foreskin; and this is what the Apostle says in I *Corinthians* ch.7: "He who is called being circumcised let him not pull down the foreskin," or, as the Greek words more clearly indicate, "let not his foreskin be drawn down."

The fifth edition was found, without name of author, in certain wine jars in the city of Jericho, as Epiphanius says in the place noted, in the seventh year of Antoninus Caracalla, who succeeded his father Severus in the Empire.

The sixth edition is also without name of author, and on the evidence of Epiphanius was found contained in wine jars at Nicepolis by Alexander, reigning son of Mameas.

From all these editions Origen, as Eusebius reports *Hist.* bk.6 ch.13 and Epiphanius *Heresy* 63 and book on *Measures and Weights*, composed what is called the *Hexapla*, or the *Tetrapla*, or even the *Octapla*. For Origen first divided the page into six columns, and on the first he wrote the Hebrew text in Hebrew letters, in the second the same Hebrew text in Greek letters, in the third the translation of Aquila, in the fourth the translation of Symmachus, in the fifth the Septuagint, in the sixth the translation of Theodotion. And these volumes are called *Tetrapla* because of the four translations, and *Hexapla* because of the six columns. He next added the fifth and sixth translations in two other columns, and those volumes are called the *Octapla*.

The seventh edition is that of Origen, who did not indeed translate the Scriptures from Hebrew, but so emended the translation of the *Septuagint*, with many things mixed in from Theodotion and notes marked with the sign of a radiant star, many too with an obelisk, that is, yoked with a spear, that he seems to have made a new edition. This edition was so approved at that time that it quickly filled all the libraries, as St. Jerome writes in epist.89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine. The same Jerome writes in the preface to bk.16 on *Isaiah*, that the same edition was also accustomed to be called common.

The eighth edition is of Lucian the priest and martyr, who since he knew that in the above numbered editions many faults had crept in, again with great labor constructed a new edition. Which edition, Athanasius writes, was in the time of the Emperor Constantinus found at Nicomedia written out in the martyr's own hands and preserved in a certain wall. Now St. Lucian suffered in the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian, while Maximian was exercising tyranny in the East, as the same Athanasius briefly indicates in his *Synopsis* and as Eusebius more fully narrates in *Hist.* bk.9 ch.6.

Ninth and last is the edition of Hesychius, who again emended the translation of the *Septuagint*, and gave it to the Churches in Egypt. About these editions St. Jerome writes in the following way in his preface to *Chronicles*: "Alexandria and Egypt in their *Septuagints* praise Hesychius as author. Constantinople up to Antioch approve the exemplars of the martyr Lucian. The province of Media among these reads the Palestinian codices, which were worked on by Origen and were made popular by Eusebius and Pamphilus."

#### *Chapter Six: On the Septuagint*

On the *Septuagint* translation, which among all the Greek editions has always rightly held the first place, there exist five questions. First, at what time it was made. Second, of which books it is. Third, how it was made. Fourth, of what authority it is. Fifth, whether at this time we have the true *Septuagint* version.

The first question is easy. For although Irenaeus bk.3 ch.25 and Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.1 write that it was made while Ptolemy son of Lagus was reigning, yet Aristaeus in his *History* about this very thing, Josephus in *Antiquities* bk.12 ch.2, Philo in his *Life of Moses* bk.2, Tertullian in his *Apologeticus* ch.18,

Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, Epiphanius on *Measures and Weights*, and all other writers name Ptolemy Philadelphus; however the interval is not so great since the later Ptolemy was the immediate successor of the former.

But this latter opinion is much more probable than the former, because it has both more and more ancient witnesses. Moreover Epiphanius took care to note not only the time of the king but also the year of the reign. For he writes that the translation was made in the 17<sup>th</sup> year of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that from that time up to the birth of Christ 291 years flowed by. Therefore the translation was made within so many years before the advent of Christ, and not without the divine counsel. For as Eusebius writes in *Praep. Evang.* bk.8 ch.1, if it had had to happen after the advent of Christ, the Jews would either from envy have hidden it, or would have given it to us more corrupted, or certainly have easily called the translators into suspicion.

The second question is a little more difficult. For Blessed Jerome in his *Hebrew Questions* and on *Ezekiel* ch.5 and on *Micah* ch.2 seems to incline to the opinion that the Seventy only translated the *Pentateuch*; and he proves this from Aristaeus in his book on the *Seventy Two Translators* and from Josephus in the preface and in bk.2 ch.12 of *Antiquities*; to whom add Philo *Life of Moses* bk.2, all of whom make mention of the law alone. But that they translated everything is written by Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, by Irenaeus bk.3 ch.25, by Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.1, by Epiphanius *Measures and Weights*, by Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* bk.8 ch.1. And that is far more probable. For the Apostles used a Greek version in citing the testimonies of the Prophets, but at the time of the Apostles there was no other version than that of the *Septuagint*.

Next, it is not likely that that king, who was bringing books into his library from the whole world, did not want as well the oracles of the Prophets and the other most ancient books of the Jews. Besides, how would it have been miraculous that in the space of 72 days they could have completed that edition if the *Pentateuch* alone was to be translated, which could be translated in a shorter time without any miracle? Nor does Jerome teach the opposite by asserting but by doubting; for in other respects he everywhere in his commentaries on the *Psalms* makes mention of the *Septuagint* version and explains it. Nor did Aristaeus in the name of the law understand only the *Pentateuch*, as the Jews seem to have thought, but all the sacred books. For all the books were named from the law, which was the chief book. Hence in *John* chs.10 and 15 the Lord says that what was written in the *Psalms* was written in the law of the Jews, and Blessed Paul I *Corinthians* ch.14 says that what is contained in *Isaiah* is written in the law.

Now as to the third question, that seems to be certain which is celebrated by the consent of all: 72 Hebrew old men, namely from each tribe of the children of Israel, most skilled in both languages, in the space of 72 days, translated in Pharos in Egypt, with miraculous consent, the divine letters from Hebrew speech into the Greek idiom. But whether they made that translation each separately, or by two and two, or rather by all consulting together with each other, is a matter for question, and the dispute seems still undecided. And Epiphanius indeed in his book on *Measures and Weights* writes that these translators were secluded in cells two by

two, and by a divine miracle each pair of them translated the whole Scripture in the same words, so that together they made 36 examples of altogether the same version.

But Justin in his *Speech of Exhortation* to the nations says that each individual was secluded in an individual cell and that by a still greater miracle the whole Scripture was rendered in the same words by each one of them separately; and he says that he saw in Alexandria the remains of the cells. Justin has been followed by many of the later authors, as Irenaeus bk.3 ch.25, Cyril *Catechesis* 4, Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.3, and Augustine *City of God* bk.18 ch.42, although Augustine in *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.15 does not dare to affirm the thing. To these certain more recent patrons of these cells add Philo *Life of Moses* bk.2, Tertullian *Apologeticus* ch.19, and Chrysostom in *Homily* 5 on *Matthew*. But these three do not mention cells, and only say that the translators miraculously agreed on the same opinion and the same words.

But Blessed Jerome in his preface to the *Pentateuch* openly laughs at this story: "I do not know," he says, "which author first constructed by his lie the 70 cells in Alexandria." Therefore Blessed Jerome reckons that the 72 translators were sitting in the same library and conferring with each other when they translated the Scripture. It is proved first by the testimony of Aristaeus, who was involved in the business, and openly says that by conferring together daily up to the ninth hour they eventually completed this version in 72 days. The same is proved by the testimony of Josephus, who although he was most eager for the glory of his nation, yet when narrating this story in *Antiquities* bk.12 ch.2 does not even mention cells.

We can also add Eusebius who in *Praep. Evang.* bk.8 ch.1 likewise narrates the whole story without any mention of cells – referring to this word – which are contained in the book of Aristaeus. We also add Philo, Tertullian, and Chrysostom above cited, who although they narrate the miracles that happened in the case of this version, would never have been silent about cells, which was the chief point of all, if they had really believed it.

But what they themselves say about the supreme agreement in every opinion does not necessarily prove that they are speaking of cells. For it was truly a miracle that so many men conferring together could, in so short a time, agree in translating each sentence. For where there is a multitude, a diversity of judgments cannot be avoided, and either they never agree or only after long debates. Wherefore Blessed Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.15 indicates that what is sung repeatedly about those translators, that they translated the Scriptures as with one voice, can very rightly be understood both according to those who hold on to cells and according to those who oppose them.

This opinion seems to me more probable. And it also seemed more probable to Titelmann in his *Apologetic Prologue* for the vulgate edition, and to Andreas Mafio in the preface to his annotations on *Joshua*. For that the Jews persuaded Justin of the story they put together, and when showing certain ruins said that they were the cells of the 70 translators, could easily have happened; nor is it less easy for some later authors to have faith in Justin, a holy man. But it is not credible that Aristaeus, who was present, wrote what was false. For the fact that Ludovic Vives on *City of God* bk.18 ch.42 and Leo a Castro in the preface to his commentaries on *Isaiah* ch.35 say that this book is truly from Aristaeus but was made up by the Jews, does not

move me; for everything that Josephus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome bring forward from Aristaeus we find word for word in our Aristaeus which is now extant.

But they say that Epiphanius reads and cites Aristaeus and yet he makes mention of cells, which he would not do if cells were excluded from the true book of Aristaeus. I do not know what Leo a Castro wants to make of this testimony of Epiphanius; for either he wants to conclude that in the time of Epiphanius the book of Aristaeus was complete and was afterwards corrupted, and then he is manifestly refuted by Josephus and Eusebius who wrote before Epiphanius and yet did not find cells in Aristaeus; or he wants the true book of Aristaeus not to have been found before the times of Epiphanius but that it was first found then, and this too cannot be said; for Jerome, who lived at the same time as and even after Epiphanius, expressly affirms that from Aristaeus cells cannot be proved but refuted.

Besides Epiphanius posits only 36 cells against the opinion of all, since the others posit either 70 cells or none. Nor is it right to prefer one Epiphanius to all the others. Therefore it is more credible that Epiphanius either did not read Aristaeus, but believed others who referred to him, or certainly when he wrote these things he did not have it in his hands and made an error of memory. For it is altogether likely that Epiphanius received the story about the cells from Justin and Irenaeus, and yet we see that he from forgetfulness told the story otherwise than they did.

There follows the fourth question about the authority of these translators, and although Jerome in his preface to the *Pentateuch* asserts that the translators were not prophets but translators, and in his *Hebrew Questions*, in his book about the *Best Way of Translating*, in his epistle to Sunia and Fretella, and in his commentaries on the *Prophets*, he everywhere blames the *Septuagint* version, yet nevertheless it should be very certain that the *Septuagint* translators translated very well, and had in a special way the assistance of the Holy Spirit lest they err in anything, so that they seem to have been not so much translators as Prophets.

This is proved in the first place by common opinion. For this is constantly asserted by all the cited authors, Aristaeus, Philo, Josephus, Justin, Irenaeus, Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, and from the Latins Tertullian and Augustine, again Hilary in his preface to the *Psalms*, and all the others. Nor should Blessed Jerome be excluded from this number, since in his first preface to *Chronicles* he writes that if the *Septuagint* version were possessed complete the way it was edited by them, he would be working in vain on translating the Bible. And in his second preface he says that the *Septuagint* translators, full of the Holy Spirit, translated what was true. Also in his *Apology against Ruffinus* bk.2 he affirms that he never wanted to detract from the *Septuagint* translators.

From which we understand that when he blames the *Septuagint* version he is not blaming the version itself but the faults that afterwards crept into it from the negligence or malice or even ignorance of others. But as to his saying that they were translators and not prophets, it does not conflict with what others everywhere say, that they were rather Prophets than translators; for neither do the others want to say that they were properly Prophets, but only that the Holy Spirit illumined them in a special way; nor does Jerome deny this, as we have shown from his own words.

Add that the Apostles frequently use this version, as is clear from their quotations, and Irenaeus bk.3 ch.25 openly asserts it; nay so also does Jerome



himself in his preface to the *Gospels to Damasus*. And presently the Catholic Church followed the same translation for many centuries, as the same Jerome in his first preface to *Chronicles* writes. Add finally that it could not without miracle have happened that with so much speed and so much agreement so great a work was completed, whereby it has come about, as Philo writes in his *Life of Moses*, that every year a feast day in the place where this translation was made was held many times in memory of so great a thing.

About the last question, although I am not ignorant that some are of the opinion that they reckon the translation of the *Septuagint* has altogether perished, I judge it much more probable that it still survives, but so corrupted and distorted that it seems to be altogether different. For that it still remains is assured by the many testimonies that are cited by the ancients from the *Septuagint* and the same are now found in our Greek codices. Next, since this translation was always the most famous and most common, who could believe that it was abolished or neglected and some other preserved? But that it is not uncorrupted but very distorted in many places, so that now it is not safe to emend the Hebrew and Latin texts from the Greek codices, can be proved by many arguments.

First, there is the testimony of Jerome, who in his preface to *Chronicles* and on *Ezra* and elsewhere warns that the *Septuagint* version is distorted in many and various ways.

Second, that the *Septuagint* translators are said to have translated everything word for word so properly that whoever knows both languages would immediately judge it to be the most faithful translation. For thus does Philo write in the *Life of Moses* bk.2: "The proper words," he writes, "are rendered by the proper words, the Greek corresponding exactly to the Chaldee. This is believed by daily experiment, whether a Chaldee has learnt the Greek tongue, or a Greek the Chaldee tongue, in each Scripture both the Chaldee and its translation, he marvels at the faithfulness, nay adores the agreement of things and words." Nor let it move anyone that he calls the Hebrew tongue Chaldee, for he did it for this reason, that the tongues are akin and that Chaldee was then more known than Hebrew because of the empire of the Assyrians. That Hebrew and Chaldee are otherwise not the same is demonstrated by Jerome on the first chapter of *Daniel*, from the fact that the Hebrew Daniel is ordered by king Nabuchodonosor to learn the language of the Chaldees.

Nor Philo alone but before Philo Aristaeus gave witness that there was an admirable agreement of things and words between the Greek and Hebrew codices. And at the end of his book he adds that the translation was by many persons discussed, considered, examined before it was put in the king's library, and it was acclaimed by all that everything was translated faithfully and sacredly, so that nothing could be added or taken away

But the Greek version which we now have dissents in many places from the Hebrew, does not have many things that are in the Hebrew, has many things that are not in the Hebrew, as all know who are well versed in it. And those who, because of lack of skill in the languages, cannot judge of this matter, should read Jerome in his preface to the *Pentateuch*, his letter to Sunia and Fretella, in his *Hebrew Questions*, his commentary on the *Prophets*, and his book on the *Best Way of Translating*.

Nor does this argument seem to be sufficiently aptly solved by those who reply that the Hebrew text is corrupted wherever it disagrees with the Greek. For neither do the heretics admit this, who prefer the Hebrew text to the Greek, nor should Catholics admit it, lest they be compelled to confess that the Latin Vulgate edition, which the Catholic Church has used already for so many centuries and which the Council of Trent judged to be authentic, is also wholly corrupted. For with the exception of the Psalter, the Latin edition agrees more with the Hebrew codices than with the Greek.

I know indeed that Epiphanius in his book on *Measures and Weights*, Jerome in his preface to the *Pentateuch* and in his book on the *Best Way of Translating*, and Augustine *City of God* bk.18 chs.42 and 44 have left in writing that the *Septuagint* translators purposely omitted certain things, added certain things, and translated certain things differently, because thus the Holy Spirit was dictating to them. But these Fathers were piously looking for reasons to excuse and defend the version that the Church was then using. Besides, if this were so, how would Philo say that there was a supreme agreement of things and words? How too would Aristaeus assert that they who saw it at the beginning acclaimed that everything was well and faithfully translated? How would they not have marveled that so many things were removed, so many added, so many rendered with contrary sense?

Third it is proved from the many opinions found in this version which in no way cohere with the truth. What is that about the counting of the years of Methusalah in *Genesis* ch.5? For according to the Greek edition Methusalah is found to have lived 14 years after the deluge, although however he was not in the Ark, for only 8 souls were saved by the Ark, that is, Noah, Shem, Ham, Japhet, and their wives, as we read in *Genesis* ch.6 and I *Peter* ch.3.

Which knot can not otherwise be solved by Blessed Jerome in *Hebrew Questions*, by Blessed Augustine *City of God* bk.15 ch.23, Eucherius and others on *Genesis* ch.5, without admitting that there is an error in Greek codices, which error the Fathers do not ascribe to the 70 elders, but to those who first wrote down the books from the king's Library; meanwhile however the codices, which we now have, they cannot deny to have been distorted. Such also is that verse of *Genesis* ch.26 where the *Septuagint* has that the servants said to Isaac about the well, "we did not find water," although the Hebrew and Latin codices have, "we have found water," which cannot both be true at the same time. And it is certain that our reading is truer, since there at once follows that for this reason Isaac called the name of the place abundance. Such also is the verse of *Jonah* ch.3 where the *Septuagint* has, "there are yet three days and Nineveh will be destroyed," although the Hebrew and our codices have, "there are yet forty days." Which place Blessed Jerome expounds and shows that the reading of the *Septuagint* can in no way be defended, and Blessed Augustine, *City of God* bk.18 ch.44, confesses that Jonah wrote forty days, not three days. There are many other things of the same sort, but it has pleased me to bring forward these three places as examples.

The last proof is that it is sufficiently clear that the *Septuagint* edition has been corrupted in many places by the Jews, as Justin affirms in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. Again it is clear that the same edition was time and time again emended by Origen, Lucian, Hesychius, Jerome; but nothing is emended that was not distorted

before. Nor is it credible that the edition that in the first 300 years had contracted so many stains has been preserved inviolate and whole in the remaining 1200 years.

Lastly it is clear that in the time of Blessed Jerome, as he himself writes in epist.89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine, almost all the Greek codices from the *Septuagint* edition had many things admixed from Theodotion with asterisks prefixed, and then the asterisks little by little fell out; also the edition of Theodotion has perished. But thence has necessarily arisen confusion, so that now no one can judge what in these books is from the *Septuagint* and what from Theodotion. So much about the *Septuagint*.

#### *Chapter Seven: On the Greek Edition of the New Testament*

Two questions about the Greek edition of the New Testament are wont to be disputed. The first is about the authors of this edition. The second is about the authority and integrity of the same edition.

And the first question indeed is not very necessary or very difficult. For it is clear that the Greek New Testament was written by those Apostles and Evangelists whose names are prefixed to the titles of the individual books or epistles, with the exception at most of the Gospels of *Matthew* and *Mark* and the epistle to the *Hebrews*, since that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew is testified to by Irenaeus bk.3 ch.1, by Athanasius in his *Synopsis*, by Jerome in the preface to his commentary on *Matthew* and on *Hosea* ch.2, and in his book on the *Ecclesiastical Writers* in *Matthew*, and all others.

Further Athanasius in the place cited thinks that the *Gospel of Matthew* was translated into Greek by the Apostle James, but others by the Apostle John, and others attribute the translation to Matthew himself. But whosoever it is, the translation is so received by the Church as if the *Gospel of Matthew* was first written in that language. Wherefore we are not in much need of the Hebrew Gospel that Munster edited, nor of that either which recently John Tilius took care to edit, in which many things are lacking, many are superfluous, not a few also are seen to have been changed; and God knows whether it was not done to take faith from the Greek and Latin edition, namely by the craftiness of the Jews, at whose promptings he produced that Gospel.

Now that the book of *Mark* was written in Latin by Mark himself at Rome, and then was by the same turned into Greek at Aquileia, is taught by Adrianus Finus in *Scourge of the Jews* bk.6 ch.80 and bk.8 ch.62, and by Petrus Antonius Beuther who followed Finus in his notes 8 and 9 on Sacred Scripture. In the life also of St. Peter which holds first place in the *Pontifical* of Damasus, it is sufficiently openly indicated that *Mark's Gospel* was initially written by him in Latin. The epistle to the *Hebrews* we have already discussed and shown that the epistle was written in Greek by Paul himself or was certainly translated from Hebrew to Greek by some Apostolic man. Therefore the whole Greek edition of the New Testament has the Apostles and Evangelists for authors.

Now as to what concerns authority there can be no doubt but that the Apostolic edition is of supreme authority unless it be clear it has been corrupted. On this matter I judge one should think as we said above about the Hebrew editions, namely that the Greek codices are not generally corrupted; however the sources are

not so very pure that necessarily whatever differs from them should be corrected, as Calvin, Major, Chemnitz, and the rest of the heretics of this age falsely think.

Now that the Greek codices are not universally and altogether corrupted can easily be demonstrated; for although heretics have tried to pervert many things, yet there have never been lacking Catholics who have detected their corruptions and have not permitted the sacred books to be corrupted. Many things were taken away from the whole New Testament and changed by Marcion, as Tertullian testifies *Against Marcion* bk.5, but Epiphanius noted almost all of them *Heresy* 42, and in our Greek codices the words are read correctly. The Arians too took away from the *Gospel of John* ch.4 “the Spirit is God,” but Blessed Ambrose indicated and noted it *On the Holy Spirit* bk.3 ch.11, and all our Greek codices have this testimony.

But that they are not everywhere uncorrupted but that some errors have sometimes crept in, at least by negligence of the copyists, and that it is not always safe to correct the Latin by the Greek, will be made plain by some examples. Certainly I *Corinthians* ch.15 should read, “the first man is from the earth earthly, the second man from the heaven heavenly,” as not only our Latin version has but also Calvin approves of *Institutes* ch.7 sect.21. But the Greeks constantly read, “the second man is the Lord from heaven.” This perversion has remained by the fault of the scribes from the corruptions of Marcion, as is plain from Tertullian *On Marcion* bk.5

Further, I *Corinthians* ch.7 where we have, “he who is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and is divided; a woman unmarried and a virgin thinks of the things that are of God,” but the Greek codices have it very differently, for the “he is divided” they join with the following words thus, “a wife is divided and a virgin.” This reading Blessed Jerome *Against Jovinian* bk.1 affirms is not of Apostolic truth. *Romans* ch.12 where we read, “serving the Lord,” the Greeks do not have “Lord” but “serving the time.” And yet that our reading is most true is plain from Jerome in epistle to Marcella, which begins “After the first letter,” where he says that in the emended Greek codices there is not read “time” but “Lord”, and it is plain too from Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and other Greek Fathers who thus read and explained it in their commentaries.

Finally it is clear that in many Greek codices there are missing many parts of the true Scripture, as the story of the adulteress *John* ch.8. The last chapter of *Mark*, the very beautiful testimony to the Trinity, I *John*, and others that we discussed above. It is also clear that certain things are found in all the Greek codices that are not parts of divine Scripture, as in *Matthew* ch.6 is added to the Lord’s prayer, “for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever.” That these words are not in the text but were added by the Greeks can be understood from two things. First from the fact that Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine expound the Lord’s prayer and yet make no mention of these words, although all the Greeks know them well. Second from the fact that the Greeks in their liturgy recite these words indeed, but they are not continuous with the Lord’s prayer.

### *Chapter Eight: On the Latin Editions*

On the Latin editions we have taken three things to be explained. First, how many and which were once the Latin editions. Second, who was the author of what is now called the Vulgate. Third, how much authority this very Vulgate edition has.

And to begin from the first: that there were, before the time of Jerome, almost innumerable Latin editions of the Old Testament from the *Septuagint* and from the Greek source of the New Testament, is testified to by Blessed Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.21 in these words: "Can they," he says, "be numbered who translated the Scriptures from the Hebrew into Greek? The Latins not at all. For as each in the first ages of faith had the Greek codex in his hands and who seemed to himself to have a little facility in both languages, so he dared to translate it." The same is taught by Jerome preface to *Job*: "Among the Latins," he says, "there are as many exemplars as codices, since each either added by choice or removed what seemed good to him."

Yet nevertheless one edition was more common, which is called the old and Vulgate edition, as is plain from Gregory preface to his books on *Morals* ch.5, and from Blessed Jerome on *Isaiah* chs.14 and 49, and elsewhere. And this seems to be the Italic translation which Blessed Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.15 prefers to all the other Latin ones, when he says: "Among the translations the Italic is preferred to the rest, for it holds closer to the words along with clearness of sense."

But St. Jerome twice translated the Old Testament; first from Greek, that is, from the *Septuagint*, as can be understood from *Against Ruffinus* bk.2 and epistle 10 of Augustine and the following epistle 11 which is from Jerome to Augustine, and also from the preface to *Job*. And a second time from Hebrew, as he himself testifies at the end of his book *On Illustrious Men*, and in the preface to the individual books that he put into Latin.

The New Testament, however, he did not translate from Greek to Latin, but only emended it from many errors that by the fault of the copyists had crept in. About this labor of his he himself writes in *Illustrious Men*, at the end: "I rendered the New Testament with fidelity to the Greek." And in his preface to the *Gospels to Damasus*: "We have," he says, "so tempered things with our pen that, having corrected those things only that seemed to change the sense, we suffered the rest to stay as they were." But if anyone thinks that the New Testament was translated by him, since Augustine writes in epistle 10 to Jerome: "Therefore we give no little thanks for your work, because you translated the Gospel from Greek, etc.," let him hear Jerome solve this doubt in epistle 89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine: "If you support me in emendation of the New Testament etc."

Further, the translation of Blessed Jerome from Hebrew to Latin soon began to be received and publicly read in certain Churches, as is plain from epistle 10 of Augustine to Jerome, but in such way, however, that the other old edition too was not contemned. This is more openly understood from Blessed Gregory in the epistle before his preface on the books of *Morals* ch.5, where he says that in his time the Roman Church was accustomed to use both editions, the old version from Greek and the new one of Jerome translated from Hebrew. But after the times of Blessed Gregory all the Latin editions seem to have vanished besides the one that we now call old and Vulgate, about whose author we will speak directly. But in this age of

ours we seem to have returned to the time when everyone who had any ability immediately translated the sacred books, since the Latin translations of recent writers, and especially of heretics, can scarce be counted. But so much on these matters.

*Chapter Nine: On the Author of the Vulgate Edition*

There is no little question about this our Vulgate Latin edition, whether it is the ancient one that existed before Jerome, or whether it is of Jerome himself, or is mixed from both. That it is not of Blessed Jerome is thought or certainly suspected by Sanctes Pagninus in the preface to his translation of the Bible to Pope Clement VII, by Paul Foro Bishop of Sempronius in his *Day of the Passion of the Lord* bk.2 ch.1. That it is on the contrary of Jerome is maintained by Augustine Eugubius and John Pico della Mirandola in the books they edited on this matter, and by some others. But that it is mixed from the old and the new is taught by John Driedo on *Ecclesiastical Dogmas and Scriptures* bk.2 ch.1, and by Sixtus Senensis at the end of *Holy Library* bk.8.

We therefore for the sake of brevity and clarity will embrace our opinion in four propositions.

First proposition. *The Latin New Testament of the Vulgate Edition we have from the old version, which however Blessed Jerome emended.* This we prove most of all by the argument that many places which Jerome blames in the old version we find in our edition corrected in the way he affirms they need to be corrected. And to bring forward some places: in his commentary on *Matthew* ch.2 he says this: "in Bethlehem of Judea" should be "in Bethlehem Juda." In *Against Jovinian* bk.1 he blames this verse in I Corinthians ch.7: "divided is woman and virgin," and he wants to be read, "an unmarried woman and a virgin etc." In the epistle to Marcella, at the end of the second volume, he blames this verse of Romans ch.12: "serving the time," and wants to be read, "serving the Lord." In the same place he blames the verse in I Timothy ch.1: "human speech," and teaches that "faithful speech" should be read. In his commentary on Galatians ch.2 he blames the verse: "to whom we yielded for an hour," and restores, "to whom we yielded not for an hour." And in his commentary on ch.5 he blames the verse: "your persuasion is from God," and wants to be read, "it is not from him who calls you." In his commentary on Ephesians ch.1 he blames the verse: "who is the pledge of inheritance for the redemption of adoption," and wants to be read, "for the redemption of acquisition." But all these things and many others of that sort we now have in the Vulgate edition the way he himself advises they should be read.

Besides, it is clear that Jerome emended the New Testament by order of Pope Damasus; it is also clear that his emendation was accepted and greatly pleased the men of his time, as can be understood from epistle 10 of Augustine to Jerome. It is not therefore likely that it was afterwards rejected but that it was rather retained and preserved.

Nor should one be moved by the fact that there are some places not emended as Jerome advises they should be emended, such as is the verse in *Romans* ch.12, "to be wise unto sobriety," which Jerome *Against Jovinian* bk.1 wants to read, "to be wise unto chastity." And the verse of I *Corinthians* ch.13, "if I hand over my body so

as to burn," which Jerome on *Galatians* ch.5 wants to read, "so as to glory," and certain other things which he himself corrects in his commentary on *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, and *Titus*. For he himself in his preface to the *Gospels to Damasus* confesses that he did not correct everything that he thought should be corrected, lest he seem to have changed too much.

Further, it can happen that while he was writing these commentaries he thought those things needed to be changed which afterwards, when he undertook to emend the New Testament, he judged on better consideration should not be changed. For that he wrote those commentaries before he emended the New Testament is collected from his book on *Illustrious Men* at the end, and indeed our version in these two places is better than that which Jerome then wanted to have substituted.

Second proposition. *The Psalter in the Latin Vulgate edition is not that which divine Jerome translated from the Hebrew, nor that which he translated from the Greek Septuagint, but that which he himself emended, it having been translated from the edition of St. Lucian the martyr, since Blessed Jerome labored four times on the Psalter. For he translated it from Hebrew into Latin, as is plain from his epistle to Sophronius; again he translated it from Greek into Latin, from the pure Septuagint version as it was contained in the Hexapla of Origen, as he himself testifies in his epistle to Sunia and Fretella. Finally he twice emended the old Latin edition, which was translated from the common and vulgate Greek, as is plain from his preface to the Psalms to Paul and Eustochius.* But let us briefly prove each point.

We say then that our Psalter is not that which Blessed Jerome translated from the Hebrew, and this is certain; for it is extant in the works of Blessed Jerome and it almost everywhere differs from ours, at least in words.

We add that neither is it that which he translated from Origen's *Hexapla*, but the common one which he twice emended. And this is proved from his epistle to Sunia and Fretella, for there he says that what is contained in *Psalms* 5, "Direct my way in thy sight," is contained differently in the Septuagint and in all other translations save the common and Vulgate one. But our edition has it thus, therefore our edition is the common and Vulgate one and is distinct from the pure translation of the *Septuagint*. Besides in the same place Jerome says that what is contained in *Psalms* 73, "make us rest all the feast days of our God from the land," is contained in the *Septuagint* in the *Hexapla*, and that in all other translators is "let us go or let us consume all the feast days," and only in the Vulgate is there contained, "make us rest." But we have "make us rest." Again what we have in *Psalms* 103, "the rock a refuge for hedgehogs," he says is translated by the Septuagint, "a refuge for hares;" therefore ours is not that very *Septuagint* version.

Finally in the whole epistle he very often sets down the words of the Latin psalter, as it was then in common use and sung in Churches; but we find them all in our psalter, therefore ours is that common and Vulgate psalter. Further that the common one is called by Jerome the one that Origen and afterwards Lucian emended, is clear from that very epistle to Sunia and Fretella. For thus does Jerome speak at the beginning of the epistle: "Know that there is another edition which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea and all the Greeks who deal with it call common

and vulgate, and now by several it is called *Lucianic*, different from the *Septuagint* which is found in the *Hexapla*."

Third proposition. *It is for us probable that the book of Wisdom, or Ecclesiasticus, and of Maccabees we do not have from the version of Jerome but from the old translation, whose author is unknown.* We are moved to this first because Blessed Jerome nowhere affirms that he translated these books, nor are any prefaces by him extant on these books, although however in epistle 89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine, he says that he prefixed little prefaces to each of the books. Second because Blessed Jerome thinks these books apocryphal, as is plain from the Galeatic Prologue and from his preface on Proverbs; therefore it is likely that he neglected to translate these books. Third because many things are cited from these books by Blessed Cyprian, especially in his book Exhortation to Martyrdom, and by other Fathers older than Jerome, wholly as we have them in our Vulgate edition.

Fourth proposition. *All the rest from Jerome's version from the Hebrew we have in the Vulgate edition.* Proof of this:

First, since it is clear that Blessed Jerome was the first and only one of the ancients who translated the Old Testament from Hebrew to Latin, and it is again clear that our edition is a translation from the Hebrew to Latin, with the exception of *Psalms, Ecclesiasticus, and Maccabees*. That Jerome translated from the Hebrew he himself testifies in his book on *Illustrious Men* at the end. That he was first among the ancients is plain from Augustine in epistles 8 and 10 and *City of God* bk.18 ch.43 and from all the prefaces of Jerome, in which he always deprecates calumny because he dared to translate from the Hebrew. That after him up to our times no one tried the same is more certain than certain.

But that now the Vulgate edition is a translation from the Hebrew, it itself in some way proclaims when almost everywhere it agrees with the Hebrew and differs from the Greek. There are besides certain signs of this fact in almost all the books. For in the *Pentateuch*, especially *Genesis* ch.5, all the ancient books, which were translated from the *Septuagint* version, contained the error about the number of years; but our edition agrees with the Hebrew truth. In the book of *Esther* and of *Daniel* we often find in the books themselves notes by Blessed Jerome saying that he expressed faithfully what was in the Hebrew, but the rest he added from the Vulgate edition or from Theodotion.

In the preface to *Job* he says that in the ancient Latin edition and in the Greek of the book of *Job* there were lacking up to 800 verses, which he himself put in his edition from the Hebrew; but our edition is very complete and full, no less than the Hebrew. Finally in his commentaries on the *Prophets* he puts and explains almost everywhere two versions, that is, his own, which is our Vulgate, and the other from the *Septuagint*.

A second proof is that all the things that Blessed Jerome in his preface to the *Pentateuch*, and in his book on the *Best Kind of Translating*, says are not contained in the *Septuagint* and that he added in his translation from the Hebrew, we find in our Vulgate edition, as this: "out of Egypt have I called my son," *Hosea* ch.11, and: "they will look upon him they pierced," *Zachariah* ch.12, and: "eye has not seen and ear



has not heard nor has it come into the heart of man what things he has prepared for those who love you," *Isaiah* ch.64.

The third proof is from the places that Blessed Jerome advises he translated differently than the *Septuagint* did, all of which we find in our edition in the way he says he himself translated them. In epistle 89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine, he says that in *Jonah* ch.4 he translated "ivy" where the *Septuagint* translated "gourd." Again in *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* he says that in *Genesis* ch.2 should be read: "God completed his work on the seventh day," although in the *Septuagint* is read, "on the sixth day." In the same place he says should be read, "she was called a manly maiden," although in the *Septuagint* is said, "woman." In the same place he says should be read, "he sent a deep sleep on Adam," although in the *Septuagint* is, "he sent an ecstasy." Many like things are found both in the *Hebrew Questions* and in the commentaries on the *Prophets*.

St. Gregory also *Morals* bk.20 ch.24, when explaining the verse, "he is changed for me to cruel," he says the old translation had it very differently, but that this new one made from the Hebrew is better. But in our edition there is, "he is changed for me to cruel," *Job* ch.30.

The fourth proof is from the prefaces. For Jerome himself testifies in the epistle to Augustine already cited that he prefixed little prefaces to almost each of the books in his edition from Hebrew, which even now we see in the Bibles of the Vulgate edition, nor has anyone ever denied that they are Jerome's; but certainly it is not credible that his whole work perished apart only from the prefaces. For why, I ask, did those who rejected or neglected the edition of Blessed Jerome keep the prefaces?

But three arguments most of all are wont to be made to the contrary. The first from Paul Foro of Sempronius and Sanctis Pagnini is taken from the many places in which our version differs from Hebrew truth; for it is not credible that Jerome, who was most skilled in the Hebrew tongue, could have made a lapse in this matter.

I reply that it happened for two reasons that our version seems sometimes to differ from the Hebrew text. One is, and it is plain far and wide, the carelessness of the copyists, about which he himself everywhere complains in his prefaces. The second cause is that often Blessed Jerome studied to express not so much the words as the sense, as he himself teaches should be done in his book on the *Best Kind of Translating*. There is an example in the words of *Ecclesiastes* ch.1: "the perverse are with difficulty corrected, and the number of fools is infinite." For these words seem to carry a far different meaning than the Hebrew which reads verbally thus: "it will not be possible to direct the perverse, and not possible for the fool to be numbered." But certainly Jerome very elegantly expressed the sense. About this argument we will say more in the following chapter.

A second argument is that Jerome in his preface to the *Psalms* and to *Job* and to *Chronicles* advises that he has distinguished his edition by asterisks and obelisks; but in our Vulgate edition we do not see these signs; therefore our Vulgate edition is not Jerome's.

I reply from Jerome himself in the epistle to Augustine cited above, that Jerome distinguished by asterisks and obelisks the edition that he made from the

Greek but not that which he made from the Hebrew. In our Vulgate *Psalter* therefore there should be asterisks and obelisks of which Jerome makes mention in his preface, but they have fallen out by the negligence of the copyists; nor is this remarkable, for even in his own time they began to fall out, as is plain from that preface itself and from the letter to Sunia and Fretella. But in the book of *Job* and *Chronicles* of our Vulgate edition there never were nor should there be asterisks and obelisks. For we have hence two prefaces to both *Job* and *Chronicles*, the first of which, where there is no mention of asterisk or obelisk, pertains to our version, which is from the Hebrew, but the second of which, where there is mention of those signs, pertains to the other version, which he made from the Greek.

The third argument. Many things are found in our Vulgate edition that Blessed Jerome in *Hebrew Questions*, in his book on the *Best Kind of Translating*, and in his commentaries on the *Prophets* and on *Ecclesiastes* teaches should be differently translated, and therefore it cannot be that our Vulgate edition is that very translation which Jerome made from the Hebrew.

I reply that for reasons has it happened that there are certain things in our text which Jerome blamed. The first is the error and negligence of the copyists. The second cause is the various signification of nouns, for sometimes they can signify two things, and Blessed Jerome followed now one and now the other meaning; we have an example in the case of *Ecclesiastes*; for Blessed Jerome translated *Ecclesiastes* twice, as is clear from the preface to this commentaries on *Ecclesiastes* and in his preface to *Proverbs*. And indeed in the first translation he translates in ch.2: "I thought to draw my flesh together into wine," and so also does he expound in his commentary; but in the second translation he preferred to write: "I thought to withdraw my flesh from wine," which is the reading we have, and our reading is better. For the Hebrew word can signify 'in wine' or 'into wine' and even 'of wine' or 'from wine'; for the relevant Hebrew letter serves both the place 'in' and the place 'of', but the context requires rather 'from wine' than 'into wine'. For there follows: "so that I might carry my soul to wisdom."

But this Hebrew letter is taken frequently for another, that is, for 'out of', 'of', 'from' is clear from this places, *Exodus* ch.12 v.43, ch.35 v.32, ch.38 v.8, and *Leviticus* ch.8 v.32, and II *Chronicles* ch.16 v.6. But that Blessed Jerome is wont to translate in various ways when the words bear it, he himself testifies in *Apology against Ruffinus* bk.1, where he says he translated *Psalms* 2, "Adore the son," since the Hebrew word is ambiguous.

The third reason is that he himself later changed his opinion and corrected his own places. And so as to provide an example, in his book on the *Best Kind of Translating* and in his preface to the *Pentateuch* he says that in *Isaiah* ch.11 should not be read: "The flower will rise from its root," but: "The Nazarean will rise from his root;" and that the *Septuagint* badly passed over this name Nazarean, and that this place is cited by *Matthew* ch.2 where it says: "So that what was spoken by the Prophet might be fulfilled, that he will be called a Nazarean;" but he himself later translated it as the *Septuagint* had, namely: "And the flower will rise from its root." And in his commentary to *Isaiah* ch.2 he gives a reason for this matter, since the Hebrew word put there is written in one way, while Nazarean is stated by a word written in another way, wherefore in his commentary on *Matthew* ch.2 he says that

this phrase: “that he will be called a Nazarean,” is not taken from any one Prophet but from the fact that all the Prophets predicted that the Lord would be holy. For like reason in his *Commentary on Isaiah* bk.5 ch.19 he says he translated badly, “the land of Juda will be in festivity for Egypt,” since it should rather be translated “in fear,” and we have it this latter way now in our Vulgate edition.

The fourth reason is that although Blessed Jerome sometimes thought that certain things should be changed in his version, and although he noted them in his commentaries, yet the Church later judged the first version to be correct and preferred to retain it in the Vulgate edition. For in his *Commentary on Isaiah* bk.5, where Blessed Jerome says he badly translated “festivity” for “fear”, he says in the same place that he badly translated “holding back” for “being wanton”, and yet we see in our Vulgate edition that the first correction has been admitted and the second one not admitted, which certainly does not seem to have happened by chance but by the judgment of posterity, or rather of the Church itself. And in this way response can be made to many other things. For the Vulgate edition, although it is in its greatest part from Jerome, yet is not that pure version which he himself translated from the Hebrew but is in some way mixed, with not a few things added from the *Septuagint* that are not found in the Hebrew, and this is most of all seen in *I Kings* and *Proverbs*.

To all these things can be added that sometimes Jerome seems to be censuring our version although however he is not censuring it but only explaining what the force of the Hebrew word is, as when in *Hebrew Questions* he says that in *Genesis* ch.1 for what we now have, “the Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters,” there is in Hebrew “was covering or cherishing” in the manner of a bird.

#### *Chapter Ten: On the Authority of the Latin Vulgate Edition*

There remains the third and most important question, namely how much of authority there is in the Latin Vulgate edition. And indeed the heretics of our time, although they differ among themselves not a little in choosing an authentic Latin edition, yet they all miraculously agree against the Church. For the Lutherans want only the version of Luther to be held as authentic, as is plain from a certain Leipzig decree to which Melancthon, Pomeranus, Major, and many others have subscribed. About which decree see Staphilus in the third preaching topic of *Lutheran Theology*.

But the Zwinglians, with whom the Anabaptists and Calvinists agree, want no version to be authentic, as is plain from the preface to the Zurich edition, where they teach that the Church should not be bound to any one version. Yet nevertheless both Lutherans and Zwinglians agree in this, that the Latin Vulgate edition is not to be held as authentic, since they detect innumerable errors in it.

There advanced hence into the battle line Martin Chemnitz from the camp of the Lutherans, and John Calvin from the camp of the Zwinglians, who write against the Council of Trent and tax the fourth session above the rest, wherein the Council defines that the Latin Vulgate edition is to be held as authentic. George Major also writes about the same matter in his preface to the *Psalms*, and Tilemann Hesshus in his book on the *600 Errors of the Pontiffs*, tit.1.

But no fewer have written in favor of the Vulgate edition, among whom are John Driedo on *Ecclesiastical Dogmas and Scriptures* bk.2 ch.1, Franciscus Titelmann

in his *Apologetic Prologue* for the Vulgate edition of the New Testament, Andreas Vega *On the Council of Trent* bk.15 ch.9, Iodocus Tiletanus in his *Apology for the Council of Trent* par.1 against Chemnitz, Lindanus *On the Best Kind of Translating* bk.1, Melchior Cano *On Places* bk.2 ch.13, Sixtus Senensis *Sacred Library* bk.8, in refutation of the last heresy. Desiring to imitate whose diligence, we will prove the same thing with the following arguments.

First is an argument of the Council itself. For the Tridentine Synod says that it approves the Latin edition of the sacred books, which has for so many centuries been approved by use itself in the Church. For not rashly for almost 1,000 years, that is, from the time of Blessed Gregory, the whole Latin Church has used this one edition, all the orators have explained and proposed it to the people, all the Councils have produced testimonies from this edition to confirm the dogmas of the faith. Further, that the Church for the whole of 800 or 900 years has lacked a genuine translation of the Scriptures, and in matters that pertain to faith and religion has cultivated as the word of God the errors of who knows what translator, is astonishing if it seem to anyone not astonishing and absurd, especially if he has learnt from the Apostle, I *Timothy* ch.3, that the Church is “the pillar and ground of the truth.”

The second argument I take from the testimonies of the ancients. For this our version is either Jerome’s or certainly the ancient common one that Augustine calls the Italic; if it is the ancient one, it has great testimony from Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.15, where he says that is to be preferred to all the others; but if it is of Jerome, as we have proved above, it has the testimonies of all the ancients who could have seen it. For in the first place Blessed Augustine *City of God* bk.18 ch.43 says, “There was not lacking in our times the priest Jerome, a most learned man and most skilled in three languages, who translated the divine Scriptures from Hebrew into Latin, whose great labor in letters the Hebrews confess to be veracious.” And in epistle 10 to Jerome he says that his version or rather emendation of the New Testament is approved by all. Again Blessed Gregory *Morals* bk.20 ch.24 says, “Because this new translation from Hebrew is said to have poured out in eloquence everything more truly for us, we must believe whatever is said in it, and our exposition should cling more subtly to its words.”

St. Isidore in *Etymologies* bk.6 ch.5 says, “The priest Jerome, most skilled in three languages, translated the divine Scriptures from Hebrew into Latin eloquence, and eloquently poured it out, whose translation is rightly preferred to the rest.” And on the *Divine Office* bk.1 ch.12 he says, “Only the priest Jerome translated the sacred Scriptures from Hebrew to Latin eloquence, whose edition all Churches generally always use, because it is truer in its opinions and clearer in its words.” So Isidore, to whom Rabanus subscribes, on the *Institution of Clerics* bk.2 ch.54.

Further, those who followed next, Blessed Anselm, Blessed Bernard, Rupert, Haymo, Hugo, Richard, and all the others sufficiently show that they approved this edition before the rest, since it alone did they undertake to explain. Add too that not only do the Latins approve this version but also the Greeks, who themselves transferred from Latin to Greek certain of the divine volumes that Jerome translated into Latin from Hebrew, as Blessed Jerome testifies, in his book on *Illustrious Men*, on *Sophronius*, and *Against Ruffinus* bk.2

Third argument. The Hebrews have the authentic Scripture in their own tongue; the Greeks also have the authentic Scripture in Greek, that is, the Old Testament from the Septuagint and the first sources themselves of the New Testament; therefore it is right that the Latin Church, in which is the see of Peter and in which the Christian faith will perpetually remain, should have the authentic Scripture in its own tongue; but it had no other for almost 1,000 years than this one; therefore this one is to be reckoned authentic.

Fourth argument. In the general Councils of the Church either very few or sometimes none were found who were skilled in the Hebrew tongue; therefore the Church would have been badly provided for if in grave matters it could not trust the Latin edition, but had to have recourse to Hebrew codices and beg the truth from hostile Rabbis. We can say the same about the Greek tongue, for although now many are found who know Greek, yet it was not always so. For if we believe Ruffinus *Hist.* bk.10 ch.21, from 600 bishops who convened at the Council of Rimini there was none who knew what 'homoousion' ['consubstantial'] meant. And therefore when certain clever Arian heretics proposed to the Synod whether it wished to worship Christ or homoousion, they all shouted that they did not want homoousion but Christ.

Next, the same is proved by experience. For we see the heretics, who have contemned the ancient edition and are eager for new translations, are coining editions so diverse and conflicting among themselves that almost nothing certain can be got from their editions. Wherefore Martin Luther in a book against Zwingli on the truth of the body of Christ in the Eucharist says, "if the world stands for a longer time, it will again be necessary for us, because of the diverse translations of Scripture that now exist, to accept the decrees of the Councils and flee to them to preserve the unity of the faith."

It remains to solve the arguments of the adversaries, but it first pleases us to note certain open lies that Martin Chemnitz and John Calvin have mixed in their arguments.

The first lie is from Calvin, that it was not done by judgment or right choice out of diverse interpretations one obtains among the unlearned. But certainly, since, all translations being done away with, this our translation has above 1,000 years been in use in the whole Latin Church, either there were no learned men for the whole 1,000 years in the Church, or Calvin is impudently lying. Next I do not think that Sophronius, Augustine, Gregory, Isidore, Bede, Anselm, Rupert, Bernard, so many other distinguished men should be numbered among the unlearned; and yet all of them, as we showed above, praised our edition either among the rest or even beyond the rest.

The other lie of the same Calvin is that the Tridentine Fathers decreed that those are not to be heard who bring forward pure drink from the source itself and demonstrate what is false from certain truth. I call this a lie because nothing of this sort is read in the decree of the Council. For the Fathers did not make any mention of the sources, but only chose from among the many Latin versions that are now circulating one that they preferred to the others, and chose (as befitted the gravity and constancy of the Church) the old before the new, the one approved by long use

before those still recent and, so to say, raw, and finally one before many that disagree and conflict with each other.

The third lie of the same Calvin is that so much is there not one complete page in the Vulgate edition that there are scarce three continuous verses not marred by some signal error. But if it is so, why in the same place does Calvin, when he undertook the noting of places falsely translated in the *Psalms*, he indicated nothing at all in the translation of the first *Psalms*? Does the first *Psalms* perhaps not have three continuous verses? But there is no need, I think, to delay over refuting such open lies. Let us come to Chemnitz.

The first lie of Chemnitz is that the Council of Trent decreed that in place of what the Holy Spirit wrote in the Hebrew and Greek sources, we receive what has been changed, mutilated, or added by the copyists. That this is a manifest lie there is none who does not understand. For which man, I do not say a Catholic, but a man of sound mind ever said that the faults of the copyists were to be taken for the words of the Holy Spirit? Next does not the Council in the same place command that Sacred Bibles should be printed that are as well emended as possible?

The second lie of the same Chemnitz is that in the index of prohibited books published by Paul IV, all editions of the Bible are condemned, even of the old translation, in which some even of the most manifest errors in the Vulgate edition have been corrected. This also is a most crass lie; for condemned in that index are only certain editions produced by heretics or by suspect printers, and all others are permitted.

The third lie of the same Chemnitz is that the Council of Trent sess.21 ch.2, in order to prove that the Church has authority to make dispensation in substantial parts of the sacraments against the institution of Christ, abuses an equivocation in the old translation, where I *Corinthians* ch.4 the ministers of Christ are called dispensers of the mysteries of Christ. On which place Chemnitz exclaims: "Good God, how great is the impudence of Antichrist to play games, amid so great a light of knowledge of languages, about a matter so grave in such a puerile fashion? For Paul calls the ministers of Christ domestic managers (*oikonomoi*)." So Chemnitz.

But we are rightly permitted to exclaim: Good God, how great is the impudence of a heretical man that he not fear to impose a most crass lie for truth? For the Council expressively testifies that the Church cannot change the substantial parts of the sacraments, but only establish the mode and order in which the sacraments should be administered. Next the Council does not abuse the word dispenser, as Chemnitz fancies; for it does not say that the Church can make dispensation in the sacraments in the way that it does in vows and laws, but that it can dispense the sacraments, that is, administer, offer, hand them over to the faithful; and in the manner of a faithful and prudent domestic manager in dispensing the goods of his master, and in nurturing the family, can prescribe a definite reason and mode, provided nothing is done against the laws and mandates of the prince.

The last lie of Chemnitz is that the Council of Trent for this reason wanted the Vulgate edition to be authentic, because it is wholly transformed into Pontifical dogmas. Which is not only the lie of an impudent man but even of an imprudent one, since it is altogether in conflict with its own author. For if Pontifical dogmas are contained in the Vulgate edition, it follows that Pontifical dogmas are most ancient

and the dogmas contrary to them are plainly recent; for they themselves confess that the Vulgate edition is very old.

Besides, if the Vulgate edition had been made after the times of Luther, there would be some reason to suspect that it was purposely accommodated to Pontifical dogmas; but it was made over 1,000 years ago, and everything that they blame in the Vulgate edition we will show to have been thus cited by the most ancient Fathers, and that these were always thus in the Vulgate edition. But the adversaries believe that what they themselves are doing is being done also by others; and because Martin Luther translated the Bible in very bad faith, as is plain from John Cochlaeus in his *Life and Acts of Luther*, 1522, where we read that in the new translation of the New Testament made by Luther there have been noted up to 1,000 places which are changed, that is, added, or taken away, or corrupted, therefore do they think that Catholics do the same; but they are deceived. For Catholic faith does not need the fortification of lies as their inventions do.

*Chapter Eleven: The Objections of the Heretics against the Vulgate Edition are Solved*

The arguments of the heretics against the Vulgate edition can be reduced to three. The first is that Blessed Jerome translated many things differently from what we have, and blamed many things in our Vulgate edition; but response has been given to this above in chapter eight [and nine].

Second argument. The word of God is more to be believed that is contained in the sources of the Hebrew and Greek codices than what is contained in the streams of the translations; for the Hebrew and Greek codices are of the Prophets and Apostles who could not err; but the Latin ones are of various translators who could err. For it is one thing to be a translator, another to be a Prophet, as Jerome teaches in his preface to the *Pentateuch*. And the same Jerome everywhere blames the old translation in his commentaries and *Against Jovinian* bk.1; but Blessed Augustine not only in general says that a translator can err, *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.12 and epist.19 and 59, but also in epist.8 to Jerome asserts that Jerome could have erred in his translation.

Add that the Fathers everywhere teach that one must have recourse to the Hebrew and Greek sources. Jerome in *Against Helvidius* and in epistle to Marcella, which begins "After the first epistle," teaches that the Latin edition of the Gospels must be recalled to the Greek sources; and he says the same about emending the Latin edition of the Old Testament from the Hebrew in his commentary on *Zachariah* ch.8. The same is contained in Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 chs.11, 12, 15, and epist.59 and elsewhere. And what is more remarkable, in *Pontifical Law* itself dist. can.9. As for the old books it says: "As the faith of the old books has been examined from the Hebrew volumes, so the truth of the new ones needs the standard of the Greek."

I reply that it cannot be denied but that the sources of the Scriptures are to be preferred to the streams of the translations when it is clear that the sources are not muddied; but that now the sources are flowing muddily in many places we have already showed above, and it can scarcely be denied but that, just as the Latin Church was more constant in retaining faith than the Greek Church, so also it was

more vigilant in defending its codices from corruption. For Jerome once wrote this in a letter to Damasus about the word *hypostasis*, namely that, with the patrimony squandered by the Greeks, the inheritance of the Fathers is only preserved incorrupt among the Latins.

But as to the objection that the translators could sometimes have had lapses, there are not lacking those who reply that the old translator of the New Testament and also Blessed Jerome as translator of the Old Testament, being illumined by the special light of the Holy Spirit, could not have erred; but there is no need to have recourse to this escape. For we admit that a translator is not a prophet and could have erred, but we say that he did not err in the translation which the Church has approved.

For the Vulgate edition is not from one author, but some is from Jerome, some from Lucian, some from Theodotion, some from some other unknown translator, but it seems silly to say that the heretic Theodotion could not have erred, and even that Jerome never erred, since he himself on *Isaiah* ch.9 says that he erred, and the Church has accepted his correction. The Church then has not canonized those authors, but has only approved this version; yet it has not so approved it that it asserted that no errors of the copyists can be found in it; but it wished to make us certain that in things especially that pertain to faith and morals there are no errors of the translators in this version.

To the other point about emendation of the Latin codices by the Hebrew and Greek, I reply that there are four times when we are permitted to have recourse to the Hebrew and Greek sources, as the Fathers advise.

First, when there seems to be an error of the copyists in our codices; thus we see that in the new Missals the verse of *Ecclesiastes* ch.45 has been emended to, "He gave precepts in his presence (*coram*)," when before it corruptly read: "He gave him a heart for the precepts (*cor ad*)." For in the Greek it says "*kata prosōpon* [in his presence]" where there is no reason to doubt the meaning, but a change from *coram* to *cor ad* was easy to make. So in *Ecclesiastes* ch.24, "I am as the river Dorix," should be corrected to, "I am as a ditch of a river," as it is in the Greek. For there is nowhere a river Dorix. For although Rabanus in his commentary on this place says, on the opinion of certain persons, that there is a river in Armenia called Dorix, yet he proves it from no author. But the Greek '*dioryx*' is a ditch drawn from a river to irrigate the land.

So *Wisdom* ch.12, "You condemn him who should not be punished, and you banish the stranger by your strength," we see is not badly corrected in the Louvain Bibles in this way, "Him who should not be punished you think by your strength to have condemned outside," as is clearly collected from the Greek; and it is manifestly an error of the copyists, although St. Gregory *Morals* bk.3 ch.11 piously expounded the first opinion.

Thus the verse of *Psalms* 41, "to God the living fount," could be safely changed into, "to God living and strong." For in the Hebrew it is plainly "to God living, strong," and in the Greek it is the same, where there is no occasion for error. In our translation 'strong' (*fortem*) could easily have been changed into 'fount' (*fontem*), especially since the preceding words are, "my soul has thirsted." So too in the Missal we see that this verse of *John* ch.19 has been emended, "He took her into his own



(sua),” which before read, “for his own (suam),” although the Greek codex plainly has “into his own.”

Second, when the Latin codices vary such that it cannot be certainly established what the true Vulgate reading is, we can then have recourse to the sources and be therefrom aided to find the true reading. So in *Joshua* ch.5 certain Latin codices have, “to whom he swore that he would show them a land flowing with milk and honey,” and others have, “that he would not show them etc.” The latter seems to be the true reading, for in the Hebrew a ‘not’ is firmly added. Just as on the contrary in *Joshua* ch.11 some codices have, “there was not a city to which he might not hand himself over,” and others have, “there was not a city where he might hand himself over,” and the latter is truer because it is conformed to the Hebrew, and the following words require it. So in *Luke* ch.1 some codices have, “redemption of his people,” and others have, “for his people,” and the latter seems truer, since so it is in the Greek.

Third, when the words or sentence in Latin is ambiguous we can have recourse to the sources, if it happen that there is no ambiguity in them. So what we read in *Genesis* ch.3, “cursed is the earth in your work,” can be understood of future work, that is, when you cultivate it, and about the past, that is about Adam’s sin, because of which the earth has been cursed. But in the Hebrew there is no ambiguity, since the Hebrew word can only signify ‘because of you’, that is, because of your sin. Hence also Blessed Jerome advises in his *Hebrew Questions* that they translated correctly who said, “cursed is the earth in your transgression.” However I am not convinced it could so have happened that this reading was in the Hebrew and it was changed by a fault of the copyists.

Thus too what we read in *Luke* ch.2, “On earth peace to men of good will,” the ‘of good will’ is ambiguous for it can be referred to ‘men’ and to ‘peace’; but from the Greek it is collected that it is better joined with ‘peace’ so that the sense is, “on earth peace to men; peace, I say, of the good will of God toward men.” For ‘good will’ in Greek is for the most part not the good will of man but the good will of God toward men. So *Psalms* 2, “lest when the Lord is angry,” and, “when his anger flared up for a moment,” and, “blessed are they who trust in him.” In the Latin there is a doubt whether these things are said of the Father or the Son, for there is mention of both in this *Psalms*. But from the Hebrew one manifestly collects that these things are said of the Son. Finally in *Psalms* 138, “my face (*os*) is not hidden from you,” there is doubt in the Latin whether it is ‘face’ (*os, oris*) or ‘bone’ (*os, ossis*). But in Hebrew it is clear, for the word is ‘face’.

Fourth, and last, it is licit to have recourse to the sources to understand the force and propriety of the words. Thus the verse in *Exodus* ch.1, “he has built them houses,” we must understand from the Hebrew phrase that it signifies fertility and abundance of sons. So also in *Psalms* 112, “who makes the barren inhabit a house.” The verse too of *Psalms* 138, “your eyes have seen me imperfect,” the Hebrew clearly indicates that it properly signifies an embryo. And the verse in the same place, “your knowledge is made marvelous out of me,” is made readily clear from the Hebrew text, for it signifies that the knowledge is more marvelous than man can grasp. Those too who are skilled in this language will recognize what sort of Hebraism is found in the words of Paul in *Ephesians* ch.3, “to know also the love of Christ

surpassing knowledge.” For the sense is not that the love of Christ is a gift that is more eminent than knowledge, as the words seem to mean, but that the love of Christ is greater than can be grasped by knowledge.

The heretics take a third argument from various places in which the Vulgate edition seems altogether to contain error. And although they bring forward these places without any order, we however will relate them in order. First places that they adduce from various books of the Scriptures of the Old Testament; then those they adduce from the *Psalms*; finally those they adduce from the New Testament.

*Chapter Twelve: The Places are Defended that Chemnitz says are Distorted in the Vulgate Edition*

The first place is *Genesis* ch.3 where we read, “she will crush your head.” This place Chemnitz says has been corrupted to prove the intercession and patronage of Mary, since it should be read, “it will crush your head,” for the Scripture is speaking about seed, that is, about Christ, as all the ancients teach.

I reply that the Vulgate edition has various readings; for some codices have ‘he’, and some have ‘she’. And for this reason it is not against the Vulgate edition if it is persuasively shown that ‘he’ or ‘it’ should be read.

I say second that it is not improbable that ‘she’ should be read, nor is this a distortion by Papists. For even though many Hebrew codices have the word for ‘it’, yet one is read in which was written the word for ‘she’, and that man indeed is most uneducated who does not know that, when the pointings are removed, the Hebrew word can be translated as ‘she’. For everywhere in the Sacred Bible one word appears for the other. So in *Genesis* ch.3 v.12, *Exodus* ch.3 v.8. Add that ‘she’ was read by Claudius Marius Victor on *Genesis* bk.1, by Alcimus Avitus in *Songs* bk.3 ch.6, by Chrysostom *Homily 17* on *Genesis*, by Augustine *On Genesis against the Manichees* bk.2 ch.18, *On Genesis to the Letter* bk.11 ch.36, by Ambrose *On Flight from the Age* ch.7, Gregory *Morals* bk.1 ch.38, Eucherius, Rupert, Bede, Rabanus, Strabus, and Liranus on this place, and Bernard *Sermon 2* on ‘He was sent’. So Chemnitz speaks a like when he says that all the ancients read ‘it’.

But you will say the word ‘he will crush’ is in Hebrew of the masculine gender, therefore it refers to ‘seed’, which is also of the masculine gender, and not to ‘woman’, which is feminine. I reply that this is not new in Scripture, that masculine pronouns or verbs are joined with feminine nouns, as in *Ruth* ch.1 v.8 where Ruth speaks to her daughters-in-law, and in *Esther* ch.1 v.20, and *Ecclesiastes* ch.12 v.5, and many others of this sort are found.

The second place is from *Genesis* ch.6 where we read, “all the thought of his heart is intent on evil,” which place Chemnitz wants to have been corrupted for purpose of extenuating original sin, since in the Hebrew it is, “the imagination of his heart is only evil all the day.”

I respond that the sense is the same; for the phrase ‘imagination of the heart’ signifies the thought of the heart because by the heart is it made up and formed, as even the Hebrews teach on this place. But the sense of “all the thought of his heart is intent on evil” is the same as “the imagination,” that is, “the thought of his heart is only evil.” Now it does not follow from this, as the Lutherans think, that all the works of men are evil; for this is a hyperbole in Scripture, which it often uses to

emphasize something; just as is said in the same chapter, “all flesh has corrupted its own way.” And yet in the same place is said, “Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations.”

The third place is from *Genesis* ch.9 where we read, “he who sheds the blood of man, his blood will be shed.” This place, says Chemnitz, has been mutilated, since in Hebrew it is, “he who sheds the blood of man, by man will his blood be shed.” I reply that this omission does not make the sense false, or imperfect; therefore it is not of great moment. For the sense is, both in Hebrew and in Latin, that he who kills a man will also be killed himself.

The fourth place is from *Genesis* ch.14 where we read, “now Melchizedek was king of Salem, bringing forward bread and wine, for he was a priest of the Most High God.” This place he says has been corrupted to enable us to prove the sacrifice of the Mass; for in Hebrew there is no word for offering, nor any connecting word giving a reason [sc. ‘for’], as there is in the Vulgate edition.

I reply that Chemnitz falsely says that the verb for offering is contained in the Vulgate edition. For we do not read ‘he offered’ but ‘he brought forward’ bread and wine. Now the Vulgate edition does have a connecting word giving a reason, but so also does the Hebrew text, although Chemnitz did not see it for lack of skill, or did not want to see it for malice. For although the Hebrew word is not the word ‘for’ but the word ‘and’, yet ‘and’ is often taken as ‘for’, the way it is in *Isaiah* ch.64, “you are angry and we have sinned,” that is, because we have sinned, and *Genesis* ch.20, “behold you will die because of the woman whom you bore, and she has a man,” and *Genesis* ch.30, “I have learnt by experience, because the Lord has blessed me;” and many places of this sort are found in the codices of the Hebrews.

Therefore that Melchizedek brought forward bread and wine, so as to offer it in sacrifice to God, because he was priest of the Most High God, and that by this deed he bore the figure of our sacrifice, whereby under the species of bread and wine we offer the body and blood of Christ to God, is affirmed by all the old Greeks and Latins, as Clement of Alexandria *Stromaties* bk.4, Eusebius *Demonstration of the Gospel* bk.5, Epiphanius *Heresy* 79, Chrysostom *Homily* 35 on *Genesis*, Cyprian bk.2 epist.3, Ambrose on *Sacraments* bk.4 ch.3, Jerome in his commentary on *Matthew* ch.26, Augustine *City of God* bk.17 ch.17, Eucherius on *Genesis* bk.2 ch.18. Lastly in *Psalms* 109 it is said of Christ, “you are a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,” as Paul expounds in *Hebrews* chs.5 and 7. But why is Christ a priest after the order of Melchizedek save because he offered bread and wine, here himself under the species of bread and wine?

The fifth place is from *Numbers*, last chapter, where we have, “every man shall take a wife of his tribe and of his kindred, and every woman shall receive a husband from the same tribe,” which place is not noted by Chemnitz but by Osiander in his notations to *Gospel Harmony*. For this precept seems contrary to many examples in Scripture. For Josabeth, daughter of King Joram of the tribe of Judah, was wife of the High Priest Joiada of the tribe of Levi, *2 Chronicles* ch.22. Ruth the Moabitess was wife of Booz of the tribe of Judah, *Ruth* ch.4. Michol of the tribe of Benjamin was wife of David of the tribe of Judah, *1 Kings* ch.18. Again all the Hebrews swore in the last chapter of *Judges* that they would not give wives of their daughters to anyone of the tribe of Benjamin; therefore if the oath had not

intervened, they were permitted to give the daughters from one tribe to men of another tribe. And the Blessed Virgin Mary of the tribe of Judah was related to Elizabeth of the tribe of Levi, *Luke* ch.1.

Lastly it seems also against the text of the Hebrews, where is only read that women who are heiresses of paternal goods could not marry men other than those of their own tribe; but about men and women who were not heirs, there was no law.

Abulensis on this place says that this law did not include the tribe of Levi, nor women of foreign nations; and in case of necessity, and because of great Princes and Kings, a dispensation could be made from it. So does he respond to all the examples adduced. But no one can dispense from divine law. Next, David, when he took Michol to wife, was not king, nor was his marriage with Michol so necessary that he should have been dispensed from the law.

Canus responds better *On Places* bk.2 ch.14, but he does not fully explain the thing. Therefore the sense of the law both in the Vulgate edition and in the Hebrew text here is that when a woman lacks brothers and is therefore an heiress, she cannot marry anyone who is not of her own tribe, and no man can take her, even if she wishes, unless he is of her tribe. Therefore the law is given both to men and to women, but yet because of the goods of the women.

That this is the sense of the law is plain from the end of the law. For its end is, as is said there, that inheritances not be mixed together and pass from one tribe to another. Further to obtain this end it was not necessary to bid absolutely that marriages not be contracted outside one's own tribe, but only that marriages not be contracted outside the tribe when the women about to be married is an heiress. And in this way satisfaction is made to all the adduced examples.

But as to the remark that it is read differently in the Hebrew, I reply that this is false. For the law given to women in the Hebrew text is clear, as it is also in the Latin. Now the law given to men, which they say is not contained in the Hebrew, is comprehended in this words, "the sons of Israel will hold each one in the possession of the tribe of his fathers." The adversaries think that this word ('will hold') refers to possession, so that the sense is, 'they will hold the possession,' that is, 'they will remain in possession of their own tribe'; but it is not so but the reference is to the wife, so that the sense is, 'the sons of Israel will hold', namely to their wife, that is, each one will contract marriages in the possession of his tribe, that is, without passing through marriage to the possession of another tribe. That this is the sense is collected from what follows. For what follows is, "and every daughter inheriting a possession will hold to a man of her own tribe etc.," and thus was this place understood by Eusebius *Hist.* bk.1 ch.6, Epiphanius *Heresy* 78, Ambrose on *Luke* ch.3, Bede on the first chapter of *Luke*, Damascene bk.4 ch.15.

The sixth place is *Ezra* bk.1 ch.9, where Chemnitz says that we have "his peace" (*pax illius*) when it should be "a small stake" (*paxillus*). I reply that this also is an error of the copyists, for the Hebrew word is stake or stick, and many Latin codices do have 'stake'.

The seventh is from *Job* ch.5, "Call if there is anyone who may respond to you, and turn you to any of the saints." This place Chemnitz wants to have been distorted so as to prove the invocation of the saints. I reply that perhaps Chemnitz was drunk when he wrote this, for very openly do the words in the Hebrew of *Job* ch.5 literally

read, "Call now, if there is one responding to you, and look to someone from the saints." And certainly if an express word is being asked for, this one is very express.

The eighth place is from *Proverbs* ch.16 where we have, "weight and balance are the judgments of the Lord, and his works are all stones of the age (*saeculi*)," although it ought to be "stones of a sack (*sacculi*)" according to the Hebrew, which signifies 'pouch' not 'age'. I reply that in our edition there are various readings, and that the one that has 'sack' is true, while in others 'age' has been put by error of the scribes.

The ninth is from *Ecclesiastes* ch.9, "man does not know whether he is worthy of hate or love." Which place Chemnitz wants to have been distorted so that doubt about remission of sins might be proved; which same thing Calvin wrote before, *Institutes* ch.5 sect.38.

I reply that our translator translated very well, not indeed by numbering the Hebrew words but by weighing them and expressing their sense. For the Hebrew text has the sense literally of "both love and hate man is not knower of, but all things before their face." That this is the sense of these words is what Jerome wants in his commentary on this place, "Further," he says, "the sense is this: I have found indeed that the works of the just are in the hands of God, and yet whether they are loved by God or not is now not possible to know; therefore they will know in the future, and in their face are all things, that is, there goes before them, when they depart from this life, knowledge of this thing, because then there is judgment, now contest." So Jerome. This very true understanding of this place the translator could not have rendered better than in these words, "man does not know whether he is worthy of hate or love, but all things in the future are kept uncertain."

But lest anyone object that the impious know they are worthy of hate, one must note that *Ecclesiastes* is speaking only of the just who, although they are conscious to themselves of no sin, yet cannot establish certainly while they live here whether they are just or not; from which it follows that they do not know whether they are worthy of hate or love.

The tenth is from *Ecclesiasticus* ch.5, "about propitiated sin do not be without fear." This place too Chemnitz wants to have been distorted so as to prove the uncertainty of remission of sins. I reply that there are here various readings, as Cornelius Jansenius shows on this place. For certain codices have 'about propitiated sin', and others 'about propitiation' or 'about the propitiation of sin', which last seems better, since it is more conform to the Greek text.

But also from here the opinion of the heretics is proved to be false, whereby they bid man to believe certainly that he is just, or will be just, if he believes; for either the Wise man is speaking of propitiation already obtained, so that 'about the propitiation of sin' and 'about propitiated sin' are the same, and what the heretics say is false, that man should be secure about having obtained pardon; or he is speaking of propitiation to be obtained, and then what the same say is false, that man ought to be secure about obtaining pardon. But of these matters in their own place.

The eleventh is from *Ecclesiasticus* ch.16, "mercy will make the place for each according to the merit of his works." Chemnitz complains that we have added the word 'merit', which is not in the Greek, and that thus we have distorted this place to

show the merit of good works, just as Calvin complained before, *Institutes* ch.10 sect.52. I reply that in the Greek text there is not the word 'merit', because this word is Latin and the text is Greek, yet there is something that signifies the same and that is rightly expressed by the name of merit. For the Greek is 'according to works', but no one who is but a little skilled in the Greek tongue can deny but that 'according to works' signifies in Latin 'for the merit of works'.

The twelfth is from *Joel* ch.2, "Preeminent above malice." These words Chemnitz says signify nothing, and are sung in our Church without any understanding. I reply that Jerome put this word in his text and in his commentary also used this word, and Chemnitz must put up with our attributing more to Jerome than to him. But "preeminent above malice" signifies "excellent in having mercy and in condoning sins" which properly belongs to God. And it is the same as this, "penitent above malice," which is the literal Hebrew, for the Hebrew word means 'to repent'. It could also, if we consider the Latin words, not badly be that "preeminent above malice" is the same as "greater than to be able to be overcome by malice." Which indeed is very true, because the infinite kindness of God is never overcome by the enormity or the number of sins.

The thirteenth is in *Micah* ch.5, where we read, "And thou Bethlehem Ephrata art little among the thousands of Judah, out of you will come for me he who will be dominator in Israel." This place Osiander, in his annotations on *Gospel Harmony* wants to have been distorted, and thinks that "thou art little..." should be corrected to "it is too little for you to be among the thousands of Judah." For he says that the unskilled translator did not notice that the Hebrews lack a neuter gender and use the feminine or masculine in its place; therefore although the Hebrew word is of masculine gender yet it should be translated as the neuter 'it is too little' and not 'thou art little'. And he proves it because what follows, "from you will come out for me etc." does not rightly cohere with what precedes unless it be said, "it is too little etc."

I reply that our translator translated correctly; for the Greek and Chaldee codices agree with it, and Jerome so read in his commentary on this place and, what is greater, *Matthew* thus cited it in his second chapter, for he said "thou art least" not "it is too little;" and although the Hebrews use the other genders for the neuter, yet not always. As to his reason, I say that the following words very well cohere with the preceding ones, provided the preceding ones are read with a question mark, as *Matthew* reads, who for this reason translates it negatively, "thou art least by no means," because he had read "thou art little?"

*Chapter Thirteen: The Places in the Psalms are Defended that Calvin Contends were Badly Translated by the Latin Translator*

Now we will come to the places that John Calvin in his *Antidote to the Council of Trent* has noted as corrupt and distorted, and although William Lindanus has before us performed this same task, yet it does not seem useless if the calumnies of the heretics are refuted by several people.

So, the first place is in the words of *Psalms* 2, "Learn discipline." Which place Calvin shows is distorted by the fault of the translator, since in the Hebrew there is

“Kiss the son;” nor could this happen in any way by the guilt of the copyists, since there is no likeness of letters.

I reply, literally in the Hebrew it is, “Kiss,” or “adore the son;” yet the sense of the place is very correctly translated by “Learn discipline.” For thus the Chaldee, thus the Greek, thus all the old Greeks and Latins have hitherto read. One must therefore observe that when it is said “kiss the son,” the sense is, “acknowledge that the Son of God is your true King and Messiah by kissing his hand in honor,” as Blessed Jerome expounds *Against Ruffinus* bk.2; and for this reason too it can be translated, “Adore the son.” Further, to acknowledge the son to be King and Messiah, we can do no other than to receive his faith and doctrine. And what else is “learn discipline” than to receive the teaching and doctrine of the Son of God?

The second place is *Psalm 4*, “Sons of men, how far with heavy heart?” This place is censured in the same place by Calvin because in Hebrew there is nothing like it; for in place of our words “why with heavy heart,” there is in Hebrew, “my glory for shame.”

I reply that it is very likely the Hebrew text has been corrupted by the fault of the copyists; for if one Hebrew letter is put for another and the pointings are changed, it will be “why heavy of heart,” and without doubt such is what the *Septuagint* read, whose version all the Greek and Latin Fathers followed, besides Jerome who, since he read otherwise, translates “my renowned ones;” the sense however is still the same, which suffices for truth of translation. For God in this place is complaining about men because, having neglected eternal things, they love temporal ones; and indeed according to the Greek and Latin translation he calls them heavy of heart, because such they are by their vice; according to the Hebrew text, as it now is, he calls them his glory, or his renowned ones, because such they are by divine beneficence if we consider in them the heavenly image and not their own vice. Besides the relevant Hebrew word can either be a passive participle or a verbal noun.

The third is *Psalm 31*, “I was converted in my toil, when the thorn pierced.” This place too is censured by Calvin because in the Hebrew there are different words and a different sense. For literally in the Hebrew it is, “My taste is without moisture, my freshness is turned into summer dryness.” And indeed the sense of our edition is, “I am converted to penitence in the time of toil and affliction, when the thorn of calamity began to pierce me;” but the sense of Hebrew truth is, “all my goods have perished, in the way that moisture and freshness dry up in summer by the heat of the sun and perish.”

I reply that our translation cannot be censured in this place because it does not translate from the Hebrew into Latin but from the Greek; but the Greek text very well responds to our text. Now the *Septuagint* seems to have read the Hebrew text a little differently than it now is. Therefore there is an error of the scribes in the Hebrew. For by a very little change in one or two letters the sense in Hebrew can become as it is in our edition. For what is translated as “my freshness” will be, if the little change is read, “I am converted in my toil,” the way also Blessed Jerome reads it, who translates, “I am turned in my misery.” And what follows, “into summer dryness,” will be, if the little change is read, “when the thorn pierced me.”

And to be sure, if when we see in the Latin text that something could easily be changed by the copyists because of likeness of letters and could not be so changed in the Hebrew, we say that the error of the copyists is in the Latin, why do we not in this place, where there could have easily been an error in the Hebrew and not in the Greek or Latin, also say that the text has been changed in the Hebrew by an error of the copyists?

The fourth is in the same *Psalm*, for where we read, “with bit and bridle restrain their jaws, who do not approach thee.” Calvin maintains that this should be read, “in jagged spikes and with bridle for coercing them lest they go before to thee.” I reply that his impudence in this matter is remarkable; for both the *Septuagint* and Blessed Jerome in his *Psalter* to Sophronius and all the Fathers always so read as we now read, and the Hebrew words, even as they now are, can be thus very fittingly expounded.

The fifth is in *Psalm* 37, “Since my loins are filled with illusions.” And what do we understand, says Calvin, by “loins filled with illusions”? I reply that the Hebrew word signifies ignominy and ardor; wherefore David speaks of the itching and ardor of lust, which when it exists in the body generates illusions in the mind; further the Greek translator, whom the Latin and (which is more remarkable) the Chaldee translator have followed, put the effect for the cause, which ought to seem neither new nor remarkable to anyone.

The sixth is *Psalm* 67, “Who makes to live of one morals in the house.” Calvin maintains that this should be read, “Who makes single persons to live in the house,” that is, who endows orphans and solitaries with a family. I reply that the Hebrew words very well admit of several senses, and all are true. One sense is: who makes to live in one house, which is the Church, men of one morals, that is, of one faith, one hope, one will, according to the verse of *Acts* ch.4, “There was for the multitude of believers one heart and one soul.” For those who are of diverse faith or will, as heretics and schismatics, cannot remain in the Church but either depart themselves or are cast out. This sense is expressed by the *Septuagint* and thence by the Latin translator and by almost all the Greek and Latin Fathers. Nor does this sense depart from the Hebrew word, which signifies one composed of many. Because however it also signifies single and solitary, thence it also has another true sense: who makes men abandoned and solitary, who have none to defend them, to live secure nevertheless in their homes, the divine aid protecting them. This St. Jerome seems to have had regard to, because he translates as solitary. The third sense is also true and does not destroy the others: who makes single men, that is, orphans or sterile to live in a house, that is, to possess a large family.

Nor is their exposition absurd who translate thus: he makes the solitary to live in a house, that is, makes some, for love of celestial contemplation, abandoning company to betake themselves to desert places and live alone, as Elijah did formerly, and John the Baptist later, and our Paul, Anthony, Hilarion and others.

The seventh is in the same *Psalm* where for what we have, “Who dwell in tombs,” Calvin contends that “in a parched place” should be read. And indeed it cannot be denied that the Hebrew word means dry and parched. But it is not credible that the Greek translator did not know this, since the word is sufficiently well known. The translator therefore wished to express horror of the desert from



which God led out his people, because it did indeed seem to be like a tomb. This phrase we see used in *Ezekiel* ch.37 who called the Babylonian captivity the tombs of the Jews.

The eighth is in the same *Psalms* where is said, "The Lord will give word to those who give good news with much virtue, the King of virtues of the beloved, the beloved, and of the beauty of a house to divide the spoils. If you sleep in the middle of the shares, a dove silvered in its wings, and on its back in pale gold." This place Calvin especially vexes above the rest, saying that where the sense in the words of David flows very well, the translator has involved it in riddles from which no Oedipus could extract himself. He himself wants to read: "the Kings of armies have fled, have fled, and the women in the house have divided the spoils. If you sleep in the middle of the jars, you will be as the wings of a dove that is covered in silver and whose wings are covered with yellow gold." I reply that one cannot accuse the Latin translator who translated most faithfully what he found in the Greek; and although in the Latin edition the place is very obscure, yet it is also obscure in the Greek and Hebrew, and in Calvin's version, as is plain.

I say in addition that the Hebrew text can easily be accommodated to our reading. For the word that signifies 'Kings of virtues or of armies', if the pointing is changed it will be 'King of virtues'. And the word that means 'will flee' seems to have been read differently by the *Septuagint* by a change of only one letter to mean 'beloved, chosen', and this word is in the title of *Psalms* 44 where is read 'song of the chosen'. But the word that means woman in the house (not women in the house as Calvin badly translates) also signifies a beautiful and chosen woman who almost always stays at home; and hence when the word is translated it means vision and beauty. For Blessed Jerome translated as beauty in this place, and almost always elsewhere.

Next the word Calvin translates as jars does not have this meaning. For it is of dual number and therefore signifies something double in its nature. For more or less thus do the Hebrews use the dual. But jars are infinite. Instead it signifies two lips or two limits or orders. Hence Jerome translates 'within the limits' and the *Septuagint* 'among the shares' that is, the lots, or inheritances, as if to say, 'between the limits of two lots'. So we have it that our reading is not foreign to the Hebrew. Now let us explain the sense.

The sense then of these words, as is collected from Augustine and other Fathers, is as follows: "The Lord will give word to those who give good news with much virtue," that is, the Lord will give to the preachers of the Gospel a mouth and wisdom which all their adversaries will not be able to resist or contradict. For what they will say they will confirm with signs and prodigies. "The King of virtues of the beloved, the beloved," that is, the Lord, of whom we were speaking, is the King of virtues, that is, King most powerful, the Lord of armies of many thousands of Angels, and at the same time father of the beloved, beloved, that is, of the Messiah his most beloved Son, who will also give the spoils to divide to the beauty of the house, that is, he will give to the same preachers to divide the spoils of the Gentiles converted to Christ, for the beauty and splendor of his house, which is the Church. For the word for 'beauty' is in the dative case and means the same as 'for beauty'. "If you sleep in the middle of the shares," that is, if you O preachers and Pastors of the Church

remain between the two lots or inheritances, the heavenly and the earthly, so that while you live here you are not wholly occupied in temporal things, nor totally in spiritual things, nor totally in action, nor totally in contemplation, but in between; then the Church will be as a most shapely and beautiful dove, having silvered wings and a golden back etc.

The ninth is in the same place where we read, "Why do you suspect the coagulated mountains?" For Calvin maintains that it should be read, "why do you envy the best mountains?" But since the word is only found in this place and there are as many interpretations of the word as there are translators, why, I ask, is one man to be followed rather than the 70 translators of the Septuagint? Certainly Calvin will not be able to confirm his translation from anywhere. Since therefore it is necessary to acquiesce in the judgment of the translators, who does not see that the *Septuagint* is to be preferred to all the others, especially since the Catholic Church has approved that version by very long use.

The tenth is in the same place, where we read, "And that the Lord God dwell among the non believers." For Calvin thinks it should be read thus, "Also the defectors, so that the Lord God may dwell there." But there is here assuredly too much lust for contradiction, since the sense is the same, and the words of the Vulgate edition are better, and so did St. Jerome translate from the Hebrew.

The eleventh is in the same place, where we read, "I will turn back to the depth of the sea." For Calvin says the contrary is contained in the Hebrew, that is, "I will bring back from the depths of the sea." But that the translation from the Hebrew can be 'to the depth' is testified to by Rabbi David who asserts that the word can sometimes be taken for 'to', as Deuteronomy ch.33 v.1, "to Sinai." Next there are various readings both in the Greek and in the Latin codices, since some read 'to the depth' and others 'in the depths'. Which latter reading seems both truer and more coherent with the Hebrew word. For what else is "I will turn back in the depths of the sea" than those too I will draw out and turn back who are in the depths of the sea? Which is how Augustine, Bede, Euthymius and not a few others expounded it.

The twelfth place is in the same *Psalms*, "There Benjamin in excess of mind." Calvin wonders what the translator was thinking who so translated, since in the Hebrew there is "their dominator." I reply that the word can signify 'their dominator' and also 'one deep sleeping'; the latter reading is followed by the Greek and Latin translator, but each is a true interpretation, nor does one destroy the other. For by Benjamin Catholic writers understand with Augustine the Apostle Paul, who was in excess of mind when sleeping so deeply that he did not know whether he was in the body, and was also at the same time chief Lord or Prince of the spiritual Church of the Gentiles.

The thirteenth is in *Psalms* 131, where we read, "Blessing his widow I will bless." Which place both Calvin and Chemnitz say is corrupt, since in Hebrew there is "his food." Calvin adds that some purblind little priest had in his codex 'victum' (food), and he thought the letters 'c' and 't' to be the one letter 'd' and so he read 'vidum'; and because this signifies nothing, he added the letter 'a' and made 'viduam' (widow), and there was no one who could notice the error.

I reply that Calvin in this place has twice lied. First when he says that no one has noticed this variation; it was noticed by Chrysostom and Hilary on this place,

and also by Jerome in *Question on Genesis*. Again several recent writers, Cajetan, Titelmann, and others on this place. Second when he says 'purblind little priest' he has corrupted the place; for in almost all the Greek codices there is 'widow' and so read Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Chrysostom, Prosper, Cassiodorus, and others. St. Hilary also asserts that before Christ was born there was 'widow' in this text.

I say further, that if there is any error here it arose from the Greek, where, with the change of only one letter, one word could be replaced for another, and 'widow' would become 'game animal'. For even now some Greeks have 'game animal' and Jerome in his *Psalter* translated 'hunting', and thus do Chrysostom and Theodoret expound it in their commentaries on this place.

Because however the sense is almost the same, and always in the Greek and Latin Church 'widow' has been read and sung, I do not think this place should be changed; for Jerome in his epistle to Sunia and Fretella often advises that what in the Latin *Psalms* seems to differ from the Hebrew must indeed be noted and observed by the learned, but not for this reason should the text be changed which has been in Ecclesiastical use for so many centuries and has obtained so much authority. Which counsel of Jerome Calvin has not at all kept, who has so overturned and changed everything that he has clearly made a different *Psalter*.

It has seemed good to transcribe at the end certain words of Conrad Pellican, a Zwinglian, so that we can truly say about our edition what Moses says about the true God, that our edition is not as theirs are, and our enemies are the judges. He then, since he twice produced a *Psalter* translated by him in accord with Hebrew truth, gave this testimony about our *Psalter*, in his preface of 1534: "We discover that the Vulgate edition of the *Psalter* concords with such very great dexterity, erudition, and faithfulness to the Hebrew as to the sense, that I do not doubt that the Greek and Latin translator was most erudite, and equally most pious, and truly endowed with a prophetic spirit; although in some places they depart from the Hebrew pointings, which now are used by the Jews, I am compelled to doubt that they were not formerly similar, and suspicion arises for those who carefully consider each thing that a change made in the letters must be complained of." So Pellican. And thus much about the Old Testament.

#### *Chapter Fourteen: The Places are Defended that the Heretics say are Corrupt in the Latin Edition of the New Testament*

Further, in the New Testament there are also not a few places noted by Chemnitz and Calvin that they say have been corrupted by the translator

The first place is *Matthew* ch.9, "I have not come to call the just but sinners." Chemnitz says "this very beautiful sentence has been mutilated, for there is lacking in the Latin 'to repentance'." I reply that among certain Latins this phrase is added; next I say that it is very likely that the phrase is superfluous in the Greek, and it was not in the emended Greek codices. For Blessed Jerome in his commentary does not read it, and yet Jerome diligently compared the Greek with the Latin and corrected the Latin by the Greek. And that it is not necessary is clear. For to call sinners, not the just, openly signifies to exhort to repentance those who need it, not those who do not, which the Lord a little before illustrated with the example of a doctor.

The second place is *John* ch.14, "The Holy Spirit will suggest all things to you that I will have said to you." This place Chemnitz maintains is distorted so as to prove that whatever is defined in Councils should be received as the oracles of the Holy Spirit, for in the Greek there is not 'I will have said' but 'I said'. I reply that St. Augustine and all the ancients read it as we read it, and the sense is the same as the Greek. For we do not understand that the Lord said, 'the Holy Spirit will suggest to you all things what I will then have said to you' but 'that I will now have said to you', that is, the things you now hear from me and do not understand the Holy Spirit will recall to your memory and explain them. Nor do Catholics place on this word their foundation for the authority of Councils, but we have other supports about which we will speak hereafter.

The third is *Romans* ch.1, "Who is predestined the Son of God." This place Calvin censures as badly rendered, both because in the Greek there is 'declared' or 'manifested' and because those are predestined who now exist, but Christ was always Son of God; and this argument Origen also uses in this place.

I reply that our translator has very well rendered it; for although the word in Greek signifies to delimit, and in profane authors is often taken as declare, yet in Scripture it is taken otherwise. For as Blessed Dionysius *Divine Names* ch.5 teaches, this word is proper to Theology, that is, it has in Scripture a special meaning; for it everywhere means to establish or decree or define and never to declare, as is plain in *Acts* chs.2, 4, 17, *Romans* ch.8, *Ephesians* ch.1, and elsewhere. For when it is said in *Acts* ch.2, "This man, handed over by the definite counsel and foreknowledge of God, you have killed," the word for definite is this same one, and yet it is certain that it does not mean declaration but divine ordination. Likewise in *Romans* ch.8, "Whom he predestined them he also called," the Greek word is again the same, which not even the adversaries maintain signifies 'he declared'.

And since the ordination and definition of God cannot be in time but eternal, therefore our translator, seeing that the Apostle is speaking of eternal definition, preferred to translate as predestined rather than as destined. And so did all the Latins read, even the most ancient, as Irenaeus *Against Valent.* bk.3, Hilary *On the Trinity* ck.7, Ambrose, Sedulius, and others on this place, Augustine *On Predestination* ch.15 and on *John* tract.105. Tertullian *Against Prisca* reads 'defined' which is the same as ours. Add that the IX Council of Toledo ch.1, which both reads and expounds 'predestined'. Nor does that little reason of Calvin effect anything; for we do not say the 'predestined' as if the Son of God began to be the Word of God, but that the Word of God became man, and therefore that he who was made for God from the seed of David, as Paul says, is the Son of God. And this is beautifully explained by Augustine and the Council of Toledo.

The fourth place is *Romans* ch.1 at the end of the chapter, where we have, "Who since they did not know the justice of God, did not understand that those who do such things are worthy of death, not only those who do them but those who consent with those who do them." This place not only Chemnitz but also Valla, Erasmus, Jacob Faber and others maintain is corrupt. First because the Greek text does not have 'did not understand', and so these words, to begin with, were added, and then that the 'who' was added in 'who do such things...and who consent'. Second because Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact expound the text as it is in

the Greek. Third, because what is contained in our text seems to be false, or certainly very unlikely. For it is said, "Who since they did not know the justice of God, did not understand that those who do such things are worthy of death, etc." For if they did not understand how did they know the justice of God? For what is the justice of God save that those who act badly are punished?

I reply that our reading is altogether better; for according to the Greek the sense is that it is worse to consent with him who acts badly than to do bad; according to the Latin the sense is the contrary, that it is worse to act badly than to consent with those who act badly. But certainly it is absolutely worse to act badly than to consent with one who acts badly. For who denies that it is worse to kill a man than merely to consent to his being killed, that is, to permit when you could prevent? For the Apostle is not speaking of command or incitement to evil but of simple consent.

Therefore to the first point I say that we can collect nothing certain in this part from the Greek source; for the reading is various among the Greeks. For Origen reads differently from Chrysostom, as is plain from their commentaries, and Oecumenius notes that some read as we now read. Titelmann also in collat.1 on *Romans* asserts that he has read in an ancient Greek codex written by hand the words 'they did not understand'.

To the second point we oppose authors to authors; for it was read and expounded as we read it by Cyprian bk.1 epist.4, Ambrose, Sedulius, Haymo, Anselm, and other Latins on this place, and by Hesychius bk.6 on *Leviticus* expounding ch.20, and by Pope Symmachus in his *Apologetic against the Emperor Anastasius*.

To the third point I say that what is contained in the Greek seems rather to be false. For what is said in the Latin "since they did not know the justice of God" does not conflict with that which follows "they did not understand." For when the Latin says "they did not know" it is speaking of theoretical knowledge; when it says "they did not understand" it is speaking of practical knowledge. Therefore the sense is that since they did not know the truth but were blinded by their evil passions, they could not seriously persuade themselves to act properly. It could also be said that the "they did not understand" is not referred to the "that those who do such things etc." but to the "but those who consent with those who do them." For the sense is that these gentile Philosophers, since they knew there was one God and that therefore it was bad to worship Jove and Mars and other false spirits, did not understand that not only was what the crowds were doing bad, but that it was also bad to consent with them and not to admonish them and rebuke them, as the Philosophers were doing.

The fifth place is *Romans* ch.4 where it is said that Abraham was not justified from works. For Chemnitz complains that we have added "of the law" so as to be able to expound the place about the works of the law that prescribed the ceremonies. I reply that this is a mere calumny. For the Latin codices, either all or almost all, do not have the 'of the law'. Nor do we understand the place of the works of the old law, but of works done by one's own resources. Add that Ambrose both has 'of the law' in his text and in his commentary expounds it of the old law. The Papists then have not corrupted this place, as Chemnitz falsely says. But of this hereafter.

The sixth is *Romans* ch.11 where we read, "If by grace it is no longer of works, otherwise grace is no longer grace." Chemnitz falsely accuses us of taking away the complete sentence, namely, 'But if it is of works it is no more by grace, otherwise work is no longer work'. I reply that this sentence is indeed in the Greek codices and is explained by Theophylact, but it is not acknowledged by any others; neither Origen, nor Chrysostom, nor Ambrose, nor any other expositors of this place have made mention of it; but not Augustine either, who very frequently treats of this place and especially in bk.2 on the *Good of Perseverance* ch.18. Nay even Erasmus in his notes on this place rejects this addition as superfluous. Which should certainly be enough for Chemnitz, who on the same page refers us to Erasmus, so as to learn from him the errors of the Vulgate edition.

The seventh place is *Ephesians* ch.5, "This is a great sacrament." For Chemnitz teaches that sacrament is a bad translation, since in the Greek it is *mysterion*, and he says this has been done so that we can thence prove matrimony to be a sacrament. I reply that mystery for the Greeks is the same as sacrament for the Latins; for the Greeks always say *mysterion* when they are dealing with sacraments. And when this place of the Apostle is being explained by the holy Fathers, Ambrose, Jerome, and the other Latins, they always use this word.

The eighth place is *Ephesians* ch.6, "Put on the armor of God, so that you may be able to resist in the evil day, and to stand perfect in all things." Chemnitz maintains that this place is distorted because in the Greek it is "to stand with all things made perfect," and so is it expounded by Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom and others. I reply that the sense is the same, but that it is necessary to join 'perfect' with the word 'all' and not with the verb 'stand'. For the sense of the Apostle is that we be armed in every part with spiritual arms, so that thus armed we may, in the battle line against the Devil, be able not to fall but to stand. He says, therefore, 'put on the armor of God', or in Greek all the armor, helmet, shield, sword, breastplate etc., so that being perfect in all, that is, fortified and armed in every part, that is, endowed and perfected with all virtues, you may be able to stand against the Devil; or, and it is the same, so that with all things perfect, that is, when you have got possession of and put on all the arms, then you may be able to stand etc.

The ninth place is *Hebrews* ch.9, "To the draining away of the sins of many." Chemnitz complains that the Greek words are badly translated, for the word is not 'to drain away' but 'to take away'. I reply that in this place the sense is the same. Besides the interpreter seems to have translated very properly; for the Greek words is properly to take up, to carry out, to lead out. Just as when water, then, or filth are drawn out from some bilge, the filth is said to be drained away, so also the sins that Christ has taken out or drawn out from the depths of our heart are rightly said to have been drained away by him.

The tenth is *Hebrews* ch.13, "God is merited by such victims." Here Chemnitz maintains that the word for merit has been put in, because it is not in the Greek. I reply that the Greek verb properly signifies that God is delighted or, as Erasmus translates, is pleased. But that in Latin it is very well said that he is merited by someone who makes a thing pleasing to him, is not unknown to anyone. So then did our translator say that God is merited by these victims, that is, by these victims a

thing is made pleasing to God and he who offers them very well merits from God. For the translator takes 'to be merited' in a passive sense.

The eleventh is *James* ch.5, "And the Lord will alleviate him." Chemnitz says that the Greek verb ('excite') is not well translated as 'alleviate', and that the place has been deliberately distorted, so that from it we may confirm the effects of the sacrament of extreme unction, although the Greek word has no such meaning. I reply that Chemnitz does not know what he is saying; for the Greek verb shows the effects of extreme unction, which Catholics recognize in that sacrament, better than the Latin verb does. For Catholics attribute three effects to this sacrament. One principle one, indeed, but common to the other sacraments, namely that it remits sins if any sins remain. A second one proper to this sacrament, that it raises up and gladdens a man who in that point of time is oppressed and numbed by sadness and grief. The third that sometimes it even heals the body.

These three effects, beginning from the least important, are expressively put by James in these words, "If anyone is sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of a faithful man will heal the sick, and the Lord will alleviate him, and if he is in sin, the sin will be forgiven him." The second effect therefore of this sacrament, that it gladdens, raises up, excites a man who on the point of death is depressed and numbed by sadness, grief, temptation, is very properly expressed by the Greek verb, which means to excite, to raise up, etc.

The twelfth is I *John* ch.5, "These things I write to you, that you may know that you have eternal life who believe in the name of the Son of God." Chemnitz says that this sentence is mutilated; for in the Greek it reads thus, "These things I write to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, so that you may know that you have eternal life and so that you may believe in the name of the Son of God." I reply that the Latin codex is not mutilated but that the Greek codex is redundant, as Erasmus also suspected on this place, to whose judgment however Chemnitz is wont to attribute a great deal. For since it is said, "These things I write to you who believe in the name of the Son of God," why is it added, "so that you may believe in the name of the Son of God"? For what was the need to admonish them to do what they had already done? Add that St. Bede too reads as we do.

#### *Chapter Fifteen: On Vernacular Editions*

There is a controversy between Catholics and heretics about whether it is necessary or at least expedient for the common use of the divine Scriptures to be in the vernacular tongue, proper to each region. And the heretics indeed of this time all agree that the Scriptures should be permitted to all, nay and should be delivered in their own tongue, and that when the Scriptures are publicly read or sung, as in the sacred offices, this too should be done in the proper and maternal tongue. Thus does Brentius teach in the *Confession of Wittemberg*, chapter on the canonical hours, and Calvin *Institutes* bk.3 ch.20 sect.33, Chemnitz in *Exam. of the Council of Trent* sess.4. All the others in fact teach the same thing, since they everywhere translate the Scriptures into German, French, English, and publicly read and sing the Scriptures in the same languages.

But the Catholic Church of Christ does not indeed altogether prohibit vernacular translations, as Chemnitz impudently lies (for in the index of prohibited books produced by Pius IV, reg.4, we see that the reading of books of this sort is conceded to those who can use them with fruit, that is, to those who have obtained the faculty from the local bishop); but the Church prohibits reading of this sort to be conceded everywhere to all without discrimination, and prohibits the Scriptures from being read or sung in the public and common use of the Church in vernacular tongues, as was laid down in the Council of Trent sess.22 ch.8 and can.9; but let us be content with the three languages that the Lord honored by his title on the cross, *John* ch.19, and which by the consent of all precede all others in antiquity, fullness, and gravity; and that finally are the languages in which the divine books themselves were written at the beginning by their authors, that is, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. About these languages Jerome thus speaks in his preface to the *Psalms*: "In these three languages most of all is preached the sacrament of the will of God and the expectation of his blessed kingdom, from which came that decision of Pilate, to write down in these three languages that our Lord Jesus Christ is King of the Jews."

About this argument two authors, as far as I indeed know, have written, Hosius Cardinal Varmiensis in his *Dialogue about Sacred Reading in the Vernacular*, and Jacob Ledesma, priest of our Society of Jesus, in the book which he wrote on this same argument. From these authors we have plucked certain things and we will insert them in this our disputation so that it may be fuller.

To begin with, then, we can prove the custom of the Catholic Church from the Church's use of the Old Testament that existed from the time of Ezra up to Christ. For from the time of Ezra the Hebrew tongue ceased among the people of God to be vernacular, since in the 70 years during which the Hebrews were among the Chaldeans in Babylon, they forgot their own language and learnt Chaldee, and thereafter Chaldee or Syriac was maternal to them, wherefore in *Ezra* bk.2 ch.8 we find that when the book of the law of the Lord was read to the whole people, Nehemiah and Ezra and the Levites interpreted, because otherwise the people were understanding nothing. So for this reason, as is said in the same place, there was great happiness among the people because they understood the words of the law when Ezra interpreted.

Besides, this is openly collected from the words of Christ and of the Evangelists. For in *Mark* ch.5 "Talitha cumi," that is, "little girl arise," is Syriac. For little girl is not called Talitha in Hebrew; thus "abba" in *Mark* ch.14, for the Hebrew is different, and in *Matthew* ch.27 "Hacheldema" is Syriac and is said otherwise in Hebrew. In the same place Golgotha is Syriac and would be said differently in Hebrew; and in the Evangelists we read Pascha, which is not Greek or Hebrew. See many other things in Jerome in his book on *Hebrew Names*. So there can be no doubt but that the vernacular at that time was not Hebrew; and yet the Scriptures were publicly read or sung in the temple or synagogues only in Hebrew. For from *Ezra* bk.2 ch.8 it is sufficiently collected that the Scripture was then read in Hebrew, not Syriac, for the people did not understand without an interpreter. To this also pertains what is said in *John* ch.7, "This crowd, which knows not the law."

Finally, up to this day in the synagogues of the Jews the Scriptures are read in Hebrew, although however for no nation is Hebrew at this time the vernacular. Nor



is it in conflict with this that a Chaldee paraphrase of the Scriptures is extant; for that was wholly or in part done after the advent of Christ, and furthermore the Hebrews have never accepted it so as to read it publicly as Scripture; but this is now our subject matter.

A second proof is from the use of the Apostles; for the Apostles preached and established Churches through the whole earth, as is plain from Paul *Romans* ch.10 and *Colossians* ch.1, and from *Mark* last chapter. Again from Irenaeus bk.1 ch.3, who although he was close to Apostolic times yet says that in his time there were already Churches founded in the Orient, in Libya, in Egypt, in Spain, in Germany, and in the middle regions, that is in Italy and Gaul. And yet they did not write their Gospels or epistles in the languages of the nations they preached to but only in Hebrew or Greek and, as some wish, Latin. For there are those who reckon that *Mark's Gospel*, as we also advised above, was written at Rome in Latin by Mark himself, and was afterwards by him translated into Greek, about which see Damasus in his *Life of Blessed Peter*, Adrianus Finus *Scourge against the Jews* bk.6 ch.80 and bk.8 ch.63, and Peter Antonius Beuter note 90 on Sacred Scripture.

Now that they did not write in any other languages, although they were not ignorant of them, since they had the gift of tongues, can be shown in many ways. First, because there is no trace extant of any Apostolic writing save in Greek, nor does any of the ancients hand on that they wrote save in Hebrew or Greek or Latin. Further, Paul wrote in Greek to the Romans, although however not Greek but Latin was the vernacular of the Romans; again Peter and James wrote in Greek to the Jews scattered over the earth, to whom however neither Greek nor Hebrew was maternal but the tongue of the region where they were living, as is plain from the verse of *Acts* ch.1, "Are not these who speak Galileans? And behold we hear them speaking in our own tongues, etc." For thus did the Jews speak who had come from various regions to the city of Jerusalem. For thus does Luke say in *Acts* ch.2, "But there were in Jerusalem Jews, religious men, from every nation under heaven." Again John wrote his first letter to the Parthians in Greek, as Blessed Higinus testifies in epist.1, and Blessed Augustine *Evangelical Questions* bk.2 q.39, and Pope John II in epist. to Valerius, although however Greek was not maternal to the Parthians.

The third proof is from the use of the universal Church; for as Augustine teaches epist.118, to dispute against what the universal Church does is a mark of most insolent madness. The universal Church, further, has used only the languages Hebrew, Greek, and Latin in the common and public use of the Scriptures, although however they had for a long time ceased to be vernacular.

Demonstration that it is so. First from the fact that Blessed Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.11 says that for understanding the Scriptures only knowledge of the three languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin is necessary, because the divine Scriptures are read in these languages, nor does any ancient author mention any other translation; and yet at that time without doubt there were many other common tongues. Therefore at least in the first 400 years in which the Church greatly flourished the Scriptures were not read in the vernacular tongue. Next, according to the rule of Augustine *Against the Donatists* bk.4 ch.24 and of Leo serm.2 on the *Fast of Pentecost*, a thing that is preserved in the universal Church, if no beginning for it can be assigned, is rightly believed to have come down from

Apostolic tradition and to have always been so. But we see now that in Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Greece, wherever Catholics are, only the Greek and Latin tongues are used in the public reading of the Scriptures, nor can any beginning be assigned for this fact. For who may say when this use began?

Add to this that in the whole Orient in the time of Jerome only the Greek *Septuagint* edition, as emended by Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius, was in public use. For as we learn from Jerome himself in his preface to *Chronicles*, from Constantinople to Antioch the Greek edition of Lucian was in use; from Antioch to Egypt, that is, through the whole of Syria, the edition of Origen was in public use; through the whole of Egypt they used the edition of Hesychius, and yet the Greek language was not the vernacular from Constantinople to Antioch, and much less in Syria and Egypt. For Galatia is between Constantinople and Syria, yet the proper language of the Galatians in the time of Blessed Jerome was not Greek but some language very similar to the language of the Treviri, as Jerome testifies in the preface to his second book on *Galatians*.

Further, Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, Phrygia, Pamphylia are situated between Constantinople and Antioch, and yet they did not have the same vernacular tongue, but diverse ones, so they did not understand each other, as is plain from *Acts* ch.2, and yet they all used one and the same edition of the Scriptures, namely that of St. Lucian. Now in Syria at that time the vernacular tongue was not Greek but another very different one, as Blessed Jerome testifies in his *Life of Hilarion*, where he says that Hilarion questioned a certain possessed man first in Syriac and then in Greek, so that the Greeks who were present would understand. Also St. Ephrem wrote many things in the Syrian speech, that is, the vernacular, as St. Jerome reports in his catalogue of writings.

But that Egypt also had its own language is witnessed by Athanasius in his *Life of Blessed Anthony*, where he says that he disputed with certain Greek Philosophers through an interpreter. Blessed Jerome also says in his book on *Illustrious Men* on Anthony that he wrote some letters in Egyptian which were afterwards translated into Greek.

In Africa it is certain that as long as Christians were there only the Latin language was in public use for the Scriptures; for there is no mention in any author of any Punic translation. And Blessed Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.13 says that in his time the *Psalms* were accustomed to be sung in Church in Latin. Again Blessed Cyprian in his sermon on the *Lord's Prayer* testifies that in his time the accustomed preface in the Mass was in Latin. Augustine on the *Good of Perseverance* ch.13 says that the Mass and the responses were in Latin. From which is manifestly collected that in Africa the Mass was wont to be said in Latin, as well as the Reading or Epistle and the Gospel, which are from the chief parts of the Mass.

But at that time Latin was not the vernacular tongue for everyone in Africa, as the same Augustine witnesses, for in his unfinished exposition on *Romans*, near the middle, he says that the Latin word *salus* (salvation) was also a Punic word, but that in Punic it means 'three', and he affirms in the same place that some knew Latin and Punic and some only Punic, as were almost all the country folk. Again in serm.35 on the *Words of the Lord*, he says that Punic is akin to Hebrew, and that what the Romans call lucre is by speakers of Punic called mammon. Blessed Jerome also in

the preface to his second book on *Galatians* says that the language of the Africans is a little different from Phoenician. But Phoenicia is part of Syria.

In Spain only the Latin language was in public use for the Scriptures as is plain from Isidore in his two books on *Divine Offices*, and also from the Fourth Council of Toledo ch.2, which took place before the year 1400, where it is laid down that in the whole of Spain the same order should be kept in singing the Psalms, the Mass, the Readings, and the other Ecclesiastical Offices; and then in chs.12-15 it is sufficiently plainly shown that all those things were then accustomed to be read in Latin, which practice has been kept to the present time.

There is not extant either any memory or trace of change, and yet for many centuries now the Latin tongue has ceased to be the vernacular in Spain. For it was separated from the Roman Empire before the year 1100 and subjected partly to the Goths, partly to the Moors, who without doubt introduced a new language. For the Goths, whom others call the Gerhas, had their own language, as Jerome testifies at the beginning of his epistle to Sunia and Fretella. In addition the Spaniards had their own tongue before the Goths corrupted it, as is insinuated by Blessed Jerome in the preface to his book on *Galatians*, where he says that in the Balearic Islands the vernacular tongue was then akin to Greek.

In England Bede *History* bk.1 ch.1 testifies that there were four vernacular languages according to the different regions of the island; yet Latin was common to them all because of the Scriptures; namely because they all used the Latin edition of the Scriptures although some had their own maternal tongues. The same practice was continued thereafter as is plain from Thomas Waldensis *On Sacramentals* vol.3 titles 3 and 4.

In France the Latin tongue was used in the public reading of the Scriptures when Latin was not the vernacular for the French, as is collected from Albinus Alcuin, preceptor of Charlemagne, in his book on *Divine Offices*, and also from Amalarius Treviri, who flourished about the year 840, and wrote very accurately about the Ecclesiastical Offices, where he also shows that not only in the whole of France but also in the whole remainder of the West the divine offices were celebrated in the same way. But in France at that time the maternal tongue was not Latin, as is collected from the fact that 200 years before the age of Amalarius France had been taken over by the Franks, who came from the region of Franconia in Germany and settled among the Gauls in great numbers. Further the Franks had their own tongue as Jerome writes in his *Life of Hilarion*, where he speaks about someone possessed by a demon and says, "You saw from the mouth of a barbarian, who knew only French and Latin, pure Syriac words resounding." Nay even before the Franks took possession of the Gauls the language of the Gauls was different from Latin, as Blessed Jerome indicates in the preface to his second book on *Galatians*.

Already in Germany at the same time only Latin was in use in the public reading of the Scriptures as is openly collected from Rabanus bishop of Mainz, who lived before 700. For when explaining, in his second book on the *Education of Clerics*, the order of the divine offices that was then kept in Germany, he plainly indicates that the divine Scriptures were wont to be read publicly only in Latin; and that the same practice was kept not only in Germany but in the remainder of the

West he indicates in the same book ch.9 when he says, “This is the Catholic order of the divine celebrations, which is kept unchangeably by the universal Church.”

The same can be understood from Rupert of Deutz, who flourished in Germany before 400, and in bk.1 of *Divine Offices* very openly shows that in Germany, as in the rest of the Church, the divine Scriptures were accustomed to be read only in Latin in Church. But that Latin was never the common tongue of the Germans is most certain both from Jerome in his epistle to Sunia and Fretella and his *Life of Hilarion*, and also because the German language has no affinity with Latin such that it could have originated little by little by corruption from Latin, the way Italian, Spanish, and French originated.

In Bohemia and the bordering regions, where Latin was never the common tongue, the divine Scriptures were before the year 500 read in Latin in the Churches. For there is extant an epistle of Gregory VII, bk.7 of the epistles written by his own hand, to the Duke of Bohemia, in which he says that he has for just causes not wished to permit them to celebrate the divine office in Slavic as they had requested.

Lastly in Italy the divine Scriptures are, without any controversy, always read in Latin in Church. For the Roman order of the divine offices is the same now in substance as it was from the beginning of the Church. For Isidore on *Ecclesiastical Offices* bk.1 ch.15 affirms that the order of divine offices used by the Roman Church began with Blessed Peter. However it was afterwards expanded and reduced to better form by Gelasius I, as is plain from the decree distinct.15 of the *Sacred Roman canon*; and later again by Gregory I, as is plain from the book of *Sacraments* edited by him. Then also Gregory VII, because by the negligence of time the order had been somewhat distorted, restored it to its pristine form, as is plain from the can. ‘On the Day’, about consecration, dist.5, and Pope Pius V did the same in our days.

Therefore we understand from bringing together all these places that at this time the Roman Church celebrates the divine offices, not only in the same language, but also in the same order and number of readings and *Psalms*, as it celebrated them over 1,000 years ago in the time of Gelasius.

But that the use of the Latin tongue ceased long ago among the people in Italy there should be no doubt, since Radevicus, who flourished in the year 1170, writes in bk.2 of the *Deeds of Frederick* ch.40 that in the election of Pope Victor the people acclaimed the fact in Italian. Blessed Thomas too, who flourished 300 years ago, in his commentary on I *Corinthians* ch.14 testifies that in his day there was one language in Italy that the people used and another in which the Scriptures were read in Church. Therefore we have it that in the universal Church of Christ the practice was always kept that the sacred Scriptures were only publicly read in Latin and Greek, although these languages were not maternal or vernacular. What more efficacious argument than this one I do not see we can desire to repress the audacity of the innovators of this time.

But let a fourth argument be added taken from reason itself. For it is altogether fitting for preserving the unity of the Church that the public use of the Scriptures be in some very common language; for unless the public use of the Scriptures is in a common language, then, in the first place, the communication among the Churches will be taken away. For no one either learned or unlearned will frequent Churches save in his own fatherland, and further no General Councils will

be able to take place, for not all Fathers who come to the Council will have the gift of tongues, and this is an a priori reason that the Apostles wrote almost everything in Greek, because then the Greek tongue was the most common of all, as Cicero testifies in his speech for *Archias the Poet*, "Greek," he says, "is read in almost all nations, Latin is confined indeed to its narrow borders."

Next however the Scriptures were translated into Latin because, as a little later the Roman Empire began to grow, the Greek language ceased to be common in the West and Latin began to be common, at least among the learned, in the whole of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and other regions. Since therefore even now there is no language common to the whole West save Latin, certainly the divine Scriptures should be read in Latin.

Fifth, if there is any reason that the Scriptures should be read in the vernacular in meetings of the faithful, that reason would most of all be that all should understand. But certainly the people would not understand the *Prophets* and *Psalms* and other things that are read in the Churches, even if these are read in the maternal tongue. For we who know Latin do not for that reason at once understand the Scriptures, unless we read or hear expositors of them. How therefore would unskilled men understand? Especially since the Scriptures are the more obscure the more they are translated into foreign languages.

What of the fact that the people might not only not gain fruit from the Scriptures but might even suffer damage? For they might very easily take occasion for erring, both in the doctrine of faith and in the precepts of life and morals; for it is from Scripture not understood that all heresies are born, as Hilary shows in his last book on *Synods*; which Luther also acknowledged, who called Scripture the book of heretics. And the same is proved by experience.

For Cassian reports, collat.10 chs.2-5, that the most absurd errors of the Anthropomorphists arose from sheer lack of skill, and Aeneas Sylvius in his book on the *Origin of the Bohemians* reports the crassest errors from the Thaboriti, the Orebati, and others, who read the Scriptures in their maternal tongue and did not understand them. The same thing happened to David Georgius, the most pestilential of all heretics, who knew no language save his own mother tongue, that is, Batavian, and yet gathered from the Scriptures that he was the Son of God and Messiah, as is plain from the book or letter about his errors that the Basilians produced.

Further, what if the uneducated populace were to hear read in their vernacular tongue these words from the *Song of Songs*, "Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth," and, "his left hand under my head and his right hand will embrace me," or this from *Hosea*, "Go and make thee sons of fornication," and the adultery of David, the incest of Thamar, the lies of Judith, and how Joseph got his brothers drunk? Sarah, Leah, and Rachel gave their maids to their husbands as concubines, and there are many other deeds of those who are mentioned with great praise in the Scriptures. If the people read these things they would either be provoked to imitate this sort of thing or they would despise the Patriarchs, as the Manichees once did, or would think there are lies in the Scriptures. And since the people would see that there are so many apparent contradictions in the Scriptures, and would not be able to solve them, there would be danger that in the end they would believe nothing.

I heard from a man worthy of trust that when in England a Calvinist minister in a temple read in the common tongue *Ecclesiastes* ch.25, where many things are said about the malice of women, a certain woman stood up and said, "This is the word of God? No, rather the word of the Devil."

Sixth, if it were necessary to read the sacred Scriptures publicly in the common tongue, it would also be necessary to change the translations for each individual age. For the common tongues change in large part from age to age, as Horace in his *Poetic Art* and as experience itself teaches. But so many changes of translations would not be done without very great danger and inconvenience. For suitable translators are not often found, and so many errors would be committed that could not afterwards be easily removed, since neither Popes nor Councils could judge so many languages.

Seventh, it altogether seems to be the case that the majesty of the divine offices requires a language more grave and venerable than are those we use commonly, if it can conveniently be done. Especially since in the sacred mysteries there are many things that should be secret, as even the ancients teach, Dionysius *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* first and last chapter, Origen homil.5 on *Numbers*, Basil on the *Holy Spirit* ch.27, Chrysostom homil.24 on *Matthew*, Gregory *Dialogues* bk.4 ch.56. Nor is the response of Chemnitz to the purpose, who tries to show that Latin is in no way a holier or more venerable language than the rest are. For we do not say it is holier, nor even graver, if we look at the words, but we say that for this fact it is graver and more reverent, because it is not vernacular.

To all these things let the testimonies be added of the good and very grave Fathers, the Greek Basil and the Latin Jerome, who indeed did not judge it expedient for all men without distinction to treat of the Scriptures, even if this could not at that time easily be prevented, since Greek and Latin were still vernacular for certain peoples. Theodoret, *Hist.* bk.4 ch.17, relates that when the Prefect of the Emperor's kitchen had brought forward something or other from the Scriptures, he was censured by the great Basil and was told, "Your job is to think about food, not to cook divine dogmas." What, I beseech, would St. Basil say now if he saw among the Lutherans, the Calvinists, and the Anabaptists drug sellers, cobblers, and other craftsmen treating of the sacred words even from pulpits? Jerome in his epistle to Paulina about the study of the Scriptures says, "Doctors promise what belongs to doctors, carpenters deal with carpentry, only the art of the Scriptures is the one that all everywhere claim for themselves. Learned and unlearned, we all write poems everywhere, here a garrulous old woman, there a delirious old man, here a verbose sophist, there everyone; they presume, mangle, teach before they have learnt."

These complaints of Jerome now most of all have place in the whole of Germany and France. For all artisans, not only men but also women, have the Scriptures in their hands, and from reading them add to their lack of skill unteachableness and arrogance. For because they can recite the words of the Apostle and quote books and chapters, they think they know everything, and do not in any way let themselves be taught. See John Cochleus in his book on the *Life and Acts of Luther*, for the year 1522.

*Chapter Sixteen: The Objections of the Heretics are Solved*

But let us see what the heretics object. In the first place they bring forward the words of St. Paul I *Corinthians* ch.14, where the Apostle teaches that public readings and prayers in Church should be in the common tongue. For he speaks thus, "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who will prepare himself for war? So also you, unless you give a manifest speech in tongues, how will it be known what is said? For you will be speaking into the air." And later, "If I speak in tongues, my spirit prays but my mind is without fruit. What then? I shall pray with my spirit and I shall pray with my mind; I will chant with my spirit, and I will chant with my mind. Besides if you bless in the spirit, who will supply the place of the unlearned, how he should say, Amen, to your benediction? For he does not know what you say; for you indeed give thanks well, but the other is not edified."

I reply in the first place that it must be that in a large part of this chapter the question does not concern the reading of the Scriptures, nor of the divine office, but spiritual exhortation or contribution. For as formerly the monks used to gather together and confer among themselves about spiritual things, whence exist conferences of the Fathers in Cassian, so also in the first Church, as Blessed Justin indicates at the end of his second *Apology*, Christians used to come together on the Lord's days and first the Scriptures were read, then a sermon by the presiding priest, then the mysteries were celebrated, lastly they would add talks among themselves about divine things.

Lest therefore the multitude should produce disturbance, the Apostle established that two or three alone should speak in individual conferences, and the rest should listen and judge, and that if perchance, while one was speaking, something better was inspired in another, the first should be silent and the second should speak. And because in Corinth there were sometimes some who, to show off the gift of tongues, would use a foreign language, the Apostle corrects them, for exhortations should be understood by all.

That this is the true exposition of the greater part of this chapter can be understood first from the fact that this place was so understood by the ancients, by Cyprian in his epistle to Pompeius, and in his epistle to Quirinus about rebaptizing heretics, whose exposition is praised by Blessed Augustine *On Baptism against the Donatists* bk.2 ch.8, and by Basil in *Questions briefly Explained* q.127, by Ambrose, Sedulius, Haymo, Theodoret, and Oecumenius on this place; second it can be understood from the words of the Apostle. For the verse, "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the rest judge." And the verse, "If a revelation is given to another, let the first be silent." And this, "Let women be silent in Church." And many like things can only be referred to exhortation; for the reading of the Scriptures and the divine office should not be judged by prophets; nor are the readings inspired when they are read, but what was formerly already inspired is recited; nor did women ever celebrate the divine mysteries in Church. About exhortation then must the words be understood that have been objected to us, "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who will prepare himself for war? So also you, unless you give a manifest speech in tongues, how will it be known what is said? For you will be speaking into the air."

But there remains still a difficulty about the words, "If I speak in tongues, my spirit prays but my mind is without fruit. What then? I shall pray with my spirit and I shall pray with my mind; I will chant with my spirit, and I will chant with my mind.

Besides if you bless in the spirit, who will supply the place of the unlearned, how he should say, Amen, to your benediction? For he does not know what you say." For in these words the question does not seem to be about exhortation but about prayers and psalms. Here one must note by the by that Ambrose and Haymo read this place with a double question mark. "Which unlearned will supply the place? How will he reply, Amen?" However the Greeks always read it as our Vulgate has it, "who will supply the place of the unlearned, how he should say, Amen?", which also Calvin, Beza, and our other adversaries approve as truer.

To take away this difficulty, then, some reply that in these words too exhortation is being dealt with, not prayers. So Basil, Theodoret, and Sedulius mentioned just above. But it seems difficult to defend this view; for the words the Apostle uses do not signify to sermonize but to pray and to sing and to give thanks. Wherefore Chrysostom and Theophylact and Ambrose and Haymo understand the place about prayers.

Others therefore say that the Apostle is indeed speaking of divine offices, but he does not require that the whole people should understand, but only that someone understand, who may reply in place of the people. For this is signified by the words, "Who will supply the place of the unlearned, how he will reply, Amen?" So was this place understood by Haymo, Primasius, Peter Lombard, Blessed Thomas, and certain others among the Latins. But the solution does not seem altogether solid; for the words of the Apostle do not signify, according to the use of the Greek tongue, who takes the part of the unlearned, but who fills the place of the unlearned, that is, who sits in the places of the unlearned, who occupies the place of the unlearned, as Chrysostom and Theophylact expound on this place; for not only profane authors but even sacred ones do not use the Greek word for 'place' to mean 'take the part of' but they used a special preposition for the purpose (*anti*), as is plain in *Matthew* ch.1 v.9, "he rose in the place of Judas," and ch.11, "so as to rule in the place of his father," and ch.13, "in the place of Jonathan his father," and ch.14, "the chief priest for his place," where the Greek word is always *anti*.

Another opinion of others is that the Apostle, when he says, 'who fills the place of the unlearned', understands him who is unlearned; yet he does not call him unlearned who is really unlearned, but who is unlearned for the office, that is, who replies for the unlearned, just as we sometime say that a man is of the populace who, although he is a patrician, yet follows the faction of the populace. Thus this opinion will be the same as the former, but a little differently explained. Thus did Sixtus in *Sacred Library* bk.6 note 263 wish to untie the knot, where he also warns that the words of Chrysostom hom.35 on *I Corinthians* are not faithfully rendered. For the words of Chrysostom are translated as, "but he calls unlearned the common people," when they should be translated, "but he calls unlearned a layman," that is, a man put in the Church for the laymen.

But neither does this explanation seem to square altogether with this place, since it can be objected that in the time of the Apostles the whole people was wont to respond in the divine offices, nor was anyone put for the laymen. For Justin at the end of his second *Apology for the Christians* says in expressive words that the whole people were accustomed in Church to respond, Amen, when the priest ended a prayer or a thanksgiving.



The same practice was afterwards for a long time kept both in the East and in the West, as is clear from the liturgy of Chrysostom which is contained at the end of his works, where very openly are distinguished what the priest would sing in the divine offices, what the deacon, and what the people. Again from Cyprian sermon on the *Lord's Prayer*, where he says the people reply, "We lift them up to the Lord;" and from Jerome first preface to bk.2 on *Galatians*, where he writes that in the Churches of the city of Rome the people were heard resounding 'Amen' like heavenly thunder.

The true opinion, then, is that the Apostle is not in this place dealing with the divine offices, nor about the public reading of the Scriptures, but of spiritual canticles, which Christians used to compose for praising God and giving him thanks, and at the same time for their own and others' consolation and edification. For that the Apostle is not speaking of the Scriptures or of the divine offices is proved from the fact that the Scriptures were without doubt read in Greek, and that the divine offices took place in Greece in Greek, as even the heretics admit; but the Apostle is here speaking of prayer and giving thanks, which are done by the gift of tongues, especially by some very foreign tongue that no one understood, as Arabic, or Persian, as Chrysostom and all others expound, nay even by a tongue that often he who was speaking did not understand, as these words indicate, "if I speak in tongues, my spirit prays but my mind is without fruit," that is, if I pray from the gift of tongues in a tongue which I do not understand, my spirit prays, that is, my affection prays, but my mind is without fruit, that is, my understanding is not taught, because I do not understand what I am saying. Again the words, "he who speaks in tongues is speaking, not to men, but to God, for no one hears," that is, no one attends, because no one understands. The Apostle then is not speaking of the divine offices, which when they happened in Greek were understood by many, but he is speaking of prayer or praise to God and giving thanks, which sometimes in their conferences some would sing in foreign tongues.

Further it is very certain that Christians were accustomed to compose spiritual canticles and to sing in Church at the time of the spiritual conferences. For this is taught by Eusebius *Hist.* bk.2 ch.17, from Philo; again Dionysius *Divine Names* chs.3 and 4, where he adduces many examples from the canticles of Hierotheus. Tertullian also in his *Apologetic* ch.39, when describing the Agape of the Christians, that is, the public feast that happened in the Church, says that those who could were accustomed to sing something to God from their own ingenuity. Lastly the Apostle himself in *Ephesians* ch.5, *Colossians* ch.3, exhorts them to move each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles; which place is understood by Haymo of canticles that they themselves composed. Since therefore these canticles were done for the consolation of the people, the Apostle wants them done in a language that is understood, so that the unlearned, who do not know how to compose similar things, can at least confirm them by saying, Amen.

But you will object: just as the Apostle wanted these canticles to be done in a vernacular tongue, so that the people might add at the end, Amen, so also he should have wanted the divine offices to be celebrated in a vernacular tongue, so that the people might respond, Amen. I reply by denying the consequence, because the divine offices were done in Greek, which many of the people understood, although not all; and this was enough, for the Apostle did not want everyone to be able to

respond, Amen. Besides, because the Christians were then few, all together would sing the *Psalms* in Church, and would respond in the divine offices; but afterwards, as the people increased, the offices were more divided, and it was left only to clerics to perform the common prayers and praises in Church. Finally the chief end of those canticles was the instruction and consolation of the people, for these were done in conferences in place of exhortation, and therefore it was right for them to be understood by many, and unless it was done in a known language, or unless an interpretation soon followed, the chief fruit of these conferences would have been lost. But the chief end of the divine offices is not the instruction or consolation of the people, but the worship of God, and what the people need to know from the divine offices is explained by pastors.

The second objection. From a prayer not understood no utility follows, *Isaiah* ch.29, and *Matthew* ch.15, "this people honors me with their lips etc.," and I *Corinthians* ch.14, "if I speak in tongues, my spirit prays but my mind is without fruit." Therefore all prayers both public and private should be done in a vernacular tongue. This objection is from Calvin, but it has an easy solution; for in the first place it is false that no fruit from the public prayer of the Church is received by the people unless the prayer is understood by the people; for the prayer of the Church is not made to the people but to God for the people. So there is no need for the people to understand so as to be profited, but it is enough if God understand. In the same way, if someone were to pray in Latin before a king on behalf of some rustic, the rustic would certainly be able to perceive the fruit of it, even if he did not understand the prayer of his advocate.

Further, the Church prays for the faithful and for other sinners, who often not only do not understand but also do not hear and do not wish to pray for themselves, and yet the Church does not pray in vain; how much more then does the Church not pray in vain for the faithful who are present and who desire their necessities to be prayed for? Hence in *Leviticus* ch.16 God commands that when the priest has entered the sanctuary to pray for himself and for the people, the people should remain without, so that not only do they not understand but neither do they hear or see the priest, which was also done at the time of Zachariah, as we read in *Luke* ch.1, and yet who can doubt but that the prayer profited the people? Hence also Origen in homil.20 on *Joshua* says, "If you see sometimes that a Scripture is read in your ears which you do not understand, know that you have in the meantime received this first advantage, that by hearing alone as by a certain request the virus of the noxious powers that beset you is expelled." And Chrysostom homil.3 on Lazarus says, "What if we do not understand what is contained in the sacred books? Indeed especially if you do not understand the things hidden therein, yet from the reading itself much sanctity is born."

Nor are the people only able to perceive fruit from another's prayer, even if they do not understand it, but also from the prayer that they themselves pour out to God for themselves; for as St. Augustine teaches *Christian Doctrine* bk.3 ch.9, the Jews did not in vain worship God in figures and various ceremonies, whose verifications many of them understood less than our rustics understand the words of Latin. Besides the same Augustine on *Baptism* bk.6 ch.25 says, "Many rush into prayers composed, not only by unskilled babblers, but even by heretics, and not

being able to discriminate them because of the simplicity of their ignorance, they use them thinking that they are good, not that what is perverse in the prayer empties out what is good in it, but rather that what is bad is emptied out by what is good." In these words Augustine teaches that even prayers, in which something from a heretic is admixed, do not lack fruit when they are said simply by one who does not understand what he is saying and thinks that he is blessing. For as the same Augustine says in the same place, the affection of the one praying overcomes the vice of the prayer. For God has regard not so much to what we say as to what we desire to say. If then prayers not understood and bad are not without fruit when they are said in good faith, how much more profit comes from the best prayers established by the Church even if they are not understood?

Hence Origen homil.20 on *Joshua* says, "Although we do not understand what we give forth with our mouth, yet the powers that are present to us understand, and invited as it were by a certain charm, they are delighted to be present to us and to bring us help etc." Which thing he illustrates with two similitudes, "For if," he says, "it is believed by the Gentiles that when certain charms, which they call incantations, in which that art exists, are whispered, and certain names are collected that not even those know who invoke them, serpents, by the sound of the voice alone, are either put to sleep or even drawn forth from their caverns, how much more do we believe that stronger and more powerful than any incantation and charm is any summoning of speeches or words of Sacred Scripture?" And later, "Doctors are wont sometimes to provide food, sometimes also to give drink, and yet it is not in eating or drinking it that we feel it is useful etc. In this way, therefore," he says, "we must also believe about the Holy Scripture, that it is useful and profits the soul even if for the present our sense does not grasp the understanding of it." So Origen.

Further, if it were necessary to understand whatever we say when praying to or praising God, surely few or none could sing the *Psalms* of David and read the Prophets and Apostles in the divine offices. For how far does anyone understand the sentences of the *Psalms*, Prophets, and Apostles? How many things occur when we sing the *Psalms* which we do not understand? And yet we should not run from the Church to the commentaries, and neither for that reason do we sing in vain, provided only we sing with devotion and reverence. For we know that whatever it is it pertains to the praise of God. What is that which St. Anthony was wont to say, that the prayer is perfect in which the spirit is so absorbed in God that it does not understand its own words?

Nor are the following Scriptures in conflict with this, "this people honors me with their lips," and, "if I speak in tongues, my spirit prays but my mind is without fruit." For in the first the question is not about prayer or reading, but about those who profess piety with their mouth and say that they love God and yet do the opposite in their deeds, as Jerome expounds on *Isaiah* ch.29, and Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.22 ch.55. If however anyone wishes to refer those words to prayer, he should say that those are rebuked who, although praying in a language they know, do not attend to what they say, but wander to other business in spirit.

In the second Scripture, it is not that prayer which is not understood is censured, but a prayer we understand is preferred to it. For the Apostle does not say that the prayer is without fruit, but that the mind is. For he who prays in a tongue

which he does not know, as when uneducated men pray the seven *Psalms* in Latin, they are profited indeed in affection and spirit, though their mind is without fruit, because they are uneducated. That this sort of prayer is not censured as bad and altogether fruitless is declared by the Apostle in the words, "For you indeed give thanks well." And the same is openly confirmed by Chrysostom on this place. Add that, as we showed above, the Apostle is speaking about a tongue that no one in the whole Church can understand. Wherefore in vain are these Apostolic words brought against the custom of the Catholic Church. For although in the common prayers of the Church the mind of rustics remains without fruit, yet the affection of rustics does not remain without fruit; nor does the mind of many others, who know Latin; and the fruit of the mind which is lacking to the uneducated is compensated for by the many advantages that come therefrom, that the Scriptures in public meeting are constantly read in the most common tongue, that is, in Latin.

The third objection is from Brentius, in the *Decretals* ch. 'Since in most cases', title on the offices of ordinary judgment. Innocent III bids that when in any city there are men mixed together of diverse tongues, the bishop should provide for suitable men to celebrate the divine offices in diverse tongues, and to administer the sacraments to men of diverse tongues.

I reply that Innocent is only speaking in that decree of the languages of Greek and Latin. For because in the time of Innocent Constantinople had been captured by the Latins, and the Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople were Latin, and there were in Greece many Latins mixed with Greeks, it was requested of the Pontiff in the general Lateran Council, at which Greeks and Latins convened, that he permit two bishops to be ordained in such places. But the Pontiff responded together with the Council that it was not fitting that there be two bishops in one Church, but yet that the bishop should provide for suitable ministers who would celebrate the sacred rites in Greek for the Greeks and in Latin for the Latins. And this is the decree in ch.9 of the Council, and from there is taken the chapter, 'Since in most cases'.

That therefore the decree is not speaking of vernacular tongues is plain both from the history just related and also because the decree was observed most of all in Italy, where the Pontiff resides and has temporal dominion. But never was this [sc. use of the vernacular] observed in Italy, for St. Thomas, who flourished a little after the decree was made, composed in Latin the feast of the body of the Lord, which we also retain today, although however he himself admits in his commentary on I *Corinthians* ch.14 that the vernacular of the Italians at his time was not Latin.

The fourth objection is from the same Brentius. The end of the divine offices and public readings is the instruction, consolation, and edification of the people; for *Romans* ch.15 says, "So that we have hope through the patience and consolation of the Scriptures." And I *Corinthians* ch.14, "I wish to speak five words with my sense, so as to instruct others, than 10,000 words in a tongue." And in the same place, "When you come together and each of you has a psalm, a doctrine, a revelation, a tongue, and interpretation, let all be done for edification." But from an unknown and foreign tongue what instruction, what edification, what consolation can be perceived?

I reply that both the proposition and the assumption of this argument are false. For the chief end of the divine offices is not the instruction or consolation of

the people, but due worship of God from the Church. For the office of clerics is to immolate the sacrifice of praise perpetually to God in the name of the whole Christian people, as God himself requires in *Psalms* 40, and to watch in the manner of soldiers, and with vigils and prayers to protect the whole camp of the Church, *Isaiah* ch.62, "On your walls, Jerusalem, I have set guards; all day and all night they will never keep silent." Next, those who are not very unskilled know Latin and are instructed when they hear the divine offices; but the rest would not be instructed even if the office were celebrated in the vernacular, for instruction is not in the words but in the sense. Wherefore very frequent sermons serve the instruction of the people, which ought to happen in each individual Church.

Nor do these three Scriptures in any way injure our opinion. For we confess that the sacred Scriptures bring great consolation to the faithful, as in *Romans* ch.15 the Apostle advises, but to the learned indeed when the Scriptures are read and to the unlearned when they are explained in sermons. And rightly did St. Paul prefer to speak five words with his sense for instruction than 10,000 words in a tongue, because an exhortation is better that is understood by all, though it be brief, than one that is not understood though it is very long. Lastly by the five words of psalm, doctrine, revelation, tongue, and interpretation are not understood the divine Scriptures but the five gifts freely given. For a little before in the same chapter the Apostle speaks about the same gifts as follows, "If I come to you speaking in tongues, what do I profit you unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in doctrine?"

Therefore by tongue he understands the gift of tongues; by doctrine he understands the gift of teaching, which pertains to good morals or also to faith; by revelation the gift of revelation. For often at that time God revealed mysteries to those seated in Church; by interpretation he understands the gift of expounding the Scriptures and of translating from one language to another, which gift Paul also very often calls prophecy; by psalm he understands the gift freely given of chanting, as Chrysostom rightly expounds, that is, the gift of composing spiritual canticles and of singing them modestly in Church. The sense therefore is that when in your meetings and conferences you are able to exercise all these gifts of tongues, revelation, etc., see that nothing is done for display but everything for utility and edification.

The fifth objection is from Chemnitz. Christ preached in the vernacular; the Apostles on the day of Pentecost spoke of the great things of God in vernacular tongues, and afterwards, when dispersed through the whole world, they preached everywhere in the languages of the peoples to whom they preached; therefore it is necessary to have the Scriptures in various languages, and those vernacular ones. For if the word of God is not stained if it is put forward in a vernacular tongue, why is it stained if it is written in a vernacular tongue?

I reply that by this argument nothing is concluded; for if the consequence from preaching to Scriptures is good, why did the Apostles only write in Greek since they preached in so many languages? Therefore the word of God is rightly preached in the vernacular, because preaching contains an explanation which all easily grasp. But when it is written, it is written bare, and is not grasped by all. Therefore just as it is not licit to argue like this: mothers give their infants bread broken into small pieces, or even pre-chewed, therefore they could also give it to them whole and

solid, for it is the same bread. Thus it is not licit to argue: the word of God explained by a homilist is administered to the peoples, therefore it should also be administered to them without explanation and written in a vernacular tongue.

The sixth objection is from the same Chemnitz. Blessed Jerome testifies that he translated the Scriptures into the Slavonic tongue. Again the Scriptures were formerly translated into Chaldee, which was then vernacular, and afterwards into Greek, which was also then vernacular, and the Apostles used that translation. Afterwards they were also translated into Latin when it was vernacular, and Christ on the cross quoted the Scripture in Syriac, that is, the vernacular. Therefore there is no crime in translating them into vernacular tongues.

I reply in the first place that we do not deny that Scripture can be translated into vernacular tongues; but what we contend is that it should not be publicly read in the vernacular, nor should the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular be permitted to everyone. But whether Jerome translated the divine letters into Slavonic I do not certainly know. For never is that read in Jerome or in any old author; yet if he did it, he did not do it for this reason, that the Scripture should be publicly read in Slavonic, but for the consolation of those men who could use it without danger, in the same way that among us at this time it is conceded to certain men. Further, the Chaldee edition is not so much a version as a paraphrase, nor has it ever had great authority among Catholics.

As for what is brought forward about the Greek translation, it makes for our side. For the Scriptures were translated into Greek, not because that language was vernacular for some people, but because it was most common. For certainly Greek was not the vernacular for Ptolemy, king of Egypt, who saw to their being translated. I say the same about Latin, namely that the Scriptures were translated into Latin because it was common to the whole West, although for some few it was still vernacular.

To the point about Christ. Although Epiphanius *Heresy* 69, which is that of the Arians, reckons that Christ on the cross spoke partly in Hebrew and partly in Syriac the sentence, My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?, yet it is more probable that it was also spoken by Christ in Hebrew, the way it is in *Psalms* 21. For there is no cause why the Lord should begin the words of David in Hebrew and then change to Syriac. Wherefore divine Jerome in his book on *Hebrew Names*, when treating of this place, does not say the words are Syriac, which however he is always wont to do in the case of those that are Syriac; but he puts the Hebrew words, and renders them thus in Latin letters, "Eli, Eli, la imma azabathani," which it is certain are Hebrew.

Erasmus too, to whom Chemnitz attributes much, teaches in his note on this place that Christ spoke those words purely in Hebrew. Add that in Syriac he would have spoken thus, Hil, Hil lemana seactani. But what we have in Greek and Latin was made to be seactani, not azabathani as it ought to be, so that it might more easily be pronounced; in the same way as we are accustomed to say Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Assuerus, and others of this sort, instead of Iesaiahu, Irmerahu, Chizkiahu, Achaseveros, and other very difficult Hebrew words.

The seventh objection is from Chemnitz. Chrysostom very often exhorts laymen to the reading of the Scriptures, therefore it is right that the Scriptures be

permitted to all in the vernacular tongue. And although Chemnitz adduced no places from Chrysostom, we can however note his places. Homil.9 on *Colossians*, "Hear," he says, "all you seculars, get for yourself Bibles, medicine for the soul, if you wish for nothing else, acquire a New Testament, Acts of the Apostles, the Gospels, etc." He has like things in homil.2 on *Matthew*, preface to the epistles of Blessed Paul, homil.3 on II *Thessalonias*, homil.10 on *John*, and homil.3 on Lazarus.

I reply that the words of Chrysostom, which he gave in his sermons, must always be taken according to his own mind, and according to the occasions on which he was induced to speak them. Since therefore at that time men were given over to theatres, spectacles, and other trifles, and never read the divine Scriptures, not even those who were capable of it, for that reason, to cut out their apathy, Chrysostom continually exhorted all to the reading of the Scriptures; not because he wanted everyone altogether, even the most uneducated, to do it, but so that at least those who would do it who could do it with fruit. For he knew he was dealing with those who needed such exaggerations. And this can be proved from many of his places; but I will be content with only three for the present.

Therefore in homil.3 on Lazarus he speaks thus, "It cannot be that anyone should obtain salvation unless he is continually versed in spiritual reading." But if this is taken literally, who does not see that it is most false? For why? Can those who have not learnt letters not be saved? Therefore the speech is hyperbolic, not proper. Homil.15 on *Genesis* he says, "It is licit to swear neither in a just thing nor in an unjust thing." And homil.17 on *Matthew* he says, "What then if someone requires an oath, and imposes the necessity of swearing it? Let the fear of God be for you stronger than any necessity." Therefore it seems that he wanted there to be no swearing of oaths at all, although however it is certain that it is a religious and a good act to swear in a just and necessary thing; but Chrysostom used these sorts of exaggerations in his sermons since his people were addicted to oaths in an astonishing way, as is collected from homil.9 on *Acts* and in other places of the same author.

They raise a final objection. It was conceded to the Moravians by the Apostolic See 600 years ago to celebrate the divine offices in Slavonic, and in addition now the Ruthenians, Armenians, Egyptians, and I know not what other peoples perform sacred rites in their vernacular tongues.

I reply that we are not more moved by the examples of the Ruthenians, Armenians, and the like than we are moved by the examples of the Lutherans, Anabaptists, and Calvinists, who publicly read the Scriptures in German, or French, or English, or even in Polish and other vernacular tongues. For these too are all heretics or schismatics, and we know that their Catholic ancestors did otherwise, as has been demonstrated above.

To the point about the Moravians I reply that there was just cause why it should be done at that time, namely that because (as Aeneas Sylvius reports in his book on the *Bohemians* ch.13) the whole kingdom was converted at once, and ministers could not be found to celebrate in Latin, it seemed better to the Supreme Pontiff to permit that it be done in Slavonic than that it not be done at all. However afterwards, when learning increased and suitable ministers were found who could make the same provision in Latin, it was better to set aside the use of Slavonic and

to follow the common custom of the whole Church; and at this time the Moravian Catholics so do.

And so much about the editions of the Scriptures.



## Book Three: On the Interpretation of the Word of God

### *Chapter One: Scripture is not so per se Open that it Suffices without Explanation for the Settling of Controversies of the Faith*

Being, in this third book, about to write on the interpretation of the divine letters, I have thought a beginning should be made from the question: are the sacred Scriptures per se very easy and very open, or do they rather need interpretation? And Martin Luther indeed, in the preface to his assertion of articles damned by Pope Leo speaks thus, "it is necessary, with Scripture as judge, to vote this opinion, which thing can only be if we give to Scripture the first place in everything that is attributed to the Fathers, that is, that Scripture is itself the per se most certain, most easy, most open interpreter of itself, proving, judging, and illumining everything of everyone etc." In the same place he contends that Scripture is clearer than the commentaries of all the Fathers. He teaches like things in his book on the *Bondage of the Will*, and elsewhere.

Because however Luther soon saw that the objection can be made of where so many controversies come from if Scripture is so clear, he thought out two subterfuges. One, that Scripture, although it is somewhere obscure, yet it proposes the same thing clearly elsewhere. The second, that Scripture, although per se very clear, yet is made obscure by the proud and the infidels because of their blindness and corrupt affection.

Brentius adds a third subterfuge in his *Prologue Against Peter a Soto*, that even while it is sometimes obscure, because of phrases in a foreign tongue, that is, in Hebrew and Greek, yet its sense is very clear. Which opinion is manifestly false; for Scripture itself gives testimony of its difficulty and obscurity. *Psalms* 118, "Give me understanding and I will examine your law." *Ibid.*, "Uncover my eyes and I will consider the marvels of your law." *Ibid.*, "Shine your face upon your servant and teach me your justifications." And certainly David knew the whole Scripture which then was, and he knew the phrases of the Hebrew tongue, nor was he proud or an infidel. Wherefore rightly does St. Jerome in his epistle to Paulina on the institution of a monk, speak, in treating of these words, in the following way, "If so great a Prophet confesses the darkness of ignorance, by what night of unknowing do you think we little and almost unweaned ones are surrounded?"

Further, in the last chapter of *Luke* the Lord interpreted the Scriptures to his disciples, who certainly knew the Hebrew phrases, since they were Hebrews, nor were they proud or infidels. In *Acts* ch.3 the Eunuch of the Queen of the Ethiopians was versed in the Scriptures and he diligently read them, and was holy, pious, and humble, as Jerome teaches in his epistle to Paulina about the study of the Scriptures, and yet he was asked by Philip, "Do you think you understand what you are reading? He replied, How can I, unless someone shows me?"

Finally II *Peter* last chapter, Peter asserts that in the epistles of Paul are certain things difficult to understand, "which the unlearned and unstable distort." Where it is to be noted that the Apostle Peter did not say there were certain things difficult for the unlearned and unstable, as the heretics expound, but difficult

absolutely. For Blessed Augustine, who certainly was not unlearned or unstable, in his book *Faith and Works* chs.15-16, confesses that very difficult to understand for himself was the place in I *Corinthians* ch.3, "If anyone build on the foundation, etc." and he says that this is one of the places that Peter warned was difficult to understand.

Next, beside the witness of Scripture, the same thing can be shown from the common consent of the ancient Fathers. Irenaeus bk.2 ch.47, after he has said that many things in created and natural things are hidden to us, adds, "If therefore even in created things there are indeed certain of them that lie with God, but certain that have come into our knowledge, what evil is it if also in the case of things that are searched in the Scriptures, since all the Scriptures are spiritual, certain of them indeed we unloose according to the grace of God, but certain we commend to God, and not only in this world but also in the world to come, so that always indeed God teaches but man always learns the things that are of God?"

Origen *Against Celsus* bk.7, "Others also, men prudent in examining Scripture, have been able to find the understanding of it, since in truth it is obscure in many places." Again, homily 5 on *Leviticus* contains a similar opinion, adducing a likeness with sacrificial victims, part of which was eaten by the priests and part was burnt for God. Again *Homily 12 on Exodus*, "Days and nights," he says, "one must beg that the Lamb of the tribe of Judah come and himself deign to open the sealed book." About Basil and Gregory thus does Ruffinus write *Hist.* bk.11 ch.9, "Both noble, both educated at Athens, both colleagues for 13 years, they gave attention, after all books of secular Greeks were taken away, only to the volumes of the divine Scripture and the understanding of them, not from their own presumption but from the writings and authority of the ancestors, who themselves too, as is clear, received the rule of understanding from Apostolic succession."

Chrysostom, whom alone the heretics are wont to object to us, already in *Homil.40 on John*, on the verse, "examine the Scriptures," says, "Christ sent the Jews back, not to the simple and bare reading of the Scriptures, but to an investigation very much diligent. He did not say, Read the Scriptures, but, Examine the Scriptures. For the divine writings need supreme diligence. For he did not speak in a shadow to the ancestors without purpose, and therefore he bids us to dig more deeply, so that we can find what is deeply hidden. For we do not dig for a thing on the surface and placed ready to hand, but for what is deeply hidden like a treasure. For he who seeks such a thing, unless he uses supreme diligence and labor, will never find what is sought for." Again the author of the imperfect work, *Homil.44 on Matthew*, adduces two reasons why the Scriptures are obscure. First, because God wanted some to be masters, others to be disciples. Second, lest if Scripture be so clear, it would not be so much useful as contemptible.

Ambrose in his epist.44 to Constantius says, "the divine Scripture is a sea, having in itself profound meanings, a depth of prophetic enigmas."

Jerome in his epistle to Paulina on the study of Scripture, purposely teaches that the Scriptures cannot be learnt without a master, and, running briefly through the names of the individual books, he shows that in every case there are many and great difficulties. In the preface to this commentary on *Ephesians* he says, "I have never ceased from my youth either to read or to ask learned men what I did not

know, or I had myself as master. Next recently I went precisely for this very reason to Alexandria to see Didymus, and from him I inquired about the things in all the Scriptures where I had doubts." And in his epistle to Algasia q.8 he says, "the whole epistle to the *Romans* is wrapped up in many obscurities."

Augustine on *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.6 says, "But those are deceived by multiple obscurities and ambiguities who read thinking one thing instead of another; but in certain places they do not find what they falsely suspect, so darkly do some statements introduce the most dense gloom. But this whole thing I do not doubt is divinely foreseen for subduing pride with labor, and for recalling from dislike the intellect of him to whom the things he investigates become for the most part cheap." He also says in *Confessions* bk.12 ch.14, "The marvelous deepness of your orations, whose surface, behold, before us caresses little ones, but the marvelous depth, my God, the marvelous depth! The awe is to apply oneself to it, the awe of honor, and the tremor of love." And epistle 3, "So great is the depth of Christian letters that in them I would make daily progress if them alone, from the beginning of youth to the decrepitude of old age, in greatest leisure, with supreme study, with greater genius, I tried to learn." And epistle 119 ch.21, "In the sacred Scriptures themselves I am ignorant of much more than I know."

Gregory *Homil.6* on *Ezekiel* says, "The very obscurity of the orations of God is of great utility, because it exercises the sense so as to extend it by fatigue, and so that he who is exercised grasps what he who is at leisure cannot. It has too something else greater, that if the understanding of sacred Scripture were open in everything it would cheapen things that in certain obscurer places restore, when found, with so much the more sweetness the more that, when being sought, they weary the soul with greater labor, etc." Certainly these Fathers knew the phrases, nor were they proud infidels, and they frankly confess that the Scriptures are difficult. From which fact, I think, the rashness and vanity of Luther and Brentius is sufficiently plainly refuted.

Nor, in addition to authorities, is reason lacking to confirm the same as well. For in the Scriptures two matters can be considered, the things that are said and the way they are said. If you consider the things you must necessarily confess that the Scriptures are very obscure. For they hand on supreme mysteries: about the divine Trinity, about the incarnation of the Word, about heavenly sacraments, about the nature of angels, about the work of God in human minds, about eternal predestination and reprobation, and about arcane and supernatural things that are not investigated without great study and labor, nor without danger of the greatest error. Certainly if the science of Metaphysics is more difficult and obscure than all other natural disciplines, because it treats of the highest causes, how will sacred Scripture, which deals with far higher things, not be most obscure? What about the fact that a great part of Scripture contains prophecies of future things, and prophecies written in poetry, than which nothing is more difficult, nothing more obscure?

But if we consider the way of speaking we will find innumerable reasons for difficulty. First, there are in the Scriptures many things that seem *prima facie* contrary, as this verse of *Exodus* ch.20, "I am a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers on the sons to the third and fourth generation," and this of *Ezekiel* ch.18, "the

son will not bear the sin of his father, but the soul that sins, it shall die." Second, there are ambiguous words and statements, as *John* 8 when to the Jews who are asking, "Who are you?" Christ responds, "The beginning, as I also say to you." For all interpreters marvelously twist this, nor is it yet known what is meant by 'The beginning, as'; and in the Greek the thing is still more obscure, where 'beginning' is in the accusative case. Third, there are incomplete statements, as *Romans* ch.5, "Just as through one man sin entered the world, and through sin death; and so death passed to all men in whom all have sinned" and the following, where there is not a main verb in the whole period. Fourth, there are inverted statements, as *Genesis* ch10, "These are the sons of Shem according to their kindred, and tongues, and regions in their families." For the beginning of chapter 11 immediately follows, "And the earth was of one tongue and of the same speech." Fifth, there are phrases proper to Hebrew, as *Psalms* 88, "His throne as the day of heaven." Again *Psalms* 118, "My soul is always in my hands," and very many others. Sixth, there are many figures of speech, tropes, metaphors, allegories, hyperbata, ironies, and other things of this sort without number.

Add lastly the witness of our adversaries, which, willy nilly, they are compelled to give to this truth. For if Scripture were as clear as they say, why would Luther and Lutherans write so many commentaries? Why would they produce such diverse versions of Scripture? Why would they explain Scripture so variously? Certainly Osiander in his confutation of the writing that Philip brought out against him, testifies that 20 very diverse opinions about justification according to the Scriptures circulate among the Confessionists alone. And did not Luther himself, in bk.1 *Against Zwingli and Oecolampadius*, leave in writing, "If the world stands any longer, it will again be necessary for us, because of the diverse interpretations of Scripture that now exist, to take again the decrees of the Councils and flee back to them for preserving unity of faith."

Luther, who in the preface to the assertion of his articles asserts that Scripture is per se very open and clear, and boasts, in his book on the *Bondage of the Will*, that there is nothing of difficulty in the sacred letters and that no place can be brought to him which he himself would not easily interpret – he himself yet says in his preface to the *Psalms*, "I do not wish anyone to presume of me what none of the most holy and learned men has yet been able to provide, that is, to understand the *Psalter* in all respects in its legitimate sense. The Spirit has reserved many things for himself so as always to have us as disciples; many things he only shows so as to entice us, many things he hands on only so as to affect us." And later, "I know him to be a man of the most impudent rashness who dares to profess that one book of Scripture has in all its parts been understood by him." And in his book *On the Councils* p.12 he says, "Twenty years ago I was compelled to condemn the commentaries of the Fathers, since Scripture had to be read in the schools, and was compelled to seek out with great sweat its true and genuine sense."

Brentius in his prolegomena *Against Petrus a Soto* says, "They trifle that Scripture is obscure and therefore needs interpretation." And later he says, "For the impious and incredulous alone is Scripture obscure, but not for pious believers." But he himself in his *Wittenberg Confession*, in the chapter on sacred Scripture, speaks thus: "It is not obscure," he says, "that the gift of interpreting Scripture is not with

human prudence but with the Holy Spirit; but the Holy Spirit is most free, nor is bound to a definite class of men, but distributes his gifts to men according to his own good will." But why, Brentius, I ask, is the gift of interpretation necessary if, as you were saying a little before, Scripture has no need of interpretation?

But already Martin Chemnitz in his *Examination of the Council of Trent* sess.4 says, "God wanted the gift of interpretation to exist in the Church, which, like the gift of healing, of miracles, of tongues, is not common to all." And later, "Gratefully," he says, "and with reverence do we use the labors of the Fathers, who helpfully illustrated many places of Scripture with their commentaries." Very grateful, to be sure, was your parent Luther to the labors of the Fathers, since in his book *On the Councils* p.53 he wrote that the commentaries of the Fathers are wood in place of gold. Nor less in conflict with Luther are the Centuriatores, who however are rigid Lutherans, when in *Centur.*1 bk.1 ch.4 col.53 they thus write, "The Apostles thought that the Scriptures could not be understood without the Holy Spirit and without an interpreter." But let us look at the arguments of Luther and Brentius.

#### *Chapter Two: The Objections of the Adversaries are Solved*

They take the first objection from the words of *Deuteronomy* ch.30, "The command that I give you today is not above you, nor is it located far away, nor sited in the heaven, nor across the sea etc." In these verses a certain supreme facility in the Scriptures is shown, "so that there should be no need," says Brentius, "to conquer mountains and go to Rome for interpretation of the Scriptures."

I reply that this place is wont to be understood in a double way. Many of the ancients understand this place, not about facility in understanding the Scriptures, but about facility in fulfilling the commands of the Decalogue, when the help of grace is present (which is contrary to all the Lutherans who teach that the commands of God are impossible). So Tertullian expounds in bk.4 *Against Marcion*, and Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostom and others on *Romans* ch.10, and Augustine in his book on the *Perfection of Justice*, penultimate response.

Others on this place, however, among whom is Abulensis, understand these words of facility in knowing, not indeed the holy Scriptures, none of which at that time perhaps existed, but only the commands of the Decalogue, which, since they are natural, are very easily understood, and those Jews in particular could easily know them, who had heard Moses explaining them and had confessed that they grasped them all and had promised that they would observe them. For this reason there is added, "the word is near in your mouth and in your heart," that is, in your heart who have now understood what should be done, and in your mouth, because you have now confessed that you have understood them. Nor in conflict with this explanation is what David above cited confesses, that the law of the Lord was difficult to understand. For David understands by the law, not those ten precepts only, but all the divine Scriptures. Which meaning is also used by the Lord in the Gospel when he says, *John* ch.15, "So as to fulfill what is written in their law, that they hated me without a cause."

The second argument is from *Psalms* 18, "The precept of the Lord is clear, illumining the eyes," and *Psalms* 118, "Your word is a lamp to my feet," and, "The

declaration of your words etc.”, and *Proverbs* ch.6, “The command is a lamp, and the law is light.”

I reply first that the question here is not about the whole Scripture but only about the Lord’s precepts that are called clear, a lamp, and light. Not that they are easily understood, although this is also true – for what is easier than “Love your neighbor as yourself?” – but that what is understood and known directs man in acting. Second, it can be said that the question is indeed about the whole Scripture but that the Scriptures are said to be clear, nay a light and lamp, not because they are easily understood, but because, when they have been understood, they illumine the mind. For the Prophet in *Psalms* 18 had spoken of the knowledge of the philosophers, although they had obtained it from creatures, when he says, “The heavens tell the glory of God, etc.” Afterwards, to show that they did not reach the light which those reach whom God deigns to instruct and to whom he gave his written law, he subjoins, “The law of the lord is pure, converting the soul, etc.” Likewise in *Psalms* 118 he wanted to show that the knowledge had from the revealed word of God is greater than that had from creatures; and for this reason he compared the word of God to a lamp, which is much more useful to us in scattering the darkness of night than the light of all the stars.

The third argument is *Matthew* ch.5, “You are the light of the world.” But if the Apostles are the light of the world, how are the preaching and Scriptures of the Apostles not most clear?

I reply that the Lord is speaking of the light of examples of probity and of morals; for he wanted the Apostles to be a sort of example of sanctity proposed to all men to imitate. Wherefore he immediately adds, “Let your light so shine before men that they see your good works.” In addition, if the Lord were speaking of the light of doctrine, the sense would not be that the Scriptures of the Apostles are very easy to understand, but that when it is understood it illumines the mind and instructs about the highest things and puts the darkness of all errors to flight. For he who speaks or writes clearly does not as much illumine as he who, whether he speaks or writes clearly or obscurely, kindles the light of truth in the mind and expels the darkness of errors.

The fourth argument is II *Peter* ch.1, “We have a firmer prophetic speech, to which you do well to attend, as to a lamp shining in a dark place.”

I reply that in this place too the words of the Prophets are called a lamp, not because they are easily understood, but because when understood they illumine and show the way to Christ, who is the true Sun of justice.

The fifth argument is II *Corinthians* ch.4, “Because if our Gospel is concealed, it is concealed in those who perish, in whom the God of this world has blinded the eyes of the unfaithful, so that the light of the glory of Christ shines not on them.” Therefore to all the faithful Scripture is open and easy.

I reply that the Apostle is not speaking of the understanding of the Scriptures, but of the knowledge and faith of Christ, which the Apostles were preaching. For he had said in the previous chapter that this is the distinction between the Old Testament and the New, that in the Old men did not see the mysteries of Christ, the incarnation, the passion, etc. save through a veil of figures and shadows. This is what the veil signified by which Moses covered his face when

he spoke to the people; but in the New Testament, with all the figures fulfilled, the face revealed, we see the glory of the Lord, and there is not an old woman, not a child, who does not know that God was incarnate, suffered, etc.

Since therefore someone could ask why, if thus it is, so many after the preaching of the Gospel still do not believe and see nothing, especially the Jews, save shadows and figures, therefore does the Apostle subjoin that the Gospel is concealed to some because their internal eyes are blinded by corrupt affections, about whom the Lord said in *John* ch.5, "How can you believe, who receive glory from each other?" Further the God of this world is not understood to be any God creator of corporeal things, distinct from the true God, as the Marcionists and Manichees interpreted, as Chrysostom relates at this point, but either the 'of this world' is not to be joined with 'God' but with 'of the unfaithful', as Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others on this place maintain, and Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.21 ch.2, or certainly the Devil is called the God of this world, not because he is God absolutely, but because he is God of the unfaithful, as is said *Psalms* 95, "The Gods of the Gentiles are demons." Thus Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.21 ch.9, and Cyril in Oecumenius.

The sixth argument is from Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.6, who speaks thus, "Wonderfully and wholesomely has the Holy Spirit so moderated the Scriptures that in the more open places he satisfies hunger, but in the more obscure he clears away disgust, for almost nothing does he dig up from those obscurities that is not found said very plainly elsewhere."

I reply that not in vain did Augustine add the 'almost'; for certain very obscure things are found that are never explained in the whole of Scripture, as a great part of the *Apocalypse*, the beginning and end of *Ezekiel* etc. Next, this itself is very difficult, namely to find where it is that what is in one place very obscurely said is openly said; otherwise how would the same Augustine in *epist.*119 ch.21 say that he was ignorant of more things in the sacred letters than he knew? What about the fact that even the place which seems very open will sometimes seem obscure to someone else? Scripture alone, then, does not suffice to take away controversies.

Certainly the words of *Matthew* ch.26, "This is my body," seem to us so clear that the Evangelist could have said nothing clearer; but to the Zwinglians they seem obscure and figurative. But those words in the same place, "Drink of this all of you," seem very clear both to us and the Lutherans, and yet they are very diversely explained. For when we read *Mark* ch.14, "And they all drank of it," which is understood of the twelve disciples, we, interpreting Scripture by Scripture, say that the Lord said to the twelve disciples, "Drink of this all of you." But Brentius in his prolegomena says very clearly that this command was given not only to the Apostles but also to everyone else, that they should drink from the chalice. And when we ask whether Turks too and Jews and infants should drink, they then add the gloss "all", that is, "all faithful adults."

The seventh argument is that the sum of the whole of Scripture, which consists in the precepts of the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's prayer, and the sacraments, has very open testimonies in the Scriptures, therefore the whole Scripture is most open.

I reply that the consequence and the antecedent are denied. The consequence indeed because, although everything can in some way be reduced to these things,

yet they themselves are in themselves very obscure, as is plain about the foretellings of the *Prophets*, the *Song of Songs*, *Romans*, *Apocalypse*, etc. But that the antecedent is false is more certain than certain. For if such clear testimonies existed about all the articles of the Creed, all the sacraments, then all controversies would have ended, although, however, there are very serious controversies even about the individual sacraments, not only about the matters Catholics disagree with heretics on, but also those heretics disagree among themselves on.

The eighth argument is that John Chrysostom *Homil.3* on Lazarus, where he shows that the Philosophers speak obscurely, subjoins as follows, "But the Apostles and Prophets on the contrary made everything manifest, and they expounded, as common doctors of the world, the clear things that were of advantage, so that each one could for himself learn from reading what was said." Again *Homil.3* on II *Thessalonians* he says, "Why is there need of an orator? Everything is clear and plain from the divine Scriptures; but because you are rather delicate hearers, hunting for delight in your listening, for that reason you seek out orators."

I respond that Chrysostom used those exaggerations to shake off the torpor from the many who could if they wished read the Scriptures with great fruit. For elsewhere he affirms in the same places that the Scriptures are difficult. In *Homil.3* on Lazarus, before the words cited, he says, "What then if we do not understand the things that are contained in the books? Indeed, especially if you do not understand what is hidden there, yet from the very reading much sanctity is born." And later he testifies that when he says the Scriptures are easy, he is speaking only of the histories and the like things; and not even these are clear and easy to all. "Take the book," he says, "into your hands, read every history, and retain in your memory what is known and frequently go through what is obscure and not very manifest. But if you cannot by repeated reading discover what is said, go to someone wiser, go to a doctor." And in *Homil.3* on II *Thessalonians*, after the words cited, he adds, "What is this obscurity? Say, I ask, are they not histories? You know what is clear, what do you ask about the obscure? There are a thousand histories in the Scriptures, tell me one of them. But you will not say. They are a pretext, and empty words." Again *Homil.10* on *John* he advises hearers that before they come to the homily they read the reading, and note what is obscure, so they may receive an explanation from the speaker. Finally in *Homil.44* on *John* he very clearly teaches that the Scriptures are obscure, as was said above.

The ninth argument. There is this difference between the Old and New Testaments, that in the Old the Scripture was a sealed book, as is said in *Isaiah* ch.9, but in the New it is an open book, as is said in *Apocalypse* ch.5, for the Lamb that was slain opened the book. In proof of which thing the veil of the temple at the death of the Lord was torn in two, *Matthew* ch.27, and this is confirmed from Jerome on *Ezekiel* ch.44 where he expounds these places of Scripture about the difficulty and facility of Scripture.

I reply that the difference between the Old and New Testaments consists in this, that then not only the sentences of the Scriptures but also the mysteries of Christ were not understood, because everything was covered in figures. And for this reason in *Isaiah* ch.29 it is called a sealed book both for those who know letters and for those who do not. But in the case of the New Testament, because Christ has



fulfilled the figures and prophecies, even rustics and women, although many of them do not understand the sentences of the Scriptures, understand nevertheless the mysteries of redemption themselves. But that neither the Scriptures nor Jerome are speaking of the sentences of Scripture is plain, first, from Origen in *Homil.* 12 on *Exodus*, where he says that there is still need now that the Lamb of the tribe of Judah should open for us the sealed books; second, it is plain from Jerome himself, who in his epistle to Paulinus about the education of a monk says that still today the veil remains, not only over the face of Moses, but also over the face of the Evangelists and the Apostles, if we consider the difficulty of the Scriptures, and for that reason we must pray with the Prophet, "Uncover my eyes, and I will consider marvels from your law."

The tenth argument is proper to Luther: the Fathers prove their opinions from Scripture; but one should not prove the more known from the less known; therefore the Scriptures are clearer than the commentaries of the Fathers.

I reply that it is remarkable why Luther, who so often censures the sophists, does not now fear to act the sophist. For when the Philosophers say that one should not prove the less known from the more known, they are not speaking of the knowledge of words, which consist in the clearness of the sentences, in the way we say that a literal sentence is more known, that is, easier and clearer than a figurative one; but they are speaking of the knowledge of the truth of the thing that is contained therein, so that one may understand that what is said is true. Let life and motion be taken for example. For if you look at the words, this sentence 'Man lives' is as equally easily understood as this other 'Man moves'. And yet as far as concerns the truth of the thing, it is more known that man moves than that he lives. So then the Fathers confirm their opinions from the testimonies of the Scriptures, because it is more known that what is contained in the Scriptures is true than that what is contained in the Fathers is; and yet the same Fathers illustrate the Scriptures in their commentaries, because the words of Scripture are more obscure than the words of the Fathers.

The eleventh argument. The Fathers of the first Church read the Scriptures without commentaries; and all the other ancients afterwards did the same; for what purpose, then, do we enter on this new path of commentaries?

I reply that the contrary is true, and that Luther brings forward no example while we can adduce innumerable. I say, then, that the first Fathers, who were immediately after the Apostles, did not read commentaries because there were none; but yet there were living commentaries present, that is, the Apostles and their disciples, and they did not want to understand the Scriptures by their own genius. So does Papias witness about himself in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 last chapter, and Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* bk.1 where he enumerates his preceptors, the disciples of the Apostles, and among them especially Panthenus. Next Justin and Irenaeus and others began to write commentaries on the divine letters, as Jerome testifies in his book on *Illustrious Men* on John, and likewise those who came later began to unroll the commentaries of the ancients, as Ruffinus *Hist.* bk.11 ch.9 writes about Basil and Gregory, and as Jerome writes about himself in the preface to his commentary on *Ephesians*. And the same could be shown about all the others, were there need.

*Chapter Three: A Question is Posed about the Judge of Controversies, and Discussion is given at the same time about the Senses of the Scriptures*

Since it has been established that Scripture is obscure and needs an interpreter, another question follows: whether the interpretation of Scripture must be sought from some single, visible, and common judge or left to each one's decision. Which is surely a very serious question, and on it depend almost all controversies. Many have written on this question, but especially John Driedo on *Ecclesiastical Dogmas* bk.1 ch.3, John Cochlaeus on the *Authority of Scripture and the Church*, Cardinal Warmiensis *Against the Prolegomena of Brentius* bks.2-3, Peter de Soto in *Defense of his Confession*, against the same Prolegomena of Brentius pp.2-3, and Michael Medina on *Right Faith in God* bk.7, and Melchior Cano on *Theological Places* bk.2 chs.6-8.

To begin with then, in order to understand what is being sought for, certain things must be noted in advance. And first about the sense of Scripture. For it is proper to the divine Scripture that it has God for author and very often contains two senses, the literal or historical and the spiritual or mystical. The literal sense is what the words immediately present; the spiritual sense is how there is reference to something other than what the words immediately signify; and this division is collected from the Apostle on I *Corinthians* ch.19 where he says that everything happened to the Jews in figure for our correction. And what is literally said about the departure of the Jews from Egypt – the crossing of the sea, the manna that rained down in the desert, the water that flowed from the rock – he accommodates to Christians. That these two senses are also signified by the book written within and without, which is dealt with in *Apocalypse* ch.5 and *Ezekiel* ch.2, is taught by Jerome on *Ezekiel* ch.2.

Philo in his book on the *Life of Theorica* and Nazianzen to Nemesius compare the literal sense to the body and the spiritual to the soul; and just as the begotten Word of God has an invisible divine nature and a visible human nature, so the written word of God has an exterior sense and an interior sense. Now, that this is proper to divine Scripture alone is taught by Blessed Gregory *Morals* bk.21 ch.1.

Further, the literal sense is double; one is simple, which consists in the propriety of the words, the other is figurative, whereby the words are transferred from their natural signification to a foreign one. And there are as many kinds of this as there are kinds of figures. When the Lord in *John* ch.10 says, "I have other sheep that are not of this flock, etc.," the sense is literal but figurative, that he has other men besides the Jews to gather into the Church. Which is said properly in *John* ch.21, that he would gather the sons of God, who were scattered about, into one. See on these figurative locutions Augustine *Christian Doctrine* bk.3.

Now, the spiritual sense is distinguished by more recent Theologians into three, the allegorical, the tropological, and the anagogical. They call it allegorical when the words of Scripture signify, besides the literal sense, something in the New Testament that pertains to Christ or the Church, in the way that Abraham, who literally in fact had two wives, one free and one slave, and two sons, Isaac and Ishmael, signified God as author of two Testaments and as Father of two peoples, as the Apostle explains in *Galatians* ch.4. They call it tropological when the words or facts are referred to signifying what pertains to morals, in the way that "Thou shalt

not muzzle the ox that treads the corn," *Deuteronomy* ch.25, which is literally understood of real oxen, spiritually signifies that homilists should not be prevented from receiving sustenance from the people, as the Apostle explains in *I Corinthians* ch.9. They call it anagogical when the words or facts are referred to signifying eternal life, in the way that the verse of *Psalms* 94, "To whom I swore in my wrath, if they will enter into my rest," which is understood literally of the land of promise, is also referred spiritually to eternal life, as the Apostle explains in *Hebrews* ch.4.

This distinction of spiritual senses was not always observed by the ancients. For although, as far as the thing itself is concerned, they recognize all these senses, yet sometimes they call them allegorical, as Basil does at the beginning of *Homil.9 Exam.*, and Augustine on the *Utility of Believing* ch.3. Further, Jerome in his epistle to Hedibias, which is numbered 12, includes under the name of the tropological also the allegorical sense, and conversely on *Amos* ch.4 he includes under the name of the allegorical the tropological.

Of these senses the literal is found in every sentence, both of the Old and of the New Testament. Nor is it improbable that several literal senses are found in the same sentence, as Blessed Augustine teaches in many places, and especially *Confessions* bk.12 ch.26, *City of God* bk.11 ch.19, *Christian Doctrine* bk.3 ch.27. Now every spiritual sense is found in both Testaments. For about the Old Testament no one doubts but that it has the allegorical, the tropological, and the anagogical sense, and very many rightly think the same about the New Testament. For Augustine tract.122 on *John* allegorically expounds the catch of fish, when the net was torn, *Luke* ch.5. But he expounds it anagogically when the net was not torn, *John* ch.21. And likewise in tract.124 on *John* he allegorically expounds that was said to Peter, "Follow me," and anagogically what was said about John, "if I will that he remain," *John* ch.21. But the Lord himself, *John* ch.13, expounds anagogically the humility wherewith he washed the disciples feet.

But although things are so, yet the spiritual sense is not found in every sentence of Scripture, either in the Old Testament or in the New. For the verse, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," *Deuteronomy* ch.6 and *Matthew* ch.12, and the like precepts have only one sense, that is, the literal sense, as is rightly taught by Cassian, *Collat.*8 ch.3. Having thus established these things, we and our adversaries agree that efficacious arguments must be fetched from the literal sense; for that sense, which is collected immediately from the words, is certainly the sense of the Holy Spirit. But the mystical and spiritual senses are various, and although they edify when they are not against faith or good morals, yet it is not always clear whether they are intended by the Holy Spirit. Wherefore Blessed Augustine in epist.48 to Vincentius rightly mocks the Donatists who, from a mystical explanation of the words, "Show me where you feed, where you rest at midday," collected that the Church of Christ remained only in Africa. Jerome too in his commentary on *Matthew* ch.13 teaches that dogmas of faith cannot efficaciously be confirmed from mystical senses.

Now about the literal sense doubts sometimes arise for two reasons. The first is ambiguity of words, as is seen in *Matthew* ch.26, "Drink ye of this all." The 'all' is ambiguous; for it is not known whether it signifies all men absolutely, or only all the faithful, or all the Apostles. The second reason is more serious, the propriety of the

words. For since the literal sense is (as we said) now simple and now figurative, there is in many places doubt whether the true sense is the simple or the figurative. For the verse of *Matthew* ch.26, "this is my body," is maintained by Catholics to be taken simply according to the propriety of the words, but by the Zwinglians in the figure of Metonymy. And for this cause some have sometimes fallen into very grave errors. Let Origen serve for example, who erred for this reason, that what was to be taken simply he took figuratively, as Jerome teaches in his epistle to Pammachus about the errors of John of Jerusalem, where he says that Origen thus allegorized the earthly paradise so as to take away the truth of the story, since he understood Angels for the trees, heavenly virtues for the rivers; and the clothes of skin for Adam and Eve he interpreted to be human bodies, as if before sin they lived without bodies.

Others on the contrary fell because they took simply and properly what was to be taken figuratively, as Papias and those who followed him, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and some others, who reckoned that what is said in *Apocalypse* ch.20, about the new Jerusalem and the 1,000 years in which the saints will reign with Christ, was to be fulfilled here on earth. Their error was censured by Jerome in the preface to his book 18 on *Isaiah*, and on *Ezekiel* ch.6, and by Augustine *City of God* bk.20 ch.7.

There is also agreement between us and our adversaries that the Scriptures should be understood by the spirit by which they were made, that is, by the Holy Spirit. This is taught by the Apostle Peter in II *Peter* ch.1 when he says, "Understanding this first, that every prophecy of Scripture is not of private interpretation. For prophecy was not ever given by human will, but holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Spirit." Here Blessed Peter proves that the Scriptures should not be expounded by one's own genius, because they were not written by human genius, but by inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

The whole question, then, is located in this, where the Holy Spirit is. For we reckon that this Spirit, although he is often conceded to private men, yet is found certainly in the Church, that is, in the Council of Bishops confirmed by the supreme Pastor of the whole Church, or in the supreme Pastor along with the Council of the other pastors. For we are not in this place disputing about the supreme Pontiff and Councils, whether the Pontiff alone can define a thing and whether a Council alone can, for we will deal with this in its own place. But here we are saying in general that the judge of the true sense of Scripture and of all controversies is the Church, that is, the Pontiff with the Council, wherein all Catholics gather; and it is contained expressly in the Council of Trent sess.4.

But all the heretics of this time teach that the Holy Spirit, interpreter of Scripture, is not bound to the Bishops or to any class of men, and therefore each one should be judge, either by following his own spirit, if he has the gift of interpretation, or by adhering to another whom he sees to be endowed with this gift. Luther in the preface to his assertion of his articles openly sends us back to the spirit that each one has when he diligently reads the Scriptures. And in art.115 from the 500 that Cochlaeus collects from the books of Luther, he says, "Take this Gospel, which is committed neither to the Pope nor to Councils nor to any man so as to establish and prove what the faith is. Therefore I should say, Pope, you have proved

it in the Councils, now I have the judgment whether I can accept it or not. Why? Because you will not stand for me, you will not reply for me when I must die. And no one can judge a false doctrine save a spiritual man. Therefore the thing is insane, that Councils want to prove and establish what should be believed; since often there is no man there who has a trace of even a modicum of the divine Spirit.”

Philip in the places in the chapter on the Church seems indeed to attribute something to the Church; but in fact he leaves the whole judgment to each private man; “Who,” he says, “will be judge when disagreement about a sentence of Scripture arises, since then there is need of a voice to stop the controversy? I reply, the word of God itself is judge, and added to it is the confession of the true Church.” Thus Philip. Yet later, when he teaches that by the true Church are not understood the prelates of the Church, nor the greater part of the faithful, but those few who agree with the word of God, he involves everything in darkness and makes each one judge. For neither can I judge which is the true Church unless I first judge what opinion agrees with the word of God; “There is,” he says, “a difference between the judgments of the Church and political judgments. For in politics or in monarchy one man alone pronounces by his own authority, or the opinion of the greater part prevails in the senate; but in the Church the sentence prevails that agrees with the word of God, and the confession of the pious, whether they are more or fewer than the impious.” See more things in the place on the notes of the Church.

Brentius teaches similarly in the *Wittemberg Confession*, in the chapter on sacred Scripture, and more fully in his *Prolegomena against Peter a Soto*, where he says two things. First, “It is not licit,” he says, “in a cause of eternal salvation so to adhere to a foreign opinion as to embrace it without our own judgment.” Second, he adds, “It pertains to each private man to judge of doctrine of religion, and to distinguish the true from the false. But there is this difference between a private man and a prince, that as a private man has private power of judging and deciding about doctrine of religion so a prince has public power of doing so.” And in almost the whole book he tries to prove these two things, that a secular prince is held to compel his subjects, even by punishment of death, to the faith that he himself judges to be true. And at the same time that subjects are obliged to follow their own judgment, not a foreign one, whosever it is; nor does Brentius notice how absurd and conflicting these things are, that the prince is held to command and the subjects are held not to obey. Nor does he notice, that if his opinion is true, Caesar and other Catholic princes will act rightly if they compel all Lutherans, even by punishment of death, to the Catholic faith.

John Calvin *Institutes* bk.4 ch.9 sects.8, 12-13, bids the definitions of the Councils, even the most general, to be examined according to the rule of the Scriptures; therefore he makes private men judges in a cause of faith, not only of the Fathers, but even of the Councils, and he leaves altogether no common judgment to the Church. Lastly Martin Chemnitz in his *Exam. of the Council of Trent* sess.4, and all the rest of the heretics of this time, draw the authority of interpreting the Scriptures away from the Councils of Bishops to the spirit of private men.

*Chapter Four: Testimonies are Adduced from the Old Testament for the Opinion of Catholics*

The opinion of Catholics is now proved, first from testimonies of the Old Testament. The first testimony is contained in *Exodus* ch.18, for there we read that when the people of God began to be reduced to some form of Ecclesiastical Republic, Moses sat as prince and chief of the Church, and he responded to all doubts that arose about the law of the Lord, and he did not send men to some spirit giving revelation. In the same place, although he had established, according to the counsel of his father in law, minor magistrates to rule the people, yet he always reserved doubts about religion to himself, surely so that we would understand that there should be one common tribunal from which all should seek interpretation of the divine law, and in which all would simply acquiesce.

This argument is wont to be eluded by some in that they say Moses was a political prince, not a Pontiff or a priest, since Aaron was the supreme Pontiff. And therefore one cannot from this place conclude that judgment about matters of faith pertains to Pontiffs, but that it in some way pertains to Kings. I reply that Moses was Pontiff, and indeed supreme Pontiff and greater than Aaron, not indeed the ordinary one to whom there would be succession, for that could only be one and he was Aaron, but an extraordinary one especially set up by God. Just as in the New Testament all the Apostles were not indeed greater, nor altogether on a par, but yet in some way equal with Peter in Ecclesiastical power, as Cyprian teaches in his tract on the *Simplicity of Prelates*; but with this difference, that Peter was ordinary Pastor of the whole Church, to whom alone there was succession, and the rest were extraordinary, to whom there was not to be succession in that power. But that Moses was priest is testified to by David when he says in *Psalms* 98, "Moses and Aaron among the priests, and Samuel with them, who invoke the name of the Lord."

But, they say, Moses was called priest because he was the principal man, in the way that in II *Kings* ch.8 we read that the sons of David were priests. On the contrary, however, because if in this place the principal men were called priests, Samuel too, who was principal man, would have been called a priest. But this was not done by David, who knew that Samuel was not priest but only judge; for he did not descend from the family of Aaron but of Core, his cousin, I *Chronicles* ch.6. But Moses was truly and properly priest, as is plain from *Exodus* chs.28-29, where Moses exercises all the sacerdotal functions. For he sacrifices, teaches, consecrates vestments, and, what is greater, anoints and initiates priests. Wherefore Moses was properly priest, as almost all the ancients teach, Philo on the *Life of Moses* bk.3 at the end, Dionysius *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* ch.5, Gregory Nazianzen in the homily he gave in the presence of Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine on *Psalms* 98, Jerome *Against Jovinian* bk.1, where he also shows that Samuel was not priest.

The second testimony is contained in *Deuteronomy* ch.17, where a general law is passed, "If you perceive that a judgment is difficult and ambiguous for you, between cause and cause, leper and non-leper, and you see that the words of the judges within your gates is various, arise and go to the place which the Lord your God has chosen, and you shall come to the priest of the family of Levi and to the judge who will be at that time, and you will ask of them, and they will shown the truth of judgment to you. And you shall do whatever they say who preside over the

place that the Lord chooses, and they will teach you according to his law, and you will follow their sentence, nor will you decline to the right or to the left. But he who is proud, not willing to obey the command of the priest who at that time ministers to the Lord your God, he will die by decree of the judge." Here too very clearly they do not send doubters back to their own spirit, but to a living judge, that is, to the High Priest.

But Brentius objects that this precept is conditional, because there is added, "You shall do whatever they say who preside over the place and they will teach you according to his law." For it seems from this place that one should not stand by the judgment of the High Priest unless he puts forward the testimony of the divine law. I reply that the 'and they will teach you, etc.' is only in the Vulgate edition, which Lutherans do not accept, nor does it indicate a condition but an assertion or a promise; for it does not mean to say, 'Stand by the judgment of the priest if he teaches you according to the law', for then men would have been more doubtful and perplexed than before; nor would there have been need to go to a priest if they could themselves have per se judged their cause from the law of the Lord. Nay, the priest would not then have been judge but they themselves, as being those who were to judge of the sentence of the priest. It is not therefore a condition but a promise. For the Lord wants to make secure the people who acquiesce in the judgment of the priest, which he does when he affirms that the priests will judge according to his law.

Second Brentius objects that in this place those who doubt are sent not only to a priest but also to a judge; but a judge was a political prince. I reply that by name of judge can here be understood the Prince of the priests; for in Hebrew it says, "Go up to the priests and the judge," as if to say, to the Council of Priests and their Prince, the Chief Priest. I say second that if by the name of judge we understand a political prince, there are here distinct offices. For to the priest was given the definitive sentence, but to the judge the execution of it against the stubborn, "But he who is proud, not willing to obey the command of the priest who at that time ministers to the Lord your God, he will die by decree of the judge."

They object, third, that what is being dealt with here is not doubts of religion but political doubts. I reply that this is false; for the law is general about all doubts that were arising from the law. Besides the occasion for this law was because of those who serve alien gods, as is plain from the beginning of the chapter. But to serve alien gods is against religion.

The third testimony is from *Ecclesiastes* ch.12, "The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails deeply fixed, which are given by the counsel of the masters from the one pastor. Do not, my son, seek further into these." In this place Solomon teaches that one should not further inquire but acquiesce wholly when a sentence has been given by the supreme Pastor, especially when the counsel of the wise is added to it. But if these things are said about a priest of the Old Testament, how much more can they be said about a priest of the New Testament, who has received much greater promises from God?

The fourth testimony is from *Haggai* ch.2, "These things says the Lord God of hosts, ask the priests the law." *Malachi* ch.2, "The lips of the priest will guard knowledge, and they will ask the law from his mouth, because he is the Angel of the

Lord of hosts." From which words we understand that to judge of the sentence of the law of the Lord does not belong to private men but to the priest, to whom, since he is an Angel, that is, a messenger of God, pertains by office the explication of the sentence of God.

Add finally the verse from *2 Chronicles* ch.19, the very good King Josaphat speaks to the priests, "Every cause that comes to you from your brothers who inhabit your cities, between relative and relative, whenever there is a question about the law, the command, the ceremonies, the justifications, show it to them, so that they sin not against the Lord. But Amarias the priest and your Pontiff will preside in matters that pertain to God; further Zabadiah, son of Ismahel, who is leader in the house of Judah, will be above the works that pertain to the office of the King." Do you see here how clearly he distinguishes the office of Pontiff from the office of King, and attributes only to the Pontiff judgment about doubts of law?

*Chapter Five: The Same is Proved from the New Testament*

Now from the New Testament. The first testimony is *Matthew* ch.16, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven etc." For by these keys is understood not only the loosing from sins but also the loosing from all bonds and impediments which, unless they are taken away, entrance into the kingdom of heaven is impossible; for the promise is general; nor is it said, "whomever you loose," but "whatever you loose," so that we may understand that all knots, whether of laws by dispensing from them, or of sins and punishments by relaxing them, of or dogmas and controversies by explaining them, can be loosed by Peter and his successors. But we will say more about this place in the first book on the Supreme Pontiff.

The second testimony can be that of *Matthew* ch.18, "If he will not hear the Church let him to be to you as a heathen and a publican." But one must observe in this place that here indeed the Lord is speaking of injuries which one person suffers from another, but a fortiori it should also be understood of injuries that are done against the whole Church and against God, of which sort is heresy. For he who bids an adulterer to be brought to the judgment of the Church, much more bids a heretic to be so. But it cannot be that they be brought to the congregation of all the faithful; therefore by the name of the Church must be understood the Prelate, as Chrysostom expounds, or (as others prefer) the congregation of Prelates. For as a man neither speaks nor hears save through his head, and yet the whole man is said to speak and to hear, so the Church hears and speaks through its Prelates. If therefore he who does not hear the Church, that is, the Pastors of the Church, ought to be as a heathen and a publican, it follows that ultimate judgment belongs with the Pastors.

The third testimony is from *Matthew* ch.23, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat, and whatever they say to you, that keep and do, but do not according to their works." Here note three things. First, that in this whole chapter the Lord is censuring the vices of the Scribes and Pharisees; and because the infirm could collect from this that one should not believe Prelates who live badly, therefore he wished at the beginning of the chapter to teach openly that, notwithstanding the bad life of Prelates, their doctrine should be followed. Second, note with Cyprian bk.4 epist.9, that never did the Lord or the Apostles in the whole of Scripture censure the Pontiffs and priests of the Jews, by naming them Pontiffs and priests, but only under



the name of Scribes and Pharisees; lest they should seem to be censuring the chair and the priesthood, and so that we might understand that honor is always due to the priesthood and the pontificate, even if by chance the person who sits on the chair is less good. From which we understand that the heretics of this time, who inveigh everywhere against Bishops and priests, and especially against the Supreme Pontiff of the Church, have nothing in common with the morals of the Lord and of the Apostles. Third, note that what the Lord says of the chair of Moses is understood a fortiori of the chair of Peter. For thus did the ancients understand, and especially Augustine in epist.165, who says, "In the order of Bishops, which is traced from Peter up to Anastasius who now sits on the same chair, even if some traitor had during that time crept in, there would be no prejudice to the Church and to innocent Christians, to whom the Lord by foresight says about evil leaders, 'What they say, do; what they do, do not do'."

The fourth testimony is the last chapter of *John*, "Simon Peter, feed my sheep." Here also three things are to be noted. First, that what is said to Peter is also said to his successors; for Christ did not want to provide for his Church for twenty five years only, but for as long as the world would last. Second, the 'feed' is understood in particular of doctrine, for thus are rational sheep fed, *Jeremiah* ch.3, "I will give you pastors in accord with my heart, and they will feed you with knowledge and doctrine." Third, the 'sheep' signifies all Christians, for he who does not wish to be fed by Peter is not of the sheep of Christ.

From these the result is that it was singularly committed to Peter and his successors to teach all Christians. But that cannot be more properly understood than in this way, that we should say it was committed to Peter and his successors to teach everyone what should be held in doctrine of faith. For if we understand it only of homilies, this precept will never be fulfilled; for the Pontiff cannot preach to all men, nor is there need, since in each individual Church there are those who preach.

If we also understand it only of homilies and comments on sacred letters, so that whom the Pontiff cannot teach by word he teaches by written commentaries, we may censure many of the most holy Pontiffs, who did no such thing. Therefore the Lord is speaking of a singular office of teaching the whole Church, by establishing and decreeing what all should believe. And in this way did Blessed Jerome understand this place in his epistle to Damasus about the word hypostasis, for when asking the Pontiff for an explanation of a certain controversy about the faith he says, "Ask for protection of the sheep from the pastor."

The fifth testimony is *Luke* ch.22, "I have asked for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren." From this place Blessed Bernard epist.90 to Innocent, deduces that the Roman Pontiff when teaching *ex cathedra* cannot err, and before Bernard so did Lucius I in his epistle to the Bishops of Spain and France, Felix I in his epistle to Benignus, Marcus in his epistle to Athanasius, Leo in serm.3 about his assumption to the Pontificate, Leo IX in his epistle to Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, Agatho in his epistle to the Emperor Constantine, which was read at the sixth Synod act.4, and then in act.8 was approved by the whole Council, Paschal II in the Roman Council, in Abbot Vispergensis in his *Chronicle*; to whom I add, whether the heretics will or no, Innocent III ch. Maiores, on baptism and its effect. If therefore the Roman Pontiff cannot err when teaching *ex*

*cathedra*, certainly one should acquiesce in his judgment, and he himself must be supreme Judge.

The sixth testimony is *Acts* ch.15, for there we read that when a serious question arose about the faith, whether the law of Moses should be kept by the converted Gentiles, they were not referred each to his own spirit, but to the Council held at Jerusalem, over which Peter presided, and Peter spoke first of all in the Council, then James confirmed the opinion of Peter, and thus the question was resolved in these words, "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us, etc." By which words they show that the opinion of the Council, presided over by Peter, is the opinion of the Holy Spirit. And in the same place at the end of the chapter we read that Paul was accustomed, wherever he went, to prescribe that they keep the decree of the Council, that is, they should acquiesce and not wish themselves to judge the opinion of the Council.

The seventh testimony is *Galatians* ch.2, "I went up," says Paul, "to Jerusalem with Barnabas and I communicated to them the Gospel that I preach among the Gentiles; but separately with those who seemed to be something, lest perhaps I should run or had run in vain." Now who they were with whom he consulted he explains later, saying they were Peter, James, and John. When explaining this place Tertullian *Against Marcion* bk.4, Blessed Jerome in epist.89 to Augustine, which is number 11 among the epistles of Augustine, and Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.28 ch.4, expressively affirm that the Church would not believe Paul unless his gospel had been confirmed by Peter. Therefore it was Peter's job then, and accordingly his successor's job now, to judge the doctrine of faith.

The eighth testimony is I *Corinthians* ch.12, "To another is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another the interpretation of words, to another prophecy etc." Here it is openly said that the spirit of interpreting the Scriptures is not give to all the faithful. And it is in addition clear from II *Peter* ch.1, "No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation," that the Scripture cannot be well expounded without the spirit of interpretation. Therefore is evidently collected that no private man is judge of the true sense of Scripture. For what will he do who does not have the spirit? Nay who will be certain that he has this spirit, since we know it is not given to all and we do not know to whom it is given? It remains then that we acknowledge the Church alone to be the judge, about which there can be no doubt but that it has the Spirit of God and teaches its sons without error, since it is the pillar and ground of the truth. This point even Luther on the *Power of the Pope* confesses in these words (whatever he wrote elsewhere, as he was varying and unstable in a remarkable way), "About no private man are we certain whether he has the revelation of the Father or not; but the Church is that about which one is not permitted to doubt, etc." Further, the Church does not otherwise speak than through the mouth of the Pastors and Doctors, and especially when gathered in a general Council.

But, they say, he is certain he has it who asks; for it is written, *Luke* ch.11, "How much more will the Father give the good Spirit to those who ask him," and *James* ch.1, "If one of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God who gives to all abundantly." I reply that in these and similar places the Lord is not speaking of the spirit of interpretation, which is a certain freely given grace, but of the spirit of faith, hope,

charity, and wisdom necessary for salvation. For as Blessed Augustine teaches tracts.73, 81, 102 on *John*, a prayer does not infallibly have its effect save for what is necessary or useful for the salvation of him who prays. Further, the gift of interpreting, like the gift of tongues and miracles, and others there enumerated, is not always useful to him who has them.

Just as therefore we cannot always obtain by prayer the spirit of speaking in tongues or of performing miracles, even if it is written, "I will give the good spirit to those who ask," so neither the spirit of interpretation. For otherwise it could happen that the whole body of the Church would be one member, that is, all would be eyes and all hands, etc., contrary to the Apostle *Romans* ch.12 and I *Corinthians* ch.12. Besides, even if the Lord in these places were speaking of the gift of interpreting, still whoever asks would not be certain that he has it, because he is not certain whether he asks well; for it is written, "You ask and you do not receive, because you ask badly," *James* ch.4. Otherwise, since the Lutherans ask for this spirit, and the Anabaptists, and the Zwinglians, how is it that they receive very diverse and mutually conflicting spirits, if to all who ask the one and true Holy Spirit is given?

The ninth testimony is I *John* ch.4, "Most beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are from God. For many false prophets have gone out into the world." The spirit of private men is to be tested whether it is from God; for many boast of the Holy Spirit who are driven by the spirit of giddiness and mendacity, as is said III *Kings* last chapter, II *Chronicles*, *Isaiah* chs.19 and 29. Therefore private spirit cannot be the judge. For how will it be judge since about it judgment must still be made?

Wherefore, if someone expounds "This is my body" as "This signifies my body," because so the spirit reveals to him, the question will still not be defined. For John advises that we test the spirit whether it is from God, lest rather perhaps it be the spirit of giddiness. But it cannot be tested from Scripture, as they wish, because we are in doubt here about a sentence of Scripture itself, therefore it must be tested from conformity with the spirit of those who it is clear have the true spirit, but such are the Prelates legitimately congregated in a Council. For we read *Acts* ch.15 that the Council said, "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us;" such also now is the Pontiff teaching *ex cathedra*, whom we showed is always directed by the Holy Spirit so that he cannot err; such too were the Apostles and the ancient faithful, who it is certain had the Holy Spirit.

Nor can Calvin deny it, seeing that on this place he reasons in *Institutes* bk.1 ch.9 sect.1 against Svenckfeld, who wanted the Spirit alone to be judge, having repudiated the Scriptures. If this spirit were good, it would be the same as the spirit of the Apostles and the first faithful; but their spirit did not wish to be judge to the contempt of the Scriptures. But now we too argue against Calvin and other heretics: if their spirit were good, it would be the same as the spirit of the Apostles and the first faithful, but their spirit did not wish to be judge but had recourse to Peter and the Council, and acquiesced in their opinion, as we showed above in *Acts* ch.15. Therefore their spirit, which makes itself judge, is not the good spirit.

*Chapter Six: The Same is Proved from the Custom of the Church*

It is proved, third, from the practice of the Church. For in all centuries new doubts have arisen in the Church and have been settled in the same way, namely by judgment of the Roman Pontiff and of the Bishops who then existed; but to say or write that what the universal Church has always done and does is not rightly done is a mark of the most insolent insanity, as Augustine says in *epist.118*.

And note that we do not only say that all causes were judged by the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops, but also that they were judged by the Pontiff and the Bishops who then existed. For a new Pope and new Bishops were never created for the purpose of judging of any doubt. We say this because of the Confessionists, who in the *Augustan Confession art.28* confess that it pertains to the Bishops to discriminate true doctrine from false. But when we ask why then do they not acquiesce in the Council of Trent? They reply that those who exist now are not Bishops but enemies of the Gospel. But the Arians and all heretics said this same thing about the Bishops of their time, and yet notwithstanding, already for 1500 years doubts of religion have always been explained by the Bishops who were then in the Churches by ordinary succession when those doubts arose; and those who did not acquiesce were held as heretics.

In the first century, then, of the Church, which extended up to the hundredth year after the birth of Christ, there arose a question about the ceremonies of the old law, whether they were to be kept by the Gentiles converted to Christ. And just as that first question arose in the Church, so was the first Council then celebrated, with Peter as presider; and all acquiesced in the decree of that Council, *Acts ch.15*.

In the second century, that is, up to the two hundredth year, there arose a question about the celebration of Easter, with some wanting it to be celebrated along with the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the first month, whether it be the Lord's day or not; but others wanted it only on the Lord's day. Now it is clear that for this reason many Councils of Bishops were celebrated, and finally it was so determined by the Roman Pontiff Victor that all the Churches of Asia were excommunicated by him because they persisted still in error. Eusebius *Hist. bk.5 chs.23-24* writes the whole history. But afterwards those were not only held to be excommunicated but also heretics who did not obey the decree of the Pontiff. For hence in Epiphanius *Heresy 50*, in Augustine *Heresy 29*, and in Tertullian *On Prescription at the end*, are numbered among the heretics, the Quartodecimans.

In the third century, that is, after the two hundredth year, the heresy of the Novatians arose, who denied that the Church could absolve those from their sins who had lapsed after baptism. But the truth was explained by the Roman Council at which Pope Cornelius presided, as Eusebius reports from Ruffinus' version, *Hist. bk.6 ch.33*, and thereafter the Novatians were also held to be heretics. In the same century a question arose about rebaptism (Anabaptism); and since different people had different opinions, Cornelius at the Council held at Rome decreed that those who had been baptized by heretics were not to be rebaptized, as Eusebius reports *Hist. bk.7 ch.2*, and afterwards Pope Stephen too wrote and commanded that those who had been baptized by heretics according to the form of the Church were not to be rebaptized. This decree is mentioned by Cyprian in his epistle to Pompeius, and

by Blessed Augustine *On Baptism* bk.5 ch.23, and by Vincent of Lerins in his *Commonitorium*.

In the fourth century, after the three hundredth year the heresy of the Arians arose, which was indeed taken away by the general Council of Nicea. Further there were 318 Bishops at that Council, and they are said to have been the sole judges along with the legates of the Roman See, the priests Vitus and Vincent, who along with Hosius, the Bishop of Cordoba, presided in the name of Pope Sylvester, and later still the whole Council by letter sought confirmation from Sylvester; the Emperor was present but acted as judge in nothing. All these things are plain from the first volume of Councils and from the historians, Eusebius *Life of Constantine* bk.3, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret *Eccl. Hist.* bk.1.

In the same century the heresy of Macedonius against the Holy Spirit was judged and condemned by the Council of Constantinople, which was confirmed by Damasus as Photius testifies in his book on the *Seven Councils*, which book is wont to be printed at the beginning of the Volume of Councils.

In the fifth century the heresy of Nestorius was condemned at the First Council of Ephesus, with Cyril presiding in the name of Pope Celestine, as Evagrius witnesses in bk.1 ch.4, and a little later the heresy of Eutyches at the Council of Chalcedon, with legates of Pope Leo presiding, as Evagrius testifies in bk.2 ch.4, and confirmation of this synod too was sought from the Roman Pontiff. And neither in this nor that Council do we read of any subscribing to it by the Emperor or by any laymen at all, but only of Ecclesiastics. See vols.1 and 2 of the Councils and Briefs of Liberatus.

In the same century the heresy of the Pelagians was condemned, which Lutherans seem to hate above others, but it was condemned by the Roman Pontiffs. For thus does Augustine say in *Retract.* Bk.2 ch.50, "The Pelagian heresy along with its authors was convicted and condemned by the Bishops of the Roman Church, first by Innocent and then by Zosimus, cooperating with the letters from the African Councils." And in his *Chronicle* Prosper says for the year 420, "A Council was held at Carthage of 217 Bishops, and the synodal decrees were taken to Pope Zozimus, by whom they were approved and the Pelagian heresy was condemned in the whole world."

In the sixth century many heresies were condemned in the Fifth Synod at which also only Bishops were judges.

In the seventh century the Monothelites were condemned in the Sixth Synod, over which presided the legates of the Roman Pontiff, and the Emperor was, to be sure, present and subscribed his name, but after all the Bishops, and not by judging or defining, as the Bishops did, but only by consenting.

In the eighth century the Iconomachs were condemned in the Seventh Synod, over which again the Legates of the Roman Pontiff presided, and no subscription by laymen is read of. About these Synods read the Volumes of Councils and the book of Photius on the *Seven Synods*.

In the ninth century certain Ecclesiastical controversies were defined in the Eighth Synod, over which also the Legates of the Roman Pontiff presided. The Emperor was present and subscribed his name after the Legates of the Pontiffs and the Patriarchs, but in the same place he expressively affirms that to judge of divine

things does not belong to himself but only to subscribe his consent, and we will adduce his words a little later.

In the tenth century no heresy arose, which is something most obscure, and for this reason too we read of no celebration of a Council, but the schism and the error of the Greeks, which had already begun a little before, was especially vigorous in this century. We will speak shortly of its condemnation.

In the eleventh century the heresy of Berengarius was condemned by Leo IX in the Council of Vercelli and by Nicolas II afterwards in the Council of Rome, as Lanfranc and Guitmund report in bk.1 *Against Berengarius*.

In the twelfth century the heresy of Peter Abelard was condemned by Innocent II, as it is in the epistles of Bernard, epist.194. Again the heresy of Gilbert Porretanus was condemned by Eugene III in the Council of Reims, on the evidence of Blessed Bernard, serm.80 on the *Song of Songs*.

In the thirteenth century the error of Abbot Joachim was condemned by Innocent III in the general Lateran Council. And afterwards the error of the Greeks by Gregory X in the general Council of Lyons. From this there is extant the ch. Fidei, On the Supreme Trinity and the Catholic Faith, in Sextus.

In the fourteenth century the errors of the Begardi were condemned at the Council of Vienne by Clement V. From this there is extant the ch. Ad Nostrum, in Clement on Heretics.

In the fifteenth century the errors of John Wycliffe and John Hus were condemned in the Council of Constance, with Martin V presiding. And again the errors of the Greeks in the Council of Florence under Eugene IV.

Finally in this our century, the sixteenth, the errors of the Lutherans have been condemned in the Council of Trent, confirmed by Pius IV. Let them now themselves find any example from antiquity by which to prove that any new error was truly held to be an error in the Church and yet was not condemned by the Pontiff but by the Emperor or some other secular Prince; or let them say, if they can, who ever dared to judge of an opinion of Councils approved by the Roman Chief and was not immediately held as a heretic by the Catholic Church.

*Chapter Seven: the Same is proved by the Testimonies of Pontiffs and Emperors*

There are added, in fourth place, the testimonies of the ancient Pontiffs and Emperors, that is, of the authors of each Right. Damasus in epist.3 to Stephen, Innocent I in epistles to the Councils of Carthage and Milevis, that are in Augustine numbers 91 and 93, Leo I in epist.84 to Anastasius, and epist.89 to the Bishops of the Province of Vienne, Gelasius in his epistle to the Dardanian Bishops, Gregory bk.4 epist.25 to the Bishops of France (as also later Popes) teach that the graver causes, and especially in cases of faith, pertain to the judgment of the Apostolic See, and Julius in epist.2 cites the decree of the Nicene Council for this.

The Emperors thought the same thing. At the time of the Emperor Aurelian, since there was a question between the Catholics and the heretic Paul of Samosata about a house of the Church, the Emperor, though a Gentile, replied and ordered the Church to be given to him whom the priests of Italy and the Roman Bishop should prescribe; he was no doubt taught by his advisers that the Roman Bishop was supreme judge of Christian causes. So does Eusebius write *Hist.* bk.7 ch.26.

Constantine, on the evidence of Eusebius *Life of Constantine* bk.3, did not sit down at the Council of Nicea until the Bishops agreed he should sit. By which sign he sufficiently indicated that he was not president of the Council. Next, at the end of the Council, he wrote a letter to all the Bishops, the whole of which Eusebius puts in the same place; the end of the letter reads, "Since these things are so, with glad hearts we embrace this decree of the Council as a gift of God and a command truly sent down from heaven. For whatever is decreed in the holy Councils of Bishops should be wholly attributed to the divine will."

About the same Blessed Ambrose thus speaks epist.32, "Constantine set down no laws beforehand, but gave his free judgment to the Bishops." About this Augustine too in epist.162 testifies that when the Donatists wanted their cause to be judged by Constantine, he sent them back to their own proper judge, that is, to Pope Melchiades, and when they appealed from the sentence of the Pontiff to the emperor himself, "he gave them," says Augustine, "the other judgment from Arles (namely from other Bishops), not because it was now necessary, but yielding to their perversities." For the Christian Emperor never dared to take up their tumultuous and false quarrels, so as to be judge himself of the judgment of the Bishops who sat at Rome.

The Emperor Gratian speaks thus in epistle to the Bishop of Aquileia, which was read in the Council of Aquileia, "nor can controversies, doubts, opinions be more rightly resolved than if we place judgment about the dispute that has arisen with the priests as themselves the interpreters, so that those by whom teaching and doctrine advance should be the same as those by whom the conflicting discords of learning are solved." Which words Ambrose himself in this Council thus interprets. "Behold," he says, "what the Emperor has established as Christian. He refused to inflict injury on the priests, he made Bishops to be the interpreters."

Theodosius the younger in his epistle to the Synod of Ephesus, which is also cited by Nicolas I in his epistle to Michael, says, "Candidianus, a magnificent companion in domestic labors, has been deputed to pass over to your most holy Synod, and in no way indeed, as regard what is to be done, to confer with you in questions about pious doctrines; for it is illicit for him who is not of the order of the most holy Bishops to involve himself in Ecclesiastical business."

The Emperor Martianus, I 'Nemo', Chapter on the Supreme Trinity and the Catholic Faith, says, "He commits injury to the judgment of the most venerable Synod who strives to go over again and dispute what has once been judged."

Valentinian the elder, as Sozomen writes *Hist.* bk.6 ch.7, when asked to permit a Synod to meet to explain certain dogmas of faith, responded thus, "It is not lawful for me, who belong with the people, to examine such things more curiously; let the priests, whose those cares are, come together among themselves in what place they wish."

The Emperor Basil in the eighth Synod spoke thus. "As to you laymen," he says, "both those in positions of dignity and those who live absolved from them, I have nothing more to say than that it is in no way licit for you to speak on Ecclesiastical causes; nor to resist at all the integrity of the Church and to oppose a universal Synod. For to investigate and seek out these things belongs to Patriarchs, Pontiffs, and priests, who have been allotted the office of rule, who have obtained

the Ecclesiastical keys, and not to us who need to be fed, to be sanctified, to be bound, or to be loosed from bonds." The same Emperor says in the same place that the other Emperors, his predecessors, Constantine, Theodosius, Marcianus and others never subscribed their names in Synods, save after all the Bishops.

Finally about Theodoric, King of the Goths, although an Arian, we read as follows in the Fourth Roman Synod under Pope Symmachus, "To these things the most serene King, God inspiring him, replied on this wise, that he prescribed that the Synodal decision on so great a business should be followed, and that nothing pertained to himself besides reverence for Ecclesiastical business."

*Chapter Eight: the Same is Proved by the Testimony of the Fathers*

It is proved fifth from the testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers. Irenaeus bk.3 ch.2 teaches that controversies cannot be ended from the Scriptures alone, because the words are expounded variously by heretics, and then in ch.3 he teaches that controversies must be ended by the doctrine of the Roman Church. "The whole Church, that is, all the faithful everywhere," he says, "must come together to this Church because of its more potent principality, in which has always been preserved the tradition that comes from the Apostles."

Athanasius in his epistle to those leading a solitary life, speaking of the Emperor Constantius, an Arian, who in Councils usurped some judgments to himself, says, "When from the beginning of the age was it heard that the judgment of the Church received its authority from the Emperor? Or when was this ever recognized for judgment? Many Synods happened before; many judgments of the Church have been passed. But never did the Fathers try to persuade the Prince of this sort of thing, nor did the Prince make himself curious about Ecclesiastical matters." And later he says, "Whoever sees that the Prince is making himself one of the Bishops in passing decrees, and is presiding over Ecclesiastical judgments, would he not rightly say that this is that abomination of desolation predicted by Daniel?" Basil in epist.52 to Athanasius says that it seems good to him that when a Synod could not then take place, they should write to the Roman Pontiff to send by his own authority some persons to the East to undo the acts of the Council of Rimini.

Gregory Nazianzen in the oration in which he excuses himself for being so long absent from his Ecclesiastical function, says, "Do not wish, you sheep, to feed the pastors, nor to raise yourselves above their limits, for it is enough for you if you are rightly fed. Do not judge the judges, nor pass law for the legislators etc." But how do they not judge the judges and feed the pastors who presume to judge the opinion of a Council or of the Supreme Pontiff? And lest you think Gregory makes an exception of Emperors, in the same oration to the citizens struck with fear and to the irate Emperor, he says, addressing the Emperor, "Would you receive a voice speaking freely? And the fact that the law of Christ has subjected you to my power and my tribunal? For we ourselves too, I add, have command, and in a greater and more perfect empire; receive therefore a voice speaking more freely: I know you are a sheep of my flock, etc." Chrysostom in his last homily on *John* says that Peter was by Christ set as master for the whole world. Cyril in his *Thesaurus*, as cited by St. Thomas in his little work on the *Errors of the Greeks*, says, "We must adhere to our head the Roman Pontiff; it belongs to us to receive from him what is to be believed,



what is to be maintained." See also Damascene in his first and second orations for images.

Among the Latins Tertullian in his book *On Prescription* beautifully proves what we wish. For he first teaches that one should not dispute with heretics from the Scriptures, because the possession and true understanding of the Scriptures belongs to the Catholic Church; one must first establish what the true doctrine of the Church is, and then from that must the Scriptures be understood. But what the true doctrine of the Church is cannot be safely inquired save from the Apostolic Churches, of which the chief is the Roman. For God handed the doctrine of truth to Christ, Christ to the Apostles, the Apostles to their successors. So in sum Tertullian. Cyprian bk.1 epist.3, "For neither have heresies arisen nor schisms been born from anywhere else than from this, that the priest of God is not obeyed, and that the one Priest at the time in the Church and the one judge at the time in the place of Christ is not thought on." For, before a definition from the Pontiffs, one may without the vice of heresy hold either side on doubtful matters; but after a definition, those who do not obey are heretics.

Ambrose epist.32 to the Emperor Valentinian the Younger who, corrupted by the Arians, wanted to judge of matters of the faith, says, "But certainly, if we go over either the series of divine Scriptures or ancient times, who would deny that in a cause of faith, a cause, I say, of faith, the Bishops are wont to judge of Christian Emperors, that is, of their faith, and not the Emperors of the Bishops (that is, of their faith)? You will, by the favor of God, become even more advanced in the maturity of old age, and then you will think about this, what sort of Bishop he is who subordinates Priestly law to laymen. Your father, a man of mature age, used to say, 'It is not mine to judge among Bishops; your Clemency now speaks, should I judge?'" And later, "If there is need of conferring about the faith, that conference should be among priests, just as was done under Constantine, Prince of august memory, who set down no laws in advance but gave free judgment to the priests. So was it also done under Constantius, Emperor of august memory, heir of his father's dignity. But what he began well ended otherwise. For the Bishops first wrote down the pure faith, but when some within the palace want to dispute of the faith, they acted to change the judgments of the Bishops with their circumlocutions." Note, reader, these last words. For laymen in the house of the Prince, when they wish to judge of the opinion of Bishops, deserve to fall into error.

Jerome in his epistle to Damasus, about the name *hypostasis*, says, "Please discriminate, I beg, I do not fear to say three *hypostases* if you command." And later, "I call your Beatitude to witness through the crucified one, the salvation of the world, through the consubstantial Trinity, so that by your letters authority may be given me to be silent or to speak about *hypostases*." He asks the same in the following epistle. And note that Jerome was far more learned than Damasus, as is plain from the many questions of the Scriptures that Jerome explained to Damasus. And yet when it was a question of faith, so as to define something, Jerome attributed all judgment to the Pontiff Damasus.

Sulpicius in *Sacred History* bk.2 reports that St. Martin once said to the Emperor Maximus, that it was a new and unheard of impiety for a secular judge to judge a cause of the Church.

Augustine *Against Cresconius* bk.1 ch.33, "Whoever fears to be deceived in the obscurity of this question, let him consult about it the Church that sacred Scripture, without any ambiguity, points to." And in epist.106 to Paulinus, speaking of the epistles of Innocent in which was expressively put that judgment about matters of faith pertains to the Apostolic See, he says as follows, "He replied to us on all matters as was right, and as the Priest of the Apostolic See ought to respond." And in his book *Against Fundamentus*, ch.5, he says, "But I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."

Calvin replies that Augustine is speaking of a certain private persuasion of the faithful, by which some are converted to the faith, so that the sense is: I would not believe the Gospel, so that I would not now be a Christian, unless Christians moved me with their persuasions. But this is a cold solution; for in the first place Augustine is speaking of the present when he says, "unless the authority of the Church moved me." Then a little later he says, "Whose instructions then did I believe, but those who commanded you I do not believe?" where not persuasion but command he attributes to the Church. And later, speaking of the book of *Acts*, he says, "I should believe this book if I believe the Gospel, since Catholic authority commends both Scripture to me similarly." In the preface to his books on *Christian Doctrine*, as if foreseeing this private spirit which disdains to have an instructor, he says, "Let us be wary of such very proud and dangerous temptations, and let us think more of the Centurion Cornelius; although the Angel announced that his prayers were heard and his works of mercy accepted, yet he was handed over to Peter to be instructed. And certainly that eunuch who, when reading *Isaiah*, did not understand, was not sent by the Apostle to an Angel, nor was what he did not understand expounded by an Angel, or divinely revealed to his mind without the ministry of a man, etc."

Prosper in his book *Against the Collector*, at the end, did not prove the Pelagians were truly heretics in any other way than that they had been condemned by the Roman Bishops Innocent, Zozimus, Boniface, and Celestine. Vincent of Lerins in his *Commonitorium* says, "Here perhaps someone may ask, since the canon of the Scriptures is perfect, what need there is that the authority of Ecclesiastical understanding should be enjoined on him. Because, to be sure, all do not take the sacred Scripture, on account of its depth, in one and the same sense, but the same sayings are interpreted by one in one way and by another in another, so that it seems possible to erect as many opinions on it as there are men who have it. And therefore there is great necessity, because of so great a twisting of such diverse error, that the line of Prophetic and Apostolic interpretation be drawn according to the norm of Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense, etc." But the norm of Catholic sense is openly shown in the same place to be the decrees of Councils, the agreement of the Fathers, and the like.

Gregory bk.5 epist.25 says, "We know that the most pious lords direct discipline, keep order, venerate the canons, and do not involve themselves in priestly business." Anselm in his book on the *Incarnation of the Word* ch.1 thus addresses Urban the Roman Pontiff, "Since," he says, "divine providence has chosen to commit to your Holiness the guarding of Christian life and faith and the ruling of

his Church, to no other is reference more rightly made if something against Catholic faith arises in the Church, so that it may by his authority be corrected, etc.”

Bernard in epist.190 to Pope Innocent II, “To your Apostolate must all dangers and scandals that emerge in the kingdom of God be referred, and especially those that happen about the faith. For I think it worthy for losses in the faith to be there most of all repaired where faith cannot feel defect.” And later, “It is time to acknowledge, most loving Father, your principate, to approve your zeal, to honor your ministry. In this you plainly fill the place of Peter, whose faith you also hold, if you confirm by your admonition hearts wavering in the faith, if by your authority you grind down the corruptors of the faith.” And in epist.189, “I said that his writings are sufficient to accuse him, nor is it my affair, but the Bishops’, to whose ministry it belongs to judge of dogmas.”

*Chapter Nine: the Same is Proved by Reason*

It is proved finally by reason. God was not unaware that many difficulties would arise in the Church about the faith, so he ought to have provided some judge for the Church. But this judge cannot be Scripture, nor a private spirit that gives revelations, nor a secular prince, therefore an Ecclesiastical prince, either alone or at least with the counsel and consent of his co-bishops, for nothing else is or can be thought up to which this judgment would seem able to pertain. And first it is plain that Scripture is not the judge, because it admits of various senses, nor can it say which sense is true. Besides, in every well established and ordered republic, law and judge are distinct things. For the law teaches what is to be done and the judge interprets the law and directs men according to it. Next there is a question about the interpretation of Scripture; but it cannot interpret itself.

But, they say, from bringing together various places anyone who is skilled in the languages can easily set up the true sense. But what if there are many skilled in the languages and they compare the places with each other, and yet can still not agree, who then will be the judge? Certainly many of the Lutherans, many again of the Zwinglians were skilled in the languages and with great labor compared the Scriptures with themselves, and yet in the explanation of this sentence, “This is my body,” they were never able to agree. But the Zwinglians, says the Lutheran, are blinded, so it is no wonder if the very clear words of the Lord are not understood. But what if the Zwinglians say the Lutherans are blinded, who will be the judge?

But that a spirit giving revelation to each private man cannot be the judge is easily shown, for the spirit that is in you is not seen or heard by me; but a judge should be seen and heard by both of the litigating parties; for such they are who contend, namely bodily men. For if we were spirits, perhaps the judgment of spirit would suffice. Besides, in a temporal republic all men have the true natural light, by which the law is made and which suffices for expounding it, and yet the interpretation of the law is never allowed to the private judgment of each man; and if it were permitted the Republic could not long endure. How much less then should the interpretation of Scripture be permitted to the judgment of each man, since all do not have the true supernatural light by which the Scripture was made and which is necessary for understanding it correctly?

Further, a judge should have coercive authority, otherwise his judgment would be useless; but private men have no such authority. Again there are many who are so uneducated and unskilled that they themselves admit that they are in no way able to judge of questions of faith, and yet they too are able to be saved. It is not therefore necessary that all should judge.

Finally, if this private spirit giving revelations were the judge, the way for the conversion of heretics would be closed off, nor could any controversies be ever concluded. For there is no heretic who does not boast of the spirit, and who does not prefer his own spirit to the spirits of others. And as in II *Chronicles* ch.18, when Michaeas, the Prophet of the Lord, said he was speaking in the name of the Lord and that the false Prophets were driven by a spirit of lies, Zedekiah the false Prophet said to him, "And by what way did the Spirit of the Lord pass from me to speak to you?" Thus if a Catholic were to say that the Spirit is revealing thus to me, the heretic will respond, and by what way, etc.?

Now that a secular Prince cannot be judge is proved, for nothing has power beyond the virtue received from its causes; but the causes of the secular principate are human and natural; for the efficient cause is the election of the people, the end is temporal peace and tranquility for the Republic. Therefore a prince has, as such, no virtue or authority save a human one, of the sort the people could give him, and of the sort that is required for preserving temporal peace, because even without the Church there are true temporal Kings and Princes; and without them there can be a true Church, as there was in the Roman world in the first three hundred years.

Nor is that an obstacle which is said in *Romans* ch.13, "There is no power but from God, and he who resists the power resists the ordination of God." For the Apostle does not mean to say that royal power is immediately from God but mediately; because God has put the natural instinct in men to create a King for themselves; just human laws too can be said to be from God because they are made by the natural light which God impressed at creation on the human mind. But the Ecclesiastical principate has divine and supernatural causes, for the efficient cause is God immediately, for neither does the Pontiff have power from the Church but from Christ, who said to him, "Feed my sheep," *John* last chapter, and, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven etc.," *Matthew* ch.16. Now the end is eternal beatitude.

Wherefore outside the Church there is found no true Pontiff, nor true priests, nor without these can there be a Church. And hence Nazianzen in his oration to citizens struck by fear, Chrysostom in *Homil.4* on the words of *Isaiah*, Ambrose in his book on *Priestly Dignity* ch.2 all say that the Bishop is as greater than the King as the spirit is than the flesh, the heaven than the earth, gold than lead. And for this reason too the Pontificate and the priesthood pertain per se to the Church; but the temporal principate pertains to it per accidens. Therefore since defining matters of faith and interpreting the divine Scriptures are spiritual and Ecclesiastical acts, they certainly do not belong to a temporal Prince but to a spiritual and Ecclesiastical one.

#### *Chapter Ten: the Objections are Solved*

But they object first the verse of *Isaiah* ch.54, "I will give all your sons to be taught by God."

I reply that Isaiah is not speaking of a private spirit giving revelation, but he is speaking of the doctrine of the Gospel, which God himself, that is, Christ preached and taught, as Cyril expounds on this place, and the sense is that I will teach the Christian people not through Prophets but by myself, according to that verse of *Hebrews* ch.1, "In many forms and in many ways, etc." Or (and this is a subtle and more genuine interpretation) he is speaking of the grace of the Holy Spirit whereby man is interiorly moved by God and is sweetly impelled to believe and love, as Blessed Augustine expounds in his book on the *Grace of Christ* chs.12-14. Therefore the sense is not that all Christians will by divine revelation understand all the secrets of the Scriptures, but that they will be such as not only to hear a master explaining the word of God outwardly but also to hear God the master persuading them inwardly so that they do what they hear. While the homily is being given, all hear and understand what is said, but one believes, another does not believe; one is converted from sin to penitence, another is not converted; the former are said to be taught by God, the latter not. In this sense does the Lord from this place bring forward testimony, *John* ch.6, "It is written," he says, "in the prophets, and they will all be taught of God. All who have heard the Father and learnt come to me." And the Apostle I *Thessalonians* ch.4, "About the charity of brotherhood we have no necessity to write to you, for you yourselves are taught by God to love each other."

The second argument is from *Jeremiah* ch.31, "I will give my law in their hearts, and in their heart I will write it, and a man will no longer teach his neighbor saying, Know the Lord, for everyone will know me from the least of them to the greatest of them."

I reply with Augustine on the *Spirit and Letter* ch.24 that in these words "I will give my law etc." is signified the grace of the New Testament, that is, faith working through charity, which God pours out in our hearts, so that not only do we know but we also fulfill the divine commands; but in the words "and a man will no longer teach etc." is signified the reward of faith, that is, beatitude, in which all the elect will see God face to face.

But if someone contends that these last words too are to be understood of the present time, one can reply that here the Prophet is not speaking of the hidden mysteries of the Scriptures but of knowledge of the one God. For since in the time of the Old Testament not only did the Gentiles adore false gods but also very frequently the people of God turned to idols and strange gods, Jeremiah predicted the future, that in the time of the New Testament all men would know the one God, which we certainly see now to have been fulfilled. For the Gentiles have been converted to the faith, and also the Jews themselves and the Turks, although they are impious, yet worship the one God.

The third argument is from *Matthew* ch.23, "But do not you wish to be called rabbi, for one is your master, Christ." Therefore we should be content with the sole internal Teacher.

I reply, God does not forbid the name and office of master, but the ambition and affectation of this honor. For II *Timothy* ch.1 the Apostle calls himself the teacher and master of the Gentiles. Besides in *Matthew* ch.23 the Lord censured the Scribes and Pharisees because "they loved the first seats and to be greeted by men as rabbi;" and in the same place he says, "and do not call anyone father on earth,"

although however it is more certain than certain that not the name or office of father is forbidden, but too great affection for parents.

The fourth argument is from *John* ch.5, "Therefore I do not receive testimony from man." The Word of God, therefore, does not receive testimony from the word of man; but the Pontiff and the Council are men; therefore the Scriptures do not need their testimony, but are per se sufficient for taking away all controversies.

I reply that Christ did not need the testimony of man for himself, because he had greater testimonies, but yet he used the testimonies of men for others' sake. *John* ch.1, "He came as testimony, to give testimony to the light." And *John* ch.15, "You will give testimony, because you are with me from the beginning." *Acts* ch.1, "You will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea." Finally why are martyrs called martyrs save because they were witnesses for Christ? When, therefore, the Lord says, "You sent to John, and he gave testimony to the truth, but I do not receive testimony from man, but this I say so that you may be saved." The sense is, I offer you the testimony of John, which you asked for; not that I need him for myself, but because it is useful for you, so that you may believe. In the same way Scripture does not need the testimony of men for itself; for whether it is understood or not it is in itself very true, yet it needs the testimony of the Church for the sake of us, who otherwise are not certain which books are truly sacred and divine nor what is their true and genuine understanding.

The fifth argument is from *John* ch.7, "If anyone wishes to do his will who sent me, he will recognize from my doctrine whether it is from God." Therefore, beside the spirit of the love of God no other master is needed for understanding the Scriptures.

I reply that the Lord does not say this to show that all good men can per se understand all places of Scripture, but to teach that honest men lack certain of the impediments because of which certain others can neither themselves nor through others understand the truth of the faith; for love of glory and riches and the like things blinds their eyes. Hence *John* ch.5, "How can you believe who receive glory from each other?" And *Luke* ch.16, "The Pharisees, who were avaricious, heard all these things and they mocked him."

The sixth argument is from *John* ch.10, "My sheep hear my voice and they follow me." Therefore we do not need any other preceptor.

I reply that the Lord is speaking of the predestined, as Augustine here expounds, who altogether hear the call of God before death, and follow him persevering to the end; nor is the discussion here about the difficulties of the Scriptures. But even if it were a question of understanding the Scriptures, we would say that Christ speaks to his sheep in many ways, by Scripture, by internal inspiration, and most openly by the mouth of his Vicars, of whom he said *Luke* ch.10, "He who hears you hears me." For neither when the Lord says, "my sheep hear my voice," does he exclude his Vicars but his enemies. For thus does he say in the same place, "they do not follow a stranger." And "they do not hear the voice of strangers."

The seventh argument is from *Acts* ch.17, "The Beroenses examined the Scriptures whether things were so as Paul preached." If it was licit for these men, who were without doubt laymen, to examine the words of Paul, why would it not be licit for us to examine the words of the Pope and of the Councils?

I reply that although Paul was an Apostle and could not preach false doctrine, yet it was not at the beginning clear to the Beroenses, nor were they held to believe at once unless they saw miracles or other probable reasons for belief. Therefore when Paul proved Christ to them from the oracles of the Prophets, they rightly examined the Scriptures whether these things were so. But Christians, for whom it is clear that the Church cannot err in explaining the doctrine of the faith, are held to receive it and not to doubt whether these things are so.

I add too that although a heretic sins by doubting of the authority of the Church into which he has been regenerated by baptism, and although the condition of a heretic, who has once professed the faith, is not the same as that of a Jew or a heathen who was never a Christian, yet once this doubt and this sin exist, he does not do ill in examining and investigating whether the places of Scripture and the Fathers brought forward by the Council of Trent are so, provided he do it with the intention of finding, not misrepresenting, the truth. He should indeed accept without examination the doctrine of the Church, yet it is better that by examination he be prepared for the truth than that by neglect he remain in his darkness.

The eighth argument is from *Romans* ch.12, "But having different gifts, according to the grace that is given us; whether prophecy according to the reason of faith, or ministry in ministering, etc." Here the Apostle teaches that the gift of prophecy, that is, of interpretation of the Scriptures, is had according to the reason, or in the Greek the analogy, of the faith; therefore the interpretation of Scripture is not to be sought from the Pope or a Council but from him who abounds more in faith, whoever he is.

I reply first that the consequence can be denied; for the Pope and a Council abound more in faith than any private man, since neither the Pope, when he teaches *ex cathedra*, nor a Council can err in the faith; but any private man can. Second, one could say that prophecy in this place is not taken for interpretation of Scripture but properly for the gift of predicting the future, as is expounded by Ambrose, Theodoret, Theophylact, Thomas, and others on this place, and by Chrysostom on I *Corinthians* ch.12. But I say, third, that however prophecy be taken, whether for the gift of predicting the future or for the gift of interpreting, nothing can be collected against us from this place; for the 'according to the reason of faith' is not conjoined with the verb 'having' but with the verb 'let us administer' understood. For the Apostle is explaining the use of graces freely given, and he is teaching that prophecy should be administered according to the reason of faith, so that no one should prophesy anything against the faith, as the False Prophets did, nor should he interpret the Scriptures in any sense contrary to the Catholic Faith, as heretics for the most part do.

The ninth argument is from I *Corinthians* ch.12, "Now the spiritual man judges all things but is himself judged by no one." Therefore the interpretation of the Scriptures pertains to spiritual men, not to the Pope or to Councils.

I reply that we do not deny that there were and are in the Church spiritual and perfect men who rightly interpret the Scriptures, nay who even foresee the future and scrutinize the secrets of hearts. Yet we deny that definitive judgment about controversies of the faith pertains to them, and for two reasons. First, because we are not certain with the certitude of faith who are these spiritual men, in the way

we are certain that the Pope and Councils are spiritual, namely ruled by the Holy Spirit. Second, because we also know that the most spiritual men are not always illumined, and that sometimes there are things they do not know, as is plain of Elisha, who had the double spirit of Elijah, and yet says IV *Kings* ch.4 that the Lord hid this from me and did not show it to me.

You will say, what then does the 'he judges all things' signify? I say that it signifies all things both spiritual and temporal, both heavenly things and earthly. For he had said that animal men do not perceive the things that are of God, but can only judge of earthly things; now he says that the spiritual judge all things, that is, both earthly and divine things; yet it does not follow that he has power for all divine things; for who denies that many of the ancient Fathers had in excellent fashion the gift of interpreting and that they were spiritual, and yet it is clear that some of the chief of them had no slight falls in some things?

The tenth argument is from I *Corinthians* ch.12, when the Apostle speaks of the gift of interpreting and of the like graces. "All these things," he says, "are worked by one and the same spirit dividing to each as he wills." This gift, then, is not tied to a Council or to the Pope, but is given freely by God to whom he wills. And they confirm it by the fact that often God, passing over the priests and the Pontiffs, raised up Prophets from the people; for Amos was a pastor of sheep and yet became a Prophet, and Deborah a woman prophesied.

I reply that the Apostle is speaking of particular men and means to say that the gift of interpreting is not everywhere given to all men. Nor does it follow from this that the gift of interpreting is not in a Council or a Pontiff teaching ex cathedra. For there is one account of Council and Pontiff and another of private men.

To the confirmations I say the privileges of a few do not make a general law. But if they maintain that it was given to all because it was given to Amos and Deborah, let them also conclude that the gift of speaking is given to all beasts of burden, because it was given to the ass of Balaam. Besides, it is one thing to speak of new revelations, another to speak of explaining a doctrine already accepted; for new revelations are not tied to the Pontiffs, neither now nor in the Old Testament. For in the Old Testament Isaiah, Jeremiah and the like prophesied, but Aaron and his successors did not; and in the New Testament Agabus and the daughters of Philip prophesied and yet the Pontiffs Linus and Clement and the rest did not prophesy. But the explanation of doctrine already accepted, and judgment about dogmas, always had regard to the Pontiffs, as we showed above.

The eleventh argument is from II *Thessalonians* ch.5, "Prove all things, hold on to what is good." And I John ch.4, "Do not believe every spirit, but prove the spirits whether they be of God." Therefore even the opinion of Council and Pope should be proved and examined; for Paul and John except nothing. The adversaries even collect from this place that the books of heretics are unjustly prohibited, since Paul says to prove all things etc.

I reply and say, first, that when Paul and John say to prove all things, or to prove the spirits, they do not mean to say that everyone from the Church should do this, but that they should do it to whom it pertains. Just as if it were written to some Academy that they should examine some book, the signification is not that the book be given for examination to all the men of that Academy, but only to the doctors of



the faculty about which the book treats. I say, second, that in both places dubious doctrine is being treated of, since it alone needs to be proved. But the doctrine of prohibited books is not dubious, for it is openly evil, since it has been examined and condemned; nor is the doctrine of Councils dubious, but openly good. And therefore the Apostle Paul in *Acts* ch.15, when he delivered to the Churches the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, did not say to prove it, but commanded them to keep the decree.

The twelfth argument is from *I John* ch.2, "You have no need that anyone should teach you, but the unction teaches you about all things."

I reply that John is not speaking absolutely of the knowledge of divine things, as if they who have received the Holy Spirit do not need a master in anything. For if so why would John write this letter and warn and instruct those who were being taught about all things by the unction? And why did God place pastors and doctors in the Church? Therefore he is speaking only of those dogmas that had already been accepted by the Apostles and that, with the cooperation of the unction of the Holy Spirit, they had taught and believed. And he warns them to remain in the faith and not to give their ears to false Prophets teaching the contrary. In this way, if some Catholic were to write to Catholics, who were besieged and perturbed by heretics, and say 'You have no need that any Lutheran or Calvinist should teach you the doctrine of Christ, for you have altogether learnt what you ought to know, and you hold it from the preaching of the Church aided by the unction of the Holy Spirit'. That this is the sense is taught by the preceding and the following words. In the preceding words he speaks thus, "I have not written to you as to those not knowing the truth but as to those knowing it. And may what you have heard from the beginning remain in you. I have written this about those who are seducing you, etc." But in the following words he says, "Just as I taught, remain therein, so that when he appears we may have confidence and not be confounded at his coming."

The thirteenth argument is from the Apostle in *Ephesians* ch.2, who writes, "You are citizens of the saints and members of the household of God, built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets." But if the understanding of the Scriptures depended on Pope and Councils, our foundation would be on the Pope and the Councils rather on the writings of the Apostles and Prophets.

I reply to this argument what Calvin often repeats and inculcates, that we do not deny, nay we defend against deniers, that the word of God ministered through Apostles and Prophets is the first foundation of our faith. For that is why we believe what we believe, because God revealed it through Apostles and Prophets; but we add that besides this first foundation there is required a secondary foundation, that is, the attestation of the Church. For we do not know with certainty what God has revealed save from the testimony of the Church, and for that reason we read that Christ is the foundation stone and the first foundation of the Church; thus do we read in *Matthew* ch.16 about Peter, "on this Peter I will build my Church." Therefore our faith adheres to Christ, the first truth, who reveals the mysteries, as to the primary foundation; we also adhere to Peter, that is, to the Pontiff proposing and explaining these mysteries, to the secondary foundation.

The fourteenth argument. If the Pontiff judges of the Scriptures, it follows that the Pontiff or a Council is above the Scriptures; and if the sense of Scripture

without the Pontiff or Council is not authentic, it follows that the word of God receives strength and firmness from the word of men, etc.

I reply that this argument, which is made a great deal of by heretics, turns entirely on an equivocation; for in two ways can the Church be understood to judge of the Scriptures. In one way that it judges whether what the Scriptures teach is true or false; in a second way that, having set down as a most certain foundation that the words of Scripture are most true, it judges what is their true interpretation. And indeed if in the first way the Church were to judge, it would truly be above the Scriptures; but this we do not say, although the heretics falsely say that we do, who are vociferous everywhere that we subject Scripture to the feet of the Pope. But for the Church or the Pope to judge of the Scriptures in the second way, as we affirm, is not for the Church to be above Scripture but above the judgments of private men. For the Church does not judge of the truth of Scripture but of your understanding, and mine, and that of others. Nor does the word of God take hence any strength, but our understanding does. For Scripture is not truer or more certain because it is expounded thus by the Church, but my opinion is truer when it is confirmed by the Church.

The fifteenth argument. If our faith depends on the judgment of the Church, then it depends on the word of men, therefore it rests on a very weak foundation. Besides the Scripture was made by the spirit of God, therefore it is to be understood by the spirit of God not of the Church.

I reply that the word of the Church, that is, of a Council or the Pope teaching *ex cathedra*, is not altogether the word of man, that is, a word subject to error, but in some way the word of God, that is, pronounced with the assistance and governance of the Holy Spirit; nay I say that it is the heretics who truly rest on a reed stalk. For one must know that a proposition of faith can be proved by the following syllogism. Whatever God has revealed in the Scriptures is true; God has revealed this in the Scriptures; therefore this is true. Of the propositions of this syllogism the first is certain for all, and the second is also very firm for Catholics, for it rests on the testimony of the Church, of a Council or of the Pontiff, about which we have in the Scriptures open promises that they cannot err. *Acts* ch.15, "It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us." *Luke* ch.22, "I have asked for you, that your faith fail not." But among the heretics it rests on mere conjectures, or the judgment of their own spirit, which for the most part seems good and is bad; and since the conclusion follows the weaker premise, it is necessary that the whole faith of heretics is conjectural and uncertain.

The sixteenth argument. Augustine and other Fathers, when they expound the Scriptures, do not usurp the praetorian power of judging, but allow their explanations to be judged by others.

I reply that it is one thing to interpret the law in the manner of a doctor and another in the manner of a judge; to explain in the manner of a doctor there is required learning; to explain in the manner of judge there is required authority. For a doctor does not propose his opinion as to be necessarily followed but only as far as reason persuades; but a judge proposes it as necessarily to be followed. We take in one way the glosses of Bartholus and Baldus, in another way the declaration of a prince. Augustine therefore and other Fathers were in their commentaries fulfilling

the office of doctors; but the Councils and the Pontiffs are fulfilling the office of judge committed to them by God.

The seventeenth argument. "Augustine contends that one should not put the Church before Christ, because Christ always judges truly; but Ecclesiastical judges, as men, are often deceived." These are the words of Calvin in the preface to his *Institutes*, from which he deduces that Prelates are not the judges of controversies.

I reply that to begin with the place is falsely cited by Calvin; for he puts in the margin that it is in *Against Cresconius* ch.2 But there are four books against Cresconius, and in no chapter 2 of these books are these words found, but they are contained in bk.2 ch.22, where Augustine is speaking of questions of fact, not of right, in which Ecclesiastical judges can be deceived. For he teaches that Ecclesiastical judges are often deceived in this, that they baptize those who come in pretended spirit to the sacrament, and yet they seem to come with a sincere will. And since Calvin sees that this place does nothing for him, therefore perhaps he did not distinctly note the place. For he is wont otherwise to note books and chapters carefully, except when the places bring with them a very open solution.

The many other arguments that seem capable of pertaining to this matter we will solve when we treat of them, whether the Church or a Council or the Pope can err, and to whom it belongs to preside at Councils.

## Book Four: On the Unwritten Word of God

### *Chapter One: Those who have most of all Defended or Attacked Unwritten Traditions*

We have hitherto discoursed of the written word of God; now we will advance to dispute briefly of the unwritten word of God, once we have first noted, to please the more studious, those who in our age have written about traditions, or certainly those we ourselves have read. For it was not licit for us to see them all.

So, on this argument Cardinal Hosius wrote excellently in bk.4 *Against the Prolegomena* of Brentius; again Peter a Soto in his *Defense* against the same Brentius, from ch.50 to ch.66; Melchior Canus on *Theological Places* bk.3; Iodocus Tilletanus in his *Apology* against Chemnitz on behalf of the Council of Trent; Alphonsus a Castro bk.1 ch.5 of his work *Against Heresies*, and the Bishop of Rochester too at the beginning of his work against the assertion of the articles of Luther; the doctors of Cologne in their *Examination* of the Catechism of Monhemius, in their censure of the sixth Dialogue; Peter Canisius in his *Catechism* about the Precepts of the Church, and William Lindanus in the five books of his *Panoply*; John Lovanius in his book on the *Invocation of the Saints* chs.23-25; Caspar Cardillus Villalpandaeus in his book on *Traditions*.

Among the heretics have written chiefly against traditions Calvin *Institutes* bk.4 ch.8 sects.6-8, and ch.10 sects.18-20, and in his *Antidote* to the Council of Trent sess.4; John Brentius in his *Prolegomena* against Peter a Soto; Martin Chemnitz in the book he inscribed *Theology of the Jesuits*, chief chapters; and with great prolixity in his *Examination* of the Council of Trent when examining the decree on Traditions, which is contained in sess.4, and a certain Hermann Hamelmann, who has recently published an immense volume against traditions, which he divided into three books of Prolegomena, and then into three parts of the principle work, each of which contains many books.

### *Chapter Two: What and How Multiple Tradition is*

The name of tradition is a general one, and signifies any doctrine whether written or unwritten that is communicated from one to another, *Exodus* ch.17, "Write this for a memorial in a book, and hand it on in the ears of Joshua." *Acts* ch.6, the written law of Moses is called tradition, "We heard him say that Jesus will destroy this place and will change the traditions which Moses handed on to us." And I *Corinthians* ch.11, "For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you." Tradition is called doctrine expounded viva voce, and II *Thessalonians* ch.2, "Hold the traditions which you have received, whether by speech or by letter."

But although the name of tradition is general, yet this very name is adapted by theologians to signify only unwritten doctrine. Thus Irenaeus bk.3 ch.2, "It happens," he said, "that they agree neither in Scriptures nor in traditions." Tertullian in his book on the *Crown of the Soldier*, "If you ask me to read," he says, you will find no Scripture, tradition is the author extended to you." And Cyprian bk.2 epist.3, "May you know we are advised that in offering the chalice of the Lord the tradition of the Lord is kept, that the chalice, which is offered in commemoration of him, is offered mixed with wine." This place Chemnitz falsely explains of written tradition,

for nowhere in the whole Gospel or the epistles of the Apostles is it written that the chalice mixed with wine, that is, wine and water are offered. In the same way almost all the ancients use the name of tradition for unwritten doctrine, and we will use the name in this way from now on.

Now the doctrine is called unwritten, not which is nowhere written, but which is not written by the first author. Let the baptism of infants be an example. That infants should be baptized is called an unwritten Apostolic tradition, although it is written in the books of almost all the Fathers.

But there is a double division of traditions; the first is taken from the authors of traditions; the second from the matter. The first is divided into divine, Apostolic, and Ecclesiastical traditions. Those are called divine which were received from Christ himself teaching the Apostles, and are nowhere found in the divine letters; such are what pertains to the matter and form of the sacraments; for we have little about this in the divine letters and yet it is certain that the essence of the sacraments could only have been instituted by Christ. For which reason the Apostle in *I Corinthians* ch.11, speaking of the sacrament of the Eucharist, said, "I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you."

Those traditions are properly called Apostolic which were instituted by the Apostles, not however without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and nevertheless they are not extant written down in their epistles; of this sort is the fast of Lent, and of the four times, and many other things about which more hereafter. Yet sometimes divine traditions are wont also to be called Apostolic, and Apostolic traditions divine. Divine traditions are called Apostolic, not because they were instituted by the Apostles, but because they were first handed on to the Church by them, since they themselves had separately received them from Christ; and Apostolic traditions are called divine, not because God immediately instituted them, but because the Apostles instituted them not without the spirit of God. In this way all the epistles of the Apostles are called divine and Apostolic writings, even if certain things in them are divine precepts and certain are properly Apostolic, as is plain from that verse of *I Corinthians* ch.7, "I do not command, but the Lord," and later, "I say, not the Lord."

Traditions are properly called Ecclesiastical which are certain ancient customs begun either by prelates or by people, which little by little with the tacit consent of the people obtained the force of law. And indeed divine traditions have the same force as divine precepts, or divine things written in the Gospels; and likewise unwritten Apostolic traditions have the same force as Apostolic written traditions, as is asserted in the Council of Trent sess.4, and the reason is manifest: for the word of God is not such as it is, nor does it have any authority, because it is written on parchments, but because it proceeded from God either immediately, as the words of the Lord, or mediately through the Apostles, as is a decree of the Apostles, *Acts* ch.15. Nor do the heretics deny this, nor can they; for as we will say later, the question is not how much force there is in divine or Apostolic tradition, but whether any tradition is truly divine or Apostolic.

But Ecclesiastical traditions have the same force as written decrees and constitutions of the Church; for also in a civil Republic there is the same force in approved customs as in written laws, as is plain from *dist.1 canon. dustom, and bk. diuturna, ff. on laws.*

The second division of traditions is according to matter, into traditions about faith and traditions about morals; which again are either perpetual or temporal, and either universal or particular, and either necessary or free. A tradition about faith is that Blessed Mary was always a virgin, that there are only four Gospels, etc. A tradition pertaining to morals is that the sign of the cross is to be marked on the forehead, that there should be fasting on certain days, or feasts should be celebrated etc.

A tradition is perpetual that is instituted to be always kept, up to the end of the world, as in the examples given. A tradition is temporal that is instituted for a certain time, as the observation of certain ceremonial laws, which were to be kept up to the full promulgation of the Gospel, so that the Church might more easily coalesce from Jews and Gentiles.

A tradition is universal that is handed on to be kept by the whole Church, such as is the observation of Easter, of Pentecost, and the like great feasts, as Blessed Augustine teaches in epist.118. A tradition is particular that is handed to only one or several Churches, such as in the time of Augustine was the fast of the Sabbath, which Peter handed on to the Roman Church, and it was kept by it alone and by certain others, as Augustine teaches epist.86 to Casulanus.

A tradition is necessary that is handed on in the form of a precept, as the celebration of Easter on the Lord's day after the fourteenth moon of March. A tradition is free that is handed on in the form of a counsel, as the sprinkling of lustral water and the like.

*Chapter Three: the State of the Question is Explained, and certain Falsehoods of the Adversaries are Uncovered*

The controversy, then, between us and the heretics consists in two things. The first is that we assert that in the Scriptures is not expressly contained the whole doctrine necessary either about faith or about morals; and therefore besides the written word of God there is also required the unwritten word of God, that is, divine and Apostolic traditions.

But they teach that in the Scriptures is contained everything necessary for faith and morals, and that therefore there is no need for any unwritten word. Luther in his commentary on *Galatians* ch.1 says, "Nor ought any other doctrine to be handed on or heard in the Church than the pure word of God, that is, the holy Scriptures. Let the doctors or other hearers with their doctrine be anathema." John Brentius in his *Prolegomena*, the chapter about traditions, says, "The Apostle clearly signifies that no tradition contrary to or in addition to the testimonies of Scripture is to be acknowledged as dogma, and necessary for salvation." John Calvin *Institutes* bk.4 ch.8 sect.8, says, "Let this axiom, then, be firm, that nothing else is to be held as the word of God, to which place is given in the Church, than what is contained first in the law and the Prophets, and then in the Apostolic writings." Martin Chemnitz in his *Examination* of the Council of Trent sess.4 very often repeats that this is the state of the question, whether the Scriptures contain all the dogmas necessary for faith, and he affirms it and we deny it.

The second point is that we disagree with what they judge, that the Apostles did indeed institute certain things besides Scripture that pertain to the rites and

order of the Church, but that these are not necessary nor precepts but free. Now that nothing pertaining to faith or morals was handed on besides the Scriptures is clearly taught by Chemnitz when he deals with the seventh kind of traditions, and by Calvin *Institutes* bk.4 ch.10 sect.20. But we recognize Apostolic traditions of all the kinds, as we expounded above.

The third point is that we disagree with what they think, that the Apostolic traditions, if there ever were any, are not now extant, that is, no Apostolic tradition can be certainly demonstrated. So Chemnitz in the same place says, "By no certain and firm documents can it be proved what rites were certainly handed on by the Apostles that cannot be shown from the Scriptures." We on the contrary affirm that definite ways and reasons are not lacking by which the Apostolic traditions can be shown.

Now before I come to proof, let me say a few things in the accustomed way about their contradictions and falsehoods. Brentius and Chemnitz in the places noted openly say that nothing can be equated with the sacred Scriptures. Brentius speaks as follows, "Not content with the divinely commended and confirmed Scripture, they boast that the Apostles handed on to posterity many things in speech that do not have a lesser authority than what they entrusted to writing." But Chemnitz says, "It is a signal audacity to equate anything to the majesty and authority of canonical Scripture."

But the same confess that the Apostles did hand on something besides the Scriptures. Brentius in the same place speaks thus, "One should not nor can one deny both that Christ said and did many things and that the Apostles handed on and instituted many things that are not included in their writings." And Chemnitz says, "That the Apostles therefore ordained and handed on certain rites to the Churches is certainly clear from their writings, and it is likely that certain other external rites were handed on by the Apostles that are not noted in the Scriptures." But now, if there is no less authority in the mouth of an Apostle giving command than in entrusting it to writing, certainly it is not audacity to equate something unwritten to the written word. For we can at least equate the ordination of an external rite handed on by the Apostles with a like ordination entrusted to writing. For they themselves confess that the Apostles ordained something in both ways. Why then do they clamor that it is a signal audacity to equate anything with the written word?

Now let us come to the lies. It is common to Calvin, Brentius, and Chemnitz to repeat rather often that we want all rites of the Church to be Apostolic tradition without any discrimination. Calvin *Institutes* bk.4 ch.10 sect.19 says, "The Roman masters wish to twist out that there is no rite among them which is not to be reckoned for Apostolic." Yet we do not say this, but that those only we receive for Apostolic that we can by the firm testimonies of the ancients prove to be Apostolic. Next it is common to the same to act as if they themselves defend the Scriptures alone and we the traditions alone, and as if we do not care whether the traditions are according to Scripture or against it; but it is not so; for we value Scripture more than they do, nor do we admit any tradition against Scripture.

But the lies of Chemnitz need to be numbered one by one. In his *Examination*, then, published in the year of salvation 1564, at sess.4 pp.68-69, he says that we assert that God established that the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles would not be

written in books but only handed on viva voce, and he himself later asserts, p.185, that the Apostles had a mandate to write. But whether it is a lie or the truth is in open view. For no Catholic ever taught that God established that the New Testament would not be written, or let Chemnitz produce the author who said this. For thus the Evangelists and Apostles, in our opinion, would by writing have very gravely sinned; but we only say that the New Testament should be principally written in the heart, and do not necessarily demand that it be written in books.

False too is it to say that God commanded the Apostles to write. For we read in *Matthew* last chapter a mandate to preach the Gospel; but that they should write we never read. Therefore God did not expressly command them to write, nor not to write. However we do not deny but that by the will and inspiration of God the Apostles wrote what they wrote. For it is one thing to do something when God suggests and inspires, and another to do so when he openly prescribes. And in this way is Augustine to be understood on the *Harmony of the Evangelists* bk.1 last chapter, where he speaks thus, that whatever God wished us to read about his deeds and words, this he commanded them to write as it were by their own hands. For he is speaking of an internal command by which Christ invisibly moves them, as the head the members, to various actions, which command should be reckoned a certain suggestion and inspiration rather than as a precept properly so called. Nor is it an obstacle that in the *Apocalypse* we sometimes read, "Write what you see." For John is commanded to write certain arcane visions, not the doctrine of the Gospel and precepts of morals, which is what we are dealing with.

Next, at the end of his disputation on traditions, p.420, he says as follows, "Lastly the reader will be much warned also by this observation, that the Pontificists do not fear to refer to the traditions of the Apostles many things which can be shown from the very writings of the Pontificists themselves to have been instituted and perfected by much later authors, etc." And he proves this with eleven examples, none of which is lacking in falsehood.

The first is where he says that Innocent III, ch. 'Cum Matthae, extra on the celebration of Masses, wrote that there are indeed more words in the consecration of the chalice than the Lord said in the Gospel, but yet they are got from Apostolic tradition. "However," says Chemnitz, "the Pontificist writers have noted by which Roman Pontiffs those words were added." The thing is a lie. For Catholic writers did indeed note in the rest of the canon which Pontiff added what; but in the words of consecration no one is found to have added anything; nor is there anyone who has contradicted Innocent on this matter.

The second lie. "If anyone," he says, "shows he even doubts that the whole canon of the mass is from Apostolic tradition, he is struck with an anathema." It is a lie. For since in the mass there is commemoration of many saints, some of whom lived 200 years after the Apostles, who can doubt that the whole canon is not from Apostolic tradition? Or let Chemnitz say openly where he has read what he so brazenly affirms. We assert, then, that not the whole canon but the sum and principal part is from Apostolic tradition, to which afterwards something was added by the Supreme Pontiffs.

The third lie. "Alexander," he says, "ruled that water should be mixed with wine in the celebration of the Eucharist. He also instituted blessed water and salt.



Therefore these rites are falsely referred to the tradition of the Apostles." A lie. For hear the words of Alexander in epist.1. He says, "Having rejected the opinions of the superstitious, let bread only and wine mixed with water be offered in the sacrifice. For (as we have received from the Fathers and as reason itself teaches) wine or water alone should not be offered in the chalice of the Lord." Therefore what Cyprian bk2 epist.2 says is true, that this is a divine tradition. For Alexander sufficiently openly indicates that this use did not begin with himself, since he says he received it from the Fathers. About blessed water too he does not say that he first ordered it to be blessed, but indicates that he is doing what is of ancient custom. For thus does he speak. "We bless," he says, "water sprinkled with salt on the people, etc." Therefore rightly is it said to be an Apostolic tradition by Clement *Apostolic Constitutions* bk.8 ch.35, and by Blessed Basil on the *Holy Spirit* ch.27.

The fourth is, "Telesphorus instituted the forty day Lenten fast." A lie. For Telesphorus does not say in his epistle that he instituted the forty days, but only that clerics would add three days to the accustomed fast of all Christians, that is, they would begin to abstain from meat on the Sunday of Lent. "You know," he says, "that it was ruled by us and by all the Bishops gathered in this holy and Apostolic See that for seven full weeks before the holy Pasch all clerics should fast from meat." To these words does very well cohere what Jerome says in his epistle to Marcella about the errors of Montanus, that the forty day fast was instituted by the Apostles in unwritten tradition.

The fifth lie. "Hyginus," he says, "instituted the chrism." A lie without any foundation. For nothing about chrism is found in the epistles of Hyginus; nor is there extant among others any such decree, save that Gratian on consecration dist.4 canon 'in the catechism' asserts a certain decree of Hyginus by which he established that it can be one and the same person who sponsors the baptized and the confirmed, that is, the patron, although it is better if they are different. Therefore rightly is it said by Pope Fabian in epist.2 that the chrism is to be renewed each individual year, because such was what the Apostles established.

The sixth is that "Calixtus established the fasts of the four times, so it is false that they are from Apostolic tradition." It is a lie that Calixtus instituted the fasts of the four times, for he himself in epist.1 says that he only added one fast to the three that were there before. Wherefore what Leo says in serm.2 about the fast of Pentecost and in serm.8 about the fast of the seventh month, that these fasts are from Apostolic tradition, does not conflict with the decree of Calixtus.

The seventh is that "Sylvester invented the confirmation of children." A most impudent lie. For nothing such is ever read about Sylvester, and decrees are found from Pontiffs long before Sylvester, on consecration dist.4 canon 'In the catechism', and canon 'not many', and dist.5 can.1 ff., where not the sacrament itself but certain rites concerning its administration are established.

The eighth is that "Felix established the consecration of altars." And this is a lie. For it is clear that Sylvester was the author of this rite. Chemnitz seems to have been deceived by the first epistle of Felix IV, where many things are disputed about the consecration of altars, but nothing new is there instituted but the ancient rites are merely explained.

The ninth is that “Felix IV established that the sick should be anointed before death.” A solemn lie. For in *Mark* ch.6 the Apostles anointed the sick with oil. And *James* ch.5 prescribes that priests should anoint the sick with oil. And Innocent I, a hundred years older than Felix IV, in epist.1 which is addressed to Decentius ch.8, says that the anointing of the sick is a sacrament of the Church.

The tenth is that “Syricius added the memory and invocation of saints in the mass.” And this is a lie. For Cyril of Jerusalem, older than Syricius, in *Catechism* 5 ‘Mystagogy’ says, “When we offer the sacrifice we make mention of those who before us have fallen asleep, first of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that by their prayers God would take up our prayers etc.” And likewise in the liturgy of Basil, who was older than Syricius, we see that there was memory and invocation of the saints.

The eleventh is that “Pelagius added to the mass annual memorials of the dead.” And this is a lie. For Tertullian, far older than Pope Pelagius, in his book on *Monogamy*, makes mention of an annual oblation for the dead, and in his book on the *Crown of the Soldier* says that prayers for the dead descend from Apostolic tradition.

To these we add a twelfth lie from the book which he inscribes, *Principal Chapters of the Theology of the Jesuits*. “You will, reader,” says Chemnitz, “note in this place the difference the Jesuits make between the written traditions of the Apostles and those they themselves make up under the name of the Apostles. The written ones they say are arbitrary, the made up ones they say are obligatory under peril of salvation.” This so signal lie is collected by Chemnitz from the fact that the doctors of Cologne in their book *Against the Catechism of Monhemius* had written that the verse, “For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you,” *I Corinthians* ch.11, does not signify ‘I commanded you’ but ‘I taught you’, and thence they deduced that from this place is not collected that laymen are obligated to use of the chalice in the sacrament of the altar. But if the “I handed on to you” does not signify ‘I taught’ but ‘I commanded’ what I ask is the sense? What does this mean, “I commanded you that the Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread etc.” Surely here a history is being narrated not a law being laid down? Therefore the Jesuits do not say that written traditions do not obligate, but that they obligate in diverse ways. When the tradition is about a doctrine of the faith or a thing done, it obliges to belief, not action, as the tradition about the death of Christ. But when it is about precepts of morals it obligates to action, which same thing must be understood of things that are unwritten.

#### *Chapter Four: the Necessity for Traditions is Shown*

Now, in order to come to the proof, we will try to demonstrate three things. First that the Scriptures are neither simply necessary nor sufficient without traditions. Second that Apostolic traditions are found not only about morals but also about faith. Lastly, how we can be certain about true traditions.

I prove the first from the various ages of the Church. For from Adam up to Moses some Church of God existed in the world, men were worshipping God with faith, hope, and love, and with external rites, as is plain from *Genesis* where are introduced Adam, Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchizedek and other just

men, and from Augustine *City of God* bk.11ff., where he brings the city of God from the beginning of the world to its end; but there was no divine Scripture before Moses, as is plain, both because, by the consent of all, Moses was the first sacred writer, and because in *Genesis* no mention is made of written doctrine but only of doctrine handed down, *Genesis* ch.18, God says, "I know that Abraham will command his sons and his house after him to keep the way of the Lord." So, for 2,000 years religion was kept by tradition alone; therefore Scripture is not simply necessary. For in the way the ancient religion could be kept without Scripture for 2,000 years, so could the doctrine of Christ be kept without Scripture for 1,500 years. Next, from Moses up to Christ for another 2,000 years there did exist Scriptures indeed but they were only of the Jews, but the rest of the nations, among whom too there was with some the true religion and faith, used only unwritten tradition.

For that, besides the Jews, many others pertained to the Church is plain from Job and his friends. Again from Augustine, who constantly asserts this, *Original Sin* bk.2 ch.24 and the *Predestination of Saints* bk1 ch.9 and *City of God* bk.18 ch.47. And in the people of God, although Scriptures existed, yet the Jews used tradition more than Scripture, as is plain from *Exodus* ch.13, "You will tell your son in that day, saying this is what the Lord has done etc.," *Deuteronomy* ch.32, "Ask your father and he will tell you, your seniors, and they will speak to you," *Job* ch.8, "Ask the ancient generation and diligently examine the memory of your fathers," *Judges* ch.6, "Where are the marvels that our fathers told us?" *Psalms* 43, "God, we have heard with our ears, our fathers have told us the work you did, etc." *Psalms* 77, "How much he commanded our fathers, make it known to their sons, so that the next generation may know, the sons who will be born and will arise, and they will tell it to their sons." *Ecclesiasticus* ch.8, "Let not the telling of your fathers pass you by, for they themselves learnt it from their fathers." And yet *Ecclesiasticus* was among the last books of the Old Testament.

Now the reason that the Hebrews used tradition more than Scripture seems to have been because, up to the times of Ezra, the Scriptures were not reduced to the form of books so as to be able easily and conveniently to be possessed, but were dispersed in various annals and papers, and sometimes, by the negligence of the priests, they were for a long time not found, as is plain from *IV Kings* ch.22, where is narrated as something new that in the days of Josiah one volume of the law of the Lord was found in the temple. But Ezra collected everything after the captivity and reduced it at the same time to one body, adding in *Deuteronomy* the final chapter about the life of Moses, and certain other things from then to the continuation of the history. About which see Theodoret in his preface to the *Psalms*, Bede on *I Ezra* ch.9, and Peter Antonius Beuter in his ninth note on sacred Scripture.

Further, from the advent of Christ for many years the Church existed without Scriptures, so that still in his own time Irenaeus writes bk.3 ch.4 that there were some Christian nations that lived very well by traditions alone without Scripture. Therefore from this deduction it sufficiently appears that the Scriptures are not simply necessary. But what Chrysostom says *Homil.*1 on *Matthew*, that the Scriptures were not necessary for the Patriarchs and Apostles, though for us, because of the corruption of men, they are necessary, is understood of necessity not

simply but for well being, that is, for utility. For in other respects there were many wicked even in the time of the Patriarchs and Apostles.

But that the Scriptures do not so contain everything that they themselves suffice without other tradition I prove first because either the whole canon of the Scriptures taken together is sufficient, or the individual books are per se sufficient. It cannot be said that the individual books are sufficient, for then would be false what Chemnitz says, that the use of tradition existed in the Church up to the completion of the whole canon of Scripture. Besides we see that the individual Evangelists do not contain everything. For John wrote nothing of the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Circumcision, the Transfiguration of the Lord, and many other things. The same can be said of the others. Again, if one book sufficiently contains everything, what need was there for so many books? Finally they themselves openly say that the whole canon is necessary so that sufficient doctrine may be had. But neither can that be truly affirmed. For many books truly sacred and canonical have perished, therefore we do not have nor have we had for 1,500 years a sufficient doctrine, if the whole doctrine is located in the Scriptures. For that many books have perished from the Old Testament is taught by Chrysostom *Homil.9* on *Matthew* on the verse, 'he will be called a Nazarene,' who says "Many things have perished from the Prophetic memorials, which it is possible to prove from the history of Chronicles. For since the Jews were slothful, and not only slothful but also impious, some things indeed they lost through negligence, but others they at times burnt, at times cut up." He teaches the same in *Homil.7* on *I Corinthians*; nor can it be replied that everything which perished was repaired by Ezra; for Chrysostom means to prove that now not all the prophecies of the Prophets are extant, and he proves it because the Jews lost many things.

Besides, Ezra did not repair the lost books but emended and collected those that were extant, *I Chronicles* last chapter, "But the earlier deeds of David," he says, "and the latest are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the volume of Caiad the seer." And in *II Chronicles* ch.9, "But the rest of the works of Solomon are in the words of Nathan the Prophet, and in the books of Abia Silonitis, in the vision also of Addo the seer." And in *III Kings* ch.4, "Solomon spoke 3,000 parables and his songs were 5,000." Where then are they all? From the New Testament the epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans has certainly perished, of which he himself makes mention in *Colossians* last chapter, and perhaps another to the Corinthians, of which there seems to be mention in *I Corinthians* ch.5, in the words "I wrote to you in an epistle." And it is very possible that some others have perished. Therefore let the heretics see whence they will restore so signal a loss.

Second, this same thing is proved from the distinction between the preaching and the writing of the Apostles. For if the proposal had been made to Christ and the Apostles to limit and restrict the word of God to written form, then in the first place Christ would have prescribed a thing of so great moment, and the Apostles would somewhere testify that they were writing from commandment of the Lord, in the way they taught in the whole world from the commandment of the Lord. But we nowhere read of this. Next, to preach viva voce the Apostles did not wait for an offered occasion or necessity, but proceeded of their own accord and by their own

purpose; but to writing they did not apply their mind unless compelled by some necessity.

Matthew, says Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.24, or ch.18 in another edition, wrote on the occasion of the fact that, since he had preached to the Hebrews and was preparing to go to the Gentiles, he judge it useful to leave to those he was abandoning in body some memorial of his doctrine. Mark, as the same Eusebius reports *Hist.* bk.2 h.15, neither on his own accord nor as commanded by Peter (whose disciple he was) but as compelled by the prayers of the Romans wrote his Gospel. Luke, as the same Eusebius hands on *Hist.* bk.3 ch.24, wrote only for this reason, that he saw that many others had presumed to commit to letters what they did not perfectly know, so as surely to remove us from the uncertain narratives of others.

John, writes the same Eusebius in the same place, preached the Gospel to extreme old age without any Scripture, and Jerome adds in his book on *Ecclesiastical Writers* that he was at length compelled by the Bishops of Asia to write his Gospel because of the heresy of the Ebionites then rising up. Therefore if the heresy of the Ebionites had not existed, we would perhaps not have the Gospel of John, just as neither the other three if the aforesaid occasions had not been offered. For rightly does Eusebius write in the place noted that only two of the twelve Apostles wrote a Gospel, and they were prompted to this by some necessity.

From which is manifestly collected that the Apostles with their primary intention thought not about writing but about preaching the Gospel. Besides, if they had wanted expressly to consign their doctrine to letters, they would certainly have written a catechism or a like book. But they wrote either a history, as the Evangelists, or epistles on some occasion, as did Peter, Paul, James, Judas, John, and in this they handled disputes about dogmas only by the by. Lastly, either the individual Apostles would have produced a written Evangelical doctrine, since they each had care of some province, or certainly, gathered all together before they departed to their provinces, they would have produced some common book, as is plain that they commonly composed a Creed, which however they did not write down but handed on only viva voce, as is taught by Blessed Irenaeus bk.3 ch.4 and by Blessed Jerome in epistle to Pammachius against the errors of John of Jerusalem, and by Blessed Augustine in his book on *Faith and Works* ch.9, and by Blessed Ambrose epist.81 to Syricius, and by Blessed Leo in epist.13 to Pulcheria, and by Ruffinus and Blessed Maximus in their exposition of the Creed.

It is proved third from the many things that cannot be left unknown and yet are not contained in the Scriptures. And first, in the time of the Old Testament without doubt women had no less than men some remedy whereby to be purged from original sin, and yet for men there was instituted circumcision, according to the opinion of many, but what there was for the women is nowhere contained in Scripture.

Next, at the same time it is not in any way credible that there was no remedy for males dying before the eighth day, on which alone they could be circumcised, and yet there is nothing extant on this matter in Scripture.

Third, many Gentiles were able to be saved and were saved in the time of the Old Testament, and they truly belonged to the Church, as we showed above, and yet

altogether nothing is contained in Scripture about their justification from original sin and from other sins.

Fourth, it is necessary to know that some books truly divine are extant, which certainly can in no way be got from the Scriptures. For even if the Scripture says that the books of the Prophets and the Apostles are divine, yet I do not certainly believe that unless I have first believed that the Scripture which says this is divine. For even in the Koran of Mohammed we read everywhere that the Koran was sent from heaven by God, and yet we do not believe it. Therefore this very necessary dogma, namely that some Scripture is divine, cannot be sufficiently got from Scripture alone. Therefore since faith rests on the word of God, unless we have an unwritten word of God we will have no faith.

Fifth, it is not enough to know that Scripture is divine, but one must know which it is. This can in no way be got from the Scriptures. For how do we collect from Scripture that the Gospels of Mark and Luke are true but the Gospels of Thomas and Bartholomew are false? For reason dictates that one should rather believe a book bearing the name of an Apostle than of a non-Apostle.

And whence would I gather that the epistle to the *Romans* is truly of Paul, but the epistle to the *Laodiceans*, which now circulates, is not of Paul? Since each bears the title of Paul, and since Paul in *Colossians* last chapter says he wrote to the Laodiceans but he never says he wrote to the Romans?

Sixth, one must also not only know which are the sacred books but also in particular that the ones now in our hands are those books. For it is not enough to believe that the Gospel of Mark is true and that the Gospel of Thomas is not true, but one must also believe that this Gospel, which is now read in the name of Mark, is the true and uncorrupt Gospel that Mark wrote, which certainly cannot be got from the Scriptures. For how would I collect from the Scripture that this Gospel is not spurious, as the Mohammedans say, or certainly not wholly distorted, as the Manichees once said and as the Anabaptists now say?

To these three things Calvin responds *Institutes* bk.1 ch.7 sects.1-2 that the sacred Scriptures are discriminated from the non sacred per se, as light from darkness, sweet from bitter. But on the contrary, for if it were so, why would Luther judge the epistle of James to be straw and Calvin to be Apostolic? Therefore Calvin adds in the same place sect.4 that this difference of Scriptures is not evident to all but only to those who have the spirit. For even the blind do not discriminate light from darkness. But on the contrary, for Calvin in the same place ch.9 sect.1 contends that the Apostles and the faithful of the first Church had the true spirit; but they judged the book of *Wisdom* to be sacred, as Augustine testifies, *On Predestination* ch.14, which book Calvin however, who also boasts of the spirit, maintains is profane.

Besides the ancients testify with one voice that from nowhere else do we have it that the Scripture is divine and which are the sacred books than from unwritten tradition. Thus in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.10 Serapion rejected certain things falsely ascribed to Peter, because he had accepted from tradition that Peter wrote nothing of the sort. And in ch.11 Clement of Alexandria, according to the tradition commended to him by his elders, teaches which are the true Gospels. And in ch.18 Origen says, "From tradition I have learnt about four Gospels, because these

alone etc.” Basil too in his book on the *Holy Spirit* ch.27 says that if the unwritten traditions are neglected the Gospel too would suffer great loss. Finally, Augustine in his book *Against Fundamentus* clearly says that he would not believe the Gospel unless the Church commanded it.

But Calvin objects that the foundation of the Church is the Scriptures of the Apostles and Prophets, *Ephesians* ch.2, so he will not believe that the Scriptures are divine from the tradition of the Church, because then the foundation of Scripture would be the Church. I reply that the Apostle does not say that the writings of the Apostles and the Prophets are the foundation, but that the Apostles and the Prophets are. But they not only wrote but also handed on by mouth, and taught that they had written. And thus from the word of the Apostles that is unwritten and handed on to us by the Church we know that there is a written word of the Apostles. But of these things we spoke in the previous book.

Brentius therefore in his *Prolegomena*, not finding a way out, confesses that this one and only unwritten tradition is to be received. And Chemnitz teaches the same when treating of the second kind of traditions in his *Examination* of the Council of Trent. But if so it is, then Scripture alone is not sufficient, as they themselves so often and so earnestly teach. For if Scripture were deprived of this unwritten tradition and the attestation of the Church it would profit little. Besides if this tradition could have come down to us, why could not other traditions also have come down to us in the same way? Lastly, either this tradition is the word of God or it is not; if it is not, then we do not have faith, for faith rests on the word of God; if it is, why then do they clamor that there is no word of God save a written one?

Seventh it is necessary not only to be able to read Scripture but also to understand it. But very often Scripture is ambiguous and perplexing, so that unless it is explained by someone who cannot err it cannot be understood; therefore it alone does not suffice. And there are many examples; for the equality of the divine persons, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as from one principle, the sin of origin, the descent of Christ into hell, and many like things are indeed deduced from the sacred letters but not so easily that, if one should fight with the testimonies of Scripture alone, strife with the perverse would never end. For one must note that there are two things in Scripture, written words and the sense contained in them; the words are as it were the scabbard, the sense itself is the sword of the spirit. Of these two the first is possessed by all; for whoever knows letters can read the Scriptures; but the second is not possessed by all, nor can we in many places be certain about the second unless tradition is added. And this perhaps is what Basil wanted to say in his *Holy Spirit* ch.27, when he says that without unwritten traditions the Gospel is a mere name, that is, only words without sense.

Eighth one must believe that Blessed Mary was always a Virgin, against the error of Helvidius, as the whole Church has always believed, and yet there is no testimony about this in Scripture.

Ninth one must believe that in the New Testament the Pasch is to be celebrated on the Lord’s day; for the Quartodecimans were held to be heretics by the ancient Church; and yet altogether nothing exists in the Scriptures about this. The same can be said of many other things.

Tenth one must believe, and the Lutherans and Calvinist believe with us, against the Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants is approved. But neither do Catholics prove this from the Scriptures alone, nor can the Lutherans in any way prove it. For they reckon that baptism without one's own actual faith has no value, and therefore they believe that when infants are baptized they actually believe, which not only does Luther teach on *Galatians* ch.3 and Chemnitz in his *Examination* of the Council of Trent sess.7, but the general Synod of Lutherans held at Wittemberg defined it. But in no way can it be proved from the Scriptures. For where, I ask, does Scripture indicate that infants use reason, before the use of reason, when they are baptized? Hence, surely, the Anabaptists reduce the Lutherans to remarkable difficulties and compel them, willy nilly, to have recourse to tradition and the use of the Church.

Eleventh Luther believes that there is a purgatory. For thus does he say in his assertions art.37, "I however also believe there is a purgatory, and I advice and persuade that it be believed." And yet in that article he asserts that purgatory cannot be proved from the sacred letters.

Finally all the heretics of this time believe that there is only a written word of God; but this certainly is nowhere found in the whole of Scripture. For what they especially are accustomed to bring from *Deuteronomy* ch.4, "You will not add to the word which I speak to you, nor will you take away from it," helps them nothing; for Moses does not say from the written word, but from the word, which I speak.

*Chapter Five: That there are True Traditions is Demonstrated from the Scriptures*

We have hitherto demonstrated that the Scriptures without traditions were not altogether necessary nor sufficient; now we will show what I proposed in the second place, namely that there are some true traditions.

And first it can be collected from what we said. For if Scripture does not contain everything and tradition is necessary, it follows that there is some tradition, otherwise God would not have provided well for the Church. Second, it is proved by the testimonies of the Scriptures. The first is *John* ch.16, "I have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now." And *John* last chapter, "But there are many other things which Jesus did, which if they were written down individually I do not think the world itself could contain the books that should be written." Therefore it is clear that the Lord did and said many things which are not written. For the books which are extant can be grasped in one hand; but John says that the whole world cannot contain the books which should be written. And in addition the things which the Lord promised he would say, *John* ch.16, he said without doubt after his resurrection, as Luke testifies *Acts* ch.1, "Appearing to them for forty days and speaking about the kingdom of God." But about the deeds and words of the Lord after his resurrection the Evangelists wrote very little. But it is in no way credible that the Apostles who saw and heard them did not hand them on to the Churches, for they were neither envious nor forgetful such that they would not wish, or not be able, to say them.

The adversaries respond that even if not everything is written that Jesus said or did, yet everything necessary has been written. But this has already been refuted,



for many necessary things are not written, and especially about the institution of the sacraments which, without doubt, the Lord handed on in those forty days.

The second testimony is I *Corinthians* ch.11, where Paul treats of two questions, one about the way of praying in the Church, the other about the way of receiving the Eucharist. He begins the first from tradition, "I praise you," he says, "because in all things you are mindful of me, and you hold my precepts as I handed them on to you." For these precepts about the way of praying, of receiving the Eucharist, are nowhere found written down. And Chrysostom and Theophylact openly note on this place that the Apostle is speaking of unwritten precepts; Epiphanius too, *Heresy* 61, which is that of the Apostolici, and Basil in his book on the *Holy Spirit* ch.29 and Damascene bk.4 ch.17. Next, because there was still something lacking to the precepts handed on, Paul adds, so that they may keep this, that men should pray in Church with uncovered head, women with covered head. And to show that much is to be attributed to the tradition and custom of the Church, even without being written down, he concludes, "But if anyone seems to be contentious, we do not have such a custom, nor the Church of God." Therefore he wishes the contentious to be held back from the custom of the Church.

The other question too he begins from tradition, "For I," he says, "received from the Lord what I also handed on to you." And he concludes, "The rest I will dispose when I come." But what he disposed is found nowhere written down. Now Catholics rightly think that he not only disposed what concerned rites and ceremonies, but also handed on other graver matters, as about the ordination of ministers, about the sacrifice of the altar, about the form and matter of the other sacraments; nor can heretics in any way show the contrary.

The third testimony is from II *Thessalonians* ch.2, "Therefore, brothers, hold the traditions which you have received, whether by speech or by our letter." To this place Chemnitz and Hermann respond in two ways. First they say that the Apostle handed on the same things first in speech and then by letter, and therefore he is not speaking of unwritten tradition. But the exposition is ridiculous. First, because the disjunctive particle 'or' openly indicates that the things he handed on and the things that he wrote were different. Second, because if it were so, one epistle to the Thessalonians should contain the whole doctrine which the Apostle preached to them. But without doubt he preached the whole Gospel fully to them, as is also collected from chs.1 and 2 of the first epistle; therefore the epistle ought to contain the whole Gospel; but it does not contain the hundredth part, as is plain.

They respond second that the Apostle is here speaking of speech which he had pronounced orally, and which he himself had not written, but which was then written, or was afterwards written, by the Evangelists. For the Apostle, as they say, taught altogether nothing that was not somewhere written in the New Testament. To this solution Brentius subscribes in his *Prolegomena*. But to the contrary. For first in this chapter the Apostle says that he preached to them about Antichrist, and besides other things taught them when he was to come. "And now," he says, "what detains him you know." And, "Surely you recall, that when I was with you, I told you these things?" But this is nowhere written, namely when Antichrist will come. Wherefore Blessed Augustine *City of God* bk.20 ch.10 says that they knew what the Apostle had taught viva voce, but we cannot know who did not hear the Apostle;

therefore not everything was written down that the Apostle said. Besides, whether what the Apostle had taught was written later or not does not matter much as far as the argument is concerned that we are collecting from this place. For the Apostle does not promise that he or another will write what he had handed on orally, but simply prescribed that they observe no less what they had received without writing than what they had received by letter. And in this way did the ancients understand this place.

Basil in his book on the *Holy Spirit* ch.29 says, "I think it is Apostolic to persevere also in unwritten traditions. I praise you," he says, "because you have remembered me in all things, and you hold the traditions the way I handed them on to you." And, "Hold the traditions which you have received whether through speech or by letter." Chrysostom on this place says, "Hence it is plain that they did not hand on everything by letters, but many things also without letters. But these as well as those are worthy of the same faith." Oecumenius and Theophylact use the same words in this place, to whom add Damascene bk.4 ch.17, who says, "Because the Apostles handed on many things without writing, Paul writes, 'Therefore, brothers, stand and hold the traditions, which you have learnt whether by speech or by letter'." In the same way does the eighth general Synod expound, final act can.1.

To these five Fathers, who expressively expound this place for us, Hermann opposes five others, Jerome, Ambrose, Primasius, Theodoret, and Anselm on this place, whom he says have expounded contrariwise to us. But I reply that those commentaries inscribed with the name of Jerome are not of Jerome but of the heretic Pelagius, as Blessed Augustine teaches *On Merit and Remission of Sin* bk.3 chs.1, 5, 12, and the very words of the commentary in *Romans* chs.5-9 cry out that their author is Pelagius.

Next, neither is Pelagius against us in this matter, for he says, "When he wants his own sayings to be kept, he does not want extraneous things added; but the Apostolic tradition is that by which the sacraments of baptism are preached in the whole world." What here is against us? For we admit that extraneous things, that is, foreign and spurious comments of false Apostles, are not to be added to the true dogmas of the Apostles. For that is why Pelagius said that the sacraments of baptism are Apostolic tradition, not the sacrament of baptism is, because he knew that there are many mysteries concerning baptism that are kept in the Church from the unwritten tradition of the Apostles, as exorcism, exsufflation, unction, etc.

Primasius too is for us, for in the first place he puts as it were literally the exposition of Pelagius, about which we have already spoken, and he adds that the Apostle is not only speaking of the sacraments of baptism but also of the traditions that are observed in the whole world and are for that reason recognized to be Apostolic. Hermann thinks that he is speaking of the written Gospel, because it is kept in the whole world; but he should have noticed that also many unwritten things are kept in the whole world, as the feast of the Nativity, of Easter, of the Ascension, of Pentecost, as Augustine teaches in epist.118. Besides, when Primasius says that the Apostle is speaking of the traditions that are recognized to be Apostolic because they are kept in the whole world, without doubt he is speaking of unwritten traditions. For he himself, since he was a disciple of Augustine, knew that the rule of

Augustine was in the same epist. 118, that what is kept in the whole world, even if it is not written, is kept by Apostolic tradition.

Neither is Ambrose against us or for us, for he only says that the Apostle is advising us in this place to persevere in the doctrine of the Gospel. But he says nothing about what is written or unwritten. Anselm rather is for us, for thus does he expound, "Hold in your heart and works the traditions which you have learnt, whether by our speech when we were present or by letter which we sent you when absent." What here is against us? What is not rather for us?

Finally Theodoret too I reckon is for us. He speaks thus, "You have," he says, "a rule of faith, our speeches, which we preached to you and wrote in our epistle." This place Hermann says makes for him, because Theodoret seems to indicate that the Apostle wrote the same words that he had preached before; but Hermann says this falsely. For the words of Theodoret can also be understood of different words, in this way: you have as rule of faith our speeches, both those which we preached and those which we wrote in our epistle. That this sense is more to the mind of Theodoret is plain, both because it is more conform to the exposition of Chrysostom, which Theodoret is wont everywhere to follow, and also because the first sense is false, since it is certain that not everything that the Apostle preached by mouth was written in the epistle. Our argument from this place of Paul, then, remains in its strength.

The fourth testimony is I *Timothy* last chapter, "O Timothy, guard the deposit." And from II *Timothy* ch.1, "You have the form of sound words, which you heard from me. Guard the good deposit through the Holy Spirit, who lives in us." And ch.2, "You, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus; and what you heard from me through many witnesses, this commend to faithful men, who will be fitted also to teach others."

In these places by the name of deposit cannot be understood the Scripture, but the treasure of doctrine, the understanding of divine dogmas, that is, both the sense of the Scriptures and of other dogmas, all which doctrine he wanted to be prolonged through tradition, as is explained by Chrysostom and Theophylact on this place; to which also Irenaeus alludes bk.3 ch.4 when he says, "The Apostles brought all the things of truth into the Church as into a most fully rich depositary." And bk.4 ch.43, "You must obey," he says, "the priests of the Church, who have succession from the Apostles, who along with the succession of the Episcopacy have received a sure charism of truth according to the pleasure of the Father." And it is easily collected from these very words. For if he were speaking of written words, he would not so anxiously commend the deposit. For Scriptures are easily conserved in chests and by copyists; but the Apostle wants it to be kept by the Holy Spirit in the breast of Timothy. And next he would not add, "Commend these to the faithful, who will be fitted also to teach others," but he would say, 'commend these to the copyists so that they may transcribe many copies'. Nor would he say, "What you heard from me through many witnesses," but 'what I wrote to you'. Therefore not words only but also the sense, and much more the sense than the words, does the Apostle commend to Timothy, and he commands him to pass it on by his hands to his successors. See on this place the advisory of Vincent of Lerins against the profane novelties of words.

The last testimony is the second and third epistles of *John*, "Having much to write to you, I did not wish to do it with parchment and ink, etc." For from these words we understand that many things were said by John to his disciples, and through his disciples to the universal Church, that yet were not written down.

*Chapter Six: The Same is Shown by the Testimonies of the Pontiffs and the Councils*  
To the places from Scripture we will add some few testimonies from the ancient holy Pontiffs and Councils. And first St. Fabian, Pope and martyr, in epist.2 to the Bishops of the East, after teaching that the sacred chrism is to be renewed each year, subjoined as follows, "We received this from the holy Apostles and their successors, and we command you to keep it." So Fabian. And to be sure we read nothing about renewing the chrism in the sacred letters.

St. Innocent I in epist.1 to Decentius says, "If the priests of the Lord wish to keep the ecclesiastical institutes as they are handed on by the Apostles, there should be no variety in these orders and consecrations." So Innocent. Here he is dealing with unwritten traditions, and especially in ch.3 when he teaches that confirmation is also to be conferred on children, and by the Bishop alone and under a certain form of words. And he so testifies that these sort of unwritten traditions are Apostolic that he did not wish even in this letter to write down the form of words. "The words," he says, "I cannot say, lest I seem to provide more than responds to the consultation."

St. Leo I in his sermon on Lent says, "Let the Apostolic institution of the forty day fast be fulfilled." And in sermon 2 on the fast of Pentecost, "One must not doubt, most beloved, that every Christian observance of education is divine, and that whatever has been received by the Church as a custom of devotion proceeds from Apostolic tradition and the teaching of the Holy Spirit." See also sermons 8 and 9 about the fast of the seventh month.

Already indeed the most ancient and famous first Council of Nicea condemned from unwritten doctrine the heresy of Arius, as is expressively testified by Theodoret *Hist.* bk.1 ch.8. For although certain Scriptures could be brought against Arius, yet because Arius also professed the Scriptures, they condemned him from an unwritten doctrine, but one handed down by the hands of the Fathers to their successors in the Church.

The second Council of Nicea act.6 vol.4 says, "But that the veneration of images has been handed on to us from the times of the Apostles, along with many other things that are observed in the Church without Scripture, is handed on extensively in the histories." And act.7 near the end it has the following, "If anyone does not care for the tradition of the Church, whether getting its force from writing or custom, let him be anathema." The same is found in the eighth General Council act.8. And after the final act can.1, the Fathers profess that they will keep all the traditions, not only Apostolic but also Ecclesiastical. From which it should not seem remarkable to the Lutherans if any other such thing is taught by the Council of Trent sess.4, for it established nothing new.

*Chapter Seven: The Same is Proved from the Fathers*

Let now be added the testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers, who teach this truth with incredible agreement. And to begin with the Greeks, Blessed Ignatius in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.16 exhorts everyone to adhere tenaciously to the traditions of the Apostles. "These traditions," says Eusebius, "he asserts he has left written down by a warning of grace." So Ignatius. From which it follows that these traditions were not written down by the Apostles.

To this testimony Hermann makes no reply save that these writings of Ignatius are not extant. But it is false that they are not extant. For Jerome writes in his book on *Illustrious Men* that Ignatius wrote an epistle to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrneans, to Polycarp, all of which are now extant, and in them we find the fast of Lent, the minor orders, the Lord's day, and other things that are not in the Scriptures, and yet Ignatius was without doubt teaching from the Apostles.

Dionysius the Areopagite *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* ch.1 says, "Our first leaders of the priestly office handed on the sum and more than the sum partly in written and partly in unwritten institutions." To these and the like things Luther, Calvin and the rest are wont to reply that the books circulated under the name of Dionysius are not from Dionysius. But the works are cited under the name of Dionysius in the sixth, seventh, and eighth General Synod; again by Gregory I in his homily on the 100 sheep, by Martin I in the Council of Rome, and by Agathon in his epistle to the Emperor Constantine; from which the heretics are compelled to admit that this author wrote over 1,000 years ago, and therefore is not to be despised.

Hegesippus in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.4 ch.8 includes the Apostolic traditions in five books, which although now they are not extant, yet this testimony sufficiently indicates that the Apostles did not write down everything they taught. Polycarp in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.5 ch.20 related the words that he himself heard from the Apostles were said by the Lord, and about his virtues and doctrine. Now Irenaeus, as is said there, describes that what Polycarp handed on was not on paper but in his heart. Here certainly it is a question of unwritten traditions. For if it were a question of written ones, nothing singular would be said of Polycarp or of Irenaeus, for I too can relate the things said by the Lord that are read in the Apostles, nor is there need for me to write them on paper.

But Chemnitz nevertheless replies that Eusebius is speaking of traditions that can be proved from the Scriptures. For he says in the same place that everything Polycarp said was consonant with the Scriptures. But Chemnitz is in error. For it is one thing to be consonant with Scripture and another to be able to be proved from Scripture. For every true tradition, nay every truth, is consonant with Scripture, since truth cannot be dissonant with truth, but not every truth can be proved from Scripture.

Justin at the end of his second *Apology for the Christians* first expounded many things about the Christians, and among others some things not written in the divine letters, as that they come together on each Lord's day and after a reading from the Scriptures and sermons, bread and wine mixed with water are offered and consecrated, and that it is not permitted in any way to partake of the Eucharist until after baptism, and other things; then he at once adds, "On the day after Saturday,

which is Sunday, when he had appeared to his Apostles and disciples, he handed these things on to them which we permit also to be considered by you, etc.” And even if Justin did not say that these things were handed on by Christ, yet since Justin was very close to the times of the Apostles, one must believe that in the Church of his time what was handed on by the Apostles was done. For who else can be supposed to be the author?

To this place and like ones from Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome and others that we will adduce, Hermann and his colleagues reply almost nothing save that they all somewhere erred. But this does not harm us. For even if some Fathers erred in some dogmas, yet they never all agreed in the same error at the same time; therefore, when we show that they all agree in asserting unwritten traditions, we can sufficiently prove that on this point they did not err.

Irenaeus bk.2 chs.2-4 says many fine things about traditions, which are however pulled by Brentius and Chemnitz to a different sense of which Irenaeus never thought. Brentius says that Irenaeus is speaking of the tradition of Scripture, that is, of the tradition, whereby we understand the succession of the Fathers, as to which are the true Scriptures. But Irenaeus does not mean this, as his words will teach us bk.3 ch.4. “For what,” he says, “if neither the Scriptures of the Apostles indeed were left to us, should we not follow the order of the tradition that they handed on to us, to whom they committed the Churches? To their ordination the nations of the Barbarians, of those who believe in Christ, assent much, having without letter or ink salvation written by the Holy Spirit in their heart, and diligently keeping the old tradition.” If Irenaeus is speaking of the tradition of Scripture, how did these barbarians, who had no Scriptures, have and diligently keep the tradition?

But Chemnitz says that Irenaeus is speaking only of the tradition of those dogmas which are found in the Scriptures and that can be proved through the Scriptures. But this too is false, as the words of the same Irenaeus will teach. For in chs.2-4 he teaches that there is no other way of reaching the truth than by consulting the Churches in which there is a succession of Bishops from the Apostles, and by considering what is taught there and what those Churches say is Apostolic tradition. Irenaeus means therefore that tradition extends further than the Scriptures, and that the sense of difficult Scripture is not had from Scripture but from tradition, so that tradition alone suffices but the Scriptures do not suffice. But all this would be false if tradition contained nothing other than what is evidently collected from the Scriptures, as Chemnitz fancies.

After then Irenaeus had said in ch.2 that heretics cannot be convicted from Scripture, and in ch.3 had enumerated the Roman Pontiffs from Peter to Eleutherius, who was then on the See, in order to show that there was in the Church a continued succession of Bishops keeping the Apostolic tradition, he speaks as follows, ch.4: “Since then these proofs are so great, one should not seek still among others for the truth that it is easy to receive from the Church; since the Apostles brought as into a rich depositary all things very fully into the Church that are of truth, so that everyone who wants may receive from it the cup of life. For this life is within, but all the rest are thieves and robbers, because of which it is necessary to avoid them, but to love what is of the Church with great diligence, and to grasp the tradition of truth. For what even if there is disagreement about some little thing, surely one should

have recourse to the Churches in which the Apostles are preserved, and to take from them about the present question what is certain and clear in fact? And what if the Apostles had not indeed handed on Scriptures, surely we should follow the order of tradition? Etc.” To which words should be added what is contained in bk.4 ch.43, “Those who have succession from the Apostles have, along with the succession of Bishops, received the sure charism of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father.” You see how the Apostles handed on to their successors not only Scriptures but the sure charism of truth, that is, the true understanding of the Scriptures and the universal doctrine of the Gospel.

Clement of Alexandria in his book on Easter, as it is in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.11, says it was forced from him by the brothers, so that he would describe in his books and hand on to posterity what had been handed on to him viva voce by the priests who were successors of the Apostles. I do not know what more clearly could be said on behalf of traditions. Origen on *Romans* ch.6 says, “The Church received a tradition from the Apostles to give baptism even to children.” And *Homil.5* on *Numbers* he says, “In Ecclesiastical observances there are some things that everyone must do, but the reason for them is not plain to everyone.” And he enumerates at once many unwritten traditions.

Eusebius *Demonstration of the Gospel* bk.1 ch.8 says, “Besides, Moses wrote his teachings on inanimate tablets, but Christ in the minds of those endowed with the perfect life of the New Testament. But his disciples, on the approval of their master, commended their doctrine to the ears of many, and whatever precepts there were from their perfect master for those who had progressed as it were beyond the habit, these they handed on to those who could grasp them; but the things they thought fitting for those who still bore souls subject to affections and in need of cure, whom they dismissed to the weakness of the many, these things they commended to them to keep partly in writing, partly without writing, as if by a certain unwritten law.”

Athanasius in his book on the Decrees of the Nicene Synod against Eusebius says, “Behold, we indeed have shown that this opinion has been handed on by hand from the Fathers to the Fathers. But you, O new Jews and sons of Caiaphas, what ancestors of your names can you show?”

Basil in his book on the *Holy Spirit*, ch.27, says, “The dogmas that are kept and preached in the Church we have partly from written doctrine, partly we have received from the tradition of the Apostles given to us in a mystery; and no one contradicts these who has but a very slight experience with Ecclesiastical rights.” And he immediately enumerates several unwritten traditions; and ch.29 contains similar remarks.

Chemnitz replies that what Basil relates is not dogmas of faith or of morals but only certain free rites, as to sign with the sign of the cross, to worship toward the East, to bless water etc. But Chemnitz should remember that he said that no rite can be shown to have been instituted by the Apostles; but here Basil boldly enumerates several instituted by the Apostles. Next, although the observation of some of these three not be necessary for salvation, yet it is necessary for salvation to believe that they are well instituted and not to condemn them; just as many things in the Scriptures are not necessary for salvation, as that a man pray with uncovered

head and a woman with a covered one, I *Corinthians* ch.11, and yet it is necessary for salvation to believe these and not to contemn them.

Next, Basil reports not only certain rites but also certain essentials, as confession of faith, that is, the Apostles' Creed, which we have from tradition, and anointing with oil in the sacrament of confirmation; he mentions also certain other things that, although not of themselves necessary, yet after they have been prescribed are so necessary that to omit them purposely is to sin gravely, as the sign of the cross in the blessing of water, of the Eucharist, of the chrism; also the renunciation of Satan and his pomps in baptism etc. For Augustine says tract.118 on *John* that without the sign of the cross no sacrament is rightly performed, and the same is taught by Chrysostom in homil.55 on *Matthew*.

But Brentius is more shameless and replies that these opinions of Basil are from the faults and errors of Basil which, for honor of so great a man, should be covered in silence; and he calls us pigs and imitators of Ham who uncover the ugliness of our Fathers. For he does not think one must accept what Basil says, that pedagogical traditions (as he calls them) about the sign of the cross and blessed water have the same force for piety as the dogmas of holy Scripture.

But passing over the insults, for it is not our job to return evil for evil, I reply to what Brentius objects, that traditions are most rightly equated with the Scriptures. For as there are in the Scriptures some great commands, as to love God, there are also some minor ones, as not to say an idle word, which do not equally oblige for observance but yet which oblige for faith and veneration. For he is no less a heretic who does not believe or does not venerate the Scripture which says, "They will render account for every idle word in the day of judgment," than he who does not believe or does not venerate the Scripture which says, "You will love the Lord your God etc." So also in the case of traditions some are greater and some lesser as to obligation of action, and yet all equally oblige for faith and veneration. And in the same way there are certain traditions that, as to obligation, are greater than some Scriptures, some lesser, some equal, although however all traditions and all Scriptures are equal as to the faith and veneration that is due to them, since they come from the same author God, and come to us through the hands of the same Catholic Church, which is our mother and spouse of Christ.

Next, Hermann, not content with what Brentius and Chemnitz had said, adds, "All these things are not Basil's, but inserted into Basil's book by some good for nothing fellow." Which to be sure is a very expeditious response, for thus it is easy to solve all arguments. Hermann brings forward no other proof than the testimony of Erasmus, who seemed to himself to have sniffed out in these chapters some difference of style from the preceding ones. But Blessed John Damascene, much older and more learned, and more versed in the writings of Basil, could sniff out nothing such. For he (to pass over several more recent writers) speaks as follows in *orat.1* for sacred images, "Thus does Basil literally say in ch.27 of this book, which he writes about the Holy Spirit in 30 distinct chapters to Amphilochius. 'The institutes that are kept and preached in the Church are partly from written doctrine, partly from the tradition of the Apostles'."

Gregory Nazianzen in *orat.1* against Julian beyond the middle, after he had said that because of the dogmas of the Old and New Testament the doctrine of the



Church seemed marvelous to Julian, he immediately adds, "Besides," he says, "it is greater and more signal because of the figures that we keep as received from tradition up to today, etc." He explains later that he calls figures of the Church the discipline, the governance, the order of the Church, the reason of singing Psalms, the mode of imposing penance, sacred things in temples, the life of monks and virgins, and many other things which we have from tradition alone. All these things Julian wanted the heathen to imitate, so as in this way to draw Christians more easily to paganism.

Chrysostom on II *Thessalonians* ch.2 says, "It is plain that the Apostles did not hand on everything by epistle, but many things without writing. But the former and the latter are deserving of the same faith." The same is contained in Theophylact and Oecumenius. Here one must note, since Basil, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius equate the traditions with the Scriptures, what one must think of the censure of Chemnitz, who says, "It is a signal audacity to equate anything with Scripture in authority and majesty." And everywhere he mocks the Council of Trent which venerates traditions and Scripture with equal affection of piety. The same Chrysostom in hom.69 to the people, and hom.3 on *Philippians*, says, "Not in vain was it sanctioned by the Apostles that in the celebration of the venerable mysteries memorial should be had of those who have departed hence. They knew that much gain was done them from here, and much utility."

Theophylact bks.1 and 3 on Easter expressively teaches that the law of fasting is Apostolic tradition. Cyril of Jerusalem in his mystagogic catechisms explains almost nothing other than unwritten traditions about baptism and the other sacraments. Epiphanius *Heresy* 55, which is of Melchisedekians, says, "Limits have been placed for us, and foundations, and a building of faith, and traditions of the Apostles, and sacred Scriptures, and successions of doctrine, and everywhere the truth of God is reinforced; and let no one be deceived by new fables." Again *Heresy* 61, which is of the Apostolici, he says, "One must also use tradition, for not everything can be received from divine Scripture. Wherefore the holy Apostles handed on some things in the Scriptures, other things in tradition."

To this the adversaries respond nothing save by blaspheming that Epiphanius was too delighted with traditions and apocryphal fables etc. And among other things Brentius thinks that what Epiphanius said is not to be borne, that it is Apostolic tradition that it is not licit to marry after giving a vow of virginity; since to be sure the first parents of the Lutherans did that, Luther and Catherine. But these things will be refuted elsewhere in their place.

From the Latins, Tertullian in the *Crown of the Soldier* says, "Even in the pretension of tradition there is required, you say, written authority. Therefore let us ask whether unwritten tradition should be accepted. Clearly we will deny it should be accepted if there is no indication already from examples of other observances which without instrument of any Scripture, by title of tradition alone, we thence vindicate for the patrimony of custom." Then having enumerated the ceremonies of baptism, sign of the cross, annual sacrifices for the dead, and certain others, he adds, "If you require a law of the Scriptures for these and like disciplines, you will find none; tradition is given you as author, custom as confirmer, and faith as observer." He everywhere teaches tradition should be used, *Against Marcion* bk.1, on the

*Veiling of Virgins, on Prescription*, where he teaches that heretics are not to be refuted from Scripture but from tradition. What the adversaries respond to these places was already refuted when we dealt with Irenaeus and Basil.

Blessed Cyril bk.1 epist.12, "He who is baptized must also be anointed etc." But it is plain that nothing about chrism is contained in the Scriptures but only in tradition. The same in bk.2 epist.3, "Know that we are advised that in offering the chalice the tradition of the Lord be kept, and that we do nothing other than what the Lord first did for us, that the chalice, which is offered in commemoration of him, be offered mixed with wine." Chemnitz responds that Cyprian is speaking of written tradition. But it is false, for the Evangelists do not mention water. Hermann says that because it is not written that the Lord put water in the chalice it is better not to put it in; for thus did the Lord do. But since neither is written it is remarkable wherefrom Hermann assumes so much for himself, that he should wish himself rather than Cyprian to be believed.

Brentius turns himself to insults, for he says that Cyprian is always excessive in asserting his opinions; and that these things came from him unthinkingly. And Brentius' reason is that Cyprian seems to prove this rite by an inappropriate reason. For he says: "One must mix water with wine because the wine signifies Christ and the water the people of the Church; and when the water is mixed with the wine the Church is joined to Christ, but if wine alone were consecrated then Christ would begin to be without the Church. Which certainly seems ridiculous. For who believes that if one priest did not mix water with wine in the chalice Christ would soon lose the Church?" But Brentius did not notice, or perhaps did not want to notice, that Cyprian is not dealing with real but with signified conjunction or separation of Christ and the Church. For most correctly in the matter of the sacraments we are increased by imperfect signifying. Besides Cyprian does not mean that this rite is observed for this reason in particular, but because the Lord so taught. But the reason is added to show that tradition is conform to reason. Wherefore even if Cyprian had not adduced a fitting reason, it should not therefore be denied that this rite is to be observed or that it was handed on by the Lord.

St. Hilary in his book against the Emperor Constantius, about the middle, when the Arian prince objects, "I do not want words that are not written to be read," replies, "This finally I ask, who commands the Bishops? Who forbids the form of Apostolic preaching? Say first if you think it rightly said, I do not wish to bring new preparations of medicine against new poisons etc." In which words Hilary indicates two things: one, the preaching of the consubstantiality of Father and Son is of Apostolic preaching, although it is not expressly written that the Son is consubstantial with the Father; the second, that the name 'consubstantial' is indeed new but must yet be retained, although it is not written, because it is conform to Apostolic preaching.

Hermann distorts this place in his gloss, for he expounds it thus. "This I ask," he says, "who commands the Bishops, that is, to bring forward something outside Scripture." But if this is a good gloss then Hilary is agreeing with Constantius; therefore he badly adds, "Say first if you think it rightly said, I do not wish etc." What of the fact that in almost the whole book he is dealing with this, that the name

'consubstantial' should be retained? Hermann would rather have wanted it abolished.

St. Ambrose in his book about those who are initiated in the mysteries, chs.2 and 6, and on *Sacraments* bk.1 chs.1-2, explains the rites that are kept by the whole Church in baptism, which are nowhere found written down in the divine letters, and which others constantly refer to Apostolic authors. In serm.25, 34, and 36 he teaches that Lent was prescribed by Christ. In epist.81 and serm.38 he teaches that the Apostles' Creed is unwritten Apostolic tradition. Hermann blasphemes much against Ambrose, but in nothing damages our claim.

St. Jerome in his epistle to Marcella on the errors of Montanus says, "We fast for one period of forty days by Apostolic tradition at the time fitting for us." In his *Dialogue against the Luciferians*, before the middle, when the heretic had said, "Many things that are observed by tradition in the Church have usurped for themselves the authority of written law," the orthodox respondent says, "I do not indeed deny that this is the custom of the Churches. But what sort of thing is it that you make the laws of the Church to be heresy?"

St. Augustine in epist.118, "The things we guard that are not written but handed on, which indeed are kept in the whole world, are given to be understood as commanded and established either by the Apostles themselves to be retained, or by plenary Councils, whose authority is very healthy in the Church; just as that the passion, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord into heaven and the coming of the Holy Spirit from heaven are celebrated in annual solemnities." To this Hermann responds by chattering much and in the end concluding, "Why, Augustine, do you obtrude on the Church along with the other Fathers traditions from outside Scripture?" Therefore Hermann confesses that Augustine along with the other Fathers recognizes unwritten traditions. Which confession ought certainly to be enough, if he had any sanity, to check his petulancy.

But Brentius responds in two ways. First he says that if it is true that this is Apostolic tradition, it should not be accepted as a necessary law but as a free observance. But on the contrary, for Augustine adds in the same place, "But the other things that vary by place of lands or regions etc. they have as free observances." Here Augustine distinguishes between these necessary Apostolic traditions and free observances. Second Brentius says that Augustine falsely teaches that this feast is from Apostolic tradition, since the Apostle rebukes the Galatians ch.4 for observing days and times. But Augustine responds in epistle 119 ch.7 that the Apostle is censuring those who observed times according to the rules of astrologers. And in his book against Adimantus ch.16 he says that the Apostle is speaking of feasts of the Jews not of Christians. In this way too Jerome and Chrysostom expound, but Ambrose embraces each exposition at the same time.

Now the same Augustine in bk.2 on *Baptism against the Donatists* ch.7 says, "This custom I believe comes from Apostolic tradition, just as many things are not found in their writings nor in the later councils, and yet because they are guarded by the universal Church they are believed to have been handed on and commended only by them." And bk.4 ch.6, "The custom which even then men, looking backwards, did not see instituted by later people, is rightly believed to have been handed on by the Apostles." And bk.4 ch.24, "What the universal Church holds and which was not

instituted by Councils but was always retained, is very rightly believed to have been handed on by Apostolic tradition." And bk.5 ch.23, "The Apostles indeed prescribed nothing then, but the custom which was opposed to Cyprian must be believed to have taken its beginning from their tradition, as are many things that the universal Church holds, and for this reason are well believed to have been prescribed by the Apostles, although nothing written is found." Again in his book on the *Unity of the Church* ch.19, "Here perhaps you say, tell me how Christ commanded those to be received who want to pass from the heretics into the Church. This neither I nor you read openly and evidently." And later he adds, "Since this is nowhere read, it is believed on the testimony of the Church, which Church Christ testified to be true." Like things are contained in *Against Cresconius* bk.1 chs.31-33.

To this Chemnitz gives two responses. First that Augustine's question in this places is whether an example can be produced from Scripture in which a heretic was taught to have been rebaptized or received without new baptism; but not whether heretics should or should not be rebaptized; and indeed Augustine thought that no such example could be produced, and this he teaches in the cited places. Second he says that Augustine without doubt believed that there exist certain and open testimonies in the Scriptures by which it is proved that heretics are not to be rebaptized; therefore this tradition is written.

The first point he proves from *Against Cresconius* bk.1 ch.33, where Augustine says, "Therefore although no certain example of this thing can be produced from the canonical Scriptures etc." and like things are contained in his book on the *Unity of the Church* ch.19. He proves the second point first from *Against the Donatists* bk.1 ch.7, "Lest I seem to be acting on human arguments, I produce certain teachings from the Gospel." Second from bk.2 ch.14, "What is more pernicious, whether not to baptize or to rebaptize, is difficult to judge. Yet having recourse to the Lord's balance, where the weight of things is measured not by human sense but by divine authority, I find an opinion of the Lord about both matters." Third from bk.4 ch.7, "Add to this that, when the reasons and the testimonies of the Scriptures about this dispute are looked at from both sides, it can also be said what the truth has declared, and this we follow." Fourth from bk.4 ch.24, "It can truly be conjectured from the circumcision of the flesh that the sacrament of baptism for children is valid, etc." Fifth from bk.5 ch.41, "From the custom of the Church and the later support of plenary Councils and from so many and so great testimonies of the sacred Scriptures and the perspicuous reasons of truth, anyone understands that the baptism of Christ consecrated with the words of the Gospel is not made perverse by the perversity of any man." Sixth from bk.6 ch.1, "That could now suffice which we have shown by reasons so often repeated, joined also with the teachings of the Scriptures." Seventh from bk.5 ch.23, "That it is against the command of God that those who come from heretics should be baptized, if they have already received the baptism of Christ, is not only shown from the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures but plainly shown." Eighth from bk.5 ch.26, "What he admonishes us, that we should return to the source, that is, to Apostolic tradition, and from there direct the channel to our own times, is very good and without doubt to be done. It has therefore been handed on to us by the Apostles, as he himself records, that there is one God, one baptism."

I reply to the first that Chemnitz is deceived. For although Augustine in that one place from *Against Cresconius* bk.1 ch.33 is dealing with examples, yet in the other places cited he is not dealing with examples but with precepts or teachings of Scripture, especially in *Against the Donatists* bk.5 ch.23, when he says, "What the universal Church holds is well believed to be a precept from the Apostles, although it is not found written down." Besides, even in that one place, the chief question was not about an example or about the fact but about the right. For it is clear that he is dealing with the question of rebaptism that existed between the Catholics and the Donatists; but it is certain that the Donatists contested not about examples but about the right.

But because in the disputing the heretics had required the Catholics to show some example in the Scriptures of someone received by the Church without baptism, Augustine responded that there were no examples in the Scriptures neither on one side nor on the other; and hence he concluded that, since there are in the Scriptures not only no precepts but also no examples, one should stand on the custom of the Church, which is very rightly believed to have been introduced by the Apostles. And that things are so is plain both from those places themselves and from the fact that, if the chief question were about examples, the Donatists would not have been heretics nor would they in any way have erred; for what they were saying was very true, and Augustine even agrees with them, that no example is extant in Scripture about this matter.

To the second I say two things. First that we do not adduce the places of Augustine chiefly because of his saying that the custom of not rebaptizing is from Apostolic tradition, but because of his adding in those places that many things are kept by Apostolic tradition that are not written down. For this principle is so certain in Augustine that he wishes to prove from it that even the custom of not rebaptizing was handed on by the Apostles. Therefore we rest more on this principle of Augustine than on his conclusion. Chemnitz however opposes us as if we rested on the conclusion alone.

I say second that Augustine never thought that this very custom could be sufficiently proved from the Scriptures; and therefore indeed he adduced reasons and Scriptures from anywhere, yet he established the chief foundation on the tradition that the custom of the Church declared, as is plain both from the places cited and from *Against the Donatists* bk.2 ch.4, where he does not think the testimonies of Scripture on this matter are so clear that he says, "Nor would we dare to assert anything unless we were strengthened by the most agreed authority of the universal Church." And it will be even more clear in the response to the individual places noted by Chemnitz.

To the first from *Against the Donatists* bk.1 ch.7 I reply that by the bad faith of Chemnitz words have been omitted that were in the middle, and that the first have been joined with the last. For after Augustine had said "Now lest I seem to be acting on human arguments," he subjoins what Chemnitz omitted, "since the obscurity of this question has compelled great men to be long in flux until by a plenary Council of the whole world what it was most salutary to think was confirmed and doubts were removed;" and then finally he adds, "from the Gospel I bring forward certain teachings."

Therefore Augustine said that the question could not be settled from the Scriptures before a plenary Council of the Church, but after the Council had explained the doubt and the whole question, then could certain teachings of Scripture be brought forward. For once the Scriptures had been explained by the Council, they firmly and certainly prove what before they did not firmly prove. That this is also true is shown by the place from the Gospel that Blessed Augustine brings forward. For he brings forward the verse of *Luke* ch9, "Do not prevent them, for who is not against you is for you." By which place he shows that there can be some gifts of God outside the Church, as was that gift of expelling demons. But whether baptism was to be numbered among them cannot be collected from that place alone.

To the second I reply that the place is not to the purpose; for there Augustine proves from the Scriptures that it is not licit to rebaptize when someone has once received true baptism in the Catholic Church; but he does not prove that the baptism of heretics is true baptism, which is our question. For he wanted to teach in that place that those can be admitted into the Church through penance who acknowledged that they did badly by rebaptizing Catholics. For he does not bring forward any other testimony of Scripture save that of *John* ch.13, "He who is washed does not need to wash again." From which place no one collects that the baptism of heretics is valid, but only (as Augustine collects) that after true baptism no other baptism is to be added, which even the Donatists did not deny.

To the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth I say that Augustine is there bringing forward conjectures from the Scriptures that, after definition by the Council and investigation of unwritten tradition, add something to confirm the truth but are by themselves not enough. This is plain from the words of Augustine where he always puts the Scriptures after custom and the Council, and uses these words, "Add to this that we can make conjecture; when the Scriptures too are added, etc."

To the seventh I say that Chemnitz has quoted in bad faith. For the words ("it is plainly shown by testimonies of the sacred Scriptures") do not refer to the preceding words that Chemnitz sets down, but to the following ones about which he is silent. For thus does Augustine speak, "It is plainly shown that many false Christians, although they do not have the same charity as the saints, without which whatever the saints could have had does not profit them, yet they have baptism in common with the saints." Here Blessed Augustine says that it is certain from the Scriptures that many Christians baptized in the Church lose charity but do not lose baptism, which even the Donatists conceded; but he does not say that it is certain from the Scriptures that baptism given by heretics is valid.

Besides, even if those words referred to the preceding ones, Chemnitz would still not have anything. For there too Augustine is not saying that it is certain the baptism of heretics is valid, but he says it is certain that he who has received the true baptism of Christ should not be rebaptized, which even the Donatists conceded; but the question afterwards remained whether the baptism of heretics was the true baptism of Christ or not.

To the eighth I say that Augustine does not there prove his opinion from the Scriptures but he relates the Scripture by which the adversaries were trying to prove the contrary opinion.

*Chapter Eight: The Same is Proved by Four Other Arguments*

Besides this common consent of the Fathers, the same thing is proved by the consensus of the heretics in their contempt for traditions. For as we collect from the common consent of the holy Fathers of all ages, who accept traditions, that the traditions are to be accepted, so we collect from the common consent of the heretics all ages, who reject traditions, that traditions are not to be rejected. About the Valentinians, the Marcionists, and the like Irenaeus gives witness bk.3 ch.2, and Tertullian on *Prescription* that they rejected the unwritten traditions of the Church.

Cyprian too, when he wanted to defend the error of rebaptism, could do no other than appeal from tradition to Scripture, as is plain from his epistle to Pompeius and from another to Iubaianus. Although Cyprian had recognized traditions before, as we showed above; and even his later error he is reckoned by Blessed Augustine, in epist.8 to Vincentius, to have corrected before death.

The Donatists too always urge the Scriptures, and Blessed Augustine, in his book on the *Unity of the Church* ch.19 and elsewhere, objects to them the traditions and the custom of the Church.

That the Arians in no way allowed anything besides the Scriptures is evidenced by Hilary, who in his book *Against Constantius* introduces an Arian saying, "I do not wish to read words that are not written." Maximus the Arian in Augustine *Against Maximinus* at the beginning speaks thus, "If you bring forward something that is common to all from the Scriptures we must listen, but those words that are outside the Scriptures are in no case received by us. Furthermore, because the Lord himself warns us and says, 'Without cause they worship me teaching as commands the precepts of men'." The same is evidenced by Epiphanius *Heresy* 69 and 73.

That the Arians also rejected traditions is written by Epiphanius *Heresy* 75. The same thing about the Eunomians is plain from Basil in his book on the *Holy Spirit* chs.27 and 29. The same about Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus is reported by Basil Bishop of Ancyra in his *Catholic Confession*, which was read in the Seventh Synod, first act; and the same about the Apostolici of his own time by Bernard in *Homil.66 on Song of Songs*. The same of John Wycliffe by Thomas Waldenses in *Doctrine of the Ancient Faith* bk2 ch.19. From these as from their hands have the Lutherans taken their own dogma about contemning traditions, just as we have been taught by the holy Fathers about receiving the same with all honor.

To these add the custom of all nations. For the Jews had some traditions outside Scripture as is taught by Origen *Homil.5 on Numbers* and in his commentary on *Romans* ch.3, and by Hilary on *Psalms* 2, and also by Anatolius, a very ancient Christian author, in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.7 ch.28. And although there are not lacking some Catholics who deny there was any unwritten tradition among the Jews, yet I cannot agree with them; since, as we showed above, the old written law did not sufficiently contain everything, and for a long time that people, even after the birth of Moses, lived without written law.

Next all the profane republics were ruled in large part by unwritten laws. Pericles in Thucydides divides Athenian law into written and unwritten. Aristotle in *Politics* bk.3 ch.11 establishes that the city should be ruled in part by the best laws and in part by the judgment of the best man, in *Ethics* bk.5 ch.4 he calls a judge or

arbiter a living law, because, namely, there was some other written law that was as it were not living. Further Lycurgus wanted to give no written law to the Spartans, as Plutarch says, but to live by traditions alone, so that they might be more careful in living than in reading. That the same pleased Cicero is evident from his *Laws* bk.1, and Caesar, *Gallic War* bk.6, writes the same about the wise men among the Gauls.

The most noble of the philosophers, Pythagoras and Socrates, although they taught much, yet wrote nothing, as Blessed Augustine teaches on the *Harmony of the Gospels* bk.1 ch.7, save that Socrates imitated in verse the fables written by Aesop. Lastly in civil law the same authority is attributed to written law as to unwritten custom. Therefore nature itself in some way seems to exclaim that unwritten traditions are necessary or certainly very useful.

Add the dignity of the Catholic Church. For as once the Jews excelled all nations, because to them were given the words of God, as is said in *Romans* ch.3, so now the Catholic Church stands above all sects, because it alone, as being the spouse of Christ, knows all the mysteries of the true religion and is conscious of the secrets of the spouse, and therefore is called the pillar and ground of the truth, I *Timothy* ch.3. But if everything was written and very openly, as the heretics wish, the Church would have no privilege. For the heretics, pagans, and Jews would know nothing less about the mysteries of our faith than we ourselves and our priests know; nor would what Irenaeus says, bk.3 ch.4, be true that into the Church alone, as into a rich treasure house, the knowledge of divine things has been deposited by the Apostles.

Add finally the dignity of many mysteries which require silence, nor is it fitting that they be explained in the Scriptures, which are read in the whole world. For if it is not licit to admit anyone not baptized to see the tremendous mysteries of the mass, how will it be licit to hand on the same writings to them? Hence the Lord explained separately to the disciples the parables that he spoke to the people, *Luke* ch.8, and the Apostle says I *Corinthians* ch.2, "we speak wisdom among the perfect." And the ancients, when they speak about the sacrament of the Eucharist, are everywhere accustomed to say, "the faithful know, the initiates know." This reason is touched on by *Dionysius Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* ch.1, by Origen *Homil.5* on *Numbers*, by Basil on the *Holy Spirit* ch.27, and by Innocent I in epist.1.

#### *Chapter Nine: Five Rules are Explained by which we Come to Knowledge of True Traditions*

It now follows for us to show by what ways and reasons we can investigate which are the true and genuine traditions of the Apostles.

So the first rule is: when the universal Church embraces something as a dogma of faith which is not found in divine letters, one must say that it is possessed from a tradition of the Apostles. The reason for this is that since the universal Church cannot err, for it is the pillar and ground of the truth, I *Timothy* ch.3, and since about it the Lord said, *Matthew* ch.16, "The gates of hell will not prevail against it," then certainly what the Church *de fide* believes is without doubt *de fide*; but nothing is *de fide* save what God has revealed by the Apostles or Prophets, or what is evidently therefrom deduced. For the Church is not ruled by new revelations but abides in those which those handed on who were ministers of the word, and therefore is it said in *Ephesians* ch.2, "Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and



Prophets.” Therefore all the things that the Church holds by faith were handed on by the Apostles or the Prophets, in writing or in speech. Of such sort is the perpetual virginity of Blessed Mary, the number of the canonical books, and the like.

The second rule is: when the universal Church keeps something that no one could have established save God, which however is nowhere found written down, one must say that it is handed down from Christ and his Apostles. The reason is similar to the preceding one. For the universal Church can not only not err in believing but neither in working, and especially in divine rite and cult; and rightly does Augustine in *epist.118* teach that it is a mark of the most insolent insanity to think what is done by the universal Church is not rightly done. Therefore what the Church cannot rightly keep unless it was instituted by God and yet does keep, one must say was instituted by God, even if it is not read anywhere. Such is the baptism of children. For the Church would err very gravely if without the command of God it baptized children who do not actually believe. Wherefore Augustine in *bk.10 on Genesis ch.23* says, “The custom of mother Church for baptizing children must in no way be spurned, nor in any way thought to be superfluous, nor is it to be altogether believed unless it were an Apostolic tradition.” Such also is that the baptism of heretics is valid, and therefore Augustine always refers the command not to rebaptize those baptized by heretics to the tradition of the Apostles. For neither can the Church give authority to baptism if it does not have it from Christ.

The third rule is: what has been kept in the universal Church and for all past time is rightly believed to have been instituted by the Apostles, even if it is such that it could have been instituted by the Church. This rule is from Augustine *Against the Donatists bk.4 ch.24*. An example is the forty day Lenten fast; for that could have been instituted by the Church if Christ or the Apostles had not instituted it, yet we say and prove that it was instituted by Christ or the Apostles; for by going back up in time and seeking the origin of this institution, we do not find it save in the time of the Apostles; although Calvin *Institutes bk.4 ch.12 sect.20* teaches the forty day Lenten fast is mere superstition, and was handed on neither by Christ nor the Apostles, but was thought out by later people through evil zeal.

Blessed Bernard *serm.3* on the Lenten fast says, “Hitherto we fast alone up to the ninth hour, but now (in Lent) we will all fast up to vespers with each other, kings and princes, nobles and peasants, clergy and people, rich and poor together in one.” Before Bernard, Gregory in *Homil.16* on the Gospels makes mention of the Lenten fast, giving a reason that we fast for forty days. Before Gregory Leo in his twelve sermons on Lent. Before him Augustine in *epists.118* and *119*, and *serm.44* on Lent. Before him Jerome on *Matthew ch.9* and *Jonah ch.3*, and elsewhere. Paulinus in *epist.6* to Amandus. Chrysostom in *Homily on Genesis* and elsewhere. Before these Ambrose in his eight sermons on Lent. Epiphanius in his doctrinal compendium. Basil in his second prayer on fasting. Nazianzen on holy washing, and Cyril in *Catechesis 5*. Before these Origen *Homil.10 on Leviticus*; before him Irenaeus in Eusebius *Hist. bk.5 ch.24*; before him Pope Telesphorus in his decretal epistle; before him Ignatius in his epistle to the Philippians, and Clement *Constit. bk.5 ch.13 can.68* of the Apostles.

For like reason Calvin *Institutes bk.4 ch.19 sect.24* says that minor orders are a novel invention which is nowhere read about save in silly advocates, Sorbonists

and Canonists. But we show from the posited rule that it is of Apostolic tradition. For before all the Sorbonists and Canonists was Isidore, who in *Etymologies* bk.7 ch.12 enumerates the individual orders and expounds the reason for their names. Before Isidore was the IV Council of Carthage, in which in chs.1-10 is handed on by what rite Bishops are ordained, and priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, lectors, exorcists, porters. And before this Council was Jerome, who on *Titus* ch.2 enumerates all the orders, besides acolytes, of which he makes mention in his epistle to Nepotianus on the life of clerics.

Before Jerome was the Council of Laodicea in whose ch.24 are named all the minor orders. Before this Council Pope Cornelius in epistle to Fabius of Antioch, as it is in Eusebius *Hist.* bk.6 ch.33, asserts that in the Roman Church in his time there were, besides the Bishop, 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, and 52 exorcists along with lectors and porters. But even before Cornelius Ignatius salutes by name all the orders in his epistle to the Antiochans.

The fourth rule is: when all the doctors of the Church teach by common consent that something comes down from Apostolic tradition, whether gathered in a general Council or writing separately in their books, this is to be believed to be Apostolic tradition. The reason for this rule is if all doctors of the Church, when they agree in some opinion, could err, the whole Church would err, since it is held to follow and does follow its doctors. An example of the first is the veneration of images, which the doctors of the Church gathered in the II Council of Nicea, final act, asserted was from Apostolic tradition. An example of the second can scarce be found, if altogether all Fathers who wrote should expressly say something; yet it seems to suffice if some Fathers of great name expressly assert it, and the rest do not contradict although, however, they make mention of the thing; for then that opinion can be said not rashly to belong to them all. For when in a grave matter one of the ancients erred, always many are found who contradict.

By this rule we prove that the rites observed in baptism are of Apostolic tradition; namely that he who is baptized be baptized with water first blessed by the priest; that he be ordered to renounce Satan and his pomps; that he be signed with the sign of the cross; that he be anointed with blessed oil, etc. For the same is expressively asserted by Basil on the *Holy Spirit* ch.27, by Tertullian on the *Crown of the Soldier*, and by certain others. But no one has ever contradicted, since there is almost no ancient writer who does not mention these ceremonies as received by all in the Church. For like reason that Lent is a divine or Apostolic tradition can also be firmly proved by this rule, because it is expressively asserted by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Ambrose, Leo, and non contradicts, although yet all make mention of this observance.

The fifth rule is that that is without doubt to be believed to descend from Apostolic tradition which is held as such in those Churches where the succession from the Apostles is complete and continued. This rule is handed on by Irenaeus bk.3 ch.3, by Tertullian in his book *On Prescription*. The reason for the rule is that the Apostles handed on to their successors, together with the office of Bishop, also the doctrine of religion.

If therefore by ascending in some Church through the Bishops succeeding each other we come to some Apostle, and if it cannot be shown that any of those

Bishops introduced a new doctrine, we are certain that Apostolic traditions are preserved there. And indeed there was once found an uninterrupted succession not only at Rome, but also at Ephesus, Corinth, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and elsewhere; and for this reason Tertullian refers men to any of the Apostolic Churches to find there the Apostolic traditions; and Theodosius I, all peoples, canon on the Supreme Trinity and the Catholic Faith, commands all to keep the same faith that was preached at that time in Rome by Damasus and in Alexandria by Peter, the two Pontiffs of the chief Apostolic Churches. But now there is lacking a definite succession in all the Apostolic Churches besides the Roman, and therefore from the testimony of this Church alone can a definite argument be taken to prove Apostolic traditions; and then especially when the doctrine or the rites of those Churches differ from the doctrine and rites of the Roman Church.

*Chapter Ten: The Objections of the Adversaries Taken from the Scriptures are Solved*

The last part of the question remains, in which the arguments of the adversaries must be expounded and solved. There are three kinds of arguments, of which the first they take from the Scriptures, the second from the Fathers, the third from reasons. From the Scriptures they propose, first, those passages that command that nothing should be added to the word of God; second those that expressly teach the Scriptures are sufficient and contain everything necessary; third those that openly condemn traditions.

The first argument then is clear from three places. *Deuteronomy* chs.4 and 12, "You will not add to the word that I prescribe to you, nor will you take away from it." The last chapter of the *Apocalypse*, "If anyone adds to this etc." *Galatians* ch.1, "But if we or an angel from heaven should preach another gospel besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." Here Chemnitz notes that it is not said 'against' but 'besides'. And lest we say that Paul is speaking of both written and unwritten word, he adduces Augustine giving this exposition *Against the letters of Petilianus* ch.6, "If anyone whether about Christ, or about his Church, or about any other thing that pertains to our faith and life, I do not say if we, but what Paul adds, 'if an angel from heaven announce to you other than what is in legal and Evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema.'" Like things are contained in Basil in his sum of morals, sum 72 ch.1.

To the first I reply, first that there it is not a question of the written word but of what is handed on viva voce; for he does not say 'to the word that I have written' but 'that I prescribe'. Second I say that the true exposition of this place is that God wishes his commands to be kept completely and perfectly as he himself prescribed, and not to be distorted in any way by a false interpretation. Therefore he does not mean to say that you will not keep other than what I now prescribe, but that in what I prescribe you will not change anything by adding or lessening but you will do completely as I command and not otherwise. This same thing Scripture is wont to signify in these words, "You will not decline to the right, nor to the left." And that this is true is plain; because otherwise the Prophets and Apostles, who added so many things later, would have sinned.

Brentius, Chemnitz, and Calvin reply that the Prophets did not add anything to the law as far as doctrine is concerned, but they only wrote certain prophecies

about the future and explained the doctrine of the law. The New Testament too is not an addition to the Old but an explanation of it; since the Apostle says *Romans* ch.1 that the Gospel was promised by God through the Prophets in the sacred Scriptures. And *Acts* ch.15 the Apostles in the Council did not dare to decree anything without the testimony of Scripture.

But on the contrary, for in this way even the traditions are not additions but explanations. For in the law of Moses the writings of the Prophets are not contained, nor in the law and Prophets is the New Testament contained save in general terms and in a certain way virtually, as the whole tree is contained in the seed. For we have in the law, *Deuteronomy* ch.18, "God will raise up a Prophet for you and him you will hear." Now there is contained there in general whatever Christ did and said; but yet that in particular Christ should preach the Trinity of persons in God, institute the sacraments, do such miracles, etc. is not contained there.

But what they allege from *Acts* ch.15 is against them. For although James in that Council proved from the Scriptures that the Church was to be built from the Gentiles, yet the decree of the Council is nowhere found in the scriptures of the New Testament. For they decreed that the Gentiles should not keep the legal provisions save, however, for abstinence from blood and suffocated animals, of which decree the second part is nowhere read in the Old Testament. For where, I ask, did any Prophet predict that in the times of the Messiah suffocated animals and blood were to be prohibited?

Thus too what is written in II *Thessalonians* ch.2, "Hold the traditions that you have received, whether by speech or by epistle." And *Luke* ch.10, "He who hears you hears me." And *Matthew* ch.18, "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to you as a heathen and a publican." Therefore we affirm that the traditions are in some way explanations of the written word, not that it contains its bare exposition, but because all the traditions and decrees of the Church are contained in the Scriptures in general; but they are not contained in particular nor should they be. Wherefore Augustine *Against Cresconius* bk.1 ch.33 says, "Although a certain example is not produced from the Scripture, yet the truth of the same scriptures is held by us, since we do what pleases the universal Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves commend."

To the second it is certain that John there prohibits the corruption of that book but not that other books should not be written or other dogmas handed on, otherwise he would have been in conflict with himself, who, according to Chemnitz in his *Examination* p.202, wrote his *Gospel* after the *Apocalypse*.

To the third, on which Brentius and Chemnitz very much rely, there is a double solution and both are solid. The first is that the Apostle is not speaking of the written word alone, but of every word whether written or handed on. For he does not say, 'if anyone preach to you a gospel besides what we have written', but 'besides what we have preached'. Nor are the words of Augustine or of Basil an obstacle, for they are not expressly treating of this place, but they are proving from this place that it is not licit to assert anything contrary to the Scriptures, which is very true. For when Paul speaks in general of Apostolic preaching, and that partly written and partly not written, we can thence rightly prove that it is not licit to assert anything against the written preaching of the Apostles. For from the negation

of a universal an argument to negation of the particular is rightly deduced, but not contrariwise. And likewise we can from this word of Paul argue against those who preach against the traditions of the Church already received, even if they seem to be preaching from the Scriptures, as Athanasius beautifully teaches in his book on the *Incarnation of the Word*, and Cyril, citing Athanasius in his book on *Right Faith to Queens*, not far from the beginning.

The second solution is that by the word 'besides' the Apostle understands 'against'; and therefore he does not prohibit new dogmas and precepts, provided they are not contrary to what has already been handed on; but he prohibits contrary and alien dogmas and precepts. This is plain first because the Apostle himself afterwards taught many other things; and after this epistle John wrote the *Apocalypse* and his *Gospel*. Second, from the purpose of the Apostle; for he is acting against those who taught that the legal provisions should be kept since he himself taught they should not kept. Therefore when he says 'besides' he understands 'against'. Third, from another place where the Apostle thus uses this word 'besides'. For in the last chapter of *Romans* he says, "Observe those who cause dissensions and offenses besides the doctrine which you have received." In this place it is so clear that the 'besides' signifies 'against' that Erasmus translates it as 'against'. But in both places the Greek words is the same. Fourth, from the exposition of the Fathers. St. Ambrose expounds 'if against', St. Jerome 'if otherwise', Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact teach that the Apostle did not say 'if contrary things' but 'if besides that which etc.', to indicate that he not only anathematizes those who teach things openly contrary to the whole doctrine, but also those who in whatever way, whether openly or obliquely, fall away in anything from the doctrine handed on.

St. Basil in his sum of morals 72 ch.1 (which place Chemnitz quoted in his own favor) teaches that from this place is got that those are to be received who hand on what is consonant with the Scriptures; those to be rejected who hand on what is foreign to them. Lastly, St. Augustine *Against Faustus* bk.17 ch.3 expounds 'against', and in tract.98 on *John* speaks as follows, "He does not say, 'more than you have received', but 'besides that which you have received'. For if he said that he would be prejudicial against himself, since he wanted to come to the Thessalonians to supply what was lacking to their faith. But he who supplies adds what was less but does not take away what was present. But he who goes beside the rule of faith does not walk in the way but departs from the way, etc."

The second argument they take from those places that seem to indicate that Scripture sufficiently contains everything, which are two. The first is *John* ch.20, "Many other signs indeed did Jesus do that are not written in this book; but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." Where John indicates that he has written, not indeed everything, but the things that were sufficient. For if we can have life through the things that are written, what more do we want?

Chemnitz gives a confirmation from three testimonies of the ancients. Augustine tract.49 on *John*, "The holy Evangelist testifies," he says, "that the Lord Christ said and did many things that are not written. Those things were chosen to be written that seemed sufficient for the salvation of believers." The same Augustine on the *Harmony of the Gospels* bk.1 last chapter says, "Whatever Christ wanted us to

read about his deeds and words this he commanded to be written by his Apostles as by his hands." Cyril bk.12 on *John* last chapter, "Not everything," he says, "that the Lord did has been written down, but what they thought by writing sufficed both for morals and dogmas, so that by right faith and works we might reach the kingdom of heaven."

The second place is II *Timothy* ch.3, "All Scripture divinely inspired is useful for teaching, for convicting, for reproof, for educating in justice so that the man of God might be perfect, instructed for every good work." This place is the Achilles of Brentius and Chemnitz. But thus is it explained by Chemnitz. The words 'all Scripture' do not signify any sacred book but the whole corpus of the canonical books together. For what follows, 'useful for teaching, for convicting, etc.' cannot fit any one book but only the whole Scripture together. But the words 'is useful' does not signify that Scripture is useful in the way in which the useful is distinguished from the necessary and sufficient; it signifies that Scripture was made as a means for perfecting the man of God; as if Paul were saying that Scripture has this use for which it was made, to which it is directed; in the way we say that food is useful for nourishing man, without which however he cannot live.

But the words 'for teaching, for convicting etc.' explain the sufficiency of Scripture. For four things only are necessary for the man of God, that is, for the Christian doctor. First that he be able to teach the doctrine of faith. Second that he be able to refute errors against the faith. Third that he be able to teach the doctrine of morals. Fourth that he be able to correct those in error about morals. But all these things are provided by Scripture. For it serves for teaching, that is, for the dogmas of the faith; for convicting, that is, for refuting those erring in the faith; for educating in justice, that is, for teaching the precepts of morals; for reproof, that is, for correcting those erring in morals, from which Paul concludes that the man instructed in the Scriptures is perfect and fit for every good work.

I reply to the first that John in that place is only speaking of the miracles of Christ and he says that he wrote only some of the miracles, not all, because they were sufficient to persuade the world that Christ was the Son of God. For he speaks thus, "Many other signs indeed did Jesus do in the sight of his disciples etc." But Chemnitz ineptly transfers what is said only about the miracles to all the dogmas of faith and precepts of morals. Besides, John is not speaking save of things written by himself, therefore if they are sufficient all the other Scriptures will be superfluous.

Chemnitz responds that John is speaking of the whole of Scripture. But John refutes this lie when he says, "Many other signs indeed did Jesus do in the sight of his disciples etc." But what is added, "but these things are written etc." does not signify that signs alone suffice for us for salvation, but that they are referred and ordered to this, and that it is one of the means required for our salvation, although it alone does not suffice.

To the places of Augustine and Cyril I say that those Fathers are speaking of the words and deeds alone of Christ; and therefore they wanted to say that the things written are sufficient, not all absolutely, but all the words and deeds of Christ. Besides these words and deeds, many other things are necessary, otherwise all the histories and teachings of the Old Testament, and the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the *Epistles* of Peter, Paul, John, James and Jude would be superfluous. Nor does this

conflict with what we said above, that the Scriptures are not absolutely necessary. For although knowledge of the many things Christ and the Apostles said or did is necessary, yet that knowledge, even without the Scriptures, could be had by tradition alone, although one should in no way deny that it was very useful that the principle chapters be written down.

Add that without doubt those Fathers do not understand from the words and deeds of Christ that everything necessary absolutely was written, but that what the Apostles thought should be written was sufficiently written. For since certain things were written and some handed on without writing, and especially the interpretation and understanding of the Scriptures, then in the sacred books are contained sufficiently all things that were entrusted to writing, or (as Augustine says) that Christ wished to be written. For he wished other things not to be read in divine letters but to be received from the Church, which however are in their own way contained in the Gospel, not indeed in particular but in general, because the Gospel advises us to consult the Church about doubtful things.

To the other place from Paul one can reply in the same way, namely that Scripture sufficiently instructs and perfects the man of God because it expressly contains many things, and what it does not contain it shows where they are to be sought. Next, I say that Paul does not from that place attribute even this sufficiency to Scripture, which fact is collected from two things. First from the words 'all Scripture', and second from the words 'is useful'. For when he speaks of all Scripture he attributes not only to the whole body of Scripture but also to the individual books the praise that they are useful for teaching, convicting etc., and yet Chemnitz admits that any one sacred book is not sufficient.

That this is so is plain first from Paul's way itself of speaking. For by the judgment of all who know Latin, what is said of all divinely inspired Scripture is said of the individual books that are divinely inspired. Second from the fact that when this letter was being written, the *Apocalypse* did not yet exist, nor the *Gospel* of John; and perhaps something else was lacking from the body of the Scriptures. He is not speaking therefore of all and only the body of the Scriptures. Third from the reasoning of the Apostle; for from the universal principle he wishes to conclude in particular that the Scripture of the New Testament, because it was divinely inspired, was useful for teaching, convicting etc. For thus he speaks, "For infancy you have known the Scriptures" (that is the Old Testament, for when Timothy was an infant the New Testament did not exist, as is plain and as the adversaries admit) "that can instruct you in salvation through the faith that is in Christ Jesus." Here the Apostle in a few words attributes to the Scripture of the Old Testament what a little later he attributes in many words to all Scripture. And lest Timothy should doubt of it, the Apostle gives proof saying, "All Scripture divinely inspired etc."

Nor is what Chemnitz objects a problem, that all these utilities are not found in any one book; for it is false that they are not found. For no part of Scripture is briefer than the second epistle of John, and yet in it we see preached that Christ is true Son of God, which is a dogma of the faith. Again we see preached that we should love each other, which is a doctrine of morals. Besides we see openly written in it that they are Antichrists who say that Christ has not come in the flesh, which

pertains to refuting heretics. Lastly we see that they are rebuked who say 'hail' to heretics, which pertains to the correction of morals.

Now the words 'is useful', however much they are twisted by Chemnitz, will yet never signify 'is sufficient'. For he proves somehow or other that there is not deduced from these words that Scripture is not sufficient; but there is not deduced that it is sufficient, which is what he had to prove. For whether you say Scripture is useful for this, or has this use, or is referred or ordered to this, or anything else similar, you will never signify that it alone suffices. Just as he too who says that food is useful for nourishing man says indeed that food is instituted for this, that it nourish, but does not say that food alone suffices; for if natural heat is lacking or some instrument of the body necessary for nutrition, food will not nourish. Therefore the Apostle does not say that Scripture alone suffices for teaching, convicting etc., and therefore for perfecting and completing man; but yet it is of advantage and help for all these things.

And although the same Apostle does not say that it does not suffice, yet we collect this from other places, as from I *Corinthians* ch.11, "The rest I will dispose when I come." And II *Thessalonians* ch.2, "Hold the traditions, whether by speech or by epistle etc." And from this place too, although it is not collected that Paul said Scripture does not suffice, yet it is evidently collected that he did not say that Scripture alone suffices, because he attributed these praises to any canonical work, and we know even from the confession of the adversaries that no one canonical work suffices, because then the others would be superfluous.

The third argument is from places in which traditions are condemned, *Isaiah* ch.29, "In vain do they worship me teaching the commands and doctrines of me," *Matthew* ch.15, "You have made void the command of God by your tradition," *Galatians* ch.1, "Being an emulator of the traditions of my fathers," *Colossians* ch.2, "See that no one deceive you by philosophy or empty deceit according to the tradition of men," I *Timothy* ch.1, "Do not attend to Jewish fables, etc." I *Peter* ch.1, "You have been redeemed from your vain conversation in paternal tradition." Here are condemned the traditions that the Jew boasted they received from the hands of Moses and the Prophets; therefore also the traditions that we say have come down to us from Christ and the Apostles by the hands of the Fathers.

I reply that Christ and the Apostles did not censure the traditions that the Jews had received from Moses and the Prophets, one of which was about the canonical books and which were true and which were not; but they censured the traditions they had received from more recent people, some of which were empty, but others pernicious and contrary to the Scriptures. For neither Christ nor the Apostles ever say that these are the traditions of Moses and the Prophets; and they openly say that they are speaking of traditions that are in conflict with the Scriptures. And besides the ancient Fathers explained expressively who was the author of the traditions that Christ and the Apostles censure.

Irenaeus bk.4 chs.25 and 26 disputes against the ancient heretics who thought that under the name of traditions censured by Christ and the Apostles was understood the law of Moses, and he teaches that not the law of Moses but the traditions that corrupt the law of more recent elders were censured by Christ and the Apostles. Epiphanius in the heresy of Ptolomaeus teaches that the traditions of



the Jews were four expositions of the sacred books. The first was of Moses and that was not censured. The second was of Rabbi Akiba. The third of Rabbi Jehuda. And the fourth of the sons of Asamonaeus. And it is these that are censured by the Lord.

Jerome on *Isaiah* ch.8 and *Titus* ch.3 and in his epistle to Agasias q.10 teaches that the traditions of the Jews that the Lord censured took their beginning from Sammai, Hillel, Akiba, and some others who existed a little before the rise of the Savior, and these traditions had not expounded the law but corrupted it; and these traditions they themselves call 'secondaries'. About them there exists in civil law a certain constituton of Justinian, q.146 novel., in these words, "The tradition that is called secondary by them we altogether forbid, since it is not contained in the sacred books nor has been handed on by the Prophets but contains certain excerpts from men who speak only of earthly things and have nothing of the divine spirit in them." Further from these sources have come down the fables that are now in the Talmud and in almost all the books of the Rabbis. But these are nothing to our traditions, which have Christ and the Apostles for authors, and are consonant with the divine Scriptures.

*Chapter Eleven: The Objections from the Fathers are Solved*

Now response must be made to the testimonies that they bring from the Fathers. So, Chemnitz first produces Irenaeus bk.3 ch.1 who speaks as follows, "For we do not know the disposition of salvation from others than from those through him the gospel came to us. What indeed they then announced they afterwards, by the will of God, handed on to us in the Scriptures, to be the future ground and pillar of our faith." All the same things then, says Chemnitz, were written by the Apostles that they preached viva voce.

I reply that Irenaeus does not say that the Apostles preached nothing other than what they wrote, but only that they wrote the gospel which they had before preached, which is true and not against us. But even if Irenaeus did say that the Apostles wrote everything they preached, he would say nothing against our opinion. For two things must be carefully noted for understanding both this place of Irenaeus and many other things of other ancient Fathers.

The first is that certain things in Christian doctrine, both of faith and morals, are simply necessary for all for salvation, such as knowledge of the articles of the Apostles' Creed. Again, knowledge of the ten commandments and of some of the sacraments. The rest are not so necessary that without explicit knowledge and faith and profession of them a man cannot be saved, provided he have a will ready to accept and believe them when they have been legitimately proposed to him by the Church.

This distinction is collected from the fact that without knowledge and faith of the mysteries of the first kind no adult is admitted to baptism; but without knowledge and at any rate explicit faith of the latter ones people are ordinarily admitted. In *Acts* ch.1, after one sermon of Peter, in which he taught the chief chapters of faith in Christ, 3,000 men were baptized in one day, who without doubt knew nothing else besides those necessary things, and therefore is added that after baptism they persevered in the doctrine of the Apostles, that is, they learnt what they had not yet heard about the Christian mysteries. Thus Paul, although he held

the Thessalonians among the number of the saints, and extolled their faith and charity with marvelous praises, yet in I *Thessalonians* ch.3 he says, "Praying that we may see your face and complete what is lacking to your faith."

Note, second, that the things which are simply necessary were wont to be preached to everyone by the Apostles, but not to everyone all of the other things; but some things to all, those namely that were useful for all, certain things only to prelates, bishops, and priests, as about the nature of governing the Church, about administering the sacraments, about refuting heretics etc.; just as even now some things are disputed in the schools among the learned, and other things are explained in popular sermons. Thus in *Acts* ch.20 the Apostle separately instructed the Bishops of Asia. So in I *Corinthians* ch.2 he spoke wisdom among the perfect. So in II *Timothy* ch.2 he says, "These things commend to faithful men, who will be fit also to each others." Thus Irenaeus bk.4 ch.32 says that the Apostles handed on their successors the charism of knowledge along with the episcopate.

Having noted these things, I say that everything was written by the Apostles that was necessary for all, and that they preached openly to all in public; but not all the other things were written. When therefore Irenaeus says that the Apostles wrote down what they preached in the world, this is true and does not oppose traditions, because they did not teach the people everything but only what was necessary or useful for them, but the rest they handed on separately to the more perfect.

Second, Chemnitz introduces Origen on *Romans* ch.3, *Homil.5* on *Matthew*, *Homil.7* on *Ezekiel*, *Homil.1* on *Jeremiah*, where Origen says that we should not speak about divine things from our own sense but should confirm everything by testimonies from Scripture; "We must," he says, "summon the sacred Scriptures to witness, since our senses and narrations have no faith without this witness." I reply that Origen is speaking of very obscure questions, such as are for the most part those that have the witness of the tradition received in the whole Church. For elsewhere Origen, *Homil.5* on *Numbers*, expressively asserts that many things are kept in the Church, and must be necessarily kept by all, although there exist no testimonies about them.

Third Chemnitz produces in witness the Emperor Constantine, who in the Council of Nicea, on the evidence of Theodoret bk.1 ch.7, speaks as follows, "The Evangelical and Apostolic books and the oracles of the ancient Prophets plainly instruct us what we must think about divine things. Therefore, putting aside all hostile discord, let us take from the words divinely inspired the explanations of questions." I reply that this testimony is not to be taken as seriously as Calvin and Chemnitz take it. For Constantine was a great Emperor but not a great doctor of the Church, especially since, according to the opinion of the new heretics and of the ancient Arians, Constantine was at that time not yet baptized, and therefore did not know the secrets of religion.

But, admitting the authority of Constantine, I say that in the case of all the dogmas that pertain to the nature of God testimonies do exist in the Scriptures, and we can about these dogmas be fully and plainly instructed by the Scriptures if we understand them rightly; but nevertheless the sense of the Scriptures depends on the unwritten tradition of the Church. Wherefore Theodoret, who in bk.1 ch.7 narrates this speech of Constantine, reports in ch.8 that Scriptures were brought

forward on both sides, and since the Arians were not convinced by them, because they expounded the Scriptures differently from the Catholics, they were condemned from unwritten words, though words piously understood; to which condemnation Constantine assented, as no one has ever doubted.

Fourth Chemnitz introduces Athanasius who in his book *Against the Gentiles*, or against idols, says at the very beginning, "The sacred and divinely inspired Scriptures suffice for all instruction of the truth." I reply that the word 'all' is added by Chemnitz himself; for Athanasius only has 'for instruction of the truth'. For he is not speaking there of all the dogmas but only of two, which are the arguments of the two books that he writes to Macharius, namely that idols are not Gods, and that Christ is true God and likewise man, which two dogmas have express testimonies in the Scriptures. Besides Athanasius adds in the same place that the Scriptures do indeed suffice for indicating the truth of these two dogmas, yet not without the explanation of the holy Fathers; but since their books cannot easily be got hold of by all, he says that he wants to write about these matters what he himself learnt from his predecessors.

Fifth Chemnitz produces Basil in his sermon on confession of faith, where Basil speaks as follows, "It is a proof of infidelity and a most sure sign of pride if anyone wants to reject anything of what has been written, or to introduce anything of what has not been written." And like things are contained in his sum of morals 72 ch.1 and 80 ch.22. I reply that Basil is speaking of those who add to the dogmas of Scripture some other things that are contrary and alien and repugnant to the Scriptures. For in the same sermon about the confession of faith he says that in his dispute against the heretics he has often used unwritten words, yet with the agreement of the Scriptures; and he says too that he has often taken testimony not only from the Scriptures of the Apostles but also from the Philosophers, when the latter were not contrary to the Scriptures. I add that Basil is speaking also about those who, not content with written words, invent others out of their own head. For this is a sign, and a very certain sign, of pride. Therefore he is dealing with traditions that are thought up by private men not about those that the Church has received from the Apostles through a succession of Bishops.

Chemnitz brings another place from epist.80, where Basil says, "We do not think it right that what custom has obtained among them should be held for law and the canon of right doctrine. Let us stand therefore on the decision of Scripture inspired by God." I reply that Chemnitz has omitted some words from the middle, and they made against him. For the question then was whether it should be said that there are three hypostases and one nature in God. Some said that one should not so speak, and they put forward as argument the custom of their region where no one used such words. To whom Basil, who thought the contrary, replies that in other regions it is the custom to say there are three hypostases and one nature in God. And so, if they did not wish to acquiesce in this custom, it was not right that they should want their own different custom to be the rule, but both should stand on the judgment of the Scripture that no one can reject. You see here, therefore, that it is not a matter of a tradition received in the whole Church, but of particular customs. Next Basil therefore appealed from custom to the Scriptures, because from contrary customs nothing certain could be established.

Sixth Chemnitz produces Chrysostom *Homil.1 on Matthew, Homil.3 on II Thessalonians, Homil.13 on Genesis*, where Chrysostom says that Scripture is useful and clear in necessary things. But to what purpose are these remarks? Next he produces the testimony of the same from *Homil.49 on Matthew*, where he expounds the verse ch.24, "Then let those in Judea flee to the mountains," and says that in time of heresies there is no other way of finding out the reason of the truth than the reading of the Scriptures. But this testimony is not from Chrysostom but from the author of an incomplete work, who was either an Arian or certainly his work has been distorted in many places by Arians. For *Homil.48* calls heretics 'consubstantial' and *Homil.49* is almost always speaking against the same, and therefore this whole place was inserted as if by Arians, and from some codices recently edited it has been removed. He produces another testimony of Chrysostom from *Homil. on Psalm 95* near the end, "If someone speaks without Scripture, the knowledge of the hearers limps, now assenting, now hesitating; but where he produces the testimony of a voice from the divine Scripture, it confirms both the speech of the speaker and the mind of the hearer."

I reply that since in the immediately preceding words Chrysostom had said, "For neither should he say anything without witnesses and by the mere knowledge of his mind," we should understand that when he immediately adds, "If someone speaks without Scripture," he wishes to be understood, "but by mere knowledge of his mind." Therefore the sense of his words is this, that if anything is said from one's own invention it does not as easily persuade as it would if what is said could be confirmed by the testimony of Scripture.

Chemnitz produces another quote of Chrysostom from *Homil.13 on II Corinthians*, "Since we have the most exact scrutiny, line, and rule of all, the assertion of the divine laws, I ask you all to leave aside what this or that man thinks, and examine everything about these things from the Scriptures." I reply that Chrysostom is not speaking of obscure dogmas of faith or morals, but of the opinion of carnal men, who prefer wealth to poverty, since the Scriptures openly teach that poverty is far more useful for salvation. Therefore Chrysostom is saying nothing other than that one should in this respect more believe the Scriptures than the opinion of men.

Lastly he produces a testimony of the same Chrysostom from the commentary on *Matthew ch.22*, "Whatever is required for salvation has already been wholly fulfilled in the Scriptures." I reply that Chrysostom is speaking of the remedies for vices, and he is teaching that there is no vice for the cure of which some remedy may not be found in Scripture. Which is also taught by Basil in his speech on *Psalm 1*. But what do these things achieve against traditions?

Seventh he brings forward Epiphanius who in *Heresy 61* says, "We cannot state the discovery of any question from our own reasonings but from the consequence of the Scriptures." I reply that Epiphanius is not saying from the consequence of the Scriptures alone, but he says very clearly elsewhere, as we showed above, that not everything can be taken from Scripture, and therefore tradition is necessary.

Eighth he brings forward Cyril, who in his book on *Right Faith to Queens* speaks as follows, "You must follow the divine letters, and depart in nothing from

their prescription." I reply that he does not say that it is not licit to say anything that is not contained in the Scriptures, but that it is not licit to speak against the Scriptures. For this is not to depart from the prescription of the Scriptures, because we too indeed gladly embrace them. For we never defend traditions in conflict with Scripture.

Again he brings this from the same Cyril in *Homil.5 on Leviticus*, "I think that in these two days the two Testaments can be understood, in which may be examined and discussed every word that pertains to God, and from these all knowledge of things can be grasped. But if there is something superfluous that no divine Scripture decrees, no other third Scripture should be taken up for authority of knowledge." I reply, first, that these homilies on *Leviticus* are not from Cyril but from Origen or someone else or other, who everywhere destroyed the letter so as to set up mystical meanings out of his own head. Therefore these homilies are not of great authority. Add that in this very place the author of the homily does not exclude the unwritten word of God, but only a third Scripture, that is, a human Scripture, which wants to sell itself as divine.

Ninth Chemnitz brings forward Theophilus *Paschalis* bk.2, who speaks as follows, "It is a mark of a diabolic spirit to think something outside the authority of the sacred Scriptures to be divine." I reply that he is speaking of the apocryphal books which were by some supposed as divine. But it is inept, to say nothing more serious, to turn what is said about one thing toward something else.

He brings forward, tenth, Apollinaris who in Eusebius *Hist.* bk5 ch.15 says that he put off for a long time writing against the heresy of Montanus lest he should seem to some to be adding to the Evangelical word of God. I reply, first, that these words are not found in all codices. Second, the author does not say 'adding to the written Evangelical word'. Third, he understands the addition to be of a new, contrary dogma; for in the same place he accuses Montanus of not keeping the doctrine that the Church had received from the Apostles by tradition and the succession of Bishops.

He brings forward, eleventh, Tertullian who in his book *Against Hermogenes* says, "I adore the fullness of Scripture. Let the workshop of Hermogenes teach, 'it is written'. But if it is not written, let him fear what is destined for those who add or take away." I reply that Tertullian is speaking of one dogma only, namely that God created all things from nothing, not from preexisting matter, as Hermogenes fancied. And since this dogma is very openly contained in the Scriptures, Tertullian says that he adores the fullness of Scripture as far as this dogma is concerned; and he adds that Hermogenes, who was adding the contrary dogma to Scripture and was opposing Scripture itself, was falling into the curse by which we are forbidden to add anything to, or taken anything away from, Scripture, so that its truth is changed.

Chemnitz puts forward, twelfth, Cyprian who speaks thus in his epistle to Pompeianus, "Whence is this tradition?" he says. "Does it descend from the Lord's and the Gospel's authority, or does it come from the commands or the epistles of the Apostles? For those things are to be done that are written, as God testifies and proposes to Joshua, saying, 'The book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth'. If then it is prescribed in the Gospel, or is contained in the epistles and acts of the Apostles, let this holy tradition too be observed etc." I reply that Cyprian wrote this

when he wanted to guard his own error, and so it is not strange if he then reasoned in the manner of the erring. Wherefore St. Augustine rightly refutes this epistle in *Against the Donatists* bk.4 chs.23ff. Besides, although Cyprian was rejecting that one tradition about baptism, because he thought it was against the Scriptures, yet he did not, for that reason, want the others to be rejected which, although they were not in the Scriptures, yet do not conflict with Scripture.

Thirteenth he brings forward that famous saying of Jerome on *Titus* ch.1, "Without the authority of Scripture talk has no faith." And that on *Matthew* ch.23, "What has no authority from the Scriptures is contemned with the same facility as it is proved." And that on *Haggai* ch.1, "What they find and make up as it were on the tradition of the Apostles, without the authority and testimonies of the Scriptures, is pierced by the sword of God." Finally that from the commentary on *Psalms* 86 on the verse, "The Lord will in the Scriptures tell of the people and the princes, of those who were in it," Jerome says, "See what he says, 'those who were' not 'those who are', so that, with the exception of the Apostles, whatever is said afterwards is cut off, does not have authority."

I reply to the first that the place has been distorted by Chemnitz, for thus does Jerome have, "Without the authority of Scripture talk has no faith, unless they seem to strengthen false doctrine even with divine testimonies." He does not therefore call talk what is put forward from outside Scripture, but he says that talkative men do not find faith among us, unless they try to confirm their errors from the Scriptures; which squares most of all with heretics. To the second I say that it too is not faithfully quoted. For Jerome did not speak universally of what does not have authority from the Scriptures etc., but he is speaking of a certain particular opinion whereby some were trying to prove from an apocryphal book that Zacharias, whom the Jews killed between the temple and the altar, was Zacharias the father of John the Baptist. He says, "Because this does not have the authority of the Scriptures, it is contemned with the same facility as it is proved." And the sense is that because this opinion is proved from an apocryphal, not a canonical, book, it is easily contemned. To the third the solution is plain, for he is only acting against those who make something up and yet wish their figment to seem to be Apostolic tradition. To the last one I say that in this place Jerome is rejecting things alien to Apostolic doctrine, that is, contrary and repugnant to Scripture.

Finally the adversaries bring forward the testimonies of Augustine. And first that from *Christian Doctrine* bk.2 ch.9, where Augustine says, "In what is openly put in Scripture are found all things that contain the faith and morals of living." I reply that he is speaking of those dogmas that are necessary for everyone simply, such as those contained in the Apostles' Creed and in the Decalogue. So the same Augustine in his book on *Merit and Remission of Sin* last chapter says, "I believe that from this is the authority of the divine speeches most clear, if a man cannot be ignorant of it without loss of promised salvation." And besides those, there are many other things that are contained in tradition alone, as we showed above from many places of Augustine.

Again, second, that from *Against the Letters of Petilianus* bk.3 ch.6, "If anyone either about Christ or about his Church or about any other thing that pertains to our faith and life, I do not say, if we, but what Paul adds, if an angel from heaven have

announced to you anything besides what you have received in the legal and Evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema.” I reply that we showed already above from Augustine’s tract.98 on *John* that this ‘besides’ signifies ‘contrary to’.

Third, Chemnitz produces certain places from *City of God* bk.19 ch.18, tract.3 on the epistles of *John*, epist.163, the book on *Pastors* ch.14, *Confessions* bk.6 ch.5, but in these places there is nothing against traditions. For Blessed Augustine only says that dogmas are to be proved from the Scriptures when testimonies from Scripture are had, and that Scripture must be believed, and that nothing must be said against the Scriptures, and the like, which are most true, but in vain are they brought against traditions, or for the sufficiency of Scripture, since by no word did Augustine indicate any such thing in these places.

Fourth he produces this from the book on the *Good of Widowhood* ch.1, “What more should I teach you than this that we read in the Apostle? For holy Scripture fixes the rule of our doctrine, lest we dare to be wise more than we should. Let me not teach you other than to expound the words of the Doctor to you.” I reply that Augustine is not speaking of every dogma, but only of the profession of widowhood, which, as to what sort of good it is, was expounded by the Apostle in I *Corinthians* ch.7, and therefore Augustine says that it is enough for him if he expounds the words of the Apostle. But as to what Augustine says generally, “Scripture fixes the rule of our doctrine,” it is said against those who make up from their judgment new doctrines that are not consonant with the Scriptures.

Fifth, that from *Against Maximinus* bk.3 ch.14, “But now neither should I put forward the Nicene Council nor you the Council of Rimini to prejudge the issue. Nor let me be detained by the authority of the latter nor you by that of the former; on the authorities of the Scriptures, not on witnesses proper to each, and on those common to both, let thing with thing, cause with cause, reason with reason contest.” Again on *Psalms* 57, “Take our papers out of the way, let the codex of God come forward, hear Christ speaking, hear truth talking.” Like things are contained in the book on the *Unity of the Church* chs.3, 6, 10, 16.

I reply that it seems indeed in these places that something is said against Councils, but not against traditions; but neither is anything taught by Augustine against Councils, as we can easily show. For it is certain that Augustine did not want the Councils to be removed from these disputations and only the Scriptures to be received because he did not believe that the authority of legitimate Councils was very great, but he did so for two reasons. First so as to deal with the issue more expeditiously. For if he had wanted to take an argument from the Council he would have first had to prove that the Councils were to be received, which was too long. And this reason chiefly has place against the Arians, who in no way admitted the Council of Nicea. The second reason is that in those questions that were then at issue, there existed in Scripture very clear testimonies, which without doubt were to be preferred to all the testimonies of Councils. And this reason chiefly has place against the Donatists in questions about the Church. Elsewhere the same Augustine in epist.118, 162, 165-166, and in his book on *Baptism*, often urges the Councils and traditions, nay also the responses of Pontiffs and Emperors.

Sixth they bring forward that from on *Merit and Remission of Sin* bk.2 ch.36, “When the dispute is about a thing very obscure, and certain and clear teachings of

the divine Scriptures do not help, human presumption should keep itself in check, doing nothing by inclining to either side." I reply that he is speaking of very obscure questions, such as he thought about the origin of souls, for determining which no firm testimonies were available but only certain conjectures from the divine letters. But this is nothing to traditions, which are strong with all consent of the ancients and of the whole Church. Which argument is a very grave one as Augustine teaches everywhere, and especially in *Against Cresconius* bk.1 ch.33, where he says that the truth of Scripture is held by us when we do what pleases the universal Church, even if we read nothing written down about it.

Seventh is that from *Catechizing the Uneducated* chs.3, 6, where Augustine teaches that a brief summa of doctrine from the Scriptures should be proposed to Catechumens, which when they say they believe and promise to wish to observe, they are to be baptized. For hence Chemnitz wishes to establish that what is contained in the Scriptures is sufficient for the Christian. I reply that it is indeed sufficient for someone to be baptized, but it is not sufficient for the Church of God absolutely. Otherwise we could also conclude that the Apostles' Creed was sufficient for the Church, and that all the rest is superfluous.

These then are the testimonies of the ancients cited by the heretics, wherein three things are to be noted. One, that those we put to the contrary are more than double; two, our testimonies expressly teach about receiving unwritten traditions, so much so that the heretics, since they cannot deny it, turn themselves everywhere to blasphemies. But the testimonies adduced by them do not properly pertain to traditions, but are ultimately twisted in that direction by the adversaries through bad consequences. Finally, when the adversaries are convicted by the evidence of the testimonies, they sometimes confess that traditions were sometimes defended by some Fathers; but we cannot be driven to admit that traditions were opposed by any of the fathers.

#### *Chapter Twelve: The Reasonings of the Adversaries are Solved*

There remains the third kind of arguments, which are taken from reason. So, the first argument is that it seems impossible that unwritten traditions could have been preserved, since there are very many impediments: forgetfulness, lack of skill, negligence, perversity, which are never lacking among the human race. From which fact also we see that it has happened that the dogmas of Lycurgus, Pythagoras, and the like, who taught and did not write, have altogether perished.

I reply that not only is it not impossible for traditions to be preserved but that it is even impossible for them not to be preserved. For this care does not fall chiefly on men but on God, who rules the Church. Just as God, therefore, has preserved the Church up to this day against so many persecutions of Emperors, Philosophers, Jews, heretics, and just as he could preserve the traditions from Adam up to Moses for 2,000 years and then the Scriptures from Moses up to this time through 3,000 and more years, so he could without doubt preserve traditions from Christ up to us for 1,500 years, especially since, besides the providence of God, which is the chief cause, there are four other assisting causes.

The first is Scripture. For although the traditions are not written in the divine letters, yet they are written in the records of the ancients and in Ecclesiastical books.



The second is continuous use. For most traditions are in continuous observance, as the rite of administering the sacraments, feast days, times of fasting, celebration of the mass and of divine offices, and others of the same sort. Therefore as vernacular languages are preserved, even if there are no grammars extant, because of continuous use, as the Hebrew tongue, which was conserved as vernacular in the people of God from Adam up to the captivity of Babylon for so many thousands of years, so too traditions of this sort could, without any Scripture, be preserved by use.

The third cause is that there are certain external records that last for a very long time, as the most ancient temples, and in them altars, sacred fonts, memorials of saints, crosses, images, Ecclesiastical books, and the like. At Baleoli in Flanders in the year 1571 it was narrated to me by the Pastor of the place, when I had by chance come to those parts, that when an heretical minister had persuaded the people that the erection of stone altars was a new invention and scarcely a hundred years old, the citizens began to demolish the altars. But when they were busy at the work, they noticed some very ancient letters incised on one of the altars, in which was noted the year in which the altar had been dedicated. Now from that notice they understood that the altar had been erected long before and, unless I mistake, some hundreds of years before the time at which the heretic had said altars began. So the stone monument confounded the heretic and preserved the tradition of the Church.

The fourth cause is heresy. For God marvelously uses the enemies of the Church to preserve the Church. For because in each age new heretics have arisen, who opposed different dogmas of the Church, therefore too in each age there have existed learned men who, in order to resist the heretics, investigated the doctrine of the Church and the ancient traditions and commended them to posterity with great care. In the same way those who possess their goods in peace for a long time easily lose the instruments and letters in which is contained whence those goods came to them and by what right they possess them. But he who is always litigating very carefully guards them nor does he allow them for any reason to be destroyed.

The second argument of the adversaries. The divine letters are written so that we may have a rule and norm of faith and morals, as Augustine teaches in *City of God* bk.19 ch.18 and *Against Faustus* bk.11 ch.5. But the words of God are perfect, therefore Scripture is a perfect rule and adequate for our faith. Therefore whatever is in Scripture is *de fide*, and whatever is not in Scripture is not *de fide*; therefore Scripture alone is necessary and sufficient for preserving the faith.

I reply to the major proposition in two ways. First, that the proper and chief end of Scripture was not to be a rule of faith, but to be a certain useful admonition to preserve and foster the doctrine received from preaching. Proof that the chief end of Scripture is not to be a rule of faith: for then it ought to contain all and only those things that pertain of themselves to the faith, as we see was done in the Creed, which is truly said, and was composed, to be a sort of brief rule of faith. But in the Scriptures there are many things that of themselves do not pertain to faith, that is, which were not written for the reason that they should necessarily be believed; but those things are necessarily believed which are written, as is plain about all the histories of the Old Testament, even about many histories of the *Gospel* and of the

*Acts of Apostles*, about the salutations of Paul in his epistles, and other things of that sort.

But that there are many things needing to be believed that are not in the Scriptures was shown copiously above; therefore the chief end of Scripture is not to be a rule of faith, but by various teachings, examples, exhortations, now frightening us, nor instructing us, now threatening us, now consoling us, to help us in this pilgrimage. For hence it is that Scripture is not one continuous body as a rule of faith ought to be, but it contains various works, histories, speeches, prophecies, songs, epistles etc. This end is expressed by Paul in *Romans* ch.15, "Whatever things were written were written for our doctrine, so that by the patience and consolation of the Scriptures we might have hope." And II *Peter* ch.1, "I think it just, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up in admonition." And ch.3, "Behold I write this second letter to you, in which I excite your sincere mind in admonition."

I say second that Scripture, although it was not made chiefly to be a rule of faith, is yet a rule of faith, not total but partial. For the total rule of faith is the word of God, or the revelation of God made to the Church, which is divided into two partial rules, Scripture and Tradition. And indeed Scripture, because it is a rule, has from this that whatever it contains is necessarily true and to be believed, and whatever is repugnant to it is necessarily false and to be rejected; but because it is not a total rule but partial, hence it happens to it that it does not measure everything, and for that reason there is something *de fide* which is not contained in it. And in this way should the words of Blessed Augustine be understood. For he nowhere says that Scripture alone is the rule, but he says that Scripture is the rule by which the writings of the ancient Fathers should be examined, so that we accept those that are consonant with Scripture, and reject those that oppose Scripture.

The third argument the adversaries take from the inconvenience that traditions bring with them. For if this door is opened, so that we say some dogmas are to be received that can be proved by no testimony of Scripture, occasion will be given for many to make up and introduce into the Church many false things under the name of traditions. For we see that formerly even the most holy men were deceived in this way. For Papias is said to have taught from tradition that the reign of Christ would be for 1,000 years after the resurrection here on earth, which was believed by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and very many others. See Eusebius *Hist.* bk.3 ch.39. Besides Irenaeus bk.2 chs.39-40 teaches from tradition that Christ suffered in the fiftieth year of his age or thereabouts; but contrariwise Tertullian in his book *Against the Jews* ch.5 and Clement of Alexandria in *Stromateis* bk.1 teach that Christ suffered in the thirtieth year of his age, which traditions are all false.

I reply. First, if this argument is of any validity, not only traditions but even the Scriptures must be rejected. For many even false and pernicious books were formerly adorned with the title of canonical books, of Peter, of Paul, of Barnabas, and of other Apostles, as is plain from Gelasius in the Council of 70 Bishops, from Jerome in his book on *Illustrious Men* on Luke. Wherefore also Paul in II *Thessalonians* ch.2 says, "Do not be afraid either by speech or by epistle, as if sent by us." Namely because both speeches *viva voce* and written epistles were being promulgated by false Apostles in the name of the true Apostles. Besides Papias took that error of his about the thousand years not so much from unwritten tradition as

from the Scripture falsely understood of the *Gospels* and of the *Apocalypse*, as Jerome teaches on *Isaiah* ch.49 and on *Matthew* ch.19. Irenaeus too tries to prove from tradition and Scripture that the Lord had reached almost fifty years of age. For he proves it from *John* ch.8, "You have not yet reached fifth years and you have seen Abraham?" Finally Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria try to prove their error from badly understood Scripture alone. In vain, therefore, and rashly does Chemnitz bring these things against traditions.

I say second that this inconvenience, which is common to traditions and to the Scriptures, does not much harm either the true traditions or the true Scriptures. For there is an authority in the Church and also a definite way and reason for discriminating true traditions and Scriptures from false; nor by the public judgment of the Church has any apocryphal book been received for canonical, or a false tradition for true.

The fourth argument of the adversaries. It is proper to heretics to hide their dogmas and to say that Christ and the Apostles preached some things openly to everyone and certain things they handed on to certain others only in secret. For Irenaeus bk.1 ch.23 writes of the Basilidians that they assert they should not speak their mysteries, but keep them secret through silence. And ch.24 about Carpocratians he says, "They say that Jesus in a mystery spoke separately to his disciples and Apostles, and required of them that they hand these things on separately to the worthy and those who assent." Tertullian too in his book on *Prescription* says, "They are wont to say that the Apostles did not know everything; or they did indeed know everything but did not hand on everything to everyone."

I reply that heretics are the apes of Christians, as Cyprian teaches in his epistle to Iubaianus, and for that reason they also want to have mysteries. But there is a difference between their mysteries and ours, that their mysteries they require to be secret for the reason that these are very base, as is plain about the gnostics, who made the Eucharist from man's semen and women's menstrual discharge, as Epiphanius reports; this is also reported by Augustine of the Manichees in his book on *Heresies* ch.46, and the mysteries of the Anabaptists are clearly similar. And he again says that they want those things to be kept secret from the learned and manifest only to the unskilled. For on this point Irenaeus and Tertullian blame the old heretics who said that Christ did not hand on those mysteries to the Apostles, nor the Apostles to their successors the Bishops, but to some unknown others.

But our mysteries are not handed on only to some people for fear of the light, but because there is no need that they be known by all, or because not all have the capacity for them. Otherwise they are such as could be publicly preached. For nothing save what is pure and chaste is done by the Church. And this I think is what the Lord wanted when he says *Matthew* ch.10, "What you hear in the ear, preach on the housetops," namely if there is need. And *John* ch.18, "I have spoken openly to the world and in the synagogue where all the Jews gather, and in the dark I have said nothing;" that is, I have said nothing that could not be said everywhere, as far as concerns the truth and purity of what I said. With this however is not in conflict that some things he expounded separately to his disciples.

Praise to God and to the Virgin Mother Mary