Martin Delrio, S.J.

THE AREOPAGITIC VINDICATIONS

A Defense of Dionysian Authorship

In Defense of the Writings of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite,
Against Joseph Scaliger

Vindiciae Areopagiticae contra Josephum Scaligerum Julii Caesaris f. — Antwerp, Plantin Press, Joannes Moretus, 1607

English translation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page · 3
Dedicatory Letter · 3
Chapter 1. On the State of the Controversy · 4
Chapter 2. Scaliger's First Argument Is Refuted, Concerning the Founder of Monks · 5
Chapter 3. Against Scaliger's Second Argument: It Is Proved That Monasticism Was Known to the Ancient Church · 6
Chapter 4. Scaliger's Last Argument from the Synod in Trullo Is Examined · 7
Chapter 5. Another Argument of Heraldus Is Solved · 9
Chapter 6. Two Arguments of Cajetan Are Solved, and One of Erasmus · 10
Chapter 7. Answer Is Made to the Objections of Certain Ancient Anonymous Men · 11
Chapter 8. How It Happened That These Works of Dionysius Lay Hidden for So Many Years · 14
Chapter 9. An Argument Taken from the Books of Dionysius Themselves, to Prove That the Works Are Genuine · 15
Chapter 10. Certain Testimonies from the Autograph of Guillaume Bude: First, from Blessed Ignatius the Martyr · 17
Chapter 11. Bude's Testimonies from Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, and Chrysostom · 18
Chapter 12. Testimonies from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria · 18
Chapter 13. From Blessed Cyril of Alexandria and Blessed Maximus, Monk and Martyr · 19
Chapter 14. Testimonies of the Two Anastasii and of a Certain Uncertain Athanasius · 20
Chapter 15. Testimonies of Sophronius the Catholic, of the Monothelite Heretics, and of the Schismatic Greeks · 22
Chapter 16. Testimonies of Theodore the Presbyter, Sergius of Tempsa, and Antonius Melissa · 23
Chapter 17. Testimonies from Elias of Crete and Andrew of Crete · 24
Chapter 18. Testimonies of Julian of Jerusalem, Epiphanius the Presbyter, Glycas, and Other Greeks · 24
Chapter 19. The Opinion of Blessed Michael Syncellus and Blessed John Damascene · 25
Chapter 20. Testimonies from Symeon Metaphrastes and Theodore Prodromus · 26
Chapter 21. From Suidas, John of Scythopolis, and George the Patrician · 26
Chapter 22. From Euthymius the Monk Zigabenus · 27
Chapter 23. Testimonies of Nicephorus Callistus, George Pachymeres, and Cardinal Bessarion · 28
Chapter 24. Testimonies from the Councils of the Greeks · 30
Chapter 25. Testimonies from the Councils of the Latins · 31
Chapter 26. Testimonies of Gregory the Great and Martin I, Roman Pontiffs · 31
Chapter 27. Testimonies of Pope Agatho, Hadrian I, and Nicholas I · 33
Chapter 28. Testimonies of Liberatus the African and Deusdedit, Bishop of Cagliari · 35
Chapter 29. Testimonies from Hilduin, Hincmar, Anastasius the Librarian, and Hugh of Saint Victor · 36
Chapter 30. Testimonies of the Scholastics · 38
Chapter 31. Other Writers Cited for Dionysius by Way of Miscellany · 38
Chapter 32. The Same Is Confirmed by Royal Authority and Miracles · 39
Chapter 33. Recollection of Authorities, Adapted to the Individual Works of Blessed Dionysius · 42
Chapter 34. Epilogue of This Action or Disputation · 43
The Author's Index of Chapters · 45
Censure and Privileges · 46

Title Page

The Areopagitic Vindications

of Martin Delrio,

Priest of the Society of Jesus

and Doctor of Theology,

Against Joseph Scaliger,

Son of Julius.

Antwerp,

From the Plantin Press,

At the house of Joannes Moretus.

1607.

Biblical Epigraph

Proverbs 26:4.

Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you become like him.

Dedicatory Letter

To the Reverend Father in Christ,

Oliver Manareus,

Visitor of the Society of Jesus in Belgium,

greetings.

Two friends at once, excellent Manareus, men who this year had deserved splendidly of our Society and of the commonwealth, have ceased to live among us: the distinguished Justus Lipsius and Carolus Billeus. Each was a Brabanter; each was worthy of everlasting remembrance: the former for the private wisdom which he cultivated by writing and teaching, the latter for his successful administration of public affairs.

With both of them, from my boyhood, a friendship had been formed by a steady likeness of character and studies; with Billeus there was also a tie by marriage. I confess that I was somewhat shaken by this double wound to our Belgium; but the hope of their good passage, conceived from their pious death, easily restored me.

And so I went on answering Scaliger's Elenchus, which I had received at Antwerp in those days. Of it I may say, with Lysias, that the work is truly complete and finished, and extremely immodest: fit neither for Mercury nor for the virgin Muses, but, as Synesius says, for Cotytto and the other Attic Conisali.

Whatever answer there is, I send to you, to whom I owe very much, and who in former years have had experience of the Leiden slanders. Let the judgment of the whole matter be yours: whether I have fought this battle in good faith; whether I have maintained, on behalf of Saint Dionysius, writings most worthy of preservation in cedar; and whether I have kept off from our Society, from Maldonatus, and from myself those foul stains of a wanton pen.

Joseph was permitted to send his Elenchus to Drusus, his fellow initiate. Why should I, a man of the Society, not be permitted to send mine to Manareus, who has presided over the Society of Jesus once as Vicar

General, and more often as Provincial and Visitor in various Provinces?

By your judgment let this Anti-Scaliger stand or fall.

Farewell, my Father.

Pinciae, on the Ides of June, 1606.

Yours in Christ,

Martin Delrio.

Chapter 1. On the State of the Controversy

Whenever Lutherans or Calvinists mention these writings of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, they assert with such confidence that they are spurious, as if they had been present with the forger when the cuckoo slipped its eggs beneath the curruca. When they are called upon for proofs, they either fall silent and demand that their pronouncements be believed, or else they bring forward arguments that display more audacity than strength, more impudence than prudence: in a word, nothing sound, weighty, or robust.

They have laid hands upon the books, and still they have not been able to show when, by whom, or where this offspring was foisted upon the great Dionysius. Therefore I bring the matter into court; and from the point at which Scaliger, by the law of the Quirites, summoned me to join issue hand to hand, from there I summon him back, and I demand vindication for the tutelary Apostle of France, a Belgian against an Aquitanian.

I decline no judges who are not heretics; nor even them, if they defer to antiquity and have not lost their forehead together with their faith. It would have been easy for me to repel my adversary with a single exception: if our Dionysius is not, and has not for some centuries been, in possession of his book, and therefore did not possess it as his own at the very time when that possession began to be disturbed by adversaries; and if he was not still possessing it now, when Scaliger joined this suit with me.

So far he has brought forward nothing to show why the Areopagite should not prevail under the praetorian interdict Utrubi, or why force should not be forbidden under Uti possidetis. If prescription has ever had force in any matter for the antiquity of a writing and the certainty of its author, it has force especially here, where both the prescription is manifest and it is plain that the objections of the adversaries possess scarcely any probative force.

I am not unaware that the substitution of a child can be proved by conjectures and presumptions that are not especially weighty; but that is accepted in the substitution of a living and actual child because proof is difficult. In the metaphorical substitution of children, that is, of books, there is no place for it, since in books many things are always found which betray fraud: style, subject matter, witnesses cited, narrative, and the indications supplied by other ancient writers.

It is clear from Theodore in the Library of Photius, and also from Hilduin, Hincmar, and Anastasius the Librarian, that certain points of this sort about our Dionysius were once brought forward. But at that time they were so clearly refuted that the Greek and Latin Church long ago gave judgment in favor of Dionysius, and that sentence stood unshaken down to the age of Leo X. Then certain heretics, together with some haughty grammarians, began to unsettle things already received, and to call again into judgment matters virtually decided and established.

It would have been equitable not to hear them on the charge of substitution, since they were protesting from the same causes already once, and more than once, brought into court, after the offspring had long since been adjudged legitimate and after the prescription of the lawful time. Indeed, all crimes are extinguished by the passage of twenty years. By what title, then, or under what color, do the innovators demand to be heard in

this case against the sentence of the Roman Pontiffs and the Ecumenical Councils after a course of almost a thousand years?

Tertullian would say that they should be removed by this single prescription, because, after abandoning what had existed before, they afterward chose what had not existed before. He would add that it is perversity of faith not to believe things proved and to presume things not proved. Yet to overcome, or at least to expose, their hardness, as the same author elsewhere advises, I shall not avoid the encounter, lest the short path of prescription be thought a protection for distrust.

There will be two parts. The first will dissolve the arguments of some moment which I have been able to find; and indeed all of Scaliger's, even those that are of no moment, will come first. The second will contain those reasons by which I hope to convince men who are not obstinate that we have scarcely any book of an orthodox Father confirmed by the unanimous consent of more numerous or weightier witnesses, and assigned to its own author, than these treatises and letters of Dionysius the Areopagite. Thus I cannot deny that I am quite unable to stop wondering at the confidence and effrontery of the adversaries in this controversy.

Chapter 2. Scaliger's First Argument Is Refuted, Concerning the Founder of Monks

At last, on page 232 of the Elenchus, I find some trace of an argument of this kind: Jerome says that Paul the Hermit was the first founder of monks, and elsewhere that Antony was the first in Egypt, Hilarion in Syria. Therefore in the time of Dionysius the Areopagite there were no monks; consequently Dionysius the Areopagite was not the author of books in which monks are mentioned.

This is the force of your argument from Jerome, this afterpiece after the fable. I congratulate you because, with the comic curtain drawn aside and the license of old comedy at least for the time being marked off, you now begin to fight with human weapons: no longer contending with abuse but with learned words; no longer hurling, in place of argument, the dung of the privy, those sacred names of Cloacina by which you dishonored not me but yourself.

In truth, against Serarius and me, under the name of a letter, you performed a shameless and wicked comedy. From it the cause for blushing remained not for us but for you, not for the man who heard evil spoken, but for the man who spoke it.

Now I answer your argument. Saint Jerome, in the Life of Saint Hilarion, introduces the opinion of certain men about the beginning of monasticism, who refer it to Elijah and the Baptist; but Jerome himself disagrees, and prefers with others to bring it back to Paul the Hermit. In confirmation of this opinion he adds that Elijah was more than a monk, and that John began to prophesy before he was born.

That reasoning does not bind. For although John was a prophet before he was born, he was not therefore less a prophet because after he was born he embraced a solitary life. Let Elijah have been more than a monk; still before Paul he led the way in the monastic life. Paul was called the first of the hermits not because there were no hermits before him, but because perhaps he was the first in Egypt to persevere to the end of his life without any human companionship. Neither Elijah nor the Baptist did that.

Certainly not even in this way could the beginning of monks be referred to Paul, but rather to Elijah, who had a disciple as the companion of his life and perhaps not rarely lived with the sons of the prophets, of whom 4 Kings 2 speaks, as Elisha also did afterward in chapter 6 of the same book.

But you say: according to the same Saint Jerome, Antony in Egypt and Hilarion in Palestine were the first founders of cenobites. Yet who taught you that Gaius and Demophilus, to whom Dionysius writes, were cenobites and not hermits? Or that they were Syrians or Egyptians? Then, too, you refuse to attend to

Jerome's meaning, whose words are very clear: "They assert that Antony was the head of this way of life, which is partly true. For it was not so much that he himself was before all others, as that from him the zeal of all was stirred up."

Therefore, according to Jerome, even in Egypt itself Antony was not so much the founder as the propagator of monks. If he was only the propagator, there were others before he propagated them; among these were those whom blessed Dionysius mentions. Jerome himself, speaking from his own judgment in book 2 Against Jovinian, near the middle of the book, writes that the cradle of monks began from John the Baptist.

I say nothing about the Essenes, lest I put my sickle into another man's harvest. Let the most illustrious Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius see to that, and also our own Gretser and Serarius; and let them go on adorning their own Sparta.

Chapter 3. Against Scaliger's Second Argument: It Is Proved That Monasticism Was Known to the Ancient Church

You object another argument: monastic life was a form of life unknown to ancient Christianity, and therefore the Areopagite could not have mentioned it. You prove the antecedent on page 233: otherwise, before Paul, we would have some mention of monks living alone, or of hermits. "They would not have been silent," you say, "all the ecclesiastical men who wrote from Justin Martyr down to Cyprian. Nor could there have been so many swarms of monks without their having, as Tertullian says, some token of fellowship with the Churches and Bishops. Finally, many testimonies about them would be extant among ecclesiastical writers. But none are extant. And the most ancient writer Tertullian makes it clear enough that in his age there were no dwellers in the wilderness. We are not, he says, forest-dwellers and exiles from life."

You, however, in the manner of your party, argue negatively from authority. How weak that argument is, even beginners in logic know. "It is not written; therefore it was not done" is a defective consequence. The poet sings:

"Many brave men lived before Agamemnon,

but all, unwept and unknown,

are overwhelmed by long night,

because they lack a sacred bard."

They existed, though they are not read to have existed. Next, you show yourself excessively hard to please toward the testimonies that do survive. So you people commonly behave toward everything by which your inventions are stripped bare. Dionysius writes to monks; at once you object that he is Pseudo-Dionysius. Eusebius judged that those Essenes were disciples of Mark and Christians, an opinion to which Jerome in the Life of Mark gives some support; and Epiphanius and Cassian thought they were monks. You wish all these men to have blundered childishly.

Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Cassian hold that the Baptist was the prince of solitary monks. You do not accept the testimony of monks about monks, and you, a monk-hater, want to be believed. Athanasius, in the Life of Antony, teaches that there were many monks before Antony. Certainly Dionysius, the Roman Pontiff, sat a little after the two-hundredth year of Christ, and the Pontifical of Damasus writes that he was taken from among the monks.

Mention is made of abbots and monks in the first volume of the Councils, in the decrees of Pope Euthymianus, and in the first Nicene synod, canon 76. Therefore they already existed then. Tertullian, in On the Veiling of Virgins, chapter 3, and Cyprian after him in On the Dress of Virgins, recognize a distinction between virgins of men and virgins of God. Who are those virgins of God, if not women veiled by solemn

rite and consecrated to God by profession of virginity, and therefore nuns, or female monks? If there were nuns then, why should it not be believed that there were monks as well?

Wilhelm Eisengrein discusses these matters more fully in Century 1, page 3, which concerns religious orders and cultivators of the religious life, distinction 1 and the five following; so does Matthaeus Galenus in On the Origin of Monasticism, chapter 5; and our Bellarmine in volume 1, book 2, On the Members of the Church, chapter 5.

Nevertheless, we do not say that before the times of Cyprian there were swarms of monks. We maintain only that before this institution there were certain men, some cultivating the eremitic life, some living in common. After Constantine the Great a vast accession was made to them, and fixed rules and laws were given by their several patriarchs. Something similar happened to the monks of Greece after Saint Basil, and to those of Italy after Saint Benedict.

Those few who then existed had a token of faith with the Church and the Bishops. But because they were so few, scarcely any testimonies about them are found among ecclesiastical writers. Yet some do exist, as I have said. When the number of monks was multiplied after the empire of Constantine, the testimonies too were multiplied; and even if you were to restrict their beginnings to that time, you would still have falsely inferred that monasticism was a form of life unknown to ancient Christianity. Christianity is certainly ancient when it is reckoned by more than twelve centuries. How great is the novelty of your faith, which has not yet lasted a single century?

Finally, maliciously, what Tertullian said about the whole Church, that is, about himself and all Christians universally, "We are not forest-dwellers and exiles from life," you transferred to a few monks. He was denying that the Church was invisible, or that Christians were skulking men hidden in the forests so that the privacy of their morals might be concealed. He was contending that they lived openly in cities and before the eyes of all. Yet on that account he must not be said to deny that any Christians at all, renouncing the world, had lived in forests or desert places and had voluntarily made themselves exiles from the advantages of common and social life.

He wished only to show, from the greater part, that Christians were useful even in the affairs of the commonwealth. Thus he writes in the Apology against the Gentiles, chapter 42: "But we are also accused under another title of injuries, and are called unfruitful in business. How so, when we are men living with you, of the same food, clothing, equipment, and the same necessity of life? For we are not Brahmans or the gymnosophists of India, forest-dwellers and exiles from life."

He is plainly speaking of himself and of those Christians who, as he adds, not without forum, not without market, not without baths, shops, workshops, inns, fairs, and other commerce, sailed, served as soldiers, farmed, and paid public taxes in this world with the Gentiles. What Septimius said of the Christians of his own time, the Greeks and Armenians living among the Turks and Persians could say today; among them, nevertheless, it is agreed that there are many monks or Caloyers.

From this Scaliger could have understood that this saying of Tertullian was a reed staff for him to lean on. Let these things suffice. For it is not now necessary to dispute more exactly about the antiquity of monasticism.

Chapter 4. Scaliger's Last Argument from the Synod in Trullo Is Examined

Your third reason, which you think the winning one, is proposed by you in these words, on page 255: that supposititious Dionysius, writing to Gaius the monk, calls him a therapeut, and in the canons of the Synod in Trullo, canon 43, you have "the ascetic life," which the Latin translator renders "the therapeutic life." Eusebius persuaded Dionysius that these Therapeutae, these "therapists," were monks; and therefore that

Pseudo-Dionysius, in order to lay claim to antiquity, used this name and betrayed his ignorance and fraud.

You are hunting with Diana very much against you. This is no battering ram to shake walls, but a spider's web. The whole force of the argument is built upon the false supposition that Eusebius is older than this Dionysius, and that therefore this Dionysius was led into error by Eusebius and took the term from him, so that, as a substituted author, he might lie hidden beneath a fig-wood mask.

The fault in the reasoning is gross: begging the question, and taking as certain the very thing in dispute. That is what you do. For we insist on the contrary: that this Dionysius was older than Eusebius, and that Eusebius took the term from him and was persuaded by him that the name Therapeutae had formerly been customarily given to monks.

The presumption of so many centuries stands for us. Therefore it was for you to prove the contrary; and, if you please, the common error had to be refuted not by bare assertions but by solid reasons and by the authority of the ancients. That the life of the ancient monks was an ascetic life is very well known from Saints Basil, Nilus, Mark, and others. Nor, because the Latin translator rendered it "the therapeutic life," would it therefore follow that Dionysius was later than Eusebius, or that the ancient monks were not called Therapeutae.

For the same life, from the difference of function, was called therapeutic and ascetic. The one name is proved from Dionysius and Eusebius; the other from Saint Basil, Nilus, and the Synod in Trullo. One name is so far from excluding the other. Your father was Burdo, but he was not therefore not called Julius Caesar.

Nor did Dionysius affect antiquity or desire to be considered a contemporary of the Apostles. He used the words of his own age, that is, the apostolic age, and therefore he disclosed no fraud or ignorance of his own. Rather Scaliger did what he usually does: he mixed falsehood with slander.

How many Lucretian phrases are found in Virgil? Yet if from that I tried to prove that the Lucretius we now have is supposititious, and that he was deceived by grammarians who cite certain Lucretian phrases, and that, in order to affect the antiquity of Virgil, he used these words, with how many acres of hellebore would your father have made me sane? If besides I were to say that it was not Virgil who borrowed from Lucretius, but Lucretius who borrowed those verses and words from Virgil, and that this theft, unknown to all for many centuries, was at last made public by me as informer, not by the little point of a lamp but by the spear of the sun, what great mockery would I owe you? How many thousands of laughs would you summon? How eagerly would you spit upon me, from the depth of your chest, thick and varicolored expectorations?

Such is your sharpness, and you argue no otherwise than I would then. Nevertheless, from here you fly off to songs of victory and sing a triumph before the victory. "No one," you say, "who has any taste of letters and ancient Christianity has failed to notice that this Dionysius is supposititious." And you repeat: "This much I know: there is no one with any taste of letters who does not detect the fraud; but whoever does not see it is a stock, a dolt, unskilled, and lacking all judgment in letters."

I confess that I do not see it, and that I despise this censure of yours, Cato the Third. Rather I perceive and believe the contrary, and I congratulate myself that I am not alone lacking letters and ancient Christianity, according to Scaliger the innovator, and therefore, of course, the most learned and most loving student of letters and ancient Christianity; that I am not alone deprived of every taste of erudition; that I am not alone pronounced a stock, a dolt, unskilled, and empty of all judgment in letters. I have as companions, and as leaders of the line, Greek and Latin Fathers most learned and most praised through many centuries. A little later I shall summon them into a synod against this foreigner who so shamelessly casts reproaches upon Catholics.

What he is attempting by the authority of the Trullan codex and canon I have not yet been able sincerely to understand well enough. For what he seems to want, at any rate, he proves no more than if he were telling his

dream. The forty-third canon of the Trullan Council reads as follows in the Greek exemplar supplied by a man of rather cultivated learning, Balfour the Scot, principal of the Aquitanian College of Bordeaux, just as the words were sent to me:

"It is permitted for every Christian to choose the ascetic life and, laying aside the tumult of worldly affairs, to enter a monastery and to be tonsured in the manner of a monk, in whatever fall he may have been found. For our Savior God says, 'The one who comes to me I shall not cast out.' Therefore, since the institution of monastic life depicts for us a life in repentance, we accept and favor the man who approaches it genuinely and sincerely, and no manner of life shall bring him an impediment preventing him from fulfilling his proper aim."

So the common Latin translator renders it in the latest Venetian edition, which came out more correctly under Clement VIII, volume 3 of the Councils, page 300. It does not have "the therapeutic life," as Scaliger says; I do not know what exemplar he used. But even if that translator had rendered it "therapeutic," what then? Would it follow that monastic life first began then, and was not rather already begun and then left open to all, even to soldiers, even to criminals, who had sometimes been prohibited? However reckless you are, you will not dare to say that monastic life began then, that is, under Justinian the slit-nosed. All the Greeks and Latins would resist you.

Or do you think it follows that all writers who gave monks the name Therapeutae are later than Eusebius? What connection does this conclusion have with its antecedent? Or do you think it follows that all who called monks by this name affected the age and contemporaneity of Philo and the Areopagite? Whoever does not see that none of this follows from the Trullan canon, in which there is no named mention of the Therapeutae at all, certainly has no taste of logic. He is irrational; he must be a stock, a dolt, unskilled, and lacking every judgment in reasoning.

He boasts that he was the first to notice that passage of the Synod in Trullo. A discovery worthy of a statue, O Gorgias, but a leaden one. How many before you do you think had read it? But none of them was so acute or judicious as to gather from it what you did, because all the rest, compared with you, were mushrooms or melons. To whom would it not have seemed ridiculous that because in Greek monasticism is called the ascetic life, it could not then also be called the therapeutic life?

Indeed, it would have seemed ridiculous and childish to everyone to argue that because the Trullan Fathers used "ascetic," and the Latin translator said "therapeutic," therefore the word Therapeutae was only recently adapted to monks, though Eusebius too gives it to them. Scaliger admits that Eusebius so called them. But because the Latin translator of the Trullan Council used that term, he wishes to persuade us that from this Latin translator it can be gathered that the Greek Eusebius persuaded the Greek writer Dionysius that monks had once been so called: that is to say, that earlier men learned it from later men, Dionysius from Eusebius, Eusebius from the translator of the Trullan Council, and that they were deceived.

O sharpness! O wisdom! For if you did not mean this, come now, for what purpose did you so gloriously bring this siege-engine from Byzantium against us? Why did you not rather observe that these canons of the Trullan Council are so new that they were collected long after the Council itself? Why did you not notice that from the same Trullan Council these books are assigned to Dionysius?

Chapter 5. Another Argument of Heraldus Is Solved

These, then, are the three legions which the great general, the son of Julius, brought into battle line. He would only have added, declaiming with Phosphorus, that most rigid rhetorician: "I come to you, excellent citizens of Leiden, from battle, with my victory, with your happiness, increased, glorious, fortunate, greatest, triumphant."

At once the merry schoolmen of the Luciferian household would have cried out: "Iu, iu! Pheu, pheu! Well done, rock of the Loyolites! Well done, dreadful scourge of the Jesuits!" I easily persuade myself of this, because I see a man of much reading singing in tune with Joseph in his Notes on book 4 of Arnobius. There, digressing from his proposed brevity in order to discuss this Dionysius, and with the other side unheard, he adjudges the case to the adversary.

He is moved by no firm reason. It is merely because this Dionysius calls bishops "hierarchs" and "divine," which Socrates once criticized, and because he calls the altar a thysiasterion, words which he wants to have been taken from the rites of the Gentiles; finally, because Dionysius treats expressly of monks. From these premises, in place of a consequence, he gathers this corollary on page 289: "These and other things of the same kind caused the persona to be taken away from this man."

Rather, I fear that by writing these and other things of the same kind, which perhaps others will collect, he has taken the persona away from himself. But what are those other Dionysian things of the same kind? I cannot divine them. Until he brings them out, I shall count them as nothing. I answer the three that he adduces.

Dionysius could expressly mention monks, as I showed in chapters 2 and 3. Those other words were used by the Gentiles. What then? Did the ancient Christians not use many words of the Gentiles? I would be most tedious if I hammered at a syllable here. They used even the flesh, bread, and wine of the Gentiles, profane and not offered in sacrifice. If the use of those words was the use of that time, at the beginning of the Church, then these very words have the flavor of antiquity.

Bishops are no less presidents of true sacred rites than the priests of the Gentiles were presidents of false ones. Why should the name "divine" offend more in those men most closely joined to God than when we read in the Pandects of "divine brothers," "divine Hadrian," and in the Code of "Divine Justinian," "divine rescripts," and the like?

The Jews had the thysiasterion, and Saint Luke used the word for an altar in chapter 1:11; John used it of the Christian altar in Revelation 6:9 and 8:3; and Paul in 1 Corinthians 9:13 and 10:18, and Hebrews 13:10. Are those books therefore supposititious to John, Paul, and Luke? What then? Does the name thysiasterion fit our altar less than those of the Gentiles or the Hebrews? The Gentiles offer sacrilegious victims; the Jews, figurative and shadowy ones. We offer the true victim of the immaculate Lamb, foreshadowed by those. Do you not assent to blessed Andrew when he affirms this and to the Church when she proposes it to be believed by faith? Dionysius, in naming it so, walked in the footsteps of his divine teacher.

Chapter 6. Two Arguments of Cajetan Are Solved, and One of Erasmus

Thomas de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, a theologian of great name and an illustrious ornament of the Dominican family, did not equal in his commentaries on Sacred Scripture the praise he had deservedly gained in scholastic commentary. Therefore Cano, in book 7 of On Theological Places, placed this judgment upon him: Cajetan could have been equal to the greatest builders of the Church, had he not defiled his teaching with certain errors, as though by the admixture of a kind of leprosy, and, either affected by a passion for curiosity or certainly trusting in the dexterity of his talent, expounded the Sacred Letters at last according to his own judgment. He did so almost always most happily, but in a few places more acutely, to be sure, than happily. For he was not tenacious enough of ancient tradition, and not sufficiently versed in the reading of the Saints; nor did he wish to learn the mysteries of the sealed book from those who opened them not by their own sense, but by the tradition of the elders, that is, by the true key of the word of God. Thus, although he had written many things excellently, at the end he overturned everything, and by certain new expositions of Scripture either weakened, or at least diminished, the authority of other things which he had said with the greatest weight.

Among these errors of Cajetan this one is not undeservedly to be counted: when, on Acts chapter 17, he believed, as he often does, one Erasmus rather than Saint Thomas, Albert the Great, Saint Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales, and the rest of the scholastic doctors. Certainly among Catholics, that is, among true theologians, I remember reading no one who preceded Cajetan in this denial. Therefore, although, as Cano says, I do it unwillingly, to criticize so learned a man even by express name, nevertheless, lest the celebrity of his name and glory be thrown at us here by the Lutherans, I thought his rashness had to be noted.

Sixtus of Siena, in book 2 of the Sacred Library, writes that most learned men had answered Cajetan's conjectures, brought forward by others long before him, very fully; and therefore it seemed superfluous to him to unweave the same web again. I have resolved to solve all the objections of the adversaries. Cajetan, then, judges that Dionysius the Areopagite left behind absolutely none of the writings that we have.

His conjectures are two. The first is that Saint Jerome, in the book On Illustrious Men, does not mention these Areopagitic writings. I answer that Saint Jerome omitted certain other ecclesiastical writers as well, either because they escaped his diligence, or because one man could not obtain or know all, or always remember all. If Saint Jerome did know them, as it seemed to Budaeus, and as is likely, he omitted them because he had decided to list only those whom Eusebius, older than himself, had listed, and the Areopagite had been passed over by Eusebius. Cardinal Baronius gathers this intention of Jerome from Saint Jerome's letter to Dexter, which is the preface to that work.

If this writer had been later than Eusebius, Jerome would have named him. Eusebius mentions the person of the Areopagite, but he does not mention the writings. Why he does not mention the writings I shall say in its own place, namely chapter 7.

Cajetan's later conjecture is that Gregory the Great, in the homily on the lost drachma, did not dare to assign these books to blessed Dionysius, and speaks only ambiguously, using the word "it is reported." I answer that he speaks so not because he himself doubted, since he had read the books in Greece, but because he speaks in the manner of Sacred Scripture, which in certain matters, accommodating itself to the mind of others, not rarely uses ambiguous words, saying "perhaps," "maybe," "whether," and the like.

Moreover, he shows clearly enough that he inclines more to the affirmative opinion, since he confirmed his own teaching from this book. He said "it is reported" because he was addressing Latins, to whom the authority of books not yet given to Latium was not yet sufficiently known or ascertained.

There was still another argument of Erasmus, in his notes on Jerome: from the fact that there were various Dionysiuses among the Greeks, it becomes likely that these books belong to another than the Areopagite. Although this pleased Caelius Rhodiginus so much that he repeated it in almost the same syllables in book 2 of Ancient Readings, chapter 3, nevertheless it collapses sufficiently of itself. For among the Greeks there were several Athanasiuses, several Basils, several Gregories. Does it therefore become likely that the works today ascribed to the Alexandrian, the Great, and the Nazianzen were another's rather than theirs?

I am weary of refuting trifles of this sort, more truly trifles than arguments; such are the remaining arguments of the more recent men, Gaza, Valla, Luther, and others.

Chapter 7. Answer Is Made to the Objections of Certain Ancient Anonymous Men

Long ago certain more ancient men attacked the Dionysian writings. Since even their names do not survive, it is no empty suspicion that they were bolder than they were weighty, and heretics rather than Catholics. When they saw that they could no longer suppress the writings of our Dionysius, which at first they had attempted, they began to weaken the authority of the books.

A certain presbyter Theodore, a learned man, had carefully collected their objections, four in number, and had more carefully dissolved each one, as Photius taught in the Library. If Photius had recalled the solutions as he recalled the objections, he would have lightened this burden for me now. Since Theodore's book has perished, I shall act briefly in this chapter.

The first argument of those Greeks was this: How, if these are true works of Dionysius the Areopagite, did not some of the later Fathers mention his golden sayings which are found in them? I answer that this question is empty and illiterate. For many Greek Fathers did mention them, such as the other Dionysius, Origen, the two Anastasii, Athanasius, and the rest whom I shall cite. Nor, even if no one had mentioned them, would more than a light suspicion arise from this.

How many books have lain hidden for many centuries, which afterward came forth into the light? Have not the letters of Saint Boniface, Apostle and Martyr of Germany, now been as it were born through the diligence of Nicolas Serarius? We knew William the Little of Newburgh; who knew that he had composed such honeyed commentaries on the Song of Songs until, from our Louvain library, I inserted them into my Mystical Chain? I say nothing of blessed Orientius. How many books, previously unknown and buried for so many years in ignorance, have Henry Canisius, our Turrianus, our Pontanus, and our Fronto restored to their ancient authors?

Then they argued in this way: Eusebius Pamphili, weaving a catalogue of the principal holy Fathers who had been famous in writings up to that time, makes no mention of this Dionysius, just as Origen Adamantius, prior to Eusebius, does not. I answer that this too, a negative argument, has only the force of a very slight conjecture.

Blessed Maximus the Martyr answers that many writers were omitted by Eusebius, and that Eusebius himself admits that innumerable books had not come to him. One fact teaches this sufficiently: since he mentions so few, and passed over even writers very well known in his own Palestine, such as Hymenaeus and Narcissus, presbyters of Jerusalem, and Pantaenus the martyr, teacher of Clement of the Stromata; and of Clement of Rome he mentions only two letters.

Yet I think this omission belonged rather to malice than to ignorance. For Eusebius, as Saint Jerome testifies, was the standard-bearer of the Arians, under which name the Sixth General Synod also accuses him. Therefore he was hostile to our Dionysius, who in chapter 2 of On the Divine Names smothered the Arians, not yet born, by his writings, as though in their mother's womb. The same Eusebius attributes to Dionysius of Alexandria only the works in which he seems to play the prelude to the Arians, as I shall teach later. Certainly he wrapped in silence the very famous writer Theognostus, from whose quiver blessed Athanasius more than once drew arrows against the Arians. Read Baronius in the notes to the Roman Martyrology, October 9.

Concerning Origen, Maximus rightly judges that nothing is to be wondered at, because he celebrated the memory of scarcely four ecclesiastical writers. From confidence in his own talent he was less assiduous in turning over the writings of others. Although perhaps Adamantius was not wholly unmindful of our Dionysius, if the passages that will afterward be proposed are his.

Third, they contend that it can in no way happen that a work is the Areopagite's in which the traditions and rites of the Church, even the smallest, are recounted with exactness in the same manner in which the Church now uses them. For it is agreed that these things were perfected little by little and introduced into the Church when it was already flourishing and established. But Dionysius lived almost in the very cradle of the Church. Therefore the inscription of the name must be judged improbable and badly fabricated.

This argument tastes of the saliva of heretics attempting to strip all antiquity from ecclesiastical rites. But I answer them: there are two kinds of ecclesiastical rites. Some belong to the administration of the sacraments

and the chief necessities of the Church; others belong to the adornment of the Church, without which the things pertaining to the salvation of Christians could have been procured, though less decorously.

Those traditions and ceremonies of the former kind took their origin already from the beginning of the Church and the times of the Apostles, some instituted by Christ himself, some by the Apostles as the anointing of the Holy Spirit taught them. Only of the rites of the latter kind is it true, as the argument assumes, that they were introduced gradually when the Church was at last flourishing, though they are nevertheless to be kept holily.

But the ceremonies and traditions which our Dionysius mentions must be said to belong to the former kind, and therefore to have already been received in his age. It would be a heavy labor, and not now necessary, to summon and recall each one. It will suffice for me to have denied that any rites are contained in these works more recent than Hadrian's empire. It will be yours, O Scaliger, and that of your herd, to select these rites and show when each was born after this time, and by whom each was prescribed to the Church.

Meanwhile Catholics may read the recapitulation of apostolic traditions collected by Genebrard in volume 2 of his Chronography, at the end of the first century; and they will see, from Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Martial, the disciples of the Apostles, and the book of the Shepherd, that the ceremonies Dionysius sets down were in use in that first century.

The fourth argument was this: How could Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, disciple of Paul, have remembered the words of blessed Ignatius in his Letter to the Romans, which Ignatius wrote in the year of his martyrdom under Trajan, at which time that Dionysius had already died?

This argument assumes that Dionysius died before Ignatius. Although many have wished this, it is far more probable and more consonant with reason that Dionysius reached the second year of Hadrian's empire, as is handed down in Bede, Ado, and the rest of the ancient martyrologies, whose consensus the Church has always regarded most highly. Thus that letter of blessed Ignatius could have been cited by him.

But then a new difficulty arises, not so much from the long life of Dionysius, for in the same century Saints Simeon, Polycarp, and Hermas extended life equally or more, as because the words of Saint Dionysius now under discussion come from On the Divine Names, chapter 4, page 306: "The divine Ignatius also writes, 'My love has been crucified.'" But that book On the Divine Names is dedicated to blessed Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus, who, it is agreed, was crowned with martyrdom before blessed Ignatius.

This matter has tormented many. For the most illustrious founder of the Annals thinks either that this Timothy was another than that famous Ephesian bishop, disciple of Paul, and that the title was added by copyists, since it was not added to the inscription of the book On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, where he also calls this Timothy "son"; or, if he is the same Timothy of Ephesus, that the book was first sent while Ignatius was still alive, and afterward, after the death of Ignatius, the quotation was added by Dionysius, as writers have often been accustomed to do.

That the Timothy in both books is the same is proved from the beginning of the later book. I would rather believe that "Bishop of Ephesus" dropped out of the inscription of the book On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy than that it was wrongly added to the inscription of the book On the Divine Names. For George Pachymeres recognizes it and teaches, in his paraphrase of On the Divine Names, that the same Timothy was beloved to Paul. And lest anyone be disturbed because he is called "son" by Dionysius, he expressly notes that this happened both because Timothy was younger in age and because this was the custom of writers, that whoever wrote to another wrote as teacher to disciple.

Thus Timothy was Dionysius's fellow disciple and also his disciple, just as Hierotheus was Dionysius's teacher and fellow disciple, as in On the Divine Names, chapter 3. But did Dionysius afterward insert this saying of Ignatius into his books? Although that could have happened, I do not see that it is necessary to say

so.

Blessed Maximus explains "he writes" as "he was accustomed to write," and notes that Dionysius therefore did not say "he writes to the Romans," but simply and absolutely "he writes." He could have done this in some other book or letter which has perished. Blessed Martyr Ignatius also could, burning with love of Jesus, have been accustomed to use that phrase by mouth and pen as a sort of motto, since he bore the name of Jesus fixed in his heart. So the other Ignatius, our patriarch, used the phrase "for the greater glory of God." And thus this difficulty seems to me abundantly satisfied, certainly for those who do not love to pull the rope of contention.

Chapter 8. How It Happened That These Works of Dionysius Lay Hidden for So Many Years

This now remains as a point of uncertainty. It has scarcely seemed credible to some that the books of blessed Dionysius the Areopagite, so famous and apostolic a man, could have been hidden for so many centuries; and it has been suspected that they emerged so suddenly from such long-standing darkness and hidden places.

Nor is the question new, nor untouched by the defenders of Saint Dionysius, who have given quite suitable causes. The first is that of Suidas and Anastasius the Librarian, which John Saracenus proposed in these words in his letter to Odo, Abbot of Saint Dionysius:

"Because Catholics were bound by the solemn adjuration of Saint Dionysius not to reveal his writings to the unskilled multitude, but only to the learned, since they exceeded the capacity of many; and because learned men gradually failed, by the fault especially, as I think, of those who confer the prelacies of churches upon any people they please and reject learned men, they had no persons to whom they might entrust them. Perhaps Jerome also did not count the most excellent Areopagite among ecclesiastical writers because he did not think that his books, being eminent, had been appointed for common knowledge."

Thus, then, this is the first cause: the mist and obscurity of the writing, which few could dispel and penetrate by understanding. From this arose the small number of copyists and the rarity of readers; this was followed by the sloth and neglect of those who despise things not understood, as we see happening, and as blessed Nazianzen reproached Julian the Apostate. That there were always some who knew the books will be clear from what follows. Therefore they lay hidden not from all, but from most people. This is less to be wondered at, since we know that it happened to most writers. Moreover, that solemn adjuration of Saint Dionysius is contained in On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 1, at the beginning and end; in On the Divine Names, chapter 1; and in On Mystical Theology, chapter 1.

The same Anastasius the Librarian also gives another cause, when he testifies that the opinion of the Greeks is true: that the books of Dionysius were hidden by ancient heretics through many centuries, until, through a certain Peter the Roman, as Maximus is authority, they were drawn out from the library of the Roman Church, which has always been the faithful guardian of the best exemplars, and were carried into Greece. In this way they gradually became commonly known, though previously few Greeks knew them and scarcely any Latins.

Nor is it surprising that a Greek author was made manifest to the Greeks by the Latin Church, because he who was first bishop of the Athenians and afterward of the Parisians, sent by blessed Peter into Gaul, left, where he fulfilled his martyrdom, both his body and his books; these were carried from Gaul to Rome. Authors who thought he was also bishop of the Corinthians seem to have confused him with the other Dionysius of Corinth.

Three things make this treachery of the ancient heretics most likely to me. First, because now we see Lutherans and Calvinists striving with so great an effort to snatch the same books from human hands and

bury them in oblivion. Second, because I do not find these books cited by any heretics up to the times of the Monothelites, who were the first to abuse them for establishing their own error, as is clear from the Roman Council under Martin I and the Constantinopolitan Council in Trullo in the time of Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, concerning which later.

Third, because the same Anastasius writes in his preface to the Areopagite that Constantine the Philosopher, a man, as he calls him, great and a teacher of apostolic life, commended this whole codex to the memory of blessed Dionysius, and was accustomed to recommend to his hearers how much usefulness its marrow contained, and to say: "If the Saints, that is, our earlier founders, who barely and in a certain way beheaded the heretics with a club, had happened to possess Dionysius, without doubt they would have slaughtered them with a sharp sword." By this saying he was certainly indicating that they would have more easily and more quickly made mute the mouths of those whom they silenced with greater labor and perhaps more slowly.

Michael Syncellus the Martyr also testified this concerning the Arians in his encomium of our martyr. And concerning the innovators of our own time, all who have read Dionysius and known their heresies can testify the same. Therefore those men now make so many attempts to wrest from us this divine discourse, sharper than every sword; but, as they say, it is not easy to wrench the club from Hercules.

Suidas and Pachymeres give a third cause, drawn from the ambition of the philosophers, whom Tertullian assigns as fathers to heretics. For when they had perceived the profundity and wisdom of the books of Dionysius, especially Proclus, they hid them as far as they could and used their more celebrated judgments as their own, so that they themselves might be regarded as the authors of such splendid discourses. Great Basil complains that the same thing happened to the beginning of the Gospel of Saint John.

Marsilio Ficino also laments the same concerning the books of Dionysius and other ancients in On the Christian Religion, chapter 22, writing thus: "I certainly found that the principal mysteries of Numenius, Philo, Plotinus, Iamblichus, and Proclus were received from John, Paul, Hierotheus, and Dionysius the Areopagite. For whatever magnificent things they said about the divine mind, the angels, and the other matters pertaining to theology, they plainly usurped from them."

Thus far I have recalled the adversaries' arguments that seemed to be of any moment, diminishing nothing, but adding what strength I could, and, as I think, have dissolved them plainly and fully. From this it is easily understood that it is not the part of a prudent or modest man, on account of such slight conjectures, together with one theologian, Cajetan, and a few men of letters, to decree vindications against the athlete of Christ on behalf of the enemies of our faith, against the Greek and Latin tradition received up to this time.

Chapter 9. An Argument Taken from the Books of Dionysius Themselves, to Prove That the Works Are Genuine

Now see whether our penetrating weapon is stronger: double, to be sure, but fortified with good steel and well furnished with its throwing thong; taken from the quiver of right reasoning and sharpened on the Lydian touchstone, which the more prudent critics have always applied in settling controversies of this kind.

There is nothing in the whole work which indicates that it is falsely ascribed to blessed Areopagite. Rather, everything suggests the contrary. Judgment about the author of a book depends on style, subject matter, method, and the testimonies of others. The testimonies will be brought forward in the following chapters; the other matters must be weighed in this one.

If you look at the style, nothing is more sublime than it; nothing breathes antiquity, the apostolic age, and the force of sacred philosophy equally. Nor do the adversaries deny this. The method is simple, and of the kind those earlier ecclesiastical writers used, blending mystical theory with practice and concealing more art than

it displays. If you weigh the dignity of the matter, and the sublimity, profundity, and most hidden mysteries of the theological treatment, you will find it to be revealed, heavenly doctrine, equal to its grand words and most worthy of a disciple of Paul.

For Luther, Whitaker, and Scaliger, in criticizing it, understood it no more than I understand Lappish or Ethiopic letters. They are like frantic men, who think and pronounce that others are mad and they alone are wise. With the best right Michael Syncellus the Martyr calls our author, as he runs through the individual books of Dionysius, "among theologians the most divinely wise, among teachers the most illuminated, among hierarchs the most holy," and other things of this kind. I would wish that the most eloquent encomium of Syncellus were read; it alone ought to suffice for blunting the insolence and pride of the innovators.

Next, the author of the book himself most openly manifests both who he is and his own age, and professes himself a disciple of blessed Paul and of Hierotheus in On the Divine Names, chapters 2 and 3, pages 271, 275, and 279. He writes that he was present at the funeral of blessed Mary the Virgin in the same book, chapter 3, page 281 and following. Likewise, in the letter to Polycarp, page 442, he writes that when Christ was suffering, he observed with Apollophanes the sophist that admirable eclipse of the sun, which Phlegon, Eusebius, Maximus, Syncellus, and others also mention.

He relates, in the letter to Demophilus, page 462, that he was received with hospitality by Carpus in Crete; Carpus is mentioned by the Apostle in 2 Timothy 4:13. He teaches that Timothy was his fellow disciple under his master Paul, in On the Divine Names, chapter 2, at the end, page 275. At Timothy's request he composed the work On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and the other On the Divine Names, chapter 2 of On the Divine Names, page 404.

He writes letters to blessed John the Evangelist, predicting to him liberation from exile and mutual sight, letter 10, page 482; to Titus, Timothy's fellow disciple and his own, letter 9, page 466, to whom blessed Paul also wrote; likewise to Polycarp, Bishop of the Smyrnaeans, whose age is clear, because Dionysius mentions that Apollophanes the sophist in letter 7, page 437. Blessed Ignatius also mentions Polycarp, and blessed Irenaeus teaches that he was a disciple of blessed John.

He writes four letters to Gaius the Therapeut, page 431. Luke names this Gaius in Acts 19:29, and Saint John sent the third canonical letter to him; perhaps Paul also mentions him in Romans 16:23. He also uses only the testimonies of illustrious men of that age, such as Saint Paul the Apostle and Hierotheus, whom some think to have been a Spaniard, in the cited places; and blessed Bartholomew the Apostle in Mystical Theology, chapter 1, page 421; and Justus Joseph in On the Divine Names, chapter 11, page 398, of whom mention is made in Acts 1:23; and Saint Ignatius the Martyr, as was said before; and Clement the philosopher.

Whether this Clement was Actius Clemens, to whom Pliny the Younger writes, as Baronius thinks, or Clement the Roman Pope, as Pachymeres wishes in the paraphrase, it is agreed from his letter to James, the brother of the Lord, that he was very devoted to philosophy. There is nothing that compels us to flee to Clement of Alexandria. Thus he cites some Clement older than the author of the Stromata, in On the Divine Names, chapter 5, page 354.

But also in chapter 3 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, page 140, he indicates that still in his own time the faithful in the Church were accustomed, with one person beginning the chant, all to follow, without the alternation of choirs. Blessed Ignatius first introduced that alternation at Antioch, and under Emperor Constantius that custom was derived into all the Churches, as Gilbert Genebrard noted from Basil the Great and Socrates the historian, volume 2 of the Chronography, first century. There are also not a few other things of this kind pointing in the same direction, but these will suffice for a lover of truth.

What does the refuter say to these things? O mouth of the man! With a great gape he boasts that all these things are fictitious and false speaking. Presumption favors us, and transfers the burden of proof to him who,

by rash contention, tries to weaken such clear testimonies by suspicions alone.

Cardinal Baronius pronounced most gravely and most truly: "It is unworthy and impious to suspect that so sublime and excellent a theologian, with a mind divinely illuminated, traversing the pivots of heaven, investigating the choirs of angels, approaching the throne of divinity and searching into its secrets, should himself, I say, like a stage-player on the stage, play under an assumed mask, should have wished deceitfully to pretend himself another than he was, to counterfeit other persons, and to compose many false things which he wanted to be received by all as true and certain, and that with great loss to his own glory. For that immortal glory which he had gained for himself from his plainly divine writings, he would have seemed vainly to squander by hiding his own name and putting on another's. If we say, as befits a wise man, that he despised glory, certainly it was not the part of a wise man to lie much, especially of one who, treating heavenly and divine things, ought to abhor even the lightest opinion of falsehood from afar."

Thus far Baronius, bringing forward and gathering into one so many evident and pregnant reasons that whoever still persists obstinate is most worthy of the compliments of Joseph Scaliger. I shall ascribe them so that he may be refreshed by his own, since he is accustomed to be nauseated by those of others: "He prophesies wildly, he is mad with madness, the author of so paradoxical and apish a drama. See what seeming-wisdom does, what zealous conceit does, what contempt of others does. What is this, unless delusion or derangement?" Scaliger, you brought forward all these things truly and aptly, but against your own trifle. I proceed to the testimonies of the Fathers, by which you are convicted just as openly.

Chapter 10. Certain Testimonies from the Autograph of Guillaume Bude: First, from Blessed Ignatius the Martyr

Guillaume Bude, the most diligent student of the Greek learning of his time, had written in the margin of a Greek exemplar of Dionysius the Areopagite many testimonies of the Fathers by which he was led to judge that these little works of the holy Father were genuine. Guillaume Morel, the royal printer in Greek, presented these passages to us in the Paris edition of 1562, at which time, as a boy, I was devoting myself to those letters.

I am compelled now to repeat them here, so that the obstinacy of the adversaries may appear more clearly; but I shall add many other testimonies to them. In this matter I would like the reader to note that throughout this whole work I have followed the pages of that Greek edition, which I received from Don Juan Fonseca, a noble young man and a student of good arts.

The Budean testimonies are some open, some more obscure; the latter I shall include in this and the following chapter. For I shall divide the battle line of proofs from testimonies into many small companies of witnesses, as it were, because of their multitude. This proof from testimonies has always seemed sufficient to the orthodox, even in deciding questions of faith, which we always see terminated in Councils by the tradition of the elders and the judgment of the Catholic Fathers. I rely on this, and I value it more highly than any novelty of acuteness.

I come to the matter. Bude first relied on a somewhat obscure, but likely, conjecture from the writings of blessed Ignatius, and likewise from the writings of Nazianzen, Jerome, and Chrysostom. He thought that blessed Ignatius the Martyr had taken certain things from this work in the Letter to the Trallians, when he writes: "For even though I am bound, and am able to understand the heavenly things, the angelic ranks, the distinctions of archangels and armies, the differences of powers and dominions, the separations of thrones and authorities, the greatnesses of the ages, the excellences of Cherubim and Seraphim, the sublimity of the Spirit, the kingdom of the Lord, and, above all, the incomparability of God Almighty," and so on.

By these words it appears that he not only alluded to the things handed down by blessed Dionysius, but even observed his very modes of speaking. For Dionysius described the supercelestial realities, the angelic ranks,

the distinctions of archangels and armies, the differences of virtues and dominions, the distances of thrones and powers, the magnificences of ages, and the excellences of Seraphim and Cherubim in the Celestial Hierarchy, chapter 6, from page 34. The sublimity of the Spirit, the kingdom of the Lord, and the incomparability, beyond all things, of Almighty God, he set forth divinely in On the Divine Names, chapter 12, page 408.

From these things I gather two points. First, that Luther was blasphemous when he did not fear to say that Dionysius, writing about these things, was a delirious old man and a mere dreamer, although we see all the same things confirmed by blessed Ignatius. Second, that this was doctrine, sense, and mode of speaking belonging to the apostolic time; and since Ignatius only touched upon the things which Dionysius explained so copiously, it must be judged not that Dionysius took them from Ignatius, but rather that Ignatius borrowed them from Dionysius.

Chapter 11. Bude's Testimonies from Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, and Chrysostom

From these writers also Bude argued, thinking that Saint Jerome, in book 2 Against Jovinian, received the sequence of the angelic orders from our Dionysius in these words: "Why in the kingdom of heaven are there archangels, angels, thrones, dominions, powers, Cherubim, and Seraphim, and every name that is named, not only in the present age but also in the future? The diversity of names is not without cause where there is no diversity of merits. An archangel is certainly an archangel of other lesser angels; and powers and dominions have other beings over whom they exercise power and over whom they rule."

If you say that Jerome borrowed this from Paul himself, as to the names I shall readily assent, but not as to that subordination which he added, and on account of which he subjoins: "This is in the heavens; this is in the mystery of God, lest you mock and jeer at us in your usual manner if we posit emperors, prefects, counts, tribunes, centurions, companies, and the rest of the order of military service." I do not think he looked anywhere else than to the things handed down and most richly explained by blessed Dionysius throughout the whole book On the Celestial Hierarchy, especially chapter 6.

Saint Gregory the Theologian, in his book On Easter, wrote to this effect: "And so indeed the Holy of Holies, which are covered by Seraphim and glorified by three sanctifications, which come together into one dominion and deity; as some other one of the elders has also philosophized most beautifully and most sublimely." Who is this? Not Isaiah, for he would not call him "some other one of the elders." Nicetas, in his annotations, took it of blessed Athanasius; but Gregory seems hardly likely to have called Athanasius, only just dead, in this way.

Bude's opinion is more likely, wishing blessed Dionysius the Areopagite to be signified, since he is deservedly so called and philosophized most beautifully and most sublimely about these matters in the Celestial Hierarchy, chapter 7, pages 44 and 45. Certainly the best and most learned man Billius Prunaeus, Abbot of Saint Michael, in book 1 of Sacred Observations, chapter 23, held that Gregory Nazianzen was not merely an assiduous reader but also a studious imitator of our Dionysius. I believe, Scaliger, that you will concede to him some taste of Greek letters.

Certainly on account of the sublimity of these writings, blessed Chrysostom, in the last book of his sermons, as Anastasius the Librarian cites him in his letter to King Charles, called our Dionysius "the bird of heaven," because, lifted by the favorable breeze of divine grace, with a wing not afraid to be loosed, he raised himself above the Cherubim and Seraphim all the way to the throne of divinity.

Chapter 12. Testimonies from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria

Among the works of Origen Adamantius, volume 2, there are extant certain orations on various places of the New Testament. In the first of these it is written: "For in him, as the divine mouth speaks, we live, move, and are; and, as the great Dionysius the Areopagite says, the being of all things is super-essence and divinity." You have the passage in our author in On the Celestial Hierarchy, chapter 4, page 25: "For the being of all things is the divinity beyond being."

If you deny that this homily is Origen's, you will do so by your own right, by which whatever pleases you is permitted to you. Certainly it belongs to a very ancient writer, since Rufinus, or someone else, translated it from Greek as Origenian. A more recent translator could have added something of his own to Origen, as we know happened not rarely; for in that homily mention is made of Arians, who are later than Origen. At least it will be the work of some ancient anonymous Father.

Blessed Dionysius of Alexandria flourished at almost the same time as Origen, according to some a hearer of Origen. Anastasius of Sinai, Patriarch of Antioch, in the book which he calls the Guide, and Maximus the Martyr on chapter 5 of the Celestial Hierarchy, testify that this man wrote scholia on these little works of Dionysius the Areopagite. From this are refuted those who attempted to attribute these little works to Dionysius of Alexandria.

But why does Eusebius not mention these scholia of Dionysius of Alexandria? He followed his own plan, so that not even in this way would he point out the books of the Areopagite. His evil mind betrayed itself, because he passed over in silence the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria in which Arius, so many years before his condemnation, was punished by anticipatory judgment. By contrast, he carefully mentioned those writings in which Dionysius, disputing sharply against Sabellius, seemed to some Catholics to favor Arianism, not from malice but from incautious zeal against an adversary, as Basil the Great accuses him in letter 41 to Maximus the philosopher, which begins "Images of souls."

Dionysius of Alexandria, then, and those who followed him, Anastasius and Maximus, held these books as Areopagitic. For if Dionysius of Alexandria had held them to be books of Dionysius of Corinth, Anastasius and Maximus would by no means have kept silent about it. As it is, they indicate sufficiently what I have said. Moreover, between Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Corinth there did not intervene a hundred years, so that it is not likely that the former composed scholia on the latter's books.

Therefore let the suspicion cease about Dionysius of Corinth as author; it is incredible that a holy martyr of God wished in this way, under a mask, to make sport of the Church of Christ. And even if the works belonged to Dionysius of Corinth, they would be judged to have an antiquity of more than fourteen hundred years. But they are not his, as I said. Finally, Eusebius and Hilduin testify that Dionysius of Corinth, in his letter to the Athenians, made mention of our Dionysius; and he would have feared to ascribe to him things about which he would then easily have been refuted.

Chapter 13. From Blessed Cyril of Alexandria and Blessed Maximus, Monk and Martyr

Greece has scarcely given us a man more learned than blessed Cyril of Alexandria. Liberatus the African testifies that Cyril borrowed certain things from the books of blessed Dionysius the Areopagite; I shall give his words in chapter 28. I did not take care to seek the passages in Saint Cyril, because I lack Greek exemplars and do not sufficiently trust the Latin ones, since I know that heretical translators behaved in their usual manner in the translation of blessed Cyril. A great part of Cyril's works has also perished, and the things Liberatus says could have been contained in them.

Blessed Maximus, monk, philosopher, and martyr, in the fifty-seventh discourse of his Theological Chapters, adduces a passage from our Areopagite: "That which is deprived of the good in every respect never was anywhere, nor is, nor will be, nor can be." You have it in On the Divine Names, chapter 4, page 320: "But

that which has been wholly deprived of the good in every way neither was, nor is, nor will be, nor can be."

The same Maximus wrote scholia on all the books of Dionysius the Areopagite, which exist printed in Greek. The same author, in the disputation against Pyrrhus the Monothelite, Patriarch of Constantinople, by which he converted him from heresy to the Catholic faith, praised the letter of our Dionysius to Gaius. The same, in the Ecclesiastical Mystagogy, adjudges these books to the Areopagite.

This Maximus was a very great man, whose sanctity, deeds, and knowledge of divine and human wisdom all the writers of that time deservedly celebrated, and whose very many books testify to the same. Photius reported many of them, and Baronius more in the Annals, volume 8, at the year of Christ 657. To him, reader, I refer you, so that you may see Joseph Scaliger's unbridled license in insulting the orthodox Fathers, and indeed martyrs. Many little works of the same Maximus against the Monothelites have recently appeared in the translation of our Francisco Torres; I have not yet read them. See below, chapter 21.

Chapter 14. Testimonies of the Two Anastasii and of a Certain Uncertain Athanasius

I have already praised in the Guide the testimony of Anastasius of Sinai. He lived under Emperor Justinian I, most famous for sanctity and reputation for learning, and an unconquered column of the Church against the heretics of his time, as Theophanes, Evagrius, and others teach. Let another testimony of his also be added from book 7 on the Hexaemeron, rendered into Latin by Hervetus in these words:

"The most celebrated Dionysius, apostolic initiate of divine things, says in his most wise Theology that God in Greek is called Θεός, *Theos*, because he beholds and looks upon (θεωρεῖ), and Lord is called Κύριος, *Kyrios*, because he rules."

This is taken, with no small change, from chapter 12 of On the Divine Names, page 409. In the translation of Ambrosius Camaldulensis: "Hence from the free power of exercising lordship come lordship, lord, and ruling. But Deity, Greek θεότης, *theotes*, is so called because it looks upon all things, and by wonderful providence and goodness runs around all things, contains all things, fills all things with itself, and transcends all things which enjoy its providence."

Anastasius of Nyssa composed certain rather lengthy Questions on Sacred Scripture, different by far from those briefer questions which are usually ascribed to blessed Athanasius of Alexandria. In them he cited many passages of the ancients, and among these certain testimonies of our blessed Dionysius the Areopagite, one lengthy passage in question 23, which Gentianus Hervetus translated thus:

"From Dionysius, On Those Who Have Fallen Asleep Holily: I myself, following the divine sayings, know rightly that each one will have the lot assigned to him. For God has shut him up against himself, says the Lord, and each one will receive through the body according to the things he has done, whether good or evil. But that the prayers of the just, even in this life, and not only after death, are effective only for those who are worthy of sacred prayers, the sacred traditions of the divine sayings teach us. For what did Samuel profit Saul? What did the prayers of the prophets profit the Hebrew people?

"Therefore the divine Pontiff is, as the sacred sayings say, the announcer of God's justifications. For he is the angel, or messenger, of the Lord God Almighty. He has certainly learned from the sayings given by God that to those who have lived holily, a most luminous and divine life is rendered according to their merits by the most just and divine scales; the clemency and kindness of God, in his goodness, overlooking the stains which have been impressed upon them by human weakness, since, as the divine sayings declare, no one is clean from stain.

"The Pontiff knows that these things are promised by the true sayings. He asks that these things may be done, and that sacred recompenses be rendered to those who have lived holily. For the Pontiff, interpreter and

announcer of divine justification, will not be able to ask that things not most pleasing, most dear, and divine to God be promised by him. For this reason these things are not promised for the profane who have fallen asleep. Not only because he would depart from the order of seer or interpreter, and would insolently and arrogantly dare something belonging to the ruler, not moved by the ruler of the sacred empire, but also because he will not obtain his holy vow from the just saying, himself also hearing, as is fitting: 'You ask, and do not receive, because you ask badly.'"

Behold one of the passages on account of which these new Aerians are carried against these writings of Dionysius with such hostile minds, because they see that prayer for faithful departed persons, just recompense, the merits of good works, and the pontifical dignity and office are prescribed to them. You have it in chapter 7 of On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, from page 224.

Our innovators are struck by another flint from the Dionysian stream, which the same Anastasius casts in question 52, not adding the place of the book, but simply praising the Areopagite, concerning these words:

"It is foreign to reason and absurd not to attend to the force of the intention and aim, but to the words. This is proper not to those who wish to understand divine things, but to those who admit bare sounds and receive them only outwardly as far as the ears, sounds which do not pass within. They do not wish to know what that expression signifies and how it ought to be explained by other expressions which have equal force and are more significant. They are attached to elements and lines which cannot be understood, to unknown syllables and words which do not pass over into the intelligent faculty of their soul, but resound outside upon their lips and in their ears."

Who, Apelles, could have painted you, Joseph, and your wisdom with a more breathing brush? Who condemned more sharply your interpreters who reject every mystical meaning? You will find all these things in our Dionysius, On the Divine Names, chapter 4, page 303.

The same Anastasius, in question 6 of the later exemplar, copied these things from Dionysius the Areopagite, On Those Who Have Fallen Asleep Holily:

"I say, therefore, following the sacred Scriptures, that in this life the prayers of the saints are altogether useful in this way. If someone, desiring a gift and religiously disposed toward participation in it, recognizing his own smallness, approaches one of the saints and asks him to become his helper and intercessor, he will altogether gain from this a usefulness surpassing all usefulness. For he will obtain the most divine gifts which he asks, since divine goodness receives him, because of the pious and religious acknowledgment of himself, because of reverence toward the saints, because of the praiseworthy desire for the sacred petitions asked, and because of a fitting and divine disposition.

"For this too has been established by the divine judgments: that divine gifts are granted to those who are worthy to become participants, in a most fitting order, through those who are worthy to impart them. But if anyone despises this beautifully instituted order, and, lifted up by a miserable persuasion concerning himself, thinks himself fit to have intercourse with God, and despises the saints; indeed, if he asks petitions unworthy of God and not holy, and does not have an intense and fitting desire for divine things, he will by his own fault fail in his foolish petition."

Here is a third weapon on behalf of the suffrages of the saints, that through them we may approach God. Here too the pride of the Calvinists is clearly painted: swollen with a wretched persuasion about themselves, they despise and spit upon this order of transacting with God through God's familiars. You have the words in our author, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 7, page 225.

Among the works of Saint Athanasius of Alexandria, Patriarch, in volume 2 of the Greek-Latin edition of Commelin, there is printed a little book of Shorter Questions to Antiochus. That it is not by that great Athanasius is gathered from the fact that Saints Epiphanius and Gregory of Nyssa are cited in it, men later

than that great Athanasius. Nor yet does the author seem the same as that Anastasius of Nyssa, although perhaps each wrote questions to the same Antiochus.

This Athanasius, in question 8, asks how many essences and orders of angels there are, and answers from Saint Nyssenus that there is one and the same essence, just as there is also one essence of all human beings. Concerning the orders, however, he says there are nine: angels, archangels, principalities, powers, virtues, dominions, six-winged Seraphim, many-eyed Cherubim, and thrones, "as Dionysius, mighty in theology, says."

He is clearly looking to the books On the Celestial Hierarchy; for there they are distinguished in this way in chapter 6, although in a slightly different order. It is possible that this Athanasius is some more recent Bishop of Alexandria, to whom also belongs the book of Definitions, in which Nyssenus is cited, and the book of Sayings and Interpretations of the Gospel Parables, where Gregory Nazianzen is cited. But these things are uncertain. It is clear enough that he is an ancient writer, since he has been received as the great Athanasius and cites no one later than Epiphanius.

Chapter 15. Testimonies of Sophronius the Catholic, of the Monothelite Heretics, and of the Schismatic Greeks

In the times of Honorius and John IV, Roman Pontiffs, there lived a certain Sophronius of Jerusalem, almost the first to oppose himself to the Monothelites, author of the Spiritual Meadow, around the year of the Lord 638. In his letter to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he writes as follows:

"We assert that there is also in Christ that power which is called the new and God-manly operation, not existing as one operation, but of different kind and distinction, which Dionysius, divinely caught up from the Areopagus by the eminent Paul, asserted."

Does he not point to the passage in the Letter to Gaius, at the end of the tenth section, page 435, concerning Jesus? "For the rest, neither performing divine things according to God alone, nor human things according to man alone, but, God having become man, showing us by his life among us a certain new God-manly operation." This passage the most crafty heretics of that time were producing on their own behalf, agreeing with Catholics that the author of the letter was the Areopagite. If the authority of Catholic monks has no weight with Scaliger, at least the opinion of heretics should have weight. It would have weight, if it did not harm Calvinism.

Nevertheless I shall enumerate those heretics, so that the agreement of the world at that time concerning the writer of that letter may be clear. In volume 3 of the Councils, in the synod held at Rome under Pope Martin I, session 3, page 121, there is extant the letter of that Monothelite Sergius to Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria. In that letter he receives the seventh chapter of Cyrus, in which Cyrus was attributing this passage to Dionysius the Areopagite. On page 123, Themistius the heretic says in a letter to Marcellinus the presbyter and Stephen the deacon, concerning the operation of Christ: "Therefore Dionysius the Areopagite named it God-manly."

The same thing was asserted by Macarius, the heretical Patriarch of Antioch, in the synod held at Constantinople in Trullo in the time of the Emperor Pogonatus, act 2, at the end: "I," he says, "do not speak of number, but of his God-manly operation, according to Saint Dionysius." Cyrus the heretic, in the said seventh chapter, had said that he believed "the same one Christ and one Son to operate things proper to God and human things by one operation of God and man, according to blessed Dionysius," in the same volume 3, page 120.

In these words Cyrus was convicted by blessed Sophronius of having corrupted the context of Dionysius and put "one" in place of "new," as Pyrrhus himself, while still a heretic, admits in the book against the dogmatic

volume of Cyrus, in these words:

"The most reverend Sophronius censured only one chapter, as falsifying the testimony of Dionysius of blessed memory by the alteration of one word. In this the aforesaid man spoke fittingly and cautiously, in the passages in which he asserts, 'but, God having become man, bringing forth for us a certain new and God-manly operation.' For in truth the named volume contained 'one'; but not maliciously, far be it, according to my statement. Rather, because 'new' cannot be understood otherwise than as 'one,' this word was put by the most holy Cyrus; because, by the denial of the higher things, the blessed Doctor constructs one confession and expresses it singly. What else did he hand down more plainly by a certain word than that one operation is to be confessed, since Christ is one?"

Thus far Pyrrhus, that torpid serpent. Having been convicted, he admits the corruption, which he could not deny, but seeks praise from the crime. The same Pyrrhus, in the disputation with blessed Maximus, monk and martyr, near the end, says, as Torres translates it: "What, moreover, shall we say about Saint Dionysius, who in the Letter to Gaius the devotee said of Christ that he exercised a certain new God-manly operation?"

You have five Monothelites. Consider for me that, in that seventh century, this opinion concerning the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite was undoubted in all the patriarchal sees, that is, in the whole Church. For at Rome Martin, Honorius, and John asserted it; at Alexandria, Cyrus; at Antioch, Macarius; at Constantinople, Sergius; at Jerusalem, Sophronius.

See also in what way, even today, in this matter, I mean concerning the books of the Areopagite, the schismatic Greeks agree with the Roman Church. When Stephen Gerlach, Martin Crusius, and other Lutheran Ubiquitarians of Wittenberg and Tubingen, against the Catholics of Germany, the Jesuits and others, were seeking everywhere supporters of their own sect, according to that verse of Virgil, "If I cannot bend the powers above, I shall stir Acheron," they sent an embassy to Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople. Afterwards by letter they asked him what the opinion of all Greece was concerning that Dionysius and his works, about whom Scaliger disputes.

He replied through Theodore Zygomalas, his secretary, in these words, which, taken from the first book of Turco-Graecia, column 97, our Petrus Duiarricius of Aquitaine sent to me:

"I wrote a life of the Areopagite and sent it to you, as I remember well. You too will find it there, provided you look for it. Know that this man is held divine by us, and is honored by the Church next after the Apostles of Christ; and that his book is approved by us, and the things written in it are considered worthy of trust."

What will Scaliger say to these things? He will laugh at the Lutherans because they consulted Jeremiah rather than the Genevans and himself. But I return to our own witnesses, that is, to the earlier Fathers.

Chapter 16. Testimonies of Theodore the Presbyter, Sergius of Tempsa, and Antonius Melissa

Let three others be added to Sophronius. Since they are unknown, I have nothing else to say about them. In the Bibliotheca of Photius mention is made of Theodore the Presbyter, when he lived and what else he did or wrote I do not know. Photius says that he had read a book of his in which he had solved four objections of adversaries, as you have above in chapter 7, and had proved these monuments to be genuine works of the divine and great Dionysius. Let the Calvinists believe Photius, a heretic as learned as he was impious, a most bitter adversary of the Roman see.

In the Lateran Council under Martin I, in the third consultation, Sergius, Bishop of Tempsa, acknowledges the said Letter to Gaius the devotee, about which I spoke in chapter 15, and admits that those very words which Cyrus was putting forward in the seventh chapter belonged to Dionysius the Areopagite.

A certain monk Antonius, whose book called Melissa is extant, often cites our Dionysius. In book 1, sermon 19, at the end, he produces these words from him: "It cannot be that those who do not repent of their sins obtain pardon." And in sermon 21: "Truth is God, since according to nature it is one, not many. For the true is one; but falsehood is multiple. For Christ too says, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.'" In sermon 73: "That silence is held as consent is taught also by a proverb." I could find none of these passages in the books which we have. It may be that they escaped my diligence.

In book 2, sermon 3, he cites these words: "Those who approach the most pure Sacrifice must be thoroughly purified even in the remotest images and likenesses of the soul, and thus, according to their powers, approach it." This is extant in On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 3. And so that you may not doubt that these things belong to the Areopagite, know that this Antonius was accustomed to attribute the name of Dionysius simply to our man; but in the case of other Dionysiuses he was accustomed to add their country. Thus, in book 2, sermon 45, he adduces this from Dionysius of Alexandria: "A strong and exact discourse says that bitter things also are causes of sweet things, and pleasures are fruits of labors. For without labor nothing beautiful can happen." And in sermon 72 he produces from the same Dionysius of Alexandria: "To be angry among us extends only so far as sin sits present. 'Be angry,' he says, 'and do not sin.' And the strictest justice is to be avoided, since Ecclesiastes says: 'Do not be just overmuch.'"

Finally, it is a settled matter among theologians that, under the designation Dionysius par excellence, the Areopagite is understood.

Chapter 17. Testimonies from Elias of Crete and Andrew of Crete

Elias of Crete composed eloquent and accurate commentaries on many orations of blessed Gregory Nazianzen. In these he rather often mentions our Dionysius. Thus, in the Apologetic Oration 1, folios 59 and 75, he says that Nazianzen borrowed the word "illuminators" from the books of Dionysius, namely from On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 5, page 181. Afterwards Elias, folio 151, clearly alludes to the hierarchical books of Dionysius, writing as follows:

"For Saint Dionysius judges that the things which are celebrated here in the churches are likenesses and images of the things which are celebrated in the heavens; and, placing our hierarchy after the celestial hierarchy, he declares it to be a fellow minister with it, and says that it receives from there, according to God's kindness, the fitting illuminations, using precisely these words: 'For the sake, therefore, of this fitting deification of ours, that kindly principality of sacred rites,' and so forth."

All these things may be read in the said chapter 5, from page 180, and in chapter 6, from page 207, where they are set forth more fully. Likewise, in the commentary on oration 19, he praises the things which Dionysius wrote about the rite of consecrating priests, which are now extant in the said chapter 5, page 194.

Saint Andrew of Crete, martyr and Bishop of Jerusalem, praised by Glycas, in his oration On the Dormition of the Virgin Mother of God, not only followed the narrative of our Dionysius concerning the death of Mary our Lady, but also tried to imitate his style and words. Anyone who compares the Greek words of Andrew with those of Dionysius, page 281, will easily gather this.

Chapter 18. Testimonies of Julian of Jerusalem, Epiphanius the Presbyter, Glycas, and Other Greeks

Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, in the book On the Divine Names, chapter 3, at the end, writes as follows:

"Since even among our own hierarchs, inspired by God, when we also, as you know, and you yourself, and many of our sacred brethren had come together to behold the body which gave the principle of life and received God, there was also present James, the brother of God, and Peter, who was the supreme and most

ancient summit of the theologians; it seemed good that after that spectacle all the hierarchs should sing a hymn," and so forth.

The Greek Fathers received these as true words of the Areopagite speaking about himself, with great agreement. From there a most ancient tradition flowed into the Church: that at the death of the Virgin Mother of God all the Apostles, and blessed Dionysius and Timothy, were present. At the time of the Synod of Chalcedon, when Marcian and Pulcheria asked for it, Julian, Bishop of Jerusalem, testified to this in these words:

"Then there were present with the Apostles the most holy Timothy, Apostle and first Bishop of the Ephesians, and Dionysius the Areopagite; just as this great Dionysius himself testifies in those things which he wrote to the lord Apostle Timothy concerning blessed Hierotheus, who himself also was then present, saying as follows: 'Since,' and so forth."

For he then adds the cited words of Dionysius. Euthymius the historian, book 3, chapter 40, cited by blessed John Damascene in the oration On the Dormition of the Mother of God, brings forward this testimony of blessed Julian. Nicephorus Callistus reports the same thing in book 15 of his History, chapter 14. Epiphanius the Presbyter also, in the oration On the Dormition of the Mother of God, Symeon Metaphrastes, Michael Syncellus in praise of Dionysius, Maximus in the scholia on Dionysius, Glycas in book 1 of the Annals, and other Greeks in a certain hymn concerning the Mother of God embrace the same authority and the same words as belonging to the Areopagite.

Read Petrus Canisius, book 5 of the Marian work, chapter 3, and Cardinal Baronius, volume 1 of the Annals, at the year of Christ 48, number 8, where he learnedly shows that this is the true opinion of Dionysius.

Chapter 19. The Opinion of Blessed Michael Syncellus and Blessed John Damascene

Blessed Michael Syncellus, a presbyter of Jerusalem, of great praise for sanctity and learning, wrote some things not in the time of Emperor Maurice, but in the age of Louis the Pious and Hilduin, when he suffered many things from Theophilus, iconoclast Emperor of the Greeks, on account of the Catholic faith, as Curopalata hands down in the History. He is also praised by Theodore the Studite in book 2, letter 213.

This Syncellus, therefore, at the same time at which blessed Methodius wrote the life and martyrdom of the Areopagite, himself also burning with love of martyrdom, composed a most eloquent encomium of the same Dionysius, which was printed in Greek at Paris, beginning with the words "Truly heavenly." In this he praises many things from both Hierarchies, from the book On the Divine Names, from the Letter to Gaius, and other things which are at everyone's hand.

A little older than Michael, and no less distinguished by the praise of confession, lived John Mansur Damascene, a clear light and star of the eighth century, a diligent reader and fair-minded praiser of these books of Dionysius. You have in book 1 of On the Orthodox Faith, chapter 12: "And these things indeed we have been taught from the sacred oracles, as the divine Dionysius the Areopagite says: that God is the cause and principle of all things, the essence of things that are, the life of living things, and the reason of beings that use reason," and so forth. Although in another order, you will find all these things in On the Divine Names, chapter 1, page 243 and following.

The same John, in book 2, chapter 18 of the same work, calls him "most holy and most skilled in theology": "As the most holy and most skilled in theology Dionysius the Areopagite says: the whole of theology, that is, sacred Scripture, has said that the celestial essences are nine." These things are drawn from the book On the Celestial Hierarchy, chapter 5, near the end, page 34.

He brings forward a third passage in the book On Those Who Have Died in the Faith: "Dionysius, the great and deep searcher of divine things, says in the mystical contemplation concerning those who sleep, speaking thus: 'That I may take a taste from his divine and venerable discourses: The prayers of the saints,'" and so forth. The passage of Dionysius is found in the last chapter of On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, page 224. I have already set it out above in full from blessed Anastasius of Nyssa, who praises the same passage, in chapter 14.

For that reason I do not repeat it, nor do I add a fourth testimony of Damascene from the oration On the Dormition of blessed Mary the Virgin, where he confirms the narrative of our Dionysius which was discussed in chapter 18. This history also blessed Michael Syncellus elegantly expanded in the aforementioned encomium of Saint Dionysius.

Chapter 20. Testimonies from Symeon Metaphrastes and Theodore Prodromus

Blessed Symeon Metaphrastes, most celebrated among the Greeks, whose authority the Ecumenical Council of Florence under Eugene IV uses in session 7, is abundant in commendation of these books, confirming that they belong to blessed Dionysius the Areopagite. First, he does this in the Life of Dionysius, which we have in the fifth volume of Surius, on the eleventh of October, where he also sets forth the subject matter of the books which we see in these works of ours.

Then, in the fourth volume of the same Surius, in the oration On the Dormition of the Mother of God, he says: "By a cloud he gathered together her venerable disciples, so that they might commit her venerable body to burial. But lest what has been said about the gathering of the Apostles, which took place at the Dormition of the Virgin, seem empty, it will be sufficient to add in summary those things which are said by Dionysius the Areopagite in the third book On the Divine Names to Timothy." He uses "book" for chapter or section, and then adds the words of Dionysius which we have above in chapter 18.

I add Theodore Prodromus, who lived much later, in the times of the Emperor Andronicus the Younger. I add him because, in reviewing certain very weighty, very ancient, and very holy Greek Fathers, by whose writings the Church was illuminated, he gives the first place to our blessed Dionysius the Areopagite. After him he places the great Athanasius, Basil, both Gregories, Ephrem the Syrian, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, our Maximus, John Climacus, and Nilus. Finally, after all these whom I have named, he places Symeon Metaphrastes, as worthy of their company. Therefore let he himself now also be associated with them.

Chapter 21. From Suidas, John of Scythopolis, and George the Patrician

That Suidas, whoever he was, whose useful collections are extant and who lived after the thousandth year of Christ, when treating of our Dionysius, makes him a disciple of blessed Paul and bishop of the Athenians. From him he narrates the history of the eclipse seen at Heliopolis while the Lord was suffering, when Apollophanes was present. He also cites the letter of our Dionysius to Polycarp, which is handled by many hands, and in that letter all the things which Suidas reported are contained word for word.

Afterwards he subjoins the whole subject matter of the book On the Divine Names to Timothy. He also acknowledges the Hierarchical books, the Mystical Theology, and all the letters which we have, and among them those to Gaius and to Demophilus, both of whom he calls Therapeutae. He also cites the encomium of Michael Syncellus, of which we have already treated.

Many hold that the Prologue prefixed to the Greek scholia of blessed Maximus is not by Maximus, but by a certain younger John of Scythopolis. Indeed, it does not agree very much with the style of Maximus, which is more compressed and simpler. In this Prologue an answer is given to certain arguments of adversaries who attempt to take these books away from Dionysius the Areopagite, arguments which we have already solved.

With most people, we attribute the Prologue to Maximus, from whom I think it should not be taken away on account of no very great discrepancy of style.

In the same Prologue there is added an index of all the works of Dionysius which now exist, and besides these of many works which have perished, mention of which is made in the works now extant. There is no need to recount these now again.

Finally, various epigrams of George the Patrician, whose homeland was Mytilene, have appeared in print in praise of the books of blessed Dionysius: On the Celestial Hierarchy, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, On the Divine Names, and On Mystical Theology.

Chapter 22. From Euthymius the Monk Zigabenus

He lived in the time of Alexius Comnenus, in the eleventh century, and among the Greeks of his age he was most learned and most diligent, as is clear from the books which are extant: namely, the commentaries on all the Psalms and on the four Gospels, and the Panoply against heresies. In this work he adduces many rather ample passages from our Dionysius, as from that great Areopagite. I shall give some from the translation of Franciscus Zinus.

In part 1 of the Panoply of the Orthodox Faith, title 2, On the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the account of divinity at once distinct and joined, he says: "Dionysius the Areopagite, from the chapter On United and Distinct Theology: We have received from the sacred books that the Father is, so to speak, the fountain of divinity; but that the Son and the Spirit are fruitful shoots of divinity, if one may so speak, divinely springing forth, and, as it were, flowers and lights superior in essence. But in what way these things are, we can neither express nor understand." These things are in On the Divine Names, chapter 2, page 268. You see how genuinely these belong to our Dionysius, whose Greek grandeur of speech scarcely any eloquence of Latin discourse can fully express; this will be equally clear from the rest.

Likewise, from the first chapter of the book On the Divine Names: "Wherefore in almost every theological discussion we see the supreme divinity celebrated in holy fashion, both as Monad and Unity, on account of the simplicity and unity of its nature, which surpasses division. From it, as from a unifying power, we are made one; and, when our divided diversities have been joined together in a manner above the world, we are gathered into a Godlike monad and a union imitating God. We also see it celebrated as Trinity, on account of the manifestation of the fecundity surpassing essence in the three persons, from which every fatherhood in heaven and on earth exists and is named." These things and all the rest which he subjoins are extant in our author from page 244.

Likewise, from chapter 3 of the Mystical Theology, he cites this: "In that book which we entitled Theological Outlines, we declared the principal matters of affirmative theology: how the divine good nature is said to be one and triune; what in it is the notion of Father, what the notion of Son, what the theology of the Holy Spirit signifies; by what reason, from the incorporeal and indivisible Good, the inward lights of goodness spring forth, and from their coeternal springing with it remain in it, and in themselves, and among themselves, in such a way that they never depart from it." They are found in Greek on page 425.

There follow in Euthymius two passages from chapter 2 of On the Divine Names. The first is this: "In the divine union, or in that nature which surpasses essence, joined and common to the one-principled Trinity are existence, the divinity surpassing essence, the deity above deity, the goodness surpassing goodness," and so forth, from that passage on page 262. The later passage is from the beginning of the same chapter: "'No one is good except God alone.' This has been explained and demonstrated by us both here and elsewhere: that all denominations worthy of God are always celebrated in the holy books not partially, but in the whole, perfect, entire, and full divinity; and that all of them are attributed indivisibly, absolutely, and without any observance of distinction, in an entire manner, to all the integrity of the perfect and whole divinity." And

many things which follow are from page 256.

Behold five testimonies from one title. I fear that I would be troublesome if I mentioned all the rest from the same work; for they are many and very great. For in title 3 there are contained twenty-seven fragments, cited paraphrastically from the book On the Divine Names and from other works; one in title 5; and in title 7 two from the same book, one from the fourth Letter to Gaius, one from the book Theological Outlines, and two from the Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

Moreover, in part 2, title 18, he reports the fifth letter of Maximus to Nicander, in which Maximus explained at length that passage of blessed Dionysius on the God-manly operation from the Letter to Gaius. Because this explanation is very learned, and shows the wisdom and learning of Maximus, whose ignorance Scaliger boasts that he has shown, I shall set it down here, in Scaliger's honor, not in Greek, because I lack the exemplar, but in Latin from Zinus's translation. He therefore says:

"We can say the same about the actions, and yet for that reason we do not deny, far be it, the singular expressions of the divine Fathers about those actions, which either the most holy Dionysius, so excellent in explaining divine things, or the wise Cyril pronounced. By these expressions the divine and human action is so declared that it appears to be joined and one. For the terms devised by them on account of the conjunction and mutual coupling of the natural actions themselves are pious and to be approved; just as those terms also are pious which declare twin actions on account of the difference subsisting in essence and nature. For that word 'theandric,' composed by Doctor Dionysius, signifies divine and human, so that by a single utterance he might indicate the double action of a double nature. Again, wise Cyril called it one joined action, so that he might teach the related coupling of the natural actions."

And after a little: "Wherefore the one and joined action of both, as Cyril says, which has been demonstrated, no otherwise than that theandric expression of Dionysius, by naturally indicating the coupling of the actions, properly demonstrates their diverse and double account."

The same Euthymius, in the same title, chapter 83, cites a clearer explanation of the same Dionysian passage, handed down by blessed Damascene against the Monothelites. It is this:

"Blessed Dionysius says that Christ used a certain new theandric action. By this word he does not remove the natural actions, but establishes one action consisting of the divine and the human. For in this way we would also say one new nature, which consists of the divine and the human. For those whose action is one have one essence also, as our divine Fathers think. But since he wished to show the new and hidden mode by which the natural actions of Christ were manifested, on account of the hidden reason by which the natures of Christ pass mutually into one another, he fittingly called even his customary action, so far as it pertains to the humanity, new and admirable. For we do not say that the actions are divided, nor that the natures act separately, but that each nature, joined with the other, acts together with the other's fellowship, doing what is proper to itself," and so forth, down to this:

"This, therefore, is what the theandric action signifies: when God had become man, his human action also was divine, that is, deified, and not without share in his divine action; and likewise his divine action was not without share in his human action, but each is considered together with the other. This manner of speaking is a compounded expression, when we embrace two things in one word. For just as we speak of one action of a fiery sword, both a cutting burning and a burning cutting, although cutting is one action and burning another, and they proceed from one nature and another, namely burning from fire and cutting from iron, so also, when we speak of one theandric action of Christ, we understand the twin actions of his two natures: the divine action of his divinity, and the human action of his humanity."

Chapter 23. Testimonies of Nicephorus Callistus, George Pachymeres, and Cardinal Bessarion

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus wrote an Ecclesiastical History, and indeed diligently, in the time of Andronicus the elder Palaeologus, around the year of the Lord 1311. In book 2, chapter 22, from the narrative of our Dionysius, whom he calls the Areopagite, in the said chapter 3 of On the Divine Names, he recounts the things which happened at the funeral of blessed Mary the Virgin. But in chapter 21 he speaks thus of our author:

"So great was his faith in Christ that not only was he worthy of the divine laver, but he was also designated Bishop of the Athenians by the hands of Paul himself, being endowed with altogether wonderful and divine charisms. He also lived on more familiar terms with the divine man Hierotheus. To each of these Paul, as he himself had been initiated when caught up into the third heaven and into Paradise, communicated and handed down the highest matters concerning theology, that is, the account of God the Word, and also concerning the Celestial Hierarchy and the most complete disposition and ordering of all things. These matters Dionysius afterwards also reported in writing.

"By magnificently preaching the word of piety and true worship, he used great freedom; and, after glorifying Christ for many years in the western regions, he came to great old age and was honored for him with the crown of martyrdom. They report that he carried his head, which had been cut off by the sword, in his hands for two thousand paces, and there handed it over, as a deposit, to the woman whom he encountered.

"The writings which he composed with sublime contemplation of divine things, with altogether admirable and excellent sentiments and expression, far removed from those things which have been published according to human capacity, are as follows. First, he wrote the work On the Divine Names in thirteen chapters, in which nearly a hundred other chapters full of divine wisdom are also added. The second book written by him he entitled On the Celestial Hierarchy, having fifteen chapters. The third, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, of seven chapters. The fourth, On Hidden or Mystical Theology, of five chapters. He also left ten letters, of which the last was written to John the Evangelist, who reclined upon the Lord's breast.

"And these writings of his are indeed circulated even today. He himself also makes mention of other studies of his, such as those which were named by him Theological Dispositions; likewise Symbolic Theology; besides these, On Angelic Properties and Orders; a commentary On the Soul; On the Just and Divine Judgment; On Divine Hymns; likewise On the Things Which Are Apprehended Either by Intelligence or by Sense. These commentaries, however, have not been seen at all, nor known either to us or to those who were before us."

Thus far Nicephorus. Concerning the writings of the Areopagite, George Pachymeres plainly agrees with him. Pachymeres lived under Michael Palaeologus and Andronicus around the year 1260, a little earlier. We have his Aristotelian epitomes and his Areopagitic paraphrases on all the books which are extant, as well as the Scholia of Maximus. He gives the names of the remaining works which, he says, are not found: On Angelic Properties, On the Soul, On the Just and Divine Tribunal, On Divine Hymns, On Intelligible and Sensible Things, On Theological Outlines, and On Symbolic Theology.

As to the surviving books, Suidas also agrees with these witnesses concerning the titles; for as to the chapters they vary, which matters little. Suidas lists the books in this way: to Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus, himself a disciple of Paul, the books On Divine Names; and he adds the titles of the chapters. To the same Timothy, another book, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; to the same, On the Celestial Hierarchy; to the same, On Mystical Theology.

Then he lists these letters: four to Gaius the Therapeuta; one to Dorotheus the minister; one to Sopater the priest; one to Polycarp, hierarch of Smyrna; one to Demophilus the Therapeuta; one to John the theologian, the apostle and evangelist. Here you see that the letter to Titus the bishop is omitted, which Maximus, Pachymeres, and Nicephorus recognize. For the index of Maximus, or John of Scythopolis, is similar to the

Pachymerian enumeration, except that it adds the places in Dionysius where he cites his books which are not extant.

Around the year of Christ 1371, when Greece was now collapsing, George of Trebizond, Theodore Gaza, and the most learned Cardinal Bessarion lived. Bessarion, disagreeing with Gaza and following his ancestors, attributed these works to the Areopagite. For in book 2, chapter 3, of the Platonic Defense, he writes as follows:

"The most holy man Dionysius the Areopagite, who was the first and highest author of Christian theology, had no writer on divine things before himself except the Apostle Paul and Hierotheus, Bishop of Athens, whom he used as his teachers."

So Morellius from the codex of Budaeus. I ask: what other writings of Dionysius on divine matters did Bessarion praise in this place, except ours? In these matters I do not fear to prefer his judgment to ten Gazas and a hundred Scaligers.

Chapter 24. Testimonies from the Councils of the Greeks

I can prove the same thing not only through individual Fathers, but also collectively through synods. The Nicene Synod, the first ecumenical synod and, so to speak, the chief of the universal councils, in the fuller canons which, from among our men, Pisanus and Turrianus published following Arabic exemplars, decreed as follows in the thirty-first canon, which concerns receiving those who return from heresy:

"And after the bishop or priest, in whose hands the matter is, has done these things, he ought to anoint him with the prayer of chrism, and three times to sign him with the sign of the cross, anointing and praying over him the prayer of Dionysius the Areopagite."

Therefore our author had established some formula of prayer, certainly. For it is extant in the last chapter of On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, page 222 and following; you will find it there.

In the sixth universal synod, which was the third of Constantinople, in the time of Pope Agatho and the Emperor Constantine IV, in the year 678, these works are received as Areopagitic. For in the eighth action, page 279, it is read:

"Likewise another testimony was reported from the same little codex, of Saint Dionysius, Bishop of Athens and Martyr, from the book Of the Divine Names; and the text of the testimony, similarly collated, contained as follows: 'But the most benign operation of God toward us is distinct, in that, according to us and from us, the Word which is above substance was wholly and truly made human, and did and suffered the principal and approved things, insofar as they belong to his human divine operation. For in these the Father and the Spirit in no way share, unless someone should say, according to the most benign mercy and will,' which things were cut off from the same testimony by the same persons, 'and through every most sublime and ineffable operation of God, which the immutable one performed, having been made according to us, since he is God and the Word of God.'"

It cites the passage from chapter 2, page 266.

Do you want something also from our own Decrees of Gratian, in which you are wrongly pleased with yourselves? Read chapter 6, which begins "Omnis," distinction 38. But lest you become nauseated, know that the same thing is found in the second ecumenical Council of Nicaea, which was the seventh universal council. There the essence of our hierarchy is handed down as placed in the oracles delivered by God, that is, in the true knowledge and understanding of divine things, "as that great Dionysius says." For that canon is conceived thus:

"For the essence of the hierarchy according to us is the oracles handed down by God, that is, the true knowledge of the divine Scriptures, as the great Dionysius declared."

You have it today in chapter 1 of On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, page 108, except that today "according to us" is read in place of a slightly different form, with the same sense and an easy change.

Chapter 25. Testimonies from the Councils of the Latins

In the Latin councils many Greeks were often present, just as in the Greek councils Latins were present; for this is the condition of universal councils. But I call them Latin because they were celebrated in the West, and Greek because they were celebrated in the East.

At Rome in the Lateran, in the year 660, a council was celebrated under Pope Martin I. Then the Fathers held these works as genuine works of Dionysius the Areopagite, as is clear from session 3, page 122. For there Martin, the most holy and most blessed Bishop of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God of the city of Rome, said: "Let those whose concern it is bring into the acts the codex of Saint Dionysius, Bishop of Athens."

Theophylact, chief of the notaries of the holy Apostolic See, said: "According to the command of your blessedness, bringing it from the venerable library of your see, I have before my hands the codex of blessed Dionysius. What do you command?"

Martin, the most holy and most blessed Bishop of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God of the city of Rome, said: "Let the codex of blessed Dionysius be received; and from the letter deposited there, directed to Gaius, let that passage about which the matter is being handled, of which Cyrus made mention in his chapter for the approval of his novelty, be read again in order before the holy Council."

And Paschal, regional notary of the Apostolic See, receiving the testimony itself translated from Greek into Latin, read it again, containing as follows: "From Saint Dionysius, from the letter directed to Gaius, at the passage: 'Not performing divine things according to God, nor human things according to man, but, God having been made man, showing us a certain new God-manly, that is, theandric, operation.'"

Afterwards Martin and the other Fathers approve these as the words of Dionysius, which, as we have already said often, are extant today in the fourth Letter to Gaius.

The eighth general synod, under Eugene IV, at Ferrara, session 7, receives the oration of Symeon Metaphrastes on the life of Saint Dionysius. In that oration, as was said above, these works of our Dionysius are reported as genuine works of blessed Dionysius the Areopagite.

Chapter 26. Testimonies of Gregory the Great and Martin I, Roman Pontiffs

I come to the Roman Pontiffs, successors of the Apostle Peter. Whoever refuses to believe them refuses to believe Peter; without their approval, not even general councils are held to be of certain faith. But if they have approved, we confess that the Holy Spirit breathed upon the sanctioned dogmas, so that Scaliger may see himself to be a fighter against the Spirit.

Saint Gregory the Great, in homily 34 on the Gospel of Luke, chapter 15, writes as follows: "It is reported that Dionysius the Areopagite, an ancient and venerable Father, says that from the ranks of the lesser angels they are sent forth, visibly or invisibly, to fulfill ministry; namely, because either Angels or Archangels come for human consolations. For those higher ranks never depart from the innermost places."

He does not cite Dionysius's very words, but Dionysius's doctrine, which he explained in almost the whole book On the Celestial Hierarchy, especially chapters 7, 9, and 13. He said "it is reported" either because he himself had not read Dionysius, or because the book was not yet commonly known sufficiently among the

Latins. See above, chapter 6. Certainly Hadrian I, Pope, held that Gregory attributed that work to Dionysius not hesitatingly, but affirmatively, as you will see in the following chapter.

Saint Martin I, glorious martyr, in the said Lateran Synod, session 1, citing various Fathers, also praises our author in these words, page 119:

"The distinguished Dionysius also proclaims that he had fleshly mass and bodily weight, and that with mass and bodily weight he walked upon the waters without his feet being wetted. Teaching this in his little works On the Divine Names, he says: 'We do not know how from the Virgin he was formed by another law beyond the natural, nor how, with unwetted feet having bodily mass and material weight, he walked upon the swelling and unstable substance.'"

And again, in his Letter to Gaius, he says: "'He also performed above man the things that belong to man. And this is shown by the Virgin bearing beyond nature, and by unstable water supporting the weight of earthly and material feet and not yielding, but by a power above nature standing without diffusion.'"

The former passage is extant in chapter 2 of On the Divine Names, page 270. The latter is in the fourth Letter to Gaius, page 434.

Finally, in session 3, page 122, he speaks thus: "Therefore the Lord has made these men manifest to you, as you see, through this testimony of blessed Dionysius which has been reread at present, showing them more clearly to be speakers of falsehood, so that concerning them also what was said by the Lord may be fulfilled, when he says: 'When he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own, because he is a liar and its father.' For iniquity has lied to itself, surely in these unstable matters as something unstable. For since blessed Dionysius asserts, as you have heard, most beloved brothers, that a certain new God-manly operation had dwelt among us, each of them has lied most openly against the Father.

"Cyrus indeed, in his seventh chapter, by changing 'new' and by putting forward 'one' God-manly operation in place of 'new,' alleges as though the Doctor had said it. Sergius, however, in the letter written to Cyrus concerning this question, not only confirms with him the alteration of 'new,' but also wholly cuts off the Doctor's God-manly term, and dogmatizes absolutely one operation in Christ God. They make deceit like a sharp razor, and do not at all consider what is written in the Psalm: 'Will not God search these things out? For he knows the hidden things of the heart,' the thoughts of such men, because they are vain. 'For each one has spoken vain things to his neighbor; deceitful lips in the heart, and with the heart they have spoken evils. But the Lord will destroy all deceitful lips and the boastful tongue, who have said: Our lips are our own; who is our Lord?' For if they retained these things in memory, they would by no means have rushed forth into such iniquity, that is, into the alteration and destruction of paternal traditions and dogmas."

Thus far Saint Pope Martin. What would he now say to you and yours, Joseph? If removing one little word and substituting another from this book of blessed Dionysius is to alter and destroy paternal traditions, what is it to abolish the whole book and to make the genuine spurious; to make a holy martyr and most weighty Doctor of the Church into a phantom, an ape, a counterfeit? See whether you are not one of those whose deceitful lips and boastful tongue admit restraints neither from Pontiffs nor from Synods. See whether God may not require these things from you, whether he may not tear you apart, he who knows the hidden things of the heart and the most concealed thoughts. Your razor is sharper than that of Sergius and Cyrus: they cut away one single word; you have cut up so many little works.

Moreover, I have set out above, in chapter 15, the words of Dionysius from the Letter to Gaius about which the matter is handled. They are found at the end of the said fourth Letter to Gaius the Therapeuta. Maximus and Pachymeres rightly explain this as "monk"; whether you translate it "devotee" with Turrianus or "physician" with Zinus. For monks were occupied before others especially with divine worship and with the medicine of their own soul. Thus they advanced from the purgative way to the illuminative, and from this to

the unitive way of the spiritual life, so that you may at last cease thinking of your physicians of bodies.

Chapter 27. Testimonies of Pope Agatho, Hadrian I, and Nicholas I

Pope Agatho, in the letter to the Emperor Constantine and to Heraclius and Tiberius, Augusti, read in the said third Council of Constantinople, page 252, writes thus:

"Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, Bishop of Athens, likewise teaches in the book On the Divine Names, chapter 2: 'Distinct from the most benign operation of God toward us is this: that according to us, and from us, the Word who is above substance was wholly and truly made human, and did and suffered the chief and approved things that accord with his human and divine operation. For in these the Father and the Spirit in no way share, unless someone should say that they share according to his merciful and most benign will, and through every most exalted and ineffable operation of God which the immutable one performed, having been made according to us, because he is God and the Word of God.'"

You have the passage today on page 266, and I set it above, chapter 24.

Pope Hadrian I, in his writing to the Emperor Charlemagne On the Veneration of Images, as you have it in volume 3 of the Councils, page 616, speaks thus about our author:

"Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, who was also Bishop of Athens, was indeed greatly praised by Pope Saint Gregory, who confirms that he was an ancient Father and Doctor. He lived in the times of the Apostles, and is shown in the Acts of the Apostles. Hence also by the aforesaid most holy Pontiffs our predecessors, in their sacred Councils, his truthful testimonies were confirmed for the veneration of sacred images. Among other things they embraced these words from the letter of Saint Dionysius, Bishop of Athens, which was directed to Saint John the Evangelist."

And below:

"What wonder is it, if Christ is true, and the unjust cast his disciples out of the cities, rightly assigning to themselves what they deserve, and if the profane withdraw and depart from holy things? In truth and manifestly, visible things are images of invisible things. For not even in the ages to come will God's regard, according to his justice, be blameworthy."

Likewise, from the same author, on the heavenly host:

"For the aforesaid incorporeal ranks are represented by different colors, and he handed them down in compositions varied through different colors, so that silently, through ourselves and through most sacred images, we may pass with a pious mind to the simple and incorporeal things. For it is impossible for our mind to attain that invisible and incorporeal imitation and vision of the heavenly host, unless through the elements we can attain, by the visible, to the invisible and most beautiful form, and unless by rational tradition the visible and fragrant images shine forth with invisible things."

These Latin words from the Greek are to be corrected.

You will find these two passages in our author: the first on page 482; the other in the Celestial Hierarchy, which Hadrian, in the manner of sacred Scripture, calls a host, chapter 1, page 3. The words of the former passage, page 482, are:

"What wonder is it if, since Christ is true, the unjust drive the disciples out of the cities, assigning to themselves what is deserved, while the impious separate themselves from holy things and depart? Truly the visible things are manifest images of the invisible. For not even in the coming ages will God be the cause of the just separations that come from him."

You will find this passage handed down more clearly by the interpreters of Dionysius than in the papal letter. I do not see what solid answer the iconomach deserter of the Dionysian faith could make to it, since he sees that this is so clearly attributed to the Areopagite, and that this same writer is affirmed to have been praised by Saint Gregory the Great, and that by other most holy Pontiffs his little books, about which we are disputing, were confirmed in Councils, over which the Holy Spirit presides, as truthful writings. This single testimony by itself ought to suffice for a Catholic man.

The words of the other passage, on the said page 3, are:

"Therefore the most perfect ordering of sacred things, judging our most holy hierarchy worthy of the supermundane imitation of the heavenly hierarchies, and variegating the said immaterial hierarchies with material figures and formative compositions, handed them down, so that, in proportion to ourselves, from most sacred formations we may ascend into simple and unfigured heights and likenesses. For it is not possible for our mind to ascend to that immaterial imitation and contemplation of the heavenly hierarchies unless it uses the material guidance which corresponds to it, judging visible forms to be images of invisible beauty."

All these things have been rendered into Latin clearly enough by Ambrose Camaldulensis, and even more faithfully by John Scotus himself, who was almost contemporary with Charlemagne. He translates in this manner:

"For this reason also the most perfect ordering of sacred things, judging our most holy hierarchy worthy of the supermundane imitation of the heavenly hierarchies, and variegating the said immaterial hierarchies with material figures and formative compositions, handed them down, so that, proportionately to ourselves, we may ascend from the most sacred formations into simple and unfigured heights and likenesses. For it is not possible for our mind to ascend to that non-material imitation and contemplation of the heavenly hierarchies, unless it uses the material guidance that is according to it, judging visible forms to be representations of invisible beauty."

How could this be proved to those iconoclasts of ours?

Finally, Pope Nicholas I, in a letter to the perfidious Emperor Michael, addresses him thus:

"If it still pleases you to know something delightful on this matter, order that the words of the ancient Father and venerable Doctor Dionysius the Areopagite to Demophilus be read to you. For he also decrees that, even in a case concerning piety, a priest who has offended may not lawfully be judged by lesser or inferior persons, lest anything disorderly happen in the Church of God and its state be thrown into confusion in any respect."

Today this letter is entitled To Demophilus the Therapeuta, that is, Monk; see above, chapter 26. It is the eighth in number among the Letters of Dionysius. On page 448 it contains the words which Nicholas cites: "It is unlawful for a priest to be judged by ministers, or by Therapeutas who are of the same order as you."

You will laugh at this mention of orders, for you have taken away every hierarchical order, so that it is clear that you are in the vestibule of that place where no order, but everlasting horror, dwells. You judge, or pretend, that the Jesuits are Zealots because they think they should obey the Supreme Pontiff rather than the secular magistrate, that is, God in his vicar rather than lay men. And for this reason you formerly drove them out of almost all Belgium. At the very time when I was writing these things, they were the first, according to the pontifical decree of our most blessed lord Pope Paul V, to leave behind temporal goods and depart from the whole dominion of the Venetians, lest they be forced to communicate with the excommunicated.

You judge the same men to be Zealots because they prefer to endure any punishment whatever rather than betray to anyone the things they have received under the sacramental seal of secret confession. For there was no other reason why, in this very summer of the year 1606, Father Henry Garnet was most cruelly dragged on

a hurdle in London, strangled on the gibbet, disemboweled, cut apart, and boiled, except that he had refused to report to the magistrate what one of the conspirators had confessed to him in private confession, although he had dissuaded him from the crime as much as he could. Happy was he in this silence, and happy the silence itself, which now also makes martyrs by a new but illustrious example!

Nor should it seem foreign to my undertaking, Reader, if in the vindication of one martyr I weave in the praises of another martyr. God is honored in his martyrs, and each of them, lest he betray faith, exchanged this earthly life for the heavenly, in an unlike cause, but with no unlike blessedness. Scaliger, you would wish this lot for your Delrio, whom elsewhere you send to the executioner to be healed. But he knows himself unworthy of martyrdom, and grieves.

Chapter 28. Testimonies of Liberatus the African and Deusdedit, Bishop of Cagliari

I have brought forward witnesses from Asia and Europe; I shall also bring forward one from Africa. I have brought forward witnesses from the continent; I shall bring forward one from the island of Sardinia. For this judgment has penetrated and prevailed through all parts of the world, through land and sea.

Liberatus the African, in the Breviary concerning the Nestorian and Eutychian cause, chapter 10, wrote thus:

"Cyril wrote four books, three against Theodore and Diodorus, as authors, so to speak, of the Nestorian dogma, and another book On the Incarnation. In these books are contained the incorrupt testimonies of the ancient Fathers: of Felix, Pope of Rome; of Dionysius the Areopagite, Bishop of the Corinthians; and of Gregory the Wonder-worker, surnamed Thaumaturgus."

Against this testimony two things could be objected by the adversaries. First, that certain Catholics have denied that these books are by Saint Cyril, being led by this reason: because Cyril had not produced these testimonies against living men, therefore this work does not seem to be Cyril's. It can be answered that he produced them only then because he had not remembered them before and afterward they came into his mind. Likewise, he may have composed this work after those men had died, against whom, while they were alive, he had not yet disputed, being still younger. But he did dispute against their disciples, Nestorius and Theodoret.

Second, it can be objected that the passage is corrupt, and that the word "Areopagite" should be deleted. I should like the ancient copies to be consulted. For it can happen that the passage is not at all corrupt, but that Liberatus was in the error of those who thought that Dionysius the Areopagite, after the Athenian chair, was transferred to the Corinthian chair before he migrated into Gaul.

Adeodatus, or Deusdedit, the venerable Bishop of the Church of Cagliari on the island of Sardinia, spoke thus in the Lateran Synod under Martin I, consultation 3:

"Your venerable blessedness, receiving from the Lord the completed and shortened word, has concisely and at the same time diligently shown us, by what he has most prudently spoken at present, both the falsehood and the novelty which Cyrus and Sergius have most openly worked against the holy Fathers and dogmas of the Catholic Church. He has shown that they are entangled in the confession of heretics, by this: that according to the execrable Themistius and Severus they declare that there is one God-manly operation, and not one marvelous and wonderful in this respect, because in the indivisible union it shows without confusion two natural operations of one and the same Christ God, that is, the divine and the human, in the most true proof that the same one is naturally God and man. This, indeed, as blessed Dionysius says, is the new thing surpassing all novelties.

"For by this composite word of his the aforesaid Father taught, not the destruction of either, but the indivisible unity. He wished to show true union, but not any diminution of the natures, which are

substantially preserved in the one Christ God, or of his natural operations. Cyrus and Sergius, denying these operations by their own writings, which have been reread at present, and for this reason also adulterating the testimonies of the holy Fathers, have deservedly been condemned by your pious apostolic sentence. We also, in agreement with it, condemn them for that reason; and also Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, because he too is known no less to have received Cyrus together with Sergius, and he took pains to advocate for him in the aforesaid seventh chapter.

"And this, although in writing he bears witness against him, because he changed the expression of blessed Dionysius and because he was justly rebuked for this kind of change by Sophronius of blessed memory. For Pyrrhus writes thus into one dogmatic volume of his: 'The most reverend Sophronius criticized only one chapter, namely because it falsified the testimony of Dionysius of blessed memory by the substitution of one word. In this the aforesaid man said fitting and cautious things, in which he asserts: But with God made man, he brought forth to us a certain new God-manly operation. The volume, indeed, contained "one" named according to truth in place of "new"; but not maliciously, far be it, according to my word. Rather, because "new" cannot be understood otherwise than as "one," this word was put by the most holy Cyrus. For since the blessed Doctor, through the denial of exalted things, constructed one confession and expressed this individually, what else did he disclose more clearly by a certain word than that one operation should be confessed, because Christ is one?'"

Behold, by his own words Pyrrhus has professed most openly both that the expression of blessed Dionysius was falsified by Cyrus, and that Cyrus was deservedly rebuked on that account, and so forth.

He is treating that passage of Dionysius from the fourth Letter to Gaius, which the Monothelites, after corrupting it and citing it badly, were misusing against the truth of the twofold will in Christ.

Chapter 29. Testimonies from Hilduin, Hincmar, Anastasius the Librarian, and Hugh of Saint Victor

Hilduin, Abbot of the monastery of Blessed Dionysius near Paris, where the body of the most blessed martyr is believed to be preserved - although the people of Regensburg contend that it was transferred to their city by gift of the kings of France and is today kept in the noble monastery of Saint Emmeram - Hilduin, I say, writing to Louis the Pious, Emperor and son of Charlemagne, testifies that the writer of these books was most noble in birth and distinguished in the mastery of philosophy, and that he flourished at Athens. He proves this from the Acts of the Apostles and from the letter of Aristarchus, a Greek chronographer, to Onesiphorus the primicerius, concerning the situation of Athens. From him he says are narrated the origin of Dionysius's lineage and his learning, the order of his way of life, or the time of his age, as well as his ordination and preaching, the substitution also of a bishop in his own place, and his arrival at Rome.

There, among other things, he writes thus about these books:

"As for knowledge of his books, which he wrote in his native language, and for those at whose request he composed them, the reading made available to us by the grace of God and by your command satisfies us; by the dispensation of that command our archives bring them forth translated for those who seek them. Moreover, we received those same authentic books written in the Greek language as a great gift when the steward of the Church of Constantinople and the other envoys of Michael, in public legation to your glory, discharged their office at Compiegne, on the very vigil of the solemnity of Saint Dionysius. Divine grace so attended this gift to our devotion, as though it had been brought down from heaven, that on that same night Christ the Lord deigned to work nineteen very notable miracles in the healing of the sick from various infirmities, among persons very well known and situated near our neighborhood, to the praise and glory of his name, by the prayers and merits of his most excellent martyr."

After this Hilduin shows the error of Bede and Gregory of Tours concerning this Dionysius of ours, and he answers those who, by the authority of Bede and Gregory, had tried to make another Dionysius, the Corinthian, the author of these books. Finally, the same Hilduin, in the Passion of Blessed Dionysius the Areopagite, which he professes to have gathered from Greek sources, sets down the summary of the things treated in the books which we have today, and in the order in which they are published.

Hincmar, Bishop of Reims, Hilduin's disciple, writing to the Emperor Charles the Bald, confirms the things which Hilduin had handed down from Greek writers by the testimony of Blessed Sanctinus. Sanctinus was first Bishop of Chartres and later Bishop of Meaux, and was a disciple of Dionysius the Areopagite. Hincmar says that from him he copied Dionysius's acts and martyrdom from very ancient parchments, and that he transmitted a copy to Charles the Bald:

"So that, if there are any remnants of those who denied that our lord and father, your patron Dionysius, was the Areopagite, baptized by the blessed Apostle Paul, ordained Bishop of the Athenians, and sent into Gaul by blessed Clement, they may recognize, from these things which Greek testimony, the attestation of the holy Roman See, and Gallican corroboration declare, that what was said long before us in this cause is established; because truth, when more often stirred, shines forth more into the light."

He proves it by three arguments, which we also have used and still use. First, by the testimony of the Greeks, namely of the envoys of the Emperor Michael, to whom I have added several decades of Fathers. Second, by the attestation of the holy Roman See, namely through Anastasius the Librarian, of whom presently; to these I add the clear testimonies of Gregory the Great, Martin I, Hadrian I, Nicholas I, and Agatho. Third, by Gallican corroboration, namely that of Hilduin and, later, of the Emperor Louis.

The words of Blessed Sanctinus about the arrival of our Blessed Dionysius in Gaul were:

"Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, illuminated with the truth of the faith by the excellent preaching of the blessed Apostle Paul, and so forth, came to Rome by revelation, the Church entrusted to him having been arranged for him; and so forth. And after he was received lovingly and honorably by blessed Clement, successor of the Apostle Peter, after some space of time he was sent with others into Gaul to distribute the seeds of the divine word. By preaching and by confirming the word with signs following, with the Lord leading, he came to Paris, where he also suffered martyrdom."

For that reason, as Hilduin noted, his memory among the Greeks was interrupted for some time.

Anastasius the Librarian of the Roman See, whose History our Joannes Buseus had printed at Mainz, wrote a letter to the same Charles the Bald against those who asserted that Blessed Dionysius, the first Bishop of Paris, was not the Areopagite. Relying on the authority of Greek codices and Latin ones, he contends that he was the same man and that he composed his lofty writings in the Greek language. What writings, pray, are these if not these very ones which, translated into Latin by Eriugena at the command of Louis and corrected by Anastasius himself, Anastasius dedicated to Charles, son of Louis, together with the Passion of Blessed Dionysius translated by himself from Methodius?

Concerning these writings, in another letter to the same Charles, he wrote thus:

"It must be noted that although this Saint Dionysius was of such glory, such knowledge, and such antiquity, nevertheless no written tradition of the orthodox reports, unless I am mistaken, that he published any little works before the Roman Pontiffs Gregory, Martin, and Agatho made mention of his sayings in their writings."

And soon after:

"From this I infer that the opinion of the Greeks is true, who testify that his books were hidden by earlier heretics until, a long time afterward, from among his little works, the single codex which is now held was

found at Rome. The rest, not yet found, was carried into Greece."

Thus he. But I have shown that certain Greeks knew these Areopagitic works even before Pope Saint Gregory. This is true: after Gregory they were received by common consent, until those sons of earth and rebels against heavenly things renewed that ancient complaint of anonymous persons with swollen and weighty, but ungrateful and useless, croaking in the mud of a pond.

Hugh of Saint Victor, a canon regular and so bright a light of his age that he was called a second Augustine, was the first of the Latins who dared an explanation of the Celestial Hierarchy of the great Areopagite. He used the version of John Scotus and, comprising it in ten books, dedicated it to Louis, King of the Franks, son of Louis the Fat. In the prolegomena, chapter 4, he gives the reason why Dionysius, theologian and narrator of the hierarchies and sacred powers - for so he calls him - judged that he should compose that work of the Celestial Hierarchy.

Let Hugh close the column of the Fathers. For those whom I shall add below, from the manner of disputing more adapted to the schools, were called Scholastics.

Chapter 30. Testimonies of the Scholastics

Peter Lombard, who is commonly called the Master of the Sentences, in book 2, and the Scholastics who followed him, held these works to be undoubtedly works of the Areopagite. Therefore they always praised his sayings about the celestial hierarchies, about the divine properties, and other matters, as established and most highly to be venerated. Apart from Thomas de Vio, I have read none of them who doubted even slightly about the author of these little works.

Their agreement, which Dionysius the Carthusian in his preface to our author calls the common agreement of all, is clear from the fact that Alexander of Hales, in part 2 from question 36; Albert the Great, on book 2 of the Sentences, distinctions 9 and 10; Blessed Thomas, in the first part, question 108, and everywhere; Blessed Bonaventure, on the said distinctions 9 and 10; Durandus, Scotus, Richard, Gabriel, and others in the same place, always called him Dionysius by antonomasia, without any addition. They would not have called him this, nor would they have valued him so highly, if they had regarded him as uncertain, doubtful, or supposititious.

With the same confidence and reverence, Saint Bonaventure, clinging to his imitation and footsteps, composed a learned book On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; and Saint Thomas published commentaries on the book On the Divine Names, as also Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, did on the Angelic Hierarchy. Alfonso de Madrigal, Tostado, Bishop of Avila, also held them to be Areopagitic in his commentaries on Joshua, chapter 10, question 88.

I know, Scaliger, that you regard all the Scholastics as masks and dullards, and that you cannot even bear their name. But in this too I see that you are very unlike your father Julius, a most learned man, and one of better judgment than you - pardon the truth - and of more solid talent as well. For he, when he had been a Franciscan, had read and learned those authors, as you admit in his Life; he always valued them very highly, and he seriously affirmed in his Exercitations on Subtlety against Cardano that he preferred their naked and uncultivated wisdom, whom he repeatedly calls, in jest, his Barbarians, to all more elegant literature.

You, enjoy your own lifted eyebrow, and shake away, though you will never shake heaven or earth. In this matter I follow the judgment of your father, and I congratulate myself that I have the Councils, the Fathers, and all the Scholastics, with one exception, as favorable judges in these Vindications.

Chapter 31. Other Writers Cited for Dionysius by Way of Miscellany

What kind of writers do you still demand to be brought forward? Do you want more recent men most skilled in the Greek language? I have praised to you, from your own France, Billius Prunaeus and Guillaume Bude. I have praised, from Greece, Cardinal Bessarion; from Italy, Marsilio Ficino. They outweighed Theodore Gaza, even if you add to him your smoking firebrand, Theodore Beza of Vezelay.

Do you want those who translated the works of our Dionysius from Greek into Latin? Besides those older men, John Eriugena Scotus and Anastasius the Librarian, you have John Saracenus, Ambrose Camaldulensis, and Benedict Perionius. Or do you rather want those who illustrated them with commentaries? I have named the Greeks: Dionysius of Alexandria, Maximus the Martyr, and George Pachymeres the philosopher. Among the Latins, I have named Hugh of Saint Victor, Thomas Aquinas the Angelic Doctor, Albert the Great, the subtle Bishop of Lincoln, and the prolific Dionysius Richelius.

Do you want writers of history? I have named Nicephorus, Glycas, Suidas, Euthymius, and others. I add Latins: Saint Antoninus, Philip of Bergamo, Raphael of Volterra, Gilbert Genebrard, Wilhelm Eisengrein, Caesar Baronius the Cardinal, Lilio Giraldi, and Arnold Pontac, Bishop of Bazas, your admirer.

Do you want writers of controversies? There are very many, as many as have mentioned our Dionysius. Now take a few, but those who teach this professedly: Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, in the preface to Dionysius; Matthaeus Galenus the Belgian, in the Areopagitica; Wilhelm Eisengrein, Century 1, page 6, distinction 4; and Baronius, whom I have mentioned, at year 2 of the Annals; Alanus Copus, Dialogue 2, chapter 5, where he refutes by name Valla, Erasmus, and the Magdeburg writers; and Sixtus Senensis, book 2 of the Library, who rebukes Cajetan.

Finally, do you want Jesuits? Though you may cry out with your Aristophanes, "Give me a basin," so that you may vomit up the bile which I have stirred, nevertheless receive this testimony: that we, as in other matters, so also in this matter, follow with one mind the judgment of the Roman chair.

Franciscus Turrianus taught this when writing against the Magdeburg writers. Peter Canisius taught it at the beginning of the Catechism, in his encomia of the Fathers. Wilhelm Duraeus taught it against Whitaker, in reason 6. Cardinal Bellarmine taught it accurately against Calvin and Heshusius, volume 1, book 2, On Monks, chapter 1. Pedro de Ribadeneira taught it in the Flos Sanctorum, volume 2, in the life of Blessed Dionysius. Our Fronto Ducaeus taught it, as I hear, for I have not yet seen the book, against Plessy; and you, I think, will not deny him discernment or taste in judging the writings of the Greek Fathers. John Lorinus also taught it in his commentary on Acts of the Apostles, chapter 17.

I too had taught it; but to my arguments you answered nothing except calumny about Maximus alone, and most obscene insults.

Chapter 32. The Same Is Confirmed by Royal Authority and Miracles

How great and how furious a madness of the Calvinists raged against the first founders of the Gallican Church is taught by their impiety against the apostles of their own nation: Saint Irenaeus of Lyons, Saint Hilary of Poitiers, Saint Martin Bishop of Tours, and Dionysius the Areopagite, earlier than all these. The sacred bones of those three, torn from precious reliquaries and dragged through filth, they consumed in groaning flames; and what remained of the ashes they scattered into the flowing waves of the Rhone and the Loire.

Their intention was to show the same reverence to the sacred relics of Blessed Dionysius in the reign of Charles IX. But Louis of Bourbon, Prince of Conde, who had occupied the shrine of Dionysius, restrained all the violence and plundering of the eager Calvinists, not so much from reverence for the relics as for the kings his ancestors, whose magnificent mausoleums are seen there. In recent years Henry III of Valois and Henry IV of Bourbon did the same. For the kings of France always had a special care for the honor of Dionysius.

Run through their three stocks. Of the Merovingians, Dagobert alone, famous for piety toward Blessed Dionysius, built a magnificent monastery and endowed it with very ample estates; yet by the beneficence of the martyr he was more illustrious and happier, being transferred from an earthly kingdom to the heavenly one, as Louis the Pious, Emperor, records in his letter to Hilduin. In that letter, with most effective words, he commends to his successors the kings, by his own example and that of his ancestors, devotion to and veneration of the most holy Areopagite, in these words:

"How great a gift and protection not only to us and to our predecessors or progenitors, but also to the peoples of our whole empire, the Lord has very often, indeed continually, bestowed through the most blessed Dionysius in great abundances of graces, all the generations of Gaul through all past times have felt; they took up the rudiments of faith by his distinguished apostleship. Our predecessors did not vainly cultivate the glory of this excellent witness and friend of God. For while they honored his sacred remains on earth, for the honor and love of God our Lord Jesus Christ, with the resources with which they could, by his most worthy prayers they deserved to obtain the privilege of honor both in earthly and heavenly things. Thus, namely, one of the ancient kings of the Franks, Dagobert, who had venerated the same most precious martyr of Christ not in any ordinary way, was both exalted in mortal life and, by his aid, as a divine and celebrated manifestation testifies, was freed from punishments and desirably established in eternal life."

See how contrary the Calvinists are to their best kings. The kings attend the relics of the blessed martyr with singular munificence and honors; the Calvinists do not even deem them worthy of an ass's burial, and because they could not burn and scatter them, they turned their anger against his books. Louis the Emperor testifies that the kingdom of France stood and flourished by the prayers of Blessed Dionysius; those fighters against the saints mock all prayers of the saints.

If you roll through the past time in memory, you will find that from the time when the arm of the golden crucifix was removed from his shrine under the appearance of a loan, dire heresies, emerging from Lake Geneva as though from hell, began to afflict France and brought it almost to final ruin.

The pious Emperor then goes on to commemorate the religion of the Carolingians, writing thus:

"Our progenitors also embraced the honey-flowing name of Lord Dionysius - for so, in their words and writings, they were accustomed to call him - not unfittingly, with pious love and most beloved piety."

And he adds that Charles Martel, his great-grandfather, was raised to the height of rule by the prayers of Blessed Dionysius; that Pepin came to the throne of the Franks and deserved to leave it to Charlemagne his son. "But we also," he says, "have experienced his benefits in many and frequent largesses, especially in the event of human vicissitude, in which, by the just judgment of God, as must always be confessed, we were visited with the rod of his instruction and with the staff of his beautiful mercy. Before the aforesaid altar, through the merits and consolation of our lord and most pious father Dionysius, we were restored and reestablished by divine power, and by episcopal judgment and authority we resumed the military belt, and down to the present time we are sustained by his gracious assistance."

He desired to put forward some sign of a grateful mind. His ancestors had already taken up the other things. God suggested to him that a trophy more excellent than buildings and gold could be erected to Saint Dionysius the Martyr, one that would truly be "a monument more lasting than bronze, and higher than the royal structure of the pyramids, which neither devouring rain nor unrestrained north wind can destroy, nor the countless series of years and flight of times"; a literary monument, I mean.

For this reason Louis ordered Abbot Hilduin to write the life of Dionysius the Areopagite and to bring to light all his little works, diligently translated from Greek into Latin. For Louis mentions the little works in express words, saying:

"We wish to remind you that whatever concerning knowledge of him has been taken by interpretation from the histories of the Greeks, or whatever from the books written by him, Dionysius, in his native language, and, by the command of our authority, by his own sagacious study and by the sweat of translators, explained into our language, has been suitable to insert into this business, and whatever also you have already found in Latin codices," and so forth.

Louis, Emperor of the West, had received from Michael, Emperor of the East, the Greek works of Dionysius the Areopagite. The one had received them as works of our Dionysius; the other had sent them as such and as genuine. Nor should it be believed that two Emperors believed this rashly, or wished to mock each other, but that they came to that opinion maturely, after an inquiry had been made by the most learned men of their age.

Indeed, for that reason Michael sent with his envoys Constantine, steward and philosopher, who could refute those who contradicted. The West then had few men skilled in the Greek language; for that reason Louis applied two who then flourished in France, John Scotus and Hilduin. Thus also Charles the Bald, successor of Louis after his brothers, followed the judgment of Hincmar and Anastasius the Librarian.

What else had to be done by these kings in this sort of business? Were they, plainly, to wait until brands were burned in at Noyon, or the Bezian heart was roasted by the torches of Candida, or Joseph Scaliger was born as approver? But no prophets had foretold that you would exist and would dissent: not the Dodonian doves, not the lowing of the cave of Trophonius, not the mad Delphic ventriloquist. For the French Gauls, concerning the Apostle of the Gauls, the testimonies of their kings and bishops are greater than any exception.

Let those Calvinistic doubters doubt, so long as they believe nothing. Catholics know that in recent memory, in the martyr's basilica, a most valiant king returned to the bosom of the Catholic faith. By whose benefaction? Was it not that of God, the Best and Greatest, whom the prayers and merits of Saint Dionysius moved, whose monastery, church, and relics that king had preserved from violation? This one led him back into the way; the same one led him from the place of his tomb to the place of his martyrdom and the seat of his episcopate, Paris.

What is more equitable, better, or more becoming to royal majesty than to imitate one's ancestors, the Louises, the Henrys, the Charleses, whose royal constancy in honoring Blessed Dionysius is deservedly celebrated? For the progeny of Capet was not inferior to the Carolingians or Merovingians in this rivalry of piety. They honored the relics and asserted the books for their author. Let posterity do both, and let them decree that he whom they invoke as patron in wars should flourish and live in the walls and minds of Catholics. The sacred monuments of the mind should not be valued less than the sacred ossuaries of the body. These are relics of remains that will rise again; those are relics of the soul, which neither perished nor could perish.

Nor did these sacred relics of divine genius lack their own miracles. For on the day on which the books were brought to the monastery of Saint Dionysius, where Louis the Pious had sent them to Hilduin to be preserved, Hilduin himself, an eyewitness, writes in his letter to the same Louis: "This gift," namely the writings of Blessed Dionysius, "as though brought from heaven to our devotion," and so forth; you have these words cited above at the beginning of chapter 29. This is indeed a very clear confirmation, and unless it had been most true, Hilduin the Abbot would never have written it so affirmatively to the Emperor at a time when he could have been convicted and condemned for imposture by rivals who were setting out to strip these books of credit.

Dionysius the Carthusian mentions the same miracles in his preface to Dionysius, but by a slip of memory says that seventeen sick persons were cured instead of nineteen; among them, he says, were the blind, the deaf, and the paralytic. I have placed this proof of Emperors and Kings, supported by a divine miracle, in the last place as the chief proof. To me it is the greatest, because I am Catholic. To you, Joseph, I know well, it

will seem nothing; because, since miracles are lacking to you, you have grown accustomed to spit upon proofs drawn from them and to mock them, if you consider the soul, with a Sardonic laugh; if you consider the face, with an ugly one, such as Minerva's was when she was blowing the flute.

Chapter 33. Recollection of Authorities, Adapted to the Individual Works of Blessed Dionysius

Since this controversy which I have with Joseph Scaliger depends chiefly on authority and ancient prescription, it has seemed good, at the end of the book, to gather the votes again by way of recapitulation, so that fair judges may have at one glance what can move them to assign the Vindications justly or to refuse them.

On Scaliger's side, who thinks that he was the first to have doubted, there were formerly certain Greeks, but anonymous men, and it is uncertain whether they were Catholics or heretics. In France also there were some, during the reigns of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald, but they too were anonymous. In the memory of our grandfathers, Theodore Gaza and Lorenzo Valla, grammarians, dug up the buried error and sold it as new; then Desiderius Erasmus, of uncertain faith; Cajetan, a Catholic, but too credulous toward Erasmus; Luther the heresiarch with his followers; Calvin, the other heresiarch, with his followers; and in these years Joseph Scaliger and Desiderius Heraldus. You see a thin maniple, and one of skirmishers.

On the other side stands a dense and plainly unconquered legion, the strength of the triarii, summoned from Asia, Africa, and Europe: universal Councils, Roman Pontiffs, Patriarchs, Bishops, Doctors of the Church, Theologians, Historians, and Philosophers, all once celebrated on earth, many now glorious in heaven.

Of these, some received all the books of Dionysius which we have, others certain of them, as genuine works of Blessed Dionysius the Areopagite.

All the books were received by all who published scholia on them, such as Maximus the Martyr and Pachymeres among the Greeks; or who presented them to Latium, such as Scotus, Hilduin, Anastasius the Librarian, and others; or who composed their tables, such as John of Scythopolis, Suidas, Symeon Metaphrastes, Nicephorus, and Hilduin; or who expressly affirmed that they are by Dionysius the Areopagite, such as Theodore the Presbyter, and the same Anastasius and Hilduin, Guillaume Bude, Matthaeus Galenus, Alanus Copus, Cardinal Baronius, and our Cardinal Bellarmine. To these one may add Jeremiah of Constantinople and many others. Likewise, those who, taking testimonies indiscriminately from these little works, confirmed theological axioms from them, such as, with the Master of the Sentences, Saints Bonaventure and Thomas, and all the rest of the Scholastics. Likewise, those who simply mentioned the writings of the Areopagite, or gathered certain fragments from uncertain places, such as Saint Cyril, chapter 13; Liberatus, chapter 28; Saint Sanctinus and Hincmar, chapter 29; Anastasius of Nyssa, chapter 14; Antonius Melissa, chapter 16; Theodore Prodromus, chapter 20; Cardinal Bessarion, chapter 23; and the eighth General Synod at Ferrara, chapter 25.

But many brought forward certain and definite passages of the little books that are extant. For example:

On the Celestial Hierarchy: Blessed Ignatius the Martyr, chapter 10; Saint Jerome, chapter 11; Saint Gregory Nazianzen, chapter 11; Saint Chrysostom, chapter 11; Saint Dionysius of Alexandria, chapter 12; Saint Athanasius of Alexandria, chapter 14; Origen Adamantius, chapter 12; Saint Michael Syncellus, chapter 19; Saint John Damascene, chapter 19; George the Patrician, chapter 21; Euthymius Zigabenus, chapter 22; Saint Gregory the Great, chapter 26; Pope Hadrian I, chapter 27; Hugh of Saint Victor, chapter 29; and Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, chapter 30.

On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: Anastasius of Nicaea, chapter 14; Elias of Crete, chapter 17; Saint Michael Syncellus, chapter 19; Saint John Damascene, chapter 19; George the Patrician, chapter 21; Euthymius

Zigabenus, chapter 22; the first Nicene Synod, chapter 24; the second Nicene Synod, chapter 24; the chapter Omnes, distinction 38, from the Decree of Gratian, chapter 24; and Saint Bonaventure, chapter 30.

From the book On the Divine Names: Saint Ignatius the Martyr, chapter 10; Saint Maximus the Martyr, chapter 13; Saint Anastasius of Sinai, chapter 14; Saint Andrew of Crete, chapter 17; Glycas, chapter 18; Julian, Bishop of Jerusalem, chapter 18; Euthymius the historiographer, chapter 18; Saint John Damascene, chapters 18 and 19; Saint Symeon Metaphrastes, chapter 20; Nicephorus Callistus, chapters 18 and 13; Epiphanius the Presbyter, chapter 18; Saint Michael Syncellus, chapters 18 and 19; the Greeks in a certain hymn on the Mother of God, chapter 18; George the Patrician, chapter 21; Euthymius Zigabenus, chapter 22; the sixth General Synod, chapter 24; Saint Pope Martin I, chapter 26; Pope Agatho, chapter 27; and Saint Thomas Aquinas, chapter 30.

From the book On Mystical Theology: George the Patrician, chapter 21, and that monk Euthymius Zigabenus, chapter 22.

All the Letters were mentioned by those who enumerate all the works; but the following mention certain letters individually and specifically in this way:

For the fourth Letter, to Gaius the Therapeuta: Saint Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem, chapter 15; Saint Maximus, chapters 13 and 22; Saint Michael Syncellus, chapter 19; Saint John Damascene, chapter 22; Euthymius Zigabenus, chapter 22; the Lateran Synod under Martin I, chapter 25; Saint Pope Martin, chapter 26; Sergius of Tempsa, chapter 16; and Deusdedit of Cagliari, chapter 28. All these are Catholics. From the Monothelites, however, you have five in chapter 15: Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Macarius the Patriarchs, and Themistius the philosopher.

For the Letter to Demophilus the Therapeuta: Pope Nicholas I, chapter 27.

For the Letter to Saint John the Evangelist: Pope Hadrian I, chapter 27.

Are they not many and trustworthy enough?

Chapter 34. Epilogue of This Action or Disputation

Relying on these forces, I went forth into battle. Shaded by this cloud of witnesses, I do not fear the thunderbolts of Salmoneus or the Claudian thunderings. I have produced witnesses who, through many centuries and throughout the whole Christian world, were most prudent, most holy, and most wise: many speaking in ecumenical Councils while the Holy Spirit inspired them; many enrolled in the number of the Blessed, illustrious by martyrdoms and miracles.

Plainly the adversary saw among the Cimmerians what none of these men could see in clear sunlight. He alone knows letters; he alone is strong in talent and judgment. Those Monothelites, men most crafty and sharp, and the Greeks of today, Jeremiah with his adherents - but I pass over heretics. All more recent Catholics - I pass over the more recent. The most clear-sighted Doctors of the middle age - I pass over the Scholastics. The ancient orthodox Greek and Latin Fathers, almost forty - I pass over those Fathers. Five Roman Pontiffs and four ecumenical Councils and, lest I pass over the great names of the age, two Emperors of East and West, and other kings of the Franks, by Scaliger's censorship, had no sense at all of ancient Christianity or of letters. By Scaliger's censorship, every one of them was a stump, a dullard, unskilled, and destitute of all judgment. For such are all those, in his eyes, who dare to dissent from this literary tyrant.

This one thing he asserts; this alone he affirms that he knows. If he knows only that, he knows nothing, because he thinks that he knows only that which, because it is not, cannot be known.

But I, for my part, think that I know this: if Scaliger knew that this was the unanimous opinion, through so many centuries, of so many and such men, and yet is not moved by it, his shamelessness is singular, his

insensibility singular, and his irrationality no less. But if he did not know, as he wishes it to seem, that others also had earlier doubted about this work, then he is of very little reading in theological and ecclesiastical questions; and this investigator of every corner has not even saluted these inner sanctuaries from the threshold.

But if, now warned, he still wishes to seem the author of so novel a drama and so tasteless a conjecture, he childishly commits what whips would punish severely, and "the gloomy ferules, the scepters of schoolmasters." Finally, if he does not wish to be warned or to come to his senses, but continues to hurl reproaches against the holy Martyr and against the sacred tribunal of the Inquisitors of the faith, he brands a stain upon his own name and conscience.

I confess that I hate these newfangled inventions worse than a dog and a snake, and with Tertullian I judge them to be "a depth from which those cast off cannot swim, a shipwreck from which those dashed upon it cannot escape, and an underwater gulf in which those swallowed cannot breathe," especially when pride has joined itself to obstinacy. It pleases me to be wise soberly, and, walking on the royal road, to stand within the boundaries which our ancestors, the orthodox Fathers, set.

I listen to the jurists: "In establishing new things there ought to be evident utility"; and "those things are least to be changed which have always had a certain interpretation." Digest, law In rebus, On Constitutions; law Minime, On Laws. See to it, Scaliger, that you are not one of those of whom Cassiodorus says: "There are some who think it praiseworthy if they think against the ancients and discover something new by which they may seem skilled." On Divine Readings, chapter 11.

This is proper to ambition and arrogance; Celestine I, Pope, pointed out to us the source of this disease in these words: "It is certain, moreover, that such novelties of opinions descend from love of empty glory, while some wish to seem acute and keen-sighted to themselves." Letter 4, to the Constantinopolitans. Abbot Hilduin confirms this same thing against the calumniators of our Dionysius, writing thus: that he asks those contentious in this case "to wipe their eyes of the white film contracted from arrogance, from the usurped wisdom by which little knowers wish to seem wise, so that they may read clear-sighted things clear-sightedly, and faithful things faithfully." In the Letter to Emperor Louis the Pious.

I would ask this same thing of you, Joseph, if you wish to answer anything: that from now on you abstain from such prostituted curses. The modest and sober are poor in these; but rich in them are those who have been brought up amid dice, taverns, and brothels, feasting and dissolving in every wantonness, truly "dregs dancing obscenely as the cup goes round." But perhaps I would sooner obtain water from pumice. For because I had asked something similar from him, and was defending Dionysius the Martyr against him, behold, I am called by him a dog, a beast, an ass, a beetle, the lowest of animals, and other jests of a most abandoned tongue which shame does not permit me to insert here.

Therefore my prayers must rather be directed elsewhere. I choose all the Franks to judge which of us has deserved better of France: Joseph the Vasco-Insubrian, who, after tearing Blessed Dionysius to pieces with insults, prosecuted him on a charge of fraud and cast him off as childless and dishonored; or I, the Belgo-Iberian, who have tried to assert for the Gallican Church its Apostle, for the Parisians their first Bishop, for Belgium its Martyr, for the Academy its Doctor, for the King and Kingdom their Patron and tutelary Saint - and finally, for him who is protector of King, Kingdom, Academy, and Church, the hierarchic Doctor, the gem of bishops, the flower of martyrs, the joy and crown of the Apostle, the divine offspring of his heavenly genius, children worthy of their father.

Certainly, if success was lacking, at least a ready will was not lacking; and I think I may rightly hope that it was not unpleasing to God, who is honored in his Saints. Would that he whom I have striven to defend here on earth may not scorn my service in heaven; and that he may obtain grace for me, so that I may imitate Synesius and hereafter thank Scaliger, when he reviles me, with an excellent spirit, and conduct myself, on

account of the divine Martyr, as one "receiving dishonor as martyrdom." Amen.

I submit these Areopagitic Vindications to the censure of the Holy and Apostolic Roman Church. Valladolid, on the Kalends of August, in the year 1606.

Martinus Delrio, priest of the Society of Jesus and Doctor of Sacred Theology.

The Author's Index of Chapters

Chapter 1. On the state of the controversy. Source page 7.

Chapter 2. Scaliger's first argument is refuted, concerning the founder of monks. Source page 10.

Chapter 3. Against Scaliger's second argument, it is proved that monasticism was known to the ancient Church. Source page 13.

Chapter 4. Scaliger's last argument from the Trullan Synod is examined. Source page 18.

Chapter 5. Another argument of Heraldus is solved. Source page 24.

Chapter 6. Two arguments of Cajetan are solved, and one of Erasmus. Source page 26.

Chapter 7. Answer is made to the objections of certain ancient anonymous writers. Source page 30.

Chapter 8. How did it happen that these works of Dionysius were hidden for so many years? Source page 37.

Chapter 9. An argument sought from the books of Dionysius themselves, to prove that the works are genuine. Source page 41.

Chapter 10. Certain testimonies from Guillaume Bude's autograph; first, from Blessed Ignatius the Martyr. Source page 46.

Chapter 11. Bude's testimonies from Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, and Chrysostom. Source page 49.

Chapter 12. Testimonies from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria. Source page 51.

Chapter 13. From Blessed Cyril of Alexandria and Blessed Maximus, monk and martyr. Source page 53.

Chapter 14. Testimonies of the two Anastasii and of a certain uncertain Athanasius. Source page 55.

Chapter 15. Testimonies of Sophronius the Catholic, of the Monothelite heretics, and of the schismatic Greeks. Source page 64.

Chapter 16. Testimonies of Theodore the Presbyter, Sergius of Tempsa, and Antonius Melissa. Source page 68.

Chapter 17. Testimonies from Elias of Crete and Andrew of Crete. Source page 71.

Chapter 18. Testimonies of Julian of Jerusalem, Epiphanius the Presbyter, Glycas, and other Greeks. Source page 72.

Chapter 19. The opinion of Blessed Michael Syncellus and Blessed John Damascene. Source page 74.

Chapter 20. Testimonies from Symeon Metaphrastes and Theodore Prodromus. Source page 76.

Chapter 21. From Suidas and John of Scythopolis, and George the Patrician. Source page 78.

Chapter 22. From Euthymius the monk Zigabenus. Source page 79.

Chapter 23. Testimonies of Nicephorus Callistus, George Pachymeres, and Cardinal Bessarion. Source page 86.

Chapter 24. Testimonies from the Councils of the Greeks. Source page 90.

Chapter 25. Testimonies from the Councils of the Latins. Source page 92.

Chapter 26. Testimonies of Gregory the Great and Martin I, Roman Pontiffs. Source page 94.

Chapter 27. Testimonies of Pope Agatho, Hadrian I, and Nicholas I. Source page 99.

Chapter 28. Testimonies of Liberatus the African and Deusdedit, Bishop of Cagliari. Source page 105.

Chapter 29. Testimonies from Hilduin, Hincmar, Anastasius the Librarian, and Hugh of Saint Victor. Source page 109.

Chapter 30. Testimonies of the Scholastics. Source page 114.

Chapter 31. Other writers cited for Dionysius by way of miscellany. Source page 116.

Chapter 32. The same is confirmed by royal authority and miracles. Source page 118.

Chapter 33. Recollection of authorities, adapted to the individual works of Blessed Dionysius. Source page 125.

Chapter 34. Epilogue of this action or disputation. Source page 130.

Censure and Privileges

Since it has always been held laudable by the holy Fathers to vindicate from the wicked calumnies of detractors those who at some time illuminated the Church by both life and writings, I judge Martin Delrio, priest of the Society of Jesus and Doctor of Sacred Theology, worthy of no small praise, because he rescues Dionysius the Areopagite, a most holy and most illustrious writer, who for some time now has been handed over to Calvinist and Lutheran butchery, and vindicates him from the calumnies of the impious. Therefore I have judged that, deservedly and for the great good of the Christian commonwealth, his Areopagitic Vindications can and ought to be published. Done at Antwerp, on the fifth day before the Kalends of June, 1607.

Laurentius Beyerlinck, Licentiate of Sacred Theology, censor of books.

Imperial Privilege

Rudolph II, by divine clemency favoring him, elected Emperor of the Romans, ever August, and King of Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, etc.; Archduke of Austria, Duke of Burgundy, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, and Wurttemberg, etc.; Count of Tyrol, etc. We make known to all by the tenor of the present letters:

It has been set forth to us that Martin Delrio, priest of the Society of Jesus, has labored for many years in the more humane arts, jurisprudence, and theology - formerly when he was in Belgium among the councillors of the Most Serene Philip II, Catholic King of Spain, and afterwards when, having been joined to the Society of Jesus, he applied himself in various Academies to the public good, according to his strength, by preaching, teaching, and composing. These works he has partly published, and partly has finished or begun so that they may be published, or desires to have reprinted with second care.

But he fears, because he has already experienced this not without some loss to his own name and to readers, that by those by whom it is least expedient these works may be printed typographically to the fraud of himself and his people. Therefore he humbly asks that we fortify him by our privilege against injury and fraud of this kind.

We therefore, benignly considering how useful a service Martin Delrio himself, who is commended to us for notable piety and learning, renders to the public commonwealth of letters, as is clear in those works which have already before been published by him, seriously and firmly forbid and prohibit all and individual

printers, booksellers, and others who exercise any book trade whatsoever: let no one presume, for the space of twenty years computed from the day of the first edition, within the borders of the Holy Roman Empire and of our hereditary kingdoms and dominions, to reprint the aforesaid works in similar or another type or format, either in whole or in part; or to send them elsewhere to be reprinted; or to import, sell, and distribute copies printed elsewhere, secretly or openly, against the will and consent of the aforesaid Martin Delrio.

But if anyone, by doing otherwise, has tried to neglect or transgress this our Imperial privilege, we decree that he is not only to be deprived in fact of the aforesaid books wrongly reprinted and imported - which the above-named Delrio and his agents, wherever they have been found, will be able to claim for themselves either by their own authority or by the help and aid of that magistrate - but also to be punished irremissibly with the penalty of ten marks of pure gold, to be paid equally to our Imperial treasury, avenger of fraud, and to the uses of the often-named Delrio or his agents.

Therefore we command all and individual subjects of ours and of the Holy Roman Empire and of our hereditary kingdoms and dominions, of whatever state, rank, order, condition, or dignity they may be, ecclesiastical as well as secular, and especially those who, placed in magistracy, exercise the administration of law and justice either in their own name or in the name and place of superiors, that they not permit anyone rashly and with impunity to transgress or violate this our Imperial privilege. Rather, let them take care that the contumacious, if they should perhaps discover any, are punished with the prescribed penalty and restrained by other suitable methods, insofar as they themselves wish to avoid the same fine; in witness of these letters, signed by our hand and fortified by the impression of our Imperial seal.

Given in our royal castle at Prague on the fifteenth day of the month of June, in the year of the Lord 1602; of our reigns, the Roman twenty-seventh, the Hungarian thirtieth, and the Bohemian likewise twenty-seventh, etc.

Rudolph.

Rud. Coraducius, etc.

By the proper command of the Sacred Imperial Majesty.

Io. Barvitius, etc.

To you alone, Joannes Moretus, I grant the power of printing the Areopagitic Vindications, according to the privilege granted to me by the Great Caesar.

Martinus Delrio, priest of the Society of Jesus.

Summary of the Privilege of the Belgian Princes

Albert and Isabella, Archdukes of Austria, Dukes of Burgundy, etc., Most Serene Princes of the Belgians, have sanctioned by privilege that no one, apart from the will of Joannes Moretus, printer of Antwerp, should within ten years print the Areopagitic Vindications of Martin Delrio, priest of the Society of Jesus and Doctor of Theology, or import into these dominions of Lower Germany copies printed elsewhere in the world, or have them for sale. Whoever acts otherwise will be punished by confiscation of the books and by another grave penalty, as appears more fully in the letters given at Brussels, 5 July 1607.

Signed:

N. Lombaerts.