Sixtus of Siena, O.P.

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VI

Annotations and Censures on the interpreters & expositors of the New Testament

English translation — Bibliotheca Sancta, Book VI

TABLE OF ANNOTATIONS

The 348 annotations of Book VI, in order, grouped by scriptural book. The page number is the page of this English translation.

◆ At the back of this volume — four indices (click to jump):
Index of Authors & Interpreters · **Subject Index** · **Index of Councils & Canons** · **Index of Heresies & Censured Opinions**

Matthew

Page 10: Annotation I, Sacred reading (Matthew 1:1)
Page 10: Annotation II, Thamar (Matthew 1:3)
Page 10: Annotation III, On the marriage of Mary and Joseph (Matthew 1:16)
Page 11: Annotation IV, On Matrimony (Matthew 1:18)
Page 12: Annotation V, Joseph in doubt (Matthew 1:20)
Page 12: Annotation VI, On the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:20)
Page 13: Annotation VII, Whether angels are living beings (Matthew 2:1)
Page 13: Annotation VIII, Whether the magic art is evil (Matthew 2:2)
Page 14: Annotation IX, Whether the prophecy of Numbers 24 is to be understood of the star seen by the Magi (Matthew 2:2)
Page 14: Annotation X, Whether Christ's nativity could be foreknown from genethliacal [astrological] divinations (Matthew 2)
Page 21: Annotation XI, Whether John's baptism conferred grace (Matthew 3:1–2)
Page 22: Annotation XII, Whether the Holy Spirit is conferred in baptism (Matthew 3:11)
Page 22: Annotation XIII, Whether the dove sitting upon Christ was a real animal (Matthew 3:16)
Page 23: Annotation XIV, *"I saw the Spirit of God, like a dove."* (Matthew 3:16)
Page 23: Annotation XV, On the Trinity (Matthew 3:16)
Page 23: Annotation XVI, On the Trinity (Matthew 4:1)
Page 24: Annotation XVII, Whether those baptized by heretics are to be rebaptized (Matthew 4:17)
Page 24: Annotation XVIII, Whether Christ and the apostles begged (were mendicants) (Matthew 5:3)
Page 25: Annotation XIX, Whether the wicked sin under the devil's compulsion (Matthew 5:5)
Page 26: Annotation XX, Whether man can attain to an impeccable perfection (Matthew 5:9)
Page 26: Annotation XXI, On the Eucharist (Matthew 5:22)
Page 27: Annotation XXII, On the degrees of consanguinity (Matthew 5:31)
Page 27: Annotation XXIII, Whether adultery dissolves the sacrament of matrimony (Matthew 5:32)
Page 27: Annotation XXIV, On divorce (Matthew 5:32)
Page 28: Annotation XXV, Whether an oath is a sin (Matthew 5:34)
Page 29: Annotation XXVI, Whether every oath, even in a true and just cause, is a sin (Matthew 5:34)
Page 34: Annotation XXVII, Whether it is lawful to seek redress for an injury in court (Matthew 5:39)
Page 34: Annotation XXVIII, On the unforgivable sin (Matthew 5:44)
Page 35: Annotation XXIX, On vocal prayer (Matthew 6:6)
Page 35: Annotation XXX, Whether Christ is to be called "the Lordly man" (homo dominicus) (Matthew 6:10)
Page 35: Annotation XXXI, Whether the bread we ask for in the Lord's Prayer is corporeal (Matthew 6:11)
Page 36: Annotation XXXII, On the forgiveness of injury (Matthew 6:14)
Page 37: Annotation XXXIII, On the dress of monks (Matthew 6:16)
Page 37: Annotation XXXIV, Whether anyone can hate God. Ps. 73 (Matthew 6:24)
Page 37: Annotation XXXV, Whether no creature is incorporeal (Matthew 6:25)
Page 39: Annotation XXXVI, Whether it is lawful for preachers to preach the Gospel for the sake of a livelihood (Matthew 6:33)
Page 39: Annotation XXXVII, On bodily human food (Matthew 6:34)
Page 39: Annotation XXXVIII, Whether there is sin in the Church (Matthew 7:5)
Page 40: Annotation XXXIX, On the Trinity (Matthew 7:16)
Page 40: Annotation XL, Whether all works apart from grace are sins (Matthew 7:17)
Page 41: Annotation XLI, Whether the privation of the divine glory is a graver gehenna (Matthew 7:19)
Page 42: Annotation XLII, On the Church (Matthew 7:24)
Page 43: Annotation XLIII, On justifying faith, and on unformed faith (Matthew 8:8)
Page 43: Annotation XLIV, On the Trinity (Matthew 8:9)
Page 44: Annotation XLV, Whether priests [truly] absolve, or only pronounce [people] absolved (Matthew 9:8)

Page 45: Annotation XLVI, Whether [our] calling comes from merits, or from [merits] foreseen by divine foreknowledge (Matthew 9:9)
Page 45: Annotation XLVII, Whether the suffrages made for the departed profit both the blessed and the damned (Matthew 9:24)
Page 48: Annotation XLVIII, Whether the soul alone is the man (Matthew 10:28)
Page 49: Annotation XLIX, On Pilate (Matthew 10:29)
Page 49: Annotation L, On the doubt of John the Baptist (Matthew 11:3)
Page 49: Annotation LI, Whether before Christ's coming faith in Christ was necessary for salvation (Matthew 11:5)
Page 50: Annotation LII, Whether reprobation is from God's pure good pleasure (Matthew 11:26)
Page 51: Annotation LIII, Whether the angels see God (Matthew 11:27)
Page 51: Annotation LIV, On the Law of Moses (Matthew 11:28)
Page 51: Annotation LV, Absolution (Matthew 11:28)
Page 52: Annotation LVI, On the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:32)
Page 52: Annotation LVII, On the sin against the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:32)
Page 52: Annotation LVIII, Whether the Virgin Mary was guilty of vainglory (Matthew 12:47)
Page 53: Annotation LIX, On Joseph (Matthew 12:48)
Page 54: Annotation LX, Whether heretics unwilling to repent are to be put to death (Matthew 13:30)
Page 55: Annotation LXI, That the prophecy of Psalm 77, cited by Matthew, is to be understood literally of Christ (Matthew 13:35)
Page 55: Annotation LXII, What kind of smith's craft Joseph practiced (Matthew 13:55)
Page 56: Annotation LXIII, [The error that] faith is given to us from preceding merits (Matthew 13:11)
Page 56: Annotation LXIV, Whether Joseph was twice-married (Matthew 13:55–56)
Page 57: Annotation LXV, Whether the angels fell from heaven on account of love of women (Matthew 14:3,10)
Page 58: Annotation LXVI, On the Eucharist (Matthew 15:11)
Page 59: Annotation LXVII, Whether restitution ought to exceed the [thing] plundered (Matthew 15:29)
Page 60: Annotation LXVIII, Whether the Church was built upon [the] Rock [Peter] (Matthew 16:18)
Page 61: Annotation LXIX, Whether the Church was built upon each and every one of the faithful (Matthew 16:18)
Page 61: Annotation LXX, Whether the priestly power is lost through any [and every] sin (Matthew 16:18)
Page 62: Annotation LXXI, Whether the power of binding and loosing resides in priests (Matthew 16:19)
Page 63: Annotation LXXII, Whether the supreme pontiff has the power of secular rule (Matthew 16:19)
Page 67: Annotation LXXIII, On the duration of the world (Matthew 17:1)
Page 67: Annotation LXXIV, On Moses, appearing in the Transfiguration of Christ (Matthew 17:3)
Page 67: Annotation LXXV, Whether clerics are immune from the tributes of secular princes (Matthew 17:24)
Page 68: Annotation LXXVI, Whether Christians ought to pay tributes to their [own] princes (Matthew 17:26)
Page 68: Annotation LXXVII, Whether to individual men individual angels are assigned for [their] guard (Matthew 18:10)
Page 69: Annotation LXXVIII, Whether those speaking and eating with the excommunicated sin (Matthew 18:17)
Page 69: Annotation LXXIX, On the marriage-unions lawful by the law of nature (Matthew 19:5)
Page 70: Annotation LXXX, On second marriages (Matthew 19:8)
Page 70: Annotation LXXXI, Whether it is lawful to repudiate an adulterous wife, and to marry another (Matthew 19:9)
Page 74: Annotation LXXXII, Whether plurality of wives is prohibited by natural or by divine law (Matthew 19:9)
Page 75: Annotation LXXXIII, Whether it is lawful for Christians to wage war (Matthew 19:12)
Page 76: Annotation LXXXIV, Whether every corporeal thing is evil (Matthew 19:14)
Page 76: Annotation LXXXV, Whether it is lawful to procure for oneself, from the goods left at [one's] death, suffrages after this life (Matthew 19:20)
Page 77: Annotation LXXXVI, On monastic vows (Matthew 19:21)
Page 77: Annotation LXXXVII, Whether those called by God are called on account of [their] merits (Matthew 20:1)
Page 78: Annotation LXXXVIII, On the Trinity (Matthew 20:8)
Page 78: Annotation LXXXIX, *"Call the laborers, and pay them their wage."* (Matthew 20:8)
Page 79: Annotation XC, The fruition [beatific vision] of the blessed (Matthew 20:16)
Page 79: Annotation XCI, Whether Moses died (Matthew 20:20)
Page 79: Annotation XCII, On the Son of God (Matthew 20:19)
Page 80: Annotation XCIII, On the death of John the Evangelist (Matthew 20:23)
Page 80: Annotation XCIV, On the Trinity (Matthew 20:23)
Page 80: Annotation XCV, Whether it is lawful for Christians to exercise trade (Matthew 21:12)
Page 81: Annotation XCVI, What "Hosanna" signifies (Matthew 21:9)
Page 81: Annotation XCVII, On the subtraction of grace (Matthew 21:33)

Page 82: Annotation XCVIII, Whether the Jews recognized the deity of Christ (Matthew 21:38)
Page 82: Annotation XCIX, Whether election is from merit (Matthew 22:14)
Page 82: Annotation C, On the Trinity (Matthew 22:37)
Page 83: Annotation CI, Whether the precepts of the second table can be fulfilled without the grace of God (Matthew 22:39)
Page 84: Annotation CII, Whether it is lawful to hang gospels and crosses on the neck (Matthew 23:5)
Page 84: Annotation CIII, On the Homoousion [consubstantial] (Matthew 24:7)
Page 85: Annotation CIV, Whether the true Church can be recognized by certain marks, and by which (Matthew 24:15)
Page 87: Annotation CV, Whether Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment (Matthew 24:36)
Page 87: Annotation CVI, Whether fasting and chastity without almsgiving are of any avail (Matthew 24:50)
Page 88: Annotation CVII, Whether we can be helped by the merits of others (Matthew 25:9)
Page 88: Annotation CVIII, Whether bad priests are [true] priests (Matthew 25:18)
Page 89: Annotation CIX, On the three Magdalenes (Matthew 26:7)
Page 90: Annotation CX, Whether Christ celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth [day of the] moon. / Whether Christ consecrated in unleavened [bread] (Matthew 26:20)
Page 91: Annotation CXI, With what words Christ consecrated the Eucharist (Matthew 26:26)
Page 94: Annotation CXII, On the Eucharist (Matthew 26:26)
Page 95: Annotation CXIII, Whether wine — or water — alone is to be used in the sacred mysteries (Matthew 26:29)
Page 95: Annotation CXIV, Whether Christ truly feared for himself, and truly prayed for himself (Matthew 26:37)
Page 96: Annotation CXV, Whether it is lawful for Christians to make war (Matthew 26:52)
Page 96: Annotation CXVI, On war (Matthew 26:52)
Page 96: Annotation CXVII, Whether it is lawful for exorcists to adjure demons (Matthew 26:63)
Page 97: Annotation CXVIII, Whether Peter denied that Christ is God (Matthew 26:74)
Page 97: Annotation CXIX, Whether it is possible that those who have denied Christ should return to repentance and obtain pardon (Matthew 26:74–75)
Page 98: Annotation CXX, Whether Judas died by hanging in a noose (Matthew 27:5)
Page 99: Annotation CXXI, Whether it is lawful for clerics to have possessions of temporal things (Matthew 27:6–7)
Page 101: Annotation CXXII, Whether Adam was buried on Mount Calvary (Matthew 27:33)
Page 102: Annotation CXXIII, On the oath (Matthew 27:34)
Page 102: Annotation CXXIV, Whether the darkness, at Christ's death, happened over the whole world (Matthew 27:45)
Page 102: Annotation CXXV, Whether Christ was struck by the lance before he was dead (Matthew 27:46)
Page 103: Annotation CXXVI, Whether the divinity was separated from the humanity of the dying Christ (Matthew 27:46)
Page 103: Annotation [unnumbered], Whether she who is called by the Evangelist the mother of James and Joses was the mother of Christ (Matthew 27:56)

Mark

Page 104: Annotation CXXVII, The fishing of the Apostles (Mark 1:16)
Page 104: Annotation CXXVIII, On monastic traditions (Mark 6:8)
Page 106: Annotation CXXIX, *"And after six days, Jesus took Peter, etc."* (Mark 9:2)
Page 106: Annotation CXXX, On the history of those selling in the temple (Mark 11:15)
Page 106: Annotation CXXXI, Whether Christ was crucified at the third hour (Mark 15:25)
Page 107: Annotation CXXXII, Whether the last chapter of Mark is of solid authority (Mark 16:9)

Luke

Page 107: Annotation CXXXIII, Whether the Virgin Mary is rightly called "full of grace." (Luke 1:28)
Page 108: Annotation CXXXIV, Whether the soul of Christ has omnipotence equal with God (Luke 1:32)
Page 109: Annotation CXXXV, Whether the angels are to be judged on the day of judgment (Luke 2:14)
Page 109: Annotation CXXXVI, Whether Mary needed purification after childbirth (Luke 2:22)
Page 109: Annotation CXXXVII, On Mary giving birth (Luke 2:23)
Page 110: Annotation CXXXVIII, Whether Mary suffered a defect of faith at Christ's death (Luke 2:35)
Page 111: Annotation CXXXIX, Whether Mary always recognized Christ to be God (Luke 2:43)
Page 112: Annotation CXL, Whether Mary always knew the divinity of [her] Son (Luke 2:50)
Page 112: Annotation CXLI, Whether Christ advanced in wisdom (Luke 2:52)
Page 112: Annotation CXLII, On the instruction, errings, and penance of the angels (Luke 3:12)
Page 113: Annotation CXLIII, Whether the generation of Cainan is superfluous in the genealogy of Christ (Luke 3:36)
Page 114: Annotation CXLIV, Whether John the Baptist doubted concerning the death of Christ (Luke 7:19–20)

Page 115: Annotation CXLV, Whether Moses and Elijah truly appeared at Christ's transfiguration (Luke 9:30–31)
Page 115: Annotation CXLVI, On the number of Christ's disciples (Luke 10:1)
Page 116: Annotation CXLVII, Whether the Apostles begged [were mendicants] (Luke 10:7)
Page 117: Annotation CXLVIII, Whether it is lawful for a Christian to have anything of his own (Luke 12:18)
Page 118: Annotation CXLIX, On the guardian angels (Luke 12:58)
Page 119: Annotation CL, Whether the good angels can be bent to virtue and vice (Luke 15:31)
Page 119: Annotation CLI, Whether those who preceded the preaching of Christ hoped for the resurrection (Luke 16:20)
Page 119: Annotation CLII, Whether anyone can attain salvation without the reading of the Divine Scripture (Luke 16:24)
Page 124: Annotation CLIII, Confession (Luke 16:31)
Page 124: Annotation CLIV, What sins are to be confessed (Luke 17:14)
Page 125: Annotation CLV, On confession (Luke 18:13)
Page 125: Annotation CLVI, Whether it is lawful for a Christian to wage war (Luke 22:36)
Page 130: Annotation CLVII, War (Luke 22:38)
Page 130: Annotation CLVIII, War (Luke 22:38)
Page 131: Annotation CLIX, The consoling apparition of the angel (Luke 22:43)
Page 131: Annotation CLX, Whether Peter denied the Godhead of Christ (Luke 22:57)
Page 131: Annotation CLXI, Whether penance profits without confession and satisfaction (Luke 22:62)
Page 132: Annotation CLXII, Whether the death of Christ is to be mourned (Luke 23:28)
Page 133: Annotation CLXIII, Whether the saints yet enjoy the divine glory (Luke 23:43)
Page 134: Annotation CLXIV, Whether the Godhead was separated from the humanity of Christ through death (Luke 23:46)

John

Page 134: Annotation CLXV, Whether the angels learned anything from the evangelical writings (John 1:1)
Page 135: Annotation CLXVI, The imprisonment of souls (John 1:1)
Page 135: Annotation CLXVII, Whether God is the form of things (John 1:1)
Page 135: Annotation CLXVIII, The stars ensouled (John 1:1)
Page 136: Annotation CLXIX, Whether the Word [was] "to God" or "with God." (John 1:1)
Page 136: Annotation CLXX, Whether Christ suffered for the angels (John 1:1)
Page 136: Annotation CLXXI, On the equality of the Father and the Son (John 1:1)
Page 137: Annotation CLXXII, On the Son, and the Holy Spirit (John 1:3)
Page 138: Annotation CLXXIII, On the true punctuation of the clause, "Without him was made nothing." (John 1:3)
Page 139: Annotation CLXXIV, Whether sin is nothing (John 1:3)
Page 140: Annotation CLXXV, Whether the Son, as regards the divinity, is less than the Father (John 1:4–5)
Page 141: Annotation CLXXVI, On the Son, and the Holy Spirit (John 1:5)
Page 141: Annotation CLXXVII, The soul of John the Baptist existing before [his] body (John 1:7)
Page 142: Annotation CLXXVIII, Whether faith alone suffices for those to be saved (John 1:7)
Page 142: Annotation CLXXIX, Whether faith is lost through [mortal] sin (John 1:9)
Page 143: Annotation CLXXX, *"And the Word was made flesh."* (John 1:14)
Page 143: Annotation CLXXXI, Whether works [done] apart from grace are sins (John 1:16)
Page 144: Annotation CLXXXII, Whether the essence of God can be beheld by any creature (John 1:18)
Page 146: Annotation CLXXXIII, *"I saw, and gave testimony."* (John 1:34)
Page 146: Annotation CLXXXIV, Whether the beginning of our salvation is from us (John 1:38)
Page 147: Annotation CLXXXV, Whether Mary always had a becoming opinion of Christ (John 2:3)
Page 147: Annotation CLXXXVI, Whether the body of Christ was first formed in the womb before it was assumed by the deity (John 2:20)
Page 148: Annotation CLXXXVII, Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (John 3:34)
Page 150: Annotation CLXXXVIII, Whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are inferior to the Father (John 4:24)
Page 150: Annotation CLXXXIX, Whether the angels insert souls into bodies (John 4:38)
Page 151: Annotation CXC, *"The man believed the word which Jesus said to him, and went his way."* (John 4:50)
Page 151: Annotation CXCI, *"Himself believed, and his whole house."* (John 4:53)
Page 152: Annotation CXCII, *"Labor not for the food which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting."* (John 6:27)
Page 153: Annotation CXCIII, On the Eucharist (John 6:29)
Page 153: Annotation CXCIV, Whether faith is from us. Rom. 10 (John 6:44)
Page 154: Annotation CXCV, Whether venial sins impede the effect of the Eucharist for those receiving [it] (John 6:49)

Page 154: Annotation CXCVI, Whether the Eucharist contains the true body of Christ (John 6:48)
Page 161: Annotation CXCVII, On the eating of the sacrament (John 6:53)
Page 162: Annotation CXCVIII, Whether the beginning of the eighth chapter of John is authentic (John 8:1)
Page 162: Annotation CXCIX, Whether [some] sins are at some time to be remitted (John 8:21)
Page 162: Annotation CC, *"If you continue in my word,"* etc. (John 8:31)
Page 162: Annotation CCI, "Beginning" [principium] (John 8:25)
Page 163: Annotation CCII, Whether priests have the power of remitting sins (John 8:34)
Page 163: Annotation CCIII, [Origen:] souls, coming into the world, bring with them seminal reasons (John 8:37)
Page 164: Annotation CCIV, Whether the soul of Christ was in heaven before [it was] in the flesh (John 8:42)
Page 164: Annotation CCV, On Thomas's exhortation to [his] fellow-disciples (John 11:16)
Page 164: Annotation CCVI, Whether Peter received the keys in his own person (John 12:8)
Page 165: Annotation CCVII, On Philip (John 12:21)
Page 166: Annotation CCVIII, Whether the Holy Spirit [is] from the Father alone (John 14:16)
Page 166: Annotation CCIX, Whether after baptism original sin, and after justification other sins too, remain (John 13:10)
Page 169: Annotation CCX, Whether all believers are certain that they are in grace (John 14:16)
Page 172: Annotation CCXI, *"The Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father,"* etc. (John 15:26)
Page 173: Annotation CCXII, Whether faith alone suffices for salvation (John 16:9)
Page 173: Annotation CCXIII, Whether Christ began to be (John 17:5)
Page 173: Annotation CCXIV, Whether only the predestined believe (John 17:6)
Page 175: Annotation CCXV, Whether all believers are certain of grace (John 17:6)
Page 176: Annotation CCXVI, *"When therefore Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished."* (John 19:30)
Page 176: Annotation CCXVII, Whether the mysteries of faith are to be proved by human reasons (John 20:19)
Page 177: Annotation CCXVIII, Whether auricular confession was instituted by Christ (John 20:22–23)
Page 177: Annotation CCXIX, Whether the care of the predestined alone was committed to Peter (John 21:17)
Page 178: Annotation CCXX, Whether it is to be read SIC ["so"] or SI ["if"] (John 21:22)
Page 179: Annotation CCXXI, Whether Peter had the keys in his own person (John 21:19)

Acts

Page 179: Annotation CCXXII, Whether Judas died by hanging (Acts 1:18)
Page 181: Annotation CCXXIII, On the oath (Acts 3:26)
Page 181: Annotation CCXXIV, On the oath (Acts 4:20)
Page 181: Annotation CCXXV, Whether the seven [of Acts 6] were true deacons (Acts 6:5)
Page 182: Annotation CCXXVI, On the true reading of this passage (Acts 9:5)
Page 183: Annotation CCXXVII, Suffrages for the dead (Acts 9:43)
Page 183: Annotation CCXXVIII, *"James answered, saying, Men [and] brethren."* (Acts 15:13)
Page 183: Annotation CCXXIX, Who Dionysius the Areopagite was (Acts 17:34)

Romans

Page 183: Annotation CCXXX, On the cause of predestination (Romans 1:1)
Page 184: Annotation CCXXXI, Whether those who scrutinize the divine mysteries are to be condemned (Romans 1:17)
Page 184: Annotation CCXXXII, Whether circumcision confers grace (Romans 2:25)
Page 185: Annotation CCXXXIII, Whether faith alone justifies (Romans 3:27)
Page 185: Annotation CCXXXIV, *"And he was not weak in faith."* (Romans 4:19)
Page 186: Annotation CCXXXV, Whether the charity by which we love God is the indwelling Holy Spirit (Romans 5:5)
Page 186: Annotation CCXXXVI, Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not [as] guilt, but [as] punishment (Romans 5:12)
Page 190: Annotation CCXXXVII, Whether the sin of Adam passed to [his] posterity not [as] guilt, but only [by] occasion (Romans 5:12)
Page 191: Annotation CCXXXVIII, Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not by propagation, but by imitation (Romans 5:12)
Page 192: Annotation CCXXXIX, Whether abstinence from an oath, and love of an enemy, are counsels or precepts (Romans 7:6)
Page 194: Annotation CCXL, Whether original sin [comes] by propagation (Romans 7:8)
Page 194: Annotation CCXLI, The exposition of this passage retracted (Romans 7:14)
Page 194: Annotation CCXLII, Whether the natural passions were in man before sin (Romans 7:14)
Page 195: Annotation CCXLIII, Whether the law of Moses commands lesser [things] than the law of nature (Romans 7:25)

Page 196: Annotation CCXLIV, Whether the flesh of Christ had an inclination to sinning (Romans 8:3)
Page 196: Annotation CCXLV, Whether the heavens were made corruptible and dissoluble on account of Adam's sin (Romans 8:20)
Page 198: Annotation CCXLVI, Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God] (Romans 8:21)
Page 199: Annotation CCXLVII, The privation of eternal glory (Romans 8:27)
Page 199: Annotation CCXLVIII, Whether all men are chosen and destined to eternal life (Romans 8:28)
Page 200: Annotation CCXLIX, Whether future things are the cause of the divine foreknowledge, or the contrary (Romans 8:29)
Page 201: Annotation CCL, Whether election and reprobation are from the foreseeing of works (Romans 8:30)
Page 201: Annotation CCLI, Whether predestination is from the merits of the predestined foreseen by God (Romans 9:13)
Page 207: Annotation CCLII, Whether God reprobates any from the purpose of his will alone (Romans 9:18)
Page 210: Annotation CCLIII, Whether Paul was equal to Peter in dignity (Romans 11:1)
Page 210: Annotation CCLIV, Expiatory fire (Romans 11:5)
Page 210: Annotation CCLV, Whether the whole life of unbelievers is sin (Romans 14:23)
Page 211: Annotation CCLVI, War (Romans 16:3)

1 Corinthians

Page 211: Annotation CCLVII, Whether the precepts of the divine law can be fulfilled by natural powers alone (1 Corinthians 1:10)
Page 212: Annotation CCLVIII, Purgatory (1 Corinthians 3:12)
Page 212: Annotation CCLIX, Whether Chrysostom acknowledged purgatory (1 Corinthians 3:15)
Page 214: Annotation CCLX, Whether it be lawful for a husband to repudiate an adulterous wife, and for a wife an adulterous husband (1 Corinthians 7:10-11)
Page 215: Annotation CCLXI, Whether before communion it is necessary to confess [one's] sins (1 Corinthians 11:28)
Page 216: Annotation CCLXII, Whether only the scriptures approved by the apostles are canonical (1 Corinthians 12:28)
Page 216: Annotation CCLXIII, Whether the Mass and public prayers ought to be said in the vernacular tongue (1 Corinthians 14:14-16)
Page 218: Annotation CCLXIV, Whether souls are blessed before the day of judgment (1 Corinthians 15:19)
Page 220: Annotation CCLXV, Whether all men are to die (1 Corinthians 15:51)
Page 221: Annotation CCLXVI, Whether the writings of heretics are to be read (1 Corinthians 15:51)
Page 223: Annotation CCLXVII, Whether it is lawful to strike either the living or the dead with anathema (1 Corinthians 16:22)

2 Corinthians

Page 225: Annotation CCLXVIII, Whether it is necessary to exhibit the Eucharist under both species to the laity (2 Corinthians 8:24)

Galatians

Page 226: Annotation CCLXIX, Whether Peter was superior in dignity to Paul and the rest of the apostles (Galatians 1:1)
Page 228: Annotation CCLXX, Election and reprobation from merits (Galatians 1:15)
Page 228: Annotation CCLXXI, Peter superior to the other apostles (Galatians 1:18)
Page 229: Annotation CCLXXII, *"But [I saw none of the apostles], except James, the brother of the Lord."* (Galatians 1:19)
Page 229: Annotation CCLXXIII, On the four precepts of the apostles to those who [are] of the gentiles (Galatians 2:2)
Page 229: Annotation CCLXXIV, Whether Peter and Paul used simulation, and whether by simulating they sinned (Galatians 2:11)
Page 230: Annotation CCLXXV, *"I said to Cephas before all, If thou, being a Jew,"* etc. (Galatians 2:14)
Page 231: Annotation CCLXXVI, Whether witches [Striges] can bewitch little infants (Galatians 3:1)
Page 233: Annotation CCLXXVII, Whether it is read in the sacred letters that God cursed anyone (Galatians 3:10)
Page 233: Annotation CCLXXVIII, Whether our liberty [free will] without grace can do good (Galatians 3:21)
Page 235: Annotation CCLXXIX, Whether it is lawful to call the prefects of monasteries abbots or fathers (Galatians 4:6)
Page 235: Annotation CCLXXX, Whether it is lawful to bend the sins of the saints to pious senses (Galatians 4:24)
Page 236: Annotation CCLXXXI, Whether those who live under grace are impeccable [free from sin] (Galatians 5:17)
Page 236: Annotation CCLXXXII, Whether the damned are ever to be saved (Galatians 5:22)
Page 237: Annotation CCLXXXIII, Whether the saints departed can pray for us (Galatians 6:5)
Page 237: Annotation CCLXXXIV, Whether all men are to be loved with an equal affection of charity (Galatians 6:10)

Ephesians

Page 238: Annotation CCLXXXV, Whether election [is] from foreseen merits (Ephesians 1:4)

Page 238: Annotation CCLXXXVI, Whether souls [were] created before the world, and thrust into bodies for their offenses (Ephesians 1:4)
Page 239: Annotation CCLXXXVII, Whether souls [were] created before the world, and afterward cast into bodies for their [own] faults (Ephesians 1:4)
Page 240: Annotation CCLXXXVIII, Whether penance is again to be given to the lapsed (Ephesians 1:6)
Page 241: Annotation CCLXXXIX, On the Eucharist (Ephesians 1:7)
Page 241: Annotation CCXC, Whether the punishments of the damned are to be ended (Ephesians 1:12)
Page 243: Annotation CCXCI, Whether the knowledge of souls is from reminiscence (Ephesians 1:17)
Page 243: Annotation CCXCII, The increments and decrements of angels (Ephesians 1:21)
Page 244: Annotation CCXCIII, Whether the stars are rational living beings, and purged by the blood of Christ (Ephesians 1:22)
Page 244: Annotation CCXCIV, The bodies of demons (Ephesians 2:2)
Page 244: Annotation CCXCV, Whether the demons are ever to be saved (Ephesians 2:7)
Page 245: Annotation CCXCVI, Angels purged (Ephesians 2:17)
Page 245: Annotation CCXCVII, The soul's prison (Ephesians 3:1)
Page 245: Annotation CCXCVIII, Whether the demons are to be restored (Ephesians 3:10)
Page 245: Annotation CCXCIX, Whether the angels, before the passion of Christ, knew the mystery of redemption (Ephesians 3:10)
Page 246: Annotation CCC, *"And he himself indeed gave some [to be] apostles."* (Ephesians 4:11)
Page 246: Annotation CCCI, Whether he is to be constituted a bishop, who cannot teach (Ephesians 4:11)
Page 247: Annotation CCCII, On the angels, and the demons (Ephesians 4:10.b)
Page 247: Annotation CCCIII, *"From whom the whole body [is] compacted."* (Ephesians 4:16.b)
Page 247: Annotation CCCIV, Whether song is to be used in the divine praises (Ephesians 5:19)
Page 248: Annotation CCCV, Whether sinners are members of the Church (Ephesians 5:24)
Page 248: Annotation CCCVI, The transformation of women (Ephesians 5:28)
Page 248: Annotation CCCVII, On the sacrament of matrimony (Ephesians 5:32)
Page 249: Annotation CCCVIII, Jacob, and the wrestling of the angel (Ephesians 6:12)
Page 249: Annotation CCCIX, The punishment of original sin (Ephesians 6:24)

Philippians

Page 250: Annotation CCCX, Whether the saints are to be invoked (Philippians 1:18)
Page 251: Annotation CCCXI, Whether prayer is to be made for catechumens departing without baptism (Philippians 1:23)

Colossians

Page 252: Annotation CCCXII, Whether the sacred letters attribute patience to God (Colossians 1:11)
Page 253: Annotation CCCXIII, Whether to individual men individual angels are deputed (Colossians 1:20)
Page 253: Annotation CCCXIV, Fascination [bewitchment] (Colossians 3:15)
Page 253: Annotation CCCXV, The common [vernacular] Bibles are to be read by all (Colossians 3:16)

2 Thessalonians

Page 254: Annotation CCCXVI, *"When I was yet with you, [I told you these things], etc."* (2 Thessalonians 2:5)
Page 254: Annotation CCCXVII, Whether monks are to be compelled to provide for themselves a living by the labor of [their] hands (2 Thessalonians 3:10)

1 Timothy

Page 257: Annotation CCCXVIII, Whether it is lawful to constitute a bigamist a bishop (1 Timothy 3:2)
Page 258: Annotation CCCXIX, Bishop, and presbyter (1 Timothy 3:8)
Page 258: Annotation CCCXX, Whether God, before the incarnation of Christ, was seen by the angels (1 Timothy 3:16)
Page 258: Annotation CCCXXI, Whether clerics ought to possess anything beyond food and clothing (1 Timothy 5:18)
Page 259: Annotation CCCXXII, The punishment of blasphemers (1 Timothy 5:23)

Titus

Page 259: Annotation CCCXXIII, Angels existing long before the world (Titus 1:2)
Page 259: Annotation CCCXXIV, Whether a bishop is greater than a presbyter (Titus 1:5)
Page 261: Annotation CCCXXV, Whether a bigamist is to be chosen for bishop (Titus 1:6)
Page 262: Annotation CCCXXVI, Daily bread (Titus 2:11)

Hebrews

Page 262: Annotation CCCXXVII, Whether the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's (Hebrews 1:1)
Page 262: Annotation CCCXXVIII, Whether the Father is the cause of the Son (Hebrews 1:3.a)
Page 263: Annotation CCCXXIX, Whether in Christ there are two persons (Hebrews 1:9)
Page 263: Annotation CCCXXX, Whether the celestial bodies are to be burned up (Hebrews 1:11)
Page 263: Annotation CCCXXXI, Whether Christ was diminished from God (Hebrews 2:7)
Page 264: Annotation CCCXXXII, Whether the laity and monks are equal — [their] obligations and offenses [being] equal (Hebrews 4:16)
Page 265: Annotation CCCXXXIII, Whence the beginning of salvation (Hebrews 7:10)
Page 265: Annotation CCCXXXIV, The state and figure of heaven (Hebrews 8:2)
Page 266: Annotation CCCXXXV, Whether the souls of the saints are yet blessed (Hebrews 11:37)
Page 266: Annotation CCCXXXVI, Confession (Hebrews 12:17)

James

Page 266: Annotation CCCXXXVII, Whether the epistle of James is canonical (James 1:1)
Page 267: Annotation CCCXXXVIII, Oath (James 5:12)
Page 267: Annotation CCCXXXIX, Whether extreme unction can be ministered by any layman whatsoever (James 5:14)

2 Peter

Page 268: Annotation CCCXL, Whether the heavens are to be burned by the fire of the world-conflagration (2 Peter 3:10)
Page 272: Annotation CCCXLI, Whether air and water at the end of the world shall be wholly dissolved (2 Peter 3:10)

1 John

Page 273: Annotation CCCXLII, Trinity (1 John 5:7)
Page 273: Annotation CCCXLIII, Whether the impugning of the brotherhood is an irremissible sin (1 John 5:16)

Jude

Page 273: Annotation CCCXLIV, Whether the epistle of Jude is canonical (Jude 1)

Apocalypse

Page 273: Annotation CCCXLV, Whether the souls of the saints see God before the day of judgment (Apocalypse 6:9)
Page 281: Annotation CCCXLVI, Whether Jeremiah is dead (Apocalypse 11:3)
Page 282: Annotation CCCXLVII, Whether there are to be two [future] resurrections, and a golden age of a thousand years between the two (Apocalypse 20:6)

(printed p. 429 [PDF p. 434], recto — the end of Book V (not translated), then the Book VI title-block, prefatory paragraph, and Ann. I–III, on Matthew 1. Read order: left column, then right.)

BIBLIOTHECA SANCTA — BOOK VI

By Friar Sixtus of Siena, of the Order of Preachers: On the ANNOTATIONS AND CENSURES upon the interpreters & expositors of the divine volumes of the New Testament — [being] of the *Bibliotheca Sancta* (the Holy Library)

(full-width prefatory paragraph:)

Although in the preface of the preceding book I had promised to comprise all the annotations upon the expositors of both Testaments together in a single volume — lest I should sunder matters joined by the affinity of one and the same kind, and rashly multiply the number of books — nevertheless, when I observed that the annotating labor I had begun was swelling to a magnitude far greater than my expectation, and was exceeding the measure of the other volumes, it seemed good [to me] to divide the work into two books, and to embrace in this sixth book of the Library the Annotations and Censures which pertain to the expositors of the New Testament: so that by a partition of this kind I might, so far as could be done, preserve the equality [balance] among the volumes, and might breathe [rest] for some few days from the unremitting weariness of reading and writing.

(the two-column Annotations begin — left column:)

Annotation I

"The book of the generation of JESUS CHRIST." — Matthew 1[:1]

[margin: Sacred reading.]

Chrysostom, homily 2 on Matthew — in which he expounds the beginning of this Gospel — not far from the end asserts that the reading and study of divine Scripture pertains more to secular [laypeople] than to monks, and is more necessary to the former than to the latter. See what we have annotated on this below, at Annotation 152.

Annotation II

"And Judas begat Phares and Zara of Thamar." — Matthew 1[:3]

[margin: Thamar.]

Chrysostom, homily 3 on Matthew, accuses Thamar as a harlot — whom elsewhere he defends from the charge of fornication. You should be mindful of the things that were said in the preceding volume, at Annotation 113 of the fifth book.

(right column:)

Annotation III

"Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary." — Matthew 1[:16]

[margin: On the marriage of Mary and Joseph.]

Jerome, in the first book of [his] commentaries on this passage of Matthew, says: "When you hear 'husband,' let no suspicion of nuptials [marital intercourse] steal over you, but recall the usage of the Scriptures — that betrothed men are called 'husbands' and betrothed women 'wives.'" The same [Jerome], alluding to this same sense in his book *Against Helvidius*, says that Joseph was rather the guardian of Mary than her husband. The scholastic theologians make use of this passage when, for the sake of disputation, they undertake to show that between Mary and Joseph there was no true sacrament of matrimony. Meeting [answering] them, St. Thomas, in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 29, says that Jerome, by the word "husband" and "married man," signified him who has already entered upon [taken to himself] his spouse; but by "nuptials," the nuptial intercourse of bridegroom and bride — of which Mary and Joseph were wholly without experience, content with the sole and indivisible union of *[minds…]*

[…the sentence runs on to p. 430 (PDF 435): "…of minds — which [union] is the first, and…"]

(printed p. 430 [PDF p. 435], verso — end of Ann. III and Ann. IIII–VI, on Matthew 1 (the Opus imperfectum *against marriage). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation III from p. 429:)

…[content] with the sole and indivisible union of minds — which is the first and chief dignity of true and holy matrimony, and its most essential form.

Annotation IIII

"When his mother Mary was betrothed." — Matthew 1[:18]

[margin: On Matrimony.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum* on Matthew, in the first homily, expounding this passage, seems to slip into the error of Marcion, Tatian, and Montanus, who condemn marriage. For he says that matrimony is by its very nature a sin, but permitted by God for necessity's sake, and consequently that it neither pleases God nor has any reward. And he sets forth this opinion in these words:

> *"The marital union, as regards the nature of the thing itself, is a sin; but by God's concession a license has been granted. A license, I say, has been granted — not a righteousness. For although, by reason of the necessity of the thing, it has ceased to be a sin, yet it has not merited to be a righteousness. And so to those who use it, though it inflicts no penalty, yet it yields no reward; though it does not kill, yet it does not save. Whence the prophet — looking not to the indulgence of God, but to the foulness of the act itself — said, 'Behold, I was conceived in iniquities, and in sins did my mother conceive me' [Ps. 50:7]: that is, what wonder if I have sinned, who am born of sin? For the nature of sin has attended its own begetting. For if matrimony itself were pleasing to God, never would a glorious crown be promised to those who abstain from it; nor would those who hate it be so loved by God. For he is not rewarded who flees the good, but he who flees the evil.*
>
> *"Do you wish to know how matrimony is lawful? — how once it was even lawful to have sisters as wives? how Cain and Abel had [them]? These are the names of the daughters of Adam, whom he had in the beginning after Cain and Abel — Risam and Edoclam — and they did not sin, because the scarcity of men and necessity excused that fault. Afterward, as the number of men grew, that evil returned into its own nature and began to be a sin; yet it remained in use, so that one man was allowed to have several wives. Then, the world being enlarged, this evil too resumed its own nature and began to be a sin; yet it remained in use, so that one man should have one wife. But now, after the fullness of time has come and the world has grown old, we know what the counsel of God is, and what he wills, and what is pleasing before him. Yet we have not dared to say [it outright], on account of incontinent men — in whose body the soul does nothing, but blood wholly possesses them, and that most filthy vapor proceeding from that insane fire.*

"Finally, when the angel commanded Tobias, at his nuptials, that before they came together according to that human custom they should first rise and pray, and say thus: 'Lord, thou knowest that not for lust have I taken a wife, but for the sake of procreating children' [Tob. 8] — for had he prayed otherwise, his prayer would not have been pleasing to God — see, therefore, that only the sake of children excuses that most base work of the flesh. But now, the world being multiplied, the occasion for creating men is extinguished; now not the multitude of men, but the charity of the saints, delights God. Behold, there is one lust which begets fornication, and [another] which supplies the marital use. But just as the shores set a boundary for the sea, saying, 'Thus far shalt thou come, and here shalt thou be constrained' — so marriage set a boundary for carnal lust, that coming just so far, it might there restrain itself. As therefore the sea, if it overpass its shores, transgresses, so also a man, if he transgress the marital license. If therefore the lust in married men and in adulterers is one and the same, how can it come about that one and the same thing should for one half be righteousness and for the other half be sin? For either it is wholly sin or wholly righteousness, since it is one thing; but it is true that lust is not righteousness — therefore it is wholly sin. Yet the penalty of that sin is not imputed, until this hateful and corruptible world pass away." — Thus far, in the first homily.

Again, in homily 82, on that passage of Matthew 19 (*"Moses, on account of [your] hardness," etc.*), speaking of second marriages, he says: "Even the Apostles enjoined [people] to enter upon second marriages on account of the incontinence of men. For to take a second [wife] is according to the Apostle's precept; but according to the standard of truth, it is truly fornication. Yet while it is committed publicly and licitly, God permitting, it becomes an honorable fornication."

(right column:)

Annotation V

"Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife." — Matthew 1[:20]

[margin: Joseph in doubt.]

Hilary, in the first canon on Matthew, says: "But most depraved men presume from this [passage] that our Lord is recorded to have had several brothers — who, if they had been Mary's, and not rather begotten of Joseph by a former marriage, [she] would never at the time of the Passion have been assigned as mother to John the Apostle." See what we remark on these things below, at Annotation 64.

Annotation VI

"For that which is born in her is of the Holy Ghost." — Matthew 1[:20]

[margin: On the Holy Spirit.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum* on Matthew, in homily 1, explaining this passage, seems to assert that the Holy Spirit was, in Christ's conception, in place of seed — speaking thus: "The Only-begotten God being about to enter the Virgin, the Holy Spirit went before, so that — the Holy Spirit going before — Christ might be born in sanctification according to the body, the divinity entering in place of seed." This opinion Augustine, in Sermon 191 *On the Season*, seems to attack in these words: "We do NOT say — as certain most wicked men suppose — that the Holy Spirit was in place of seed, but [that the conception was] wrought by the power and virtue of the Creator." St. Thomas, in the third part of the *Summa Theologica*, question 32, article 2 — citing the former opinion under the name of Chrysostom, but the latter under the name of Jerome — reconciles the two thus: he says that Chrysostom, by the term "seed," did not understand the *substance* of seed (which is wont to be transmuted in the conception of a fetus, and which in Christ's conception Jerome deservedly abhors), but wished to signify the agent power of the Lord's incarnation — which was the Holy Spirit himself — the angel saying to Mary, *"The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee"* [Luke 1:35].

[catchword "An-" → Annotation VII, on p. 431 (PDF 436).]

(printed p. 431 [PDF p. 436], recto — Ann. VII–X, on Matthew 2 (the Magi; Origen and the magic art; astrology begins). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column:)

Annotation VII

"Magi come from the East." — Matthew 2[:1]

[margin: Whether angels are living beings.]

Gregory, in the tenth homily on the Gospels, at its beginning — inquiring why an angel appeared to the shepherds, but a star to the Magi — answers that to the Jews, as [people] using reason, a rational animal (that is, an angel) ought to make the proclamation. St. Thomas, in part 1 of the *Summa Theologica*, question 51, notes that this passage is appealed to by those who hold that angels are living beings composed of soul and body. Refer back, above, to Annotation 8 of book 5.

Annotation VIII

"The Magi, seeing the star," etc. — Matthew 2[:2]

[margin: Whether the magic art is evil.]

Origen, in the fifth treatise on Matthew — expounding the history of the Magi, as Polychronius reports [in his commentary] on Ezekiel — commended the magic art in the highest degree. And Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, the perpetual enemy of Origen's name, censuring this more sharply than was fair, in the second Paschal book inveighs against Origen thus: "Let Origen be confounded, who — among the other kinds of outrages that he fabricates, lending patronage to the magic arts as well — spoke in his *Treatises* in these words: 'The magic art does not seem to me to be the name of anything that subsists; but, even if it does exist, it is not [a thing] of evil operation, nor such as can be held in contempt.' By saying this he shows himself, at all events, a partisan of Elymas the magician — who withstood the Apostles — and of Jannes and Mambres, who resisted Moses by the magic arts, etc." — But since Origen so often, in his writings, detests the sorceries of the magicians — and especially in the 23rd homily on Numbers, where in a long discourse from the divine testimonies he lays low the magi, the sorcerers, and every kind of enchanter — there is no ground why we should suspect such things of Origen.

And, lest anyone be moved by the aforesaid testimonies of Polychronius and Theophilus, it must be known that Magic is twofold: the one — everywhere condemned by Origen — which, entered into by pacts with demons, works either truly or in appearance; the other — praised by Origen — which pertains to the practice of natural philosophy, teaching that admirable things are wrought by the mutual application of natural powers acting and being acted upon one another. This division Jerome embraces in the first book of [his] commentaries on Daniel, on those words of chapter 2, *"The king commanded that the soothsayers, and the magi, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans be summoned"* — where, noting why Daniel distinguished the magi from the sorcerers, soothsayers, and Chaldeans, he writes thus: "Those whom we have rendered 'soothsayers,' the rest [have rendered] *epaoidous* — that is, 'enchanters' — seem to me to be those who accomplish the matter by words; the *magi*, those who philosophize about particular things; the *sorcerers* [malefici], those who use blood and victims and often touch the bodies of the dead. Moreover, by 'Chaldeans' I think the *genethliaci* are meant, whom common usage calls 'mathematicians' [astrologers]. But common custom takes 'magi' for 'sorcerers,' though they are held otherwise among their own nation, in that they are the philosophers of the Chaldeans; and to the science of this art

(continuing in the right column:)

kings too, and the princes of that same nation, devote everything. Whence also, at the nativity of the Lord and Savior, they were the first to understand his birth; and coming into holy Bethlehem, they adored the child, the star showing him from above." The same [Jerome], in the second book against Jovinian, says: "Eubulus, who wrote the history of Mithras in many volumes, relates that among the Persians there are three kinds of magi, of whom the first — who are the most learned and most eloquent — take, besides meal and vegetables, nothing further as food."

This [says] Jerome: before whom Justin, philosopher and martyr, had approved the same distinction in the book of *Questions* [put forward by the gentile nations], questions 24 and 26 — in which, discussing what difference there is between the miracles of the Egyptian magicians and [those] of Moses, and between the miracles of Christ and [those] of Apollonius of Tyana, the philosopher or magician, he speaks thus: "Those miracles which were performed by Moses were divine works performed — namely, through a change of the nature of the water, which was carried over into the nature of that which was being effected. But those which the magicians performed were works of demons performed, who brought it about that the eyes of those who beheld [it] seemed to see a serpent, blood, and frogs — which did not [really] exist. And Apollonius indeed, a man endowed with knowledge of natural faculties, and of the harmonies and contrary affections which are in them, out of that art produced his operations — not by divine authority. And so in all [his] accomplishments he needed the taking up of a suitable material; by whose help he completed what was being brought about. But our Savior Christ, performing marvelous and unwonted works by his own divine authority and right, nowhere required matter, but [only] a command."

Annotation IX

"We have seen his star." — Matthew 2[:2]

[margin: Whether the prophecy of Numbers 24 is to be understood of the star seen by the Magi.]

Ambrose [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa [Conza], in the second book of [his] *Annotations*, refutes Thomas Cajetan; because, examining this passage, [Cajetan] denied that that Balaamic prophecy of Numbers 24 — *"A star shall arise out of Jacob,"* etc. — signified the rising of the star which pointed out Christ's birth: against the authority of all the holy fathers, among whom Jerome, in the first commentary on Matthew, says: "For the confounding of the Jews — that they might learn Christ's nativity from the gentiles — a star arises in the East, which Balaam (whose successors [the Magi] were) had known by prophecy would come to be. Read on this the book of Numbers." This [says] Jerome.

Annotation X

"We have seen his star." — Matthew 2

[margin: Whether Christ's nativity could be foreknown from genethliacal [astrological] divinations.]

Peter d'Ailly (Petrus Aliacus), cardinal-priest — disputing in his 30th Question on Genesis, and in the book *On Laws and Sects*, concerning the star seen by the Magi in the East — shows that those Magi, being most skilled in the science of the stars, could from astrological contemplations have foreknown the coming nativity and life of Christ; yet not with that certainty by which they afterward recognized Christ's birth when the new star pointed it out.

[signature "Nn 2"; catchword "nam" → continues on p. 432 (PDF 437).]

(printed p. 432 [PDF p. 437], verso — Ann. X cont., on Matthew 2 (d'Ailly's astrology; a nativity-horoscope figure; Augustine contra). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation X:)

…For although Christ's conception and nativity exceed all the powers of the heavens and all the faculties of nature in most respects, yet in some [respects] the virtues of the heavens and stars — like handmaids serving their lord — most abundantly furnished to the newborn Christ the friendly lights and benign influences which they had received from Christ. For that reason it was possible for the Magi, besides this appearance of the recent star, to have foreknown by two other indications that a man distinguished in religion, empire, and glory was to be born:

First, from a certain great conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn — which, in the sixth year before our Savior's birth, came together in the sign of Cancer, all the astronomers of those times predicting that a great change of religions was portended.

Second, from observation of the configuration of the heaven which Christ's nativity itself had. It fell in the 42nd year of Octavian Augustus, on the eighth of the Kalends of January [25 December], before midnight; and in it the ascendant was the eighth degree of Virgo (which signifies changes of religion); and at the midheaven [was] Saturn, the Sun holding the nadir, and the other planets arranged in that order which the following astronomical diagram represents to you — drawn for the latitude of the city of Jerusalem, distant thirty-six degrees from the Equator.

> ***[Figure]** — caption: "The configuration of the planets shining upon the nativity of our Savior Jesus Christ."*
>
> *A square (diamond-in-square) horoscope chart, centrally titled "**FIGURE OF THE HEAVEN AT THE TIME OF THE NATIVITY OF CHRIST.**" The twelve houses carry zodiac signs and degrees with planetary symbols — legible among them: Leo 15°, Cancer, Saturn (♄) 15° and Jupiter (♃) near the midheaven, Virgo 8° (ascendant region), Scorpio 8°, Sun (☉) 1°, Aquarius 15°, with the lunar nodes and Mars, Venus, and Mercury distributed around the remaining cusps.*

This is d'Ailly's opinion; which long before, Albert [the Great] — great in his own age — had professed. In the book to which he gave the title *Speculum* [*The Mirror*], reporting the description of the sign Virgo handed down by the astronomer Albumasar, he left it written thus: "Albumasar, in his greater *Introductorium*, treatise six, says: *There ascends, in the first face [decan] of that sign [Virgo], a Virgin beautiful and honorable, holding in her hand two ears of grain, and she nurses a boy — and a certain nation calls that boy JESUS; and the star of Virgo ascends with her.*" Thus he. But we know that our Lord Jesus Christ was born under the ascendant of that same Virgo — together with this, that the equation of the motion of the eighth sphere at the time of the same [nativity] was eight

(right column:)

degrees and thirty minutes, according to a most certain calculation; and that it was then to be subtracted from the places of the planets found by the canons [tables]. Not because [the Creator] is subject to the motion of the stars, or most desirous of judging the newborn by them — he who had created the stars themselves — but because, when he stretched out the heaven like a skin, forming the book of the universe, he did not wish its lettering to be missing from among these things which, according to his providence, are written in the book of eternity; [nor missing] that most elegant [sign] from nature, that [Christ] should be born of a Virgin — so that assuredly by this it might be signified [that here was] a real and fleshly man who was not being born in the natural way: not that the figure of the heaven was the cause why he should be born, but rather a signification; nay, and more truly, he himself was the cause why the manner of his admirable nativity should be signified through the heaven. Thus far Albert — or someone else under his name; for that book is denied by the learned to be Albert's.

Augustine disproves this opinion in the fifth book of *The City of God*, chapter 1. There, after refuting those who say that the stars are efficient causes, in infants' birth-charts, and distribute to each one being born his

lots and fates, he then also confutes those who teach that the positions of the stars at infants' births are not causes but only signs — signs which signify the future life, character, and fortune of the one being born — writing thus:

> *"If it be said that the stars rather signify these things than effect them, so that their position is, as it were, a kind of utterance foretelling the future and not producing it (for this was the opinion of no mean men) — as, for example, that Mars so placed signifies a murderer but does not make a murderer — how comes it that the astrologers could never say why, in the life of twins (in their actions, events, professions, arts, honors, and the other things pertaining to human life, and in death itself) there is often so great a diversity that, as far as these matters are concerned, many strangers are more alike to them than the twins are to each other? — twins separated at birth by the tiniest interval of time, yet conceived by one act of intercourse and sown in one and the same moment."*

And below, in the third chapter of the same book, he refutes those who, from the response of Nigidius Figulus, referred that disparity of twins to the whirling of the celestial rotation — which, by the swiftness of both births, would change each infant's horoscope in a tiny moment of time. He speaks thus:

> *"In vain is that famous conceit of the potter's wheel brought forward, which they say Nigidius — disturbed by this question, whence he was called Figulus [the Potter] — gave in answer. For when he had spun a potter's wheel with all the force he could, he struck it twice with ink, as it ran, as though at one and the same spot, with utmost speed. Then, when the motion had stopped, the marks he had made were found on the rim of that wheel separated by no small interval. So, he says, given the great rapidity of the heavens, even if one twin be born after another with as much speed as I struck the wheel twice, [that interval] amounts to a very great distance in the space of the heavens. Hence come, he says, all those most dissimilar things reported in the characters and fortunes of twins." — This fabrication is more fragile than the vessels which are shaped by that rotation. For if there is so great a difference in the heaven, which by the constellations is compre-*

[margin: Suetonius writes that Nigidius, having ascertained the hour of Octavian's birth, foretold that a lord of the world had been born.]

> *[catchword "pre-" → "comprehended…" continues on p. 433 (PDF 438).]*

(printed p. 433 [PDF p. 438], recto — Ann. X cont., on Matthew 2 (astrology condemned at Trent; the Saravallius affair). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation X:)

…be compre**hended**, such that to one of two twins the inheritance falls and to the other it does not — why do they dare, concerning others who are *not* twins, once they have inspected their constellations, to pronounce such things as pertain to that secret which no one can grasp, and to record [them] by the moments of those being born? etc.

From these words of Augustine it is clear that the divination of those who, from the significations of the horoscoping stars, foretell the future outcomes of birth-charts is false and empty — both because there are in the stars no such significations of contingent things, and because, even were they granted to be present, they could be grasped by no human ingenuity. It is likewise plain that the excuses of the recent astrologers are cold and worthless. Of these, some defend their superstition by saying that they ascribe to the stars no efficient force that compels by producing [effects] and imposes necessity, but only a force that *inclines*; others, consulting for themselves by a more honorable evasion (as they think), say that they deny to the constellations even that very faculty of inclining, and profess in them only a certainty of signifying and forewarning.

Accordingly, the holy Synod of Trent, desiring utterly to overthrow whatever defenses these men make, counted all the judgments of the genethliac art — nay, of the imposture — among the other impieties of sacrilegious divination; and, drawing no distinction between the astromancers who divine either from the

efficiency or from the signification of the stars, condemned indiscriminately all their studies and writings, whatever they be, in these words: *[margin: In the Index of books condemned by the Synod of Trent, Rule 9.]* "All books and writings of geomancy, hydromancy, aeromancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy, necromancy — or in which are contained sortileges, sorceries, auguries, auspices, incantations of the magic art — are utterly rejected. And let the bishops diligently see to it that the books, treatises, and indexes of judiciary astrology be not read or kept — [those] which dare to affirm that something will certainly come to pass concerning future contingent outcomes, or fortuitous chances, or those actions which depend on the human will."

You have what pertains to this argument in book 5, Annotations 15 and 81, and in book 2, under the heading *Of Curious Arts*.

While I was preparing these things, a certain Saravallius — a theologian not unlearned, but marvelously addicted to the vanity of judiciary [astrology] — fell in with a venal copyist to whom I had given this work to transcribe. And, with that man's connivance and unbeknownst to me, having read through a great part of the volume at his place, and having read this annotation among the rest, a little later he tore my name to shreds in a company of learned and noble men — clamoring that I was an enemy of the good arts, [I] who affirm that astrology is not an art but a detestable deception and imposture; whereas on the contrary (he said) the divine Thomas — whose very doctrine I profess — approves astrological divinations in many places, and all the learned confess the science of astrology to be most true and excellent; and that it, if rightly understood and handled by those who know it well, presents most useful and admirable predictions of the future. He added

(right column:)

also, from the most approved historians, for the confirmation of his opinion, a long catalogue of astrologers who most certainly foretold [things] concerning the births, life, death, reigns, wars, victories, and the other outcomes — both fortunate and unfortunate — of kings and emperors. Finally, after a lengthy enumeration of examples, he inferred that I, driven by some hidden force of the truth I was assailing, had myself gone over to the astrologers' opinion — since, in the fourth book of this work, I wrote that certain poets, [gifted] for illustrating Christian poesy and singing sacred poems, were born under a most happy star. *[margin: pp. 352 & 398.]*

When certain friends had reported these things to me, and had warned that the accuser's complaints were not to be neglected (by which even some of those noble men seemed moved), I resolved to meet the adversary's accusations with words of peace [as far as I could], and to satisfy my friends' desire.

First, then: when he grieves that astrology is called by me not an art but an imposture and a fraud, I confess — and freely declare — that it *is* so, provided the word "astrology" signify astromancy, or genesiology, or genethliomancy — that is, the profession of nativity-divination, which from the birth-stars of mortals conjectures the whole course of [a person's] life. For who, unless he be utterly mad, would dare to call this insane deception an "art," or reckon it a "science" — one confirmed by no solid reason, resting on no certain experiment, proved by no authority of the wise; but which the philosophers hiss off the schools' stage as a mockery, the imperial laws condemn, the decrees of the pontiffs and the synodical sanctions forbid, the divine Scripture detests, and the judgments of all theologians reprove? *[margin: Divination is reproved in the sacred writings — Deut. 18; Isa. 47; Jer. 10; Gal. 4; and in the Decretum, cause 26, q. 7; in the Council of Trent, Index Rule 9; likewise in the Code of Justinian, under the title "On Astrologers," the law "Nemo."]*

But he says: "If the study of such astrologers is vanity and an empty fiction, how comes it that they, from the configuration of the stars shining upon nativities, predict many true things?" Indeed, this is that singular and chief demonstration of the diviners, on which — as on an immovable foundation — they rest the whole edifice of their divination. But how slippery and weak it is, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, and other ancient doctors have openly uncovered, in various disputations published against the astrologers; in which they

excellently demonstrated that the truth of those predictions is not to be referred to observations of the constellations (which are mere dreams), but to four other, more powerful and more evident causes — namely, to **chance**, to **pacts** [with demons], to the **prudence of those consulted**, and to the **folly of those consulting**.

First, indeed, the planetary [astrologers] utter most true things not by the art of the inspected stars, but by **chance** — chance, I say, understood according to the pious definition of the theologians: that is, from the hidden disposition of divine providence. Which (as Augustine says in the fourth and seventh [books] of the *Confessions*) sometimes so stirs the blind and wicked minds of those consulted, by a certain hidden instinct, that unwittingly they utter what those consulting ought to hear — whether from their own deserts or from the abyss of [God's] just judgment. So it once befell among the pagans, that while some, from the poems of a poet who was singing and intending something far different, [drew lots and found]

[signature "Nn 3"; catchword "sor-" → "chance…" (the sortes Virgilianae) continues on p. 434 (PDF 439).]

(printed p. 434 [PDF p. 439], verso — Ann. X cont., on Matthew 2 (the four causes of true astrological predictions). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation X:)

…[some, consulting] lots, chanced upon verses wonderfully consonant with their present or future affairs — as [befell] Alexander Severus, who, while still a youth and not [yet] hoping for the empire, was searching the Virgilian lots, and verses came out of the sixth [book] of the Aeneid which portended to him the future empire, in these words:

"Thou, O Roman, remember to rule the peoples with [thy] sway

(these shall be thine arts), and to impose the custom of peace,

to spare the subjected and to war down the proud."

But if, at the nod of the divine lot, responses have sometimes come forth from songs of this kind as different from the thoughts of their own authors as they were congruous with the outcomes of those consulting — what wonder if, from an astrologer who knows nothing of what he says, true prognostications occasionally fall out? — his tongue being governed by him who drew most true oracles of the future not only from the mouth of Balaam, the soothsayer and false prophet, but even from the mouth of the ass on which that diviner sat.

Secondly, many things said by the astrologers — and, as foretold, coming to pass — [happen] not from the astromantic discipline (which is nothing), but from a fellowship and pacts established between them and the demons; concerning which Augustine, in the fifth book of *The City of God*, chapter 7, speaks thus: "All these things being considered, it is not without reason believed that, when astrologers give many marvelously true answers, this comes about by the hidden instinct of spirits that are not good — whose care it is to insinuate and confirm in human minds these false and noxious opinions about astral fates; and not [by any] horoscope observed and inspected by some art, which is nothing." And in the second book *On Genesis according to the Letter*, chapter 17, explaining the same thing more fully, he says: "It must be admitted that, when true things are told by them, they are told by a certain most hidden instinct which human minds unknowingly undergo. And since this is done to deceive men, it is the operation of seducing spirits — to whom it is permitted to know certain true things about temporal matters: partly by the keenness of a subtler perception, partly because they thrive in subtler bodies, partly by a shrewder experience owing to their great length of life, partly [by information] from the holy angels — since the demons themselves learn from omnipotent God, the angels revealing [it] to them at his command, [God] who distributes human deserts with the sincerity of a most hidden justice. But sometimes those same nefarious spirits also foretell, as if divining, the very things

which they themselves are about to do." Wherefore a good Christian must beware of the astrologers — or of any who impiously divine, *especially* when they tell true things — lest, by fellowship with demons, they ensnare the deceived soul by a kind of pact of association.

Thirdly, the prognostications of the astromancers are very often fulfilled even without any consideration of the stars, from the mere foresight of moral prudence — to which it belongs not only to recall the past and behold the present, but also to look ahead to the future and to foresee, long beforehand, what is to come. For there are certain men so prudent, both by nature and by practice, that from men's temperaments, inclinations, virtues, and vices — and from their friendships and enmities, means, affairs, pursuits, and opportunities — they foreknow much that will befall them,

(right column:)

and utter it with such constancy of assertion that they are rarely deceived. Thus Hannibal, a most prudent general — having perceived the rashness and inexperience of Terentius Varro, the Roman consul — predicted with great confidence victory for the Africans and disaster for the Romans; the prediction being confirmed a little later by the outcome of the battle, most disastrous for the Romans fighting at Trasimene. And — that I may not fetch examples from abroad — so, in recent years, when our Sienese republic was ablaze with implacable civil discord, seditions, and internecine wars, there were not lacking very many excellent citizens who, destitute of all knowledge of the stars, foretold the present calamity of the ruined republic and city: and that not from astrological outcomes, but from the judgment of civil prudence, whose most certain canon is this — **THAT THE DISCORDS OF SEDITIOUS CITIZENS PORTEND INEVITABLE RUIN TO STATES.** By this reasoning, then, it comes about that sometimes the planetary [astrologers], knowledgeable of political affairs, foretell many most true things even *against* the astrological canons — for example, that a prince raging tyrannically against his citizens will be slain by his own [people]; that a man living by continual theft and robbery will perish by the hanging of the gallows; that a despiser of religion and mocker of the saints will be burned in the flames — because, from a prudence confirmed by very many experiences, they know that such crimes prepare such penalties for those [who commit them].

The fourth and last cause, for which divinations of this kind hit their foreseen marks, is the **folly of those consulting** — or [their] foolish credulity, by which the inquirers easily believe from their consultants those things which they themselves either most eagerly pursue or flee. For that credulity is wont to inject into the credulous minds of the consulters either the hope of happiness promised by the diviner, or the fear of calamity announced by him. And these two affections frequently bring it about that human affairs attain their foretold ends. For just as hope and confidence boldly undertake difficult tasks and complete them successfully and splendidly, so dread and fear begin things timidly and carry through what is begun basely and unsuccessfully. And hence it sometimes happens that some greedy or ambitious inquirer — believing and hoping that he will easily attain the riches or honors promised by the astromancer — applies a mind steeled with great confidence, and all his powers and pursuits, to attaining that man's promises. And since it does sometimes happen that what is sought with unremitting labor and utmost diligence is found, it follows too that occasionally the pursuers of riches and honors attain (God permitting) those resources and dignities which the astrologer had foretold them — by a response indeed fortuitous, and produced by no art of the consultant, but so received by the consulter and stored up in his mind as if it were an oracle of most certain authority and undoubted trustworthiness. We have an example of this in the Roman armies: among whom, as Livy writes, when the auguries and auspices — secretly inspected by their keepers — threatened an unlucky and mournful expedition, the augurs, lest they should dismay the soldier setting out to war with a deadly announcement, turning [it] into the con-

[catchword "con-" → "contrary…" continues on p. 435 (PDF 440).]

(printed p. 435 [PDF p. 440], recto — end of Ann. X, on Matthew 2 (physical vs. fictitious astrology; Aquinas). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation X:)

…[turning it] into the contrary interpretation of the auspices, they lied that all things — favorable and triumphal — were shown by the gods. By which lie the soldiers, usefully deceived, fought with such alacrity and courage of spirit that they routed those very enemies to whom the Roman auguries were [in fact] promising victory against the Romans themselves. On the contrary, when an eclipse of the Moon fell on the night on which the fleet of the Athenians was attempting flight from the harbor of Syracuse, its commander Nicias — ignorant that this happens from the entry of the lunar globe into the earth's shadow — suspected that by that failure of light was signified the shipwreck of the fleet and the drowning of the soldiers, should he sail from there that night. Fallen, therefore, from this false suspicion into a vain trepidation, when he had abstained from the intended voyage (in which there was most certain safety), a little later he fell into the enemy's power. From these causes, then, it comes about that not a few things are foretold by the judiciary [astrologers] which we often see fulfilled — without any marking of the stars — either by chance, or by pact, or by prudence, or by folly.

But as to what he says — that I, against the principles of St. Thomas (by which I am bound by my scholastic profession), disapprove astrological prognostics — I answer that there are two kinds of divinatory astrology, the **physical** and the **fictitious**, which are distinguished from one another by a threefold difference: namely, by *observation*, by *application*, and by *foreknowledge*.

First, by observation: because physical divination observes only the physical influences and impressions of the stars, which subsist not by mere imaginative contrivance but truly, in reality, among the works of nature, and are demonstrated by both sense and physical reason — such as the light and motions of the wandering stars, and especially of the solar star, from whose approach and recession to us the generations and corruptions of things proceed. On the contrary, fictitious divination, neglecting the physical influences, observes certain imaginary and made-up outflowings of the constellations — that is, certain sidereal "breathings" which neither exist anywhere, nor can be detected by any demonstration or certain experiment, but are introduced solely by the vanity of the astromancers and received by the credulity of foolish men. Of these are those peculiar, occult properties which of old the inventors of this madness — out of the dullness of their brains, and as it seemed [good] to each — ascribed to the various stars: to Venus a breath of lust; to Mars an outflow of anger and fury; to the Moon an influx of madness; to Capricorn a force that makes those born under it kings; to Andromeda unlucky irradiations that bring exiles, captivity, and prisons; to Orion rays that produce a hunter; to Canopus beams that engender fishermen; to the star of Medusa a venomous influence that brings unexpected and sudden destruction — and other things like these, feigned and refeigned out of the fictions of the poets.

Secondly, they differ especially in this: that the physical diviners so apply the actions of the sidereal impressions to bodies that they assert the energy and force of the stars to be impressed first, of themselves, directly, and necessarily upon bodies alone, but upon souls by no means — except accidentally, and quite

(right column:)

indirectly and contingently: that is, insofar as human wills, of their own accord, consent to bodily passions [that have been] stirred by the physical outflow of the stars. As when the traveler's body, drained by the solar rays, drags the mind — neither resisting nor gainsaying — into the vice of tippling and drunkenness. But the fictitious diviners apply the forces of the stars first, of themselves, and necessarily, no less to the soul than to the body; and they drive the whole man at once by these fictitious "breathings," and from their force decree for him journeys, voyages, wars, imprisonments, slaughter, and other such events, which he must suffer even

unwilling and resisting.

Thirdly they differ, because the discipline of physical divination abstains from any certain and determinate prediction of the singular and (especially) contingent events of each individual man, but pronounces about human actions only generally and universally, with no fixed determination of the thing predicted. For example: that when the star of Aries rises, men will be livelier — because then, as the Sun returns to us and brings back the loveliness of spring, all things are made more cheerful; but when the Pleiades rise, men will be sadder — because the Sun, receding from our regions, leaves behind wintry colds, rainy days, and the sad darkness of longer nights. The planetary [astrologers], on the contrary, foretell for each person his particular acts, events, and outcomes — fortunate and unfortunate — with a certain and determinate assertion.

These divinations, then, being thus distinguished, if anyone should ask me what St. Thomas thought of each, in a single word I answer: the **physical** foreknowings are accepted and approved by him, but the **fictitious** (such as that querulous astro-theologian peddles to silly little men) are utterly rejected and refuted in many writings of his theology. Let the prudent reader read the first part of his *Theological Summa*, question 115, article 4; and the *Secunda Secundae*, question 95, article 1; and the opusculum *On the Judgments of the Stars* — and he will find that what I say is true. Thus far on behalf of the opinion of St. Thomas, whose sanctity I adore and whose doctrine I embrace with [my] whole heart.

It remains that, at the end of this Annotation, I answer what that astro-theologian added in the last place — that I too assented to the genethliac tenets when I wrote that certain poets were born under happy stars. I confess, indeed, that this was said and written by me — yet not in the sense in which he trifles, but so that, by the common form of speech, I might designate perfect and accomplished poets. For the common run of men is wont to say that those things are done "by favorable auspices" or "under propitious stars" which are on every side happily accomplished; nor do I think it should be counted a fault in me if what the common people have taken up into everyday speech from the vanity of the astrologers, I have applied to Christian poets — since even the divine Scriptures have transferred to the stars of heaven the names of Orion, Arcturus, the Hyades, and the Pleiades, borrowed from the poetic and astrological fables of the pagans. And let these things, said in answer to the astro-theologian's complaints, be enough.

[signature "Nn 4"; catchword "An-" → Annotation XI, on p. 436 (PDF 441).]

(printed p. 436 [PDF p. 441], verso — Ann. XI–XIII, on Matthew 3 (John's baptism; the dove at Christ's baptism). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column:)

Annotation XI

"John the Baptist came, preaching and saying: Do penance," etc. — Matthew 3[:1–2]

[margin: Whether John's baptism conferred grace.]

John Calvin, in chapter 17 of his *Institutes*, accuses **Chrysostom** — [in] homily 10 on Matthew, explaining these words — because, treating of John's baptism, he affirmed that it did not confer the remission of sins, against the authority of Luke, who writes that John preached a baptism of penance for the remission of sins. But it is truly strange why this rash man does not [likewise] charge with the same crime also Paul the Apostle, and John the Baptist himself, who plainly preached the very same things that Chrysostom taught from their opinion and from the Catholic Church's sanctions. For Paul, when at Ephesus he ordered those to be rebaptized who had received John's baptism, showed that that washing had not brought the grace of the Holy Spirit, but had been preparatory to obtaining the grace to be obtained in the baptism of Christ. And on that account, meeting those who thought John's baptism, once received, sufficed for them, he said: *"In what,*

then, were you baptized?" John baptized the people with a baptism of penance, saying [they should believe] "in him who was to come" — as if he had said: John's baptism was nothing but a certain preparation, leading the penitent to the baptism of Christ; and therefore you must be baptized again in the name of Christ. And the Baptist himself, recognizing this, cried out: *"I indeed baptize in water unto penance; but he who is to come after me is mightier than I: he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire"* — that is, I baptize not with a life-giving spirit that affords health and remission of sins, but in water; namely, that by this symbol of washing I may admonish you that, having taken the road of penance, you may hasten to the baptism of Christ, who — cleansing you by the water of his grace and purifying you by the fire of his Spirit — will carry you up to eternal happiness. Therefore, just as it is impious to think that Paul and John disagree with Luke's judgment, so it is of the utmost impudence to affirm that Chrysostom opposes the same Evangelist — [Chrysostom] who, in that very passage which Calvin condemns, showing in what sense Luke declared that John preached a baptism of penance for the remission of sins, says that this is to be understood not of a present remission of crimes granted in John's baptism, but of a future forgiveness of offenses to be obtained in the baptism of Christ. By which words Chrysostom plainly showed that neither does Luke disagree with Paul and John, nor does he himself (as Calvin wickedly lies) contend with Luke, but thinks and teaches things consonant with both.

Annotation XII

"I indeed baptize you in water, but he shall baptize you in the Spirit." — Matthew 3[:11]

[margin: Whether the Holy Spirit is conferred in baptism.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 3 — enumerating four kinds of baptism (that is, of the Word, of Water, of the Spirit, and of Temptation [trial/martyrdom]) — asserts that in the baptism of water

(right column:)

past sins are washed away and remitted to the penitent, but that their soul is neither sanctified nor receives the Holy Spirit. His words run thus: "The baptism of water avails, because it does wash away the sins which have already gone forth into act — and this, if [the man] has repented; but it does not sanctify the soul, nor does it forestall the concupiscences of the heart or evil thoughts, nor repel them, nor even restrain the carnal concupiscences. Whoever, then, has not been so baptized as [that one should reckon] him to receive the Holy Spirit, is indeed baptized in body, and his sins are pardoned, but in soul he is [still] a catechumen. For thus it is written: *'Because whoever has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his'* — on account of which his flesh will afterward sprout worse sins for him, since he has not in himself the Holy Spirit to preserve him, but the house of his body is empty. Therefore that [unclean] spirit, finding the house empty and swept clean of the doctrines of faith (as if with brooms), enters and dwells there sevenfold." This [is from] the fourth homily; concerning which the fifth homily too, not far from its beginning, makes mention.

Annotation XIII

"He saw the Holy Spirit descending like a dove." — Matthew 3[:16]

[margin: Whether the dove sitting upon Christ was a real animal.]

Chrysostom, homily 12 on Matthew — refuting the Arians, who twist this passage toward an inequality of the Son and the Holy Spirit — seems to assert that the dove in which the Holy Spirit was seen did not have the nature of a dove, but only its figure and appearance, in these words: "I hear some saying: As great as is the difference between a man and a dove, so great is the distance between Christ and the Holy Spirit — because the one was seen in our very nature, the other in the appearance of a dove. What, then, can be answered to such things? — except that the Son of God assumed the nature of man, but the Holy Spirit did not assume the nature of a dove. Therefore the Evangelist said 'like a dove' — not in the nature, but in the

appearance, of a dove; for then only was he seen in this figure." Agreeing with him, **Ambrose**, in the first book *On the Sacraments*, chapter five, says: "*And behold,* [it was] as a dove [that] the Holy Spirit — not a dove — descended, but as if a dove. Remember what I have said: Christ took on flesh, not as [apparent] flesh, but the reality of that flesh; but the Holy Spirit descended from heaven not in the reality of a dove, but in the appearance of a dove." With both agrees **Procopius of Gaza**, in his commentaries on Genesis, chapter 18, saying: "God, in the Old Testament, was beheld in a bodily form; yet that body did not have the property of a mortal body, for it consisted of neither flesh nor blood. In the same way the Holy Spirit came into our sight in the appearance of a dove; yet it was not a dove, because it did not have the property which a dove has." The same thing **Thomas Cajetan** held, in his explanation of this chapter. But against this opinion **Augustine** protests, in the book *On the Christian Combat*, chapter 22, writing thus: "Nor do we say this in such a way as to say that the Lord Jesus Christ alone had a true body, but that the Holy Spirit

[catchword "sanctum" → "the Holy Spirit [appeared falsely]…" continues on p. 437 (PDF 442).]

(printed p. 437 [PDF p. 442], recto — end of Ann. XIII and Ann. XIIII–XVIII, on Matthew 3–5 (censures of the Opus imperfectum*; rebaptism; whether Christ begged). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation XIII:)

…[Augustine: nor that] the Holy Spirit appeared deceptively to the eyes of men; rather, we believe that both those bodies [Christ's flesh and the dove] were real. Almost all the scholastic theologians follow Augustine's opinion — especially St. Thomas, in the third volume of the *Theological Summa*, question 39, article 7.

Annotation XIIII

"I saw the Spirit of God, like a dove." — Matthew 3[:16]

What Thomas Cajetan wrote on this passage, see at the preceding Annotation.

Annotation XV

"He saw the Holy Spirit, like a dove." — Matthew 3[:16]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum* must be read cautiously — homily 4, near the end — where in the Arian manner he hands down that the three divine persons are altogether unequal among themselves, in these words: "In what mystery Christ was born, in this mystery he also received the Holy Spirit. For, the Son of God receiving baptism and the Spirit descending, the one [the Father] stood in human form, the [third] was descending in the appearance of a dove; while [the Father], neither standing in human form nor descending in the appearance of a dove, was heard only in a voice coming down from above." — But this is the confession of foolish heretics. The more prudent heretics do not say that the three are one God, but that the three have the same substance — which Macedonius confesses rather than the *homoousion* [consubstantial]. "Let us see, then, to whom [the Spirit] is equal. [The Father] did not say 'This is our beloved Son,' lest, like God [the Father], the Holy Spirit too should seem to have been the Father of Christ. For if they are equal in all things — just as [the Father] is honored with fatherhood, so too the Holy Spirit [would be]. But if God is Father because he has a Son, while the Holy Spirit is not Father because he has no Son — is he equal in all things? Nor was it said 'These are our beloved Sons,' lest the Holy Spirit, together with Christ, be thought a son. For if he is equal to Christ in all things, he too is a son, just as Christ. But if not a son, as Christ [is], but a faithful minister of Christ — is he not [then] unequal to Christ?"

Annotation XVI

"Jesus was led into the desert by the Spirit," etc. — Matthew 4[:1]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, at the beginning of homily 5, writes that Jesus was led into the desert by the Holy Spirit — not as a lesser by the command of a greater, but as a greater by the exhortation of a lesser. Which is an Arian dogma. In the same place, a little later, he seems to favor the Lutheran heretics, who affirm that original sin does not depart from the baptized except at death. For he says: "What sin is remitted at death, he knows who understands for what sin death was introduced. For if a man dies on account of sin, doubtless that on account of which he dies is [only then] loosed."

(right column:)

Annotation XVII

"And then Jesus began to preach." — Matthew 4[:17]

[margin: Whether those baptized by heretics are to be rebaptized.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, in homily 6, not far from the end, judges that those who have been baptized by heretics, or by [persons] not baptized, have not obtained the sacrament of baptism, and therefore need a second baptism. He writes thus: "*From then* Jesus began to preach — from when [after] he had been baptized in water by John, but in Spirit by the Father, so that of himself he might be able to baptize others (I speak according to [his] humanity): because had he not been baptized, he could not baptize others. For how shall a naked man clothe a naked man, or how shall a beggar make another rich? So too, he who is not baptized — how can he give baptism to another? According to this we say also of heretics: where faith is, there is the Church; where the Church, there a priest; where a priest, there baptism; where baptism, there a Christian. But where faith is not, there neither is the Church; where the Church is not, [there is] no priest; where a priest is not, [there is] no baptism; where baptism is not, [there is] no Christian. Why then does he rebuke, as [needing] a second baptism, one who does not understand what the first is?" — Thus far I have recounted the author's words: which indeed we can piously interpret, saying that they hold [only] when the Catholic form of baptizing is not preserved. For the 47th canon of the Apostles decreed that such persons were to be rebaptized; and the 19th canon of the Nicene Synod decrees the same concerning those baptized by the Paulianists. For these — stemming from Paul of Samosata — undermined the divinity of Christ; which impiety Arius, and especially Aetius, afterward spread more widely — [Aetius] who, as Epiphanius reports, baptized under this form of words: "In the name of the uncreated God, and in the name of the created Son, and in the name of the sanctifying Spirit — [the Spirit] created by the created Son." Since, then, by these words the whole faith was overturned, it was necessary that those so baptized be baptized again, as [being] not baptized.

Annotation XVIII

"Blessed are the poor in spirit." — Matthew 5[:3]

[margin: Whether Christ and the apostles begged (were mendicants).] [margin: John 4; John 13.]

Thomas, Cardinal Cajetan, while explaining these things in his commentaries, proposed a question in these words: "Why does JESUS call the 'poor in spirit' blessed, when he himself — the exemplar of all perfection — was not a beggar according to the truth of the matter, but rather [one] giving alms to beggars, as is clear from John 13, when it was supposed that Jesus had ordered Judas (who held the purse) to give something to one in need? For from this it is clearly established that he did not number himself and his own among beggars. And the same is plain when the disciples went into the city, not to beg but to buy food; and in several other Gospel passages the same is found." — I answer that Jesus was not a beggar, because he is

nowhere read to have asked [anything] except from the Samaritan woman a drink of water — which is agreed not to be, properly, [an act] of beggars, since it can befall anyone of higher station. (Although elsewhere, following others, we may have written otherwise.) But he was, in a moderate

[catchword "medio-" → "moderate [poverty]…" continues on p. 438 (PDF 443).]

(printed p. 438 [PDF p. 443], verso — end of Ann. XVIII and Ann. XIX–XXI, on Matthew 5 (the mendicant orders; free will; peacemakers). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XVIII:)

…a moderate [poverty] of beggars — because he had nothing at all of his own, except clothes, from the time he began to preach. But he lived not on begged things, but on things offered by devout persons — according to that [passage] of John 13: "Judas held the purse, and carried the things that were given." And Luke 8 clearly says that women ministered to Christ, as he went about preaching, out of their own means. Thus far Cajetan.

Whom Ambrose [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa, attacked in the second book of [his] *Annotations*, in a sharp and lengthy digression — maintaining that these things do the greatest injury to the mendicant orders, and are diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the saints and to the ecclesiastical decrees. And he shows, from several testimonies of divine Scripture and opinions of the fathers, that the Apostles were truly beggars, and that Christ — of whom it is said in the Psalm, *"But I am a beggar"* [Ps. 39/40:18] — lowered himself of his own accord to the state of mendicancy for two reasons: first, that he might make abundant satisfaction for our pride and wantonness. For we arrogantly seized food not our own, but forbidden (which we do continually); but he, [asking for] what was his own, humbly and lowlily, as if it were another's, asks [for it] as a favor. Then, that he might give us an example of humility and subdue our pride, he begged the place where he might celebrate the Passover with the disciples; he begged the ass on which he rode into the holy city; he begged lodging from Zacchaeus, and likewise food from the women who are read to have ministered to him out of their means.

But to the things which Cajetan brought forward to confirm his opinion, he [Catharinus] responds thus: **First**, Cajetan argues: "The disciples went into the city to buy food; therefore they were not begging." Good God, what is this worth? — as if we, who continually beg, do not also buy food with what we have begged! **Secondly** he argues: "Judas carried the purse and received from devout persons what was given there; therefore the disciples were not begging." Who would not marvel at the argument? — whence one ought rather to have concluded, "Therefore they *were* begging." For so do we too beg, sending one of our number with a purse, that he may thus ask, and receive, and bring back what is given there. **Thirdly** he argues that Christ gave to the needy. But this the state of mendicancy required — that what was left over be given out to the poor; for so did the blessed men Dominic and Francis, and so they commanded it to be done. **Fourthly**, what he adds about the women who ministered to him is rightly turned back against himself — even on his own authority, since [Cajetan], thinking more correctly elsewhere, said that Christ, inasmuch as [he was] a beggar, had brought them in for this [purpose]. Finally, Ambrose infers that this opinion of Cajetan was of old condemned by the Church in [the person of] William of Saint-Amour, who first — out of hatred of the mendicant friars — taught that neither Christ nor the apostles ever begged, and that those who beg by choice are unworthy of the fellowship of Christians.

Annotation XIX

"Blessed are they that mourn," etc. — Matthew 5[:5]

(right column:)

[margin: Whether the wicked sin under the devil's compulsion.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 9, explaining this [verse], seems to hint that there are some who sin under the devil's forcing and compelling — which certainly overturns the liberty of the human will. For thus we read in him: "The saints, so long as they are in the world — not knowing the providence of God nor fully understanding [it], who fall under the devil's compulsion, and who do not love evils out of an evil purpose — all, [as] sinners, mourn, thinking that all are circumvented and compelled by the devil." I judge that he used the words "forcing" and "compelling" hyperbolically — not to [assert] a liberty of the will already destroyed (which elsewhere he even exalts more than is fair), but to express the vehement temptation of the devil, which can scarcely, and only with difficulty, be resisted.

Annotation XX

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God." — Matthew 5[:9]

[margin: Whether man can attain to an impeccable perfection.]

Augustine, in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 9, so expounded this passage that he afterward retracted it, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 19, in these words: "In the first volume, on account of that which is written, *'Blessed are the peacemakers,'* etc., I said: Wisdom befits the peacemakers, in whom all things are now set in order, and no motion is in rebellion against reason, but all things obey the man's spirit, since he himself obeys God. This rightly raises the question of how I could have said [it]; for it cannot befall anyone in this life that the law [of the members], warring against the law of the mind, should be wholly absent from the members — since, even if the man's spirit should so resist it that it slipped into no consent, it would nonetheless not fail to war [against him]. Therefore, this that was said — that there is no motion rebellious against reason — can rightly be taken now of the peaceable [nations], [as a thing reached] by taming the concupiscences of the flesh, so that one may at length come to that fullest peace. And so, whereas in another place, repeating the same evangelical saying, when I had said *'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God,'* I added, saying, *'And these things indeed can be fulfilled in this life, as we believe them to have been fulfilled in the Apostles'* — this is to be understood thus: not that we should think that in the Apostles, living here, no motion of the flesh warred against the spirit, but that these things can be fulfilled here [only] to the extent that we believe them to have been fulfilled in the Apostles — that is, by that measure of human perfection, as great as perfection can be in this life. For it was not said, 'These things *can be* fulfilled in this life,' for we believe them to have *been* fulfilled in the Apostles; but it was said thus, 'as we believe them to have been fulfilled in the Apostles,' so that they may be fulfilled just as they were fulfilled in them — that is, by a certain perfection of which this life is capable — not [in the way] that those things are to be fulfilled which we hope for in fullest peace, when it shall be said, *'O death, where is thy strife?'*"

Annotation XXI

"Whoever shall say, 'Thou fool,' shall be liable to the fire of Gehenna." — Matthew 5[:22]

[margin: On the Eucharist.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 11, seems to allude to the heresy of those who deny the true [body] of Chri-

[catchword "Chri-" → "…of Christ" continues on p. 439 (PDF 444).]

(printed p. 439 [PDF p. 444], recto — end of Ann. XXI and Ann. XXII–XXV, on Matthew 5 (real presence; remarriage; divorce; oaths). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XXI:)

…[those who deny the true body] of Christ to be in the sacrament of the altar — when he says: "To transfer sanctified vessels to private uses is a sin and a danger, as Belshazzar teaches us, who, drinking from the consecrated cups, was cast down from his kingdom and from his life. If, then, to transfer to private uses these sanctified vessels — in which is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of Christ's body is contained — is so dangerous, how much more [to profane] the vessels of our body, which God prepared for himself as a dwelling." Nor does he diverge from this opinion when, in homily 17, not long before the end, he calls the Eucharist "blessed bread"; and in homily 19, almost at the beginning, calls [it] "the sacrifice of bread and wine."

Annotation XXII

"Whoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce." — Matthew 5[:31]

[margin: On the degrees of consanguinity.]

Augustine corrected the exposition he had brought to this passage in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 25, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 19, thus: "Likewise, what I said — 'This is to be understood both of father and mother and of the other bonds of blood, that in them we should hate that which the human race has drawn by lot in being born and dying' — sounds as if these necessities would not exist if, no sin of human nature preceding, no one died: which sense I have already above disapproved. For there would assuredly be thoughts and kinships, even if — no original sin existing — the human race grew and multiplied without death. And therefore the question is otherwise to be resolved — why the Lord commanded that enemies be loved, while elsewhere he commands that even parents and children be held in hatred — not as it is [here] resolved, but as we have often resolved it afterward: that is, that we should love enemies [so as] to win them for the kingdom of God, and hate [them] in [our] kinsfolk if they hinder [us] from the kingdom of God."

Annotation XXIII

"Whoever puts away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, and marries another, commits adultery." — Matthew 5[:32]

[margin: Whether adultery dissolves the sacrament of matrimony.]

Hilary, in canon 4 on Matthew, elucidating these things, is believed to be of the opinion of those who teach that it is lawful to cast off a wife guilty of adultery and to marry another. Read below, Annotation 81. — **Chrysostom** is thought to hand down the same as Hilary, in homily 17 on the fifth chapter of Matthew. See below, in the same place. — **Theophylact**, in his commentary on the fifth chapter of Matthew, seems to write the very same. See below, in the same place. — **Euthymius**, in his commentary on the same passage, presents the same. See below, in the same place. — **Chromatius**, in his commentary on the fifth chapter of Matthew, [says] the same. Wherefore see below, in the same [place].

Annotation XXIIII

"Everyone who puts away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, makes her commit adultery." — Matthew 5[:32]

[margin: On divorce.]

Augustine, in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 26, inquiring how far in this passage

(right column:)

"fornication" is to be understood, seems to be of this opinion: that he thinks it lawful for a divorce to be made on account of any sin whatever, whether of the husband or of the wife. For he writes thus: "From which it is understood that, on account of unlawful concupiscences — not only those committed in debaucheries with other men or women, but absolutely any whatever, which make the soul (misusing the body) stray from the law of God, and which perniciously and basely corrupt [it] — both a man may without crime dismiss his wife, and a wife her husband. Because the Lord makes the cause 'fornication,' which fornication (as was mentioned above) we are compelled to understand generally and universally — that is, that [fornication] of which it is said, *'Thou hast destroyed all who fornicate away from thee'* [Ps. 72(73):27]." These words Augustine, in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 19, approves — referring the reader to what he wrote later on this question, especially in the two books *On Adulterous Marriages*, in which he determines that divorce is not lawful except on account of the carnal fornication which is [committed] in debaucheries.

Likewise, in the same book and place, he affirms that a divorce from the [marriage-]bed on account of carnal debaucheries is *permitted*, [but] not *commanded*. Which statement he condemns, in the same book and chapter of the *Retractations*, as contrary to the opinion of Solomon, who says, "He who keeps an adulteress is foolish and impious." See below, Annotation 81.

Annotation XXV

"But I say to you, not to swear at all." — Matthew 5[:34]

[margin: Whether an oath is a sin.] [margin: Gen. 42.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 12, interpreting this precept, teaches three things at variance with the common consensus of the theologians: first, that to swear rightly *by God* is a sin; second, that to swear rightly *by creatures* is a sin; third, that to swear rightly by creatures is a *more* execrable sin than to swear rightly by God. And he comprises these in these words: "Behold the fourth commandment, which the covetous think the least [important] — who do not think that to swear rightly is a sin, without which the mandate of the law cannot stand," etc. And after he had discoursed much about the sin of oath-taking, he finally concluded: "These things are said of those who swear by God; but of those who swear by the elements, the iniquity is more execrable. For God created heaven and earth and the rest for his own service, not for men to swear by," etc. — As for how the first and second of these propositions can be expounded, see the following Annotation. But the third proposition is to be understood of those who swear by creatures for this reason: because they believe them either to be gods, or that some [portion] of divinity is in them. For these sin most gravely, because they show to creatures the worship of *latria*, which befits God alone. But those who swear by creatures — not because they believe them gods, but because they see the divine truth shining forth in them — swear rightly, after the example of Joseph, who swore "by the safety [life] of Pharaoh": venerating in Pharaoh (as Augustine says) nothing other than God, from whom Pharaoh's power was.

Hilary, in canon 4 on Matthew, seems to forbid to Christians every oath whatsoever. See the following Annotation.

[catchword "Hil-" → "Hilary…" continues on p. 440 (PDF 445).]

(printed p. 440 [PDF p. 445], verso — Ann. XXVI, on Matthew 5:34 (Chrysostom's rigorism on oaths). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing the catena from Annotation XXV:)

Jerome, in [his] commentary, has the same. See the following Annotation. — **Chromatius**, in [his] commentary, the same. Read the following Annotation. — **Theophylact**, in [his] commentary, the same.

Consult the following Annotation. — **Euthymius**, in [his] commentary, the same. Read the following Annotation.

Annotation XXVI

"But I say to you, swear not at all." — Matthew 5[:34]

[margin: Whether every oath, even in a true and just cause, is a sin.] [margin: Gen. 22; Jer. 4.]

Chrysostom seems to hold — not only in the present passage, but in almost innumerable other places — that an oath is a most evil thing, and so forbidden to Christians that it is nowhere lawful for them to swear, not even in a just cause. He plainly pronounces this opinion, homily 15 on Genesis, in these words: "Let a Christian flee oaths in every way, hearing the sentence of Christ which says, 'It was said to the ancients, Thou shalt not forswear thyself; but I say to you, there is to be no swearing at all.' Let no one, therefore, say, 'I swear in a just cause'; for neither in a just matter nor in an unjust one is it lawful to swear." And in homily 9 on the Acts of the Apostles, he decrees that those are impious and deserve to be barred from the Church, who in forensic actions, contracts, and sureties either swear or exact an oath from others. Again, assigning the causes for which it is not lawful to swear, he reckons among others this — that an oath is an utterly diabolical crime. For thus he speaks, in the homily on the fifth Psalm: "To swear is from the devil, since Christ says, 'For whatever is more than these is from evil.'" And in homily 19 to the people of Antioch: "You have heard the wisdom of Christ, saying that not only to forswear, but even to swear in any way whatsoever, is diabolical and wholly the contrivance of the evil one." And in the first book *Against the Detractors of the Monastic Life*: "If to swear is found to be diabolical, with what punishment must those be smitten who forswear?" And in the first book *On Compunction of Heart*: "If truly to swear is a crime and a transgression of the commandment, where shall we place perjury?" Nor content with these [alone], Chrysostom also refutes the reasons of the theologians that cry out against his opinion.

Of which the first is: that if an oath were of itself evil, God — who cannot do evil — would not have sworn, saying to Abraham, "By my very self have I sworn, says the Lord"; and in Psalm 109, "The Lord has sworn, and he will not repent."

The second is: if to swear were a crime, God would not have commanded us, through the prophet Jeremiah, "Swear by the true God."

The third is: that since an oath is most necessary for settling civil and ecclesiastical controversies, it is not to be refused by a good man, but — as often as a just necessity presses — most promptly to be rendered.

Meeting these, Chrysostom responds to the first reasoning that God in no way swears; and that if the divine Scriptures sometimes testify that God has sworn, an oath is ascribed to God not properly and according to the human manner of swearing, but improperly and metaphorically, insofar as the oath

(right column:)

signifies a pledge and a sure promise. For thus he writes, in the homily on the hundred-and-ninth Psalm, expounding that [verse], "The Lord has sworn," etc.: "But when you hear 'oath,' do not think it is [truly] an oath. For just as anger in God is not [passionate] anger, but is the right of punishing and not a perturbation of mind, so also [is] the oath. For God does not swear, but declares what is certainly to be." And in homily 47 on Genesis, and on the eleventh [chapter] of the Epistle to the Hebrews, explaining God's oath to Abraham, he asserts that the words by which God seems to swear are not oaths but promises — which nonetheless God calls "oaths" in the human manner, condescending to human infirmity; and that he may adapt himself to it, he regards not his own dignity, but — to persuade men — taking up words unworthy of himself, he calls his pledges "oaths" after the manner of men, who, when they wish things to be believed without any doubt, promise that they will do them with an oath added.

Next, he satisfies the second argument in homily 17 on Matthew, where, explaining that [saying], "Let your speech be Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatever is beyond these is from evil," he questions himself thus: "If an oath is from evil, how then was it commanded in the Law?" And a little later he answers: "An oath, in the Old Law, was not commanded, but only permitted — just as also divorce [was permitted] — on account of the infirmity of those who received the Law, lest they should either worship idols or swear by idols. Wherefore, just as divorce, once conceded, is now judged adultery, so an oath, once permitted in the Law, is now — in the evangelical law, after such great arguments of virtue — believed to be from evil, and doubtless has very much of evil in itself."

Finally, rejecting the third reason too, in homily 8 to the people of Antioch: "What then," he says, "if a necessity of swearing be present? I answer: Where there is transgression, there is no [true] necessity; for it is possible not to swear at all." And in homily 17 on Matthew, repeating the same: "What then," he says, "if someone exacts an oath, and imposes the necessity of swearing? I answer: Let the fear of God be more forcible to you than any necessity; for if you are always willing to bring forward occasions of this kind, you will keep nothing of what is commanded." Thus far Chrysostom. It remains that — to avoid a superfluous repetition of this argument — I set down here the opinions of the fathers who are thought to agree with Chrysostom, with their "antidotes" added, so that they may be read without any offense.

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew: "It behooves not that a man who wishes to live according to the Gospel should put another under oath. For similar is that which the Lord himself says in the Gospel, 'But I say, swear not at all' — [and therefore] adjure not at all. For if to swear is not lawful, as regards Christ's evangelical commandment, it is true [also] that neither is it lawful to adjure another."

Athanasius, in the sermon *On the Passion and Cross of the Lord*: "If, therefore, there is faith and truth in the one who has sworn — what use is an oath? But if there is no faith in him — why do we take on so much impiety as, for the sake of poor mortal men, to invoke as witness God, who is above men? What, then, is to be done?"

[catchword "dum?" → "…to be done?" continues on p. 441 (PDF 446).]

(printed p. 441 [PDF p. 446], recto — Ann. XXVI cont., on Matthew 5:34 (a father-catena on the lawfulness of oaths). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XXVI:)

[margin: Gen. 22; Ps. 109.]

…[what is to be done? — nothing more] than that our "yes" be "yes," and our "no," "no"; and, in sum, that we not lie. For thus we shall be seen to imitate God. — But perhaps someone might object thus: "If an oath is forbidden to men, and by not swearing one imitates God, how is it that God himself is reported in the sacred Scriptures to swear? For he even swore to Abraham himself; and in the Psalms it is written, 'The Lord has sworn, and he will not repent.' For these things seem either to conflict with the foregoing, or else hereby the faculty of swearing is conceded to men." But this is not so; nor let anyone think it. For God swears by no one, but is said to swear [only] as speaking to men — and this too in the human manner. For as an oath confirms men's speech, so also the things God speaks are, on account of the firmness and immutability of his will, to be reckoned as oaths. Therefore God does not swear after the manner of men; nor ought we, from this, to be led to the making of oaths.

Epiphanius, in the first book of the *Panarion*, disputing against the Ossenes, says thus: "First, then, one ought not to swear — neither by the Lord himself, nor by any other oath. For to swear belongs to that evil one, namely the devil."

Hilary, in canon 4 on Matthew: "The Law had appointed a penalty for perjury, that the sacredness of the oath might restrain the deceit of liars; but faith removes the practice of oaths, establishing the affairs of our life in truth. Therefore, for those living in the simplicity of faith, there is no need of the religion of swearing — with whom what is, always 'is,' and what is not, 'is not'; and by this their action and all their speech is in truth. 'Neither shalt thou swear by heaven,' etc. — He does not merely forbid us to render oaths to God (since all the truth of our word and deed is to be maintained by simplicity); but he condemns the superstition of the old obstinacy. For with these names of the elements the Jews had a [false] religion — to swear by heaven and earth, by Jerusalem, and by their own head — by which, to the reproach of God, they paid to the oath the veneration [due to God]."

Ambrose, in the exposition of Psalm 118, on [the verse] "I have sworn and determined": Therefore the Lord — who came to teach the little ones, to instruct the new, to form the perfect — says in the Gospel, "There is to be no swearing at all," because he was speaking to the weak. And indeed he was speaking not to the Apostles alone, but to the crowds. For he wished you not to swear, lest you forswear. And he added, "Swear not, neither by heaven, nor by earth, nor by Jerusalem, nor by thy head" — namely, by those things which are not subject to thy power. "The Lord has sworn, and will not repent." Let him, then, swear, who cannot repent of his oath. And what did the Lord swear? That "Christ is a priest for ever." Is what the Lord swore uncertain? is it impossible? could it be changeable? Do not, then, usurp the example of an oath, you who have not the power of fulfilling the oath.

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, in the fifth chapter of [his] commentaries on Matthew: "'But I say to you, swear not at all,' etc. — [this comes] through the grace of the evangelical doctrine. The Law, given through Moses, received [its] perfection [from the Gospel]. In the Law it was commanded that one should not forswear; but in the Gospel, that one should not [even] swear. And this same thing the Holy Spirit commanded through Solomon,

(right column:)

foretelling, saying, 'Accustom not [thy mouth] to swearing'; and again, 'As a slave, constantly scourged, is not [freed] from bruising, so everyone who swears will not be purged from sin' — whence it is by no means fitting for us to swear. For what need is there for each of us to swear, since it is not at all lawful for us to lie — [we] whose words, being always so true, ought to be so trustworthy that they be held [as good] as an oath? And therefore the Lord forbids us not only to forswear, but even to swear."

Jerome, in chapter 5 of [his] commentaries on Matthew: "'Swear not at all,' etc. The Jews were permitted to swear by God — not because they did this rightly, but because it was better to render this to God than to demons. But the evangelical truth does not admit an oath, since every faithful speech is [as good] as an oath." And in chapter 4 of [his] commentary on Jeremiah, expounding "Thou shalt swear in truth, says the Lord," etc., he speaks thus: "If the Lord says 'Swear in truth,' how does the Gospel forbid us to swear? I answer: here 'Thou shalt swear' is said for confession, and for the condemnation of the idols by which Israel used to swear." Likewise, in the commentaries on the eighth chapter of Zechariah, he says: "'Love not an oath' — the Lord commanding in the Gospel, 'But I say to you, that you swear not at all.' In the precepts which pertain to [right] living, and are clear, we ought not to seek allegory — lest, as the comic poet [says], 'we seek a knot in a bulrush.'"

The author of the *Opus imperfectum* on Matthew, attributed to Chrysostom: "Hear, O clerics, who hold out the holy gospels to those swearing oaths: how can you be secure from that oath, you who give the occasion of perjury? If to swear rightly were just, you would justly say, 'We gave them the Gospel that they might swear, not forswear.' But now, since you know that even to swear rightly is a sin, how can you be guiltless, you who give the occasion of sinning against God?" These things are said of those who swear by God; but of those who swear by the elements, the iniquity is more execrable.

Theophylact, in the fifth chapter of [his] commentary on Matthew: "To swear," he says, "and to add anything further — even 'yes' or 'no' — is from the devil. But if you should say, 'Then the Law of Moses too will be evil, since it commands swearing' — learn that then it was not evil to swear; but after Christ it is evil, just as also to be circumcised, and, in sum, whatever is Jewish. For **to suck [milk] befits a boy, but a grown man by no means**." *(the verb is "sugere," to suck: an oath is the milk of spiritual infancy — Sixtus quotes and glosses this same line on p. 443 / PDF 448.)*

Oecumenius, in the fifth chapter of [his] commentary on the Epistle of James, on "Above all, my brethren, swear not," etc., speaks thus: "But someone will say, 'If one is compelled to swear, what is to be done?' We say that the fear of God will be stronger than the necessity that brings force to bear. But someone might also doubt: since the old Law reckons him who swears by the name of the Lord worthy of praise, how does grace [the Gospel] forbid doing this? We say that the old Law — drawing the Jews away, lest they swear by idols — commanded them to swear by God; just as it also commanded them to sacrifice to God, drawing them away lest they sacrifice to idols. But when it had sufficiently taught the worship of God, then it also rejected the sacrifices as useless."

Euthymius, in the fifth chapter of [his] commentary on Mat-

[signature "Oo"; catchword "thaeum" → "…Matthew" continues on p. 442 (PDF 447).]

(printed p. 442 [PDF p. 447], verso — end of Ann. XXVI, on Matthew 5:34 (Sixtus's resolution on oaths, vs. the Anabaptists). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XXVI, Euthymius:)

…[on Mat]thew: "If an oath is from the devil, how did the old Law permit it? Because the sacrifices too were from evil, and by [means of] the deception of idols — yet the Law permitted these on account of the infirmity of the Hebrews. For since they were gluttons and gormandizers, they loved the meats offered to idols; and thus, being unbelievers, they also loved swearing. But that they might neither sacrifice to idols nor swear by idols, the Law indeed permitted [them] to sacrifice and to swear [by God], and whatever else is similar — but transferred all things to God. And it was to come to pass that, in the course of time, it should cut away even these things by a loftier legislation. And to suckle [with milk] is useful for infants, but for grown men quite unfitting; and therefore we concede this to [people] living in the manner of infants. What, then, is to be done, if someone demands an oath — nay, compels [one] to swear? Let the fear of God be more forcible to you than this necessity; and choose to suffer all things, rather than transgress the precept."

These and such-like authorities of the saints have been used by the heretics who have forbidden to Christians every kind of oath whatsoever — such as the Waldenses, the Albanenses, the Wycliffites, the Pseudo-apostles, and recently the Lutherans and Anabaptists. Against whose wicked dogma all the schools of theologians and the sanctions of the pontiffs cry out, establishing that an oath is a thing venerable, sacrosanct, and excellent — both from its origin and from its end [purpose]. *[margin: Aquinas, Summa II-II q. 89.]* From its origin, indeed, because an oath has its rise from the reverence which we show to God — showing what estimation we have of him: namely, that he knows those things about which there is controversy among us, and that he is truthful and cannot lie; and on that account, when swearing, we invoke God as witness of what we say. Wherefore an oath is rightly placed among the first parts of that supreme worship which by the Greek word is called *latría* — God saying, in the fifth book of the Law, "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him alone shalt thou serve; and by his name shalt thou swear." *[margin: Deut. 6.]* And from its end, they say an oath is excellent, because it is necessary for verifying men's actions and for ending inextricable controversies which cannot be resolved by human judgment. Whence, when in the fourth [session of the] Ecumenical Synod of Ephesus the fathers had decreed that Nestorius should sing the palinode of his heresy, and did not sufficiently trust his words, they exacted from him an oath in these words: "It is fitting also that

you confess by oath that you anathematize your polluted and profane dogmas, and that you hold and teach what we believe and hold." And in the same synod, a certain Victor, a friend of Cyril — falsely accused — could not be cleared until, with hands lifted up to heaven, he had sworn himself innocent by holy baptism and the venerable mysteries of Christ. And in the Council of Constance, after — among the other heresies of Wycliffe — the article which abolishes all oaths had been condemned, it was decreed by the fathers that, for the confirmation of the treaty which the kings of the Romans [the Empire] and of Aragon had entered upon for the overthrow of the schism, an oath should be demanded from all then present in the council — which was there and then fulfilled, all swearing.

But as far as pertains to the aforesaid opinions [of the fathers], if with a fair mind we weigh the intent and scope

(right column:)

of the authors who put them forth, we shall recognize that they did not wish to take away from Christians the duty of swearing, but wished chiefly to forbid three things concerning the rite of the oath.

First, that no one should in any way swear blasphemously and impiously *by creatures* — as if reckoning that something of divinity lies hidden in them, and paying to them the worship owed to the Creator — but [that one should swear] only by the Creator. Because Christ especially forbade this when he said, "Swear not at all, neither by heaven, nor by earth," etc. In which sense, indeed, Epiphanius and Jerome are to be interpreted; for both testify that Christ, by these words, wished to remove the depraved custom of swearing by the elements.

Second, that no one should swear by God *easily* and *without necessity* — lest from facility they descend to habit, and from habit to contempt of the oath and the practice of perjury. For, looking to this, Christ said, "Let your speech be Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatever is beyond these is from evil" — that is, either from the evil habit of him who, even unasked and without any necessity, swears by God; or from the evil of him to whom [the oath] is sworn, who is unwilling to trust another's words without an oath. To this end especially are to be referred the things which Chrysostom brought forth against oaths, by an excess of speech and out of the ardor of rebuke, desiring to root out utterly the inveterate license of the Greeks — who (as he himself complains in various homilies), in workshops, at crossroads, and in the marketplace, for ten obols, for a pair of shoes, and for any most trivial things whatever, were not afraid to exact and render untimely oaths. That Athanasius, Chromatius, and Oecumenius also had this in view, the words plainly show which they add a little after the quoted opinions, condemning those who incessantly, and without any discernment, run of their own accord to oaths. But Athanasius is so far from a prohibition of a *just* oath that he himself, in the apology to the Emperor Constantius, offers an oath from the divine oracles, and exacts [one], in these words: "To your Piety, with a great and clear voice and with hand outstretched — as I learned from the Apostle — I call God to witness upon my own soul, and (as is written in the books of Kings) I take an oath: let the Lord be witness, and his Christ [be] witness, that I never made mention of you for evil before your brother Constans Augustus, nor stirred him up against you." And a little below: "I could wish that this man, whoever he is, were present here, that — an oath being tendered — I might question him about these things under attestation of the truth. For the things we wish to be said and heard as if in God's presence, we Christian men are wont to express under this formula of an oath."

Third, those most weighty men wished to warn that no one of those who profess the highest state of Christian perfection should — for any cause, even a just one — swear by God in controversies arising among the perfect themselves; because Christ, among the counsels of surpassing perfection, gave this counsel too: that the perfect, in their own causes and when dealing among the perfect, should abstain altogether from every oath. Which was also observed of old by the Essenes, [who]

[catchword "per-" → continues on p. 443 (PDF 448).]

(printed p. 443 [PDF p. 448], recto — end of Ann. XXVI and Ann. XXVII–XXX, on Matthew 5–6 (non-resistance; sin unto death; public prayer). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation XXVI:)

…[the Essenes, who] profess the most perfect life among the Hebrews. For these (as Josephus and Philo write) shunned an oath as [they would] perjury, reckoning that among perfect men oaths are neither to be exacted nor rendered — both because it ought [to hold] that whatever is declared by perfect men has the force of an oath; and because he would seem convicted of lying who would not be believed without God as witness. Therefore it is agreed that Hilary, Ambrose, Theophylact, and especially Euthymius spoke according to this sense — when [Euthymius] says, "To suckle is useful for infants, but unfitting for grown men; therefore we concede this (namely, the oath) to those living in the manner of infants." From whom Theophylact does not much differ, saying: "**To suck** befits a boy, but grown men by no means" — hinting by this metaphor that an oath befits beginners and the still-imperfect, but the perfect by no means. *(This is the line printed a touch ambiguously on p. 441/PDF 446 — the verb is "sugere," to suck.)*

Annotation XXVII

"But I say to you, resist not evil." — Matthew 5[:39]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to seek redress for an injury in court.]

Chrysostom, homily 18, expounding this sentence, says: "What then — ought we not to resist evil? We ought indeed, but not in that manner in which the Law commanded, but in that which he [Christ] enjoined: namely, that we offer ourselves to the suffering of injuries. For fire is not ever [quenched] by fire, but fire is quenched by water," etc. This passage Bodius, in [his] *Collectanea*, reckons among those by which the Lutherans persuade [people] that it is not lawful for Christians in any way to demand back redress for an injury inflicted, nor retaliation of a loss, in court. Which error Jacobus Faber [Lefèvre d'Étaples] and Erasmus followed, in expounding this same law. But it is strange that these men — most sharp-sighted in many things — did not see that both Christ and Chrysostom counsel this as an *evangelical counsel*, which touches the perfect alone, and does not bind all by the obligation of a precept.

Annotation XXVIII

"Love your enemies." — Matthew 5[:44]

[margin: On the unforgivable sin.]

Augustine, in the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 43, discoursed certain things about the sin unto death, which he corrected in the nineteenth chapter of the first book of the *Retractations*, with these words: "In another place I judge a brother's sin to be 'unto death' when — after the acknowledgment of God through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ — someone attacks the brotherhood and, against that very grace by which he was reconciled to God, is driven by the firebrands of envy. This I did not firmly affirm, since I said that I 'thought' this; but yet it had to be added: *if* he ends this life in such wicked perversity of mind. For concerning any [however] evil person while set in this life, one must certainly not despair; nor is prayer imprudently [made] for him of whom one does not despair."

Again, in chapter 44 of the same book, he seems to assert that the sin of those attacking the brotherhood is so exceedingly pernicious that no one can rise again from it. For he says: "The stain of that sin is so great that it cannot submit to the humility of praying [for pardon], even if, by an evil conscience, one is forced both to acknowledge and to declare his sin."

(right column:)

The divine Thomas, in the third part of the *Summa*, question 86, mitigating this saying, says it is to be understood in the way in which we are wont to say that he "cannot be healed" who cannot *easily* be healed. For although this sin is by its own nature most difficult to cure, it can nevertheless easily be cured by the help of divine grace — which, according to David's saying, sometimes even turns [dries up] the depth of the sea.

Annotation XXIX

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy chamber," etc. — Matthew 6[:6]

[margin: On vocal prayer.]

Chrysostom, homily 19 on Matthew, brought forward, toward the exposition of this passage, certain things concerning vocal prayer, which the heretics of our times abuse against the prayers and supplications which are wont to be publicly read or chanted by priests in the churches of the Christians. But the very course of Chrysostom's words plainly proves that he does not condemn the vocal and public prayers of the Church — to which he exhorts the people in almost all his sermons — but that he speaks against certain vain and foolish show-offs, who preferred vocal prayer to spiritual, and on that account prayed in the church with disordered, immoderate, and unseemly gestures and shoutings, so as to be more conspicuously marked off from the rest — not without the admiration of the onlookers. These men Chrysostom, recalling them from ostentation and immodesty to modesty and humility, [addresses thus]: "Let us, therefore, render the vows of our prayers not by gestures of the body, nor by clamors of the voice, but by the best intention of the will — not with the sound of the mouth and its noise, not for such importunate ostentation and boasting, but with all modesty," etc.

Annotation XXX

"Thy kingdom come," etc. — Matthew 6[:10]

[margin: Whether Christ is to be called "the Lordly man" (homo dominicus).]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, wrote here that Christ is a "Lordly man" (*homo dominicus*), saying that the only-begotten Son of God would come from heaven, in the Lordly man, to judgment. This same thing he retracted in the second book of the *Retractations*, chapter 19, saying: "Wherever I said this, I could wish I had not said it; for since Christ Jesus is by nature Lord, he cannot be called a 'Lordly man.'" On which matter St. Thomas, in the 16th question of the third part, brings this reason: that since this word "Lord" is said of the Son of God according to [his] essence, it ought not to be predicated of him according to a denomination [derived name], and as though [it were] something accessory.

[signature "Oo 2"; catchword "Anno-" → Annotation XXXI, on p. 444 (PDF 449).]

(printed p. 444 [PDF p. 449], verso — Ann. XXXI–XXXIII, on Matthew 6 (supersubstantial bread; forgiving injuries; the monastic habit). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation XXXI

"Our supersubstantial bread," etc. — Matthew 6[:11]

[margin: Whether the bread we ask for in the Lord's Prayer is corporeal.]

Jerome, in the first book of [his] commentaries on Matthew, seems to disapprove those who think that by this petition a corporeal bread is to be asked for, in this manner: "What we have rendered as

'supersubstantial,' in the Greek is *epiousion*, which word the Seventy [LXX] very frequently render *periousion*. We considered, therefore, in the Hebrew; and wherever they expressed *periousion*, we found *Segula* — which Symmachus translated *exaireton*, that is, 'chief' or 'excellent' — although in a certain place he interpreted it as 'peculiar' [one's own]. When, therefore, we ask that God grant us a 'peculiar' or 'chief' bread, we ask for him who says, 'I am the living bread, who came down from heaven.' In the Gospel called 'According to the Hebrews,' for 'supersubstantial bread' I found *Machar*, which is called 'of tomorrow'; so that the sense is, 'Give us today our tomorrow's' — that is, future — bread. We can also understand 'supersubstantial' bread otherwise — [as that] which is above all substances and surpasses all creatures." Explaining this same thing more clearly, in [his] commentary on the second chapter of the Epistle to Titus, he says: "That which in the Gospel, according to the Latin translators, is written, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' is better [rendered] in the Greek, 'Our bread *epiousion*' — that is, 'chief, excellent, peculiar' — namely, him who, coming down from heaven, said, 'I am the living bread, who came down from heaven.' Far be it, indeed, that we — who are forbidden to think about tomorrow — should be commanded, in the Lord's prayer, to ask about that bread which, after a little, is to be digested and cast out into the privy."

Nor does John Cassian think otherwise, in the ninth Conference, where he determines that those gravely offend God who, in this petition as in the rest of the Lord's Prayer, demand from God anything corporeal and temporal. His words run thus: "'Give us this day our *epiousion* — that is, supersubstantial — bread'; which [word] another Evangelist called 'daily,' [and it] signifies the quality of its nobility and substance — namely, that it is above all substances, and that the sublimity of its magnificence and sanctification surpasses all creatures." And after this, some things being interposed, as if he wished to give a reason for such an explanation, he added: "You see, then, what kind of form of prayer has been set before us by him who, [as] judge, is to be prayed to through it — in which no mention is contained of corporeal or temporal life. For the Founder of eternity wishes nothing perishable, nothing temporal, to be begged of him. And so whoever — the everlasting petitions here being passed over — shall have preferred to ask of him something transitory and perishable, will do the greatest injury to [God's] magnificence and munificence, and will incur rather the offense than the propitiation of his Judge, by the [self-serving] 'usefulness' of his prayer." This [says] Cassian.

(right column:)

John Chrysostom disagrees with this opinion, in homily 20 on Matthew, where he shows that this petition is to be understood *corporeally*, in these words: "What is 'our *epiousion*' — that is, 'daily' — bread? Because he had said, 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth' — but he was speaking to men surrounded by the frailty of the flesh, and subject meanwhile to the necessity of nature, not having the same impassibility which the angels enjoy. By [his] precept he commands [things] to be done by us as they are said to be fulfilled even by those [angels]; but he condescends to the frailty of [our] nature, as if he said: 'The same diligence of conduct I demand of you; yet I do not require impassibility, for the very frailty of nature does not permit it, since it needs to be sustained by necessary food.' But do you consider how even to carnal things very much of the spiritual is joined. For not for the sake of riches and delicacies, but only for daily bread, did he command prayer to be poured out — and for daily bread indeed, that we should not be anxious for the morrow." Augustine too, in the letter to Proba, laid down that everything can be asked of God which may lawfully be desired; and temporal things, insofar as they conduce to virtue, may lawfully be desired — therefore also prayed for.

I should believe that Jerome and Cassian, in writing such things, wished to warn [us] not to ask for temporal and perishable things *for their own sake*, but only that through them we may preserve this body of ours in the service of the spirit as it aspires to eternal happiness.

Annotation XXXII

"For if you forgive men their sins," etc. — Matthew 6[:14]

[margin: On the forgiveness of injury.]

Thomas Cajetan, in [his] commentaries, says that if anyone forgives injuries from the heart for God's sake, even if he persists in fornication, God will at length convert him to penance and pardon him all [his] offenses. **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, condemns this opinion in the second book of [his] *Annotations*, because it affords an occasion of fornicating and of persisting in fornication.

Annotation XXXIII

"Be not made sad, like the hypocrites." — Matthew 6[:16]

[margin: On the dress of monks.]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 19, writes some things which St. Thomas, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 187, cites as spoken in the character of those who disparage the cheap and abject dress of the monastic profession. And these are they: "In this chapter it must most especially be observed that there can be boasting not only in the mere splendor and pomp of corporeal things, but also in their mournful squalor itself — and [boasting] the more dangerous, in that it deceives under the name of the service of God." To these words of Augustine he [Aquinas] adds the testimonies of Jerome and Strabo; of whom the former [Jerome], writing to Nepotian, says: "Dark [drab] garments are to be shunned equally with white; finery and squalor are to be avoided in like manner, because the one

[catchword "terum" → "the other…" continues on p. 445 (PDF 450).]

(printed p. 445 [PDF p. 450], recto — end of Ann. XXXIII and Ann. XXXIIII–XXXV, on Matthew 6 (whether any creature is incorporeal). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation XXXIII:)

…[because] the one [drab garb] smacks of self-indulgence, the other [white] of vainglory. And **Strabo**, on that [verse] from the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse, "Behold a pale horse," etc., says: "The devil, seeing that he can profit neither by open tribulations nor by open heresies, sends ahead false brethren, who under the habit of religion take on the nature of the black and red horse by perverting the faith." St. Thomas says that by these authors the poor, unadorned, and lowly dress of monks — and of other pious men, who use abject clothing for the exercise of humility and penance, out of contempt of worldly glory, and that by their example they may turn others from the vanity of the age — is not disapproved; but that the hypocrisy, pride, and iniquity of those is condemned who delight in the filth and squalor of their garments, either to draw upon themselves the eyes and mouths of all, or to cover a wolfish mind under sheep's clothing, to the ruin of those whom they desire to deceive.

Annotation XXXIIII

"No one can serve two masters." — Matthew 6[:24]

[margin: Whether anyone can hate God. Ps. 73.]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 22, expounding this, says: "Scarcely anyone's conscience can hate God." This same thing he retracted, in the same book and chapter of the *Retractations*, as contrary to divine Scripture — which says of many, "the pride of those who hate thee."

Annotation XXXV

"Is not the soul more than food, and the body more than raiment?" — Matthew 6[:25]

[margin: Whether no creature is incorporeal.]

Hilary, in the fifth canon, in the exposition of this passage, writes that no creature is incorporeal, in these words: "There is nothing which is not, in substance and in creation, corporeal; and the elements of all things — whether in heaven or on earth, whether of visible or invisible things — have been formed [as bodies]. For the kinds of souls too — whether of those possessing bodies, or of those exiled from bodies — nevertheless obtain a corporeal substance of their own nature, because everything created must be in some [place]."

Claudianus [Mamertus], bishop of Vienne, refutes this opinion, in the second book *On the State of the Soul*, saying: "Hilary of Poitiers, among several of his lofty disputations, thinking something amiss, discoursed these two things contrary to the truth: one, that he said nothing created is incorporeal; the other, that Christ felt nothing of pain in the Passion — and if his passion was not real, our redemption too could not be real. But since the blessed Hilary abolished the fault of this opinion by the virtue of [his] confession [of faith], he so bears the pen of rebuke that he suffers no loss of [his] merits. Wherefore it is fitting that trust be given to the expositors of the divine Scriptures, so long as they accord with it in the tenor of truth."

But as for what Claudianus condemns in Hilary, I find that it so pleased the ancients that it was received among the catholic rules and the synodical sanctions.

(right column:)

Among the works of Augustine, in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas* — said to be by Gennadius — in chapter eleven there is read an ecclesiastical canon in these words: "Nothing is to be believed incorporeal and invisible by nature, except God alone — that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Every creature is corporeal; the angels and all the heavenly Virtues are corporeal, although they do not subsist in flesh."

John Cassian, writing on this matter, in the thirteenth chapter of the seventh Conference, says: "Although we may declare that certain natures are spiritual — such as the angels, archangels, and the other Virtues, and our very soul, or certainly this subtle air — yet they are by no means to be reckoned incorporeal. For they have, according to themselves, a body by which they subsist, though far more tenuous than our bodies — according to the Apostle's saying: 'And [there are] heavenly bodies and earthly bodies'; and again, 'It is sown an animal body, it rises a spiritual body.' By which it is manifestly gathered that nothing is incorporeal, except God alone." Jerome seems at times to allude to this opinion; for when, on the tenth chapter of Matthew, he had said that the soul is incorporeal, he straightway added, "I mean, in comparison with the grosser substance of our body" — by that form of speech indicating that the soul is incorporeal not simply, but [only] in comparison with our body.

Tertullian, in the book *On the Soul*, chapter two, speaks thus: "The corporeality of the soul shines out in the Gospel. For in the underworld the soul of a certain [man] grieves, and is punished in the flame, and is tormented in [its] tongue, and implores from the finger of a happier soul the solace of dew. Do you think that outcome — of the poor man rejoicing and the rich man mourning — [only] a figure? And what is the name 'Lazarus' doing there, if the matter is not in reality [true]? But even if it is to be believed a figure, it will [still] be a testimony of the truth. For if the soul had no body, the image of the soul would not receive the image of a body; nor would Scripture lie about corporeal members, if they did not exist. Therefore, if the soul perceived anything of torment or of solace in the fire, or in Abraham's bosom, the corporeality of the soul will be proved. For incorporeality suffers nothing, having nothing through which it can suffer; or if it has [something], this will be a body. For insofar as everything corporeal is passible, to that same extent everything passible is corporeal." *[margin: Luke 16.]*

But since St. Augustine, in the tenth book *On Genesis according to the Letter*, disapproves this opinion in Tertullian, and all the scholastic theologians reject the same, it may be believed that those ancient

theologians, when they declared the soul corporeal, did not think it to be a body by its own nature and in itself, but with regard had to God — in comparison with whom there is nothing that can be called altogether incorporeal, as God [is]: seeing that he neither needs a body, nor is circumscribed by place, nor enclosed by bounds, but is everywhere and fills all things. But creatures, however spiritual they be, are applied to certain bodies (which they animate) or to corporeal places (in which they exist). Read Annotation 142 of the preceding book.

[signature "Oo 3"; catchword "Anno-" → Annotation XXXVI, on p. 446 (PDF 451).]

(printed p. 446 [PDF p. 451], verso — Ann. XXXVI–XL, on Matthew 6–7 (preaching for a living; sin in the Church; Ferus on faith and works). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation XXXVI

"Seek first the kingdom of God." — Matthew 6[:33]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for preachers to preach the Gospel for the sake of a livelihood.]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapters 24 and 25, pursues this passage in a lengthy exposition; from which the Master of the Sentences [Peter Lombard], seizing a handle for disputation, maintains that it is not lawful for evangelical preachers to set themselves two ends of preaching — one primary, for the kingdom of God, the other secondary, for bodily sustenance. This patchwork of him [Augustine] is gathered in the second book of the *Sentences*, distinction 38, thus: "We ought not to preach the Gospel in order to eat, but to eat in order to preach the Gospel — so that food is not the good which is sought, but the necessary [thing] which is added, that this may be fulfilled: 'Seek first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added to you.' He did not say, 'First seek the kingdom of God, and then seek these things, although they too are necessary,' but he says, 'All these things shall be added to you' — that is, these will follow, if you seek those; [take heed] lest, while seeking these, you be turned away from thence; or lest you set up two ends, so as to desire both the kingdom of God for its own sake and these necessary things for its sake. Therefore we ought to do all things only for the sake of the kingdom of God — not, even along with the kingdom of God, to have in view a bodily reward." — Thus far Augustine's words; by which the Master shows that preachers are not absolutely forbidden to set themselves two ends, but only [forbidden to set] two ends tending in different directions, of which the one is not referred to the other. But if they desire the kingdom of God first, and for its own sake, and then, in the second place, seek food, clothing, and lodging for the sake of that same kingdom — they in no way stray from the evangelical scope, because they subordinate all ends to one only end, which is God.

Annotation XXXVII

"Sufficient for the day is its own trouble." — Matthew 6[:34]

[margin: On bodily human food.]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, expounding this, thought that by the name of "trouble" [malice] Christ wished to signify the food and drink which men need — because they are penal to us, pertaining to this frailty and mortality which by sinning we have deserved. This same opinion he retracts in the first book of the *Retractations*, [chapter] 19, as incautiously said, since he did not take heed that food had been given to the first men too in paradise, *before* they deserved, by sinning, this penalty of death.

Annotation XXXVIII

"Hypocrite, cast out first the beam," etc. — Matthew 7[:5]

[margin: Whether there is sin in the Church.]

Augustine, in the second book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, seems to agree with the Lutheran heretics who teach that there is no sin in the Church of God — when he says: "God chose for himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle."

(right column:)

But he declares this same thing [more clearly] in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 19, showing that that opinion is to be understood not of this Church militant — mixed of good and bad — but of the glorious and triumphant Church.

Annotation XXXIX

"Do they gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" — Matthew 7[:16]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 19, judges those to be heretics who confess the most holy Trinity. For thus he expounds this passage: "And it is true indeed that he called all wicked heretics 'thorns' and 'thistles'; yet perhaps the Lord — knowing that this heresy would prevail above all — called them 'thistles,' as it were professors of the Trinity, bearing a 'triangular' wisdom in their perfidy." *(a sneer of the Arian-leaning author: he puns on tribulus, the three-pointed thistle/caltrop, to brand the Trinitarians.)*

Annotation XL

"Every good tree makes good fruits; but a bad tree makes bad fruits." — Matthew 7[:17]

[margin: Whether all works apart from grace are sins.] [margin: Gen. 8; Isa. 9, 53.]

John Ferus [Johann Wild], in the first book of [his] commentaries on Matthew, narrating this passage, uses these words: "From this it follows that no work is good and pleasing to God apart from faith; nay, only the faithful do good works. The reason is that, without faith and grace, a man is nothing but an unfruitful and bad tree, and therefore cannot bear good fruits. The virtues of the philosophers, therefore, are not good — because, although they have the appearance of good, they do not come forth from a good tree; for they proceeded either from love or hope of praise, or from fear of blame. And not only can our nature not bear good fruits without grace, but it also produces bad ones — according to that [saying], 'The sense and thought of man is prone to evil'; likewise, 'All are hypocrites, and every mouth has spoken lying'; likewise, 'All are vain, vain their works, and all their counsels vain'; likewise, 'We have all erred, everyone into his own way,' etc. You see, therefore, that whatever is done apart from faith is not merely not-good, but evil."

These words of Ferus are similar and akin to the words often repeated by the same author in his commentary on John, and in the book of *Annotations* which Dominic Soto published against Ferus, with [certain passages] noted and condemned — which indeed are found in the places [treated] below. In the explanation of that saying of John, from the first chapter, "the life was the light of men," he says: "Reason is indeed a light given by God, by which we know that good is to be done and evil fled; yet for the most part — nay, always — it is deceived in [its] choice, unless the divine light be present. We are admonished, therefore, by this word, that we should obey not our reason, but the word of God, which is the true light." Likewise, on that [verse] of the same chapter, "Who [are born] not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh," etc.: "By this word, therefore," he says, "he condemns wholly the old birth, and thereby also all the powers of nature, which by [their] natural

[catchword "turali" → continues on p. 447 (PDF 452).]

(printed p. 447 [PDF p. 452], recto — end of Ann. XL and Ann. XLI, on Matthew 7 (grace and good works, Trent; the pain of loss vs. gehenna). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XL, Ferus's statements:)

…[all the powers of nature] which by their natural propagation are transfused into [their] offspring.

Again, on that [verse], "Of whose fullness we have all received," these things are read written: *[margin: John 1.]* "Accursed are not only the things which we do, but also the things which are done in us; accursed is the thought of our heart, [our] reason, mouth, hands, feet; accursed to us are all contingent things, whether joyful or sad. Hence it is that in joys we swell up, in sorrows we are broken and despair."

And below, on the words "The Law was given through Moses," it is written thus: "Although the Law itself is good in itself, yet if grace be not present, it produces nothing but hypocrites."

Again, on that [verse] of John 3, "The Light came into the world," etc.: "Christ," he says, "first makes manifest that all our things are mere darkness and sins."

These, and passages of this kind of this author, Dominic Soto judges are to be avoided, because they seem to favor the Lutheran heretics — who teach that human nature, without the special help of justifying grace, can choose and do nothing but evil, and on that account that all the actions of unbelievers, and even their very virtues, are sins; and that all the works of Christians, however good, are — if they be done without the good of a special gratifying grace — evil and hypocritical. But this error the holy Synod of Trent detests, in the sixth session, canon seven, in these words: "If anyone shall say that all works which are done before justification, in whatever manner they be done, are sins — or that the more vehemently one strives to dispose himself for grace, the more gravely he sins — let him be anathema."

Michael Medina, in the *Apology* which he wrote in defense of Ferus, defending these opinions against Soto's censures, says: first, that the author, when he said that works done without grace are evil and sins, did not have regard to the dogma of the Lutherans, but to the phrase and manner of speaking customary with the ancient fathers — who called all works done apart from the help of divine grace not merely "not good," but very frequently termed [them] "evils," "vices," "sins," and "darkness" — not that they believed them truly and simply evil and sins, but because they knew that these [works] neither avail for acquiring Christian righteousness, nor conduce to obtaining the good of eternal happiness, and on that account did not deign to reckon them among good [works]. Likewise he says that what was said by Ferus — that all things done by us, and in us, are "accursed and damned" — is not to be so understood as if he thought that all things done naturally by the judgment of right reason are outrages worthy of damnation and cursing; but is to be interpreted of the affections, passions, and propensities to evils, arising from the impulse of our corrupt nature. By which form of speech the Apostle said, *[margin: Rom. 7.]* "I know that there dwells not in me — that is, in my flesh — any good; but sin dwells in me." In like manner, [as to] what the author says — that without divine help the human intellect can neither know the good, nor the will choose the good — he wishes it to be expounded not of the moral and human good, which is subject to our knowledge and choice,

(right column:)

but of the highest and everlasting good — which without the revelation of the divine light cannot be known and chosen — under that aspect by which it is the goal of the beatitude to be hoped for, and the way of the spiritual life leading to eternal happiness. See Annotation 255 of this book.

Annotation XLI

"Every tree that does not make [good] fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire." — Matthew 7[:19]

[margin: Whether the privation of the divine glory is a graver gehenna.]

Chrysostom, homily 24 on Matthew, discoursing (on the occasion of this saying) about gehenna, says that the lack of the divine vision is a greater punishment than all the torments of gehenna. And he expresses this opinion in these words: "I know that very many dread gehenna alone; yet I say that the loss of that glory is a far more bitter punishment than gehenna itself." And below: "Intolerable indeed is that thing, and horrible that punishment; yet if someone should set before me a thousand gehennas, he will say nothing such as it is to be repelled from the honor of that blessed glory." And in the first exhortation to the fallen Theodore, he says: "There are some of an absurd judgment; these merely love to have escaped gehenna. But I, on the contrary, affirm that there is a certain torment much harsher than gehenna — that is, not to have attained so great a glory, and to have fallen away from it. Nor do I think that one should mourn over the evils of gehenna with as great a grief as it is necessary to bewail [our] fall — that we have fallen from the heavens — which is doubtless the harshest torment of all."

St. Bonaventure (in the second book of the *Sentences*, distinction 33, question 3) and Richard of Middleton (on distinction 50 of the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, in the last question) observed that this opinion seems to differ from the universal definition of the theologians, who lay down that the punishment of infants — lacking the divine vision alone — is the mildest of all punishments, as Augustine taught in chapter 55 of the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*. St. Thomas, in the *Disputed Questions*, in the question on the punishment of original sin, article one — and the same Bonaventure and Richard — say that Chrysostom's assertion is most true in [the case of] adults, but by no means in infants; and that the cause of this difference is that the former [adults] see themselves expelled from eternal happiness by the wickedness of their own will, but the latter [infants] know that they lack the heavenly glory not by their own [fault], but by the fault of the first parent.

But Prudentius — although he was an adult, and already worn with old age — nevertheless seemed to have thought the punishments of hell more grievous, and more to be dreaded by him, than the loss of eternal happiness; when, at the end of his *Hamartigenia* — choosing rather to be thrust out of heaven than thrust down into gehenna — he prayed to Christ in these verses:

> *"In the Father's treasuries there is much dwelling, O Christ,*
>
> *divided among unequal places; I do not ask [for] a blessed*
>
> *home in the [heavenly] region — let the holy throngs of the pious be there;*
>
> *but for me it is enough, if no face of an infernal minister*
>
> *meet me, nor the greedy flame of gehenna*
>
> *devour this soul, plunged in the lowest furnaces."*
>
> *[signature "Oo 4"; catchword "Anno-" → Annotation XLII, on p. 448 (PDF 453).]*

(printed p. 448 [PDF p. 453], verso — Ann. XLII–XLV, on Matthew 7–9 (Ferus's "faith = fiducia"; priestly absolution; Trent). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation XLII

"He built his house upon the rock." — Matthew 7[:24]

[margin: On the Church.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 20: "The Church," he says, "which Christ built upon the rock, cannot perish. Nor is it contrary [to this] that certain [persons] fall away from the Church; for those were never Christians." **Henry of Andernach**, on the first [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 40, question 2,

citing these words under the name of Chrysostom, says that by them it is signified that those who have finally fallen from the Church were not Christians according to the grace of eternal righteousness, but only according to the grace of present righteousness.

Annotation XLIII

"Say only by a word, and my servant shall be healed." — Matthew 8[:8]

[margin: On justifying faith, and on unformed faith.]

John Ferus, in the second book on Matthew, expounding this clause, seems to allude to the error of those who teach that justifying faith is nothing else than a confidence of the divine mercy remitting sins for Christ's sake — and that unformed faith is nothing else than a historical and empty opinion. For thus he speaks: "Not always is [true] faith what we [commonly] call faith. We call 'faith' [merely] to assent to those things which are set forth in the divine histories, and which the Church proposes to be believed. This the scholastics [call] 'unformed,' and James calls a 'dead' faith. But what sort [of faith] is that which is dead, and lacks its own substantial form? Assuredly it is not faith, but an empty opinion. Far otherwise does Scripture speak of faith; for according to Scripture, faith is nothing else than confidence of the divine mercy promised in Christ. And below: Of this faith mention is made in the Gospel. 'Whoever believes in the Son of God,' says Christ, 'is not judged.' He speaks here not of historical or unformed faith, but of confidence of the mercy to be shown through Christ; for the highest faith, which Scripture commends, is nothing else than to trust in the gratuitous mercy of God. This is the true faith by which the just man lives; this one [faith] God requires of us," etc. "You have an example of this faith in this Centurion; for you do not read that he recited the articles of faith, but you read that he approached God with great confidence. Whence it was said, 'I have not found so great faith in Israel'; and likewise, 'Go, and as thou hast believed, be it done to thee.'"

Dominic Soto, in [his] *Annotations* against Ferus, writes that this same definition of faith is also inculcated by the same author in [his] commentaries on John — especially on that [verse] from the third chapter of John, "The man believed the word which Jesus spoke, and he went [his way]"; in which place words of this kind are read: "We are taught what the nature of faith is — namely, to conceive a confidence about God, that he will save us; but how, and when, and through what afflictions, in no way pertains to us." Examining this opinion, Soto disapproves Ferus, because, contrary to the catholic definition of the theologians, he does not say that faith is the whole assent to those things which God has revealed, or [assent] to the articles of faith, but [makes it] a confidence of the promises — which the Lutherans say suffices for justification, and which the holy Synod of Trent condemned in the sixth session,

(right column:)

canon twelve, in these words: "If anyone shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than a confidence of the divine mercy remitting sins for Christ's sake, or that it is that confidence alone by which we are justified — let him be anathema."

Annotation XLIIII

"For I too am a man set under authority." — Matthew 8[:9]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 22, here adds an altogether Arian exposition, by which he destroys the equality of the Son and the Father, in these words: "See in what way — the Spirit suggesting [it] — he [the centurion] depicted in himself the mystery of the Father and the Son. Was it not enough, for confessing Christ's power, to say only this: 'And I am a man having soldiers under me; and I say to this one, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he comes'? — since Christ too has under him angels, to whom he

gives the command of going and returning. What need, then, was there to add, 'And I too am a man set *under authority*,' except that he might most fully show Christ's dignity in himself? — that is: 'I am under the authority of another; yet I have the authority of commanding those who are under me. For I am not hindered from commanding inferiors because I am [myself] under superiors; but I am commanded by those under whom I am, while I command those who are under me. So you too, although you be under the Father's authority, yet have the authority of commanding your angels; nor are you hindered from commanding inferiors because you [yourself] have a superior. For you are commanded by the Father as a lesser, yet you command the angels as a greater.'" — But perhaps the heretic says, wishing to show the Father and the Son [to be] one or equal: "This passage is not to be understood thus, but so: If I, set under authority, can command those under my authority, how much more can you, who are under no one's authority, command those whom you have in [your] authority?" But the text does not admit this perverse interpretation; for he did not say, "If I, a man, [were] in authority," but thus: "For I too am a man *under* authority." He made no difference of comparison between himself and Christ, but introduced a relation of *likeness*.

Annotation XLV

"…God who gave such power to men." — Matthew 9[:8]

[margin: Whether priests [truly] absolve, or only pronounce [people] absolved.]

John Ferus, in the second book of [his] commentaries on Matthew, interpreting these [words], speaks of the sacramental absolution of sins in such a way that some have suspected him to assert that the power of remitting sins, handed to priests, is not a power of truly and properly remitting sins, but only a faculty of pronouncing, declaring, attesting, and certifying that the sins of penitents have been remitted and loosed by God. Which error is reproved in the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent, canon 9, in these words: "If anyone shall say that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring that sins are remitted to the one confessing — let him be anathema."

But the words of Ferus are these: "Who would not praise God…

[catchword "-det" → continues on p. 449 (PDF 454).]

(printed p. 449 [PDF p. 454], recto — end of Ann. XLV and Ann. XLVI–XLVII, on Matthew 9 (vocation and foreseen merits; suffrages for the dead). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XLV, Ferus's words:)

"[Who would not praise God] that he has now given such power to men, and to our brother Christ — nor to Christ alone, but also to others through Christ? *[margin: John 20 (21); Isa. 43; Apoc. 1.]* 'Whose sins,' he says, 'you shall have remitted, they are remitted to them,' etc. — not that a man properly remits sin, but that he shows and certifies [it] to have been remitted by God. For absolution, which you receive from a man, is nothing else than as if he said: 'Behold, my son, I certify to you that your sins are remitted; I announce to you that you have God propitious; and whatever Christ promised us in his baptism and Gospel, he now announces and promises to you through me. Of this you shall have me as witness. Go in peace, and in quiet of conscience.'" Again, in the same volume of commentaries, on that sentence of the eleventh chapter, "Come to me, all you who labor," etc., he seems to confirm this same teaching, speaking thus: "What else does the priest do in absolving, than [what] the Gospel preaches? Is it not the Gospel and the good news, when he says, 'By the virtue of Christ's passion I absolve thee, and I judge thee free from thy sins, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'? For what else does he wish [to convey] by these or like words, than if he said: 'Behold, my son, you tremble because of your sins: but fear not. God has now become to you a kindly father, and has remitted your sins; and whatever Christ, by the virtue of the keys of

binding the obstinate and loosing the penitent, promised in baptism or the Gospel, he has now secretly fulfilled in your heart, and truly announces this to you through me. Take me as witness of it: go, therefore, in peace and tranquillity of conscience, and sin no more.'"

These things [says] Ferus — whom, on this article, the things written down by him in the third book of these commentaries plainly show to have thought and taught piously and holily. There, on that saying of the Savior to Peter, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," there is a sure and undoubted opinion of this author concerning the power of the keys and the faculty of absolving, in these words: "From what has already been said, the question is easily resolved which torments some — namely, how priests can remit sins, since that belongs to God alone (according to that word, 'I am he who blots out thy iniquities'), and since Christ alone has the keys of death and hell. To which it is usually answered thus: that God alone remits sins, because the Apostles and their successors employ those [means] through which God remits sins and gives grace — such as the word of God and the sacraments; therefore they too are said to remit sins and to open heaven, for no other reason than that they employ the means. So Paul says, 'You are God's tillage and building, but we are God's helpers.' In sum, the keys of the Church are nothing else than the power of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins," etc. From these words of Ferus, we can easily suspect that the aforesaid words which are at variance with these were corrupted by Lutheran corrupters after the author's death, or thrust in here from elsewhere out of the commentaries of heretics. You have things pertaining to this article in Annotation 62 of the fifth book, and in Annotations 71 and 202 of this book.

(right column:)

Annotation XLVI

"He saw a man sitting at the toll-booth, Matthew by name." — Matthew 9[:9]

[margin: Whether [our] calling comes from merits, or from [merits] foreseen by divine foreknowledge.]

Chrysostom, at the beginning of homily 31 on Matthew, discoursing about the calling of Matthew, seems to indicate that the calling of this [man] and of the other Apostles had its occasion from the foreknowledge, in the divine prescience, of their own good will and faith. For thus we read there: "For what reason did he not call him at the same time as Peter and John and the other disciples? Certainly, just as he then came to those [others] and called [them] when he knew they would obey, so now he called Matthew too, when he saw [him] subdued by the fame of [his] miracles, [and that he] would in no way resist. For which cause he also 'fished for' Paul after the resurrection. For he who searches hearts and beholds the hidden things of minds was not ignorant of when each one was ready to obey. Therefore, not beginning immediately, when he was harder [more resistant], but after a thousand miracles and [his] notable and widespread fame, he called [him now] as more fit for obeying." See below, Annotations 87 and 251.

Annotation XLVII

"The girl is not dead, but sleeps." — Matthew 9[:24]

[margin: Whether the suffrages made for the departed profit both the blessed and the damned.]

Chrysostom, in homily 33 on Matthew — when, narrating this passage, he treated of the care to be taken for the dead — fell in a certain way into the opinion of those who think that the suffrages and prayers which are here performed in the church profit both those who are damned in hell and those who enjoy eternal glory. For there he relates such things: "For if many barbarous nations are wont to burn the goods of the dead together with the dead, how much more fitting is it that you, [when your] son is dead, can hand over his own [goods] — not that they be reduced to ashes, but that they may render him more glorious. Do you think he departed stained with spots? Give his own [goods for him], that he may wipe himself clean of those spots. Do you think he died in righteousness? Offer your [goods] for him, for an increase of [his] reward and recompense."

And in the liturgy of the divine sacrifice published by him — and approved by the same [author] in various homilies — he composed a formula of praying and offering for all the faithful departed, and especially for the souls of the blessed, in these words: "We offer to thee this rational worship for those resting in the faith — the fathers, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, the heralds and evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and every soul initiated in the faith."

Nor does Gregory, the Roman pontiff, seem far from this opinion, in the book of the *Sacraments* [Sacramentary], where, in the sacred mysteries of the Mass, he appointed [us] to pray in these words: "We have received, O Lord, the divine mysteries; [grant that,] as they profit thy saints unto glory, so, we beseech, they may avail us unto healing."

Again, [as to the point] that prayers and oblations [profit] some-

[catchword "quid" → continues on p. 450 (PDF 455).]

(printed p. 450 [PDF p. 455], verso — Ann. XLVII cont., on Matthew 9 (the dossier on prayer for the dead). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation XLVII:)

…[that prayers and oblations profit some]thing of refreshment to those who have departed without penance — the same Chrysostom seems to indicate, in the third homily on the Epistle to the Philippians, where he addresses those who mourn the dead beyond [what is] fitting, thus: "Bewail those who have died in [their] riches and procured no consolation for their own souls out of their riches — who, when they had received the power of washing away their sins, would not. Let us weep for these, but with the modesty of decorum. Let us weep for these, let us help them with [our] strength, let us procure for them some aid — little indeed; yet let us help them. How, and by what means? By praying, let us exhort others too to pray for them; and let us unceasingly give alms to the poor for them. This thing has no little consolation. For not in vain was it ordained by the Apostles that, in the celebration of the venerable mysteries, memory should be made of those who have departed hence. They know that much profit accrues to them from this, much benefit. But this indeed we say of those who have departed in the faith; but the catechumens are not reckoned worthy even of this consolation, but are destitute of all such aid, except one only. And what is that? It is permitted to give to the poor in their name, whence some little refreshment accrues to them."

John Damascene, in the sermon *On Aiding the Dead*, confirms these words of Chrysostom, adducing several examples which openly show that the suffrages of the faithful profit, in some part, even the unbelieving and impious [who are] damned to eternal punishment. And first he brings forward Falconilla, a woman who, as long as she lived, was a worshiper of idols and alien to the religion of Christ — whom Thecla the protomartyr, while still living among us, rescued from the underworld by her prayer. He likewise brings forward, from the sacred history of Palladius [dedicated] to Lausus, Macarius the Great, praying assiduously for the dead: to whom, anxiously inquiring whether his prayers profited the departed, a certain dry skull of an idolater which happened to lie in the road, bursting forth into speech at the divine command, said: "When, O Macarius, you offer prayers for the dead, we meanwhile feel some [degree of] relief." He adds also, among other examples, the deed of Gregory, the Roman pontiff, who, when he earnestly prayed to God for the salvation of Trajan Augustus (who had died nearly five hundred years before his time), heard a voice divinely brought, saying: "I have heard your prayers, and I give pardon to Trajan; but do not you henceforth offer me a sacrifice for an impious [man]." From this opinion Augustine seems not to have altogether shrunk — especially in the *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 110, where he set down these things: "When the sacrifices, whether of the altar or of any alms whatsoever, are offered for all the baptized dead, for the very good they are thanksgivings; for the not-very-bad they are propitiations; for the very bad, even if they are no aids to the dead, they are some kind of consolations to the living. And those to whom they

profit, [profit] either to this — that there be full remission — or at least that the damnation itself become more tolerable." And below, permitting the mitigation of the damnation to be believed, he says: "I judge the punishments of the damned, at certain intervals of time,

(right column:)

if it please [i.e. if it be found acceptable to hold this], to be somewhat mitigated — provided it be understood that the wrath of God (that is, the damnation itself) remains in them: in which [damnation] God, his wrath remaining, does not nevertheless withhold his compassions; not by ending the eternal punishments, but by applying [some] relief, or interposing [it amid] the torments." This [says] Augustine.

But also Aurelius Prudentius, in the hymn *On the New Light of the Paschal Sabbath*, relates that the lost souls of the guilty rest from torments on the Paschal vigil — which of old all Christians were wont to bring about [for them] by prayers and sacrifices. And he sings in this manner:

> *"There are also, for the harmful spirits, oft-recurring holidays of their punishments, famous under the Styx,*
>
> *on that night when the sacred God returned to the upper world from the Acherontic pools.*
>
> *Tartarus grows slack with milder punishments,*
>
> *and exults in the leisure of its prison.*
>
> *The people of the shades [are] free from the fires,*
>
> *and the rivers seethe not with their wonted sulphur."*

In these, and in other such sayings of illustrious fathers, the scholastic theologians have variously interpreted [them], especially in those [passages] which speak of alleviating the punishments of the damned. For just as they did not dare to condemn the opinion of the saints, so neither did they think it safe to embrace it — lest by that assertion they should gradually be driven into Origen's error, [namely] that the punishments of hell will someday be ended. For they foresaw that those torments, by the multiplication of the prayers and alms of the pious, could be so far mitigated and diminished that at length they would sometime cease to be torments. Therefore, lest they be dashed against this rock, they searched out various paths of escape.

Prepositinus [of Cremona], a priest of the church of Liège, wrote in the compendium of his theology that so great a multitude of suffrages could be heaped upon the damned that, in the progress of time, they would be stripped of all punishments — yet not forever (as Origen had thought), but until the resurrection, in which — their bodies being resumed — they would again be thrust into eternal punishments, every hope of refreshment and solace being utterly cast off.

Gilbert [of Poitiers], bishop of Poitiers, in the book of *Theological Questions*, thought that by the prayers and oblations of the faithful the punishments of the reprobate are taken away — without their consumption [i.e. without ending them] — in that manner in which infinite proportional parts are wont to be taken away from a line: from which, although it be not itself infinite, yet infinite parts can be subtracted without any consuming of it.

William [of Auxerre], bishop of Auxerre, at the end of [his] *Summa Theologica*, judges that the aids of the living give suffrage to the damned, not toward the diminution or interruption of the torment, but toward the comforting and strengthening of the sufferer: as if someone should refresh with food a man weighed down by a huge burden, or drench [him] with cold water — he will indeed render him stronger for bearing the load, yet will not diminish the load even a tiny bit.

Rupert [i.e. the bishop of Lincoln — Robert Grosseteste], not far from the end of [his] *Theological Summa*, handed down that the punishments of the damned are neither taken away, nor interrupted, nor diminished,

[catchword "-cia" → continues on p. 451 (PDF 456).]

(printed p. 451 [PDF p. 456], recto — end of Ann. XLVII and Ann. XLVIII–LI, on Matthew 10–11 (prayer for the dead; John the Baptist's "doubt"; pre-Christian faith). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation XLVII:)

…yet some occasion of a graver misery is withdrawn from them, while they perceive that by these — who extend suffrages [to them] — they are not utterly cast off, but find among the living some commiseration for their present evils.

St. Thomas, on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 45, question 2 — the opinions of these [scholars] being refuted — decrees that our suffrages profit neither the blessed nor the damned in anything: the former, because — abounding in all abundance of goods — our aids can confer nothing on them; the latter, because — sunk in the utmost depth of all evils — no effect of redemption, however slight, may be hoped for [them]. But as for those things which chiefly Chrysostom and Gregory advise concerning prayers pertaining to the blessed, he says that the sayings of both are not to be so understood as that we should think the glory of the blessed, in the blessed themselves, is increased and receives an accession from our prayers and oblations; but that we should believe their glory grows in us who pray and offer, and brings to us many and great increases of virtues for attaining that same glory of theirs. Just as when we praise God, we acquire by these praises no increase of glory for his divinity; but the glory of his majesty is rendered more and more conspicuous in us.

But to those things brought forward from Chrysostom and other fathers in the case of the damned: St. Thomas, in the first place, notes that the name "damnation" is extended also to the punishments of purgatory; and that, according to this signification, Augustine said that the damnation of some — namely, of those existing in purgatory — is made more tolerable by the aids of the faithful.

In the second place he observes that that kind of consolation and refreshment, which is sometimes related to have reached the souls of the damned from the prayers of the saints, brought them no diminution of torment, but a certain empty appearance of a deceptive joy, and a pleasing illusion of the mourning mind — such as they say is [found] in the demons, who, when they have drawn men into sinning, are so affected by a certain false and imaginary gladness that nothing of their punishments is [thereby] decreased.

Lastly, to that which Damascene relates — that the souls of Falconilla and Trajan were aided by the prayers of Thecla and Gregory — he answers that helps of this kind were special dispensations, granted to each by a singular privilege; and that those things conceded to some, outside the common law, by [special] grace, are not to be drawn into a precedent for the rest.

Consult what we have touched upon below, at Annotation 311, concerning catechumens who have died — on the opinion of Chrysostom, drawn in here from the Epistle to the Philippians.

Annotation XLVIII

"Fear not those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul." — Matthew 10[:28]

[margin: Whether the soul alone is the man.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 25, seems to hint that the soul alone is the man, but that the body is its garment, created by God to this end,

(right column:)

that with perpetual and natural hatred it might war against the soul. His words are these: "Fear not those who kill the body: for the substance of man is not the body, but the soul; and the body is the garment of the soul." And below: "But I will say what I think more truly: the flesh was created not only to be the soul's garment,

but rather for its temptation — as a domestic and natural enemy — [and to it] it has been coupled," etc. The former part of this error was followed, in earlier years, by Francesco Giorgio [Veneto], whom we confuted in Annotation 26 of the fifth book; but the latter part — alleged under the name of Chrysostom — Johannes of Mechelen noted, on the second [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 32, saying that it is to be understood [as applying] in the state of [fallen] nature deprived [of grace]. Read Annotation 26 of the fifth book.

Annotation XLIX

(the print reads "Annotation LXIX," evidently a misprint for XLIX)

"Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?" — Matthew 10[:29]

[margin: On Pilate.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 25, brings forth here a harsh and awkward proposition, saying: "Pilate wished to release Christ, but could not, because God was handing him over [to death]."

Annotation L

"Art thou he who is to come, or do we look for another?" — Matthew 11[:3]

[margin: On the doubt of John the Baptist.]

Gregory, in book 40 of the Homilies, homily six, seems to charge John the Baptist with doubting about two articles of the Christian faith — namely, whether Christ would die, and whether he would descend to the underworld. See below, Annotation 144.

Annotation LI

"Go, and tell John: The blind see," etc. — Matthew 11[:5]

[margin: Whether before Christ's coming faith in Christ was necessary for salvation.]

Chrysostom, homily 37 on Matthew, disputing on these [words], seems to opine that for the Gentiles and Jews living well before Christ's coming, no faith in Christ, no knowledge of Christ, was necessary for salvation. For there he relates such things: "Men who died before Christ's coming could then be saved even without having confessed him. For the worship of Christ, who had not yet come, was not required of them; but that — the worship of idols being spurned — they should know the one only God, the Founder of all. 'For the Lord,' he says, 'thy God is one Lord.' *[margin: Deut. 6.]* Therefore the Maccabees are [objects] of admiration, who chose to die rather than betray the Law. We greatly admire also those boys, and several others among the Jews, who lived well and most excellently, and preserved this measure of knowledge inviolate — of whom nothing further was required; for then, as we said, it sufficed to know the one only God. But now it is not so; rather, the knowledge of Christ is necessary for salvation." And below: "But [as to the fact] that those who died before Christ, and therefore did not know him — if they withdrew from the worship of idols and adored God alone, [and] if besides [they behaved well toward] men…

[catchword "ho-" → "men…" continues on p. 452 (PDF 457).]

(printed p. 452 [PDF p. 457], verso — end of Ann. LI and Ann. LII–LIV, on Matthew 11 (pre-Christian faith; reprobation; whether angels see God). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation LI:)

…[if besides they behaved well toward men and] passed their life honorably, they will attain eternal goods and beatitude. Hear what Paul says: "Glory, and honor, and peace to everyone who works good — to the Jew

first, and to the Gentile." Again, in the first sermon on Lazarus, he indicates that the just who preceded the time of the evangelical preaching had no faith in a future resurrection, writing thus of the beggar Lazarus: "Lazarus could not so much as philosophize about the resurrection, but believed that the affairs of this life were ended with the end of this life; for he was of the number of those who preceded the grace of the Gospel," etc. Thus far Chrysostom — whose opinion certain very ancient writers had professed many years before him. Of whom Justin Martyr, in the book of *Questions* posed by the gentiles, question eight, says: "Those who lived according to reason are Christians, even if they were thought not to have known God — such as, among the Greeks, Socrates, Heraclitus, and others like [them]," etc. And Clement of Alexandria, in the fifth and sixth book of the *Stromata*, says that those who lived before Christ and lived honorably were made just, either by the law or by philosophy, but that they lacked only faith in Christ; wherefore in hell they awaited the coming of Christ and the apostles, and by their preaching there were converted, so that they believed in Christ, and thus at length were saved.

Against this assertion the other theologians seem to protest — before others, Augustine, who in the 157th letter, to Bishop Optatus, writes thus: "Let that faith be preserved [sound] in us, by which we believe that no one of men — whether of greater age, or of however tender and recent an age — is freed from the contagion of the ancient death and from the obligation of the sin which he contracted by [his] first birth, except through the one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus; by the most salutary faith in whom — the same [being] man and God — even those just [ones] were made saved, who believed, before he came in the flesh, that he would come in the flesh. For the faith is the same, both ours and theirs; since they believed that would be, which we believe has been done." And below: "Accordingly, since all the just — whether before Christ's incarnation or after — have neither lived nor live except by faith in Christ's incarnation, in whom is the fullness of grace: assuredly that which is written, that there is no other name under heaven in which we must be saved, avails for saving the human race from that time [onward] from which the human race was corrupted in Adam." This [says] Augustine.

I should believe that Chrysostom, in his words, wished to allude to that knowledge and faith which the Scholastics call *explicit* — that is, an open and distinct knowledge of the singular mysteries of Christ — which not all the just before the Savior's coming attained. For it sufficed for the simpler and lesser Jews to have [only] the knowledge of the human redemption, wrapped up under the veils and coverings of the sacrifices and ceremonies. But for the Gentiles — if any attained salvation without knowledge of the Mediator — it was enough to have the same faith enclosed within a belief in the one God: that is, to believe that God was the Savior of the human race, according to an order hidden in his admirable providence, and

(right column:)

revealed by a special privilege [to some of their own seers and Sibyls]. See below, the passage bearing on this, Annotation 151.

Annotation LII

"Yea, Father, for so it was pleasing before thee." — Matthew 11[:26]

[margin: Whether reprobation is from God's pure good pleasure.]

The commentary of **Thomas Cajetan** runs thus: "By these words he renders the reason — first [in intention] and last in resolution — of the hiding [of these things] from the prudent and their revelation to the little ones: [namely] the divine will. Do not, therefore, dispute about the cause of election and reprobation — why, that is, God chose those and not these; for here you have the first, supreme, and last cause: 'Because so it was pleasing to God.'" **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, appended to this passage such a censure: "What he here says, in respect of reprobation, is false and impious; because God reprobates no one from [his] pure good pleasure, but from [de]merits. For reprobation and rejection presuppose the fault of the one

reprobated and rejected. For God wills all men to be saved, and drives no one to sin." Read below, Annotation 248.

Annotation LIII

"All things are delivered to me by my Father." — Matthew 11[:27]

[margin: Whether the angels see God.]

Athanasius of Alexandria, in a sermon published on this passage, hints in a certain way that the angels do not see God, saying: "Men truly bold and proud, who do not tremble at that glory into which the angels desire to gaze, bent and bowed down — although they are by far more sublime than [men] in nature and order! For what is nearer [to God] than the Cherubim and Seraphim? They do not gaze upon this majesty, nor hold themselves erect on [their] feet; nay, they do not even leave [their own] face bare, but — it being veiled — they extol the glory and majesty of God with lips that never cease." See below, Annotation 182.

Annotation LIIII

"Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you." — Matthew 11[:28]

[margin: On the Law of Moses.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 28, calls the Law of Moses unjust, cruel, and proud, saying: "Do you see that the Law is unjust and burdensome? Therefore Christ exhorts men to come out from under the weight of the Jewish law, and to attain to the delightful grace, saying, 'Come to me, all you.' And below: Therefore the law was harsh; because whatever it commanded, it commanded in its wrath — not that it might save, but that it might punish. Likewise the law is proud: for it forbids every man to approach the holy things, except the high priest; it forbids a one-eyed man, or one weak in any member, to perform the priesthood. You see how the law is proud." *[margin: Lev. 21.]* These words are not to be understood simply, as they are written, but are to be referred to the dignity of the evangelical law and grace — whose righteousness, gentleness, and humility are such that, in comparison with it, the Mosaic law, although just, mild, and humble, may seem to be unjust, proud, and harsh. In which sense also God, speaking in the prophet Ezekiel about the laws which he had given the Jews through Moses, says: "I gave them precepts [that were] not *[margin: Ezek. 20.]*

[catchword "non" → "…not good," Ezek. 20:25, continues on p. 453 (PDF 458).]

(printed p. 453 [PDF p. 458], recto — end of Ann. LIV and Ann. LV–LVIII, on Matthew 11–12 (the sin against the Holy Spirit; the Virgin's alleged vainglory). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LIV:)

…[precepts] not good, in which they cannot walk" — that is, precepts less good than the evangelical precepts themselves.

Annotation LV

"Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened," etc. — Matthew 11[:28]

[margin: Absolution.]

John Ferus, in the second book of [his] commentaries on Matthew, illustrating this sentence by an exposition, seemed to affirm that priests, in sacramental absolution, do not remit sins, but only pronounce and attest that they have been remitted by God to the penitent. See above, Annotation 45 of this book.

Annotation LVI

"Whoever shall speak a word against the Son, it shall be forgiven him; but whoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him." — Matthew 12[:32]

[margin: On the sin against the Holy Spirit.]

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Matthew, expounding this, left it written thus: "The Father penetrates into all things and contains all things — animate, inanimate, rational, irrational; but the power of the Son extends itself over the rational alone, insofar as they are [rational]. Among which rational [beings] are the pagans, who blaspheme, faith not yet [being] received. But the Holy Spirit unfolds himself over those alone who have been made partakers of him by the grace of baptism. When, therefore, the pagans sin by blasphemy, they sin against the Son, because he is in them; yet they can obtain pardon. But when the baptized — upon whom the gift of regeneration has been conferred — sin, an iniquity of this kind extends itself against the Holy Spirit: because, since they were contained in the Holy Spirit, they commit an offense, and therefore their fault is unpardonable." **Athanasius**, in the book which he wrote on this passage, disapproves these things on two counts: both because the external works of the Trinity are so far undivided that wherever the Father is, there are the Son and the Holy Spirit; and because these [statements] incline toward the inhuman dogma of Novatus.

Theognostus, in the book on the same words of the Gospel published by him, following Origen, himself also taught that those who sin against the Son are those who offend before baptism, and are therefore worthy of pardon, because they have not yet received the grace of the Holy Spirit; but that those who sin after baptism receive no expiation, because — since they have received the gift of the Holy Spirit — no excuse or plea for pardon is left them. Athanasius, in the same volume, hisses off this opinion — as favoring the Novatianists — from the catholic assertions.

Annotation LVII

"Whoever shall speak a word against the Holy Spirit," etc. — Matthew 12[:32]

[margin: On the sin against the Holy Spirit.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries on this passage, has thus: "What is signified by 'the Holy Spirit' is not clear; yet the subject matter suggests that by the name 'Holy Spirit' is signified God — according to that whereby he exercises the office of the Holy Spirit, that is, whereby he makes the souls of men spiritual and holy. So that to speak a word

(right column:)

against the Holy Spirit is by words to assail God who sanctifies men. For this is directly and by intention to speak against the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as 'Holy Spirit' is an essential name of God — not regarding, as far as this text is concerned, [the name] insofar as it is proper to the third person in the Trinity." **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, in the fourth book of [his] *Annotations*, refutes Cajetan, because he denied that this passage pertains to the person of the Holy Spirit.

Annotation LVIII

"Behold thy mother and thy brethren," etc. — Matthew 12[:47]

[margin: Whether the Virgin Mary was guilty of vainglory.]

Chrysostom, homily 45 on Matthew, expounding this clause, seems to attribute to the Virgin Mary something of ambition and vainglory, in these words: "From the mother's action, some importunity accrued. Consider the importunity both of the mother and of the brethren; for whereas they ought to have entered and

heard together with the crowds, or at least awaited outside the end of the discourse, and then approached — moved by a certain ambition and ostentation, they called him outside, in the presence of all, that they might be seen easily, and with great power, to command Christ. Whence it is plain that they were moved by a certain vainglory, thinking as yet nothing great about him" — and the rest that follows. And again, in homily 46 on Matthew, praising the prudence of Christ's disciples, who awaited the opportune time to question the Master, he says: "So [Mary] too, and the brethren, would he have taught to act — not to call [him] outside openly for the sake of ostentation." The same [Chrysostom], narrating the miracle of the water turned into wine, in homily 20 on John, even more clearly ascribes to her some affection of pride, saying: *[margin: John 7.]* "For she wished the miracle to be done, that she might conciliate to herself the favor of men, and that she herself might be made more illustrious by [her] son's grace; and perhaps she was affected by some human affection, just as also his brethren [were], when they said, 'Show thyself to the world,' desirous of gaining fame for themselves by his miracles." And a little later, [saying] the same: "(Since indeed she did not yet have the due opinion of him,) but after the manner of mothers, Mary thought she might by right command her son in all things — when it was [rather] fitting to worship and revere [him] as [her] Lord."

This passage Euthymius noted among the Greeks, in his commentaries, and did not dare to disapprove [it]; but among the Latins, Thomas [noted it], in the third volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 27 — where, civilly excusing Chrysostom, he says that he exceeded out of the impulse of speaking (as sometimes happens to orators and preachers); and that his words can also be so expounded, he says, that we understand Christ to have checked an affection in [his] mother — not one that really was in her, but one which others might perhaps have supposed to be in her. Which excuse we most gladly accept, lest we defraud the Virgin Mother of God of that signal privilege of her integrity, which the appended canon of the Synod of Trent attributes to her: "If anyone shall say that a man once justified can no longer sin, nor lose grace — and therefore that he who falls and sins was never truly justified; or, on the contrary, that he can, throughout [his] whole life, avoid all sins

[signature "Pp"; catchword "omnia" → "…all [sins]," continues on p. 454 (PDF 459).]

(printed p. 454 [PDF p. 459], verso — end of Ann. LVIII and Ann. LIX–LXI, on Matthew 12–13 (may obstinate heretics be executed?; Ps. 77 of Christ). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Tridentine canon quoted at the end of Annotation LVIII:)

…all [sins], even venial ones — unless by a special privilege of God, as the Church holds concerning the Blessed Virgin — let him be anathema."

Theophylact, in the interpretation of this sentence, following the sayings of Chrysostom, must be read with caution in these words: "The mother wished to show something human — namely, that she had power over [her] son; for she did not yet understand anything great about him. For this reason, while he was still speaking, she wished to draw him to herself, as [one] somewhat ambitious, [having] so great a son subject to her. What, then, [did] Christ [do]? Since he knew her intention, hear what he says: *'Who is my mother?'* — not affecting [his] mother with injury did he say this, but correcting her mind, [which was] greedy of glory and human." Consult on these [matters] Annotations 103 and 151 of the fifth book, and Annotations 138, 139, 140, and 185 of this book.

Annotation LIX

"Who are my brethren?" — Matthew 12[:48]

[margin: On Joseph.]

Euthymius, in [his] commentaries, hands down that Joseph, the husband of Mary, had sons and daughters, and that these were called the "brethren" of Christ. See below, Annotation 64.

Annotation LX

"Let both grow together until the harvest." — Matthew 13[:30]

[margin: Whether heretics unwilling to repent are to be put to death.]

Chrysostom, homily 47 on Matthew, examining this passage, has certain words which Hermann Bodius, in his *Collectanea*, adduces under the heading "On heretics," in order to maintain that heretics — however pertinacious they may have been in [their] heresy — are not to be punished with the penalty of death. And these are they: "Christ does not forbid that the conventicles of heretics be broken up, [their] mouths be stopped, [their] freedom of speaking be cut off; but he forbids [that they] be killed and slaughtered. And see how gentle he is: for he not only forbids [it], but expounds the reason why he forbids [it], saying that the tares must be spared as long as they are in the field together with the wheat, because they can be changed into the condition of wheat." This indeed is the opinion of Chrysostom — in which, since Augustine had once been [of the same mind], he afterward testifies that he changed it, in Letter 48 to Vincentius, the champion of the Rogatian heresy, writing thus: "My opinion at first was that no one is to be compelled to the unity of Christ; that [the matter] must be conducted by word, [that one] must fight by disputation, must conquer by reason — lest we should have as counterfeit catholics those whom we had known [to be] open heretics. But this opinion of mine was overcome, not by the words of gainsayers, but by [the] examples of those pointing [it] out. For first there was set against me my own city, which, whereas it was wholly on the side of the Donatists, was converted to catholic unity by the fear of the imperial laws — [the city] which we now see so detest the ruin of that [sect] that it might be believed never to have been in it. So too many others, which were named to me one by one, so that by the very facts I recognized that in this matter too there could rightly be understood that which is written: *'Give an occasion to a wise man, and he will be the wiser.'"* Thus far Augustine — who, in the book against the epistle of Parmenian, explaining the mind of Christ saying "Let both grow together until the harvest," says that these words are to be observed only in that case, when the tares cannot be uprooted without the uprooting of the wheat —

(right column:)

— that is, when the heretics cannot be killed and extinguished unless the catholics too are slaughtered along with them. But when this fear is not present, and their crime is notorious and execrable, and they do not have such defenders through whom a schism could arise: then severity is to be exercised against them. For if emperors punish thefts and murders, why should they not punish heresies and sacrileges? Nor does Chrysostom disagree from this opinion of Augustine, as his own words openly show, prefixed to the aforesaid words, in this manner: "The Lord forbids the tares to be plucked up, lest perchance together with the tares the wheat-plant also be plucked up; for it was fitting that he should forbid wars and the effusion of blood: for if the heretics were then slaughtered, [it] would bring an atrocious and irreconcilable war upon the world."

Euthymius, in the exposition of this sentence, following Chrysostom's explanation, writes thus: "'Let both grow together until the harvest.' By 'harvest' he means the consummation of the world. He commands, therefore, that men of both kinds — that is, heretics — be allowed to live, growing and increased in number in the world, up to the consummation. For it is likely that before that time many heretics will be converted; and yet on this account one ought not to be mingled with them. For this world is spacious; and they ought to live by themselves — not taken away, indeed, but separated, lest by teaching they corrupt what is sown [as] wheat." This passage was added, for the defense of heretics, by the Lutherans in Bodius's work already cited. But moreover, from the words which immediately precede this period, it appears that Euthymius thought the

same as Chrysostom; for he says: "He forbade the heretics to be taken away, lest the orthodox too be equally taken away — for it would come to pass that wars and slaughters should arise."

Annotation LXI

"I will open my mouth in parables." — Matthew 13[:35]

[margin: That the prophecy of Psalm 77, cited by Matthew, is to be understood literally of Christ.]

Thomas Cajetan, elucidating this prophecy of the psalm in [his] commentary on Matthew, speaks in this manner: "Transumptively Matthew drew the prophetic word from Psalm 77; for to the letter that text speaks of a similitude of deeds [done]. But the Evangelist, using a mystical sense, applies [it] to metaphorical similitudes. For both agree in the common notion of a parable, or similitudinary speech." Against this explanation, **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, in book 2 of [his] *Annotations*, is found [inveighing] with these words: "These things are false and dangerous. False, I say, because they suppose those words to be verified to the letter of that Asaph. But what was he, that it should befit him according to the letter to say, 'Attend, my people, [to] my law'? — what people did he himself have under him, or what law could he prescribe to anyone? And with what face does he say that this passage is drawn transumptively to Christ, when the Evangelist testifies [it] to be fulfilled in him — [a thing] which, according to truth, must be understood of those parables which the Lord was uttering, which were not something really done? But whereas he says that similitudes of things really done agree, in the notion of a parable, with metaphorical and fictitious similitudes, [that] is true only very equivocally. Likewise, unfittingly would one thing said precisely [of the one] be drawn to the other, even if they agreed in a generic notion. For speech —

[catchword "enim" → "…for [speech]," continues on p. 455 (PDF 460).]

(printed p. 455 [PDF p. 460], recto — end of Ann. LXI and Ann. LXII–LXIV, on Matthew 13 (Joseph's craft; the "brethren of the Lord"). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXI, Catharinus still speaking:)

— for [speech], spoken precisely of the ass, would be unfittingly drawn to man, on account of that [generic] agreement, because man and ass agree in the notion of animal. In Christ, therefore, that passage is verified to the letter, as all catholics have received [it]; because the Evangelist attests this, and the words themselves [attest it]. For he himself is the true Asaph, who came that he might gather together the scattered [things]; to him a people was given to be instructed; he, finally, brought forth his own law by his own mouth, and taught [it]. Beware, then, if you are wise, pious reader, of this doctrine, which so manifestly fights against the sense of the doctors and against most assured truth." This [says] Ambrose [Catharinus].

Annotation LXII

"Is not this the carpenter's son?" — Matthew 13[:55]

[margin: What kind of smith's craft Joseph practiced.]

Hilary, in canon 14 on Matthew, writes that Joseph, the father of Christ, was a blacksmith, in these words: "Plainly this [Christ] was the son of a smith — [a smith] who conquers iron by fire, decocts every strength of the age by [his] judgment, and forms the mass into every work of human usefulness," etc. Nor does **Bede** seem to think otherwise, in [his commentary] on Mark, book 2, saying: "For although human [things] are not to be compared with divine, yet the type is entire, because the father of Christ works by fire and by breath. Whence also, concerning him — as of a smith's son — his forerunner says: 'He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire'; because [God], by softening the vessels of wrath with the fire of his Spirit, changes [them]

into vessels of mercy." Thus Bede, alluding to those three [things] which blacksmiths chiefly use to tame iron — namely, fire, breath, and water. **St. Thomas**, in the commentary on Matthew, specially noted that Joseph did not practice the iron-craft, but the wood-craft [carpentry]; and to this subscribe Peter [de Natalibus] of Equilio, bishop, in book 3 of *On the Lives of the Saints*; James of Genoa [Jacobus de Voragine], bishop, in the book of *Fasti*; Nicholas of Lyra; and nearly the whole consensus of the scholastics. Nor does the most ancient custom of ecclesiastical painting disagree from this opinion, representing Joseph [as] an old man, together with the boy Jesus handling wooden boards. **Thomas Cajetan** says it is uncertain what kind of smith-craft Joseph practiced, since "smith" (*faber*) is a generic name, embracing goldsmiths, silversmiths, blacksmiths, carpenters, and stonemasons — whose judgment the Greek word of Matthew favors: ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, that is, "the carpenter's son." For τέκτων, as Suidas indicates, is common to stonemasons, blacksmiths, and carpenters.

Annotation LXIII

"To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of heaven." — Matthew 13[:11]

[margin: [The error that] faith is given to us from preceding merits.]

**The author of the* Opus imperfectum*, homily 31, indicates that the knowledge of the mysteries of faith and of the kingdom of heaven is given to those who use the natural light well, as a reward for good will — which opinion Augustine, having followed [it] before [his] episcopate, afterward, once made bishop, retracted. The author's words run thus: "The Lord gives general grace, that is, the understanding of good and evil, to all, by the necessity of nature; because we do not even seem to be men created to the image of God, unless we have divine understanding. But to the more worthy he gives special grace — such as, of knowing the mysteries — not by the necessity of nature, but for the reward of good will, or of good works. See, therefore, how he says, 'To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of heaven.' He did not say, 'It is given to you, [or] to anyone, who has the knowledge of good and evil.' If, then, there is someone who does not have the grace of the knowledge of good and evil, it is not the fault of the man not having [it], but of God not giving [it]. But if all men understand good and evil, yet not all have the grace of knowing the mystery of the kingdom: it is not the fault of God not giving, but of the man not seeking, nor hastening, nor laboring, to merit to receive [it]. For if you had gone through that general knowledge of good and evil — that is, if you had used [it] well — you would justly have merited this special knowledge of knowing the mystery."

John Driedo, in the book *On the Concord of Free Will and Divine Predestination*, chapter 3, receiving this passage under the name and authority of Chrysostom, elucidates it with these words: "Chrysostom, when he says that that general knowledge of the commandments — which each one received when he was created — is a grace by which, if he used [it] well, he would merit the special knowledge by which he might know the mystery of the heavenly kingdom (concerning which the Savior [says], 'To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God,' etc.) — says [it] indeed most truly; but he does not mean that general knowledge of the commandments to be a grace of God as [our] Redeemer, but of God as [our] Founder. If anyone uses the gifts of nature well, he without doubt merits [thereby]; but no one avails to use these well without the grace of a merciful God, and without certain beginnings of faith. The example is plain in Cornelius the Centurion, and in the Apostles; whom, for their good wills, God — by a certain grace of prevenience and of humbling — deigned to set forth and to reveal the mysteries of Christ the Redeemer."

Annotation LXIV

"Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" — Matthew 13[:55–56]

[margin: Whether Joseph was twice-married.]

Theophylact, in the commentary on Matthew, appended to this text an exposition of this kind: "The Lord had brethren and sisters, sons of Joseph, whom he begot from the wife of his brother Cleophas. For, Cleophas having died without children, Joseph, according to the [levirate] law, took his wife, and begot six children — four males and two females: Mary, who was called the daughter of Cleophas according to the law, and Salome." This same [thing] he repeats at chapter 27 on Matthew, where he also writes that the mother of Christ was the stepmother of Joseph's sons. To this opinion assent most of the Greek fathers — in the first place Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, in book 2 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 1, where he writes that James the Just, bishop of Jerusalem, called the "brother of the Lord," was the son of Joseph by another wife, before he was betrothed to Mary. Euthymius, in the chapter on Matthew 12, says that Joseph had sons and daughters. Oecumenius, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, chapter 2, and on Acts, chapter 2, relates that the sons of Joseph doubted about Christ — about whom their father Joseph himself never doubted. Epiphanius, in book 3 of the *Panarion*, disputing against the Antidicomarianites, narrates that Joseph had a first wife of the tribe of Judah, and took up from her six children — among whom the firstborn was James, surnamed the Just, born about the fortieth year of [his] father's age; then, this wife having died, when he was passing his eightieth year, [Joseph] married Mary the mother of Christ. Origen, when in the *Tomes* on

[signature "Pp 2"; catchword "per" → "…[su]per [Matthaeum]," continues on p. 456 (PDF 461).]

(printed p. 456 [PDF p. 461], verso — end of Ann. LXIV and Ann. LXV–LXVII, on Matthew 14–15 (angels and the daughters of men; Origen's "symbolic" Eucharist). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXIV, Origen still under discussion:)

…discoursing on this passage through Matthew, indicated that this opinion had proceeded from the gospel entitled *According to Peter*, or from the gospel which is called *of James*, and that it pleased him wonderfully — because it is also consonant with reason that Jesus was the first-fruits of male virginity, and Mary of female [virginity]; nor is it plausible to ascribe the first-fruits of virginity to any others besides these. This same [thing], among the Latins, Hilary professes, in canon 1 on Matthew; Ambrose, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, chapter 2; Thomas Cajetan, in the expositions of the same epistle and chapter. From the opinion of these [men] **Jerome** dissents, in book 2 on Matthew, writing thus: "Some suspect the brethren of the Lord to be sons of Joseph by another wife, following the ravings of the apocrypha, and inventing [them] out of a certain little woman [named] Escha. But we — as is contained in the book which we wrote against Helvidius — understand the brethren of the Lord [to be] not sons of Joseph, but cousins of the Savior, the children of Mary, the maternal aunt of the Lord, who is said to be the mother of James the Less and Joseph and Jude, whom in the gospel we read [to be] called the brethren of the Lord; and that 'brethren' are called 'cousins,' all Scripture demonstrates." **Augustine**, in sermon 14 on the Nativity of Christ, ascribes to Joseph the privilege of virginity in these words: "Have, therefore, O Joseph, in common with Mary thy spouse, the virginity of [thy] members, because from virgin members is born the virtue of angels. Let Mary be the spouse of Christ, [her] virginity being preserved in her flesh. And with these [gifts] be thou too, O father of Christ — [with] the care of chastity and the honor of virginity. Rejoice, therefore, O Joseph, because through the merit of virginity thou art so separated from the bed of [thy] wife that thou art called the father of the Savior."

Annotation LXV

"Herod held John, and beheaded [him] in prison." — Matthew 14[:3,10]

[margin: Whether the angels fell from heaven on account of love of women.]

Chrysostom, in the homily delivered on the beheading of John the Baptist — which is extant outside the homilies of the commentaries on Matthew — seems to indicate that the angels of God, allured by the love of women, fell from [their] heavenly glory. For thus he speaks: "O supreme evil, and sharpest dart of the devil — woman! Through a woman [the devil] laid Adam low in Paradise; through a woman he thrust the most chaste Joseph into prison; through a woman he cut off by the head that lamp of the whole world, John. And what shall I say of men? A woman laid low not only men, but even angels from heaven." Someone — I know not who — corrected this last clause, the words being changed and expounded in this manner: "through a woman he cast down angels from heaven — that is, holy men, who were pressing on toward heaven." **Alcuin** [Albinus], in the *Homiliary of the Yearly Festivities*, inserting this homily among the other sermons collected by him, acknowledges the former reading as genuine; and it may be that this correction was first appended in the margin by some studious [person], and thereafter — as usually happens — transferred by the copyists into the text. See what we have noted above, Annotation 73 of book 5.

Annotation LXVI

"Not what enters the mouth defiles the man." — Matthew 15[:11]

[margin: On the Eucharist.]

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Matthew, in the explanation of the present chapter, making mention of the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord,

(right column:)

calls it a typical and symbolic body, and likewise the bread of the Lord, which — entering into the mouth of those eating — passes into the belly and is cast out into the privy. His words run in this manner: "But someone, falling upon this passage, might say that, just as what enters into the mouth does not defile the man — even if it be thought defiled by the Jews — so what enters into the mouth does not sanctify the man, even if it be believed by the simpler [folk] to sanctify — namely, that which is called the bread of the Lord. And it is, unless I am mistaken, a saying not to be despised, and one therefore desiring a lucid exposition, which to me indeed seems to be such: Just as it is not the food, but the conscience — with the hesitation [doubt] of the one eating — that defiles the eater (inasmuch as he who hesitates, if he eats, has been judged [condemned], because [he eats] not from faith); and just as nothing is impure of itself, [but only] to the polluted and unbelieving [person], yet on account of his own uncleanness and unbelief: so that which is sanctified through the word of God and through supplication does not by its own nature sanctify the user. For if it were so, it would sanctify also him who eats unworthily; nor would anyone, on account of this eating, have become weak or sick, or have fallen asleep [in death]. For Paul demonstrates some such thing, when he says: 'For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and many sleep.' *[margin: 1 Cor. 11.]* Accordingly, in the bread of the Lord too there is a usefulness of eating [only] then, when with unpolluted mind and pure conscience one partakes of that bread. So, as far as concerns the eating in itself: neither on this account — because we do not eat of the bread sanctified by the word of God and through supplication — are we defrauded of any good; nor by eating do we abound in any good. Since indeed the cause of defect is malice and sins, and the cause of abundance is righteousness and right deeds: so that it is such as is said in Paul in these words: 'Neither if we eat shall we abound, nor if we eat not shall we have less.' But if whatever enters into the mouth passes into the belly and is cast into the privy: that food also, which is sanctified through the word of God and through supplication, as regards what it has [that is] material, passes into the belly and is cast into the privy. But as regards the prayer which has been added to it, it becomes useful in proportion to faith, effecting that the mind become clear-sighted, looking to that which is useful. Nor is it the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it, that profits him who eats it not unworthily of the Lord. And these things indeed [are said] concerning the typical and symbolic body. Many things, moreover, could also be said of the Word himself — who was made flesh and true food; whom whoever shall eat shall altogether live forever; whom no evil [man] can eat.

For if it could come to pass that one who still persists evil should eat the Word made flesh — since he is the Word and the living bread — it would by no means have been written, 'Whoever shall eat this bread shall live forever.'" **Erasmus of Rotterdam** first of all noticed this passage, and in the scholia on the Origenic fragment translated by him, brought it forth to be weighed by the judgment of readers. I, to pronounce my opinion freely, suspect the passage to have been corrupted by heretics.

Annotation LXVII

"When Jesus had passed thence, he came beside the sea of Galilee." — Matthew 15[:29]

[catchword "Chry-" → "Chry[sostom]…," continues on p. 457 (PDF 462).]

(printed p. 457 [PDF p. 462], recto — end of Ann. LXVII and Ann. LXVIII, on Matthew 16 (the rock of the Church — Christ and Peter). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXVII:)

Chrysostom, in homily 53 on Matthew near the end, speaking about restitution, openly asserts that it is not enough for robbers, for the expiation of the crime, to restore just as much as they plundered; but that it is needful that they render more than tenfold. Which opinion he supports also by two arguments — namely, by reason of the insult which, beyond the loss, [the robber] inflicted, and by reason of the evangelical law, which in this matter exacts more from its own [followers] than the Mosaic law, [which was] content with fourfold restitution.

[margin: Whether restitution ought to exceed the [thing] plundered.]

His words express this sense thus: "Do not tell me, 'If I have taken away from another, to this [other] I have [merely] given the same amount.' For this is certainly the worst [thing]. Do not believe it possible, by giving in the same measure by which you plundered, to heal that wound which through avarice was inflicted by you. For he who plundered a mina will not have [done] enough for himself as a remedy for this ulcer, if — struck by penitence — he mercifully gives [back] a mina; but he will need a talent — on which account [one] condemned of theft restores fourfold. Since, then, the plunderer is much worse than the thief, and since that [thief] restores fourfold: tenfold, nay rather much more, this [plunderer] ought to restore; and would that even so we might wholly wipe away the filth of plunder. For I do not think that this is that [true] mercy, for which a great heap of merits is reserved. Wherefore Zacchaeus was saying: *[margin: Luke 19.]* 'If I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will give fourfold, and I will offer the half part of my goods to the needy.' But if fourfold is rendered in the time of the [Mosaic] law, how much more under grace? And if a thief must restore only as much [as he stole], [how much more] the plunderer? For, beyond the loss, plundering is an insulting thing. Wherefore, even if you give a hundredfold, you have scarcely rendered the whole. Not rashly, therefore, did we say that a talent is to be offered, if a mina has been plundered from you."

All the schools of the theologians seem to protest against this opinion — in which it is decreed that no one is to be compelled, by reason of the thing taken away, to restore more than he took; because the aim of restitution is to recall to equality that which was unequally taken away. I think that the interpretation of these words is to be taken not from the nature of the thing taken away, but from the manner of the seizing. For, if we regard the thing taken away, the theologians rightly define that the justice of restitution demands back nothing further from the robber than what he plundered, and as much as he plundered. But if we look to the insult and injury which one inflicted on him whom he despoiled, it is not enough to restore just as much; but, when he shall have been condemned, he ought to restore as much as an equitable judge shall have pronounced must be restored by reason of the unjust taking away — whether that be tenfold, or more than tenfold. And this sense, unless I am mistaken, the words of Chrysostom exhibit.

Annotation LXVIII

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." — Matthew 16[:18]

[margin: Whether the Church was built upon [the] Rock [Peter].]

Augustine, in the sermon *On the Words of the Lord according to Matthew*, sermon 13, so expounds this passage as to say that the Church is not founded upon *petra* [the rock] — that is, upon Peter — but upon the Rock, which is Christ, speaking thus: "Thou art therefore," he says, "Peter; and upon this rock, which thou hast acknowledged [saying, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'], I will build my Church. Upon me I will build thee, not me upon thee." The same [thing] he also has in Tractate 124 on John, on these words: "'Upon this rock,'" he says, "'I will build my Church.' For the rock was Christ, upon which foundation Peter himself also was built. For *[margin: 1 Cor. 3.]* no one can lay another foundation than that which is laid, Christ Jesus."

(right column:)

The heretics of our times deride us, because — expounding the proposed sentence of Christ, "Thou art Peter" — we say that Peter is the rock upon which the Church is founded, against Augustine's explanation and against the voice of Paul, who lays no foundation besides Christ. To whom we reply that we embrace the present exposition of Augustine with [our] whole heart, and also firmly retain our own interpretation, as received from the same Augustine. For he, in the first [book] of the *Retractations*, chapter 21 — approving both, and preferring neither to the other — uses these words: "I said, in a certain place, concerning the apostle Peter, that upon him, as upon a rock, the Church is founded — which sense is also sung by the mouth of many in the words of the most blessed Ambrose, where, concerning the cock, he says:

> *'At this, the very Rock of the Church,*
>
> *[the cock] crowing, washed away [his] fault' —*

but I know that I have afterward very often so expounded what was said by the Lord, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' that by 'this rock' should be understood [him] whom Peter confessed, saying, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.' But which of these two opinions is the more probable, let the reader choose." Thus Augustine — whom, as we do not contradict, so neither do we lay any other primary foundation besides Christ. For we believe, and with sure faith confess, that Christ is the first and chief foundation of the whole ecclesiastical edifice; but upon this foundation we also assert that other stones are superimposed — namely Peter and the rest of the Apostles, whom John in the Apocalypse names the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem, *[margin: Apoc. 21.]* upon which we do not doubt that the remaining parts of the ecclesiastical structure are built.

Nor are there lacking, among the ancient fathers, those who interpret this response of Christ to Peter as [said] of Peter — among whom **Clement of Rome**, in the first epistle to James, [says]: "Simon Peter, by the merit of [his] true faith and on the strength of [his] upright preaching, was by Christ appointed to be the foundation of the Church." **Origen**, in book 5 on the epistle to the Romans, says: "When to Peter the summit of affairs was handed over for the feeding of the sheep, and upon him — as upon [firm] earth — the Church was founded, no other virtue is required of him except charity." And on Matthew, chapter 16: "Christ in truth was saying to Peter, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God' — in which [confession] he was both beatified, and by promise merited to become the foundation of the Church." **Basil**, in the second book against Eunomius: "Peter, because he excelled in faith, took up in his very self the building of the Church." **Theophylact**, in the explanation of this passage: "The Lord rewards Peter, giving him a great reward — that upon him he built the Church." In the same manner interpret [it] **Jerome**, in book 3 on Matthew,

[signature "Pp 3"; catchword "&" → continues on p. 458 (PDF 463).]

(printed p. 458 [PDF p. 463], verso — end of Ann. LXVIII and Ann. LXIX–LXXI, on Matthew 16 (the rock; the gates of hell; the keys). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXVIII's catena:)

…and Chrysostom, chapter 16 on Matthew.

Hilary, in canon 16 on Matthew, expounds these words in the same manner — although Erasmus strives to drag his words into another sense, adding in the margin a scholium of this kind: "The foundation of the Church is faith"; by which words he wished to interpret Hilary, as if he [Hilary] held faith and the rock, and not Peter, to be the foundation. Yet Hilary speaks most openly of Peter, as is manifest to one reading his words. But — [even] to grant to Erasmus that Hilary's mind in this place is not easily grasped — what will he [Erasmus] say to those [words] which the same [Hilary] writes on this matter in the exposition of Psalm 103, in these words, clearer than the noonday light? "When Jesus had spoken certain things about his passion to the disciples, and Peter had detested this as unworthy of the Son [of God] — Peter, to whom [Jesus] had earlier given the keys of heaven, upon whom he was about to build the Church, against whom the gates of hell should have no power, and whatever [things] he should have loosed or bound on earth, those should remain in heaven loosed or bound — him, therefore, detesting this sacrament of the passion, [Jesus] met with such a reviling [and] such a response: 'Get behind me, Satan; thou art a scandal to me.' *[margin: Matt. 16.]* For so great was his devotion to suffering for the salvation of the human race, that he named Peter — the first confessor of the Son of God, the foundation of the Church, the door-keeper of the heavenly kingdom, and, in the earthly judgment, the judge of heaven — with the reviling [name] of 'Satan.'" See below, Annotation 206.

Annotation LXIX

"Upon this rock I will build my Church." — Matthew 16[:18]

[margin: Whether the Church was built upon each and every one of the faithful.]

Origen, in the *Tomes* on Matthew — in the first of those [treatises] which we now have — has this: "A rock is everyone who is an imitator of Christ; and upon all such the Church of God is built. But if you think the whole Church to be built upon that one Peter [alone]: what do you say of James, and John, and the sons of thunder, or of the individual Apostles?" **John Bonderius**, in [his] *Contestations against the Heresies of This Age*, title 31, article 4, cites this passage among those which the Lutherans bring forward against the primacy of Peter, saying that the Church is not founded primarily upon Peter, but upon each and every one of the faithful. And to these [things] he adds that Origen's exposition is typical, and according to allegory — [an allegory] which is not wont to be adduced for confirming dogmas; and that this is clear from the fact that Origen interprets the "gates of hell" [as] sins, [and] the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" [as] virtues.

Annotation LXX

"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." — Matthew 16[:18]

[margin: Whether the priestly power is lost through any [and every] sin.]

Origen, in the first of those treatises which now survive on Matthew, seems to allude to the error of the Hussites — [who say] that the power of the supreme pontiff and of the bishops so depends on the imitation of Peter's sanctity, that as often as they lose sanctity by sinning, they lose also Peter's power. The very words are written in this manner: "Since those who claim for themselves the place of the bishops use this saying — that, like Peter, they too have received from the Savior the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and teach that the [things] which have been bound by them, that is, condemned, are likewise bound also in heaven, and again that the [things] which have been loosed by them are likewise loosed also in heaven — it must be said that

they speak rightly [only] if they also have the deeds on account of which it was said to him who was Peter, 'Thou art Peter'; and if they be such that upon them the Church may be built by Christ, and that [saying] can rightly be referred to them. But the gates of hell ought not to prevail against him who wishes to bind and to loose. But if he is bound fast by the ropes of his own sins, in vain does he bind or loose. If, therefore, anyone — since he is not Peter, nor has those [qualities] which are here spoken of, as Peter had [them] — believes that he will bind on earth so that what he binds is bound also in heaven, and that he will loose upon earth so that what he looses is loosed in heaven: this [man] is puffed up, not understanding what the Scriptures mean; and, swollen [with pride], he has fallen into the ruin of the devil." This error is condemned by the authority of the Council of Trent, in whose fourteenth session there is a canon, number ten, in these words: "If anyone shall say that priests who are in mortal sin do not have the power of binding and loosing — let him be anathema." Consult Annotation 101 of this book.

Annotation LXXI

"To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." — Matthew 16[:19]

[margin: Whether the power of binding and loosing resides in priests.]

Jerome, in book 3 of the *Commentaries on Matthew*, expounding this, seems to hand down that priests have no power of loosing and binding, and that nothing else was granted to them by Christ except that they may show and pronounce sinners [to be] bound or loosed. Which opinion he embraces in these words: "Bishops and presbyters, not understanding this passage, assume to themselves something of the pride of the Pharisees — so as either to condemn the innocent, or to think that they loose the guilty — whereas before God not the sentence of the priests, but the life of the accused, is inquired into. We read in Leviticus concerning lepers, where they are bidden to show themselves to the priests, and, if they have leprosy, then to be made unclean by the priest — not that the priests make [them] lepers and unclean, but that they may have the knowledge of the leper and the non-leper, and may be able to discern who is unclean and who [clean]. In what way, then, the priest there makes the leper clean or unclean: so here too the bishop or presbyter binds or looses — not those who are innocent or guilty [as such], but, by [virtue of] his office, when he has heard the varieties of sins, he knows who is to be bound and who to be loosed."

Peter [Lombard], bishop of Paris, explaining Jerome's words more clearly, in book 4 of the *Sentences*, distinction 18, speaks thus: "Various [things] are handed down by the doctors on these [matters]; and in this so great variety, we can indeed say and hold this — that God alone forgives sins and retains [them]. And yet he conferred on the Church the power of binding and loosing; but he himself looses or binds in one way, the Church in another. For he alone by himself forgives sin, [he] who both cleanses the soul from [its] interior stain and looses [it] from the debt of eternal death. But this he did not grant to the priests, to whom nevertheless he gave the power of loosing and binding — that is, of showing men [to be] bound and loosed. Whence the Lord first by himself restored the leper to health, and then [sent him] to the

[catchword "sacer-" → "…to the priests," continues on p. 459 (PDF 464).]

(printed p. 459 [PDF p. 464], recto — end of Ann. LXXI and Ann. LXXII, on Matthew 16 (the keys and papal temporal power; Ferus and Bernard). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Peter Lombard's citation in Annotation LXXI:)

…[the Lord sent him] to the priests, by whose judgment he might be shown [to be] cleansed. So too he presented Lazarus, now brought back to life, to the disciples to be loosed [unbound]: because, even if someone is loosed before God, yet he is not held loosed in the face of the Church except through the judgment of the priest. In loosing faults, therefore, or in retaining [them], the evangelical priest so operates

and judges as of old the legal [priest did] concerning those who were defiled by leprosy, which signifies sin. And this manner of binding and loosing Jerome noted above." Thus far Peter [Lombard].

There have emerged from this explanation of Jerome two errors. The former and older is that of certain scholastics, asserting that an excommunication unjustly imposed is of no force, and therefore is not to be feared — the handle for which assertion they took from the fact that Jerome said that the bishops who suppose themselves to condemn the innocent and to loose the guilty assume [this] from the pride and haughtiness of the Pharisees, condemned by the testimony of Christ.

[margin: Whether an excommunication unjustly imposed is of any force.]

Meeting these [errorists], St. Thomas, in [book] 4 of the *Sentences*, distinction 18, question 4, says that Jerome spoke as far as concerns guilt, not punishment. For no innocent [person] can be bound in [his] sins by priests, nor can anyone deliberately persisting in sins be absolved from [his] sins; but in ecclesiastical punishments, sinners can be bound even by unjust pastors excommunicating [them] out of anger and hatred.

The latter and more recent error is that which Martin Luther here and there twisted [out of it], teaching that in no way can sins be retained or loosed by priests. Refuting his madness, Alphonsus de Castro, in the first book *Against Heresies*, elucidates the present passage of Jerome in this manner: "But that Luther adduces Jerome for his own opinion proceeds from a depraved understanding; wherefore these words must be well discussed, that their clearer sense may appear. First, then, it must be observed [what] Jerome said — namely, that the priest, by [virtue of] his office, when he has heard the varieties of sins, knows who is to be bound and who to be loosed; but he did not say, 'He knows who has been bound, or who has been loosed,' as he had previously said of the priest of the old law, that he discerns who is clean and who is unclean. From which words it is most plainly proved that blessed Jerome placed some distinction between the priest discerning about leprosy and the evangelical priest absolving from sin. For the priest of the old law did not cleanse the leper, but only judged that he had been cleansed; whereas the evangelical priest judges the penitent, who confesses his sins before him, through the key of knowledge and discretion, [as to] whether such a one is worthy of absolution or not — yet he is not as yet absolved before the priest utters the words of absolution; just as the leper, after cleansing has been obtained, is truly clean before the priest judges him clean. Wherefore blessed Jerome, speaking of the priest of the new law, did not say, 'He knows who has been bound, or who has been loosed,' but said, 'He knows who is to be bound, or who to be loosed'; because from the knowledge of the sins, and from the disposition of the penitent himself, he recognizes whether he ought to absolve or to bind. For if he knows the sinner to be obstinate in evil, such that he suspects him to be in a purpose of returning to his vomit, he judges him unworthy to receive absolution. Since, therefore, Jerome said of the priest that 'he knows who is to be bound, or who to be loosed,' he intimated plainly enough that after the priest's inspection — that is, after the hearing of the sins — something still remains that is to be done by the priest concerning the penitent himself, namely to bind or to loose. And as to what Jerome said, that before God not the sentence of the priests, but the life of the accused, is inquired into — [this] is to be understood not as though the life of the accused alone is inquired into, but that it is inquired into more principally, as the foundation of the whole structure, on which whatever the priest shall afterward do somehow rests. For if the sinner be in a resolve of sinning, however much the priest may utter the words of absolution, the sinner will never be absolved. Something more, therefore, the evangelical priest does concerning the penitent than of old the priest of the old law used to do concerning the leper." See above, Annotation 62 of book 5, and Annotation 45 of this book, and below, Annotation 202.

(right column:)

Annotation LXXII

"To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." — Matthew 16[:19]

[margin: Whether the supreme pontiff has the power of secular rule.]

John Ferus, in the third book of the *Commentaries on Matthew*, coming to the explanation of this passage, seems to take away from Peter, and from his successors, all power of earthly principate, and [all] dominion over temporal things, when he writes thus: "Thirdly, this too is to be observed — that he expressly says, 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' He does not say, 'of the kingdom of the earth.' These words regard nothing of earthly power — which, nevertheless, [some] strive to establish from these words, asserting that Peter received the plenitude of power not only in spiritual [matters], but also in external [ones]. Which [claim] Bernard, in the first book *On Consideration* to Eugene, manifestly refutes: 'In crimes,' he says, 'not in possessions, is your power; since for the sake of the former, and not for the sake of the latter, you received the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' And there follows: 'Which power seems to you the greater — [that] of remitting sins, or [that] of dividing estates? These earthly and lowest [matters] have their own judges — the kings and princes of the earth. Why do you invade others' boundaries? Why do you extend your sickle into another's harvest? Why do you wish to be greater than the Lord? — who, being interpellated by a certain [man] saying, "Tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me," answered, "Who appointed me a judge over you?" *[margin: Luke 12.]* — and so forth.'" These [things] from Bernard, [reports] Ferus, adding a little below these [words]: "You have heard that it was said to Peter, 'To thee I will give the keys.' These keys, as I said, are not material, but metaphorically signify power. Power, therefore, Peter received — not any earthly [power], such that he might, namely, give, take away, [or] alienate kingdoms, principalities, etc.; nor such a power that it should be lawful for him to do whatever he pleased (which most [men] dream); but he received the power of binding and loosing, of remitting sins and retaining [them], of opening and closing — and that not at his own pleasure, but as a minister, fulfilling the will of the Lord."

Thus far Ferus — or rather some other [person] under the name of Ferus. For there are not lacking trustworthy witnesses who assert for certain that his commentaries on Mat-

[signature "Pp 4"; catchword "thaeum" → "…on Matthew," continues on p. 460 (PDF 465).]

(printed p. 460 [PDF p. 465], verso — Ann. LXXII cont., on Matthew 16 (papal temporal power; the "two swords"; Torquemada) [running head misprinted "47·"]. Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation LXXII, on the doubtful authenticity of Ferus's text:)

[his commentaries on] Matthew were, after the author's death, before they were printed, corrupted by heretics — especially in this passage. **John Calvin**, the heresiarch of our times, in that impious *Institution* of his, chapter 8, abuses the same testimony of Bernard against the pontifical dignity — which [testimony], however, if — private hatreds laid aside — it be considered with an even mind, does not infer that which Calvin wrongly gathers from it, namely, that the Roman pontiff has no right in secular kingdoms. For to whom would it be credible that Bernard held such [views] — [Bernard] who, writing to the same pontiff, and in the same books, ascribes to him the true power of both spiritual and temporal [things], and girds him with each sword — the ecclesiastical, namely, and the royal? In the third volume of the work already cited he freely confesses, and clearly pronounces, that there is in the Roman bishop not only the pontifical majesty of Aaron the high priest, but also that jurisdiction of political principate which of old was in Samuel the judge, in Moses the leader, in Melchizedek the king and priest. For thus he addresses Pope Eugene: "Come, let us investigate yet more diligently who thou art — that is, what character thou bearest for the time in the Church of God. Who art thou? A great priest, the supreme pontiff. Thou [art] the prince of bishops, thou the heir of the apostles; thou in primacy [art] Abel, in governance Noah, in patriarchate Abraham, in order Melchizedek, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judgeship Samuel, in power Peter, in unction Christ." And in the fifth book of the same volume, speaking of both swords, he addresses the pontiff in these words: "Why dost thou attempt anew to usurp the sword, which thou wast once bidden to put into [its] sheath? — which

[sword], nevertheless, whoever denies to be thine seems to me not sufficiently to attend to the word of the Lord, who says thus: 'Put up thy sword into the sheath.' It, then, is also thine own — to be drawn, perhaps, at thy nod, though not by thy hand. Otherwise, if it in no way pertained to thee, when the apostles said, 'Behold, [there are] two swords here,' *[margin: Luke 22.]* the Lord would not have answered, 'It is enough,' but, 'It is too much.' Both swords, therefore, are the Church's — the spiritual, namely, and the material; but the one [is to be wielded] for the Church, the other also by the Church: the one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hand of the soldier — yet, to be sure, at the nod of the priest and the command of the emperor. And of this [I have spoken] elsewhere." These [things says] Bernard — from which it is clear that he did not take away from the Roman pontiff the dominion of a temporal kingdom, but rather conferred [it].

But you will say: How, then, are his premised words — which seem contrary to these — to be understood? **John of Torquemada**, cardinal-priest, in the second book of the *Summa on the Church*, chapter 113, weighing Bernard's words, says that the power over temporal things is twofold — the monarchical, namely, and the pastoral. Now he calls "monarchy" that [power] which constitutes a man the monarch of the universe — that is, which so makes him the supreme and singular lord of all lands, that it is lawful for him not only to claim for himself the right and name of monarch, but also to take up subjects of his own dominion into [the governance of] principalities, kingdoms, and empires, howsoever it seem [good] to him; and to depose those [thus] taken up, even without cause, from those same kingdoms, and to transfer those kingdoms from one [person] to another at the discretion of his own will. This kind of power, therefore, he judges that the Roman pontiff cannot, by the right of the pontificate, usurp to himself.

(right column:)

Since indeed, whereas he is himself the successor of the apostolate of Peter, he cannot by apostolic right arrogate to himself that which Christ forbade to Peter and the Apostles, when — as they were disputing among themselves about the monarchy of a temporal kingdom — he said to them: "The kings of the nations lord it over them, and those who are greater exercise power upon them. It shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be greater among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be first among you, shall be your servant: *[margin: Matt. 20.]* even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," etc. Nor do the Roman pontiffs deny this — who, in their decrees, distinction 96, chapter *Cum ad verum*, confess that it is not lawful for them to snatch the titles and rights of emperors, and to usurp the secular dominions of princes.

But the pastoral power over temporal things is that which it befits the ecumenical pastor of the whole Christian world to have, from the office of pastoral care, for the preservation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and for the administration and dispensation of the spiritual goods of the Church. This [power] indeed the Roman pontiff is bound to have by apostolic right and evangelical precept. For since it was commanded him by Christ that — as the pastor of the universal Christian sheepfold — he should feed the whole flock of Christ, and to him the keys were given, by which, as the doorkeeper and key-bearer of the heavenly kingdom, he might bring the sheep entrusted to him into eternal felicity: it is necessary that he take care of princes, kings, and emperors — who are the chief sheep of the Christian flock — and strive with the utmost diligence that their dignities, empires, kingdoms, and other earthly advantages may serve for the illustration of Christ's glory, for the propagation of the worship of the Christian religion, for the strengthening of the Church's peace, and for the attaining of the beatitude of the eternal kingdom — to which, as to the mark and ultimate end of ruling, all the kingdoms of Christian kings look. It is necessary also that he himself employ a huge and assiduous solicitude, lest through the negligence or malice of secular princes heresies, schisms, dissensions, wars, and other things like these arise among the sheep committed to [his] apostolic care; and, if they have arisen, it is his part first to admonish paternally the princes who are disturbers of ecclesiastical peace, and to correct and rebuke [them] according to the law of Paul and of Christ; then, if they neglect the admonitions, to coerce them with ecclesiastical animadversions and censures. But if, perchance — given over to a reprobate

sense — they despise these too: then the pontiff (if, nevertheless, he shall know it to be expedient for ecclesiastical tranquility) will be able to absolve the peoples from the oath of obedience by which they had bound themselves to those lords, while [the latter] still ruled justly. It will also be lawful for him to deprive those lords themselves — as incorrigible and rebels against the Church — of the jurisdiction of their principalities, and to transfer their rights to other orthodox princes; summoning also, if need be, the military aids of pious dukes and kings for the correction of the rebelling sons. Which [thing] the gravest writers testify was of old, and often, and by right, done by the Roman pontiffs — among whom Innocent, pontiff, the first of that name, on account of the unjust expulsion of John Chrysostom, marked with anathema Arcadius Augustus; whose father, Theodosius the Great, Augustus, St. Ambrose — on account of the slaughter of certain inno-

[catchword "inno-" → "…innocents [perpetrated]," continues on p. 461 (PDF 466).]

(printed p. 461 [PDF p. 466], recto — end of Ann. LXXII and Ann. LXXIII–LXXV, on Matthew 17 (popes who deposed emperors; the "six days" = 6000 years; Moses at the Transfiguration; clerical tax-immunity). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXXII's catalog:)

[on account of the slaughter of certain] innocent Christians, not long before had expelled from the Church. **Gelasius the First** bound Anastasius the Emperor — [who] thought not rightly concerning religion — with the bond of excommunication. **Zacharias the First** cast down Carloman, king of the Franks, from the royal dignity, because he was useless in administering the kingdom, Pippin — his brother, and the father of Charlemagne — being substituted in his place. **Hadrian the First** compelled Desiderius, king of the Lombards, hastening to the sacking of the city of Rome, by pontifical edict to return into Insubria; and, Charlemagne, king of the Franks, being summoned, shook off the Lombard yoke from the neck of Italy. **Gregory the Third** interdicted the emperor Leo the Third from the communion of the faithful, because he had caused all the sacred images to be cast out of the churches. **Leo the Third**, pontiff, when he saw the care of the Christian commonwealth neglected by the Greek emperors, transferred the rights of the Roman empire from Constantine, son of Irene, to Charlemagne, king of the Franks; and conferred on him the title of Augustus and the insignia of emperor. **Leo the Eighth** again, for just causes, transferred the empire from the Franks to the Germans, and named Otto, duke of the Saxons, the first emperor from Germany; and not long after, **Gregory the Fifth** granted to the German princes the perpetual right of electing the Caesars — the authority of confirming those whom they should have elected being nevertheless reserved to himself and to his successors. **Gregory the Seventh** interdicted the emperor Henry the Third [IV], rebelling against the Apostolic See, from all sacred [things], and deposed [him] from the empire; nor did he restore him to his former dignity except [when] begging pardon for [his] error. **Alexander the Third** permitted the emperor Frederick Barbarossa — ensnared with anathema and cast down from the imperial majesty, because he assailed the Roman Church with an unjust war — not to be recalled to the empire before he, [as] a suppliant, should beg that his fault be forgiven him. I pass over, for the sake of brevity, **Urban the Second**, by whose edict, standard, and watchword that holy and memorable war against the Saracens was accomplished, by which the kingdoms of Jerusalem and Syria were again received [back] by the Christians. I omit **Gregory the Fourth, Leo the Fourth, Nicholas the First, John the Eighth**, and very many other pontiffs, who by warlike expeditions vindicated into liberty Italy, Sicily, and various shores of Spain, snatched from the servitude of the Saracens. All which [things], indeed, since neither they themselves could bring to effect without a certain procuration, administration, and jurisdiction over temporal things, nor can other pontiffs fulfill such offices of the pastoral duty without that same jurisdiction: it is manifest that the supreme prelate of the Christian religion has, over the earthly resources of the whole Christian commonwealth, a certain pastoral, administrative, and dispensatory power and authority — such as it befits the ecumenical pastor of

the Christian world to have.

These [things], therefore, being weighed in this way, to those [objections] which John Calvin and John Ferus raise from Bernard, we reply that that blessed man [Bernard] did not write such [things] with the intent of taking away from the Roman pontiff the pastoral power of administering and dispensing temporal things — [a power] which he himself proved, as we have now shown, by most abundant testimony; but that he [wrote them] to admonish the Roman

(right column:)

pontiff not to usurp to himself, by apostolic right, the monarchical domination over secular possessions — [a domination] forbidden to the apostles by Christ. Which [thing] he himself indicated not obscurely, when, in the second book of the aforesaid work — after he had discoursed much about the pontiff's authority — he at last added: "The apostolic form, therefore, is this: domination is forbidden, ministration is enjoined." Subscribing to whom, St. Thomas, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 100, article 1, says: "Although the goods of the Church belong to the Pope as the chief dispenser, yet they are not his as [their] lord and possessor."

Annotation LXXIII

"And after six days Jesus took," etc. — Matthew 17[:1]

[margin: On the duration of the world.]

Hilary, in canon 17 on Matthew, elucidating allegorically this number of six days, indicates that the universal resurrection, and the renovation of the whole age [world], will be [when] six thousand years from the creation of the world have been completed, saying thus: "When, after six days, the appearance of the Lord's glory is shown — [that is,] the time of six thousand years having rolled by — the honor of the heavenly kingdom is prefigured." **Ambrose**, explaining the present passage of the gospel, disapproves this opinion — in which, nevertheless, were once Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Lactantius, Jerome, Cyril, and Augustine. Consult Annotation 190 of book 5.

Annotation LXXIV

"And behold, there appeared to them Moses and Elijah." — Matthew 17[:3]

[margin: On Moses, appearing in the Transfiguration of Christ.]

Jerome, in the third book of the *Commentaries on Matthew*, hints that Moses had risen again from the lower regions, and in his own body was present to our Savior transfiguring himself, saying these [words]: "To the scribes and Pharisees tempting him and demanding signs from heaven, he refused to give [them], but confuted [their] depraved demand with a prudent reply. But here, to increase the faith of the Apostles, he gives a sign from heaven — Elijah descending thence, whither he had ascended, but Moses rising again from the lower regions." This same [thing] the author of the work *On the Marvels of Divine Scripture* confirms, book 3, chapter 10. **St. Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 45, says that this opinion is not to be so taken, as though the soul of Moses had resumed its [own] body; but that his soul, some other body being assumed, appeared in that manner in which angels render themselves visible in assumed bodies. An observation similar to this you have below, Annotation 145.

Annotation LXXV

"The kings of the earth — from whom do they receive tribute?" etc. — Matthew 17[:24]

[margin: Whether clerics are immune from the tributes of secular princes.]

Jerome, expounding these [words] in the third book on Matthew, **Erasmus of Rotterdam** noted in his *Annotations* with these words: "It seemed [good] to note this in passing — even if it does not properly pertain to this undertaking: [namely] that it is not sufficiently understood by me what he means, [that] which Jerome writes on this passage — 'Our Lord was, both according to the flesh and according to the spirit, the son of a king, [being] begotten either from the stock of David, or [as] the word of the omnipotent Father. Therefore tribute, as

[catchword "quasi" → "…as [free ones exempt we do not owe]," continues on p. 462 (PDF 467).]

(printed p. 462 [PDF p. 467], verso — end of Ann. LXXV and Ann. LXXVI–LXXIX, on Matthew 17–19 (clerical taxes; guardian angels; the excommunicated; lawful marriage-unions). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Erasmus citation and Sixtus's reply in Annotation LXXV:)

[tribute], as though the son of kings, he did not owe; but he who had assumed the humility of the flesh was bound to fulfill all righteousness. We unhappy [ones], who are reckoned by the name of Christ, do nothing worthy of so great a majesty. He, on account of [his] surpassing charity, for us endured even the cross, and paid tribute; [yet] we, for his honor, do not pay tribute, and — as though sons of a king — are immune from taxes. Since indeed Jerome seems to attribute this to arrogance — that ecclesiastics are burdened to pay tribute to princes — whereas today it is held [to be] the highest piety to fight tooth and nail, by every means, for the immunity of clerics." This [says] Erasmus. To whom — lest for [his] stings I return stings — we briefly reply, with evangelical modesty preserved, that Jerome does not speak of that tribute which their subjects owe to the princes of this world, but of that tribute which we all owe to Christ: [Christ] who, being such and so great, paid taxes for us; "why, then," says Jerome, "do we, wretched [ones], who profess ourselves to be the servants of Christ, not render to his majesty the due tribute of servitude?"

Annotation LXXVI

"Therefore the sons are free." — Matthew 17[:26]

[margin: Whether Christians ought to pay tributes to their [own] princes.]

Augustine, in the book of *Evangelical Questions*, question 23, expounds this passage thus: "What he said — 'Therefore the sons are free' — is to be understood [thus]: that in every kingdom the sons of the kingdom are free, that is, are not subject to tax. Much more, then, ought the sons of that kingdom, under which are all the kingdoms of the earth, to be free in any earthly kingdom [whatsoever]." Erasmus noted this passage as seemingly flattering those who think that no Christian owes taxes to his princes — on the ground that all Christians are sons of the kingdom, and all sons of the kingdom are free. I judge Augustine's exposition to be mystical, and that in it the matter treated is the tribute of carnal and diabolical servitude (from which the sons of the kingdom, called into the liberty of the spirit, wherever they live, ought to be free) — and not [the tribute] of external and political [nature], which, according to the precept of Paul and of our Savior, must be paid to princes. For the liberty of Christ does not free the sons of the evangelical kingdom from external debts, but from those interior debts, from which we daily ask to be absolved, saying, "Forgive us our debts."

Annotation LXXVII

"Their angels always see the face of the Father." — Matthew 18[:10]

[margin: Whether to individual men individual angels are assigned for [their] guard.]

Thomas Cajetan [says]: "Note well that he does not say, 'Their individual angels,' but says, 'Their angels.' For from this text it is not had that individual men, or even the individual little ones believing in Christ (of whom the text literally speaks), have individual angels; but only that they have blessed angels — for the verification of which it is not required that there be individual angels of individuals, but it suffices that there be many angels of them, that is, of their multitude." **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, in the second book [of his *Annotations*], disapproves this thus: "I confess that the words do not compel [it]; but since they are not repugnant, but rather agree [with it]; and since reason favors [it]; and since the theologians take this dogma from here; and since it has now been persuaded to all [men]; and since it moves toward edification — exciting charity

(right column:)

toward God, and calling forth from us thanksgivings toward God himself for his so great providence over us, and toward the angels themselves for their peculiar care over us, and not [merely] a common [care]; and since Scripture also elsewhere favors [it], which hints that a peculiar angel was the guardian of Peter — which Cajetan himself also noted: [this dogma] ought not in any way to be called into doubt."

Annotation LXXVIII

"Let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." — Matthew 18[:17]

[margin: Whether those speaking and eating with the excommunicated sin.]

Thomas Cajetan's exposition is this: "I would gladly see this sentence — defined by Jesus Christ — observed, and the penalty of those not hearing the Church; namely, that it would suffice for them to be held as heathens — that is, that they themselves indeed, by force of excommunication, should be held as heathens and publicans; and that other innocent [persons] should not be involved [in it] by speaking with them, who incur no sin [by] speaking and eating with heathens." **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, in the first book of [his] *Annotations*, disapproving these [things], says: "This too displeases [me], that he carps at the Church — [saying] that in imposing sentences of excommunication [the Church] has departed from the tradition of Christ; whereas, nevertheless, the Church observes nothing other than what Christ taught. For to be held as a heathen and a publican is nothing other than to deny to him [social] intercourse, companionship, and familiar conversation. For this the Jews observed toward heathens and publicans; and therefore they accused Christ, because he ate with publicans."

Annotation LXXIX

"For this cause a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife." — Matthew 19[:5]

[margin: On the marriage-unions lawful by the law of nature.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries on Matthew, seems to hold that all marriage-unions between [persons] joined by blood and affinity are lawful, except between mother and son, [and] father and daughter. For thus he left [it] written on this passage: "God instituted not only marriage, but instituted persons apt for marriage — by exempting from marriage [only] father and mother; [for] it is against the divine and natural law that a man be joined in marriage with [his] father or mother. And therefore it is said that a man shall leave [for the sake of] marriage — a daughter [her] father, and a son [his] mother — and shall cleave not to [any] woman, but to a wife; not to any [wife] whatever, but to his own. By this signifying that all other persons are apt to be spouses. For from the fact that he excluded only father and mother, he signified the rest — namely brothers and sisters, nephews and nieces — [to be] free to be husbands and wives." **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, explaining these [things], in the fifth book of [his] *Annotations*, attacks Cajetan with a prolix disputation, because by these words he openly denied that unions between [blood-]related persons are unlawful by natural and divine law, except that which is between father and

daughter, [and] mother and son. Which opinion the same bishop detests as unchaste. Cajetan wrote copiously on this matter in the commentaries on the *Secunda Secundae* of St. Thomas, question 154, article 9, where the curious reader will be able to read what impelled him to this assertion.

[catchword "Anno-" → "Anno[tatio LXXX]," continues on p. 463 (PDF 468).]

(printed p. 463 [PDF p. 468], recto — Ann. LXXX–LXXXI, on Matthew 19 (second marriages; remarriage after adultery — a father-catena). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation LXXX

"Moses, because of the hardness of heart, permitted you to dismiss [your] wives." — Matthew 19[:8]

[margin: On second marriages.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 32, in the exposition of this sentence, is believed to have condemned second marriages in these words: "The Apostles enjoined [men] to enter second marriages on account of the incontinence of men. For to take a second [wife] is, according to the precept of the Apostle, [lawful]; but according to the reckoning of truth, it is truly fornication. Yet since, with God permitting, it is committed publicly and lawfully, it becomes an honorable fornication."

Annotation LXXXI

"Whoever dismisses his wife, except for fornication, and marries another, commits adultery." — Matthew 19[:9]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to repudiate an adulterous wife, and to marry another.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries, so discusses the present passage that he seems to decree that it is lawful to repudiate an adulterous wife and to marry another. For he uses these words: "I understand, therefore, from this law of the Lord Jesus Christ, that it is lawful for a Christian to dismiss [his] wife on account of the carnal fornication of the wife herself, and that he can marry another wife — the definition of the Church always being safe[guarded], which hitherto does not appear. For the pontifical Decretals on this matter are not definitions of faith, but judicial [rulings] of fact. And the pontiffs themselves profess, as is plain — in chapter 4 *On Divorces*, and in the chapter *Licet, On the Betrothed of Two* — that the Roman pontiffs have sometimes erred in these judgments of marriages. Nor from these [things] should you understand that a wife also can dismiss a fornicating husband; because Jesus, who is true God, did not grant this — nor is the reasoning equal, as is plain; nor even in the old law could a wife repudiate [her] husband. Nor am I the first who [thus] understood the text of the gospel; since, a thousand years ago, blessed Ambrose, understanding [it] thus, taught the same on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 7." Thus Cajetan — in whose opinion very many of the ancient fathers are thought to have been, whose testimonies (usurped partly by catholics, partly by heretics, for the confirmation of this dogma) are these.

Ambrose, on the seventh chapter of the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, expounding that [text] — "I command — not I, but the Lord — that a husband not dismiss [his] wife," etc. — says: "But there is understood [the exception], 'except for the cause of fornication'; and therefore he did not add, as [he did] concerning the woman, that 'if she departs, [she should] so remain' — because it is lawful for a man to marry [another] wife, if he has dismissed a sinning wife; for he is not bound by the law in the same way as the woman [is]. For the head of the woman is the man." The same [Ambrose], speaking a little earlier of the woman, says: "But if she cannot contain herself, because she is unwilling to fight against the flesh, let her be reconciled to [her] husband. For it is not permitted to a woman to marry [again], if she has dismissed her own husband for the cause of fornication or of apostasy — or if, an unlawful wantonness impelling [her], she

seeks the [conjugal] use [with another]; because the inferior [party] does not use this law in every respect, by which the superior [does]. If, however, the husband apostatizes, or seeks to pervert the [conjugal] use of the wife: the woman still cannot marry another, nor return to him."

Tertullian, in the fourth book *Against Marcion*, elucidating that sentence of Matthew from

(right column:)

chapter 5, teaches that Christ forbade the Mosaic divorce not altogether and wholly, but conditionally. For thus he writes: "I say that Christ now made the prohibition of divorce conditionally — that is, if someone dismisses [his] wife for this [reason], that he may marry another. 'Whoever,' he says, 'dismisses [his] wife and marries another, has committed adultery'; and he who marries a woman dismissed by [her] husband is equally an adulterer, and for the same cause by which it is not lawful to dismiss [her] that another be married — [he,] taking as un-dismissed a woman unlawfully dismissed. For the marriage remains, which has not been duly dissolved: while the marriage remains, to marry [again] is adultery. So, if he prohibited conditionally to dismiss [one's] wife, he did not prohibit [it] wholly; and what he did not prohibit wholly, he permitted. You have, therefore, Christ [as] a champion of the justice of divorce."

Hilary, in canon 4 on Matthew, explaining that [text], "Whoever dismisses his wife," etc., speaks thus: "Whereas the [Mosaic] law had granted the liberty of giving a bill of divorce by the authority of a document, now the evangelical faith has enjoined upon the husband not only the will of peace, but has even imposed [the burden] of a wife forced into adultery — if, by the necessity of [her] departure, she is to be married to another — prescribing no other cause for keeping [her] from [a new] marriage than that which would pollute the husband by the fellowship of a prostituted wife."

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 32 on Matthew, has thus: "As he is cruel and unjust who dismisses a chaste [wife], so he is foolish and unjust who retains a harlot. For he is the patron of her turpitude who conceals the crime of [his] wife. We ought, therefore, to be imitators of God — that, as he deals with the Church, so we may deal with [our] spouse. For he will never forsake [her], unless she voluntarily pass over to heathenism and heresy. So too let the husband indeed dismiss a harlot; but otherwise let him chastise and keep a badly-behaved [wife]."

Chrysostom, homily 17 on Matthew, meeting those who complain that this law is burdensome, says: "Christ made this law light and easy. For he left to the husband one mode of expulsion, by saying, 'except for the cause of fornication'; otherwise all [things] would return again into the same turpitude. For if he had commanded that a wife defiled with many [men] should nevertheless be retained by the husband, he would again have turned the whole business into a license for adultery." Again, in the homily *On Divorce*, on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, chapter 7, he so condemns divorce as to except the cause of adultery, saying: "For when a husband has dismissed [his] wife without the cause of fornication, [and] when another has married [the woman] cast out while the husband lives, [that second husband] shall be punished together with that ejected [woman]."

Euthymius, the abbreviator of Chrysostom, on Matthew chapter 5, on that [text], "Whoever repudiates [his] wife," etc., speaks thus: "Moses commanded [a man] to give a bill of divorce, lest afterward he might again lay hold of [a woman] now married to another man, as [if she were] his own — and hence would arise disturbances and seditions. But Christ, instructing them more gently by the aforesaid words, commands that they not repudiate [their] wife, except for the cause of fornication. And by 'fornication' he here means adultery. For he who repudiates his [wife] apart from the cause of fornication makes her to be an adulteress, when she unites with another man; and he who marries [a woman] thus repudiated by another commits adultery with another['s wife]."

[catchword "Theo-" → "Theo[phylactus]," continues on p. 464 (PDF 469).]

(printed p. 464 [PDF p. 469], verso — Ann. LXXXI cont., on Matthew 19 (remarriage after adultery; Trent sess. 24, canon 7). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — the catena continuing:)

Theophylact, on the 16th chapter of Luke, brings in Christ speaking thus: "For behold, concerning the dissolution of marriage the [Mosaic] law gave precept on account of the murderousness of the Jews. I, training [my] hearers toward more perfect [things], forbid divorce without a reasonable cause — not teaching [things] contrary to that [law], but rather perfecting its will." And on Matthew chapter 5: "Christ did not abolish the Mosaic [law], but corrects [it], terrifying the man, that he may not without cause hold [his] wife in hatred. For if he has dismissed her for a just cause — namely, [as] fornicating — he is liable to no condemnation; but if without the cause of fornication, he is condemned. For he compels her to commit adultery. But also he who takes her [in marriage] is an adulterer. For unless he had taken [her], she would surely have returned, and been made subject to [her] husband."

Augustine, in the book *On Faith and Works*, chapter 19, testifies that it is not manifest from the divine Scriptures whether he who, after dismissing an adulterous wife, has married another, is an adulterer. His words are these: "Whoever dismisses a wife caught in adultery and marries another does not seem to be equated with those who dismiss and marry apart from the cause of adultery. And in the divine sentences themselves it is so obscure whether even this [man] — to whom, indeed, without doubt it is lawful to dismiss an adulteress — is nevertheless to be held an adulterer if he marries another; that, as far as I judge, one errs [only] venially [in this matter]."

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, in the commentaries on Matthew chapter 5, when he was explaining that [text], "Whoever dismisses [his] wife, except for the cause of fornication," etc., says: "By saying 'except for the cause of fornication' — [that] it is not lawful to dismiss a wife — he plainly shows how grave a crime of damnation before God they incur, who, through the unbridled pleasure of lust, wish — their wives dismissed without the cause of fornication — to pass over into other marriages. But just as it is not right to dismiss a wife living chastely and purely, so also it is permitted to dismiss an adulteress; because she has made herself unworthy of the husband's fellowship — she who, by sinning against her own body, has dared to violate the temple of God."

Zacharias, the first pope [of that name], decreed that a wife — [her] husband being rejected, who had defiled her sister — might marry another man, if she was unwilling to contain [herself]. And Gratian relates this decree in Cause 32, question 7, in these words: "Hast thou lain with the sister of thy wife? If thou hast done [so], mayst thou have neither. And if she who was thy wife was not conscious of the crime — [and] if she is unwilling to contain herself — let her marry in the Lord whom she will; but do thou, and the adulteress, remain without hope of marriage." There is extant, in the same Gratian, in the same question a little before, a not dissimilar decree, which is believed [to be] of the Council of Elvira, permitting a husband — his wife, who mingled herself with the husband's brother, being cast off — to marry another, in these plain words: "A certain [woman] slept with her husband's brother; it is decreed that the adulterers never be coupled in marriage; but to him whose wife was defiled, lawful marriages are not to be denied."

In the councils of Mainz and Tribur, as Gratian writes in the same place, there is another decree of the same kind, by which a man who has dismissed a wife married [by him after she had been] deflowered by [his] stepson is permitted to take another spouse. The words of the edict are these: "If anyone has slept with his stepmother, neither [of them] can attain

(right column:)

to marriage; but her husband can, if he wishes, take another, if he cannot contain himself."

Ambrose [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa, in the commentaries on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, and especially in the fifth volume of [his] *Annotations*, contends with many arguments that it is lawful for a husband, after repudiating an adulteress, to marry another wife; saying that it seems to him an exceedingly hard and unjust thing that an innocent man — meanwhile flourishing in age and prone to venery — through no fault of his own (nay, rather from another's fault, and from an injury inflicted upon himself) should be compelled to change [his] state and to lead a perpetually celibate and mournful life, joined with the burning of lust and the affliction of childlessness — whereas it is neither lawful to be joined with an adulteress, nor to seek another.

And these are the [testimonies] which I have read among catholic authors [as] worthy of note. But among heretical writers, **Philip Melanchthon**, in the Appendix of [his] *Commonplaces*, writes that in the ancient Church there was a custom that, after a divorce, it was lawful for the innocent party — the [other] spouse [still] surviving — to marry another. And, citing as a witness of this matter first of all Justin the philosopher and martyr — who, in the first *Apology for the Christians* to the Emperor Antoninus, praises a Christian woman who, when she had a husband seeking out every kind of lust, even against the laws of nature, resolved to be separated from the marriage; and when she was being drawn away from that purpose by her [friends], who urged that there was hope that at some time her husband would change [his] life and morals, doing violence to herself, she remained in the [married] life; but afterward, when she heard that her husband, having set out for Alexandria, was committing [things] much more foul still, deeming it wicked and impious to be held [bound] to so impure a spouse, sent him a bill of divorce and wholly severed herself from him, from the right of marriage and the bond of nuptials. To Justin he [Melanchthon] joins Origen, who in the seventh treatise on Matthew testifies that certain bishops were known to him who permitted wives who had made a divorce with [their] husbands to marry other men, lest something worse should follow thence. To these he wove in that noble Fabiola, celebrated in Jerome's epitaph, who — her husband of monstrous lust being repudiated — passed to a second marriage.

But against all these stands the immovable faith of the Church, by whose authority it is established that a marriage, once it has been consummated, can in no way be dissolved, except by the death of one [party]. Which opinion, indeed, all theologians ancient and more recent have taught, the decrees of the pontiffs have approved, and at last the most holy Tridentine Synod, in the twenty-fourth session, confirmed — a new canon being promulgated in these words: "If anyone shall say that the Church errs, when she taught and teaches, according to evangelical and apostolic doctrine, that on account of the adultery of one of the spouses the bond of marriage cannot be dissolved; and that both [parties] — or even the innocent one, who gave no cause for the adultery — cannot, the other spouse [being] alive, contract another marriage; and that he commits adultery who, the adulteress being dismissed, marries another, and she who, the adulterer being dismissed, marries another — let him be anathema."

Therefore, lest any scruple from the adduced sentences of the fathers — which seem to be opposed to this canon — settle in the reader's mind: it is to be known that the catholic authors are distinguished in a twofold order. Of these, the former em-

[catchword "com-" → "…em[braces]," continues on p. 465 (PDF 470).]

(printed p. 465 [PDF p. 470], recto — end of Ann. LXXXI and Ann. LXXXII, on Matthew 19 (divorce resolved; whether polygamy is forbidden by natural law). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXXXI:)

[the former order] embraces [those] who indeed grant, counsel, and sometimes enjoin husbands to cast out of the house adulterous wives — especially incorrigible [ones] — and to repudiate [them]; but neither persuade nor permit [them] to take another spouse. It embraces also those who separate husbands from the bed and

cohabitation of an adulterous spouse, but absolve no married [person], the other [being] alive, from the right of matrimony, from the covenant of nuptials, and from the bond of the sacrament. In this series are Hilary, Chrysostom, Chromatius, the author of the *Opus imperfectum*, Euthymius, Theophylact, and especially Augustine — who, in the book *On Adulterous Marriages*, and in very many other places, openly affirms that it is lawful for any chaste man (nay, even fitting) to cast out an adulterous wife; but that, she surviving, to enter a second marriage is never lawful for anyone.

In the latter order are placed those who teach a divorce of both kinds — that is, [both] from cohabitation and from the marriage-bond. And these too are divided into three classes: of which the first contains those who propose this position not as a sentence of firm determination, but as a probable opinion, to be sifted by the disputations of the learned, and to be judged by the authority of the Church — such as, in our age, were Thomas Cajetan, cardinal-priest, and Ambrose [Catharinus], archbishop of Compsa. The second holds those who permitted such repudiations, and sometimes commanded [them], sanctions and decrees being promulgated on these [matters] — not indeed general and perpetual [ones], but for a time; and that for certain nations and peoples, and only in [cases of] incest and certain other atrocious crimes — lest far worse and fouler [things] be perpetrated by those who could not tolerate such foul marriages. In the number of these are to be placed those bishops who, in the time of Origen, granted repudiations; likewise Pope Zacharias the First, and all those fathers who, in the provincial synods of Elvira, Mainz, and Tribur, established the same for their [own] provincials for that time. The third class, finally, comprises those who, by a certain and indubitable assertion, approved the license of both [kinds of] repudiation — such as Tertullian and Ambrose; although the Master of the Sentences, in the fourth book, distinction 35, judges Ambrose's commentaries in that place to have been corrupted by forgers.

Let these [things], said in reply to those [testimonies] which are brought forward from catholic writers, suffice. But to those which have been adduced by the heretics, we reply very briefly: that Origen does not praise that deed of the bishops — nay, he says that they did [it] against the precept of divine Scripture, even though they permitted it lest worse [things] should follow. Justin, moreover, praises that woman because she made a divorce; but he does not say that she married another, the former husband [being] still alive — which was what Philip [Melanchthon] had to prove from that same author. Jerome, too, so far from approving Fabiola's boldness, expressly professes that she acted against the law of Paul, nay of Christ — [in] that, ignorant of the vigor of the gospel, she married another, and was therefore guilty of sin. For he says: "But why do I linger among abolished and ancient [matters], seeking to excuse the fault of Fabiola, which she herself confessed by public penance?" Let these [things], said concerning divorce, suffice.

(right column:)

Annotation LXXXII

"Whoever dismisses [his] wife, except for the cause of fornication, and marries another, commits adultery." — Matthew 19[:9]

[margin: Whether plurality of wives is prohibited by natural or by divine law.]

Thomas Cajetan is accused by Ambrose [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa, [on the ground] that in the commentaries on Matthew, sifting this passage, he hints that a plurality of wives at the same time was never forbidden either by natural law or by the divine laws. And the words which afford such a suspicion are these: "Observe that from this [passage] Innocent the Third — [in the Decretals] *Extra, On Divorces*, chapter *Gaudeamus* — takes it that it is not lawful to have several wives. For if it were lawful to have several wives, [then] he who, without dismissing a fornicating [wife], took another, would not commit adultery, but would [merely] use marriage with the second [wife]. But in the text it is said that he commits adultery. And unless Mark had added 'against her,' Innocent's argument would lack [its] scruple."

Ambrose [Catharinus], in the fifth book of [his] *Annotations*, charging against Cajetan that elsewhere too he professed this dogma more clearly, defends Innocent's argument, writing in this manner: "The argument of Pope Innocent the Third — a most holy and most learned man — is unconquerable. For he, condemning the plurality of wives, and forbidding [it] even to converted pagans (who, before they came to the faith, were thus joined [to several wives] according to their own laws), says thus: 'This seems dissonant, and hostile to the Christian faith, since from the beginning one rib was turned into one woman, and Scripture testifies, "For this cause a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh." He did not say "Three, or More," but "Two"; nor did he say "He shall cleave to [his] wives," but "to [his] wife."' And below: 'Nor was it ever lawful for anyone to have several wives at once, except when it was granted by divine revelation (which custom is then reckoned to be lawful) — through which, just as Jacob [is excused] from lying, the Israelites from theft, and Samson from homicide, so too the patriarchs and other just men, who are read to have had several wives at once, are excused from adultery. Truly this veracious sentence is proved also by the testimony of the Truth, testifying in the gospel: "Whoever dismisses his wife and marries another commits adultery." But if, [his] wife being dismissed, another cannot lawfully be married, [then] much more [is it so] with her [still] retained. By which it evidently appears that plurality is to be reproved in each sex, since they are not judged [to be] on unequal terms.' These [things says] he in the chapter *Gaudeamus*, *On Divorce*. Nor does it avail that the Cardinal [Cajetan], meeting this argument, says that what Matthew says — 'He commits adultery' — is absolutely completed by Mark, who says, 'He commits adultery against her.' But what [is] this to the matter? Does he, I ask, who commits adultery against his [own] wife, therefore not commit adultery? Or does he who commits adultery not commit adultery against his wife? This was the nerve of Innocent's argument: that if it were lawful to have several wives, surely he who — the first being dismissed — married another, would not commit adultery, nor would he commit adultery against her, because he would be using his own right, even if he did evil to her by dismissing her. Efficacious, therefore, is Innocent's argument, and burdensome [inadequate] is the reply of the most reverend [Cajetan] — as the Philosopher said concerning Melissus." These [things says] Ambrose [Catharinus].

[signature "Qq"; catchword "Libet"(?) → continues on p. 466 (PDF 471).]

(printed p. 466 [PDF p. 471], verso — end of Ann. LXXXII and Ann. LXXXIII–LXXXVI, on Matthew 19 (Christian warfare; death-bed suffrages; religious vows). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation LXXXII:)

It is worth noting here in passing that, when I searched among ecclesiastical authors — especially those who wrote on heresies — [to find] who among Christians had been the author of the aforesaid dogma [of polygamy], I found no one who asserted it except the one emperor Valentinian: who, as Socrates relates in the fourth book of the *Ecclesiastical History*, although he thought rightly about the Trinity and held catholic opinions on the rest, yet in this [matter] declined from the rectitude of the faith. For, whereas he had a wife Severa — or, as others read, Serena — from whom he had begotten Gratian Augustus, now a youth, he, retaining her, married also Justina, the daughter of Justus, captivated by the beauty of the maiden — a law being passed too, that it should be lawful for anyone to have two wives at once. And from this Justina was born Valentinian the Younger, who afterward reigned as Augustus together with the Augusti Gratian and Valens.

[margin: Julius Caesar caused a law to be made, by which it was lawful — for the sake of begetting children — to take as many wives as each wished to marry.]

Annotation LXXXIII

"He who can take [it], let him take [it]." — Matthew 19[:12]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for Christians to wage war.]

Origen, in the seventh treatise on Matthew — [of those] which we now have — writes thus: "Jesus answered, 'He who has not, let him sell his garment and buy a sword.' If, therefore, anyone, wishing to regard the letter and not understanding the will of the words, should sell [his] bodily garment and buy a sword — such a one, taking [Christ's] word against the will of Christ, will perish. But of what sword he speaks, it is not [the business] of this place to expound." **Erasmus**, in the *Annotations* on chapter 22 on Luke, quite wrongly maintains that Origen was of the opinion that it is in no way lawful for Christians to wage war; and he says that Origen held this also in the second book *Against Celsus*. But of these [matters], see below, Annotation 156.

Annotation LXXXIV

"For of such is the kingdom of heaven." — Matthew 19[:14]

[margin: Whether every corporeal thing is evil.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 32, at the end writes thus: "The reason why foods are to be sanctified is this — that the whole world is placed in [the power of] the evil one. Therefore also every corporeal thing, since it is a part of the world, is placed in [the power of] the evil one, and it too must be sanctified." **Peter, bishop of Crete**, in the second [book] of the *Sentences*, in the question *On Evil*, says that this passage is wont to be adduced, under the name of Chrysostom, by those who — according to the dogma of Mani — asserted this world to be by nature evil and founded by an evil principle. And he adds that this saying is to be interpreted not according to the nature of the world (which is good, and proceeds from a good author), but according to the malignity of those who use the goods of the world badly.

Annotation LXXXV

"The young man says to him, 'All these I have kept from my youth.'" — Matthew 19[:20]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to procure for oneself, from the goods left at [one's] death, suffrages after this life.]

Basil, at the end of the sermon which he delivered on this passage, seems to explode the custom of those who, dying, prescribe that, from the goods left at [their] death, suffrages be made for them after death. For thus he speaks: "Do not err; God is not mocked. What is dead is not brought to the altar: bring [rather], he says, thy living victim. He who offers from the surplus is not admitted. Superfluous and rejected [things], if they be offered, lack grace.

(right column:)

But wilt thou offer to thy benefactor [the things] that shall be left over to thee after thy whole life [is done]? If thou darest not to receive distinguished men with the leavings of [thy] table, how darest thou to appease God with leavings?" **John Damascene** noticed this passage, and disclosed its right understanding in the sermon *On the Care to be Taken for the Dead*, writing in this manner: "Well does that great Basil both speak and teach; but see to whom — namely, to the avaricious, to plunderers, to those who have known neither covenant nor mercy — as he himself testifies, saying: 'We are speaking to a stony heart; and as long as thou wast alive, thou wast given over to delights and pleasures, and thou didst overflow [with them], not bearing that the poor should so much as look upon thee; [now] that thou art dead, what reward, thinkest thou, [is due]? What fruit shall be given to thy work?' And again: 'The neighboring house makes mine dark; and the avaricious [man] neither reveres time, nor knows bounds, but, like fire, invades and lays waste all things, and, like a rapid torrent rushing with force, drags [things] cast [before it] along with itself.' And other [things]

like these, known to all who diligently attend to that most holy book of his. From which [it is] clear that the discourse was elaborated against those who have no care for the poor." These [things says] Damascene on Basil's behalf — [Basil] whom I too believe not to have wished, by these words, to take away the force of the suffrages which the faithful shall have arranged to be made for them after death, but rather to have wished to commend those [good works] which each does for himself while he lives.

Annotation LXXXVI

"Go, and sell all that thou hast," etc. — Matthew 19[:21]

[margin: On monastic vows.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the explanation of this passage, Ambrose [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa, confutes — [on the ground] that he thought ill concerning the vows of religious. For thus he writes, in the second book of [his] *Annotations*: "I judged that [statement] to be altogether disapproved and exploded, which Cajetan says on Matthew chapter 19: 'Attend, prudent reader, that no vow is enjoined by Jesus upon one wishing to attain the perfection of life; because the attainment of perfection consists not in the bonds of vows, but in works.' On Luke also, chapter 14, he writes thus: 'To renounce all that we possess is commanded by Christ, as [to those] professing the perfection of the apostolic life; and I understand "to renounce" [to mean] by deed — whatever be [the case] concerning a vow. For that is the true renunciation which we read of in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the holy ancient fathers — Ambrose, Antony, Paul, Benedict.'" These same [things] he confirms there and elsewhere — [things] which manifestly assist the Lutheran and Erasmian doctrine; wherefore they are to be utterly overthrown. First, then, against these [stands] the opinion of Augustine, who writes thus of the Apostles: "For those powerful [men] had said, 'Behold, we have left all and followed thee.' This vow they had vowed most powerfully; but whence [came] this to them, except from Him of whom it is said just here, '[He who] gives the vow to the one vowing'?" Gregory, on Ezekiel, teaches thus: "When anyone vows to almighty God all that he lives [by], all that he tastes [of], it is a holocaust"; and [he says] that this pertains to those who forsake the present world. Whoever, therefore, denies that the Apostles did this, denies also that they forsook the world.

[catchword "An-" → "An[notatio LXXXVII]," continues on p. 467 (PDF 472).]

(printed p. 467 [PDF p. 472], recto — Ann. LXXXVII–XCI, on Matthew 20 (the vineyard laborers; grace vs. debt; Moses not yet dead). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation LXXXVII

"He went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard," etc. — Matthew 20[:1]

[margin: Whether those called by God are called on account of [their] merits.]

Chrysostom, homily 56 on Matthew, asking why [the householder] did not hire all the laborers into the vineyard immediately from the beginning, so answers the question that he seems to ascribe the grace of the divine calling — which is given freely — to the will and faith of those called, in these words: "He would indeed have hired all from the beginning, but from the will of the called this difference resulted. Therefore some are called at the [first] morning [hour], some at the third, some at the sixth, some at the ninth, some at the eleventh hour — because then they were about to obey. Which Paul also plainly signified, saying: 'But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb.' *[margin: Gal. 1.]* But when did it please him? Assuredly, when [Paul] was about to obey. For [God] would have [called him] even from [his] first infancy; but because he knew that he would resist, he willed [it] then, when he knew that the calling would penetrate his mind. So too, when he afterward called the thief, he could have called him earlier; but that

[thief], [if] called, would not have obeyed. For if Paul had not obeyed from the beginning, much less would that thief [have]."

This same solution of the question — very often repeated by Chrysostom, with almost the same examples and words — Augustine once employed, in the book of *Six Questions against the Pagans*, question 2. Where, answering Porphyry — [who was] asking why Christ did not come in the earlier ages to call all men to the way of salvation and to the truth — he says thus: "Let us say only this, for brevity's sake, in the solution of this question: that Christ willed then to appear to men, and his doctrine to be preached among them, when he knew, and where he knew there to be, those who were going to believe in him. For in those times and in those places in which the gospel was not preached, he foreknew that all [men] would be, in [the case of] its preaching, such as many were in his bodily presence — who were unwilling to believe in him, even [when] the dead were raised by him."

Afterward reproving this response, Augustine, in the book *On the Good of Perseverance*, chapter 9, and in the second book of the *Retractations*, chapter 31, [in reference] to the second question, says: "What I said, I did not say as though anyone was worthy of the calling from his own merits; but, as the Apostle says, [that] it was said 'not from works, but from Him who calls' — *[margin: Rom. 9.]* 'The elder shall serve the younger.'" Which calling he asserts pertains to the purpose of God — not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace; and whence he likewise says: "We know that to those who love God all things work together for good — [to those] who, according to [his] purpose, are called [to be] holy." *[margin: Rom. 8.]* Concerning which calling he says: "That he may hold you worthy of his holy calling." Wherefore, [see] below the elucidation of Chrysostom's sentence, Annotation 251.

Annotation LXXXVIII

"The lord says to his steward," etc. — Matthew 20[:8]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 34 on Matthew, writes that the Father and the Son are neither of the same dignity nor of the same substance, in these words: "He says to his steward. To what steward? Without doubt the Son says [it] to the Holy Spirit. And, if you wish, I grant to you that the Father says [it] to the Son. I do not inquire whether the Son is the Father's steward, or the Holy Spirit the Son's; but this I say — that a steward of the house and the householder cannot be of the same substance, nor be one person, nor [of] equal dignity. If, therefore, the one is [the] householder, the other the householder's steward: how can your 'Trinity' have place? But if this [steward] is of the same substance, and is [yet] less, he does injury to the substance; but if [there is] not equal dignity, where is [there] one substance?"

(right column:)

Annotation LXXXIX

"Call the laborers, and pay them their wage." — Matthew 20[:8]

John Ferus, in the third book of the commentaries on Matthew, after the exposition of this passage, brought in these words: "This parable teaches that whatever is given to us by God is grace, not a debt. For all our righteousnesses [are] as a menstruous cloth; nay, not even the sufferings of this time are worthy of the future glory. But if you sometimes hear a reward promised, know that it is due for no other reason than that, by [his] divine promise, he freely promised [it] and freely renders [it]. If, therefore, you desire to preserve the grace and favor of God, make no mention of your [own] merits." **Jerome, bishop of Verona**, in the commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, censures Ferus, [on the ground] that in this and in this [passage], and in very many other places, he overthrows the merits of good works, and those two modes of meriting — of which St. Thomas, in the *Prima Secundae*, question 114, article 3, calls the one "of congruity," the other "of

condignity." I judge that Ferus's words can be bent to that sense in which above — from the doctrine of the same St. Thomas — we expounded certain sentences of Augustine, Basil, and Bernard. Consult Annotations 195, 199, and 217 of book 5.

Annotation XC

"The first shall be last," etc. — Matthew 20[:16]

[margin: The fruition [beatific vision] of the blessed.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, at the end of homily 34, seems to hint that the souls of the saints do not yet enjoy the vision of divine felicity, speaking thus: "Or [is it] for this [reason that] he says the first shall be last," etc. See below, Annotation 345.

Annotation XCI

"The mother of the sons of Zebedee came to him." — Matthew 20[:20]

[margin: Whether Moses died.]

Hilary, in canon 20 on Matthew, hands down that Moses is not yet dead, but lives until the time of Antichrist — in whose [time] he will be slain together with the prophet Elijah. His words run thus: "Christ, having taken Peter and James and John, appeared with the appearance of his glory, Moses and Elijah accompanying [him] on the mountain. And we understand these same two prophets, [who were] preceding his [Antichrist's] coming, [to be those] whom John's Apocalypse says are to be slain by Antichrist — although the opinions of very many have arisen variously, whether concerning Enoch or concerning Jeremiah, that the other of them, like Elijah, must die. But we cannot corrupt the truth of the faith, which the Lord revealed by the three above-mentioned witnesses, by the opinion of our own [private] sense —

[signature "Qq 2"; catchword "cor-" → "…cor[rupt]," continues on p. 468 (PDF 473).]

(printed p. 468 [PDF p. 473], verso — end of Ann. XCI and Ann. XCII–XCVI, on Matthew 20–21 (Arian Opus imperfectum *censures; John the Evangelist martyred?; Christian trade; "Hosanna"). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation XCI, Hilary on Moses:)

— nor think that others are to come than those who have been seen to come to the pledge of faith. And although it is not necessary to opine beyond the evangelical truth: yet if anyone diligently considers the condition both of the death and of the sepulcher of Moses — [and] if he has obtained knowledge of the secret [hidden] Scriptures, according to the authority of the Apostle — he will understand that all [these things] were so treated [handled] that Moses could now [already] have been seen. That Ambrose thought this same [thing] is clear from those [passages] which were noted above, Annotation 61 of book 5.

Annotation XCII

"And on the third day he shall rise again." — Matthew 20[:19]

[margin: On the Son of God.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 35, seems to embrace the dogma and expressions of Arius, calling the Son of God "unbegotten God from unbegotten God." His words are these: "But also, after three days he shall rise again in the souls of those believing in him, when three days have been completed in them. The first day [is] the Father, the second day the Son — according to what is said in the prophet: 'Announce

from day to day his salvation.' But what is [meant by 'one] day from [another] day,' except unbegotten God from unbegotten God? Consequently the Holy Spirit too is the third day; since by these three the hearts of believers are illuminated."

Annotation XCIII

"You shall indeed drink my cup." — Matthew 20[:23]

[margin: On the death of John the Evangelist.]

Chrysostom, homily 66 on Matthew, relates that John the Evangelist — whom many very grave authors have written to be still alive — died, slain by a violent death. For thus he introduces Christ speaking to the sons of Zebedee: "You shall indeed drink my cup. Great goods do I foretell to you: for you shall obtain the crown of martyrdom, and by a violent death, as I too, you shall depart from life, and in these [things] you shall have communion with me." And in the homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews 27, on that word, "Others were stretched out," etc., describing the kind of martyrdom and death of both, he says: "In this passage he seems to me to signify John and James. For 'distention' is said [to mean] beheading — unless perhaps by 'John' he understood the Baptist, beheaded by Herod." Certainly Euthymius, in [his] commentaries, testifies that Chrysostom taught — not only in the present homily, but also in the first and second homily on the gospel of John — that the Evangelist was slain in Asia. **George of Trebizond**, citing this passage from the homily on Matthew, in [his] book *On John [being] still alive*, says that Chrysostom speaks of the martyrdom and violent death which John — preaching penance at the end of the age together with Enoch and Elijah — will suffer under the last persecution of Antichrist.

Annotation XCIV

"It is not mine to give to you." — Matthew 20[:23]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 35 on Matthew, denies that the Son is coequal and consubstantial with the Father, in these words: "What then — did Christ lie, saying, 'It is not mine [to give]'? No. For everyone who has power, if he has [it] received from another, [that power] truly belongs to him who gave [it]. For what did the Son have as his own, since he himself was not his own, but the Father's? Therefore between him and [the one] whose [the power] is not, [there is] neither one person,

(right column:)

nor equal power. For if [there is] one God — both Father and Son — either assuredly he can, or assuredly he cannot [do a thing]. Who has [ever] seen such a one heavenly God worshipped — [one] who in half is powerful, and in half powerless? Or who would think those equal, whose power is not equal?"

Annotation XCV

"And he cast out those selling and buying." — Matthew 21[:12]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for Christians to exercise trade.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 38, judges that all merchants are to be cast out of the Church — and especially those who buy things, not that they may exercise a craft upon them, but that they may sell them more dearly. And he speaks in this manner: "No Christian ought to be a merchant; or, if he wishes to be [one], let him be cast out of the Church." And below: "I will show you who is not a trader — that you may understand that all who are not [conformed] to this rule are traders: that is, whoever purchases a thing, not that he may sell the thing itself whole and undefiled, but that he may make a work out of it, he is not a trader.

For he who purchases for himself material to work with, from which to make a work — he does not sell the thing itself, but rather his own craftsmanship: that is, he who sells a thing whose valuation is not in the thing itself, but in the craftsmanship of the work — that is not trading. For instance, a smith buys iron and makes a tool; but that tool has not as much of iron as it is worth, but is priced according to the work of the tool. But he who buys a thing that he may profit by giving [selling] it whole and unchanged — he is the merchant who is cast out of the temple of God." **St. Thomas**, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 77, noting this passage as [being] Chrysostom's, says that it is not to be understood of every kind of merchant, but only of those who set the ultimate end of the whole business in gain. For gain itself too can be lawfully sought by merchants — not as the ultimate end, but for the sake of another necessary and honorable end. And to this sense also, he says, is to be referred what Cassiodorus brought forth against traders, in the exposition of Psalm 70. See above, Annotation 187 of book 5.

Annotation XCVI

"Hosanna to the son of David." — Matthew 21[:9]

[margin: What "Hosanna" signifies.]

Jerome, in the little book to Damasus, faults **Hilary** — who expounds this [word] in canon 21 on Matthew — because, through inexperience of the Hebrew tongue, he interpreted "Hosanna" [as] "Redemption of the house of David": whereas among the Hebrews the word written *pheduth* (פדות) means "redemption," and "house" [is] *beth* (בית), while "David" is the same word among the Hebrews as among the Greeks and Latins. And [Jerome] indicates that this passage is taken from Psalm 117 [118], in which, besides other [things] which are found manifestly said of Christ, this too is read: "O Lord, save me; O Lord, prosper [me] well: blessed [is] he who comes in the name of the Lord." Moreover, for that which is [rendered] in the Septuagint translators [as] "O Lord, save me," in the Hebrew is read *Anna Yehovah oshi'ah-na* (אנא יהוה הושיעה נא) — which [Jerome] interpreted more clearly

[catchword "est" → "…[interpreted] more clearly," continues on p. 469 (PDF 474).]

(printed p. 469 [PDF p. 474], recto — end of Ann. XCVI and Ann. XCVII–CI, on Matthew 21–22 (grace subtracted?; the Jews' knowledge of Christ's deity; love of neighbor and Pelagianism). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation XCVI, on "Hosanna":)

— is Symmachus, saying, "I beseech [thee], O Lord, save me." For *oshi'ah* (הושיעה), "save," signifies [that]; and *na* (נא), "na," is an interjection among the Hebrews, as of one earnestly demanding or imploring. Ambrose interprets "Hosanna" in almost the same way as Hilary. Euthymius expounds [it as] "a hymn," or "praise"; and he says that "Hosanna to the son of David" is the same as if you should say, "A hymn to the son of David."

Annotation XCVII

"And he went abroad." — Matthew 21[:33]

[margin: On the subtraction of grace.]

Ambrose [Catharinus], reproving Thomas Cajetan's exposition in the second book of [his] *Annotations*, says: "That which he expounds in the parable of the vineyard — that the 'going abroad' is a subtraction of the gratuitous help which preserves them from evil — I judge false and dangerous: because, if [God] did this, he would unjustly demand fruit. And in other parables, although the lord [has] gone abroad, they nevertheless

render him the gain of the talents and the minae — which would not be [so], if such a 'going abroad' signified that, namely, a subtraction of the divine help."

Annotation XCVIII

"This is the heir." — Matthew 21[:38]

[margin: Whether the Jews recognized the deity of Christ.]

Strabo, in the [ordinary] Gloss, expounds the present clause thus: "It is plain from these words of the Jews that the princes crucified the Son of God not through ignorance, but through envy. For they understood him to be that [one] to whom the Father says through the prophet, 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance.'" **St. Thomas**, in the third part of the *Summa*, question 47, article 5, notes this passage — adduced under the name of Jerome — as repugnant to the Apostle, saying to the Corinthians, "If they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory." Then, removing a repugnance of this kind, he writes thus: "It must be said that those words, 'This is the heir,' are said not in the person of the whole people of the Jews, but in the person of the tenant-farmers of the vineyard — by whom are signified the rulers of that people, who knew him to be the heir, inasmuch as they knew him to be the Christ promised in the Law. But against this response it seems [to stand] that those words of the psalm, 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance,' are said to the same [one] to whom it is said, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.' *[margin: Ps. 2.]* If, therefore, they knew him to be the [one] to whom it was said, 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance,' it follows that they knew him to be the Son of God." Chrysostom too, in the same place, says that they knew him to be the Son of God. Bede also, on that [text] of Luke 23, "For they know not what they do," says: "It is to be noted that he does not pray for those who preferred to crucify [him] whom they had understood to be the Son of God, rather than to confess [him]." But to this it can be answered that they knew him to be the Son of God not by nature, but by the excellence of [his] singular grace. We can, however, say that they are also said to have known [him to be] the true Son of God, because they had evident signs of this thing — to which, nevertheless, they were unwilling to assent, on account of hatred and envy, so as [not] to acknowledge him to be the Son of God.

(right column:)

Annotation XCIX

"Many are called, but few chosen." — Matthew 22[:14]

[margin: Whether election is from merit.]

Theophylact, explaining this, is noted [censured] by the heretic Oecolampadius, his translator — [on the ground] that he ascribed to the merits of the elect the election of God, which Paul attributes to divine grace alone, in these words: "Many are called, but few chosen. For [there are] few who are saved, and who [are] worthy to be chosen by God: so that to call [is] indeed God's [part]; but to become elect, or not, is ours." He shows, therefore, that the parable was spoken on account of the Jews: who were indeed called, but not chosen, because they did not hear [obey]. See below, Annotation 251.

Annotation C

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." — Matthew 22[:37]

[margin: On the Trinity.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 42, shows that the Son is not the first God, as the Father is, in these words: "The first commandment [is], and [is] great, to love God the Father; but the second, like to it, is to love the Son of God — that is, to acknowledge [him]. Therefore the Son of God is great, as the Father [is].

For whatever the Father can [do], the Son too can [do]. For the Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hands. But because the Son can [do] all things — the Father giving [the power] — as the Father [can]: therefore the Father [is] great God, and first; but the Son [is] indeed great God, yet not first — as [Paul] says, 'Awaiting the coming of the great God, and of our Savior Jesus Christ.'"

Annotation CI

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." — Matthew 22[:39]

[margin: Whether the precepts of the second table can be fulfilled without the grace of God.]

Ambrose [Catharinus], in the second book, disapproves Thomas Cajetan's exposition as Pelagian, in these words: "The commandment concerning [the] neighbor — of which the Lord [speaks], 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' — he [Cajetan] says is not to be understood of love from charity. And he proves [it thus]: because this precept presupposes proper [self-]love, which can be fulfilled without charity, as is plain in those keeping all the precepts of the second table without charity; and so it does not presuppose love from charity. Therefore love of neighbor from charity is not commanded [here]." Thus he [Cajetan], firstly. But it is false, what he assumes as [if] granted — namely, that the precepts of the second table can be fulfilled without charity and the grace of God; nay, according to Augustine's opinion, it is Pelagian. For nothing would prevent [that] even without charity the precepts of the first table too could be fulfilled — which Cajetan himself also admits. And so, without grace and charity, the whole Law and the Prophets could be fulfilled, and Christ would abound to us superfluously. But this is the very dogma of Pelagius. He adds a second argument, and says: "Here love of neighbor is commanded from the example of proper [self-]love, [which is] certain and indubitable — that is, 'as thou dost in fact love thyself'; but love of neighbor from charity is not certain and indubitable." Thus he. And this too, which he assumes, is most false: because love of neighbor is not commanded us [to be] as we in fact love ourselves, but as we are reasonably bound to love our-

[signature "Qq 3"; catchword "metipsos" → "…our[selves]," continues on p. 470 (PDF 475).]

(printed p. 470 [PDF p. 475], verso — end of Ann. CI and Ann. CII–CIV, on Matthew 23–24 (wearing gospels/crosses; the Nicene homoousios*; the marks of the true Church). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CI, Sixtus refuting Cajetan:)

— ourselves: for so ought the words of the law to be interpreted; lest otherwise, if anyone perversely loves himself in fact — as are those who willingly work iniquity — they should even receive the commandment of loving [their] neighbor thus; which it is insane to admit. For that [saying] too, "Whatever you wish that men do to you," is not understood [as] "whatever you wish in fact," but "whatever you ought reasonably to wish, by [right] estimation" — as Cajetan himself there expounds, and rightly. And as for what he adds in the third [place] — that love of neighbor from charity is not commanded [here] because it would be superfluously commanded, since it is implicitly contained in the first commandment concerning the love of God — this, in truth, elegantly overturns his own exposition. For if in the first commandment is contained the commandment of love of neighbor from charity, then it is superfluous to command that [the neighbor] be loved not from charity, since it is enough — nay, more [than enough] — to love [him] from charity. For grace does not destroy nature, but perfects [it]. Add [too] that if the first commandment concerning the love of God is understood [to be] from charity, and this second is said [to be] "like to it," as the Lord says: certainly it too ought to be understood [as] from charity in like manner; otherwise it would be very unlike, and would differ [as far] as darkness differs from light.

See, then, how he is deceived everywhere, and errs, as is said, at the very doors [threshold]. For these are the principles of our faith. For he too, writing on Deuteronomy chapter 6, holds that both these precepts, handed down there — "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," etc. — are not [to be] understood [as] from charity. But if this is true, then it would be false [that] the Lord [says] that this was the greatest commandment. For it would not be the greatest, since a far greater [one] would be given — namely, to love from charity. Likewise, [Christ] would falsely have promised eternal life to the one doing it — for thus he said, "Do this, and thou shalt live." And it would be false that on this [depend] the whole Law and the Prophets. And [it would be] false that it was greater than all holocausts, etc.

Annotation CII

"For they enlarge their phylacteries, and magnify [their] fringes." — Matthew 23[:5]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to hang gospels and crosses on the neck.]

Jerome, in the fourth book on Matthew, seems to condemn the custom of those who, out of a pious affection of mind, carry divine words and sacred things hung on the neck, saying thus: "The Pharisees did not understand that these [things] are to be carried in the heart, not on the body; otherwise both cupboards and chests have books, and [yet] do not have the knowledge of God. This, among us, superstitious little women — with tiny gospels, and with the wood of the cross, and things of this kind, which have indeed a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge — do to this day, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel." The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 44, in the exposition of the same sentence, seems to agree with Jerome, in these words: "Many, by the example of the scribes and Pharisees, invent certain Hebrew names of angels, and write [them], and bind [them] on themselves — which to those not understanding the Hebrew tongue seem, as it were, [things] to be feared. But some [bind on themselves] a written part of the gospel. Tell [me], foolish priest: is not the gospel read daily in the church, and heard by men? To whom, then, the gospels placed in [his] ears profit nothing — how shall [they], suspended around [his] neck, be able to save him? Then, where is the power of the gospel — in the figures [shapes] of the letters, or in the understanding of the meanings?

(right column:)

If in the figures, [then] you rightly suspend [it] around [your] neck; but if in the understanding, then [the gospels], placed in the heart, profit more than [when] suspended around the neck." **St. Thomas** notices this passage, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 96, article 4, saying that by these words are not condemned those who, for the sake of piety and religion, carry the divine Scriptures, the relics of the saints, and other sacred things; but [rather] those who look more to the [written] characters of Scripture than to the understanding of Scripture — and those especially who, either led by vain superstition or puffed up by ambition, carry these [things] about. Those, therefore, who carry things and words of this kind out of trust in God and reverence for the saints, are in no way to be accused. For we read that blessed Cecilia always carried the gospel-codex in [her] bosom; and that Constantine Augustus carried the nail of Christ about in [his] diadem; and that the Apostle Barnabas cured the sick by the touch of the gospel-writing.

Annotation CIII

"Nation shall rise against nation." — Matthew 24[:7]

[margin: On the Homoousion [consubstantial].]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 48, says that the assertion of the catholics — who teach the Son [to be] "homoousion" with the Father, that is, consubstantial — is a heresy which is opposed to the Church of Christ. "The heresy," he says, "of the Homousians is opposed not only to the Church of Christ, but also to all the heresies not wise in like manner." Therefore Christ says, "Nation shall rise against nation."

Annotation CIV

"When you see the abomination," etc. — Matthew 24[:15]

[margin: Whether the true Church can be recognized by certain marks, and by which.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 49, writes that the Church cannot be known [as to] whether it is the true [one] — neither from [its] bishops, nor from miracles, nor from sacraments, nor from good morals; but only from the divine Scriptures. The words expressing such an opinion are these: "For those wishing to know which is the true Church of Christ, there is no other way than through the Scriptures. Why? Because all these [things], since they belong properly to Christ in truth, those heresies too have in [their] schism — likewise churches, likewise the divine Scriptures themselves, likewise bishops and the other orders of clergy, likewise baptism, likewise the Eucharist, and all other [things], and then Christ himself. Whoever, therefore, wishes to know which is the true Church of Christ — whence should he know [it], amid so great a confusion of likeness, except only through the Scriptures? Likewise, formerly [true and false Christians] were recognized also by signs — who were true Christians and who false — in what way? The false either could not do [signs] as the true Christians [did], or could not [do] such [signs] as the true Christians: but they did empty [ones], producing admiration indeed, but having no usefulness, as we have frequently explained. But the [true] Christians did full [signs], not only producing admiration, but also having every usefulness. And by these it was recognized who were true Christians, [and] who false. But now the working of signs is altogether removed [ceased]: nay rather, feigned [signs] are found to be done even among those who are false Christians. And, as Peter expounds in [the writings of] Clement, to Antichrist too the power of doing full signs is to be given. Likewise, from the morals themselves the Church of Christ was formerly known, when the conversation [way of life] of Christians —

[catchword "aut" → continues on p. 471 (PDF 476).]

(printed p. 471 [PDF p. 476], recto — end of Ann. CIV and the start of Ann. CV, on Matthew 24 (Scripture and tradition — the Vincentian canon and Augustine; Christ's "ignorance" of the day). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Opus imperfectum citation of Annotation CIV:)

[the way of life of Christians] was holy — either of all, or of many — which was not [found] among the impious. But now Christians have become either such [as], or worse than, the heretics or the gentiles are. And still greater continence is found among those [heretics], although they are in schism, than among [the] Christians. Whoever, then, wishes to know which is the true Church of Christ — whence should he know [it], except only through the Scriptures?" This passage, under the name of Chrysostom, the heretics of our age usurp — who, the judgment of the fathers and the definition of the councils being scorned, contend that one must rely only on the divine Scriptures, and that the knowledge of the true Church must be sought from these alone.

But how miserably these unhappy [men] are deceived, that most holy — and, among the fathers who flourished nearly twelve hundred years ago, most learned and most eloquent — **Vincent of Lérins** most clearly demonstrated, in a truly golden little book published [by him], which all lovers of catholic piety ought to turn over with assiduous hand, as a handbook, or a soldier's little dagger against the profane innovations of all heresies. He, then, among other [things] which he disputed concerning the method of discerning the true Church and faith from the false church and faith of the heretics, brought forward three rules — beyond and after the divine Scripture — by which the difference of the two churches may most certainly be detected. And these are: the **Universality**, the **Antiquity**, [and] the **Consent** of ecclesiastical tradition. But it is better to report these in his most elegant words, which are had almost at the beginning of the same little work in this

manner: "Often, inquiring with great zeal and the utmost attention from very many men outstanding in sanctity and doctrine, in what way I might be able — by a certain fixed, and as it were general and regular, way — to discern the truth of the catholic faith from the falsehood of heretical depravity: I always received a response of this kind from almost all, that whether I, or anyone [else], wished to detect the frauds of the rising heretics, and to avoid [their] snares, and to remain sound and whole in a sound faith, he ought — the Lord helping — to fortify his faith in a twofold manner: first, namely, by the authority of the divine law [Scripture], and then next by the tradition of the catholic Church.

Here perhaps someone may ask: Since the canon of the Scriptures is perfect, and of itself more than sufficiently suffices for all things — what need is there that the authority of ecclesiastical understanding be joined to it? [I answer:] because, namely, on account of its very depth, not all receive Sacred Scripture in one and the same sense; but one and another interprets its utterances in one way and another way, so that almost as many opinions seem able to be drawn thence as there are men. For Novatian expounds it one way, Sabellius another, Donatus another, Arius, Eunomius, [and] Macedonius another; Photinus, Apollinaris, [and] Priscillian another; Jovinian, Pelagius, [and] Coelestius another; and lastly Nestorius another. And therefore, on account of so great [and] so various windings of error, it is very necessary that the line of prophetic and apostolic interpretation be directed according to the norm of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense. And within the catholic Church itself, great care must be taken that we hold that which has been believed *everywhere, always, and by all*. For this is truly and properly 'catholic' — as the very force of the name, and its reasoning, declares — [that name] which comprehends all things truly [and] universally. But this [we shall achieve] only thus,

(right column:)

if we follow Universality, Antiquity, [and] Consent. And we shall follow Universality in this way, if we confess this one faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world confesses; but Antiquity thus, if we in no way depart from those senses [interpretations] which it is manifest our holy elders and fathers celebrated; and Consent likewise, if in that very antiquity we follow the definitions and opinions of all — or at least of almost all — the priests and teachers alike. What, then, shall a catholic Christian do, if some little part of the Church has cut itself off from the communion of the universal faith? What, indeed, but that he prefer the health of the whole body to a pestilent and corrupt member? What, if some novel contagion tries to defile not now a small portion only, but the whole Church equally? Then likewise he will provide to cleave to antiquity, which now cannot in any way be seduced by any fraud of novelty. What, if in that very antiquity an error of two or three men, or certainly of one city, or even of some [one] province, be detected? Then he will altogether take care that, over against the rashness or ignorance of a few, he prefer — if there are any — the decrees of a universal council [made] universally of old. But if any such thing should emerge, where nothing of this kind is found: then he will take pains to consult, and to interrogate, the collated opinions of the elders — of those only who, though [living] at diverse times and places, yet remaining in the communion and faith of the one catholic Church, stood forth as approved teachers; and whatever he shall recognize that not one or two only, but all alike, with one and the same consent, openly, frequently, [and] perseveringly held, wrote, [and] taught — let him understand that this too is to be believed by him without any doubt." Thus far Vincent.

But Augustine, compressing the same marks of the true Church into fewer words, and showing that these very [marks] are found in the Roman Church, speaks thus in the book *Against the Letter of Mani*, chapter 4: "There are many [things] which most justly hold me in the bosom of the Church. The consent of peoples and nations holds me; the authority holds [me] — begun by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, [and] confirmed by antiquity; the succession of priests holds me — from the very see of Peter the Apostle (to whom, after his resurrection, the Lord commended his sheep to be fed) down to the present episcopate; lastly, the very name of 'catholic' holds [me] — which, not without cause, this [Church] alone has obtained amid so

many heresies."

Annotation CV

"But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the Son of man." — Matthew 24[:36]

[margin: Whether Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 50, seems to place in Christ an ignorance of the day and hour of judgment, speaking thus: "Those considering this passage ought not to blush to be ignorant of anything of the mysteries of God, since they read that he himself did not blush to confess his ignorance in answering — [namely] that 'of that day and hour no one knows, neither the angels, nor the Son' — especially since there is a great depth of the mysteries of God; nor yet does he lie, since what he himself knows, he received from the Father. Deservedly he denies [his own] knowledge,

[signature "Qq 4"; catchword "qua" → continues on p. 472 (PDF 477).]

(printed p. 472 [PDF p. 477], verso — end of Ann. CV and Ann. CVI–CVIII, on Matthew 24–25 (Christ's "ignorance" of the day; almsgiving; the virgins' oil and the saints' merits). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CV, the Opus imperfectum still speaking:)

— [that knowledge] which was not from himself; just as elsewhere too, when he was good, he denied himself [to be] good, because his goodness was from the Father; and lest, on account of the human dispensation, he be thought to have denied that he knew [it], he did not say, "Neither the Son of man" — because he would have said [it] according to [his] divinity, not according to [his] human nature. For between the Son of God and the Son of man there is no difference.

But St. Augustine reproves this opinion — that in Christ there was an ignorance of the day and hour of judgment — teaching that it was said for this reason, that not even the Son himself knows the day of judgment: because he did not know that day in such a way as to be about to reveal it to others. **Jerome**, elucidating this passage in [his] commentary, affirms that in the Greek codices — especially those of Adamantius [Origen] and Pierius — that clause, "nor the Son of man," is not had; and Euthymius testifies the same. But **Ambrose**, in book 5 *On the Faith*, chapter 8, asserts that this same clause was formerly not written even in Mark, but was craftily added by the Arians. For he says: "'It is written,' say the Arians, 'But of that day and hour no one knows, neither the angels of heaven nor the Son, but the Father alone.' First, the ancient Greek codices do not have [the clause] 'nor the Son knows'; but [it is] no wonder if they falsified this too — [they] who interpolated the divine Scriptures. And by what reasoning it seems to have been added is disclosed, since it is drawn out to the interpretation of so great a sacrilege." However, **Origen**, treatise 30 on Matthew; **Chrysostom**, homily 78 on Matthew; **Hilary**, canon 26 on Matthew; and **Augustine**, homily 21 *On the Words of the Lord*, on Matthew — had in this passage "nor the Son"; and they expounded [it] according to the aforesaid understanding.

Annotation CVI

"The lord of that servant will come on a day when he does not expect." — Matthew 24[:50]

[margin: Whether fasting and chastity without almsgiving are of any avail.]

Chrysostom, at the end of homily 78, seems to teach that fasting, prayer, chastity, and virginity, without almsgiving, profit nothing, saying: "Prayer takes [its] strength and wings from almsgiving. And not prayer alone, but fasting too is strengthened thence. For if you fast without almsgiving, this is not even reckoned

[as] fasting; since [such a one] is worse than a slave of the belly and a drunkard who [still] fasts thus — and so much the worse, as cruelty is more wicked than [self-]indulgence. Why do I speak thus of fasting, when chastity itself and virginity, lacking almsgiving, is cast out from the bridechamber of the Bridegroom? For although virginity is indeed a great thing, yet, unless almsgiving accompany it, it is cast out." These words are to be interpreted not of the external distribution of alms itself — which can neither always, nor by all, be done — but of the very affection and zeal of almsgiving, that is, of mercy and charity, without which no work is so excellent that it is worthy of the eternal reward. But if anyone should contend that Chrysostom speaks also of the external bestowal of alms, I would not much resist — provided only that these very words be granted to be said only of those who are so far devoid of fraternal charity that they refuse to bring aid to needy brethren even in [their] extreme necessities.

Annotation CVII

"Lest perhaps there be not enough for us and you." — Matthew 25[:9]

[margin: Whether we can be helped by the merits of others.]

(right column:)

Hilary, in canon 27 on Matthew, says: "They answer that they cannot give oil, because it is necessary for each one to buy oil for his own lamp" — and [that] no one is to be helped by the works and merits of others. **Erasmus**, in the scholia on Hilary published by him, noted this passage in the margin, as though pointing with [his] finger to a staff on which the heretics may lean — [those] who in these times deride the merits, intercessions, and suffrages of the saints. **Bodius** too, in his *Collectanea*, casts this opinion in the teeth of catholics who implore the prayers and helps of the saints — not noticing that Hilary speaks not of those who, at the opportune time and from a sincere affection of charity, earnestly beg the help of the blessed; but of those who, having neglected their [own] salvation in this life, at last after death flee to the saints, when no faculty of truly repenting and meriting remains.

Annotation CVIII

"But he who received the one [talent], going away, dug in the earth," etc. — Matthew 25[:18]

[margin: Whether bad priests are [true] priests.]

The author of the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 53, indicates that bad priests and deacons are not ordained by God, but by men; and that, although they are held by men [to be] priests, yet as regards God they are not priests. This opinion is read in him in this manner: "To deacons and teachers, according to his providence, God seems to enjoin the ministry of the diaconate — or of the presbyterate — [upon] those who are just; but those who are found unjust, men seem to have ordained, not God. Therefore from the outcome of the matter it is known who has been ordained by God, and who by men. For he who shall have well completed his ministry, [it] appears that he had been ordained from God; but he who shall not have well completed his ministry, has been ordained from men. And in what way certain priests are ordained from men is plainly stated in the eighth book of the Canons of the Apostles. But he who has been ordained from men, as regards God is not a deacon or a priest. Therefore, among the priests indeed [and] the deacon, he is not found who loses the talents — [namely one] who is ordained by God according to [his] foreknowledge. But among the common people it happens, just as [it also happens] that one who is going to be a sinner has received from God the grace of faith. According to these [things], then, which we have said: if a presbyter or deacon is found [to be] a sinner — since, as regards the foreknowledge of God (as we have already said), he seems to have been made a presbyter or deacon not from God, but from men — he is found, like a layman, among those who received the one talent of faith. And through this, no one ordained by God sins, except [him] who received the one talent from God. And therefore the grace of faith is bestowed by God on all, but the grace of

the clerical state not on all, but on the worthy: because in the former [faith] is the cause of salvation, but in the latter [is] the dispensation of the ministry."

John, bishop of Ostuni, the interpreter and scholiast of the Constitutions of St. Clement, explaining the Apostolic canon adduced by this author (and noted by Clement in the eighth book of the *Constitutions*, chapter 1), admonishes readers not to slip, on the occasion of this opinion, into the error of the Hussites — who teach that bishops or presbyters bound by mortal sin are no longer bishops and priests,

[catchword "sacer-" → "…[and] priests," continues on p. 473 (PDF 478).]

(printed p. 473 [PDF p. 478], recto — end of Ann. CVIII and Ann. CIX–CX, on Matthew 26 (how many women anointed Christ; the Greek–Latin leavened/unleavened bread controversy). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CVIII, John of Ostuni's gloss:)

[are no longer] priests. And he says that Clement's opinion is not to be so taken, as though he wished those who are bad to lose the power which they received in ordination; but that he denies them to be bishops and priests inasmuch as the offices and functions which they discharge are not pleasing and acceptable to God — nay, their election is not even ascribed to Him, but to men: as if he should say that they are bishops as to [their] dignity, but not as regards God; because their institutions and offices, which they afterward exercise, are not approved by God. He adds also that, according to this sense, the sayings of this author are to be understood — and likewise those words which Jerome wrote in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, asserting that those are ordained by men who, unworthily, by the favor of the people, despising the patience of the Lord, are ordained to the divine priesthood against [their] merit. For these, although by force of sacred ordination they have the power divinely conferred upon them, yet, by the depraved administration of [their] office, are not priests such as God requires and desires.

Annotation CIX

"A woman came to him, having an alabaster [box] of ointment." — Matthew 26[:7]

[margin: On the three Magdalenes.]

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew, asserts that there were three Marys Magdalene — or [three] women — who anointed Christ: the first, a harlot, who anointed the Lord in the house of the Pharisee, of whom Luke writes in chapter 7; the second, who anointed his feet six days before the Passover in Bethany in [her] own house — and this was Mary the sister of Lazarus, having an approved and admirable life, whom John mentions in chapter 12; the third, who two days before the Passover poured ointment upon the head of Jesus in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, of whom Mark chapter 14 and Matthew chapter 26 speak. With Origen agree Theophylact, in the commentaries on chapter 7 on Luke, and Euthymius, in the explanation of chapter 26 on Matthew. **John [Fisher], bishop of Rochester**, attacked this opinion — defended by James, bishop of Vienne — in three volumes.

There are [others] who posit only two women anointers of the Lord: one, the harlot, who anointed first the feet at the Pharisee's [house] and then the head of Christ in the house of Simon the leper; the other, the sister of Lazarus, anointing the feet of the Lord as he supped at her house. Of this number is **Chrysostom**, homily 81 on Matthew and homily 61 on John; and **Bernard**, in the sermon on the Magdalene, mentions two, but somewhat differently.

There are others who assert only one Magdalene, the sister of Lazarus — [who], in the house of the Pharisee, in the house of Simon the leper, and in the house of Lazarus, twice anointed the feet [and] once the head.

Among these are held **Augustine**, book 2 *On the Agreement of the Evangelists*, chapter 9; **Gregory**, in the homily on the Magdalene; **Bede**, book 3 of the commentary on Luke; **Christian Druthmar**, chapter 26 on Matthew; **Rabanus**, on Luke 7; and very many others. Following whose opinion, Odo, abbot of Cluny, in the hymn which the Dominican church now uses, sang thus:

Mary, the sister of Lazarus,

who committed so many crimes,

from the very jaws of Tartarus

returns to the threshold of life.

(right column:)

St. Ambrose, in book 6 on Luke, says that it can be said both that there was one [woman], and [that there were] several.

Annotation CX

"And when evening was come, he reclined with the twelve." — Matthew 26[:20]

[margin: Whether Christ celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth [day of the] moon. / Whether Christ consecrated in unleavened [bread].]

Euthymius, explaining this passage in the commentaries on Matthew, hands down two [things] foreign to the rite of the Latin Church. The first is that Christ celebrated the Passover and completed the last supper on the thirteenth day of the lunar month, but suffered and was crucified on the fourteenth. The second is that Christ, in the last supper, after the legal eating of the lamb, used leavened bread, and that in it he instituted the sacrament of his body and blood. These indeed fight diametrically with the decrees of the Latin Church and of the Roman faith; which first asserts that Christ ate the paschal lamb on the fourteenth [day of the] moon, as did the other Jews also — because, as Chrysostom says, he always kept the law until death — but suffered on the fifteenth [day of the] moon. Then [the Latin Church] affirms that in that supper no other bread was set out than unleavened; because Matthew, Mark, and Luke testify that the time of the supper was the first day of unleavened bread, on which it was not lawful to eat leavened [bread]; and accordingly that Christ confected the sacrament of his body from unleavened [bread], and left us an example of consecrating in unleavened [bread].

The more recent Greeks defend Euthymius's opinion from the gospel of John — in which it is read that Christ supped with the disciples *before the feast day of the Passover*, *[margin: John 13.]* that is (as they expound), on the thirteenth [day of the] moon, when leavened bread was still in the houses. It is also had, in the same gospel, that Christ was slain on the day of the Preparation [*parasceve*], John saying: "And they themselves did not enter into the praetorium, lest they be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover"; *[margin: John 18.]* and again below, "Now it was the Preparation"; and, a little after, "There they laid him, because of the Preparation of the Jews." *[margin: John 19.]* Which words, according to their interpretation, show that Christ was slain on that day on which the lamb was slain — that is, on the fourteenth [day of the] moon, on which was the Preparation, that is, the preparation of the Passover: for on its evening the lamb was immolated, and the eating of the unleavened [bread] began. They say also that Christ, by [way of] dispensation, anticipated the legal supper by one day, and completed the Passover before the lawful time, lest the passion of the cross should take from him the opportunity of eating the mystical lamb with his disciples. For he knew that he would be slain on the fourteenth [day of the] moon — so that on that day on which the figurative lamb was immolated, the true Lamb also might be immolated, and the truth might in this way correspond to the figure.

But since the present altercation of the Latins and Greeks took its beginning from that [seeming] controversy which appears to be between John and the other evangelists: it is to be known that that day is the same [day] which the three Evangelists called "the first [day] of unleavened bread," and which John named "before the feast day of the Passover" — that is, the fourteenth [day of the] moon, in whose evening the solemnity of unleavened bread, or of the Passover, began, and the lamb was immolated, and with it the unleavened [loaves] were eaten, when no more leaven was found in the houses of the Jews, the Law so commanding in the volume of Exodus. Nor

[catchword "neque" → continues on p. 474 (PDF 479).]

(printed p. 474 [PDF p. 479], verso — end of Ann. CX and Ann. CXI, on Matthew 26 (unleavened bread; the words of consecration; the Greek epiclesis). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CX:)

Nor does that fight with these [things] which John wrote — that the Jews were unwilling to enter Pilate's praetorium, lest they be defiled, but [that they wished to] eat the Passover. For in that place "Passover" does not signify the paschal lamb — for the Jews had already eaten it the past night, on which Christ supped with his disciples (which is gathered from Matthew, *[margin: Matt. 26.]* who says: "And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they immolated the Passover," etc.) — but it signified the unleavened loaves, which had to be eaten for seven continuous days, of which the first and most celebrated was that day on which Christ was slain — namely, the fifteenth [day of the] moon, beginning (as has already been said) from the evening of the fourteenth. But that which John adds — that on that day was the Preparation — is not to be interpreted of the parasceve of the Passover, on which the Jews prepared themselves for the eating of the lamb (which was to be immolated toward the evening of the fourteenth [day of the] moon), but of the parasceve of the following Sabbath, which was called "the Sabbath of the Passover," because it had fallen within the paschal week, and was therefore held more celebrated than other sabbaths — as the Evangelist indicates, *[margin: John 13.]* saying: "For that day of the Sabbath was a great [day]." Wherefore, since that day was festive by a twofold right — both on account of the Sabbath, and on account of the paschal week (which was wholly festive) — there was need also of a great preparation for its celebration. From these [things], then, it is established that Christ completed the supper on the fourteenth day of the month, toward the evening of the Passover — that is, on the fifth day of the week — and instituted the sacrament of his body in that kind of bread on which it was then lawful to feed at the tables of the Jews, namely unleavened, and without any leaven. Preserving which rite, the catholic Church of the Latins, by best right, commands that unleavened bread be consecrated in the sacred mysteries.

Annotation CXI

"Jesus took bread, and blessed [it]." — Matthew 26[:26]

[margin: With what words Christ consecrated the Eucharist.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentary, appends to these words such an elucidation: "Jesus took bread, and blessed [it] with a blessing of praise, not with a blessing of consecration. Which is plain from the fact that both Luke and Paul, in place of 'blessing,' put 'thanksgiving,' which is a blessing of praise." **Ambrose [Catharinus]**, bishop of Compsa, in the first edition of his *Annotations*, suspects that Cajetan brought this forth because he was uncertain and ambiguous about the form of consecration — that is, by what words Christ consecrated. And he brings forward two causes of [his] suspicion: one, that Cajetan was unwilling that these words be understood of the blessing of consecration, as St. Thomas and very many celebrated doctors have expounded; the other, that although he has so often in his commentaries explained that sentence "This is my body," he has nowhere made even the least mention of the form of consecration which is included in it.

Edward Lee condemned this same thing in Erasmus — [namely] that in the *Annotations on the New Testament* he wrote that it is not to be pertinaciously asserted by what words Christ consecrated, and by what words the priest confects [it], since this is nowhere expressly read; and that those words, "This is my body," seem to be rather [the words] of one handing over bread already consecrated, than of one consecrating the bread.

Mark of Ephesus, bishop; **Nicholas Cabasilas**, bishop of Thessalonica; and certain other more

(right column:)

recent Greeks, who have published explanations on the Liturgy of the Greek Church — although they do not deny that the aforesaid words, "This is my body," are necessary for the sanctification and consecration of the Lord's body — nevertheless deny that these alone suffice for the perfect transmutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, unless to these be added certain prayers and blessings handed down by the holy fathers, which, through the invocation of the Holy Spirit, have the power of transmuting the bread and wine into the body and blood of the Lord. Which opinion they also strive to demonstrate from the sacred Liturgies of the holy fathers — namely of James, Basil, and Chrysostom — in which, after the recitation of the Lord's saying "This is my body," there are superadded prayers which, through the imploring of the Divine Spirit, in act complete and perfect the consecration and transmutation of the bread and wine — which had already received, from the utterance of Christ's words, the disposition and power [to that end] — so that by the following supplication of the priest they might be sanctified and turned into the Lord's body. And the formulas of prayers of this kind are these.

James the Apostle, in the Liturgy — or Mass — published by him, prescribed the rite of confecting the Eucharist in this order: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, taking bread into his holy and immortal hands, looking up to heaven and showing [it] to thee, God and Father, giving thanks, sanctifying, breaking, gave [it] to us his disciples and his apostles, saying: 'Unto the remission of sins, and unto eternal life, take and eat: this is my body, which is broken for you, and given for the remission of sins, Amen.' In like manner, after he had supped, taking the cup and mingling [it] of wine and water, and looking up to heaven and showing [it] to thee, God and Father, giving thanks, sanctifying, blessing, filling [it] with the Holy Spirit, he gave [it] to us his disciples, saying: 'Drink ye all of this: this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many, and is given for the remission of sins. Do this in my commemoration.'" And after these [words]: "Being therefore mindful, we also sinners, of his life-giving sufferings, offer to thee this awesome and unbloody sacrifice, praying thee, O Lord, that thou send down thy most holy Spirit upon us and upon these holy gifts set forth, that, coming upon [them], he may by his holy and glorious presence sanctify [them], and may make this bread the holy body of thy Christ, Amen; and this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, Amen."

Clement, the third pontiff after Peter, in his Liturgy has [it] in this manner: "The Lord Jesus, on the night in which he was betrayed, taking bread into his holy and immaculate hands, and lifting up [his] eyes to thee, God and his Father, broke [it] and gave [it] to his disciples, saying: 'Take, eat of it: this is my body, which is broken in pieces for many unto the remission of sins.' In like manner also the cup, tempered with wine and water, he sanctified and gave to them, saying: 'Drink ye all of it: this is my blood, which is shed for many. Do this in my commemoration.' Being therefore mindful of his passion, according to his institution we beseech thee, that thou vouchsafe to send thy Holy Spirit upon this

[catchword "hoc" → "…this [sacrifice]," continues on p. 475 (PDF 480).]

(printed p. 475 [PDF p. 480], recto — end of Ann. CXI and the start of Ann. CXII, on Matthew 26 (the words of consecration; the epiclesis harmonized; Druthmar). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CXI, the liturgy of Clement concluding:)

[send thy Holy Spirit upon] this sacrifice, that he may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ."

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, also — relating in what manner the sacred host is consecrated — writes these [things] in the fifth Mystagogical Catechesis: "We pray the most benign God that he send forth the Holy Spirit upon those [gifts] set forth, that he may make the bread indeed the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. For altogether, whatever the Holy Spirit touches, this is sanctified and transmuted."

Basil too, in [his] Liturgy, sets down the words of consecration thus: "Christ, on the night on which he delivered himself for the life of the world, taking bread into his holy and immaculate hands, and showing [it] to thee, God and Father, giving thanks, blessing, sanctifying, breaking, gave [it] to the Apostles, saying: 'Take, and eat: this is my body, which is broken for you unto the remission of sins, Amen.' In like manner also the cup, etc." And after these [words]: "Therefore we pray that thy Holy Spirit come upon us, and upon these gifts set forth, and bless them, and sanctify [them], and make this bread indeed the honorable body of the Lord God and our Savior Jesus Christ; but that which is in this cup, the very blood of the Lord God and our Savior Jesus Christ, which was shed for the life of the world."

Chrysostom likewise, after the recitation of the Lord's word "This is my body," uses such a deprecatory [petitionary] consecration: "We pray, we beseech, and we implore that thou send thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts set forth; and make this bread indeed the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Christ, changing [them] by thy Holy Spirit, Amen." From these [things], then, those Greeks maintain that the words of the Lord's consecration, without the prayers of the fathers, do not suffice for the transmutation of the bread and wine into the body of Christ.

But that the mind of the Latins and of the ancient Greeks is one and the same on this matter, **Chrysostom** clearly demonstrates in the homily *On Judas the Traitor*, where — teaching that the conversion of the mysteries is accomplished by the word of Christ alone, uttered by the priest — he writes thus: "It is not man that makes the body and blood of Christ, but he who was crucified for us, Christ. The words of Christ are uttered by the mouth of the priest, and by the power and grace of God the [gifts] set forth are consecrated. 'For this,' he says, 'is my body.' By this word the [gifts] set forth are consecrated. And just as that voice which said, 'Increase and multiply, and fill the earth,' was indeed said [but] once, yet through all time it obtains its effect for generation, nature operating [it]; so too that voice [of Christ] was said [but] once, yet through all the tables [altars] of the Church, up to the present day, and up to the coming of Christ, it gives firmness to the sacrifice." To this opinion of Chrysostom accedes the decree of the ecumenical Synod of Florence — received by the consent of all the Latins and Greeks — in these words: "We decree that the Armenians conform themselves to the whole Christian world, and that their priests, in the oblation of the cup, mingle a little water with the wine; using the form of this sacrament, which is the words of the Savior, by which this sacrament is confected. For by the power of these very words the substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into the

(right column:)

blood — yet in such wise that the whole Christ is contained under the species of bread, and the whole under the species of wine."

But to those [things] which the bishops Mark and Nicholas bring forward, I find a threefold response among the Latins.

First, Gentianus Hervetus, in the preface to the work of Cabasilas translated by him, says that when in the Masses of the Greek fathers, after the utterance of the words of Christ, there is added "Let it become the body, let it become the blood," etc. — it is not to be believed that the conversion then first takes place (which

was already made a little before), but that it is [thereby] shown that, although the word of Christ has passed away in [its] utterance, yet the effect of the consecration remains under the symbols, or species, of bread and wine. And he says that a similar manner of speaking is found in Mark, concerning the woman laboring with an issue of blood: who, after she had been healed by Christ through faith and by the touch of the fringe of his garment, nevertheless hears from Christ, "Be [thou] healed of thy plague" — though she had already been healed; that it might be signified that, although the effect of the touch of the fringe had passed, yet the [effect] obtained thence persevered.

Second, John, bishop of Ostuni, in the scholia on Clement, thinks — unless I am mistaken — that these [words] are to be taken by the figure of πρωθύστερον [*hysteron-proteron*, the latter put first]: that is, that we should understand the Holy Spirit to be invoked then as the operator of a consecration already accomplished and of a conversion already perfected.

Third, Bessarion, Patriarch of Constantinople, expounding these [things], says that the Lord's body is twofold — the true, namely, and the mystical — and that the former is perfectly confected by the words of the Lord himself, whose body it is; but the latter (which is [what] we ourselves are) is completed by the superadded prayers of the fathers, in which, after the transmutation of the bread and wine into the very body of Christ, the priests pray that those standing by the mysteries may, through the worthy reception of the sacrament, be made one body with Christ. Which interpretation those prayers confirm which, immediately after the consecration of the Eucharist, Basil and Chrysostom append in these words: "That we all, who partake of the one bread and cup, may be united together into the communion of the one Holy Spirit; and mayst thou make [us] to receive thy holy body, that we may find mercy and grace in the assembly of all the saints."

Annotation CXII

"Take, and eat: this is my body," etc. — Matthew 26[:26]

[margin: On the Eucharist.]

Christian Druthmar is reckoned by the Sacramentarian heretics into the number of the ancient fathers, whom they falsely and impudently boast to be defenders of their impiety — because, in the commentary on Matthew, he so declares this sentence that he seems to assert that the Body of Christ is present in the sacrament of the altar no otherwise than in figure. For he writes in this manner: "He gave his disciples the sacrament of his body, unto the remission of sins, and unto the preservation of charity, that, mindful of that deed, they might always do this in figure [as a memorial] of what he was about to do for them; and, that they might not forget this charity, [he said,] 'This is my body' — that is, in the sacrament." And a little after: "As if someone, departing on a journey, leaves to those who love him a certain bond of love, to this end, that they do these [things] every day, that they may not forget him:

[catchword "ita" → "…so [too]," continues on p. 476 (PDF 481).]

(printed p. 476 [PDF p. 481], verso — end of Ann. CXII and Ann. CXIII–CXV, on Matthew 26 (Druthmar vindicated; wine and water in the chalice; Gethsemane; may Christians war?). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Druthmar citation of Annotation CXII:)

so the Lord commanded us to do — spiritually transferring [his] body into the bread, [and] into the wine [his] blood — that by these two [things] we might commemorate what he did with his body and blood, and might not be ungrateful for so most-loving a charity." Know, Christian reader, that this passage has been shamefully and dangerously mutilated and corrupted — whether by the ignorance of copyists, or by the

negligence of printers, or by the fraud of heretics; which I detected not by empty conjecture, but from the genuine and entire reading of a most ancient codex, which I inspected at Lyon, [in] manuscript, in the Library of the Franciscans. For in place of what the codices printed in Germany have — "This is my body, that is, in the sacrament" — the Lyon exemplar has more: "This is my body, that is, truly subsisting in the sacrament." Again, where in the printed volumes we read, "spiritually transferring [his] body into the bread, [and his] blood into the wine," in the Lyon [manuscript] it reads: "transferring the bread into [his] body, and the wine into [his] blood." I am not unaware that the words of this author, even as they have been published by the printers, can most easily be vindicated from the usurpation of the heretics. But since they themselves, restored to their integrity, most clearly show that the pious mind of the author abhors the madness of these [heretics], I have judged [it] superfluous to bring forward here any other interpretation.

Annotation CXIII

"I will not drink of this fruit of the vine." — Matthew 26[:29]

[margin: Whether wine — or water — alone is to be used in the sacred mysteries.]

Chrysostom, homily 83, in the exposition of that sentence, brings forward these words: "For what reason did Christ drink, after the resurrection, not water, but wine? He wished to pluck up by the roots a certain pernicious heresy — [of those] who use water in the mysteries; so that he might show that, both when he delivered this mystery, he delivered wine, and when after the resurrection he used wine at the bare table of the mystery. And he says 'of the fruit of the vine,' which certainly produces wine, not water." From these words, badly understood, the Armenian heretics used wine alone in the mysteries. Against whom the universal council — surnamed "in Trullo," celebrated under Justinian — in canon 32 decrees thus: "Since we have learned that in the region of the Armenians they offer only wine on the sacred table, not mingling water with it — [they] who perform the unbloody sacrifice, pretexting the doctor of the Church, John Chrysostom, on account of these words in the interpretation of Matthew, 'For what reason did Christ [drink] not water, but wine,' etc.; by which words they think that Christ forbids the oblation of water in the holy sacrifice — [therefore], that these may be freed from [their] ignorance, we open up the mind of that father orthodoxly, saying that he wished to subvert the ancient and depraved heresy of the Hydroparastatae [water-offerers], who used water alone instead of wine in the sacrifice. If, therefore, any bishop or presbyter does not offer wine mingled with water in the sacrifice, let him be deposed."

Annotation CXIV

"He began to be sorrowful and heavy." — Matthew 26[:37]

[margin: Whether Christ truly feared for himself, and truly prayed for himself.]

Hilary, canon 31 on Matthew, hints that Christ neither truly feared for himself, nor truly grieved [nor truly prayed for himself], but for his own [disciples]. And he uses these words:

(right column:)

"And having taken Peter, James, and John, he began to be sorrowful. Therefore he is not sorrowful before he takes [them], and all the fear began to be for them, [they] being taken up; and thus the sadness arose not from him, but from those whom he had taken up. And below: Finally he says, 'My soul is sorrowful even unto death.' Does he say, 'My soul is sorrowful on account of [my] death'? Certainly not so. For if there was fear about death, it ought surely to be referred to that [death] through which it existed. But it is one thing to fear up to a point, another to fear on account of it. Again, a little after: The whole fear, therefore, was over those who were about to suffer. And therefore, because it is not possible that he should not suffer, he prays for those who were about to suffer after him, saying, 'Let the cup pass from me' — that is, as it is drunk by me, so let it be drunk by these without distrust of hope, without sense of pain, without fear of death." The Master

of the Sentences interprets this passage, book 3, distinction 17; whose interpretation, seek above, Annotation 186 of book 5.

Jerome, book 4 on Matthew, expounding the beginning of chapter 26, seems to subscribe to Hilary, when he says: "Let them blush who think that the Savior feared death, and out of dread of the passion said, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.'" See Annotation 183 of book 5.

Annotation CXV

"Put back thy sword into its place." — Matthew 26[:52]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for Christians to make war.]

Euthymius, in the exposition of this passage, seems to affirm that no right of war — not even for the defense of the Christian religion — is granted to clerics, saying: "When he had rebuked him — namely Peter — he taught that the sword must not be used, even for defending God. And by 'the sword' he forbade all arms."

John Ferus, in the fourth book of the commentary on Matthew, following the same opinion, writes that all faculty of making war is forbidden not only to clerics, but even to laymen, in these words: "By this word Christ teaches three [things]. First, that the gospel is to be defended not by secular arms, not by human help, but that its defense is to be committed to God. Thus Paul: 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal.' *[margin: 1 Cor. 10.]* Thus Christ used no sword. Secondly, in Matthew he says: 'You have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye; but I say to you, Love your enemies.' *[margin: Matt. 5.]* Thirdly, here he specially forbids to the Apostles the external sword. For they have, and ought to have, the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. *[margin: Eph. 6.]* Hence Isaiah foretells that the battle of the Apostles will be as in the day of Midian — that is, as Gideon conquered the Midianites not by arms, but by trumpets and the crashing of pitchers: *[margin: Isa. 9; Judg. 7.]* so the Apostles were about to do, spiritually."

John Henten, the translator and scholiast of Euthymius, judges that Euthymius speaks not of the public, but of the private person. For it is lawful for no one — except the magistrate and his ministers — to use the sword by right. But as for those [things] which Ferus reasons for the assertion of his dogma, see what we have written below, Annotation 156.

[catchword "An-" → "An[notatio CXVI]," continues on p. 477 (PDF 482).]

(printed p. 477 [PDF p. 482], recto — Ann. CXVI–CXIX, on Matthew 26 ("buy swords"; adjuring demons; Peter's denial; the Novatian error). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation CXVI

"They who take the sword shall perish by the sword." — Matthew 26[:52]

[margin: On war.]

Chrysostom, homily 85 on Matthew, [says]: "That they might more easily believe that he was [to be] betrayed, he therefore said to them, 'Buy swords' — not encouraging [them] to strike, but that he might set the prediction before [their] eyes." **Erasmus**, in the annotations on Luke, uses these words for the confirmation of his dogma — by which he teaches that every kind of war is forbidden to Christians. The refutation of which error you have below, Annotation 156.

Annotation CXVII

"I adjure thee by the living God," etc. — Matthew 26[:63]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for exorcists to adjure demons.]

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew — [of those] which we have — narrating this, seems to explode from the Church of Christ the rite of the exorcists, who adjure demons with sacred conjurations. For he speaks in this manner: "Someone will ask whether it is fitting to adjure demons. He who looks to the many who have dared to do such [things], will say that this is done not without reason. But he who looks to Jesus — not only commanding the demons, but also giving power to his disciples over all demons, and to heal infirmities — will say that to adjure demons is not according to the power given by the Savior: for it is a Jewish [thing]." **St. Thomas**, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 90, article 2, observing this passage, says that there are two kinds of adjuration: one deprecatory, by which malefactors and enchanters allure demons to their wishes by prayers and sacred ceremonies — and this Origen rightly condemns, because it requires benevolence and a close bond with the demons; the other kind is compulsive, by which — through the power of the divine name — Christian exorcists, every superstition and malice being set aside, adjure demons and expel [them] from possessed bodies. You have, in this very treatise, a little before the sentence [just] adduced, certain words which seem to take from Christians every faculty of swearing; concerning which see above, Annotation 26.

Annotation CXVIII

"He began to curse and to swear, [saying,] I know not the man." — Matthew 26[:74]

[margin: Whether Peter denied that Christ is God.]

Hilary, canon 31 on Matthew, on that sentence — "My soul is sorrowful even unto death" — speaking of Peter's denial, seems to signify that he did not deny God, but [only] man. For thus he says: "Christ knew that the disciples would be terrified, put to flight, [and] would deny him. But because the blasphemy of the Spirit is remitted neither here nor in eternity, he feared lest they deny [him to be] God — [him] whom they were about to behold beaten, spat upon, and crucified. Which reasoning was preserved in Peter: who, when he was about to deny, denied thus: 'I know not the man' — because 'anything said against the Son of man shall be forgiven.'" *[margin: Matt. 12.]* And below, in canon 32, expounding that [saying] "I know not the man," the same [Hilary] more clearly repeats [it] in this manner: "But it must be carefully considered under what condition Peter denied — although this has been treated above. For first he says that he does not understand what [the accuser] means; in the next [denial], that he did not adhere to him; but in the third, that he does not know the man. And truly he was now almost without sin denying [to be] a man [him] whom he had, as the first, acknowledged [to be] the Son of God: yet because, from the infirmity of the flesh, he had shown himself even ambiguous, he wept most bitterly — recalling the fault of that trepidation, and that he had not been able to avoid [it] even [though] forewarned." Again, in the exposition of Psalm 52, he so excuses Peter as to say that in this denial he did not lose faith, but preserved the firm and unshaken constancy of believing. This same [thing] Ambrose seems to hold, in the commentaries on Luke; and Pope Leo, Sermon 9 *On the Lord's Passion*; and Bernard. Read above, Annotation 183 of book 5.

Annotation CXIX

"And immediately the cock crew; and going out, he wept bitterly." — Matthew 26[:74–75]

[margin: Whether it is possible that those who have denied Christ should return to repentance and obtain pardon.]

(right column:)

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew, discoursing on these words, seems to maintain that it is impossible that those who — after receiving the grace and faith of the evangelical preaching — have denied Christ, should again return to repentance and obtain pardon of [their] offense. Which error was condemned in the Novatians. His words are read in this manner: "But perhaps all men too, when they deny Jesus — in such

wise that the sin of their denial may receive healing — are seen to deny him before cockcrow, the Sun of justice not yet having risen for them, nor his rising drawing near to them. But if, after the rising of such a Sun to the soul, we sin willingly, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains for us a sacrifice for sin, but a terrible judgment, and the zeal of fire, which shall consume the enemies. *[margin: Heb. 10.]* And in Peter, indeed, then denying, it was not fitting to say, 'How do you not think that they deserve worse punishments, who have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have esteemed the blood of the testament — by which they were sanctified — [as] common, and have done injury to the Spirit of grace?' *[margin: Heb. 10.]* For Peter had not yet been sanctified by the blood of Christ, which was the blood of the New Testament; nor did he do injury to the Spirit of grace, which he had not from the beginning even received: since Jesus had not yet been glorified, nor was the Holy Spirit [yet] in men. *[margin: John 7.]* But if in us this impious sin of denial should be committed, it is fitting to say all these [things]; since we too have been sanctified in the blood of the testament, and have received the Spirit of grace. Therefore, to esteem [as] common the most precious blood of the testament, and to do injury to the Spirit of grace, is worse than all sins — so that we can receive remission neither in this world nor in the [world] to come, if we deny the Son of God. Since, therefore, the night has gone before us, and the day has drawn near, and the sign of the day — the cockcrow — has sounded for us: therefore let us stand, striving against sin even unto blood, and for the sake of charity; let us bear all [things], never falling away, that with the perfect we may obtain the inheritance therein. And attend to this: that before cockcrow, and before the Holy Spirit, in the time of the deep night, even if one has frequently denied, he can [still] live — which is manifest from the fact that Peter denied thrice. But if, after cockcrow, [even] once, being set in any danger, one has denied: it is impossible for him to be renewed unto repentance, *[margin: Heb. 6.]* so as again to crucify to himself the Son of

[signature "Rr"; catchword "bi filium" → "…the Son [of God]," continues on p. 478 (PDF 483).]

(printed p. 478 [PDF p. 483], verso — end of Ann. CXIX and Ann. CXX–CXXI, on Matthew 27 (Judas's death; clerical possessions). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Origen citation of Annotation CXIX:)

to himself the Son of God." Thus far Origen — who is believed to have drunk in this error from the school of Clement of Alexandria, his teacher. For he [Clement], in the second book of the *Stromata*, seems to admit only two penances throughout the whole of life — one before baptism, the other after — but by no means more. However, it is credible that both Clement and Origen did not wish to deny penance to the lapsed, but wished to deter [men] from sinning by relapse, by these sayings. But to those [things] which Origen brings forth from the epistle to the Hebrews against a repeated penance, you have the response in book 7, in the confutation of the eighth heresy, objection 2.

Annotation CXX

"And going away, he hanged himself with a noose." — Matthew 27[:5]

[margin: Whether Judas died by hanging in a noose.]

Euthymius, in the commentaries on Matthew, asserts that Judas did not die by hanging in a noose, but that — before he was choked — he was taken down by certain [persons] who recognized him; and that he at last, after some time, perished, burst by a fall, his intestines poured out — the conjecture [being] taken from the fact that Luke, in the first chapter of Acts, writes that Judas possessed a field from the reward of iniquity, and that, being made prone [falling headlong], he burst asunder in the middle, and his bowels were poured out — which kind of death does not pertain to one hanged. The contrary opinion Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Bede, and all the Latins hold, who write that Judas was choked by the noose. Read below, Annotation 222.

Annotation CXXI

"And they took the thirty pieces of silver, and gave them for the potter's field." — Matthew 27[:6–7]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for clerics to have possessions of temporal things.]

Chrysostom, homily 86 on Matthew, taking occasion from these words, seems to deplore, with a long complaint, the calamity of the prelates and pastors of the Church — that they possess villas, houses, possessions, and wealth of gold and silver; which, he says, it would have been much better [for them] to be retained by laymen than by clerics; because priests and bishops cannot follow Christ unless — the possessions of the churches being left [behind] — they are freed from all secular care. His words run thus: "Let it come into your mind that eight thousand Levites were wont to feed [support] the Jews, and with these the widows and the orphans deprived of parents; but now [they possess] fields, houses, rentals of buildings, vehicles, horses, mules, and many other such [things] on your account; and the Church possesses [them] to your reproach. For it behooved you to retain this treasure of the Church, and [for] the Church to obtain no small fruits from your devotion. But now two evils are committed: for both you, as though you ought to give nothing, contribute nothing; and the priests of God handle [things] foreign to the priesthood. Could not houses and fields be possessed by the Church even in the time of the Apostles? For what reason, then, did they [the faithful], selling [them], offer the money? Because that was assuredly much better. And below: That evangelical [word], 'Go, and sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and follow me,' etc., *[margin: Luke 18.]* can now opportunely — and deservedly — be said to the presidents of the Church, on account of the broad possessions of the Church. For we cannot follow Christ otherwise, unless we are devoid of all grosser and secular care. But now — alas for the grief! — the priests of God attend to the vintage and the harvest, and to the selling and buying of the fruits," etc.

(right column:)

This same opinion he repeats more lucidly in homily 15 on the first [epistle] to Timothy, where it reads thus: "It behooves that necessary sustenance be abundantly furnished to the teachers, lest they fail, or be dissolved [in spirit], nor — occupied with the least [things] — deprive themselves and others of the great [things]; so that they may work spiritual [things], having no account of secular [matters]. Of this kind were the Levites — who had no care of secular things, as the laity [do]. To these laity too the care of the Levites was committed, and by the law revenues were established for them — tithes, gold, first-fruits, vows, and very many other [things]. But those [things] were deservedly permitted to them by the law, [as] seeking only present and earthly [things]. But I would boldly say that the prelates of the Church ought to have nothing beyond food and clothing, lest [their] desires be drawn to those [things]." Thus far Chrysostom.

To whom **Jerome** seems to subscribe, in the little book *On the Life of Clerics* to Nepotian, saying thus: "Let the cleric, who serves the Church of Christ, first interpret his own name; and, the definition of the name being set forth, let him strive to be what he is called. For if *cleros* in Greek is called 'lot' in Latin: therefore they are called 'clerics' — either because they are of the lot [portion] of the Lord, or because the Lord himself is the lot, that is, the portion of the clerics. But he who is either himself the portion of the Lord, or has the Lord [as his] portion, ought so to show himself that he both possesses the Lord and is possessed by the Lord. He who possesses the Lord, and says with the prophet, *[margin: Ps. 72.]* 'The Lord is my portion,' can have nothing outside the Lord. But if he shall have anything else besides the Lord, the Lord will not be his portion. For example, if [he have] gold, if silver, if possessions, if varied furniture: with these portions, the Lord will not deign to become his portion. But if I am the portion of the Lord, and the measuring-cord of his inheritance, I do not receive a portion among the other tribes; but, like a Levite and priest, I live from the tithes; and, serving the altar, I am sustained by the oblation of the altar: having food and clothing, with these I will be content; and, naked, I will follow the naked Cross." Thus Jerome. The more recent heretics object and cast these words in our teeth, and by them at the same time animate and inflame avaricious princes to reduce

the plundered possessions of the Church and the goods of the clerics into the Treasury, and turn [them] to their own uses.

But if, all hatred removed, they would weigh the sayings of both authors with a pious mind, they will recognize that Chrysostom did not condemn the possession of riches in clerics, but rather the cause on account of which bishops and clerics were compelled to possess and administer riches. This was the inclemency and cruelty of the rich of that age; who, in order to free themselves from the assiduous and burdensome solicitude of finding, providing, handling, and distributing those [things] which would suffice for the daily uses of the clerics and for the other necessities of the poor, had assigned to the prelates of the Church certain estates and farms, and had driven them to procure, from the care and administration of these, the necessaries of life for themselves and for the other poor of the people. This indignity Chrysostom deservedly reprehends —

[catchword "sto-" → "Chryso[stom]," continues on p. 479 (PDF 484).]

(printed p. 479 [PDF p. 484], recto — end of Ann. CXXI and Ann. CXXII, on Matthew 27 (clerical possessions; whether Calvary is Adam's tomb). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CXXI, Sixtus expounding Chrysostom:)

[Chrysostom], judging it unjust that clerics should be compelled, on account of temporal ministries and the bodily care of the poor, to relinquish the offices of spiritual and sacerdotal functions. Which the Apostles too once complained of, saying, "It is not right for us to leave the word of God, and to serve tables." *[margin: Acts 6.]* But if that blessed pontiff [Chrysostom] therefore blames the rich of his time — not because they had given riches to the Church, but because they had given with a mind too little benevolent and grateful, [and] with this end, namely, to free themselves from the tedium and irksomeness of feeding the clerics and the poor — with what mind, with what tongue, with what words do you think he would have deplored, and at the same time detested, if he had lived in this our age, the most wicked princes and tyrants of the heretical factions? — who, to fill the desire of their insatiable avarice, have despoiled the temples of the saints of their treasures, [and] plundered the wealth of the Church (which of old catholic princes had given to the bishops and clerics, either for [their] necessity or for the honor of [their] life), and have reduced the ecclesiastical caretakers to misery and extreme want. But this is not the place for deploring such [things]: we are writing annotations, not declaiming.

But as regards Jerome: St. Thomas, in the latter part of the second volume of the *Summa Theologica*, question 185, sifting his words, says that he pronounced these [things] not against clerics who use the possession of riches rightly, but against those who abuse the possession of them — so cleaving to their wealth that they neglect the pursuit of piety, and abandon the worship of God and the care of spiritual [things], which ought to be the chief and prior solicitude of all bishops and clerics. There are also [those] who think that Jerome, by these words, gave the clerics not a precept, but a counsel; and that, in exaggerating this counsel, he strove to draw the clerics to that side [of possessing nothing], so that they might at least settle in the middle, and be content with a moderate use of riches — speaking after the manner of those who demand the extremes in order to obtain the moderate; and following the example of those who violently twist to the right a tree bent to the left, so that it, thence returning of its own accord to the middle, may rise up into the straight height of the trunk. Nor do I think it should be passed over here [what] St. Thomas, in the place mentioned above, noted — that there were of old [those] who thought that it is not lawful for clerics, and especially for bishops, to possess riches, on account of the height of supreme perfection which they profess; whom he, rejecting [them] as inept, says [that] it is not necessary that, where there is greater perfection of life, there [too] be greater poverty — since at the very summit of perfect sanctity there can be the greatest opulence. For Abraham — to whom it was said by God, "Walk before me, and be perfect," etc. — and very

many other most perfect men flourished in a great affluence of riches. To this Annotation are to be recalled certain words of Origen from homily 15 on Leviticus, together with the sayings of Hilary from the exposition of Psalm 118, which seem to exclude clerics from the possession of secular things. These you have [in] Annotation 200 of book 5.

(right column:)

Annotation CXXII

"They came to the place called Golgotha, which is the place of Calvary [the Skull]." — Matthew 27[:33]

[margin: Whether Adam was buried on Mount Calvary.]

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew, seems to refer the cause why that place was called "of Calvary" to the skull of Adam, the first parent, buried there; concerning which he brings forth this: "The place of Calvary is said to have [this] dispensation — that there should die [he] who was about to die for men. For a certain tradition of this kind has come to me: that the body of Adam, the first man, is buried there, where Christ was crucified — so that, as in Adam all die, so in Christ all may be made alive: that in that place, which is called 'the place of Calvary,' that is, 'the place of the head,' Adam, the head of the human race, may find resurrection, together with the whole people, through the resurrection of the Savior, who there suffered and rose again." **Epiphanius**, at the end of the first book against heresies, explaining this matter more fully, wrote thus: "One may wonder that our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified in Golgotha, and nowhere else than where the body of Adam lay. For, having gone out from Paradise, he [Adam] afterward departed thither, and, in this place — namely of Jerusalem — paying the debt of nature, was there buried in the place [of] Golgotha. Whence it deservedly had the surname 'of Calvary,' because the skull and relics of Adam, the first-formed man, were there. Christ, therefore, in a riddle showed forth our salvation, when — crucified there — he began with his blood to besprinkle the relics of the first father from the beginning of the human mass [race], that he might show us the besprinkling of his blood made unto the cleansing of the whole human defilement. Wherefore here too was fulfilled that which was said, 'Rise, thou that sleepest, and rise again from the dead, and Christ shall enlighten thee.'" Very many embrace this ancient narration as most true — among others especially Athanasius, in the book *On the Lord's Passion*; Cyprian, in the sermon *On the Resurrection*; Ambrose, in book 5 of the *Letters*, letter 19, and on Luke chapter 23; Theophylact, on Matthew chapter 27, and on Mark chapter 15, and on Luke 23, and on John chapter 19; Euthymius too, on chapter 27 of Matthew; and many others, whom for brevity's sake I pass over. **Jerome**, exploding this kind of tradition as fabulous, spoke thus in the fourth book on Matthew: "I have heard someone expound the place of Calvary [to be that] in which Adam was buried, and [that] it was so called because the head of the ancient man was buried there; and that this is [what] the Apostle says, 'Rise, thou that sleepest, and rise from the dead, and Christ shall enlighten thee.' A favorable interpretation, soothing the ears of the people, yet not true. For outside the city, and beyond the gate, are the places in which the heads of the condemned are cut off; and therefore the Lord was crucified there, that where before was the ground of the condemned, there the standards of martyrdom might be raised. But if anyone shall wish to contend that he was crucified there so that his blood might trickle upon the tomb of Adam: let us ask him why the other thieves too were crucified in the same place. From which it appears that Calvary is not the sepulcher of the first man, but signifies the place of the beheaded; that where sin abounded, grace might super-abound. But Adam we read to have been buried near

[signature "Rr 2"; catchword "ta" → "…near [Hebron]," continues on p. 480 (PDF 485).]

(printed p. 480 [PDF p. 485], verso — end of Ann. CXXII and Ann. CXXIII–CXXVII, on Matthew 27 (the darkness; the lance before death?; the divinity's withdrawal; Mary of James). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Jerome citation of Annotation CXXII:)

near Hebron and Arbee, in [the book of] Joshua, son of Nun, we read." Thus far Jerome — who repeats the same in book 3 of the commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians.

Annotation CXXIII

"And they gave him wine to drink mingled with gall." — Matthew 27[:34]

[margin: On the oath.]

Athanasius, in the treatise *On the Passion of the Lord*, expounding these [words], seems to take away from Christians the faculty of swearing, in whatever cause, even a just one. You have this noted above, Annotation 26.

Annotation CXXIV

"But from the sixth hour there was darkness over the whole earth, until the ninth hour." — Matthew 27[:45]

[margin: Whether the darkness, at Christ's death, happened over the whole world.]

Origen, treatise 35 on Matthew, reports that the darkness which happened while Christ suffered was not made over the whole globe of the lands, but only over the whole land of Judaea; and, again, that that darkness was not an eclipse, but an obscuration and hiding [of the sun] by clouds set before the Sun. This opinion he expresses in these words: "As the other signs, which were made in the Passion of the Lord, were made only in Jerusalem, so also the darkness was made only over the whole land of Judaea, until the ninth hour. But [as to] what I say, that in Jerusalem only these [things] were done — that the veil of the temple was rent, that the earth quaked, that the rocks were split, that the tombs were opened: for neither outside Judaea were rocks split, nor other tombs opened, save only those which were in Jerusalem, or perhaps in the land of Judaea. Nor did any other land tremble then, save the land of Jerusalem. For it is not related anywhere that every element of the earth trembled in that time, so that they should feel [it] — for example, those who were in Ethiopia, and in India, and in Scythia. And if it had been done, without doubt it would be found in some of the histories of those who wrote in [their] chronicles any new events." And a little after he adds: "The darkness was not made by a failing [eclipse] of the Sun then over all Judaea; for the Evangelists did not name the Sun in this place, but only [say] that darkness was made, the Sun not being named. It is consequent [therefore] to understand that certain most dark clouds ran together over the land of Judaea to cover the rays of the Sun."

Bede the Younger [Bede of the Nativity], in the volume of his *Annotations*, condemned this opinion in Erasmus, as adverse to the judgment of Augustine and of Dionysius the Areopagite — of whom the former, in book 2 *On the Marvels of Divine Scripture*, relates that in the earthquake of the Lord's Passion eleven cities in Thrace fell; but the latter, in the epistle to Polycarp, testifies that he, at Heliopolis, a city of Egypt, together with the philosopher Apollophanes, beheld, at midday of the Lord's Passion, horrible darkness poured around the globe of the Sun.

Annotation CXXV

"Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?" — Matthew 27[:46]

[margin: Whether Christ was struck by the lance before he was dead.]

Chrysostom, homily 89 on Matthew, after the exposition of these words, subjoins the following words of Matthew in this manner: "'For they thought,' he says, 'that Elijah was being called by him; and they at once gave him vinegar to drink; but another, coming near, with a lance

(right column — continuing Annotation CXXV:)

opened his side.' Then, having set forth the explanation of these words, he again subjoins from the same Evangelist: 'But Jesus, crying with a great voice, gave up the spirit.'" A certain uncertain [anonymous] scholiast of Cornelius Agrippa abuses this reading of Chrysostom for the confirmation of a detestable error, which the same Cornelius left written in the book *On the Vanity of Sciences*, chapter 100 — affirming that Matthew the Evangelist erred, when he said that Christ was struck by the lance *before* he expired, against the authority of John, who related that he was pierced with the lance *after* death. Wishing to defend this vanity of Agrippa, that scholiast builds [the claim], from the adduced reading of Chrysostom, that the present passage stood thus in the codices of Matthew, and that Chrysostom read and expounded it in this manner. But since this reading is nowhere found in Matthew — neither in the exemplars of the Greeks, nor of the Latins — nor did any of the ancient expositors make any mention of this matter, it must be admitted that these words, together with the exposition of Chrysostom, were transposed by the carelessness of copyists; especially since the author himself, in this very place, asserts that the side of Christ, [when] entirely dead, was wounded; and repeats this same [thing] in homily 84 on John, explaining that [text], "One of the soldiers with a lance opened his side." I suspect that Agrippa — most zealous for heretical dogmas — took the occasion of this rash assertion not from the Gospel of Matthew, where no mention of this matter exists, but from the ravings of Peter John the Minorite [Olivi]; who — as Guido, bishop of Elne, is witness in the book *Against Heresies* — first published this error with foolish zeal. For he, when he was expounding the Passion and death of Christ in a public sermon, feigned that Christ, while still living, was wounded by the lance — that, by the amplification of Christ's sufferings, he might stir up the people more and more to mercy and weeping. And since he afterward persevered in obstinately defending this opinion, he was at last condemned in the Council of Vienne. The condemnation of this error stands in the first book of the *Clementine* sanctions, title 1.

Annotation CXXVI

"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" — Matthew 27[:46]

[margin: Whether the divinity was separated from the humanity of the dying Christ.]

Hilary, canon 33 on Matthew, seems to write that the divinity withdrew from the humanity of the dying Christ, when he says: "But the cry to God is the voice of the body, attesting the separation of the Word of God departing from it. Finally, why he is forsaken, he cries out, saying, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' But he is forsaken because he was a man, to be brought through even to death." In this opinion Ambrose too is reckoned to be, in book 10 of the commentaries on Luke. Consult Annotation 164 of this book.

Annotation [unnumbered]

"Mary [the mother] of James, and the mother of Joses, etc." — Matthew 27[:56]

[margin: Whether she who is called by the Evangelist the mother of James and Joses was the mother of Christ.]

Chrysostom, homily 89 on Matthew, in certain exemplars — both Greek and Latin — has, in the exposition of this passage, some words signifying that Mary, who here by the Evangeli-

[the heading is printed "ANNOTATIO ✚✚" — two cross-marks where the numeral should stand, a compositor's lapse; since the next annotation is printed "CXXVII," this one is left effectively unnumbered in the print. Catchword "geli-" → "…Evangeli[st]," continues on p. 481 (PDF 486).]

(printed p. 481 [PDF p. 486], recto — end of the (cross-marked) Mary-of-James annotation and Ann. CXXVII–CXXVIII, on Mark (the Apostles' fishing; monastic traditions — Cajetan vs. Catharinus). Read

order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the (cross-marked) annotation on Mary of James and Joseph:)

by the Evangelist is called the mother of James and Joses, is Mary the mother of Christ. But since this opinion can easily be bent toward the heresy of Helvidius — who asserts that Mary, after the birth of Christ, bore other sons — I judge those exemplars [to have been] corrupted by heretics; although there are not lacking [those] who defend these words of the homily, saying that Mary is called mother of James and Joses not according to truth, but according to dispensation [economy] — because these were the sons of Joseph, the spouse of Mary, by another wife. Chief among these is **Theophylact**, who in the commentaries on this passage speaks thus: "But he calls Mary the Mother of God the mother of James and Joses. For James and Joses were sons of Joseph by his former wife; yet, because the Mother of God was called the wife of Joseph, [she was called] mother — that is, stepmother." He repeats this same [thing], expounding Mark chapter 15, Luke 24, and John 19. But **Euthymius**, in the commentaries on the gospels, refutes a defense of this kind, writing thus: "Since there were many [women], he enumerates the more notable. Certain [people], then, say that the Mother of God is she who among the Evangelists is now indeed named mother of James and Joses, but sometimes 'Mary of James,' and at times 'Mary of Joses.' For these were the sons of Joseph; and just as their father was called her husband, on account of the dispensation, so again these [are called] sons of the Virgin. But this saying seems absurd. For, first, what forbade [him] to call her mother of Jesus? — especially since in the preceding narrations he had for the most part so called her. Then it would also be absurd that, in the following passages, Magdalene should everywhere be set before her, and that she [Magdalene] should be shown to have been more fervent than the Mother of God. Whence we suspect that this was some other Mary, who was mother of James the Less and of Joses — not of the sons of Joseph, but of others, who were of the seventy disciples; for there were many of such similar name among the Jews. But it is likely that the Mother of God then stood nearer to the cross than the other women — and that by the burning of [her] heart [bowels] overcoming fear; and perhaps also she went about, since on account of the goads of nature she could not remain in the same place; and afterward she remained by the sepulcher, and beheld each thing. But if we accept this, it must be asked why the Evangelists did not mention her. Because it was known concerning her that she was present, and did what belongs to mothers; and therefore they did not [even] write of her lamentation — for they amply satisfied [us] by declaring that she followed the Son as he taught. But it behooves [us] both to know this and that, and to accept what is more conformable to nature." **Jerome**, in the book *Against Helvidius*, discourses at length upon this saying of Matthew, against that same Helvidius, who abused the testimony of the Evangelist.

Annotation CXXVII

"He saw Simon and Andrew casting their nets into the sea, etc." — Mark 1[:16]

[margin: The fishing of the Apostles.]

The author of the explanation on Mark ascribed to Chrysostom, expounding this in homily 4, is censured by **Godefridus Tilmannus**, because he asserted that it is not written in the gospel that the Apostles, fishing before the Passion of the Lord, ever caught anything; whereas nevertheless it is read in Luke chapter 5 that the disciples, before the death of Christ — at the command of the

(right column — continuing Annotation CXXVII:)

Lord — took so great a multitude of fish that the nets were breaking.

Annotation CXXVIII

"He commanded them that they should take nothing on the way." — Mark 6[:8]

[margin: On monastic traditions.]

Thomas Cajetan, when in explaining he had come to this passage, brought forward these [things]: "It is discordant with the whole evangelical doctrine to give commands about food, drink, clothing, beard, hair, and the like, which are indifferent [things] — as being a matter unworthy of so great and so eminent a Teacher; and [so] that by this we may recognize him to be God, who made all things, whom all things serve, to whom none of these [things] is displeasing, who gave to all the nations in the whole world laws suited to each and all, burdensome to none, nowhere and at no time in need [of exception]." **Ambrose** [Ambrosius Catharinus], in the second book of the *Annotations*, inveighs against these [statements] thus: "These, to speak most sparingly, are assuredly false, and consonant with the pernicious dogmas of heretics. For if these [things] are indifferent, and are not of care to God: why did God from the beginning command Adam that he should abstain from it [the tree]? and why is John praised for [his] contempt of foods? And if these indifferent [things] stand apart from evangelical doctrine: why did the Lord in the gospel so greatly extol John concerning the rough manner of [his] clothing, obliquely censuring the softer [sort], when he said, 'Behold, they that are clothed in soft [garments] are in the houses of kings'? If the Lord is not solicitous about dress: why does he blame the rich man who clothed himself in purple and fine linen? *[margin: Matt. 7; Matt. 19.]* why does Paul praise those who were covered with sheepskins? and command women not to adorn themselves with braided hair, gold, pearls, and precious clothing? He added also that the Lord commanded nothing about beard and hair: but the chiefs of the Apostles mentioned this — of whom the one blames outward hairdressing, the other braided locks, and asserts it a reproach for a man to nourish [long] hair. It is credible that it came from the traditions of the Apostles that clerics are shorn, and the hair shaved on the crown. Therefore these [things] do not so greatly differ from the evangelical doctrine which evangelical and apostolic men so greatly cared for. Yet I confess that Jesus was unwilling to make explicit discourse about those [things] which could more conveniently be taught by his disciples, and be determined by special traditions. But what is it that he says — that the Lord did not give such precepts, so that we might recognize him to be God, who made all things, whom all things serve? As though God were not, even to that degree, known in the Old Testament — [God] who commanded many such [things], and baser [ones], and without doubt indifferent. And what is it that he adds — 'to whom none of these [things] is displeasing'? nay, we see [them] to be displeasing. And what also is it that he added — that he gave laws burdensome to none? Not, then, is the way narrow that leads to life! The disciples call the law of marriage hard, even with Christ himself approving [it]; and Christ himself says [it] is difficult for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven; *[margin: Acts 14.]* and Paul, 'Through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God.' And now we have heard [that] the laws of the Lord are burdensome to none. It is true — yet indeed to those who love God, to whom nothing is so difficult and arduous but that it becomes easy and passable, the laws of Christ are not burdensome. Nor is that true which he perniciously subjoined — that all the commandments of the Lord suit all men. For Jerome says:"

[margin: Read Annotation 244, book 6. Signature "Rr 3"; catchword "ait" → "Jerome says," continues on p. 482 (PDF 487).]

(printed p. 482 [PDF p. 487], verso — end of Ann. CXXVIII and Ann. CXXIX–CXXXII, on Mark (pseudo-Chrysostom slips; the "third hour"; the last chapter of Mark). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXXVIII, the Jerome citation adduced by Catharinus:)

says: "It is not commanded to all, that they should not have two tunics, nor food in a wallet, money in [their] belts, a staff in [their] hand, a sandal on [their] feet — [but rather] that they should sell all [things], and give to the poor. And Peter not rashly asks: 'Lord, dost thou speak this parable to us, or to all?' — knowing that the same [things] are not commanded to all, on account of the diverse states and offices." Although the modern

heretics wickedly and impiously confound these [things].

Annotation CXXIX

"And after six days, Jesus took Peter, etc." — Mark 9[:2]

The author of the exposition on Mark, which is called Chrysostom's, homily 10, warns that in the gospel according to Matthew it is written, "And it came to pass on the eighth day"; but in Mark, "After six days" — which is certainly not so. For what he says is had in Matthew, that [rather] stands in Luke chapter 9. This error — of whatever kind, whether arisen from a lapse of the author's memory, or from the carelessness of the copyist — **Godefridus Tilmannus**, the scholiast of this author, noted.

Annotation CXXX

"When he had entered into the temple, he began to cast out those selling and buying." — Mark 11[:15]

[margin: On the history of those selling in the temple.]

The author of the narration on Mark, bearing the title of Chrysostom, at the beginning of homily 13, affirms that the history of the casting-out of the sellers, described by Mark, is the same as that which we read in John. **Godefridus Tilmannus** annotated this passage with these words: "If you compare this very history according to Mark with John — namely, chapter 2 — it will easily become clear to you, looking a little more deeply, that there was not only one casting-out, but two. For twice the Lord is read to have gone up to Jerusalem for the celebration of the Passover: once indeed, John the Baptist not yet delivered to prison for the truth by Herod — that is, in the first year of the gospel preached by our Lord, of which John too, chapter 2, makes mention; and again, hastening to accomplish the mystery of human redemption. Of this [latter] Mark here makes mention, with whom Matthew chapter 21 also agrees. In each of these [times of] going up to Jerusalem, the Lord is read to have expelled from the inner precincts of the temple those selling and buying. But this rough and dilemmatic passage can somehow be resolved, if you say that the author speaks of the account of the *time* at which he went up to Jerusalem, not of *how often*."

Annotation CXXXI

"And it was the third hour, and they crucified him." — Mark 15[:25]

[margin: Whether Christ was crucified at the third hour.]

Thomas Cajetan, explaining these [words], is refuted by **Ambrose of Compsa** [Ambrosius Catharinus] in book 1 of the *Annotations* with these sayings: "Cajetan thinks the text here is faulty, and that it ought to be read, 'the sixth hour'; nor does he notice that a little after there follows, 'and the sixth hour being come,' etc. How much more prudent, then, was it to acquie-

(right column — continuing Annotation CXXXI:)

sce in the sound distinction of others, who said, for the concord of the Evangelists, that at the third hour he was crucified by the sentence and acclamation of the Jews, as Mark says; but at the sixth hour by the deed itself, as the other Evangelists testify. For both the accuser, and the judge, and the executioner are rightly said to have killed the accused — the one [the accuser] by accusing and proving the crime, the judge by condemning, the executioner by carrying out the sentence. This passage could also be expounded otherwise: that what is said, 'It was the third hour,' be referred to the [things] above — namely, when he was handed over to be crucified; and what follows, 'And they crucified him,' is to be understood [as done] afterward, at the sixth hour." These [things] Ambrose [says] against Cajetan. For whose excuse it is worth noting here that Jerome long ago held this same [view], in the explanation of Psalm 77, where he uses these words: "It is

written in Matthew and John that our Lord was crucified at the sixth hour. Again it is written in Mark that he was crucified at the third hour. This seems to be different, but it is not different. It was an error of the copyists. For many thought that the Greek epis■mon [☐] was Γ [gamma]." By which words St. Jerome indicates that a copyist put "the third" in place of "the sixth" hour, deceived by the similarity of the numeral characters which he found in the Greek codices. For indeed the epis■mon [☐], which is the mark of six, is so like the letter Γ, which is the sign of three, that it was easy for a copyist to slip from the one into the other, and, in place of the epis■mon [☐], which denoted the sixth hour, to substitute Γ gamma, which signifies the third. Nor does **Theophylact** dissent from Jerome — except that he thinks the fault of the arithmetical figure happened not in Mark, but in John, where the error of the copyists, Γ being changed into [☐], made the sixth hour out of the third.

Annotation CXXXII

"But Jesus, rising early on the first [day] of the week." — Mark 16[:9]

[margin: Whether the last chapter of Mark is of solid authority.]

Thomas Cajetan is here censured by **Ambrose** [Catharinus] with such a rebuke: "Cajetan says that the last chapter of Mark is not of solid authority for establishing the faith, as the other undoubted [chapters] of Mark are, for the reason that some have at some time suspected that it was added. Therefore Scripture ought to waver at the suspicion of any men whatever! If the matter stands thus, what now will be firm concerning it? Besides, if this chapter is not proper to the gospel of Mark, it follows that the Church of Christ has the gospel of one Evangelist mutilated — and that indeed in the part which was most important, where the resurrection was treated, the narration of which most befitted Mark, who on account of the victory of the resurrection is designated by the lion. Who, unless he be a fool, would approve these [things]? Add [further] that this chapter, which these [men] call into doubt, the Church recites with a clear voice on two most solemn feasts — that is, on the holy day of Easter — and chants in the sacred temples under the title of Mark; and [as for] those who dare to say that [the Church] errs in such a matter, there is nothing which they cannot either assert or deny, as it pleases [them]. Wherefore they are rather to be despised than to be deemed worthy that you should contend with them."

[catchword "AN-" → "AN[NOTATIO CXXXIII]," continues on p. 483 (PDF 488).]

(printed p. 483 [PDF p. 488], recto — Ann. CXXXIII–CXXXVI, on Luke 1–2 ("full of grace"; Christ's soul and omnipotence; guardian angels judged; Mary's purification). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation CXXXIII

"Hail, full of grace." — Luke 1[:28]

[margin: Whether the Virgin Mary is rightly called "full of grace."]

Bernard, in homily 3 on the history of the Lord's Annunciation, narrating these [things], **Erasmus** censures in his annotations — because he philosophizes wrongly and beside the point in these words, as though it peculiarly belonged to Mary to be called "full of grace," whereas it was not said by Luke, "full of grace," but κεχαριτωμένη [kecharit■men■], that is, "graced [favored]"; and this expression is found promiscuously attributed to many [persons] in the sacred writings. For indeed of John the Baptist it is read, "He shall be filled with the Holy Spirit"; and of Elizabeth, "She was filled with the Holy Spirit"; and Stephen is called "full of grace." Certainly I do not see why Erasmus thinks Bernard is to be censured in this matter, since all the Latin fathers through so many successions of ages have read "full of grace," and St. Ambrose, skilled in the Greek tongue, judged that this epithet rightly agrees with Mary — because she is second to none in [her]

graces. Jerome too — or Sophronius, familiar with Jerome (for each was excellently versed in the Greek tongue) — in the sermon *On the Assumption*, explaining this praise-title, says: "Well [is she called] 'full of grace,' because grace is bestowed on the rest in parts [piecemeal]: but into Mary the whole plenitude of grace poured itself at once. Truly 'full of grace,' through whom every creature has been overflowed with the abundant shower of the Holy Spirit." Moreover **Theophylact**, the Greek author, recognizing both readings — both "gracious" and "full of grace" — reads [thus], saying: "For this is to be gracious, or full of grace: that she found grace with God. For many others also found grace before God; but that she conceived the Son of God in [her] womb — this [was] singular to her, which was granted to no other." This same [thing] St. **Athanasius** most clearly proclaims in the sermon *On the Most Holy Mother of God*, speaking in this manner: "The Holy Spirit descended into the Virgin with all his essential virtues [powers], imbuing her with grace, that she might be gracious in all [things]; and therefore she was surnamed 'full of grace,' because by the infilling of the Holy Spirit she abounded in all graces." And below: "For it is fitting that thou be surnamed mother, regeneratrix, lady, and mistress — because from thee came forth the King, the Lord, and our God — [thou] standing beside him, to us indeed terrible [awesome], but to thee sweet, and bestowing every grace: for which cause it came to pass that thou art called 'full of grace' — inasmuch as thou didst abound in every grace." From the words of these authors it is easily washed away [refuted], what Erasmus says: that in the sacred writings other saints too are called "full of grace." For although we confess the saints [to be] full of grace, yet we believe — as Sophronius says in the same sermon — that the mother of Christ has so great a plenitude of grace as no [other] of mortals has received. For God made her such and so great that he himself willed to be born through no [other] creature than through her.

*(At the foot of the left column stands the lemma of **Annotation CXXXIV**; its exposition follows at the head of the right column:)*

Annotation CXXXIV

"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High." — Luke 1[:32]

[margin: Whether the soul of Christ has omnipotence equal with God.]

Ambrose, in the commentaries on Luke — as the Master of the Sentences reports — seemed to attribute to the soul of Christ omnipotence equal with God: which the theologians do not accept, lest they equate the creature with the Creator. For indeed, when he was interpreting this passage, he wrote thus: "'Not for this [reason],' says the angel, 'will he be great — because before the Virgin's childbearing he was not great; but because the power which the Son of God has naturally, the man was to receive in time, so that the man and God may be one person.'" The Master of the Sentences, book 3, distinction 14, resolving the ambiguity of this saying, says that it is to be understood of the person — not inasmuch as [he] is [the person] of God, but inasmuch as [he] is [the person] of man: for although the person of the Son of God and of the son of man is one, yet inasmuch as [he] is the person of God, he always and naturally had omnipotence; but inasmuch as [he] is [the person] of man, he did not always have [it], because he did not always exist. And according to this — that [he] was going to be the person of man — [the man] was to receive in time the power which naturally and always he had had inasmuch as [he was] the person of God. This passage, which almost all the scholastics allege from Ambrose's commentaries on Luke, we — although we have long and much searched in all the Ambrosian works — have nevertheless not yet found. **William Opembacchius** and **Henry Hayton**, on the third [book] of the Sentences, cite the same from the commentaries of Bede on Luke: but neither in those does it stand. These [things] it pleased [me] to note on account of those who, content with mere anthologies, are loath to unroll the very writings of the authors. We meanwhile — since we are compelled to turn over the fathers with nightly and daily hand — if perhaps we shall come upon this passage, and others like it, wrongly adduced, will restore [them] to their authors with unbroken fidelity.

Annotation CXXXV

"And on earth peace to men of good will." — Luke 2[:14]

[margin: Whether the angels are to be judged on the day of judgment.]

Origen, in homily 13 on Luke, writes that the angels — appointed for our guardianship — will be judged on the day of judgment, and will receive rewards and punishments according to the account of the governance [they have] performed. His words run thus: "Since this is so, let us beseech Almighty God that both the angels, and men — the bishops of the churches — may be a help to us; and let us know that both are judged by the Lord on our behalf. But if they shall have been judged, and the fault and sin be found not in their carelessness but in our negligence: we shall be accused and punished. For, while they do all [things] and strive for our salvation, we nonetheless [must] be free from sins. Moreover it frequently happens that, while we labor, they do not fulfill their office, and are in faults." We have said abundantly about this in Annotation 124 of book 5.

Annotation CXXXVI

"After the days of purification were fulfilled, etc." — Luke 2[:22]

[margin: Whether Mary needed purification after childbirth.]

Origen, in homily 14 on Luke, indicates that the Virgin Mary needed purification after childbirth, in these words: "When now the days of pur-

[signature "Rr 4"; catchword "pur-" → "…of pur[ification]," continues on p. 484 (PDF 489).]

(printed p. 484 [PDF p. 489], verso — end of Ann. CXXXVI and Ann. CXXXVII–CXXXVIII, on Luke 2 (Mary's purification; virginitas in partu*; the sword through Mary's soul). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CXXXVI, the Origen citation and Sixtus's gloss:)

of their purification, according to the law of Moses, they brought him to Jerusalem." "On account of *their* purification," he says. Of which "their"? If it were written, "On account of *her* purification" — that is, Mary's, who had given birth — no question would arise: and we would boldly say that Mary, who was a human being, needed purification after childbirth. Perhaps Origen understands [this] not of a purification from the uncleannesses and defilements of childbirth — to which there is no doubt Mary was not liable — but of the rites and ceremonies by which Moses had commanded women in childbed to be purified. These it was necessary [that] be observed by his mother, [by him] who had come to fulfill the law, not to destroy [it]. **Arnobius**, in the exposition of Psalm 14, seems to attribute certain stains to Mary, from which, on Christ's entering into her womb, she was cleansed. Of which opinion you have the explanation in book 5, Annotation 153.

[margin: The purgatorial fire.]

In the same homily you must beware of what Origen says — that we, after the day of resurrection, need purification — in these words: "I think that even after the resurrection from the dead we [shall] need a sacrament washing and purifying us (for no one will be able to rise again without defilements); nor can any soul be found which is at once free from all vices," etc. You have these [matters] treated more accurately and at greater length in Annotations 170 and 171 of book 5.

Annotation CXXXVII

"Every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord." — Luke 2[:23]

[margin: On Mary giving birth.]

Ambrose, in book 2 of the commentaries on Luke, expounding this passage, seems to hold that the womb of the Virgin Mary was opened in [the] birth, and the enclosures of [her] virginity loosed. Which indeed conflicts with the definition of all the theologians, who teach that Christ came forth without the striving, pain, and defilements of one giving birth — the Virgin's womb [remaining] closed — through the intact enclosures of [her] virginity, like a ray of the sun sent through the solidity of glass without any injury to the glass. But he [Ambrose] writes in this manner: "He who had said to the prophet, *[margin: Jer. 1.]* 'Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee, and in the womb of [thy] mother I sanctified thee' — and who sanctified another's womb, that a prophet might be born a prophet — this is he who opened the womb of his [own] mother, that he might go forth immaculate." St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 28, says that Ambrose, by the word "opening," did not signify that laying-open of the womb which happens to other [women] giving birth, but that going-forth of the offspring which did not violate the enclosures of virginal modesty. But lest the words of the law, adduced by the Evangelist, cast a scruple upon anyone, it is worth bringing here the opinion of **Bernard** at the beginning of the third sermon *On the Purification of Mary*, writing in this manner: "In the law it was written, that a woman who, having received seed, had borne a son, should be unclean seven days, and on the eighth day the boy should be circumcised; thereafter, intent on the washing and purification, she should abstain from entering the temple for thirty-three days. These being fulfilled, she should offer the son to the Lord with gifts. But who does not notice, at the very beginning of this statute, the mother of the Lord [to be] free from this precept? For do you think that Moses, about to say that a woman who had borne a son is unclean, did not fear to incur the crime of blasphemy against the mother of the Lord — and therefore prefaced 'having received seed'

(right column — continuing the Bernard citation of Annotation CXXXVII:)

— otherwise, unless he had foreseen a virgin about to give birth without seed: what necessity was there to make mention of 'received seed'? It is clear, therefore, that this law does not include the mother of the Lord, who — no seed being received — bore a son."

Origen, homily 14 on Luke, treating this very clause of Luke, asserts that the womb of Christ's mother was opened in [the] birth, in these words: "Of all women, [it is] not the birth of the infant, but the intercourse of a man, [that] opens the womb; but the womb of the Lord's mother was opened at that time in which also the birth was brought forth, because a male in no way touched, before the nativity of Christ, that holy womb, worthy of all veneration." **Tertullian** too, touching the present passage in the same manner, at the end of the book *On the Flesh of Christ*, brought in thus: "This, in fine, is the womb on account of which it is also written concerning others, *[margin: Exod. 13.]* 'Every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord.' Who [is] truly holy, save the Son of God? who properly opened the womb, save he who laid open the closed [one]? but for [all] others, marriage lays [the womb] open. Therefore [hers] was the more opened, because it was the more closed. Assuredly she is rather to be called not-a-virgin than a virgin — at least in a certain way [she was] a mother before [she was] a bride. And what further is to be reconsidered about this? Since the Apostle, by this reasoning, pronounced the Son of God brought forth not from a virgin, but from a woman, he acknowledged the nuptial travail of the opened womb." As the words of these authors are consonant with the sayings of Ambrose, so they receive the same understanding.

Annotation CXXXVIII

"And a sword shall pierce through thy own soul." — Luke 2[:35]

[margin: Whether Mary suffered a defect of faith at Christ's death.]

Origen, in homily 17 on Luke, hands down that, when Christ was dying, a sword of scandal [stumbling] and unbelief pierced the soul of Mary. And he expresses this opinion in this discourse: "What is that sword, which pierced through not only the heart of others, but even of Mary? It is openly written that at the time of the Passion all the Apostles were scandalized, the Lord himself also saying, 'All you shall be scandalized in this night.' Therefore all were scandalized so far, that Peter too, the chief of the Apostles, denied [him] thrice. What do we think — that, the Apostles being scandalized, the mother of the Lord was immune from scandal? If she suffered no scandal in the Lord's Passion, Jesus did not die for her sins. But if all have sinned, and lack the grace of God, [being] justified by his grace and redeemed: assuredly Mary too was scandalized at that time. And this is what Simeon now prophesies, saying: 'And through thy own soul (thou who knowest that thou didst bear a virgin [child] without a man — thou who didst hear from Gabriel, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee") there shall pass the sword of unbelief, and thou shalt be struck with the point of doubt, and thy thoughts shall tear thee in divers ways, when thou shalt see him — whom thou hadst heard [to be] the Son of God — crucified, and dying, and at the last tearfully complaining, and saying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"'" These [things] Origen [says]; with whom **Chrysostom**, in the explanation of Psalm 13, writes plainly in words consonant with these: "When Christ was crucified, there was none who did good. The disciples all fled: John withdraws stripped: Peter denies. The soul of Mary his mother the sword

[catchword "gladius" → "the sword [pierced]," continues on p. 485 (PDF 490).]

(printed p. 485 [PDF p. 490], recto — end of Ann. CXXXVIII and Ann. CXXXIX–CXLII, on Luke 2–3 (Mary's "doubt"; Christ's growth in wisdom; Origen on angels). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXXXVIII, the Chrysostom citation and the further witnesses:)

[pierced through] — the sword of doubt pierced through. **Augustine** agrees with both, whose words in the book *Questions on the Old and New Testament*, question 73, are these: "But what he added, saying, 'And a sword shall pierce through thy own soul, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed' — this assuredly signified that Mary too, through whom the mystery of the Savior's incarnation was accomplished, would doubt at the death of the Lord — yet in such wise that she would be confirmed at the resurrection. For who would not waver, seeing him, who called himself the Son of God, so humbled that he descended even unto death?" Nor does **Theophylact** differ from these, writing thus in the commentaries on Luke: "But perhaps he calls 'sword' also the grief which she bore in the Passion; and perhaps also the scandal by which Mary was offended. For seeing [him] crucified, perhaps she was thinking: how [is it that] he who was born without seed, who did miracles, who raised the dead, is crucified, spat upon, dead? But what he says, 'That the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed' — this signifies that the thoughts of many, who are scandalized, will be revealed and made manifest, and, being reproved, will find a sudden remedy; just as thou too, O Virgin, wilt be revealed and made manifest [as to] what thou thinkest of Christ, and thereafter wilt be confirmed in faith in him; likewise Peter too will be revealed, when he shall have denied, but the power of God will be [thereby] demonstrated, which received him back through penance."

St. **Thomas**, in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 27, article 4, weighing the opinion of Augustine which we cited above, says that it is to be understood not of that kind of doubt which proceeds from unbelief, but of the hesitation of stupor [amazement] which is wont to accompany a great wonder. Nor does what Augustine said differ from this — that all doubted, by a certain stupor, at the death of the Lord. Whether these [things] can be accommodated to the foregoing sayings of Origen and Theophylact, let others see: for concerning the opinion of Chrysostom we have written above, in Annotations 104 and 156 of book 5.

Annotation CXXXIX

"And his parents knew [it] not." — Luke 2[:43]

[margin: Whether Mary always recognized Christ to be God.]

Euthymius, in the commentaries on Luke, expounds this passage thus: "According to divine providence this happened, lest Joseph and his mother should hinder him as [being] a boy and unlettered." Noting these words, the scholiast of Euthymius writes this: "From these words, and at the same time from those which are had a little after upon that word, 'And seeing him, they were astonished,' it appears that the author holds that the Virgin at this time did not know Jesus to have been God." Yet he [Euthymius] does not hold so — which is clear from his exposition of that saying, "And his mother kept all these words, pondering [them] in her heart," which follows a little after the aforesaid. Read the following Annotation.

Annotation CXL

"And they understood not the word which he spoke to them." — Luke 2[:50]

[margin: Whether Mary always knew the divinity of [her] Son.]

Origen, in homily 20 on Luke, seems to hint that Mary, while Christ was still a boy, did not have full faith of his divinity — for he says thus:

(right column — continuing the Origen citation of Annotation CXL:)

"Then, therefore, they did not understand the word which he spoke to them. And at the same time attend to this: that Joseph and Mary did not yet have full faith. Therefore they could not remain above with him." I think that Origen, by the phrase "full faith," understood full knowledge of all the mysteries of the divinity and humanity of Christ — which the Virgin Mary did not yet have at that time, although she held all those [things] which she then knew of Christ with a most certain and unshaken faith. See below, Annotation 185.

Annotation CXLI

"Jesus advanced in age and wisdom." — Luke 2[:52]

[margin: Whether Christ advanced in wisdom.]

Peter, bishop of Crete, alleges the authority of Ambrose from the expositions on Luke, in [his commentary on] the third [book] of the Sentences, in the person of those who, for the sake of disputation, maintain that Christ, inasmuch as he was man, advanced in learning and wisdom according to the increase of age. These are the words of Ambrose: "Jesus advanced in age and wisdom. How he advanced in wisdom, let the order of the words teach thee. For therefore he put 'age' before, that thou mightest believe [it] said according to the man. For age is [a property] not of divinity, but of the body. Therefore, as he advanced in the age of the man, so he advanced in the wisdom of the man." Know, excellent reader, that these words are nowhere had in the commentaries of Ambrose on Luke — in which there is no mention at all of this evangelical passage. But they are had in Ambrose['s book] *On the Sacrament of the Lord's Incarnation*, chapter 7 — whence also they are cited by the Master of the Sentences, who, elucidating them in book 3, distinction 14, says that they are not to be taken so as [that] we should think the boy Jesus acquired for himself anything of wisdom through the increases of age; but that, by the expression and showing-forth of his wisdom, he advanced daily more and more, and, according to the estimation of men, his wisdom seemed to grow and advance from day to day.

Annotation CXLII

"And there came also publicans, to be baptized." — Luke 3[:12]

[margin: On the instruction, errings, and penance of the angels.]

Origen, in homily 23 on Luke, brings forth four [things] beside the common opinion of the theologians, from the workshop of his own dogmas. Of these the first is, that the angels are instructed by men, and also learn from them. The second is, that the bishops of the seven churches — whom John in the Apocalypse, by reason of [their] office, calls "Angels" — were truly angels, and had the true nature of angels. The third is, that those angels were liable to sins, and were reproved for these by John. The fourth is, that Christ came into this world to preach penance not only to men, but also to angels. These opinions he expresses in these words: "The Prophets and Apostles preach all that they proclaim not only to men, but also to angels. For thou wilt find, in very many places, and especially in the Psalms, that discourse is made even to the angels — power being given to a man, namely to him who has the Holy Spirit, that he may address the angels. Of which [places] I will set down one example, that we may know that the angels too are instructed by human voices. It is written in the Apocalypse of John: 'To the Angel of the church of the Ephesians write: I have somewhat

[catchword "aliquid" → "I have somewhat [against thee]," continues on p. 486 (PDF 491).]

(printed p. 486 [PDF p. 491], verso — end of Ann. CXLII and Ann. CXLIII–CXLIV, on Luke 3 & 7 ("of Cainan" and a superfluous generation; did John the Baptist doubt?). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXLII, the Origen citation and Sixtus's gloss:)

against thee'; and again, 'To the Angel of the church of Pergamum write: I have somewhat against thee.' Certainly he is a man who writes to the angels, and commands something. For I do not doubt that there are angels — not only generally for every church, but also individually; concerning whom the Savior says, 'Their angels always see the face of the Father.' And below: 'These [things] we have said for this [reason], that we might show that the publicans too are taught by John. For not John and a [mere] prophet only came, but also the Savior himself, to preach saving penance both to men, and to angels, and to the other Powers — that in the name of Jesus every knee may bow, of [things] heavenly, earthly, and infernal.'" These [things] Origen [says]; whose first proposition can be piously interpreted according to the sense of what Paul, writing to the Ephesians, said — that the wisdom of God became known to the Principalities and Powers through the preaching of the Church. You have this more clearly explained below, in Annotations 195, 182, and 298.

Annotation CXLIII

"Who was [the son] of Cainan." — Luke 3[:36]

[margin: Whether the generation of Cainan is superfluous in the genealogy of Christ.]

The exposition of **Thomas Cajetan**, **Ambrose** [Catharinus], in book 1, annotated with these words: "This I judged must be noted as intolerable — that he admitted, as though a possible thing, that Luke in the genealogy of Christ added one superfluous generation. But he excuses him, [saying] that he followed the Seventy, who were of great authority. Very well. Do, then, the authors of sacred Scripture follow [mere] interpreters? and do those who found the sea — whence the streams flow out — receive from the streams, so as to create the sea? He adds: 'And thus the Holy Spirit provided, lest it be imputed to the holy doctors that they expounded the text of sacred Scripture according to the commonly received interpretation — since it was permitted to the Evangelist to have done the same without an error of his own.' These [things] he [says] toward the excusing of Luke: but it would then be necessary also to excuse the Holy Spirit — that he permitted his amanuensis to be led by the authority of men, or even, [being] led, to err, and thus by a remarkable providence to leave an error in the gospel. Besides, was Luke devoid of the Hebrew tongue, so that he had need to follow the Septuagint? And even if he had been, [were] at least the Apostles, who saw and approved this gospel — were they too ignorant of the tongue, so as not to see this error? But if the Apostles did not approve this gospel, then, according to Cajetan's doctrine, it does not have the authority of Scripture." These [things] Ambrose [Catharinus says].

This passage once so vehemently tormented the mind of **Bede** the presbyter, that in the preface to the Acts of the Apostles he wrote thus: "I especially wonder — and, struck with the most vehement stupor on account of the slowness of my wit, I know not [how] to search out — by what reasoning [it is] that, whereas in the Hebrew Verity ten generations are found from the Flood to Abraham, Luke himself — who, the Holy Spirit ruling [his] pen, could in no way write a falsehood — chose rather to put eleven generations, according to the Seventy interpreters, Cainan being added, in the gospel." See what we have written about this matter in book 7, heresy 4, and in book 5, Annotation 88.

*(At the foot of the left column stands the lemma of **Annotation CXLIV**; its exposition fills the right column:)*

Annotation CXLIV

"Art thou he that is to come, or do we look for another?" — Luke 7[:19–20]

[margin: Whether John the Baptist doubted concerning the death of Christ.]

Bede, in book 2 on Luke, interpreting this, seems to impute to John the Baptist that he doubted concerning the death of Christ — namely, whether he was to die for the salvation of the human race — speaking thus: "'Art thou he that is to come?' The sense is: Tell me — because I am to be killed by Herod, and to descend to the nether regions — whether I ought to announce thee to those below too, [I] who have announced [thee] to those above; whether it be not fitting for the Son of God to taste death, and whether thou wilt send another for these mysteries."

Jerome, in book 1 of the commentaries on Matthew, writes the same opinion in the same words: and there is no doubt that Bede took it thence.

Eusebius of Emesa, in the homilies marked with his name, reports that John doubted concerning Christ's descent to the nether regions, saying thus: "'Art thou,' he says, 'he that is to come? I indeed go to the patriarchs and prophets, I descend into hell: but wilt thou too come thither? Ought I to announce to them that thou art to come thither, as I announced to the world that thou hadst come? Wilt thou descend thither in thine own person, or do we look for another from thee? For I fear to believe this of thee, unless this be made certain to me by thee. Greatly indeed hast thou humbled thyself — or perhaps wilt thou humble thyself more? What shall I say to them, what shall I announce?'"

Pope Gregory, in the book of 40 Homilies, homily 6, seems to ascribe to John both hesitations — both concerning Christ's death, and concerning his descent into hell — with these words: "John therefore says, 'Art thou he that is to come, or do we look for another?' — as if he plainly said: As thou hast deigned to be born for men, [say] whether thou also deignest to die for men and to descend to the nether world; make [it] known, that I who [am] the forerunner of thy nativity may become also the forerunner of [thy] descent, and may announce thee as about to come in hell, [thee] whom I have already announced as having come to the world."

Chrysostom, in homily 38 on Matthew, and **Theophylact**, and **Euthymius**, assail both opinions, as ridiculous and false, in a long discourse — because it is not credible to them that so great a prophet, and more than a prophet, who was greater than all the prophets, was ignorant of what the other prophets had foretold concerning the death, burial, and descent to the nether world of Christ, and which he himself had preached. There are [some] of ours who say that John most steadfastly believed that Christ would penetrate hell by the efficacy of his power, and thence snatch away the patriarchs, but that he was in doubt whether he [Christ] would go down to the nether regions according to the substance of [his] soul. Which, however — Theophylact being witness — **Gregory the Theologian** [Nazianzen] disapproves, affirming that John knew that he [Christ] was to come to hell with [his] soul, that he might there save the believers. It must therefore be said that John asked this not as though ignorant of it, but so that his disciples — still rude and incredulous — being sent with this question to Christ, might, from Christ's response, come to know and believe the majesty

of Christ, not yet [by them] recognized. Or, according to Ambrose, it can be said that John was in doubt concerning the death of Christ — not by a doubt of incredulity, but by the hesitation and stupor of a mind wondering, and considering, how it could come to pass that men should dare to kill him who raised the dead and produced such great miracles of power.

[catchword "ANNO-" → "AN[NOTATIO CXLV]," continues on p. 487 (PDF 492).]

(printed p. 487 [PDF p. 492], recto — Ann. CXLV–CXLVII, on Luke 9–10 (Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration; "seventy-two" vs. "seventy" disciples; the Apostles begging). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation CXLV

"And Moses and Elijah were seen in majesty." — Luke 9[:30–31]

[margin: Whether Moses and Elijah truly appeared at Christ's transfiguration.]

The **Postil** of **Hugh of Saint-Cher** [Hugo Carensis] on Luke reports that Moses and Elijah were present and appeared at Christ's transfiguration not truly, but imaginarily: and it cites as witness of this Ambrose, in a certain gloss, saying thus: "It must be known that not the bodies, nor the souls, of Moses and Elijah appeared there, but that those bodies were formed in a subject creature [an underlying substance]. For it can be believed that this was done by angelic ministry, so that the angels assumed their persons." These [things are] in Hugh's Postil: whence they are taken, I know not. Certainly, so far as I know, they are nowhere found in Ambrose. I suspect that in this place the name of Ambrose was rashly added by some smatterer; who, with no reckoning of the times, also inserted there the name and opinion of John Scotus [Duns Scotus], who wrote almost sixty years after the death of Hugh. St. **Thomas**, in the last part of the *Summa*, question 45, article 3, refuting this kind of opinion as absurd and false, reports that by some it is believed these words were taken from the work *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture*; which, since it is falsely inscribed to Augustine, its authority is not received. And yet [it is] so far [from being the case] that the words of this gloss were sought from the work *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture*, that in the third book of the same volume, chapter 10, an entirely contrary opinion is affirmed in these plain words: "But since Elijah, remaining in the body, had come to such a meeting; what is to be said of Moses? — whether he was present in the body again for this showing; or whether, simulated from air, as Samuel was seen, he feigned a semblance: even if he came clothed in his own body, did he on this occasion complete his resurrection, which for the rest is to be [only] at the last [day]?" Concerning which question the authors, having brought forth one and the same opinion, say without difference that, while the Lord is not doubted to have met with his three disciples and Elijah — not with imagined, but with true bodies — Moses too seems [to have been present] in his own true body, resumed from the sepulcher. But the Lord Jesus, the firstborn of the dead, is rightly believed to have again, after this vision, committed the body of Moses to burial, that he might be hoped to assume it at the last day, when the dead shall rise. See above, Annotation 74 of this book.

Annotation CXLVI

"The Lord appointed also other seventy-two." — Luke 10[:1]

[margin: On the number of Christ's disciples.]

Erasmus judges that the Vulgate edition of the Latin translator is redundant in this place, because in it the particle "TWO" [*duos*] is read superfluously: and he strives to establish this by the authority of the Greek codices, in which only "Seventy" is written; and he says that Ambrose, Jerome, Cyril, Theophylact, and Eusebius (in the first volume of the *Ecclesiastical History*) agree in the same number. **Augustine** opposes

this opinion, in book 2 of the *Evangelical Questions*, asserting that the number seventy-two aptly fits the disciples of the Lord — because, as in twenty-four hours the whole world is bathed with the light of the Sun, so the splendor of the most holy Trinity is borne to the whole world through thrice twenty-four disciples — that is, seventy-two. **Bede**, on Luke, book 3, recognizing the same reading, says that the number of seventy-two disciples bears the figure of the seventy-two presbyters, etc. But because Erasmus insists that Augustine and Bede had faulty codices, and that the truth of the Greek exemplars is to be consulted:

(right column — continuing Annotation CXLVI:)

it is worth here subscribing the reading of **Epiphanius**, a very ancient author among the Greeks, who at the end of the first tome *Against Heresies* brings forth these [things] concerning the number of seventy-two disciples: "And Christ sent forth also other seventy-two to preach: of whose number were the seven set over the widows — Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolaus, and before these Matthias, who was numbered in the place of Judas among the Apostles; and after these seven, and Matthias before them, Mark, Luke, Justus, Barnabas, Apelles, Rufus, Niger, and the rest of the seventy-two; and after these, then, all [of them], Paul the Apostle — whom we find that holy Luke, being of the number of the seventy-two, made his follower." These [are] the words of Epiphanius: which, lest anyone should suspect [them] badly translated, in Greek run thus: "ἀπέστειλε δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἑβδομήκοντα δύο κηρύττειν, ἐξ ὧν ἦσαν οἱ ἑπτά, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χηρῶν τεταγμένοι, Στέφανος, Φίλιππος, Πρόχορος, Νικάνωρ, Τίμων, Παρμενᾶς, καὶ Νικόλαος, πρὸ τούτων ἢ Ματθίας, ὁ ἀντὶ Ἰούδα συμψηφισθεὶς μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων· μετὰ τούτους ἢ τοὺς ἑπτὰ καὶ Ματθίαν τὸν πρὸ αὐτῶν, Μάρκον, Λουκᾶν, Ἰοῦστον, Βαρνάβαν, καὶ Ἀπελλῆν, Ῥοῦφον, Νίγερα, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἑβδομήκοντα δύο· μετ' αὐτῶν ἢ πάντας Παῦλον τὸν Ἀπόστολον, ὃς εὑρίσκεται τὸν ἅγιον Λουκᾶν τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο ἀκόλουθον ἑαυτῷ ποιήσας." **Clement**, the third pontiff after Peter, agrees in this number, in book 2 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, chapter 59. A Greek codex of the Apostolic [Vatican] Library, bearing a wonderful antiquity, corroborates these [readings]. Nor does the authority of the ancient fathers — on which Erasmus chiefly relies — stand against these. For it is likely that those writers, for the sake of brevity, cited "seventy" for "seventy-two": which we also see done in the first interpreters of the Mosaic Law; who, though they were seventy-two — namely six chosen from each of the twelve tribes — are alleged by all ancient writers under the title of "the Seventy." So too the Romans, from a zeal for brevity, called their hundred-and-five Judges — three chosen from each of the thirty-five tribes — "the Hundred Men" [Centumviri].

Annotation CXLVII

"In the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as are with them." — Luke 10[:7]

[margin: Whether the Apostles begged [were mendicants].]

Theophylact, according to the ancient translation which St. Thomas uses in the *Catena Aurea*, expounds this passage thus: "See, therefore, how he taught the disciples to beg, and willed that they should have their nourishment for a price." In place of which **John Oecolampadius**, the new translator of Theophylact, renders thus: "See, therefore, how he instructs the disciples unto want, saying, Have food for [your] wage." **Alphon-**

[catchword "Alphonsus" → "Alphon[sus]," continues on p. 488 (PDF 493).]

(printed p. 488 [PDF p. 493], verso — end of Ann. CXLVII and Ann. CXLVIII–CXLIX, on Luke 12 (private property — Basil and Ambrose; guardian angels). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXLVII, on whether the Apostles begged:)

Alphonsus [de Castro], in book 10 *Against Heresies*, suspects that Oecolampadius purposely changed the word "to beg," because it seemed to bring support to the pious mendicancy of the monks — which he pursued with many insults, as the chief plague of the Church. To me, noting these [things], since a Greek codex of Theophylact was lacking, it was not permitted to investigate Alphonsus's suspicion. You have what pertains hither in Annotations 118 and 317 of this book.

Annotation CXLVIII

"I will gather together all things that are grown to me, and my goods, etc." — Luke 12[:18]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for a Christian to have anything of his own.]

Basil, in the sermon *On the Rich Man whose field brought forth abundant fruits*, is thought to hold that it is lawful for no one to possess any thing as his own. For he uses such words as these: "'To whom,' [says] the rich man, 'do I do injury, if I retain and keep what is mine?' Tell me, what [things are] 'thine'? Whence, having received [them], didst thou bring [them] into life? Just as if someone, in a theater, the place for spectating being [already] occupied, should then forbid [others] entering — judging that to be his own property which is set forth in common for the use of all: such are the rich. For, seizing beforehand the common [goods], they make them their own by anticipation, and think them to be theirs. Whereas, if each one, taking what [suffices] for the solace of his own need, would leave to the needy what is superfluous, no one would be rich, no one poor. Didst thou not fall naked from the womb? shalt thou not return naked again into the earth? But whence are the present [things] thine? If thou sayest [they came] by spontaneous chance: thou art impious, not acknowledging the Creator. But if thou confessest [they are] from God: tell us the reason for which thou hast received [them]. Is God unjust, who distributed to us unequally the things necessary for life? Why art thou rich, but that one needy?" And below: "Art thou not a plunderer? — thou who makest thine own those [things] which thou hast received to be dispensed? It is the bread of the hungry which thou withholdest; it is the cloak of the naked which thou keepest in [thy] wardrobe; it is the silver of the needy which thou hast buried. Wherefore thou doest injury to as many men as thou couldst give to," etc.

Ambrose, the translator of Basil, in the eighty-first sermon published on this passage, subscribes to Basil's opinion with these words: "'What is unjust,' thou sayest, 'if — since I do not invade another's [goods] — I keep my own more diligently?' O shameless saying! Thou callest [them] 'thine own.' What [things]? From what hidden stores didst thou bring [them] into this world? When thou didst enter this light, when thou camest forth from the mother's womb — with what resources, I ask, and with what supplies begirt, didst thou enter? Learn thy coming into this world from the Apostle Paul, saying: *[margin: 1 Tim. 6.]* 'For we brought nothing into the world; nor indeed can we take anything away. But having food and clothing, let us be content with these.' The earth was given in common to all men; let no one call 'his own' that which, taken from the common [store] beyond what would suffice, has been violently gotten." And a little after: "Is God unjust, in not distributing to us equally the supports of life — that thou shouldst be affluent and abounding, but to these it should be lacking, and they be in want? It is the bread of the hungry which thou withholdest; it is the clothing of the naked which thou lockest away; the redemption and release of the wretched is the money which thou buriest in the earth. Know, therefore, that thou seizest as many goods as thou couldst bestow, as many as thou wilt."

(right column — continuing Annotation CXLVIII:)

These passages of Basil and Ambrose are to be prudently inspected, lest we slip into the error of the **Apostolics**: concerning whom Augustine, in the book *On Heresies, to Quodvultdeus*, chapter 40, relates these [things] from the second book of Epiphanius *Against Heresies*: "The Apostolics, who most arrogantly called themselves by this name, because they did not receive into their communion [those] using marriage and possessing things of their own — such as the Catholic Church has, and very many monks and clerics.

But these are heretics for this [reason]: that, separating themselves from the Church, they think that those have no hope who use these things which they themselves lack. These are like the Encratites: for they are also called Apotactites — that is, 'extraordinary,' or 'renouncers.'"

St. **Thomas**, in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 66, articles 1 and 2, sifting the sayings of both authors, says that the right of possessing things of one's own can signify two [things], among others. First, indeed, the power of procuring and dispensing external goods delivered to one by God; in which manner it is certainly lawful for each to possess things of his own; nor do the aforesaid opinions of the fathers disapprove the possession of this kind of property. Secondly, [it can signify] a certain peculiar and singular use of a thing, assigned to its possessor alone; by which arrangement it is lawful for no one to possess external things as though proper to himself alone. And this is what Basil and Ambrose chiefly condemn in the rich, who — spending nothing on the needy — draw all things into their own uses. But it is worth here subscribing the words of Thomas himself, since they have something more than I have expressed: "To the second argument, from Basil, it must be said that he who, coming beforehand to the spectacles, seized a place before others, would not act unlawfully; but he acts unlawfully in this — that he forbids others. And similarly the rich man does not act unlawfully if, seizing beforehand the possession of a thing which from the beginning was common, he also shares [it] with others; but he sins if he indiscriminately forbids others from the use of that thing. Whence Basil says in the same place: Why art thou rich, but that one begs — unless that thou mightest obtain the merits of good stewardship, and he be crowned with the rewards of patience? To the third it must be said that when Ambrose says, 'Let no one call his own that which is common,' he speaks of property as regards use. Whence he adds: 'Taken beyond what would suffice, it has been violently gotten.'"

Annotation CXLIX

"When thou goest with thy adversary to the ruler, etc." — Luke 12[:58]

[margin: On the guardian angels.]

Origen, in homily 35 on Luke, hints that some of the angels — appointed for our guardianship — do not yet see God, and are still uncertain concerning their own salvation. His words are these: "At the same time inquire whether the angels of the little ones in the Church always see the face of the Father, and [whether] the angels of others do not have the freedom to behold the countenance of the Father. For it is not to be hoped that the angels of all see the face of the Father who is in heaven. If I shall be of the Church — however least I be — my angel has the freedom and confidence always to see the face of my Father who is in heaven. But if [I be] outside, and not of that Church which has no spot, or wrinkle, or anything of that kind

[catchword "usmo-" → "of that ki[nd]," continues on p. 489 (PDF 494).]

(printed p. 489 [PDF p. 494], recto — end of Ann. CXLIX and Ann. CL–CLII, on Luke 15–16 (angels' vision and free will; Chrysostom on Scripture-reading begins). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Origen citation of Annotation CXLIX:)

of that kind, and by the very fact I am proved to be a stranger to such a congregation. My angel does not have confidence to look upon the face of my Father who is in heaven." For which cause the angels are solicitous for the good, knowing that if they govern us well, and bring [us] through unto salvation, they too shall have confidence to see the face of the Father. For as, if by their care and industry salvation is procured for men, they always behold the face of the Father: so, if by their negligence a man has fallen, they are not ignorant that the matter is [one] of their own peril also. And as a good bishop, and the best steward of the Church, knows [it] to be [a matter] of his merit and virtue, if the sheep of the flock entrusted to him have been guarded: so understand also concerning the angels. It is a disgrace to an angel, if a just man has been

entrusted to him, and he [the man] has sinned; as, on the contrary, it is a glory to an angel, if [the one] entrusted to him has been, at least, the least in the Church. For they will see, not sometimes, but always, the face of the Father who is in heaven, whereas others do not always see [it]. For according to the merit of those whose angels they are, the angels will contemplate the face of God either always, or never, or little, or more.

Annotation CL

"Son, thou art always with me." — Luke 15[:31]

[margin: Whether the good angels can be bent to virtue and vice.]

Jerome, in the exposition of the parable of the prodigal and thrifty sons, to Damasus, explaining this, writes thus: "'In thy sight shall no living [one] be justified' — he does not say, 'shall not every man be justified,' but 'every living [one]' — that is, not an evangelist, not an apostle, not a prophet; ascending to greater [things], not the angels, not the Thrones, not the Dominations, not the Powers, and the other Virtues. God alone is [he] into whom sin does not fall. The rest, since they are of free will — according to which man too was made to the image and likeness of God — can bend their will to either side." **Peter Lombard**, in book 2 of the Sentences, distinction 7, says that from these words, not well considered, it could be gathered that the good and the bad angels, since both have free will, can be bent as much to good as to evil — which is certainly rejected by all theologians. Accordingly, he warns that Jerome's opinion ought to be taken according to the state in which man and angel were first created. For both man and angel were so created that they could be bent to either [side]. But afterward the good angels were so confirmed by grace that they cannot sin; and the bad [angels] so hardened in vice that they cannot become good: and yet both have free will — because both the good, by no compelling necessity, but by their own and spontaneous will (aided indeed by grace), choose the good and reject the evil; and the bad, likewise, by [their] spontaneous will, destitute of grace, shun the good and follow the evil.

Annotation CLI

"There was a certain beggar, named Lazarus." — Luke 16[:20]

[margin: Whether those who preceded the preaching of Christ hoped for the resurrection.]

Chrysostom, in the first sermon on Lazarus, not far from the end, asserts that Lazarus could hope nothing concerning the resurrection: because those who preceded the time of evangelical grace had no knowledge of the resurrection. And he expresses this in these words:

(right column — continuing the Chrysostom citation of Annotation CLI:)

"I can add yet another [thing] to all these — namely, that Lazarus could not even reason anything about the resurrection; but he believed the affairs of this life to be bounded by the end of this life. For he was of the number of those who preceded the grace of the gospel. But if now, in these times — after so great a knowledge of God, after the excellent hopes of resurrection, after the punishments there laid up for sinners, after the goods prepared for those who have lived rightly — there are some so cast down in mind, and wretched, that not even by the expectation of these [things] are they corrected: what, in fine, must be thought to have befallen Lazarus, destitute even of this anchor? For he could never reason any such thing, because the time of such doctrines had not yet come." You have an observation akin to this passage above, in Annotation 51 of this book.

Annotation CLII

"Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus." — Luke 16[:24]

[margin: Whether anyone can attain salvation without the reading of the Divine Scripture.]

Chrysostom, in the third sermon on Lazarus, and in very many other homilies, exhorting his hearers to the reading of the sacred volumes, uses several sentences by which the heretics of our times try to persuade [people] that the holy Scriptures ought to be translated into all the languages of all peoples, so that they may be read by the rude people without any distinction, and understood without labor. For they say that nothing is a hindrance to the divine Scriptures being understood by all, even the unlearned, save ignorance of a foreign tongue. Now the propositions culled by the heretics from Chrysostom are chiefly three. The **first** is read in the third sermon on Lazarus, in these words: "Let us extinguish from afar the darts of the devil as they come, and drive [them] away by assiduous reading of the Scriptures. For it cannot be — it cannot be, I say — that anyone attain salvation, unless he be perpetually engaged in spiritual reading." And this proposition he urges by a twofold argument: first, indeed, from the necessity of instruments in any art whatever, saying thus in the same place: "Dost thou not see the coppersmiths, the goldsmiths, the silversmiths — in short, those who practice any art whatever — have all the instruments of [their] art ready [at hand]? With this same disposition it behooves us too to be endowed. For, as their instruments of art are the hammer, the anvil, the tongs; so for us the instruments are the books of the apostles and prophets, and every Scripture divinely inspired. And as they, by those instruments, accomplish whatever they undertake to do: so indeed we too by these fashion, correct our soul, and renew [it grown] old." **Secondly**, he establishes the same from this — that by divine precept each one ought to be prepared to render an account of his faith to whoever asks. His words, in the sixteenth homily on John, are these: "If the pagans watched so diligently to speak against our religion, what pardon shall we deserve, unless we know how to repel assaults of this kind against us? This Peter commands us. For he says: *[margin: 1 Pet. 3.]* '[Be] always ready to give satisfaction to everyone that asks you a reason of that hope which is in you.' And Paul: *[margin: Col. 3.]* 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you abundantly.'" *[margin: Prov. 10.]* But what [our theologians] answer to these [things]

[signature "Ss"; catchword "fucis" → continues on p. 490 (PDF 495).]

(printed p. 490 [PDF p. 495], verso — Ann. CLII cont., on Luke 16:24 (the three Chrysostom proof-texts the heretics cull for lay Scripture-reading). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing the Chrysostom citations of Annotation CLII, from the catchword "fucis" of the previous page:)

— [replies] more foolish than [their own] pretenses? "Blessed is every simple soul: and he who walks simply walks in confidence." For this indeed is the cause of all evils — that not many know how to adduce the testimonies of the Scriptures in seasonable matters. For "simple," in that place, is not to be understood as [meaning] "foolish," and as one who knows nothing; but as [meaning] not-evil, not-crafty. For if it were so understood, it would have been superfluous to say, *[margin: Matt. 10.]* "Be prudent as serpents, and simple as doves."

[margin: Whether the reading of the Scriptures pertains more to clerics than to laymen.]

The **second** proposition is, that the reading of the divine Scripture pertains not only to theologians, and clerics, and monks, but also, and much more, to laymen — especially merchants and craftsmen. And this he shows in the third sermon on Lazarus, writing thus: "Let no one say to me: I am fastened to lawsuits; I conduct public business; I ply a craft; I have a wife; I bear the care of a household; I am a worldly man; it is not for me to read the Scriptures, but for those who have said 'Farewell' to the world, who have occupied the mountain-tops, who lead such a life continually. What sayest thou, man? It is not thy business to unroll the Scriptures, because thou art distracted by innumerable cares? Nay, it is thine more than theirs. For they do not need the aid of the Scriptures in like manner as we, tossed in the midst of the waves of business. For the monks, indeed — free from the forum and forensic affairs, and who have fixed their little huts in the desert, and have commerce with no one, but philosophize in that quiet tranquillity with all security, and, sitting as it

were in a harbor, enjoy things exceedingly safe — but we, on the contrary, tossing as in the midst of the sea, and, will we or not, bound by innumerable sins, always have need of the perpetual and continual solace of the Scriptures." Again, in the second homily on Matthew, confirming this same [thing], he says: "But is there at last any defense of these faults? 'I am not,' he says, 'a monk; I have a wife and children, and bear the care of a household.' This indeed is that which corrupts all [things] as by a certain single plague — that you think the reading of the divine Scriptures pertains only to monks, whereas it is much more necessary for you than for them. For those who are engaged in the midst [of the world], and daily receive wounds, need the medicine the more," etc.

[margin: Whether occupation, want, or ignorance excuse anyone from the reading of the Divine Scripture.]

The **third** proposition, which is completed in three parts, is: That no one can be excused from the reading of the divine Scriptures, either by the occupation of business, or by the want of books, or by the obscurity of the divine eloquence. The first and second parts of this proposition he urges in the tenth homily on John, in these words: "What, then, do we demand of you? That on one of the days in the week — at least on the Lord's day — you make it your care to read the evangelical lessons; to have them in hand before these sermons, to repeat them frequently at home, diligently to search out their sense; to note what is clear, what obscure in them; what may seem to conflict, though it does not conflict — all [these] being thoroughly examined, [that] you may show yourselves most attentive to these sermons. But if there are [some] who plead business and occupations: first, in this they err not a little — that they are so always fastened to secular affairs that they bestow not even the least study on those [things] which are most necessary.

(right column — continuing Annotation CLII:)

Then, moreover, they bring forward a frivolous excuse of no moment — [that] in worthless matters, every excuse being rejected, they can apply diligent study, but toward the divine [things] think that not even the least care is to be imposed. And in what way are those who feel such [things] worthy to breathe, or to behold the Sun?" There is also another inept excuse of these drowsy [sluggards] — namely, the want of books. And to the rich it is indeed ridiculous to respond to this. But since I judge that many poor use an excuse of this kind, it pleases [me] to jest a little with these, and thus to question them: Have they not all the instruments of their [own] craft? And if they are much hindered by poverty in procuring these: is it not, then, absurd — here not to plead poverty, but where they would obtain so great a benefit, to bewail [their] occupations and want? The **third** and last part of this proposition he pursues thus, in the sermon on Lazarus already cited: "'What, then,' they say, 'if we do not understand the [things] which are contained in the sacred books?' Very [much profit], indeed: even if thou understandest not the [things] hidden there, yet from the very reading much holiness is born. Although it cannot be that thou be ignorant of all [things] equally. For therefore the grace of the Spirit dispensed and tempered those [things] — so that publicans, fishermen, tent-makers, shepherds, the unlearned and illiterate apostles, might be made safe through these books — lest any of the unlearned could flee to this excuse of difficulty: that the [things] which are said might be easy to the sight of all, that both the craftsman, and the servant, and the widow, and the woman, and the most unlearned of all men might carry off from the heard reading some gain and profit. For not for empty glory, as the pagans [did], but for the salvation of the hearers, did they compose these [things]. The philosophers, not seeking what profits the common [good], but looking to this — that they themselves be [held] in admiration — even if they said anything useful, this too their accustomed obscurity hid in a certain fog of wisdom: but the apostles and prophets did the contrary. They set forth all [things] manifest and clear, expounded [them] to all, as common teachers of the world, so that each might be able to learn by himself, from the reading alone, the [things] which are said." Again, in the third homily on the latter epistle to the Thessalonians, he indicates that the Scriptures are so clear that those who read them do not need the explanation of preachers and doctors. His words run thus: "But thou sayest, Why do I go into the church, if I hear no one preaching there? This has ruined and corrupted all [things]. For what need is there of a preacher? Through our negligence has this

necessity been made. For why is there need of a sermon? All [things] are clear and plain from the divine Scriptures: whatever [things] are necessary are manifest. But because you are dainty hearers, hunting for delight in listening, therefore you seek preachers. But I am ignorant, thou sayest, of the [things] which are set down in the divine Scriptures. Why? [Are they] uttered in Hebrew? in Latin? in some other foreign tongue? Are they not spoken in Greek? But obscurely, thou sayest. What is that obscurity, tell [me], I pray? Are they not histories? Thou knowest the [things] which are clear, [seeing] that thou askest about the obscure [ones]. There are a thousand histories in the Scriptures. Tell me one of them. But thou wilt not say [one]. These are pretexts, and empty words."

[catchword "HAEC" → "These [things Chrysostom said]," — Sixtus's reply to the three propositions continues on p. 491 (PDF 496).]

(printed p. 491 [PDF p. 496], recto — Ann. CLII cont., on Luke 16:24 (Sixtus's reply on vernacular Bibles; Trent's Rule 4). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Sixtus's reply, from the catchword "HAEC" of the previous page:)

These [things], then, have been said by Chrysostom on this matter, from which the heretics draw three errors: **first**, that the reading of the divine Scripture is necessary for all, the learned as much as the unlearned; **second**, that the divine Scripture is by its own nature most clear, and so easy of understanding that it can be most plainly understood by any rude and simple little fellow, if the impediment of a foreign tongue be absent; **third**, that the divine letters ought to be translated into the peculiar and proper languages of each people — so that, this one obstacle of an unknown tongue being removed, all the nations of the whole world may read and understand the sacred volumes; which of old, too, it is agreed was done with great profit to the Christian world by the ancient fathers of the Church — of whom, as very many ecclesiastical writers testify, **Chrysostom** translated the New Testament and the Davidic Psalms into the Armenian tongue; **Jerome**, both Testaments into the Dalmatian [Slavonic] tongue; **Ulphilas** [Wulfila], bishop of the Goths, all the sacred Bible into the Gothic tongue; and in Chrysostom's times all the Greek church read the divine books, either published or translated, in the vulgar tongue.

Against errors of this kind it behooves [us] to remember — what we have also often warned elsewhere — that the words of preachers are not always to be taken with that rigor with which they first come to the ears of the hearers. For many declaimers frequently pronounce and inculcate [things] by hyperbole — whether led by the occasion of places, times, and persons, or carried away by the impulse of the affections and the course of [their] discourse. This sometimes befell Chrysostom, and [befell him] especially [when] speaking on this argument. For indeed, when he noticed that the multitude of the Greeks — intent on theaters, spectacles, stage-plays, and the fables of the poets — utterly despised the divine Scriptures; he, bearing grievously so great a sloth and ignorance of his flock, desired that all, if it could be done, might be theologians and teachers; by which spirit Moses of old, [being] inspired, said, *[margin: Num. 11.]* "Who will grant that all the people may prophesy, and that the Lord give them his spirit?" And on account of this he exhorted all indiscriminately to the divine reading — as though it pertained promiscuously to all, and no access of salvation lay open to [anyone] who did not read the sacred volumes.

[margin: In what way the reading of Divine Scripture is necessary for all.]

Accordingly, when we read in him that the study of the divine Scripture is necessary for all, and that the reading of the Scriptures pertains more to laymen than to monks: his words are not to be so taken as if he means [that] craftsmen, fishermen, farmers, and illiterate men of this kind — who neither know letters, nor have learned to read — cannot be saved unless they unroll and read the sacred codices (for this would be to close the kingdom of heaven to the foolish and the rude, which Christ willed to be open no less to the unlearned than to the learned); but it is credible that he understood, by "the reading of the Scriptures," that

knowledge to which the supreme heads of the whole divine Scripture are referred — such as are the precepts of the Decalogue, and the sentences of the Christian Creed; which, being utterly unknown, it is certain that no one attains eternal life.

[margin: In what way the Divine Scripture is easy, or difficult.]

But as to what he says — that the divine Scriptures are so clear that they can be understood by anyone, however unskilled — [this] is to be referred not to the whole, but to [some] parts. For Chrysostom distinguishes the divine writings into two classes: of which one contains the hidden and abstruse mysteries of a higher wisdom, neither accessible to all, nor necessary for all to know — such as are, for the greater part, the epistles of Paul: concerning which Peter, speaking, says: *[margin: 2 Pet. 3 (printed "1 Pet. 3").]* "Our most dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote epistles, in which are certain [things] hard to understand, which the unlearned and unstable pervert — as also the other Scriptures — to their own destruction." The other class is open and clear, embracing the first and highest principles of the things to be believed, and the chief precepts and examples of living well, easy to understand — such as are the moral sentences, and certain sacred histories, useful for the forming of morals; concerning which almost all the exhortations of Chrysostom are to be understood.

(right column — continuing Sixtus's reply:)

[margin: Whether the Divine Scriptures ought to be translated into the mother tongues of each people.]

But to that which the heretics contend — that the divine letters ought to be translated into the mother tongue of each nation, because of old this very thing was done with great benefit to the Church — it is answered that an argument of this kind is inept: for many [things] have at other times been instituted for the common utility of the commonwealth, which, when afterward they brought inconvenience and danger, were abrogated. There were once held, by the institution of the Church, great night-vigils at the tombs of the martyrs, with a great throng of holy virgins, of monks, and of secular men: but when thence, little by little, many foul and base wickednesses began to issue forth, they were entirely abolished by the sanction of the Council of Elvira. There was once given — as is clear from book 6 of the Eusebian History, chapter 33, and from the fifth volume of Theodoret, chapter 18 — the sacrament of the Eucharist into the hands of the faithful; but, when many were detected who handled it unworthily, and who carried it off secretly home, hidden, for magical vanities, that custom was abolished. *[margin: Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, in the 5th Mystagogical oration: "Approaching," he says, "to communion — not with the palms of the hands spread out, nor with the fingers apart, but make thy left hand a kind of throne beneath the right, which is about to receive so great a King; and with hollowed hand receive the body of Christ, saying 'Amen.'"]* We ourselves, therefore, confess that formerly the sacred books, rendered into the vulgar tongue, [were spread] with great propagation of the Christian faith. But now it is not altogether expedient that this same be done — since by most certain experience we have learned that a very great crowd of the simple has, from this occasion, fallen into detestable and irremediable errors, while every cobbler, fuller, and tanner, relying on a vernacular translation of the Scriptures, dares in this insolent age rashly to discourse of the obscure difficulties of the divine Scripture, and to judge, according to his own madness, of the chief dogmas of the faith. Therefore so great an abundance and license of vulgar versions is to be restrained — both for the reverence of the divine Scripture, and for the salvation of souls — lest, against the Savior's precept, the holy [thing] be given to be eaten by dogs, and the pearls be trampled by swine. And as a certain prudent and pious moderation is to be applied in this matter — that translations of the sacred volumes of this kind be not forbidden to all, lest the unlearned (as Chrysostom says) be entirely deprived of the instruments of their art: so care must be taken that the divine letters be not everywhere published to all indiscriminately, but only to those who are endowed with a right faith toward God and with approved morals; even as the sacrosanct Synod of Trent, in the Index of Prohibited Books, Rule 4, decreed in these words: "Since it is manifest by experience that, if the sacred Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted everywhere without distinction, more harm than utility arises thence, on

account of the rashness of men: in this matter let it be [committed] to the judgment of the bishop, or [of the] inquisi-

[signature "Ss 2"; catchword "inquisi-" → "inquisi[tor]," continues on p. 492 (PDF 497).]

(printed p. 492 [PDF p. 497], verso — end of Ann. CLII and Ann. CLIII–CLVI, on Luke 16–22 (confession to God alone?; "buy a sword" and Christian warfare begins). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLII, the text of Trent's Rule 4, from the catchword "inquisi-":)

-tor — that, with the counsel of the parish priest or confessor, they may grant the reading, in the vulgar tongue, of Bibles translated by catholic authors, to those whom they shall understand able to receive from such reading not harm, but an increase of faith and piety: which faculty they are to have in writing. But he who without such faculty shall have presumed to read or to have these [Bibles], let him not be able to receive absolution of [his] sins unless he have first returned the Bibles to the ordinary. And the booksellers who shall have sold, or in any other way granted, Bibles written in the vulgar tongue to one not having the aforesaid faculty, let them lose the price of the books — to be converted by the bishop to pious uses — and let them be subject to other penalties, according to the quality of the offense, at the judgment of the same bishop. But regulars may not read or buy these [Bibles] except with a faculty had from their prelates.

Annotation CLIII

"If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they hear if one rise from the dead." — Luke 16[:31]

[margin: Confession.]

Chrysostom, in the fourth homily on Lazarus, narrating these [things], speaks of confession in such a way that from his words it could be gathered that one is to confess to God alone: for he speaks thus: "Why, I ask, art thou ashamed, and dost thou blush to tell thy sins? For beware lest thou tell [them] to a man, lest he reproach thee: for neither dost thou confess to a servant, that he may bring [them] out into public," etc. See above, Annotation 175 of book 5.

Annotation CLIV

"Go, and show yourselves to the priests." — Luke 17[:14]

[margin: What sins are to be confessed.]

Bede, in book 5 of the commentaries on Luke, chapter 68, expounds this passage thus: "The Lord is found to have sent to the priests none of those on whom he bestowed these bodily benefits, except the lepers: because, namely, the priesthood of the Jews was a figure of the future royal priesthood which is in the Church. And whosoever — whether by heretical depravity, or by gentile superstition, or by Jewish perfidy, or even by fraternal schism, as if steeped in a varied color [of disease] — shall have lacked the grace of the Lord: it is necessary that he come to the Church, and show the true color of the faith which he has received. But the other vices — as [diseases] of the health, and as it were of the members of the soul and of the senses — the Lord heals and corrects inwardly, by [the man] himself, in conscience and in [his] understanding." **Beatus Rhenanus**, addicted to the Lutheran sect, in the Annotations which he published on Tertullian's book *On Penance*, perversely gathers from these words that only in the crime of schism, heresy, and infidelity must one confess to priests; but in the other sins it suffices to confess to God alone. But Bede's mind is to show by these words a twofold kind of confession: one, which is part of public and solemn penance — and this he says is necessary for heretics, schismatics, and infidels; the other is the kind of clandestine and secret confession, which he asserts to suffice in the other offenses for those who bring forth the secrets of the breast,

to God alone, into the ear of the priest, and accuse [their] sins.

(right column:)

Annotation CLV

"God, be merciful to me a sinner." — Luke 18[:13]

[margin: On confession.]

Chrysostom, in the homily *On the Publican and the Pharisee*, in the explanation of this sentence, seems to be content with confession alone, which is made secretly before God, when he says: "Therefore I advise that thou confess assiduously. For I do not lead thee to the theater of thy fellow-servants; nor do I compel thee to declare thy sins to men; lay open thy conscience to God: to him show [thy] deeds and wounds, and from him seek medicine: show [thyself] to one not reproaching, but healing," etc. See above, Annotation 175 of book 5.

Annotation CLVI

"He that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a scrip: and he that hath not, let him sell his tunic, and buy a sword." — Luke 22[:36]

[margin: Whether it is lawful for a Christian to wage war.]

Hugh of Saint-Cher, expounding this passage in the Postil on Mark, is censured by **Erasmus** with a twofold charge: first, indeed, that most shamelessly twisting the saying of Christ, he asserted that he [Christ] warned the Apostles by these words that, when the storm of persecutions rushed on, they should fortify themselves with two things — namely, provisions and the defense of arms; then, that he made Chrysostom the author of so absurd a wresting — [Chrysostom] who everywhere rejects this fabrication. Erasmus condemns these [things] in the Annotations on the third chapter and on the twenty-second chapter of Luke, where, digressing from his purpose in a prolix discourse, he deplores, with almost tragic complaints, the judgment of the school-theologians; who, by their insipid (as he says) fabrications and frigid little distinctions, subvert the evangelical doctrine — teaching that the right of warring is not forbidden to Christians, but that it is lawful for Christians to wage war. Their opinion, indeed, he attacks, as impious, with a great number of testimonies — that those whom he cannot overcome by the weight of witnesses, he may at least overwhelm by [their] multitude. Among these the weightier are, that Christ in the gospel commanded his own *[margin: Matt. 5.]* not to resist evil, but to love [their] enemies; to pray for those who calumniate [them], to seek the peace of persecutors, to do good to enemies, to offer the other cheek to those who strike, and, to those who take away the tunic, to leave the cloak also besides; and, *[margin: Rom. 12.]* according to Paul's precept, to burn up [their] adversaries with the flames of love and of kindnesses. To these he adds the authority of many ancient fathers, but first of all of **Origen**; who, in the seventh treatise on Matthew, explaining the present passage, pronounces that Christ's discourse about buying a sword is pestilent, if it be taken to the letter. Then he compares **Ambrose** to Origen; whose explanation upon these words of Christ is read in the tenth commentary on Luke in this manner: "O Lord, why dost thou bid me buy a sword, [thou] who forbiddest me to strike? why dost thou command [me] to have [that] which thou forbiddest to be drawn forth? — unless perhaps that a defense be prepared, [and] vengeance not [be] necessary; and [that] I may seem to have been able to avenge [myself], but to have been unwilling. Yet the Law does not forbid me to strike back: and therefore perhaps, to Peter offering two swords, 'It is enough,' he says — as though it were lawful up to the Gospel, so that in the Law there be the instruction of equity, in the Gospel the perfection of goodness." To many this

[catchword "hoc" → "this [saying]," continues on p. 493 (PDF 498).]

(printed p. 493 [PDF p. 498], recto — Ann. CLVI cont., on Luke 22:36 (whether a Christian may wage war — Erasmus's witnesses and Sixtus's reply). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CLVI, from the catchword "hoc":)

this [saying] seems unjust; but the Lord [is] not unjust, who, when he could avenge himself, chose rather to be sacrificed. To these he also joins **Chrysostom**, cited from the *Catena Aurea* of St. Thomas; who narrates this very discourse of Christ thus: "'He that hath not, let him sell his garment, and buy a sword.' What now [is] this? Does he arm the disciples — he who says, 'If anyone strike thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also'? — *[margin: Matt. 5.]* he who commanded that we bless those who assail us with reproaches, [that] we bear with [those] invading [us], [that] we pray for [our] persecutors — does he now arm [them]? and arm [them] with one sword only? And how are these [things] consonant with reason? For if there were altogether need of arms, [it ought] not [to be] with a sword alone; but he ought to have armed [them] also with a shield, and a helmet, and greaves. And indeed, if he had wished to dispense and act in these [matters] after the human manner, this precept was ridiculous. For, although they had possessed six hundred [countless] arms of that kind against the ambushes and assaults of peoples, tyrants, cities, nations: how would eleven [men] have been reckoned the stronger? Why, then, does he say these [things]? He wished to indicate the ambushes of the Jews — and [to do so] manifestly, and not by riddles, lest again they be confounded [confused] along with him." **Sulpicius Severus** is put [as witness] in the last place, who, in the *Life of Martin*, brings him in refusing Caesar's donative — which was wont to be paid out to the soldiers — with these words: "Hitherto, O Caesar, I have soldiered for thee: now permit that I may soldier for God. Let him who is about to fight receive thy donative: I am a soldier of Christ; it is not lawful for me to fight." At last, after many [things], he [Erasmus] infers that a Christian man must fight not with bodily and iron arms, but with the spiritual and evangelical panoply with which Paul equips the soldier of Christ — that is, with the helmet of salvation, the shield of faith, and the sword of the spirit: which [thing], he says, Ambrose too openly declared, in the book *On Widows*, when he says: "The arms of the Church are faith; the arms of the Church are prayer, which conquers the adversary."

These [things] Erasmus [says]: who, as in those [things] which he brought forth against the scholastic theologians he is vehemently deceived, so in that which he casts up against **Hugh of Saint-Cher** he is utterly mistaken. For, since here two [things] are numbered by Christ — namely, the fitting [provision] of the purse and scrip alike, and the buying of a sword — Hugh, expounding the first of these in the first place, says that Christ, by the admonition about the purse and scrip, granted the Apostles license that thereafter they might prepare for themselves certain [things] necessary for [their] sustenance, [things] which are signified by the name of "purse and scrip." And he uses, for the confirmation of this interpretation, the testimony of Chrysostom, cited in truncated form for the sake of brevity. Which, lest anyone suspect [it to have been] falsely adduced, I will subscribe here the entire opinion of Chrysostom, from the homily on that [text] of the epistle to the Romans, "Salute Prisca and Aquila," etc. — where, dissolving the question, why the Apostles, to whom Christ had by a law forbidden the purse, the scrip, shoes, and doubled tunics, used all these after Christ's resurrection — he speaks in this manner:

"What, then, shall we say to these [things]? Christ did not wish the Apostles to be always bound by the necessity of this law, but he absolved them from this law, when he was now about to go to the saving cross. And whence is this clear? From the Savior's discourses. For, about to undertake the Passion, having called them, he said: 'When I sent you without purse and scrip, was anything lacking?' But they, answer-

(right column — continuing the Chrysostom citation of Annotation CLVI:)

-ing said, 'Nothing.' But he said to them: 'But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and a scrip; and he that hath not, let him sell his garment, and buy a sword.' *[margin: Luke 22.]* Now perhaps someone will say [that] the Apostles [are] by these words absolved from the charge. But further it is asked, why Christ commanded

contrary [things]. For at one time he says, 'Possess not a scrip'; but at another, 'He that hath not a purse, let him take it, and a scrip.' Why did he do this? Certainly he did these [things] very worthily, according to his wisdom and the care which he bore for the disciples. For from the beginning of [their] calling he did this — that the disciples might make trial of their [own] courage; and thereafter, [being] about to go out into the world, [that] animated by this example they might trust the more in him. But when they now began to recognize their own power, he willed that they themselves should furnish among themselves some specimen of virtue; and he permitted them to bear their own temptations — namely, lest they should sit perpetually idle, and be carried like children even to the end. For at the beginning he suffered them to endure nothing, but everywhere was present, fortifying and entrenching them about, and making all [things] flow to them abundantly: but when it was time that they themselves should declare their own manliness, he withdrew [his] benefit for a while, commanding them that they too should accomplish many [things] by themselves. And for this cause, when they had no shoes, nor girdle, nor staff, nor money, nothing was lacking to them. For he says, 'Was anything lacking to you?' and answering they said, 'Nothing.' But at the time when he permitted them to have a purse, and a scrip, and shoes, they were found both hungering, and thirsting, and going naked. Whence [it is] clear why he suffers them everywhere to be endangered and afflicted — namely, that they may have some reward. And just as birds, cherishing their young, sit so long in the nest until their feathers grow; and when they have seen [these] to have grown, they first teach them to flutter about the nests, then wholly leave them to their own support: so also did Christ. For in Palestine he nourished the disciples as in a nest, and taught them to fly, [being] present and carrying [them]: at last he permitted them to fly into the whole world, a command being given them, that they should not fail themselves."

These words of Chrysostom [were] summarily culled by Hugh — not, however, as Erasmus charges, falsely and corruptly cited. Agreeing with which, **Theophylact**, in the exposition of the same passage, writes thus: "At the beginning of the preaching, indeed, the Lord, sending the Disciples into the towns and cities, sent [them] without the necessaries; nor did he give [them the things] of which they had need, nor did he wish them to bear [such] care — and in these [things] it was fitting that they learn his power. For, having care of them as of the weak, he made all necessaries flow to them abundantly, apart from their own care. But now he commands the contrary — not [being] contrary to himself, but showing them that up to this time he had carried them as little children, and had not made them solicitous about anything. But now it is needful for them that they attend to the [things] which are of grown men, and provide for themselves. 'For I,' he says, 'your father, having care of you, now depart. From this time be prepared, and bear yourselves the care of your own affairs, and cast not all care upon me. For your works will not be so easy, and free from labor; but you will be subject to hunger, thirst, and many adversities. For these [things] are intimated by the purse and the scrip.'" From these

[signature "Ss 3"; catchword "his" → "From these [things]," continues on p. 494 (PDF 499).]

(printed p. 494 [PDF p. 499], verso — Ann. CLVI cont., on Luke 22:36 (Christian warfare — Sixtus's positive case; Augustine). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CLVI, from the catchword "his":)

From these [things], then, it is clear that Hugh was unworthily condemned by Erasmus in this part.

There **follows** a second charge of Erasmus, accusing Hugh — that against the opinion of Christ he affirmed that Christ granted to the Apostles the power of warring, and the use of the sword, when he exhorted them that, [their] garment being sold, they should buy a sword; and again, that he ascribes this violent interpretation to Chrysostom, [who] manifestly disapproves it. Of which accusations the latter, indeed, is so far from the truth that in this part which pertains to the sword no mention of Chrysostom is found in Hugh. But the former accusation contains an open calumny. For although Hugh writes that Christ, by that discourse,

gave the Apostles license to use the sword, yet he did not by this saying wish to signify what Erasmus imputes to him — namely, that Christ commanded the disciples to descend into battle girt with the sword, about to fight it out with their own hand against enemies: but he wished it to be understood that Christ granted to the Apostles the just use of the sword — not, indeed, in their own person, nor for that time, but in the person of the whole Church, and for the future time; because, at the outset of the nascent Church, the use of arms would be least fitting.

But lest anyone perhaps suspect that these [things] are fabricated by me either out of hatred of Erasmus, or in favor of Hugh, the very words of Hugh run thus: "Note, that although the Lord spoke specially to the primitive Church, yet the primitive Church did not have the sword, nor was it fitting for it to fight it out with the sword. For as long as the Church was new, it behooved that it be planted by two [things] — namely, by sufferings and miracles. But after, by the process of time, the Church was grown, those two are no longer necessary. But since the sword does not belong to the primitive Church: why did he command the Apostles to take up the sword in the time of persecution? — that it might appear that the faculty of defense was not lacking to them; and thus [that] the Lord was shown to come willingly to the Passion. And this is what follows in the Gloss of Bede: 'He bids [them] either to take up a sword [already] had, or, if not had, to buy [one] — that readers may know that the faculty of resisting was not lacking to the disciples, but rather that in the Master there was the love of suffering.' Likewise in the Gloss of Ambrose: 'Why dost thou bid [me] buy a sword, [thou] who forbiddest [me] to strike? why dost thou command [me] to have [that] which thou forbiddest to be drawn forth? — unless perhaps that a defense be prepared, [and] vengeance not [be] necessary; and [that] I may seem able to avenge [myself], but to have been unwilling,' etc." Thus far Hugh.

There **remains** the last complaint of Erasmus against the more recent theologians — that against the evangelical and Apostolic philosophy they teach that it is lawful for Christians to soldier and to wage wars. Which complaint, indeed, is so unjust — not to say Manichaean and impious — that the accuser himself manifestly betrays himself an adversary of the evangelical discipline, and a subverter of the Christian polity, while he takes from Christians the rights of just defense — instituted by the laws of nature, and confirmed by the common consent and authority of all nations. For if war were altogether forbidden by the evangelical law, **John**, to the soldiers asking what would be expedient for them unto salvation, *[margin: Luke 3.]* would have said, "Cast away [your] arms, desert this soldiery; strike no one" — but he did not say this. But he only admonished [them] that, content with their pay, they should abstain from calumny — being also,

(right column — continuing Annotation CLVI:)

moreover, about to prohibit the exercise of warring, if he had thought it unlawful. Again, when the **Centurion** tried to show the authority of Christ from the command which he himself had over his soldiers, *[margin: Matt. 8.]* Christ, having praised the soldier's faith, did not command him the desertion of [his] soldiery — [Christ] who without doubt would have forbidden [it], if war were in no way lawful. Likewise to the Herodians asking whether it were lawful to give tribute to Caesar, *[margin: Matt. 22.]* he answered, "Render to Caesar the [things] that are Caesar's." Now for this cause tributes are rendered — that thence pay may necessarily be paid to the soldier for the preservation of peace. For thus says **Paul**, when he treats of the obedience to be shown to the prince: *[margin: Rom. 13.]* "Therefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For therefore also you pay tributes: for they are the ministers of God, serving unto this very thing." Rightly, therefore, St. **Augustine**, in the fifth letter to Marcellinus, treating of Christian war, spoke thus: "For if Christian discipline blamed all wars, this counsel would rather be given in the gospel to those seeking salvation — that they should cast away arms, and withdraw themselves altogether from soldiery. But it was said to them: 'Do violence to no one. Be content with your pay.'" To whom he commanded that pay ought to suffice, [and so] soldiering he certainly did not forbid. And in the letter to Count **Boniface** — which is number fifty — exhorting him to coerce the Donatists by war, he says: "Do not think that no one can please God who serves in the arms of war. Among these was holy David, to whom the

Lord gave so great a testimony. Among these was that holy Centurion, who said to the Lord, 'I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof.' This, then, first consider, when thou art armed for battle: that thy valor, even the very bodily [strength], is a gift of God. For if thou wilt think of [it as] the gift of God, thou wilt not act against the Lord. For faith, when it is promised, must be kept even to the enemy against whom war is waged: how much more to the friend for whom [one] fights. To have peace is [a matter] of the will: but war ought to be [a matter] of necessity — that God may free [us] from necessity, and preserve [us] in peace. For peace is not sought that war may be exercised, but war is waged that peace may be acquired. Be therefore, [even] in warring, peaceful — that those whom thou overcomest, thou mayest, by conquering, lead to the peace of unity."

But, that I be not longer, I pass over what the same **Augustine** wrote on the right of Christian war in almost innumerable places — especially in book 22 *Against Faustus*, from chapter 74 up to 79 — and what **Gregory**, **Bernard**, and very many other ancient Fathers said in favor of Christian soldiery. But I come to those [things] which Erasmus opposes. First, from the Evangelical and Apostolic writings, by which we are forbidden to resist evil, are commanded to remit injuries, to love enemies, to seek peace with these, to pray well for those who curse [us], to do good to persecutors, to offer the right [cheek] also to be struck to [him who] strikes the left, and other [things] like these, which seem to explode the rights of warring. To this objection we answer: [that] of those [things] which have been enumerated, some are precepts, but some counsels. But it is indeed a precept, in a certain way and in general [in the disposition of the heart], to love enemies, to love foes, not to forsake the persecutors of the help of prayer, to wish and seek their peace and good will. Which precepts, indeed, [do not take away] the right and facul-

[catchword "facul-" → "the right and facul[ty of warring]," continues on p. 495 (PDF 500).]

(printed p. 495 [PDF p. 500], recto — end of Ann. CLVI and Ann. CLVII–CLX, on Luke 22 (Christian warfare concluded; "two swords"; the angel in Gethsemane; Peter's denial). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLVI, from the catchword "facul-":)

-ty and exercise of fighting — [these precepts] neither take [them] away, nor always hinder [them]. For those wars are just and truly Christian which are waged by peaceful warriors — that is, by those seeking peace — with love of the enemies, for the defense of justice and the attainment of peace, according to that rule of Augustine: "War is waged, that peace may be acquired. Be therefore, in warring, peaceful — that those whom thou overcomest, thou mayest, by conquering, lead to the benefit of peace." Moreover, among these [things] are counsels: not to resist evil, not to defend oneself, to render good for evil, to offer even the left [cheek] to [him who] strikes the right, to let go the cloak also, besides, to [him who] snatches the tunic, to follow with a doubled number of paces [him who] drags [thee] one mile, and very many other [things] of that kind; which, apart from the crisis of necessity — as Augustine says — are not precepts of the deed, but of the disposition, to be kept in the preparation of the mind: that we may, namely, be always ready not to resist evil, but to conquer evil with good, and to repay a kindness for a wrong, if that be needful. But if it be otherwise expedient — whether for the common good, or for the benefit of those who assail us — then, as Augustine writes in the letter to Marcellinus, many [things] must be done, even the unwilling being chastised with a certain benign severity. For he from whom the license of iniquity is taken away is usefully conquered: "Since nothing is more unhappy than the good fortune of sinners, by which penal impunity is nourished, and the evil will, as an interior enemy, is strengthened."

But to that which Erasmus objects — that the Christian must fight with prayers and supplications — we confess indeed that to the just warrior prayers and supplications, poured out to God with the whole heart, are necessary first of all: because, as that noble Maccabee said, "the victory of war is not from the multitude of

the army, but strength is from heaven." But after these [things], even if necessity press, arms must be taken and battle entered: since, while Moses prayed on the mountain, the army of the Amalekites is overcome by Joshua fighting.

Lastly, to those [things] which are brought forward by Erasmus from the fathers: first I answer to the passage of Ambrose, that his words are not to be so taken as if he means war to be unlawful to all these who profess the gospel — but [only] to those men (according, however, to the common rule) who have given themselves wholly to the divine worship, and hold a more eminent perfection of goodness, placed in the observance of the counsels: which Ambrose himself not obscurely indicates, saying, "that there may be in the gospel the perfection of goodness." To the same sense, too, are to be referred the words of Chrysostom. For indeed, since the Apostles stood on the highest summit of evangelical purity, it was not lawful for them to put on arms, to gird [themselves] with the sword, to lay [their] hand on the sword, and to be besprinkled with another's blood. Whence Origen deservedly said that Christ's discourse, exhorting to the sword, is pestilent to those who understand it according to the letter — that is, to those who think that Christ, by that saying, commanded his Apostles to arm themselves for battle; whereas that would not befit men holding the citadel of all perfection. Nor does the answer of Martin depart from this aim, who declined soldiery not only for this cause, but also for another far graver — namely, because he judged [it] a wickedness that a Christian soldier should soldier under an impious and apostate Emperor.

(right column — concluding Annotation CLVI:)

For Julian, having openly deserted the religion of Christ, had fallen away to paganism.

These [things], perhaps, [have been] said at greater length than would suit the present purpose, [but] out of a zeal for piety, against Erasmus — whom, lest I seem to have utterly stripped him of his defense, I will not be silent [in noting] that he, after a long and pernicious digression by which he wounded the reader's mind, at last, at the end of the discourse, added: "And we wish these [things] to be held as matters disputed, not as [things] asserted" — namely, that by such a paint [pretense] he might provide for himself, and, as it is said in the adage, might hide his hand, the stone [having been] cast.

From those [things] which have been said in this Annotation, [those things] are most easily refuted which **John Ferus** wrote against the Christian right of warring, in the Commentaries on the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew. These read above, Annotation 115.

Annotation CLVII

"Lord, behold here [are] two swords." — Luke 22[:38]

[margin: War.]

Nicholas of Lyra Erasmus derides, because in this place, following the opinions of Hugh [of Saint-Cher], he wrote that Christ commanded the Apostles that, when the time of persecution threatened, they should prepare provisions, and make ready arms for defense. Consult the preceding annotation.

Annotation CLVIII

"But he said to them, It is enough." — Luke 22[:38]

[margin: War.]

Ambrose, in book 10 on Luke, so interprets this passage that he seems to hold that the right of warring is forbidden by the evangelical law. Which opinion Erasmus and Oecolampadius abuse for the overthrow of Christian soldiery. Read what is had above, Annotation 156.

Annotation CLIX

"There appeared an angel of the Lord, strengthening him." — Luke 22[:43]

[margin: The consoling apparition of the angel.]

Thomas Cajetan, interpreting these [words], **Ambrose** [Catharinus] refutes, in book 3, with these words: "Cajetan notes that Jerome does not think this apparition of the angel altogether certain: which is most false. Nay, he proves and cites [it] as certain — although he says [it] is absent in many codices. But this does not prove that Jerome did not hold [it] as certain." Concerning this we have written in book 1, section 2.

Annotation CLX

"But he denied him, saying, Woman, I know him not." — Luke 22[:57]

[margin: Whether Peter denied the Godhead of Christ.]

Ambrose, in book 10 of the commentaries on Luke, excusing Peter's denial, says that he did not deny him [Christ] to be God, but denied [knowing] him [only] as a mere man. For he speaks thus: "The first voice is that of Peter denying — by which, however, he seems not to deny the Lord, but to have separated himself from the treachery of the woman. But consider what he denied: that he was assuredly of those who were with Jesus the Galilean, or, as Mark put [it], with Jesus the Nazarene. Did he deny that he had been with the Son of God? This is to say: 'I know not the Galilean, I know not the Nazarene' — [him] whom I know [to be] the Son of God. Let men have the names of places: [his] native region cannot name the Son of God, whose majesty [the place]

> *[signature "Ss 4"; catchword "locus" → "whose majesty [no] place [can hold]," continues on p. 496 (PDF 501).]*

(printed p. 496 [PDF p. 501], verso — end of Ann. CLX and Ann. CLXI–CLXII, on Luke 22–23 (Peter's denial and tears; "weep not over me"). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Ambrose citation of Annotation CLX, from the catchword "locus":)

whose majesty no place includes," etc. This same [thing] **Hilary** held, in canon 2 on Matthew. **Jerome**, in book 4 on Matthew, disapproving this opinion, says: "I know that some, out of pious affection toward the Apostle, so interpreted this passage as to say that Peter denied not God, but man; and that the sense is, 'I know not the man, because I know [him to be] God.' How frivolous this is, the prudent reader understands. Thus they defend the Apostle so as to make God guilty of a lie. For if he did not deny [him], then the Lord lied, who had said: *[margin: Matt. 26.]* 'Amen I say to thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.' Observe what he says: 'Thou shalt deny *me*, not the man.'" These [things] Jerome [says]; to whom **Theophylact**, in the commentary on this passage, subscribes much more freely with these words: "Certain [men] feign I know not how foolish a defense for Peter, boldly saying that Peter denied, but said, 'I know not the man' — that is, 'I know not [him as] a mere man, but [as] God made man.' Their foolish argument I will leave to others: for they make the Lord a liar, and are contrary to the context of the gospel, and can in no way make the sequence of the narrative cohere; and, moreover, why did Peter weep, if he did not deny?"

Annotation CLXI

"And going forth, Peter wept bitterly." — Luke 22[:62]

[margin: Whether penance profits without confession and satisfaction.]

Ambrose, in the tenth commentary on Luke, so expounds this passage that he seems to exclude confession and satisfaction from true penance. For he uses these words: "Peter grieved and wept, because he erred as a man. I do not find what he said: I find that he wept. I read his tears; I do not read [his] satisfaction. But what cannot be defended, the tears wash away the offense — [that] which it is a shame to confess with the voice, the weeping provides for [both] pardon and modesty. Tears speak the fault without horror. Tears confess the crime without offense to modesty; tears do not ask for pardon, but merit [it]." The same opinion, and in almost the same words, he repeats in the sermon *On the Penance of Peter* — which is number 46 — where it is read thus: "Peter burst into tears, praying nothing with the voice. For I find that he wept: I do not find what he said. I read his tears: I do not read [his] satisfaction. Rightly, indeed, did Peter weep, and keep silence — because what is wont to be wept over is not wont to be excused; and what cannot be defended can be washed away. For a tear washes away the offense which it is a shame to confess with the voice. Tears, therefore, provide alike for modesty and for salvation; nor do they blush in asking, and they obtain in entreating. More profitable are the prayers of tears than of speech: because speech, in praying, perhaps deceives; a tear deceives not at all."

This same [thing] **Maximus**, bishop of Turin, has in the sermon *On Penance*.

Gratian annotated this passage, in the first distinction *On Penance*, and **Peter**, bishop of Paris [Lombard], in book 4 of the Sentences, distinction 17. But each of them says that the words of Ambrose and Maximus are to be referred to *public* penance — for it is not necessary to disclose by public confession and satisfaction that which is hidden; but it suffices, by hidden tears and secret con-

(right column — continuing Annotation CLXI:)

-fession, to accuse the offense to the priest alone — that [offense] which it shames us to confess publicly. But as to what Ambrose wrote — that he read the tears of Peter, [but] did not read [his] confession and satisfaction — the Master of the Sentences says that [Ambrose] does not [thereby] explode either confession or satisfaction, because many [things] were done which are not written; and because, perhaps, the secret confession which we now use had not yet been instituted. Read above, Annotations 16 and 174 of book 5.

Annotation CLXII

"Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not over me, etc." — Luke 23[:28]

[margin: Whether the death of Christ is to be mourned.]

Theophylact, elucidating this clause, says: "Women, indeed, are a kind of people easily weeping and wailing; as though something grievous had befallen the Lord, they weep, showing forth great compassion, and lamenting the injustice. But he does not approve, but rather rebukes them. For he was suffering voluntarily. And it is not fitting to lament him who suffers willingly and for the salvation of all: but it is congruous that he should rather be extolled and celebrated with praises. For through the cross both death was destroyed, and hell made captive. For laments, for those who suffer willingly, bring no consideration [do not befit them]. Therefore the Lord rebukes those who were mourning him." **Erasmus**, from these words, gathers that it is not lawful for a Christian man to weep over the Passion of Christ, and to follow his death with tears; because Christ willed his death to be not mournful, but glorious, and did not wish [it] to be deplored, but adored — as [a death] which was undertaken willingly for the salvation of the whole world.

He confirms this opinion by the testimony of **Bede**, who in book 6 of the commentaries on Luke writes thus: "'Do not lament me,' says Christ, 'as about to die — [me] whose swift resurrection can dissolve death, whose death is about to destroy both all death, and the very author of death.'" Again he joins **Ambrose** to Bede; who, although he passes over this discourse of the Lord to the women, yet at the mention of the cross at once bursts into triumphal, not mournful, words: "But now let the victor raise his trophy," he says. And then, "Now, since we have already seen the trophy, let the triumpher mount his chariot," etc. This opinion of

Erasmus the **Faculty of the Paris theologians**, in the censures which it published on the works of Erasmus, orders to be held among the impious and heretical dogmas. It indicates also that the aforesaid authorities of the fathers are to be taken in that sense in which Christ said to the mourning women: "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not over me, but weep over yourselves."

By which words, indeed, he did not forbid himself to be wept over by the women of Jerusalem — [wept over] prudently and becomingly, out of a certain pious affection of charity. For it is not credible that Christ, in these [women], either forbade or reproved what the feeling of a compassionate nature suggests, [what] the reasoning of friendship urges, and [what] the divine oracles of the prophets had foretold would be. For — to omit the rest — the sword of grief, according to Simeon's prophecy, *[margin: Luke 2.]* pierced through the soul of Mary [his] mother at the death of the Son: and let no one believe that her grief and tears were condemned by Christ, unless he be utterly foolish. Therefore Christ forbade to the daughters of Jerusalem another kind of weeping — namely, some blind and undue [weeping] of the little women

[catchword "inde-" → "and undue [weeping]," continues on p. 497 (PDF 502).]

(printed p. 497 [PDF p. 502], recto — end of Ann. CLXII and Ann. CLXIII–CLXVI; the series crosses from Luke into John (do the saints see glory before Judgment?; the divinity's withdrawal; Origen on star-souls). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLXII, from the catchword "inde-":)

—an undue and unseemly mourning: [these women] — not yet recognizing the divine power of the Son of God, and [his] ineffable charity — [seeing] that he, willing and gladly, of his own accord hastened to death for the salvation of his own, wept over him as [over] an infirm and feeble man, suffering dire and unworthy [things] with an unwilling mind, and not able to defend himself from hostile injuries. Restraining this kind of unworthy weeping, Christ admonishes [them] that they rather weep, by this manner of mourning, over themselves and their sons — over whom [there] hung an ineluctable calamity, and the inevitable destruction of the city. From these [things] it is clear that Christ did not forbid, nor condemn, the pious and religious custom of mourning by which the Christian Church every year concelebrates the memory of the Passion and death of Christ with mournful pomp and tearful ceremonies. For the Church, taught by the Spirit of Christ, knows [it] to be fitting that her sons — who are members of Christ — be conformed to Christ [their] head, grieving and suffering, condoling and compassionating. And accordingly she instituted this kind of weeping-rite, in which she commanded, chiefly and most of all, that our sins be mourned — the expiation of which drove Christ into death. This the prophet Zacharias too especially admonished, saying: *[margin: Zech. 11.]* "All the tribes of the earth shall wail over him." For he did not say only, "They shall wail [over] him," but "They shall wail over themselves, over him" — that is, [because of] their own crimes, laid upon him who by his own death paid the penalty of them.

Annotation CLXIII

"This day thou shalt be with me in paradise." — Luke 23[:43]

[margin: Whether the saints yet enjoy the divine glory.]

Theophylact, in the explanation of this sentence, seems to hand down that the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, do not enjoy the divine glory — [saying] in these words: "The saints, although they do not yet enjoy the perfect goods, yet already dwell in bright and fragrant places, and beautiful tabernacles — even if they do not yet attain the distribution of the royal goods; so also the thief was in paradise, even though he has not yet received [it] perfectly, lest he be made perfect without us. And this I think the truest of all — not to say that the graces of the saints, in the daily workings of miracles, are deservedly called 'Paradise'; and

[that] all the saints, as many as have been made partakers of spiritual gifts, and have the pledge of the Spirit, are in Paradise — even if they are not yet perfect, and have received the kingdom, as Paul says in the epistle to the Hebrews — even if they have not yet received the promises. For by saying 'promise,' he meant the entire felicity." **Alphonsus de Castro**, in book 3 *Against Heresies*, reckons this passage among those which agree with the errors of the Greeks and Armenians. Read Annotation 345 of this book. **Euthymius**, in the commentaries, at the exposition of the present passage, follows this same opinion of Theophylact — expressed also in clearer words; you have it below, Annotation 345, where the sayings of Theophylact too are annotated.

Annotation CLXIV

"And saying this, he expired." — Luke 23[:46]

[margin: Whether the Godhead was separated from the humanity of Christ through death.]

Ambrose, in book 10 on Luke, teaching how our Redeemer expired, seems to hold that the humanity of the dying Christ was divided from the divinity of the Word — writing thus:

(right column — continuing the Ambrose citation of Annotation CLXIV:)

"I will not blush to confess that Christ did not blush to profess with a loud voice, attesting the withdrawal of the divinity and the body. For thus it stands: Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, *[margin: Matt. 27.]* 'God, my God, look upon me; why hast thou forsaken me?' The man cried out, about to die by the separation of the divinity. For since the divinity is free from death, death assuredly could not be, unless life departed — because life is the divinity." In the same opinion — as we noted above, Annotation 126 — **Hilary** is believed to have been, in canon 33 on Matthew. The **Master of the Sentences**, book 3, distinction 21, elucidating the sayings of both doctors, says that the separation of which both speak is to be so understood as the forsaking signified by those words, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" — that is, not according to the loosing and division of the union of God and man, but according to the withdrawal of protection; by which the divinity, laying aside for a time the patronage of the humanity, deserted that man in torments, pains, and death, [as one] separated from the [divine] defense, not divided from the union. Read Annotation 126 of this book.

Annotation CLXV

"In the beginning was the Word." — John 1[:1]

[margin: Whether the angels learned anything from the evangelical writings.]

Chrysostom, in the first homily — or in the preface of the homilies — on John, hints that the angels learned much from the preaching of John the Evangelist, which they were before ignorant of: for he writes thus: "John utters to us nothing human, but out of the deep and hidden treasures of the Holy Spirit [utters] all [things] — which not even the angels knew before he said [them] here; for they too learned along with us, through the voice of John, and through us learned what we came to know. Which the blessed Paul also signified by these words: 'That the manifold wisdom of God may now be made known to the Principalities and Powers in the heavenly [places] through the Church.' If, then, it plainly appears that the Principalities and Powers, the Cherubim and Seraphim, learned these [things] through the Church, [it appears] that the angels themselves showed themselves hearers of it with the greatest attention — for on this account we obtain no small honor, that the angels learned along with us [things] which they knew not." He confirms this same [thing] in the fourth homily *Against the Anomoeans*, saying: "There are certain dispensations which those Powers understood along with us — [things] which, before we understood [them], were utterly unknown [to them]; and [they understood them] not only along with us, but even through us [they] themselves understood [them]," etc. Of the same opinion is **Origen**, homily 23 on Luke, and **Theodoret** in [the dialogue] *The Unchangeable*. See below, Annotations 182, 299, and 320.

Annotation CLXVI

"In the beginning was the Word." — John 1[:1]

[margin: The imprisonment of souls.]

Origen, in the first tome on John, in the exposition of the present clause, hands down that the soul of the devil, and the souls of the Sun and of the other stars, [were] bound to bodies on account of their fall into sins. His words run thus: "It must necessarily be known — since the saints were passing a life devoid of all matter and body in beatitude — whether he who was called the dragon, after he fell from the pure life, worthy

[catchword "dignus" → "worthy," continues on p. 498 (PDF 503).]

(printed p. 498 [PDF p. 503], verso — end of Ann. CLXVI and Ann. CLXVII–CLXXI, on John 1:1 (the Word as "form"; ensouled stars; Cajetan's "toward God"; Origen's Arian article-argument). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Origen citation of Annotation CLXVI, from the catchword "dignus":)

was fit to be bound, before all [others], in matter and body — so that for this cause the divine oracle [Scripture, speaking] through wind and clouds says [of him], "this is the beginning of the fashioning of the Lord, made to be mocked by his angels." *[margin: Job 40.]* It could indeed be that the dragon was not altogether the beginning of the Lord's fashioning: but since many [things] were made, that they might be mocked by the angels, it behooved that this one be the beginning of such [beings] — because certain [beings] could be [present] in a body [but] not in this manner. For indeed the soul of the Sun is in a body, and [so is] every creature, of which the Apostle says: *[margin: Rom. 8.]* "Every creature groans, and is in labor even until now." And perhaps that [saying] of the same [Apostle] is understood of the same [matter]. Read Annotation 182 of book 5.

Annotation CLXVII

"In the beginning was the Word." — John 1[:1]

[margin: Whether God is the form of things.]

Augustine, in the sermon *On the Words of the Lord* 38, narrating this clause, has certain words which those are wont to use who, for the sake of disputation in the schools, argue that God comes into the composition of things after the manner of a form. They are: "The Word of God is a certain form — a form not formed, but the form of all formed [things]." St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Summa*, says that this saying is to be taken of the exemplary form — that is, that the Word of God is the exemplary form, but not the form which is a part of a composite.

Annotation CLXVIII

"The Word was." — John 1[:1]

[margin: The stars ensouled.]

Origen, in the first tome on John, touching on his own peculiar dogma concerning the ensoulment of the stars, writes thus: "The firstborn of all creation, on account of the greatest honor which he attributed to man, was made a man indeed — not, however, any [one] of those living beings which are in heaven: but that star which appeared in the East was made both second, and minister, and servant to Jesus — either like the other stars, or perhaps even more excellent, since it was the sign of him who is more excellent than all." Consult the preceding book, Annotation 107.

Annotation CLXIX

"And the Word was with God." — John 1[:1]

[margin: Whether the Word [was] "to God" or "with God."]

The interpretation of **Thomas Cajetan**, **Ambrose** [Catharinus] reprehends, in book 1 of the Annotations, writing thus: "That [reading] displeased [me] vehemently — that he so changes what follows, 'And the Word was *with* God' [apud Deum], into 'And the Word was *toward* God' [ad Deum], commending to us here a certain loftier interpretation. For, he says, 'to be' of the Word is 'to be toward God' — that is, [the Word] is referred to God — which can be said of no [created] substance." These [things] he [Cajetan says], but utterly falsely. For neither is the being of the divine substance said to be "toward," nor is the being of the Word said [to be referred] "to God," but "to the speaker," according to the proper expression of relation. For the son too is called son of the father, not of the man, or of Socrates: or otherwise, if the relative be sought in divine [matters], Christ is called not "Son of God," but "Son of the Father": and thus the Word is fittingly called not "the Word of God," but "the Word of the speaker." In which place I wonder at the man who, from Aristotle's Categories, did not notice this.

(right column:)

Annotation CLXX

"And the Word was with God." — John 1[:1]

[margin: Whether Christ suffered for the angels.]

Origen, in the first tome on John, writes that Christ suffered not only for men, but also for the angels, and for the stars — in these words: "Since, therefore, he who has so great [things], and is [our] advocate, has had compassion on our infirmities, because he was tempted in all human [things] by [our] likeness, and [yet] without sin — he is a great high priest, since not for men alone, but for every [being] that is partaker of reason, [as] a victim once offered, he offered himself. For, 'except God, he tasted death for all,' as it is placed in certain copies of the epistle to the Hebrews, 'by the gift and grace of God.' But whether 'except God he tasted death for all' — [then] not only for all men did he suffer death, but also for the rest [of beings] which use reason; or [whether] 'by the grace of God he tasted death for all' — [then] for all except God he bore death. For 'by the grace of God he tasted death for all.' For indeed it is absurd to say that he died for human sins, but not also for some other [being] which, besides man, was in sin — for example, for the stars — since not even the stars are altogether clean before God, as we read in Job: *[margin: Job 25.]* 'But the stars are not clean before him' — unless perhaps this was said hyperbolically." See Annotation 117 of book 5, and below, Annotation 296.

Annotation CLXXI

"And the Word was God." — John 1[:1]

[margin: On the equality of the Father and the Son.]

Origen, at the beginning of the second tome on John, seems to have furnished a certain seedbed for the Arian heresy: for when he examined the cause why the Word in this place is called "God" without the addition of the Greek article ὁ, he says that this was done to show the difference of the Father and the Son. For the Father, because he is God by his own nature, is called, the article being added, ὁ Θεός ["the God"]; but the Son, because he is God by participation in his [the Father's] divinity, is called, without the article, Θεός ["God"]. His words are these: "With great observation — not as [though] ignorant of Greek subtlety — John in one place used the articles, in others he was silent about them: to the name, indeed — that is, to 'Word' [λόγῳ] — adjoining the ὁ; but to the word 'God' in one place adjoining [the article], in another taking [it]

away. For he applies the article when the name 'God' is said of the unbegotten cause of all [things]; but does not apply the same, when the Word is named 'God.'" Then a little below, rendering the reason of this variety, he says: "It must be said that he who is God through himself is τὸν Θεόν — that is, God himself, as the Savior said in his prayer, *[margin: John 17.]* 'that they may know thee the only true God'; but everything which, besides God himself, is made God by participation in his divinity, is more properly called not τὸν Θεόν — that is, 'God himself' — but Θεός." And again, after a little: "The true God, therefore, is ὁ Θεός — that is, God himself; but those who are formed and fashioned after him are Θεοί — that is, gods, and are images of the first form and exemplar."

Chrysostom, in homily 3 on John, refutes this interpretation, the author's name being suppressed, re-

[catchword "re-" → "re[futes]," continues on p. 499 (PDF 504).]

(printed p. 499 [PDF p. 504], recto — end of Ann. CLXXI and Ann. CLXXII–CLXXIII, on John 1:1–3 (Chrysostom refutes the article-argument; creation "through" the Word; the John 1:3–4 punctuation dispute). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Chrysostom citation of Annotation CLXXI, from the catchword "re-":)

-futing [it], demonstrates that it is of no moment — because both the Son in the sacred writings is sometimes called "God" with the article, and the Father is sometimes called "God" without the article. And he writes in this manner: "But someone will say [that] the Father is set [named] with the addition of the article, [and] the Son without the article. What, then? — when the Apostle says, *[margin: Tit. 2.]* τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ, that is, 'of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ.' And again, *[margin: Rom. 9.]* ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, that is, 'Who is over all, God,' without the article. Likewise, writing of the Father to the Philippians, *[margin: Phil. 2.]* ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, that is, 'Who, when he was in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' And to the Romans, *[margin: Rom. 1.]* 'Grace to you and peace ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, from God our Father, and [from] the Lord Jesus Christ' — he neglected the article. For it is superfluous to prefix it everywhere, especially since above he had frequently used it. For just as, speaking of the Father, he says, *[margin: John 4.]* πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, 'God is a spirit'; and [just as], although he does not add the article to 'spirit,' we do not on that account deny that God is incorporeal: so in this place, although the article is not prefixed to the Son, not on that account is the Son a lesser God than the Father. Since, therefore, he calls both this one and that one 'God,' he makes for us no difference of divinity of either, but altogether the contrary." Consider, prudent reader, whether the sayings of Origen can be benignly interpreted from those [things] which we have brought forward below, Annotation 175.

Annotation CLXXII

"All things were made through him." — John 1[:3]

[margin: On the Son, and the Holy Spirit.]

Origen, in the second tome on John, seems to draw two errors from this clause: first, that the totality of creation was not made *through* the Word, except as through an instrumental cause, and through a lesser [being]; second, that the Holy Spirit is a thing made of the Word itself. For he expresses both thus: "The [phrase] 'through which' never holds the first place, but always the second: as in the epistle to the Romans Paul says, *[margin: Rom. 1.]* 'through whom we have received grace'; and, 'which he had before promised through the prophets.' And in the epistle to the Hebrews, *[margin: Heb. 1.]* 'he has spoken to us in [his] Son, through whom he also made the ages' — teaching us that God made the ages *through* the Son, [namely] that through the only-begotten (who has that 'through which') the ages were made. So, then, in this place also, if

all things were made *through* the Word itself, they were not made *by* the Word itself, but by [one] higher and greater than the Word is. And who is this, but the Father? But it must be considered — this being true, 'All things were made through him' — whether the Holy Spirit too was made through him. And I think it necessary that he who concedes the Spirit to have been made, and confesses that 'All things were made through him' is true, [should] concede and prove that the Holy Spirit was made by the Word, which [is] more ancient than it. But he who is unwilling to concede that the Holy Spirit was made through Christ, it follows that he says [the Spirit] was not made — [if] he judges that the [things] which are written in this gospel are true." And below: "These [things] have been much and long proved for those who would see more plainly and openly, that, if all things were made through him, the Spirit too was made through the Word — [the Spirit] who, [as] one of all things, is understood [to be] inferior to him through whom [it] was made — even if certain words seem to draw us to the contrary side."

(right column:)

Annotation CLXXIII

"And without him was made nothing." — John 1[:3]

[margin: On the true punctuation of the clause, "Without him was made nothing."]

Chrysostom, in the fourth homily on John, weighing this passage, seems to condemn as heretical the reading of those who read, "Without him was made nothing"; and then, a final period being placed, undertake another clause, saying, "What was made, in him was life." For he says: "When we shall have said, 'Without him was made nothing,' let us not mark it with a full period, as the heretics think. For these, since they wish the Spirit to be a creature, thus read: '[that] which was made, in him was life.' But by no reasoning at all can this sentence be understood."

Theophylact, in the commentaries, agreeing with Chrysostom, explains the names of the heretics who use this reading, with these words: "The **Pneumatomachi** [Spirit-fighters], who deny the Holy Spirit to be God, so read this clause: 'And without him was made nothing.' Then, a point being made in this place, they read, as [beginning] from another beginning, '[That] which was made, in him.' And they interpret that passage according to their own mind, saying that in this place the Evangelist speaks of the Holy Spirit, saying, '[That] which was made in him — that is, the Holy Spirit — was life.' Now this the **Macedonians** say, trying to show that the Holy Spirit is a creature, and to number him among those [things] which were made. But we [read] not thus: but, a point being made, after he said '[that] which was made,' we read a new beginning, 'In him was life.'"

Euthymius, subscribing to both, renders the reason why that reading is not to be received; he uses these words: "Those who resist the Holy Spirit, and diminish his nature, place a distinction [stop] after that which is said, 'Without him was made nothing'; then read together what follows, '[That] which was made in him was life' — that they may show the Holy Spirit to have been made. For they say [the Evangelist] speaks of him by such a word. But they are easily refuted: first, because that part, '[That] which was made,' being set indistinctly, indicates everything that was made; then, because 'life' too is said to be 'light' — for he adds that 'the Life was the light of men.' And a little after, speaking of John, 'He came for a testimony, that he might bear witness of the light.' But it is manifest that John bore witness not of the Holy Spirit, but of the Son — as we find in what follows."

These [things] Euthymius, Theophylact, and Chrysostom [say]; from whose words it is not to be inferred that those are heretics who place a period after the word "Nothing," but [only] those who do it to this end — that they may deny the divinity of the Holy Spirit. For among the Greeks **Cyril**, and among the Latins **Augustine**, a point being placed after the word "Nothing," undertake a new sentence, saying: "[That] which was made, in him was life." And this reading all the Latin Church follows, which to me too seems true and genuine. For it

agrees with the peculiar style of this Evangelist to begin, as it were, each [following] member from the end of the preceding member: "was made nothing" is the end of the upper clause; "[That] which was made" is the beginning of the other. Of which form are also those [phrases]: "In the beginning was the Word"; and "the Word was with God"; and "God was the Word." The phrase, ending

[catchword "finiens" → "the phrase, ending," continues on p. 500 (PDF 505).]

(printed p. 500 [PDF p. 505], verso — end of Ann. CLXXIII and Ann. CLXXIV–CLXXV, on John 1:3–5 ("nothing" = sin/idol/devil?; whether the Son is less than the Father — Cyril's Thesaurus*). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CLXXIII, from the catchword "finiens":)

[the phrase] ending the prior clause begins the following. In the fourth [member] he repeats the beginning of the first: "This was in the beginning"; and thus he completes the period. Again, in this which follows — "[That] which was made, in him was life; and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not" — always the step of the following [member] is taken from the nearest [preceding] member.

Annotation CLXXIV

"And without him was made nothing." — John 1[:3]

[margin: Whether sin is nothing.]

Augustine, in the first tractate on John, weighing that word "NOTHING," asserts that by "NOTHING" can be understood malice and sin, likewise also the sinful man, and the idol, and the devil — which indeed were not made by God. And he explains this interpretation with these words: "See, do not so think, as though 'nothing' were something. For many, ill understanding 'Without him was made nothing,' are wont to think that 'nothing' is something. Sin, indeed, was not made through him, because sin is nothing, and men become nothing when they sin. And the idol was not made through the Word. It has, indeed, a certain human form: but the man himself was made through the Word (for the form of man in the idol was not made through the Word); *[margin: 1 Cor. 8.]* and it is written, 'We know that an idol is nothing.' Therefore these [things] were not made through the Word."

Jerome, in chapter 2 on Micah, explaining that [text], "On account of the uncleanness of the corrupt, you have fled from the corruption, no one pursuing," etc. — seems in a certain way to explode this exposition as forced, saying: "I know that I have read, in the commentaries of a certain [author] expounding the beginning of John the Evangelist — 'All things were made through him, and without him was made nothing' — [that] this [word] which is said, 'nothing,' he referred to malice; and again, that he interpreted malice itself [to be] the devil, and by this step, as it were, understood that itself, which was made without Christ — 'Nothing' — [to be] the devil. If, then, malice, or the devil, is nothing; and those who are corrupted with corruption have fled: no one — that is, 'Nothing' — pursuing, the devil pursued them into nothing." But if to anyone this seems too forced, and set forth against the simplicity of Scripture rather by an artifice of eloquence than by a true interpretation, let him follow another exposition. These [things] Jerome [says].

There are [some] who think that Augustine too recognized this, and therefore expounded this passage otherwise, in the book *On the Nature of the Good, against the Manichaeans*, chapter 25 — where, the tropological understanding (which he followed here) being omitted, and embracing the genuine literal sense, he interprets "that 'Without him was made nothing' is worth just as much as if you say, 'Whatever was made, was not made without him'; or, 'Whatever subsists among created things, was made by him.'"

Annotation CLXXV

"The life was the light of men, and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." — John 1[:4–5]

[margin: Whether the Son, as regards the divinity, is less than the Father.]

Origen, in the second tome on John, elucidating this clause, seems to have pronounced that the Son, as regards the divinity, is less than the Father, and divided from the paternal essence — speaking in this manner:

(right column — continuing Annotation CLXXV:)

"Since in this place the Savior is simply called 'light,' but in the catholic epistle of John himself *[margin: 1 John 1.]* God is said to be 'light'; a certain [author] thinks that hence it is gathered that the Father is not distinct in essence from the Son. But he who observes more diligently, and speaks more rightly, will say that by nature the 'light which shineth in the darkness, not apprehended by the darkness itself' is not the same as the 'light in which there is in no way any darkness.'" And below: "This light is called 'the true Light,' by which the Father, the God of truth, is ampler [more] than the Word; and greater than the truth; and, because he is the Father of wisdom, is better and more excellent than wisdom itself, and by this reasoning the true Light excels [it]," etc.

In these Origenic words, two [things] are to be inspected: first, that Origen does not deny the Son to be of the same substance or essence with the Father — which he openly affirms in many places, and most constantly proclaims; but he says [that] it cannot be gathered from this passage so plainly as some think. Then it is to be observed that the Greek fathers do not shrink from this Origenic manner of speaking, by which the Son is asserted [to be] less than the Father — not, indeed, in substance, but in origin. According to which reasoning, very frequently among the Greek theologians the Father is said to excel the Son by the dignity, authority, and majesty of [being the] principle [source]. But if to anyone it seems that faith is not to be given to me [in this], let him read **Cyril**, bishop of Alexandria, in book 1 of the *Thesaurus*, chapter 10 — where, explaining that [text] from John's gospel, "The Father is greater than I," he writes thus: "In a certain place Christ says, *[margin: John 14.]* 'The Father is greater'; and of him again we read, *[margin: Phil. 2.]* 'He thought it not robbery to be equal with God': it must be diligently investigated how he is at once both equal, and has a greater Father — for these seem mutually to conflict. But we, weighing them piously, will neither deny the Son to be equal, because the Father is greater; nor say the Father not to be greater, because the Son is equal; but by a pious interpretation we will confirm both. Since, then, the nature of the divinity is simple and uncomposed, it could never have been distinguished in thought into Father and Son, unless a certain difference were applied — not in the essence itself, but extrinsically — by which each person, remaining in its own hypostasis, might be joined, on account of the same nature of both, in one divinity, so that no confusion or commingling of the Father and the Son should be made. Which indeed would happen, if the persons of the Father and the Son — on account of [their] exquisite likeness, which would not allow those twin [persons] to be seen [as distinct] — should run together into one hypostasis. For hence some have suspected that the Father and the Son are the same, and not two distinct persons. Therefore it behooved us to recognize both the begetting nature, and the hypostasis begotten from it. On this account Scripture set before us the names of 'Father' and 'Son,' that we might understand [them as] 'light from light,' and both in their own hypostasis, and the same essence in both. But, imitating our custom, does it call the Father 'greater,' that on every side we may recognize the persons [as] distinct, and the one from the other? — yet it attests the same equality, lest we should suspect any dissimilarity of the essence of the Father and the Son. The Son, therefore, since by reason of essence he is equal to the Father, and in all [things] like [him], calls him 'greater' as [being] the principle without principle — that he may declare that he [the Son] is from him [the Father], although he has one and the same [nature] with him

[catchword "illo" → "with him," continues on p. 501 (PDF 506).]

(printed p. 501 [PDF p. 506], recto — end of Ann. CLXXV and Ann. CLXXVI–CLXXIX, on John 1:5–9 ("greater" by origin not nature; Origen's pre-existence errors; Ferus on faith). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLXXV, from the catchword "illo":)

he has one and the same nature with him." These [things] Cyril [says]; with whom **Chrysostom** agrees, in homily 74 on John, where, expounding that [text], "The Father is greater than I," he says: "If anyone should call the Father greater than the Son, inasmuch as [he is the] principle of the Son, neither would we contradict this: yet this does not make the Son to be of another substance." Nor does **Hilary** dissent from these, in book 9 *On the Trinity*: where, expounding the same passage of John, he says that the Father is greater than the Son by the authority of generation, [but] that the Son, nevertheless, is not less than the Father by the nature of the divinity. In the same manner St. **Thomas** notes, in the book *Against the Errors of the Greeks*, that **Basil** said [that] the Son is second to the Father in dignity, and the Holy Spirit second to the Son in dignity — that is, in the dignity of hypostasis, not of nature.

Observe these [things] carefully, reader, that thou mayest be able to interpret piously all passages of this kind, in which Origen, on account of the unusual form of [his] words, seems to have thought ill of the *Homoousion* [consubstantial] Son of God. But in the other passages, which cannot be defended by an interpretation of this kind, remember that Origen was most wickedly corrupted by the Arians, especially in this topic — as very many and most luminous testimonies of his concerning the consubstantial and coeternal deity of the Son and the Father, cited in the *Apology* of Pamphilus the Martyr, show more clearly than the light.

Annotation CLXXVI

"The light shineth in darkness." — John 1[:5]

[margin: On the Son, and the Holy Spirit.]

Origen, in the second tome on John, seems in a certain way to number the Son and the Holy Spirit among those [things] which were made, when he says: "If anyone should consider the multitude of the contemplations which are in God, and of the knowledge which cannot be comprehended by human nature — and perhaps by the others which were made, besides Christ and the Holy Spirit — he will understand that darkness surrounds God."

Annotation CLXXVII

"This man came for a testimony, that he might bear witness of the light." — John 1[:7]

[margin: The soul of John the Baptist existing before [his] body.]

Origen, in the second tome on John, narrating this clause, brings forth three [things] beside the common opinion of the theologians.

The **first** is, that the soul of John the Baptist was more ancient than his body — in these words: "For he who observes that nothing is done unjustly, nor by chance, nor by lot, [for him] it is necessary to approve that the soul of John [is] more ancient and prior to [his] body; and that this same soul — since it previously cohered [existed] and was — was sent unto the ministries of testimony concerning the truth."

The **second** is, that many angels were of old incarnated, and that perhaps one of these was John the Baptist. Which position he explains thus: "Since we are engaged in a discourse about John, we will conveniently add our opinion which we hold about him. For since we read this prophecy about him — *[margin: Mal. 3.]*

'Behold, I send my angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee' — let us consider whether he, [being] one of the holy angels, is sent to the ministry [as] the forerunner of our Savior. Nor is it a wonder if, when the firstborn of all creation had, out of his love toward the human race, put on a body, there were some rivals and imitators of Christ,

(right column — continuing Annotation CLXXVII:)

who wished, with a like body, to minister to his benignity among men; but that a certain [one] did not imitate [him], who venerated [him], leaping with joy, even when he was in the womb — as though surpassing the common nature of men. But if anyone accepts also the prayer of Joseph, ascribed among the mysteries [apocrypha] which are current among the Hebrews, he will take thence a dogma and decree like to this — namely, that those who were from the beginning, since they had something special beyond other men, and were much better than the rest in [their] souls, descended from the nature of angels into the nature of men. For Jacob says: 'For I speak to you, [I] Jacob and Israel: I am the angel of God, and a chief spirit; and Abraham and Isaac were created before every work.'"

The **third** is, that Jacob and Esau were reckoned worthy of God's hatred and love for this [reason] — that their souls acted in heaven before they descended into bodies. This opinion he embraces in these words: "Consider whether that common and celebrated saying about Jacob and Esau has [this] explanation: *[margin: Rom. 9.]* 'When they had not yet been born, or done anything good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand — not of works, but of him that calleth — it was said to her: The elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated. What, then, shall we say? Is there injustice with God? By no means.' But if, when they had not yet been born, or done anything good or evil, [and yet] 'that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,' it was said [thus] — and if we do not run to works which precede this life — how is that true, that there is no injustice with God [in] the elder serving the younger, and being held in hatred before he did the [things] worthy both of servitude and of hatred?" *[margin: The cause of the election of Jacob, and the reprobation of Esau.]* Read Annotation 182 of the preceding book.

Annotation CLXXVIII

"That all might believe through him." — John 1[:7]

[margin: Whether faith alone suffices for those to be saved.]

John Ferus, in the commentaries, expounding this sentence: "You see," he says, "that John came for our sake; but he does not say, 'that they might believe *in* him': for faith is to be referred to God alone. But if John was sent for no other [reason] than that we might believe *through* him: therefore faith is the sum of Christian justice — as also elsewhere it is said, 'The just [man] lives by faith.'" **Domingo de Soto**, in his Annotations, gathers from these words that Ferus holds, with the Lutherans, that faith alone is sufficient for the salvation of the soul, and that the works of charity are not necessary. See below, Annotation 212.

Annotation CLXXIX

[the print misnumbers this "ANNOTATIO LXXIX," dropping the leading C]

"It was the true light." — John 1[:9]

[margin: Whether faith is lost through [mortal] sin.]

John Ferus, in the exposition of this passage: "He, therefore," he says, "who acts impiously — fearing that he would be tormented by hunger if he lived piously — does not believe Christ to be God." **Domingo de Soto**, disapproving these words in his Annotations against Ferus, says: "He seems to reckon all who are in mortal sin [as] acting impiously; for he appears to bring forward examples of those who, lest they be

tormented by hunger, fal-

[the heading is printed "ANNOTATIO LXXIX" — the "C" of CLXXIX dropped; signature "Tt"; catchword "-tati" → the word begun "fu-" (perhaps fu[rati sunt], "have stolen") continues on p. 502 (PDF 507).]

(printed p. 502 [PDF p. 507], verso — end of Ann. CLXXIX and Ann. CLXXX–CLXXXII, on John 1:14–18 (faith lost through mortal sin?; whether God's essence can be seen — Chrysostom, Theodoret). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLXXIX, from the catchword completing "fu-":)

steal; and of those who, succumbing to another disease [vice], perpetrate another evil. But to say that all delinquents of this kind do not believe Christ to be God, is an error condemned at Trent — namely, that faith is lost through any [kind of] mortal offense, since it is not lost except through unbelief." These [things] he [Soto says]. **Michael Medina**, refuting this kind of censure in his *Apologeticum*, says: "In confuting these [things], many [things] would indeed have to be said by us, by which we might assail his petty reasonings, did we not fear the increase of a large volume, and were we unwilling to exceed Christian modesty. Only so much is to be brought forward by us in this part [as shows] how far Soto departs from the Christian manner of speaking, [Soto] who condemns the very first elements of the words of God. Who — a Christian [even] of three months old — is ignorant that it is rightly and most Christianly said that sinners, whoever they be, lose the Christian faith, especially in that part in which they most obstinately sin? Not that that barren faith — to which the vice of idolatry, or of unbelief, is opposed — vanishes when a mortal sin is committed (for this the Lutherans have foolishly held, being ignorant of the phrase of the Scriptures, which calls 'faith' only that [faith] which, joined to charity, produces the glorious fruits of works); but that, by the plain manner of speaking which sacred Scripture always observes, that languid and nerveless credulity, from which altogether contrary acts are derived, is judged unworthy of the name of 'faith.' *[margin: Titus 1.]* 'They confess,' says the Apostle, 'of certain [men], that they know God, but by [their] deeds they deny [him]; being abominable, and incredulous, and reprobate to every good work.' Behold, here the Apostle calls unbelievers [those] sinners who, although they confessed with the mouth, yet by [their] deeds produced works contrary to faith. And elsewhere, *[margin: 1 Tim. 5.]* 'If anyone has not care of his own, especially of his household, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever.' Not that in these passages the Apostle Paul means that unformed faith vanishes through a mortal offense; but that he does not believe entire faith to stand together with a perverse perseverance in enormous offenses — which [entire faith] alone Christ and the sanction of the evangelical law demand."

Annotation CLXXX

"And the Word was made flesh." — John 1[:14]

Chrysostom, in the tenth homily on John, seems to except no one from the reading and study of the divine Scripture. Read what is written above, Annotation 152 of this book.

Annotation CLXXXI

"Of whose fullness we all have received." — John 1[:16]

[margin: Whether works [done] apart from grace are sins.]

John Ferus, in the commentaries on John, explaining this, **Domingo de Soto**, in the Annotations published against the same [Ferus], reprehends — because he broke out into these words: "Cursed are not only the [things] which we do, but also the [things] which are done upon us: cursed is the thought, the reason, the mouth, the hands, the feet of our heart; cursed are all [things] that befall us, whether joyful or sad," etc. See

above, Annotation 40.

(right column:)

Annotation CLXXXII

"No man hath seen God at any time." — John 1[:18]

[margin: Whether the essence of God can be beheld by any creature.]

Chrysostom, in the fourteenth homily on John, seems to gather two [things] from these words. The **first**, that the nature, substance, and essence of God cannot be beheld by any creature by an intuitive vision of the mind, but is known only by an abstraction of thought and imagination. And this he sets forth in these words: "That which God is, not only did the prophets not see, but neither the angels nor the archangels. For if thou shalt question them, thou wilt hear nothing from them about the substance of God, but only, *[margin: Luke 2.]* 'Glory to God in the highest.'" And a little after he adds: "But if all nature is created, by what reasoning will it be able to see the uncreated? For if we cannot manifestly behold an incorporeal power, however begotten [created] — and this has often been shown in the angels — much less [can we behold] the incorporeal and unbegotten substance. Wherefore Paul says, 'Whom no one has ever seen, nor can see.'" And below, meeting the objection which seems to stand against these [things], he says: "What, then, is that saying, *[margin: Matt. 18 & 5.]* 'Their angels see the face of my Father who is in heaven'; and 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God'? For [that] thought and imagination which, according to our strength, we conceive of God — that he calls 'vision.' Nor is it to be understood otherwise of the angels, on account of their pure nature, subject to no sleep, since they ever ponder in [their] mind nothing else than God."

[margin: Whether the Son of God was invisible to the angels before the incarnation.] The **second** [point] deduced from this evangelical clause is, that the Son of God, before he put on a body, was invisible to the angels; but then, after he put on flesh, [was] seen by the angels. And he expresses this opinion in this manner: "Paul says of the Son, *[margin: 1 Tim. 3.]* 'Who was manifested in the flesh' — but the manifestation through the flesh is not according to [his] substance. For [to show] that he is invisible not only to men, but also to the supernal Powers, when Paul had said [he was] 'manifested in the flesh,' he added, 'seen by angels.' Therefore, from [the time] when he put on flesh, then was he seen by the angels: but before, he was not so seen, since to them too his substance was invisible." Thus far Chrysostom.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, seems to explain the former proposition of Chrysostom more openly, teaching that God is seen by the angels not in [his] substance and essence, but through certain likenesses, in the manner in which of old he was seen by the prophets. But it is better to bring here his words from the dialogue, which is entitled *The Unchangeable*: in which the Orthodox and Eranistes are brought in speaking in this manner. ERANISTES: How shall we understand that "their angels always see the face of the Father"? ORTHODOX: As we are wont to understand those [things] which are said of the men who are reckoned to have seen God. ER.: Speak more plainly; for I did not understand. ORTH.: Can God be seen by men? ER.: By no means. ORTH.: And yet we hear the divine Scripture saying, *[margin: Gen. 18.]* "God was seen by Abraham at the oak of Mambre"; and Isaiah saying, *[margin: Isa. 6.]* "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lofty." And of Moses the history says, *[margin: Exod. 33.]* "The Lord spoke to Moses face to face, just as a man speaks to his friend." Nay, more-

[catchword "-tiam" (etiam) → "Nay, moreover," continues on p. 503 (PDF 508).]

(printed p. 503 [PDF p. 508], recto — end of Ann. CLXXXII and Ann. CLXXXIII–CLXXXIV, on John 1:18–38 (God seen only through likenesses; Chrysostom's "Pelagian" reading; Cassian's semi-Pelagianism). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding the Theodoret citation of Annotation CLXXXII, from the catchword "-tiam":)

Nay, moreover, the God of all [things] himself also says, *[margin: Num. 12.]* "Mouth to mouth will I speak to him in [open] sight, and not through riddles." What, then, shall we say — that they saw the divine nature? ER.: By no means. For God himself said, "No one shall see my face, and live." ORTH.: Do they lie, then, who said they had seen God? ER.: By no means: for they saw those [things] which could be seen by them. ORTH.: God, then, measures [his] revelations by the powers of those who see. ER.: Most certainly. ORTH.: And this he made manifest through the prophet, saying, *[margin: Isa. 6.]* "I have filled visions, and in the hands of the prophets I have been likened" — he did not say, "I was seen," but "I was likened." But a likening does not signify the same nature of him who is seen. For neither does the image of a king show the very nature of the king, even if it reproduces the express and evident features of the king. ER.: This is obscure, and not sufficiently plain. ORTH.: Therefore neither did those who contemplated those revelations see the substance of God. ER.: But who would be so mad as to dare to say this? ORTH.: Yet it was said that they saw [him]. ER.: It was said. ORTH.: But we, both using pious reasonings, and believing the divine sentences, which openly cry out, "No man hath ever seen God," say that they did not see the divine nature, but certain visions which suited their faculty, and did not exceed its measure. ER.: So we say. ORTH.: So, then, let us understand of the angels, hearing that "they see the face of the Father." For they do not see the divine substance, which can neither be circumscribed, nor comprehended, nor perceived by the mind, and which comprehends all [things], but a certain glory which answers to their powers, and is measured out to them. ER.: That these [things] are so, is confessed. These [things] Theodoret [says].

Theophylact seems to follow the same opinion; in whose commentaries, at the exposition of this passage, it is read thus: "But here perhaps someone will say: How do we learn in this place that no one has seen God, when the prophet says, *[margin: Isa. 6.]* 'I saw the Lord'? The prophet did indeed see God — but not the substance itself, but a certain likeness and appearance, as he was able to grasp [it]. And another again saw [him] in another figure, and another in another. Whence, namely, they did not see the very Truth: for they would not have seen in diverse figures that [Truth] which is simple and unfigurable. Nay, neither do the angels see the substance of God, although they are said to see his face. For this indicates that God always appears to them. The Son, therefore, alone of all men always sees the Father." Thus far Theophylact.

Euthymius, agreeing with these, says in the commentaries: "No creature sees God — not only [no] material [one], but also [no] immaterial [one]. For even to the immaterial Powers themselves God is invisible in his own nature — although, as [far as] is granted to them, they [do] see God."

St. **Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Theological Summa*, and in the fourth [book] of the Sentences, question 1, article 2, weighing the adduced opinion of Chrysostom, sets forth a rule from Augustine's book *On Seeing God*, most apt for explaining sentences of this kind. For he says they are to be interpreted in a threefold way. The **first**, that we understand [it to mean that] no one has ever seen, or will see, the divine essence with bodily eyes;

(right column — concluding the Aquinas rule of Annotation CLXXXII:)

secondly, that no one, while he lives in this mortal flesh, will see the nature of the divine substance with the spiritual eye of the mind; **thirdly**, that no one has ever seen, or will ever see, the substance of God by the vision of comprehension — by which, namely, God knows himself, and he alone comprehends his own substance, of what quality and how great it is. And in this way [Aquinas] holds that Chrysostom is to be understood: and he says that [Chrysostom] manifestly signifies this in the following words, when he says: "Many of us know God: yet the substance itself, of what quality it is, his only-begotten alone knows — [he] who has a certain notion, and sight, and comprehension [of it], such as it is fitting the Son should have of the Father." These [things] Thomas [says]; to whose interpretation thou canst recall the sayings of Theodoret, Theophylact, and Euthymius. And let these [things] concerning the first proposition of Chrysostom suffice.

Concerning the **second** proposition we have touched on some [things] above, in Annotations 142 and 165, and below, Annotation 299.

Annotation CLXXXIII

"I saw, and gave testimony." — John 1[:34]

Chrysostom, in the sixteenth homily on John — what he said about the reading of holy Scripture, [as] necessary for the salvation of all — thou hast above, Annotation 152.

Annotation CLXXXIV

"But Jesus turning, and seeing them following, said to them, What seek ye?" — John 1[:38]

[margin: Whether the beginning of our salvation is from us.]

Chrysostom, in the seventeenth homily on John, expounding these [words], is thought to be of this opinion — that the beginning of our salvation is so implanted in us by nature that, without the help of prevenient grace, we can by our own powers attain justification. Which savors of the dogma of the Pelagians. For thus he left [it] written in that place: "Hence we can be admonished that God does not, by his benefits toward us, forestall our wills, but that a beginning must be made by us: but when we show ourselves, with a prompt and prepared mind, ready to receive grace, then he offers us many occasions of salvation."

John Cassian, a disciple of Chrysostom, placing himself in the middle between those who, with the catholics, affirm that we are prevented [forestalled] by the grace of God, and those who, with the Pelagians, assert that we forestall the grace of God, taught that some [men] anticipate the divine grace by their own will, but that the wills of some are anticipated by the divine grace. His words, in the thirteenth book of the *Conferences*, chapter 11, run thus: "Among many [it] is debated with a great question: whether God has mercy on us because we have furnished a beginning of good will; or [whether] because God has mercy, we obtain a beginning of good will? For many, believing these [things] singly, and asserting [them] more than is just, have been entangled in various and mutually contrary errors. For if we shall say that the beginning of good will is ours: what was there in the persecutor Paul, what in the Publican Matthew — of whom the one, brooding over the blood and torments of the innocent, the other over violences and public robberies, is [nonetheless] drawn to salvation? But if [we shall say] that the beginning of good will is always inspired by the grace of God

[signature "Tt 2"; catchword "prin-" → "the begin[ning]," continues on p. 504 (PDF 509).]

(printed p. 504 [PDF p. 509], verso — end of Ann. CLXXXIV and Ann. CLXXXV–CLXXXVII, on John 2–3 (Cassian's semi-Pelagianism; Mary's "vainglory" at Cana; the 46-year temple; the Filioque *begins). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding the Cassian citation of Annotation CLXXXIV, from the catchword "prin-":)

—the beginning [of good will], what shall we say of the faith of Zacchaeus, what of the piety of that thief on the cross — who, by their [own] desire bringing a certain violence upon the heavenly kingdoms, forestalled the special admonitions of [their] calling?" etc.

Prosper, bishop of Riez, disputed against the opinion of Cassian in a particular volume, entitled *On Free Will*; **Gennadius**, however, taking [it] ill — who, in the catalogue of illustrious writers, complains that the little works of Cassian, which the Church of God approves as salutary, were unworthily defamed by Prosper. What is to be thought concerning the opinion of Chrysostom, thou hast above, Annotation 101 of book 5.

Annotation CLXXXV

"The wine failing, she says [to him], They have no wine." — John 2[:3]

[margin: Whether Mary always had a becoming opinion of Christ.]

Chrysostom, in the twentieth homily on John, seems to assert that the Virgin Mary did not always have a becoming opinion of Christ's divinity, and that on that account she, at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, out of a certain human affection of empty glory, unseasonably asked a miracle of [her] Son. For thus we read in him: "It is worth inquiring in this place whence it came into the mother's mind to conjecture something great about [her] Son: for he had as yet done no sign. For this he did [as] the beginning of signs. [His divinity] had already begun to be manifested, both by John's testimony, and from those [things] which he had foretold to the disciples; and, before all these, the nativity itself, and the [things] which had happened at that time, had stirred up the greatest opinion about the boy. For she heard, he says, all [things], and kept [them] in her heart. Therefore, when she had heard that John had come to bear testimony about him, and now saw the disciples, she began to dare [to hope]. And, the wine failing, she says, 'They have no wine' — for she desired both now to win the favor of men, and that she herself might be made more illustrious by the [display of the] Son's grace. And perhaps she was affected by some human feeling — just as also his brethren, when they said, *[margin: John 2 (cf. John 7).]* 'Show thyself to the world,' being desirous of gaining fame for themselves by his miracles. On that account he answered rather harshly, 'What is it to me and to thee, woman? My hour is not yet come.' For that he reverenced [his] mother, *[margin: Luke 2.]* Luke attests — [in saying] that he was subject to [his] parents; and this Evangelist [attests] how great care he had for [his] mother at the time of the Passion. For where the parents would in no way hinder the divine mysteries, [and] would give no offense, it is fair and necessary for the Son to obey, nor can he refuse without great peril. But on the contrary, when they ask something unseasonably, and hinder [his] spiritual discourse, it is not safe to comply with them — on that account here too he answers thus. And elsewhere again, he said, 'Who is my mother, and [who are] my brethren?' For they did not yet have a due opinion of him, but, after the manner of mothers, Mary judged that she might by right command all [things] to [her] Son — whereas it was fitting to worship and reverence [him] as Lord; therefore he answered in this manner. Consider how unseemly it was — the whole people standing by, and hanging [in suspense] to hear him and his doctrine — [for] her, coming forward into the midst, to hinder the public benefit, and to hold discourse about private matters, and to call [him] away from such an assembly." The same thou hast above, Annotation 58 of this book.

(right column:)

Theophylact writes here the same as Chrysostom. **Euthymius** likewise the same.

Annotation CLXXXVI

"Forty and six years was this temple in building." — John 2[:20]

[margin: Whether the body of Christ was first formed in the womb before it was assumed by the deity.]

Augustine, in the book of 83 Questions, question 56, so expounds this passage that he seems to affirm that the body of Christ was conceived in the womb of [his] mother before it was assumed by the divinity — saying thus: "Human conception is said to proceed and be perfected thus: that in the first six days it has, as it were, a likeness of milk; in the following nine days it is converted into blood; then in twelve days it is solidified; in the remaining eighteen days it is formed, up to the perfect lineaments of all the members. Forty-five days, then, with one added — which signifies the sum: for six, and nine, and twelve, and eighteen, brought together into one, make forty-five; one being added, therefore, as has been said, they make forty-six. Not absurdly, then, is the temple said to have been built in forty-six years — [the temple] which signifies his body: so that, as many years as there were in the building of the temple, so many days there were in the

perfecting of the Lord's body."

Peter Lombard, in the third book of the Sentences, distinction 3, sifting this interpretation of Augustine, writes thus: "On the occasion of these words, certain [men] have presumed to say [that] the form of the Lord's body [was] perfected in so many days, after the manner of other bodies, and distinguished by the lineaments of [its] members; and [that] then the Word is said to have united to itself flesh and soul: and in this manner they say that that number befits the perfection of the Lord's body. But there was another reason for that saying, from which a sound understanding of the word arises. For Augustine did not say that [as though denying] that, as soon as that flesh — sanctified by the working of the Holy Spirit, and separated from the rest — was united to the Word of God together with a soul (so that [he] might be perfect and true God, [and] perfect and true man): but [he said it] because the distinction of the members of that Lord's body, in the very moment of the conception and of the union of God and man, was so slight and small that it could scarcely be submitted to human sight; but in those days which Augustine mentions, it was perfected and made conspicuous."

Annotation CLXXXVII

"For God giveth not the Spirit by measure." — John 3[:34]

[margin: Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.]

Theophylact, in the commentaries, expounding this clause, teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father and the Son, but from the Father only — with these words: "It will not be unseasonable to say in this place how the Son has the Spirit, and how [the Spirit] is called the Spirit of the Son. For the Apostle too says, 'He sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father'; and again, 'But if anyone has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' Truly the Latins, expounding these [things] badly, and understanding [them] less rightly, say that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son. But we say this first of all to them: that it is one thing to be *from* someone, and another to be [someone's]

[catchword "tu-" → "to be [someone's own]," continues on p. 505 (PDF 510).]

(printed p. 505 [PDF p. 510], recto — Ann. CLXXXVII cont., on John 3:34 (the Filioque *— Theophylact vs. Sixtus; the Greek fathers; Council of Florence). Read order: left column, then right. NB: this page had heavy ink show-through; it was collated word-for-word against a clearer parallel edition (printed pp. 494–495) and confirmed correct.)*

(left column — continuing the Theophylact citation of Annotation CLXXXVII, from the catchword "tu-":)

—[another thing to be] someone's own: as the Spirit is indeed the Spirit of the Son, without doubt, and approved by all Scripture; but that [the Spirit] is *from* the Son no Scripture attests — lest we introduce two principles of the Spirit, [namely] the Father and the Son. "Assuredly," he says: "for [Christ] both breathed on the disciples, and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit.' O folly! if he then gave the disciples the Spirit, when he breathed [on them]: how did he afterward say to them, 'You shall receive the power of the Holy Spirit coming upon you, not after many days'? Or how do we believe the descent of the Spirit to have been made at Pentecost, if indeed he gave him on the evening of the day of resurrection? For then he breathed [on them]. But these [things] are indeed very ridiculous. For it is manifest that he did not then give them the Holy Spirit, but one gift of the Holy Spirit — namely, the remission of sin. For at once he adds, 'Whose sins you shall remit.' But the Son has the Spirit substantially, as consubstantial to himself — not [as one] from whom he receives operation, as the prophets [do]. And [the Spirit] is called the Spirit of the Son inasmuch as [he is] truth, and power, and wisdom. But the Holy Spirit is described by Isaiah as the Spirit of truth, and of fortitude, and of wisdom. And otherwise [he is called the Spirit of the Son], because through the Son he is

given to men: on that account he is called [the Spirit] of the Son. Believe thou, therefore, that the Spirit indeed proceeds from the Father, but is given to the creature through the Son; and let this be to thee the canon of orthodox doctrine."

This opinion of Theophylact, **John Damascene**, **Euthymius**, and very many other more recent Greeks approve — though the ancient fathers of the Eastern and Western church cry out against [it], who most clearly testify that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and* the Son. *[margin: John Damascene, bk. 1 On the Faith, ch. 11, says: "'from the Father' we say, but 'from the Son' we do not say [it] of the Holy Spirit." Yet the same [author], in the history of the two soldiers of Christ (Barlaam and Josaphat), not far from the middle, says: "Know [the Spirit as] one, proceeding from the Father and the Son, perfect God and life-giving." — John 15.]* But because Theophylact charges the Latin defenders of this opinion with a twofold argument — namely, that they have no testimony of this assertion in the divine Scripture, and that they set up two principles of the Holy Spirit, namely the Father and the Son — therefore, refuting both, we say, first, that we have in the sacred writings the testimony of Christ, who, speaking of the Holy Spirit in John, says: "When he shall come, that Spirit of truth, he will teach you all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, he shall speak; he shall glorify me, because he shall receive of mine, and shall announce [it] to you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine. Therefore I said, that he shall receive of mine, and shall announce [it] to you." From these words it is clear that the Holy Spirit is produced from the Son; for [in] that he says, "He shall receive of mine," it is just as if he said: As he shall receive subsistence from me by production, so also [he shall receive] all knowledge. For as the Son had said elsewhere that he had heard from his Father, so now he says that the Holy Spirit hears from him. And how [the Spirit] hears, he declares, adding, "Because he shall receive of mine" — that is, "Because he is, and is [being] produced, and shall be produced, of my substance, and from me. And that I said he would receive from me — do not wonder: because, as he receives from the Father, so he receives from me. For all [things] which the Father has are mine. If, then, he receives of the substance of the Father, he must [also] receive of mine." If, therefore, the Spirit receives of my substance, it cannot be but that he also proceeds from me.

And lest anyone suspect that this passage was understood otherwise by the ancient fathers of the Eastern church, it is worth bringing forward here the interpretations of certain illustrious

(right column — continuing Annotation CLXXXVII:)

fathers of Greece — among whom **Didymus**, in book 1 *On the Holy Spirit*, Jerome [being] the translator, writes thus: "The Savior, who is also the Truth, says of the Spirit, *[margin: John 15.]* 'He shall not speak of himself' — that is, not without me, and without what is mine, and the will of the Father; because he is inseparable from my will and the Father's: because he is not of himself, but is of the Father and of me. For this very [thing], that he subsists and speaks, is to him from the Father and from me. I speak the truth — that is, I inspire — [the things] which he speaks: since indeed he is the Spirit of truth." **Epiphanius** too, bishop of Salamis, in the book which is entitled *Ancoratus*, expounds this same testimony of Christ with these words: "'He shall glorify me, because he shall receive of mine, and shall announce [it] to you.' If, then, he proceeds from the Father, and 'shall receive of mine,' says the Lord — just as no one knows the Father, save the Son, and no one [knows] the Son, save the Father — I dare indeed to affirm that no one knows the Spirit, save the Father and the Son, from whom he proceeds, and shall receive." And below: "The Spirit is of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son — not according to any composition, as in us the soul and body [are], but in the midst of the Father and the Son, [proceeding] from the Father and the Son." **Athanasius** likewise, writing to Serapion, interprets thus: "The Spirit receives from the Son, according to the Lord's word, 'He shall receive of mine, and shall announce [it] to you.' For the Spirit has such an order and nature toward the Son as the Son [has] toward the Father." These [things are] to the first objection of Theophylact.

But as to what he adds in the second place — that we deduce the Holy Spirit from two principles — [it] is so far from the truth that we even execrate those who hold so, as is clear from the anathematisms of various

synods, but especially of Lyons and of Florence. For in the eighth session of the general Council of Florence it is read thus: "Since the Greeks suspect that we profess two principles, or two causes, in the holy consubstantial Trinity, therefore [those] holding this opinion, or professing such [things], we mark with an anathema. *[margin: The Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit.]* Since we ourselves believe that the operation and power of the Father and the Son [is] the one single cause of the Holy Spirit — so that the Son is not a principle different from the Father, from which the Holy Spirit proceeds and has [its] being. For we profess the Father to be the one cause, and root, and fount of the divinity; yet not so as to confound the persons of the Father and the Son [as arising] from it, [merely] because we believe their operation to be one (for that would be impious to believe); but [we profess] that there exist two persons, of the Father and of the Son, but one operation, and one power of theirs of sending [the Spirit]; and, in fine, that there is one [Spirit] which is sent from their substance and hypostasis. And on this account we say that the divine Creed was declared and elucidated by our elders — lest anyone, doubting whether the Son is a cause of the Holy Spirit, should fall into some heresy. For those believing that the Holy Spirit in no way proceeds from the Son must [necessarily] understand that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and consequently [that] there is no Son. But those who assert that the Spirit proceeds from the person of the Father alone — these without doubt separate the substance from the hypostasis, and imagine a partition of the divine substance — which [the Council] piously believes to be very alien from reason and from faith."

I pass over, consulting brevity, the anathematisms of the Council of Lyons and of the Lateran, [directed] both a-

[signature "Tt 3"; catchword "-uersus" (adversus) → "both a[gainst]," continues on p. 506 (PDF 511).]

(printed p. 506 [PDF p. 511], verso — end of Ann. CLXXXVII and Ann. CLXXXVIII–CXCI, on John 3:34–4:53 (Filioque concluded; Origen's subordinationism and angels forming bodies; Ferus on faith). Read order: left column, then right. NB: the right column suffered heavy ink show-through; Ann. CXCI, illegible here, has been restored in full from a clearer parallel edition (printed p. 496).)

(left column — concluding Annotation CLXXXVII, from the catchword "-uersus" (adversus):)

—both a[gainst] those who assert that the Holy Spirit [proceeds] from two principles, and against those who deny that he proceeds from the Son. I omit likewise the sentences of Athanasius, Basil, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Maximus, which teach the same [thing]. Whoever desires to see these [things] more fully treated, let him read the seventh and eighth sessions of the Council of Florence.

Annotation CLXXXVIII

"God is a Spirit." — John 4[:24]

[margin: Whether the Son and the Holy Spirit are inferior to the Father.]

Origen, in the thirteenth tome of the commentaries on John, seems to make the Son and the Holy Spirit inferior to the Father, with these words: "We say that the Son, and the Holy Spirit, excel all [things] which are begotten — not by comparison, but by an eminent pre-eminence — [the Son] who is surpassed by the Father by as much, or by a greater, pre-eminence, as [that] by which he himself, and the Spirit, surpass the rest [of things], and [those] not any [common] ones. For he is the image of his goodness, and a splendor — not of God, but of his glory, and of his eternal light; and a vapor, not of the Father, but of his power; and a pure emanation of his most sovereign glory; *[margin: John 14.]* through which mirror [as] Paul and Peter, and [those] like [them], see God: [he] who says, 'He that seeth me, seeth also my Father who sent me.'"

Annotation CLXXXIX

"I sent you to reap that whereon you have not labored; others have labored, and you have entered into their labors." — John 4[:38]

[margin: Whether the angels insert souls into bodies.]

Origen, in the same thirteenth tome, expounding this passage, said that it is the ministry of the angels to insert into bodies the souls of the men over whose guardianship they preside, and to form the very bodies in the womb — and that this is "the labor of others," into which the Apostles entered. And he speaks thus: "It must be considered whether, since the angels have been set over the sowing [scattering] of the seed of men, the Apostles — [as] helpers of the perfecting of those [things] which have been sown — enter into the labors of others, [and] reap. And if the matter stands thus, it must also be seen whether the ministry and office of the angels in inserting souls into bodies be not troublesome and full of labor — since they bind together two [things] contrary by nature into one tempering [blend], and at a certain and appointed time begin to apply the care which pertains to each [soul], and bring forth into the light, to bear fruit, him who was before fashioned." But someone, wishing to oppose these [things], will say that God himself is said to form and fashion [man], in that passage, *[margin: Job 10.]* "Thy hands

(right column — concluding Annotation CLXXXIX, then CXC–CXCI:)

made me, and fashioned me"; and in that [other], *[margin: Jer. 1.]* "Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee." To which it must be answered, that it can be [the case] that, even [with] the angels [being] set over the birth of men, God says that he himself fashions him in the womb.

Annotation CXC

"The man believed the word which Jesus said to him, and went his way." — John 4[:50]

John Ferus, in the commentaries on John, narrating this pericope: "We are taught," he says, "what the nature of faith is — namely, to conceive a confidence [fiducia] concerning God, that he will save us. But how, [and] when, and through what afflictions, in no way pertains to us," etc. What **Domingo de Soto** admonished must be guarded against in these words, thou hast above, Annotation 43 of this book.

Annotation CXCI

"Himself believed, and his whole house." — John 4[:53]

Michael Medina, defending against Soto's reprehensions the exposition of **John Ferus** adduced here, writes thus: "HERE Ferus, after many [things] excellently noted, had taught that a certain mystery lies hidden here — [namely] that the Evangelist, narrating the faith of the ruler [*centurio*], related nothing of the faith of the rest of the Capernaites; just as, after the miracle of the turning of water into wine, the faith of the disciples alone is related, when it is said, 'And his disciples believed in him.' He judges that in these passages the fewness of the true faithful is intimated, and that it is taught [that] true faith is [only] a settled [*rata*] [faith]. 'The greater part,' he says, 'even if it see and hear, yet remains in sin.'" These words Dominic Soto interprets (as is his wont) [as] a Lutheran error, and believes the Author here approves [the notion] whereby it is said that no sinner truly believes; and so he says: "He seems here to repeat the error [namely] that no one of those who is in sins truly believes — assuredly, since he explains the fewness of those who truly believe in no other way than by saying that there are [those] who, even if they see and hear, yet remain in sins, as if he should say [that] therefore they do not believe, because they remain in sins." Thus far he [Soto].

But what faith is called the true faith of Christ and of all Christians, we have shown in the preceding [pages] by manifold reasoning. For the true faith is [the faith] of Christian truth, of which we Christians always speak, which — since it consists together with a fervent and efficacious love — always, if it can, goes forth into works, and, in fine, [is] that [faith] which Paul calls the [faith] working *[margin: Gal. 5:6.]* through love.

Hence the Christian reader gathers that sinners, who, remaining obstinate, do not live by the Christian discipline, in no way have true faith — since they are destitute of love, which is the other part of Christian faith. As, therefore, they are not true Christians, so neither do they possess in themselves the true Christian faith, which not only shuns sins, but produces the fruits of eternal salvation. But lest that barren faith which is called "demonic" be retained whole by these [men]: for obstinate and hardened sinners do not seem to have any reckoning of the other life, nor to believe for certain that God's justice will be severe against sinful men. For they do believe, but with a certain languid and nerveless faith which — as we have said in the preceding — in men of this sort degenerates into the nature of [mere] opinion. For assuredly it belongs to the nature of faith [to have] the certitude of the divine promises and threats — which certitude such sinners have little of, or none. But the un-evident knowledge which remains in them, being destitute of certitude, passes over into the nature of opinion, as we said in the preceding — not that I teach that a barren and unformed faith is formally extinguished by sin (which the Lutheran madness teaches), but that, by the obstinacy of sins (which sometimes grows languid, and is turned into a worse opinion), nay sometimes, quite pressed down by the magnitude of sins, [it comes] to vanish. Therefore, even if the Author had openly said that none of those who is in sins truly believes, he would have wounded nothing of the catholic decrees of faith — although he would wound Soto, who [thereby] betrays that he is ignorant of these Christian manners of speaking; and it ought to have been marked that the Author was speaking of these obstinate [sinners], since he did not say [absolutely that] whoever is in sin does not truly believe, but [of those] in sins — according to the manner of speaking by which we understand many [men to be] defiled by the filth of sins.

[In this edition Ann. CXCII ("Labor not for the food," John 6:27) follows next; in the scan followed here CXCI's last lines and the start of CXCII fall at the top of p. 507 (PDF 512).]

(printed p. 507 [PDF p. 512], recto — end of Ann. CXCI and Ann. CXCII–CXCIIII, on John 6 ("labor not for the food"; "believe, and thou hast eaten"; whether faith is from us). Read order: left column, then right. NB: the top of the left column (the end of Ann. CXCI) was destroyed by show-through; CXCI is given complete on p. 506 (PDF 511), restored from a clearer parallel edition.)

(left column — the top continues and concludes Annotation CXCI (the final sentence, "Therefore, even if the Author had openly said that none of those who is in sins truly believes…" through "…defiled by the filth of sins"). In the scan followed here this column is destroyed by ink show-through; the annotation is given complete, restored from a clearer parallel edition, on p. 506 ([PDF 511](sixtus_p0511.md)). CXCII begins immediately below.)

Annotation CXCII

"Labor not for the food which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting." — John 6[:27]

The commentaries of **John Ferus** have this exposition of the present passage: "Christ does not forbid laboring for the body's food; nay, this is enjoined upon all: 'In the sweat,' he says, 'of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' *[margin: Gen. 3; Ps. 127; 2 Thess. 3.]* And David: 'The labors of thy hands thou shalt eat.' And Paul: 'He that laboreth not, let him not eat.'" **Domingo de Soto** disapproves this doctrine of Ferus, because he seems to teach that bodily labor is a precept [binding] on all without any distinction — which indeed seems to condemn the institution of the mendicant monks, who, having omitted the labor of the hands, provide sustenance for themselves by begging alone. **Michael Medina**'s *Apologia* refutes this with these words: "Here there is no reason why Soto should torture himself with suspicions. For 'precept' is not always taken for 'law': for sometimes 'precept' is taken for doctrine, counsel, or persuasion. By which reasoning Plutarch calls conjugal precepts 'doctrine,' or 'matrimonial counsels.' By which reasoning also we call military and paternal precepts the institutions of soldiers or of sons — concerning which Solomon: *[margin: Prov. 6;*

Prov. 7.] 'KEEP, my son, the precepts of thy father,' and afterward in the following chapter he says, 'MY SON, keep my words, and lay up my precepts with thee.' We call [it] a 'precept,' then, in the plain manner of speaking, whatsoever is enjoined upon anyone by way of an imperative, even if it does not induce the obligation of sin; in which manner we call a 'precept' that benediction which God imparted to the first parents and to all living creatures at the first beginning of things, saying, *[margin: Gen. 1.]* 'INCREASE, and multiply, and fill the earth.' By which manner also the divine maledictions, twisted into the form of an imperative, are likewise called precepts — such as that first one inflicted on the woman, *[margin: Gen. 3.]* 'IN sorrow shalt thou bring forth thy children'; and this one, which the author adduces in this place, *[margin: Gen. 3.]* 'IN the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' Nay, and besides this looser acceptation of 'precept,' the Apostolic precept also — according to the proper notion of precept — about working with the hands, [is directed to] those who from elsewhere have not whence to sustain [their] life, [and] is enjoined by Paul the Apostle upon certain [men] (who were walking inordinately), commanding: *[margin: Eph. 4.]* 'LET him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labor with his own hands'; and elsewhere, 'He that will not labor, let him not eat.' That this precept is divine and natural is not to be doubted. Therefore the author sinned in nothing: who, in order to show by those words, 'Labor not for the food that perisheth,' etc., that bodily labor is not forbidden, said [that] the same [labor] is [enjoined] through a precept enjoined — as if he should say [that] it was not only not forbidden, but is the matter of a precept. Of a precept, I say, taken in that larger signification, or in the stricter [one], by which it induces the obligation of sin, if we regard [those] who wander and walk inordinately. And so Calepinus should rather have been consulted, before the author [were] accused in this part." These [things] Michael Medina [says]. Thou hast [things] pertaining hereto below, Annotation 317.

Annotation CXCIII

"This is the work of God, that you believe." — John 6[:29]

[margin: On the Eucharist.]

Augustine, in tract 25 on John, elucidating this, says: "THIS is therefore to eat the food which perisheth not, but which endureth unto life eternal. Why dost thou make ready teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." The Sacramentarians abuse these words for the confirmation of their heresy: what is to be answered to them, see below, Annotation 196.

Annotation CXCIIII

"No man can come to me, except my Father draw him." — John 6[:44]

[margin: Whether faith is from us. Rom. 10.]

The exposition of **Augustine**, which is had in tractate 26 on John upon this saying, the **Master of the Sentences** noted, in the second book [of the Sentences], distinction 26, with these words: "It is not to be ignored that Augustine elsewhere seems to signify that faith is from the will; upon that word of the Apostle, *[margin: Rom. 10.]* 'With the heart it is believed unto justice,' thus treating upon John: 'Therefore the Apostle did not simply say "it is believed," but "with the heart it is believed" — because a man can [do] the other [things] unwilling, [but] can believe [only if] willing: he can enter the church, and approach the altar, [while] unwilling, but not believe.' Likewise upon Genesis, where Laban and Bathuel said, 'Let us call the girl, and ask her will,' etc., the expositor says: 'Because faith is of the will, not of necessity.' To which, answering, we say that these [things] are not to be so taken as [that] faith be understood to come forth from the will of man — since it is properly the gift of God, as the Apostle says, and from it the good merits of man begin. For through this [faith], as Augustine says upon Psalm 67, 'the impious is justified' — that is, 'of an impious [man] a pious [man] is made' — so that thereafter faith itself begins to work through love: whence all good

merits begin. But rather these [things] are said thus for this [reason], that there is no faith except in him who wills to believe — whose good will faith precedes not in time, but in cause and nature. Whence Augustine above congruently said that good will is in those gifts which it does not precede: and it itself [grace] helps those whom it helps, [those] whom it forestalls, while it consents with them unto the effect of good; and it is in them, because in time it is not preceded by them."

Theophylact, expounding this passage in the commentaries,

[signature "Tt 4"; catchword "-nens" (exponens) → "expounding," continues on p. 508 (PDF 513).]

(printed p. 508 [PDF p. 513], verso — end of Ann. CXCIIII and Ann. CXCV–CXCVI, on John 6 (Theophylact's magnet simile; venial sins and the Eucharist; the great real-presence annotation — Bertram/Ratramnus). Read order: left column, then right. NB: the ink-spotted opening of Ann. CXCVI was collated against a clearer parallel edition (printed p. 497) and confirmed correct.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXCIIII (Theophylact), from the catchword "-nens" (exponens):)

—expounding [this passage], he too seems to think that the gift of faith and grace is forestalled by us, and is acquired from the preparation of good will: for there he speaks thus: "The Father draws those who have an aptitude of will; but those who do not make themselves fit, he does not draw to faith — for just as the magnet [attracts] not all [things], but attracts iron alone, so also God indeed makes himself accessible to all, but draws those who [are] more fit and who show forth a familiarity toward him." Again, at the end of the commentary on Mark, expounding those words, "They went forth [and] preached everywhere, the Lord cooperating," etc., he says: "See — everywhere our [part] first, then God's help: for when we work, and shall have given the beginning, the Lord cooperates; and likewise, if we shall not have given [him] occasion, he will not cooperate." These words of Theophylact, excerpted from various sayings of Chrysostom, ought to be understood in the same manner as those [things] which were expounded by us in [our] comments, Annotation 101 of book 5.

Annotation CXCV

"Your fathers did eat manna." — John 6[:49]

[margin: Whether venial sins impede the effect of the Eucharist for those receiving [it].]

Augustine, in tract 26 on John, explaining this, says: "SEE, brethren, eat the heavenly bread spiritually, carry innocence to the altar. [As for] sins — even if they be daily, or [even if] they be not deadly — before you approach the altar, take heed [to] what you say: 'Forgive us our debts.'" **St. Thomas**, in the third part of the *Summa*, question 79, article 8, reckons this passage among those by which the scholastics are wont to demonstrate, for the sake of exercise, that venial sins do not impede the salutary power and effect of the Eucharist for those who receive [it]. And he dissolves the objection, saying that by venial faults the effect of the sacrament is not utterly and altogether impeded, but only in some part. For although venial delinquencies by no means take away the acquisition of ampler grace and charity, yet they take away a certain taste of spiritual sweetness, which the exactly-purified experience when the sacrament of the Lord's body is received.

Annotation CXCVI

"I am the bread of life." — John 6[:48]

[margin: Whether the Eucharist contains the true body of Christ.]

The exposition of **Augustine** set to this passage, **Bertram** the priest — or someone else under his name — in the book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, twists to the heresy of the Sacramentarians, who assert that the

Eucharist is nothing else than the substance of bread and wine, which bears the figure, likeness, and name of the body of Christ — [a body] which is not corporally and truly in the sacrament, but only spiritually and mystically. And the words of Augustine, cited from tract 26 on John, are of this sort:

1. "PHINEHAS also ate, and many there ate, who pleased God, and did not die. Why? Because they understood the visible food spiritually, spiritually hungered, spiritually tasted, that they might be spiritually satisfied. For we too receive a visible food; but the sacrament is one thing, the power [virtue] of the sacrament another. Likewise in the later [words], 'This is the bread which came down from heaven.' This bread the manna signified; this bread the altar of God signified: those were sacraments; in the signs they are diverse, in the reality which is signified they are alike. Hear the Apostle Paul: *[margin: 1 Cor. 10.]* 'I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all in Moses were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink.' The same spiritual [food], assuredly, [though] the bodily [was] another — because [for] them [it was] manna, [for] us another [thing]; but a spiritual [food] the same as [ours]. And he adds, 'And all drank the same spiritual drink.' Another [thing for] them, another [for] us — but in visible appearance, which yet would signify this same [thing] by spiritual power. For how did they drink the same drink from the spiritual [rock] following [them]? 'And the rock was Christ.' The rock [was] Christ in a sign, the true Christ in the word, and in the flesh."

2. Thus far Augustine's words; to which Bertram, in the same volume, added also other sayings of the same author, violently distorted to the confirmation of his error. For, when he wished to show that it is a crime to believe that the true flesh of Christ is contained in the Eucharist, he usurped from the third book of Augustine's *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 16, these words: "IF a preceptive expression forbids either a shameful deed or a crime, or enjoins [some] utility or beneficence, it is not figurative; but if it seems to enjoin a shameful deed or a crime, or to forbid [some] utility or beneficence, it is figurative. *[margin: John 6.]* 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you' — [this] seems to enjoin a crime or a shameful deed; it is, therefore, a figure, prescribing that [we] must communicate in the Lord's passion, and sweetly and profitably lay up in memory that for us his flesh was crucified and wounded," etc.

3. Likewise, when he was about to demonstrate that the sacrament of the Eucharist is called the body of Christ not because it is [it], but because it signifies Christ's body, he used a testimony from epistle 23 to Boniface the bishop — in which Augustine seems to intimate that the sacrament of the altar is called the body of Christ according to the common form of speaking, by which we are wont to call the day of the commemoration of the Lord's passion "the passion of Christ," because it has a likeness to that day on which of old Christ's passion was once accomplished. The words of the epistle run thus: "OFTEN we so speak that, as Easter approaches, we say that tomorrow, or the day after, is the Lord's passion — although he suffered [it] so many years before, nor was that passion done at all except once. Indeed, on the Lord's day itself we say, 'Today the Lord rose again,' although so many years have passed since he rose. Why is no one so foolish as to charge us, speaking thus, with having lied — except because we name these days after the likeness of those [days] on which these [things] were done? So that the [present] day is called that very [day], which is not the same, but is like it by the revolution of time; and it is said to be done on that day, on account of the celebration of the sacrament — [that] which was done not on that day, but already of old. Was not Christ once immolated in himself, and yet is he immolated for the peoples in the sacrament, not only through all the solemnities of Easter, but every day? Nor does he lie who, being asked, answers that he is immolated. For if the sacraments did not have a certain likeness of those things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all: and from this very

[catchword "ipsa" → "from this very [likeness]," continues on p. 509 (PDF 514).]

(printed p. 509 [PDF p. 514], recto — Ann. CXCVI cont., on John 6:48 (real presence — Bertram's and Berengar's abused Augustine passages). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CXCVI, from the catchword "ipsa":)

—[likeness] they [the sacraments] often now take even the name of the very things [they signify]. As, therefore, according to a certain manner, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, [and] the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ; so the sacrament of faith is faith," etc.

4. AGAIN, to show that in the sacrament there is nothing else than the substance of bread and wine, and a representation of the mystical body, he takes a fragment from Augustine's sermon *On the Sacrament, to the Infants [newly baptized], at the altar*, in these words: "THIS, which you see on the altar of God, you saw also [when] the night was past; but what it was, what it meant, how great a thing the sacrament contained, you have not yet heard. That, then, which you see is bread and a cup, which your very eyes also report to you; but [as to] that which your faith requires to be instructed [about] — the bread is the body of Christ, the cup is the blood of Christ. Briefly indeed has this been said, which may perhaps suffice for faith; but faith desires instruction. For the prophet says: 'Unless you believe, you shall not understand.' You can, then, say to me: 'You have bidden [us] believe; expound, that we may understand.' For such a thought can arise in anyone's mind: We know whence our Lord Jesus Christ took flesh — namely, from the Virgin Mary; as an infant he was suckled, was nourished, grew, was advanced to youthful age, suffered, was slain, was buried, on the third day rose again, ascended into heaven, there raised up his body, and is there now, sitting at the right hand of the Father: how, then, is the bread his body? And the cup, or what the cup holds, how is it his blood? These [things], brethren, are on that account called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What is seen has a bodily appearance; what is understood has a spiritual fruit. If, then, you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the Apostle saying to the faithful: *[margin: 1 Cor. 12.]* 'You are the body of Christ, and members.' Your mystery is placed on the table; you receive the mystery of God. To that which you are, you answer 'Amen,' and by answering you subscribe [to it]. You hear, then, 'the body of Christ,' and you answer 'Amen.' Be a member of the body of Christ, that your 'Amen' may be true."

5. BERENGAR, deacon of the church of Angers — who nearly two hundred years after Bertram renewed the same heresy in the year of the Lord 1160, when, [as] a heretic, he impiously composed an *Apologia* for his dogma against Humbert the Burgundian, a catholic man — brought forward, besides these, also other testimonies of Augustine, of which the more notable are these: AUGUSTINE, on the third Psalm: "Christ admitted Judas to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to the disciples the figure of his body and blood."

6. THE SAME AUGUSTINE, on Psalm 98: *[margin: John 6.]* "THE SPIRIT is what quickens; the flesh profits nothing. When the Lord had commended this, and had spoken of his flesh, and had said, 'Unless anyone eat my flesh, he shall not have eternal life in himself' — certain of his disciples were scandalized, nearly seventy; and they said, 'This is a hard saying'; and departed from him. For it seemed hard to them, what he said, 'Unless anyone eat my flesh, he shall not have eternal life.' They received it foolishly; they thought of it carnally; and supposed that the Lord was going to cut off for them particles from his body, and to give [them] to them. But when the twelve disciples had remained with him, [the others] departing, he instructed them, and said: 'It is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.' Understand spiritually what I have spoken. It is not this body which you see that you are going to eat, nor are you to drink that blood which they who will crucify me are going to shed. I have commended to you a certain sacrament, [which,] spiritually understood, will quicken you. Even though it must needs be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly."

7. THE SAME [Augustine], in tract 25 [26] on John: "This is to eat the food, not that which perisheth, but that which endureth unto life eternal. Why dost thou make ready tooth and belly? Believe, and thou hast

eaten." By these sentences Berengar persuaded [himself] that in the sacrament there is only a sign of the body of Christ, but not the very body of Christ; which also he contended cannot be in heaven and on the altar at once — the words of Augustine being brought forward for this from epistle 57 to Dardanus, which run thus:

(right column — continuing Annotation CXCVI:)

8. "DO NOT doubt that the man Christ Jesus is now there, whence he is to come [again]; and by memory recall, and faithfully hold, the Christian confession: that he rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and from nowhere else than thence is to come to judge the living and the dead — in the same form and substance of flesh, to which indeed he gave immortality, [but] did not take away its nature. According to this form he is not to be thought diffused everywhere. For it must be guarded against, lest we so build up the divinity of the man that we take away the truth of the body. For [it is] one person [that] is God and man, and each is one Christ Jesus; everywhere by [reason of] that [by] which he is God, but in heaven by [reason of] that [by] which he is man."

9. THUS FAR [the passages] which Bertram and Berengar collected from Augustine. Now it pleases [me] to add two other passages, the former of which Bertram dragged to his cause from the book of St. **Ambrose** *to those who are initiated in the mysteries* [*On the Mysteries*]; in whose eighth and tenth chapters these words are read, here and there and pieced together: "THIS food which thou receivest, this living bread which came down from heaven, supplies the substance of eternal life; and whosoever shall eat this bread, shall not die forever: and it is the body of Christ." And below: "THE word of Christ, who was able to make out of nothing that which was not — cannot [that word] change the things which are into that which they were not? For it is not greater to give new things [being] than to change natures." And a little after: "WHY dost thou here seek the order of nature in Christ's body, since the Lord Jesus himself is [born] beyond nature, brought forth of a virgin? Truly indeed it is the flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried. Truly, therefore, this is the sacrament of his flesh. The Lord Jesus himself cries out, 'This is my body.' Before the benediction of the heavenly words, another species is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified." And below: "WHAT we eat, what we drink, the Holy Spirit has expressed to thee elsewhere through the prophet, saying: *[margin: Ps. 33.]* 'Taste, and see, that the Lord is sweet: blessed [is] the man that hopeth in him.' In that sacrament is Christ, because it is the body of Christ; therefore [it is] not bodily food, but spiritual. Whence the Apostle says of its type: 'Because our fathers ate spiritual food, and [drank the same spiritual]

[catchword "potum" → "drink," continues on p. 510 (PDF 515).]

(printed p. 510 [PDF p. 515], verso — Ann. CXCVI cont., on John 6:48 (real presence — Calvin named; Lanfranc and Peter Lombard's three Rules). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CXCVI, from the catchword "potum":)

—"[they drank the same spiritual] drink. For the body of God is a spiritual body; the body of Christ is the body of the divine Spirit — which Spirit is Christ, as we read, *[margin: Lam. 4.]* 'The Spirit before our face, Christ the Lord.'" By these words Bertram said it is manifest that, although the substance of bread and wine after the consecration remains the same as it was before, yet it is inwardly changed, by the power of the word of God, into the sacrament, the likeness, and figure of the true body of Christ — which feeds the souls of the faithful, and supplies the nourishment of eternal life.

10. THIS interpretation of Bertram, Berengar confirmed, adducing another testimony under the name of Ambrose from the book *On the Sacraments*, in these words: "AFTER the consecration of the altar, the bread and wine become the sacrament of religion — not so that they cease to be what they were, but [so] that they be what they were, and be changed into another [thing]." These, then, are the sayings of Augustine and Ambrose, which of old Bertram and Berengar — but most recently John Calvin, in the seventh chapter of his

Institutes, and other Sacramentarian heretics — have wrongly abused against the truth of this most holy sacrament.

THE most pestilent error of these [men], **Lanfranc**, archbishop of Canterbury, most stoutly refuted, in the book *On the Sacrament, against Berengar*; and after him **Peter Lombard**, bishop of Paris, in book 4 of the Sentences. These, then, admonish [us] that, for the exact elucidation of these passages, three [things] must be observed, and held as rules.

[margin: Three rules.]

THE FIRST rule will be, that in the Eucharist three [things] must be regarded: one, which is a sacrament, or sign, and not a reality [res]; another, which is a sacrament, or sign, and [also] a reality; a third, which is a reality, and not a sign or sacrament. Now the sacrament-and-not-reality is the species of bread and wine, and the visible form — which two signify, namely, the body and blood of Christ, the true food and drink of the soul, lying hidden in the Eucharist; and the unity of the ecclesiastical body, which is gathered out of many faithful no otherwise than [as] one bread out of many grains, and the same wine out of many berries. The sacrament-and-reality is the proper flesh and blood of Christ. It is indeed a reality, because it is that same body which — born, dead, and revived — sits at the right hand of God. But it is a sacrament and sign, because, just as this very [body] consists of many most pure and immaculate members, so the mystical body of the glorious Church consists of many faithful [who are] free from the filth of crimes. The reality-and-not-sacrament-nor-sign is the unity of the Church in the predestined, the called, the justified, and the glorified. *[margin: The Master in Sentences bk. 4, dist. 8.]*

THE SECOND rule teaches that there are two modes of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ — namely, the sacramental and the spiritual. The sacramental is that by which we receive the true body of Christ, not according to the customary manner of eating — by which we press with the mouth the visible flesh of slain animals cut into morsels, grind [it] with the teeth, and send [it] down into the stomach for the body's nourishment — but by a sacramental rite, by which we receive the Lord's body, not in a visible form, nor cut into parts to satisfy the body's hunger, but for the soul's nourishment, invisibly, under the species of bread and wine, whole

(right column — continuing Annotation CXCVI:)

and impassible, living, and divine, [thus] we eat [it]. But the spiritual [mode], which befits only the good and pious, is that by which we receive not only the body of Christ, but also the power flowing from it — that is, the life of the soul. Speaking of the former mode, the Savior said, "The flesh profits nothing"; but of the latter, "It is the Spirit that quickens." I here pass over, for brevity's sake, the twofold variety of this spiritual eating — of which the one befits not only us, but also the angels, and the ancient fathers of the Old Testament, whom Paul and Augustine admonish [us] to have eaten the same spiritual food as we; but the other befits us alone, by which we receive the true body of Christ, and the efficacy of its power.

THE THIRD rule indicates that a twofold presence can be considered in Christ's body: namely, a conspicuous and visible [presence], by which of old he was seen on earth, and conversed with men; and an invisible and hidden presence, according to which he is invisibly present in the sacrament of the altar, covered by the form of bread and wine. These [things] being established in this manner, there is an easy approach to the plain understanding of the objected passages.

THE FIRST passage, then — from tract 26 on John — so speaks of the spiritual eating of the body of Christ, according to the second rule, that it does not reject the sacramental eating of the same; [and] it so mentions the sign, or sacrament, that it does not exclude the reality and power of the sacrament — nay, connecting both together at once, it says: "FOR we today have received a visible food; but the sacrament is one thing, the power of the sacrament another. The rock [is] Christ in a sign; the true Christ [is] in the word and in truth."

THE SECOND passage — from the third book *On Christian Doctrine* — is not to be so taken as if Augustine determined that that saying of Christ cannot be interpreted of the sacramental eating of the body of Christ. For he did not mean this; but he signified that Christ's saying is not to be understood according to the hard and savage understanding of the Capernaites, who supposed that the flesh of Christ must be eaten cut into morsels, and torn with the teeth, after the manner of the Laestrygonians and the Anthropophagi [man-eaters], who feed on human flesh. Removing this inhuman interpretation, Augustine says that that expression, [taken] from the precept of the second Rule, must be understood figuratively — that is, not of the eating of a lifeless and mangled corpse, but of the sacramental and spiritual eating of the living and life-giving flesh of Christ.

THE THIRD passage — from the epistle to Boniface — does not have [that] which Bertram lyingly gathered from it, namely, that the sacrament of the altar is called the body of Christ not from this, that it has the very body of Christ in itself, but only from this, that it bears a likeness of it. Far be it that Augustine should assert this! But what he [does] show is this: [that] the body of Christ, truly and essentially existing in the sacrament, is itself also, according to a certain manner, a sacrament and sign of the body of Christ — namely, of the mystical [body] — in that manner in which it was set out in the first Rule. And this mystical body is called "the body of Christ" according to a certain likeness, by which very often the things signified are wont to be named by the term of the things signifying. By which reasoning likewise the Lord's own sacra-

[catchword "-menti" (sacramenti) → "the Lord's own sacra[ment]," continues on p. 511 (PDF 516).]

(printed p. 511 [PDF p. 516], recto — Ann. CXCVI cont., on John 6:48 (real presence — the three Rules applied; Sixtus's Ambrose and Augustine catena). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CXCVI, from the catchword "-menti" (sacramenti):)

—the species of the Lord's sacrament are, in a certain manner, called "the body of Christ," since they are signs of the body of Christ, [and] because it is contained hidden in them.

THE FOURTH passage — from the sermon to the newly-baptized — is to be understood, according to the reasoning of the first Rule [canon], of the mystical body, which is signified not only by the true body of Christ, but also by the very species of bread and wine, which Augustine there calls "bread" and "wine" according to the common manner of speaking, by which we are wont to leave to things the names of those things which they themselves formerly were.

THE FIFTH passage — from the third Psalm — the first Rule opens up. For although in that Psalm the sacrament of the Eucharist is named "a figure of the Lord's body," yet the very body of the Lord is not thereby banished from the Eucharist.

THE SIXTH passage — from Psalm 98 — is to be referred to the third Rule, so that according to it we understand the words that were said, "It is not this body which you see that you are to eat, nor to drink that blood which they who will crucify me are to shed," [as meaning] this: you will not have to eat a body of this kind in a visible form, in a passible and mortal manner, in that manner by which the flesh of cattle is chewed with the teeth; but you will eat, invisibly, under the form of bread and wine, a glorious and impassible body.

THE SEVENTH passage — from tract 25 on John — the second Rule elucidates.

IN THE EIGHTH passage — from the epistle to Dardanus — we will apply the third Rule, understanding [him to mean] that Christ's body is in one place only according to the visible presence — namely, in heaven, where it appears visibly in human form; but invisibly, and according to its invisible presence, it is on every altar, wheresoever the mysteries of the Eucharist are celebrated.

THE NINTH — the Ambrose passage — is to be interpreted partly by the first, partly by the second Rule. For [that] which is subjoined at once after those words, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, dies not forever" — namely, "And it is the body of Christ" — understand, by the first Rule, of the mystical body. But [that] which he adds, "Therefore it is not bodily food, but spiritual," is thus expounded by the second Rule: that the flesh of Christ is not bodily food — that is, [not] of the number of the bodily foods which we daily consume for the body's nourishment — but spiritual food, in which, without its consumption and diminution, the true body of Christ is received sacramentally and spiritually.

THE TENTH passage, Lanfranc asserts to exist nowhere in Ambrose, but to have been impudently and impiously fabricated by Berengar, so that by its authority credence might be built up for his impious dogma.

Let it suffice to have said these [things] briefly on the proposed sentences of Ambrose and Augustine. But, lest any of the heretics complain that they have been expounded by us far from the true and genuine sense of their authors, it is needful to subjoin here some passages of the same fathers, by which it may become clear that they held [it] as we have expounded, and that they taught, concerning the truth of the most holy sacrament, those [things] which the catholic and apostolic Church teaches and preaches.

Ambrose, book 4, *On the Sacraments*, chapter 4:

(right column — continuing Annotation CXCVI:)

"THOU perhaps sayest, 'My bread is ordinary.' But this bread is bread before the words of the sacraments; when the consecration has been added, of bread it becomes the flesh of Christ. This, then, let us establish: how can [that] which is bread be the body of Christ? By the consecration. But the consecration — by what words is it, and by whose discourses? [By those] of the Lord Jesus. For [as to] all the rest which are said, praise is offered to God, [and] by prayer petition is made for the people, for kings, for the rest. But when [the priest] comes to consecrate the venerable sacrament, then the priest [uses] no longer his own discourses, but uses the discourses of Christ. Therefore the discourse of Christ confects this sacrament."

Again, in the same place: "Therefore thou hast learned that out of bread is made the body of Christ. And [as to] the wine and water [that] is put into the chalice — it becomes blood by the consecration of the heavenly word. But perhaps thou sayest, 'I do not see the appearance of blood.' But it has a likeness. For as thou hast taken up the likeness of [his] death, so also thou drinkest the likeness of [his] precious blood — that there be no horror of gore, and yet the price of redemption may work [its effect]. Thou hast learned, therefore, that what thou receivest is the body of Christ."

The same, in the same book, chapter 5: "WHO, the day before he suffered," he says, "took bread in his holy hands. Before it is consecrated, it is bread; but when the words of Christ have been added, it is the body of Christ. Finally, hear him saying: 'Take, and eat ye of it; for this is my body.' And before the words, the chalice is full of wine and water; when the words of Christ have worked, there the blood is made [effected], which redeemed the people. See, then, by how many kinds [of things] the word of Christ is powerful to change all [things]. Then the Lord Jesus himself testifies to us that we receive his body and blood. Ought we to doubt of his assurance and testimony?"

The same, book 5, *On the Sacraments*, chapter 4: "MINDFUL of my discourse, when I was treating of the sacraments, I told you that before the words of Christ, that which is offered is called bread; [but] when the words of Christ have been brought forth, it is no longer called bread, but is named the body," etc. "This is not that bread which goes into the body, but that bread of eternal life, which supports the substance of our soul."

The same, book 6, *On the Sacraments*, chapter 1: "AS our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Son of God — not in the manner of men, by grace, but as a Son from the substance of the Father — so [it is] true flesh, as he himself said, which we receive, and [it] is a true drink," etc.

Augustine, on Psalm 98: "The only-begotten Son of God took earth from earth, because flesh is of earth; and of the flesh of Mary he received flesh. And because in this same flesh he walked here, and gave this same flesh to us to be eaten unto salvation — but no one eats that flesh unless he has first adored [it]: it has been found out in what manner such a footstool of the Lord's feet may be adored; and [that] not only do we not sin by adoring, but we [would] sin by not adoring."

The same, book 3 *On the Trinity*, chapter 4: "WE call the body and blood of Christ that which, taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by the mystical prayer, we duly receive unto spiritual salvation, in memory of the Lord's passion for us. Which, when by the hands of men it is brought to that visible species, is not sanctified so as to become so great a sacra-

[catchword "-mentum" (sacramentum) → "so great a sacra[ment]," continues on p. 512 (PDF 517).]

(printed p. 512 [PDF p. 517], verso — end of Ann. CXCVI and Ann. CXCVII–CCI, on John 6–8 (real presence concluded; Cajetan censured by Catharinus on sacramental eating, on doubting the adulteress pericope, and on "principium"; Origen on the remission of blasphemy). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CXCVI (the Augustine On the Trinity *citation), from the catchword "-mentum":)*

—[so great a sacra]ment, except by the Spirit of God working invisibly — since God works all these [things] which are done in that work through bodily motions.

The same, tract 84 on John: "It is read in the Proverbs of Solomon, *[margin: Prov. 23.]* 'If thou sit to sup at the table of a ruler, considering, understand what is set before thee; and so put forth thy hand, knowing that thou oughtest to prepare such [things].' For what is the table of the ruler, but that from which is taken the body and blood of him who laid down his soul for us? And what is it to sit at it, but to approach humbly? And what is it to consider and understand what is set before thee, but worthily to ponder so great a grace?"

The same, on Psalm 33: "A man can be carried by the hands of others; by his own hands no one is carried; but Christ was carried in his own hands, when, commending his own body, he said, 'This is my body.' For he was carrying that body in his own hands." He says the same in the second sermon on the same psalm.

The same, to Julian, epistle 111: "Let everyone, before he receive the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, prove himself, and, according to the Apostle's precept, 'So let him eat of that bread, and drink of the cup.' For he who unworthily eats the body and blood of the Lord, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. For when we ought to receive him, we ought beforehand to have recourse to confession and penance, and to discuss all our acts more carefully; and if we have felt [any] harmful sins in us, let us quickly hasten to wash [them] away through confession and true penance — lest, concealing the devil within us together with the traitor Judas, we perish."

Thou wilt do well, best reader, to recall to the rules set down in this annotation all the passages of Origen, Chrysostom, and other authors pertaining to the Eucharist, which we have left undiscussed in this work. These are had at Annotations 120, 121, 152, 164, [and] 194 of book 5, and at Annotations 21, 66, 112, 193, and 206 of this book.

Annotation CXCVII

"Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man." — John 6[:53]

[margin: On the eating of the sacrament.]

Cardinal Cajetan, expounding these [words] in the commentaries, **Ambrosius** [Catharinus] — refuting [him] in a prolix treatise in the fifth book of the Annotations — marks with a twofold fault: first, that against

the common opinion of the holy [fathers] he tried by empty arguments to show that the present passage does not pertain to the sacramental eating of the body of Christ; secondly, that he dared to ascribe to the holy doctors this interpretation, which is peculiar to Luther and Oecolampadius — whereas it is certain that Cyril, Augustine, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and other fathers, as well ancient as more recent, interpreted this passage of the sacramental eating of the body of Christ.

Annotation CXCVIII

"But Jesus went unto the Mount of Olives." — John 8[:1]

(right column — the body of Annotation CXCVIII:)

[margin: Whether the beginning of the eighth chapter of John is authentic.]

Thomas Cajetan, entering upon the exposition of the present chapter: "TAKE NOTICE," he says, "that this first part of this chapter, with the whole history of the adulteress, is not altogether authentic: since it is not established that it is a part of the Gospel," etc. **Ambrosius** [Catharinus], in the third book, marked this opinion of Cajetan with a censure of this kind: "Concerning the history of the adulteress — that it should be irrational to cut it off from the Gospel, or to assert [it] not authentic (and this only because in some codices it was formerly not found), when for so many centuries it has been received by all the holy doctors, and preached, and celebrated in the discourses of churchmen as true and evangelical — I do not think it [belongs] to a pious, and at the same time prudent, heart to suppose [it inauthentic], much less to teach [so]. But as to what he added, to press this point — that there is no continuation of the following history with this one — it truly moved my stomach; nay, this interposition of this history made the matter itself marked [notable] to us, without which the narrative would be maimed. For in the preceding chapter it is said that every one of them returned to his own house; but in this [chapter] it is said of Jesus that he went to the Mount of Olives, and afterward that he came into the temple, and that then, out of malice, some of the malevolent [men] brought to him that adulteress, to hinder his teaching; but the Lord eluded them, and consequently there arose an occasion of teaching: and it well follows, *[margin: John 8.]* 'Again therefore he spoke to them' — so that here thou mayest see the discourse so chained together that, if thou omit anything, without doubt it would appear maimed, or at least a discourse not connected, but having its own [separate] beginning."

Annotation CXCIX

"Whither I go, you cannot come." — John 8[:21]

[margin: Whether [some] sins are at some time to be remitted.]

Origen, in the eighteenth tome on John, while he was expounding this passage, speaking incidentally of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, said that although that sin is not remitted either in this age or in the [age] to come, yet in the ages which will follow the [age] to come, it will at some time be remitted. This same dogma — reprobated by the catholics — he holds in very many places, but especially in the first volume of the *Periarchon* [*On First Principles*].

Annotation CC

"If you continue in my word," etc. — John 8[:31]

Chrysostom, in the fifty-second homily on John, narrating this, judges that the reading of the divine Scripture is necessary for all unto salvation. Read what has been written about this, Annotation 152.

Annotation CCI

"The beginning, who also speak to you." — John 8[:25]

[margin: "Beginning" [principium].]

Thomas Cajetan is here reproved by **Ambrosius** [Catharinus], because, for the particle which in Greek is read τὴν ἀρχὴν, and in the Vulgate edition is rendered *principium* [beginning], he himself — having changed not only the word "beginning," but also the sense of the same word — reads "In the first place" [*In primis*]; and expounds it not as a noun, as Ambrose and Augustine expounded [it], but as an adverb, in the manner in which Erasmus reads [it]. This very [thing] he [Catharinus] condemned in E-

[catchword "-rasmo" (Erasmo) → "in Erasmus," continues on p. 513 (PDF 518).]

(printed p. 513 [PDF p. 518], recto — end of Ann. CCI and Ann. CCII–CCVI, on John 8–12 (do priests remit sins? — Theophylact; Origen's soul-pre-existence and his "dream" about Thomas at Lazarus's raising; Augustine on Peter's keys, abused by Calvin). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCI, from the catchword "-rasmo":)

—[condemned this] in Erasmus [did] **Edward Lee**, in the Annotations and censures published against the same Erasmus; whose reasons, studying brevity, I omit.

Annotation CCII

"Everyone that committeth sin is the servant of sin." — John 8[:34]

[margin: Whether priests have the power of remitting sins.]

Theophylact, in the commentaries, interpreting this, says: "But the servitude of sin is heavier, from which God alone can free [one]. For to remit sins belongs to God alone. Therefore he says, 'Everyone who commits sin is the servant of sin': you therefore also are servants, because [you are] sinners." Moreover, because it was likely that they would say, "Although we are liable to such servitude, yet we have priests who will purge us from [our] sins," he says that they too are servants: *[margin: Rom. 3.]* "For all have sinned, and need the glory of God. And your priests, since they too are servants, have not the power of remitting sins to others." Which Paul too says more manifestly: *[margin: Heb. 5.]* "The priest has need to offer for himself, as [well as] for the people, because he too is liable to infirmity." This passage is cited everywhere by the Lutherans; and in the *Collectanea* of Bodius it is reckoned among those [passages] which are objected by the same heretics against the authority which priests have of remitting sins. And yet Theophylact's words plainly show that he speaks not of the evangelical priests, but of the Mosaic — of whom Paul too said *[margin: Heb. 10.]* that they could not remit sins. But our priests, having obtained a nobler dignity, have the right of loosing and binding, and truly remit sins — not as the principal authors of such remission (for God alone, who alone is Creator, in this manner pardons offenses by justifying grace), but as ministers and dispensers of the divine indulgence. See above, Annotation 62 of book 5, and 71 of this book.

Annotation CCIII

"I know that you are the children of Abraham." — John 8[:37]

[margin: [Origen:] souls, coming into the world, bring with them seminal reasons.]

Origen, in the beginning of the twentieth tome on John, on the occasion of this clause, teaches that souls, coming into this life, bring with them diverse seminal reasons, as well just as unjust. And he writes thus: "But SINCE from [their] morals and deeds the sons of Abraham are judged, I know not whether those who are the seed of Abraham ought to be designated, and as it were delineated, by certain reasons of seed which are scattered and sown in certain souls, as I judge. For if — just as, a reckoning being had of the body, not all men are the seed of Abraham — so from those [things] which were just now explained concerning who

indeed are the seed of Abraham, it is clear that not all men come into the life of men with the same seminal reasons which are scattered and sown in their souls. But the cause of these [things] — [proceeding] from the great judgments, both such as can hardly be set forth, and such as are discerned by those who have received the sense and mind of Christ, that they may know the [things] which have been given them by God — few can comprehend: [those] who, with great diligence and care, have explained, concerning each [soul], the [things] which happen before [its] birth and in [its] birth."

(right column:)

Annotation CCIIII

"I came not of myself, but he sent me." — John 8[:42]

[margin: Whether the soul of Christ was in heaven before [it was] in the flesh.]

Origen, in the 20th tome of the commentaries on John, so interprets this passage as to intimate that the soul of Christ was first blessed in heaven, and then sent by the Father into the womb of Mary, that thence it might assume flesh. His words are these: "Nor is the disputation concerning the soul to be passed over in this place. For perhaps the soul of the Son, when it was in its perfection, was in God, and in [His] fullness; and, having set out thence, by this very [fact] that it was sent by the Father, it assumed a body from Mary. But other souls are not so perfected by God — that is, they are not sent, nor permitted, by the will of God."

Annotation CCV

"Let us also go, that we may die with him." — John 11[:16]

[margin: On Thomas's exhortation to [his] fellow-disciples.]

Origen, narrating this passage in the Tomes, **Theophylact** derides in the commentaries, with these words: "But Origen tells a certain dream about Thomas. For Thomas, when he had heard the prophecies about Christ, and had learned that he was to descend even with [his] soul into hell to liberate souls — after he heard Christ saying, 'I go, that I may awaken Lazarus' — thought that he could be raised in no other way (that is, his soul liberated) unless he himself also, having laid down [his] body, descended into hell. Therefore, as a true disciple of Christ, and unwilling to be torn from [his] master in this [matter], he wishes both himself and his fellow-disciples to lay down their bodies, that they may descend with Jesus — who was about to lay down his soul, as he [Thomas] supposed, to bring back from hell the soul of [his] friend." This ridiculous narration I have set down, that I might confound with shame those who commend Origen's [teachings].

Annotation CCVI

"The poor you have always with you, but me you have not always." — John 12[:8]

[margin: Whether Peter received the keys in his own person.]

Augustine, in the fiftieth tract on John, sifting the present clause, has two passages unjustly usurped by the heretics of our times: one for the overthrow of the primacy of Peter, the other for the abolishing of the truth of the most sacred Eucharist.

The FIRST passage seems to intimate that Christ gave the keys to Peter not in his own person, but in the person of the whole Church — as if all the good who are in the Church have the keys, and a power of the keys equal to Peter's. His words are these: *[margin: Matt. 16.]* "'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatsoever thou shalt loose,' etc. If this was said to Peter only, the Church does not do this; but if it also takes place in the Church — that what [things] are bound on earth are bound in heaven, and what [things] are loosed on earth are loosed in heaven — [then] if this takes place in the Church, Peter, when he

received the keys, signified the holy Church. Thus in the person of Peter the good in the Church were signified," etc. This passage John Calvin adduces against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, in chapter 8 of his *Institutes*.

The SECOND passage, which seems to exclude the true body of Christ from the Eucharist, is had in these

[signature "Vu"; catchword "verbis" → "these words," continues on p. 514 (PDF 519).]

(printed p. 514 [PDF p. 519], verso — end of Ann. CCVI and Ann. CCVII–CCIX, on John 12–14 (Augustine's "the poor you have always" applied to the Eucharist and to Peter's keys, vs. Calvin; whether Philip the Apostle = Philip the deacon; Euthymius and the Filioque*; Ferus on baptism and remaining sin, defended by Medina against Soto). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCVI (the second Augustine passage), from the catchword "verbis":)

—[these] words: ""THE POOR you shall always have with you, but me you shall not always have.' Christ was speaking of the presence of his body. For according to his majesty, according to [his] providence, according to [his] ineffable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which was said by him, 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the age.' But according to the flesh, which the Word assumed — according to that [by] which he was born of a virgin, [by] which he was seized by the Jews, [by] which he was fastened to the wood, [by] which he was taken down from the cross, [by] which he was wrapped in linens, [by] which he was laid in the sepulchre, [by] which he was manifested in the resurrection — 'You shall not always have me with you.' Why? Because he conversed, according to the presence of [his] body, forty days with his disciples, and, they escorting him by seeing [him], not by following, he ascended into heaven, and is not here. For there he sits at the right hand of the Father, and [yet] he is here — for the presence of [his] majesty did not depart. Otherwise, according to the presence of [his] majesty, we always have Christ; [but] according to the presence of the flesh, it was rightly said to the disciples, 'Me you shall not always have.' For the Church had him according to the presence of the flesh for a few days: now it holds [him] by faith, [and] does not see [him] with the eyes."

TO THE FIRST passage it must be answered to the heretics that, although the keys were given to Peter in the person of the whole Church, yet it does not follow thence that all who are in the Church have the keys, and a power of the keys equal to Peter's — of which there would surely be no use, if all had [them]. But the sense of the words is that the keys were given not to Peter alone, but to Peter in the person of the Church — that is, not for the use, dignity, and advantage of Peter alone, but that Peter might use them for the profit and benefit of the whole Church, lest, looking out for himself alone, he should turn the power of the keys into a tyrannical dominion. Read Annotations 68 and 231 of this book.

[margin: On the Eucharist.] The SECOND passage is to be interpreted of the mortal and visible presence of the body of Christ, according to which we no longer have Christ — whom yet, according to the glorious and (to us) invisible presence of the same body, we have in the sacrament of the altar, in that manner which was explained above, Annotation 196.

Annotation CCVII

"These therefore came to Philip." — John 12[:21]

[margin: On Philip.]

Thomas Aquinas, in the commentaries on John — [those] which are said to be his — affirms that Philip the Apostle, who led the Gentiles to Christ, is the same [Philip] whom Luke, in the eighth chapter of Acts, reports to have preached to the Samaritans, and to have baptized the eunuch of Queen Candace. **Eusebius**

opposes this opinion, in book 2 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 1; [and] **Chrysostom**, in the 18th homily on Acts, saying that he [Philip] was one of the seven deacons, the second after Stephen. The same **Oecumenius** confirms in the *Collectanea*, asserting that he conferred baptism on the Samaritans, but by no means the Holy Spirit — because this office pertained not to the deacons, but to the Apostles, by whom afterward Peter and John were sent, who bestowed on the Samaritans the Spirit of confirmation by the imposition of hands,

(right column — concluding Annotation CCVII:)

which Philip, because he was not an Apostle, could not furnish. This same [thing] **Bede** approves in the commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.

Annotation CCVIII

"I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete." — John 14[:16]

[margin: Whether the Holy Spirit [is] from the Father alone.]

Euthymius, interpreting these [words] in the commentaries, **John Henten** — the scholiast and translator of the same [Euthymius] — charges with the dogma of the more recent Greeks concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone; a conjecture being taken from this, that the author [Euthymius], expounding this passage, used this form of speaking: "The Holy Spirit is given by the Father, inasmuch as proceeding from him; but is sent by the Son, as it were co-operating, and not contrary." And again, in the exposition of the fifteenth chapter, he repeats the same, saying: "The Holy Spirit proceeds, therefore, from the Father, as [being] of his substance; therefore he knows the [things] which are the Father's, as also the Son [does]," etc. But how much such a conjecture is to be esteemed, and whether on its account Euthymius is to be dragged into the error of the Greeks, let others more learned than I judge. See Annotation 187 of this book.

Annotation CCIX

"He that is washed needeth not, but to wash his feet, but is clean wholly." — John 13[:10]

[margin: Whether after baptism original sin, and after justification other sins too, remain.]

John Ferus, explaining these [words] in the commentaries, **Domingo de Soto** on that account warns is to be shunned — because he seems to think, in the Lutheran manner, that sins are altogether taken away neither by baptism nor by any other way, but that after justification original guilt and actual sins always remain, yet on account of faith are not imputed. And he says that this error is contained in the following words of Ferus: "But it might move someone, that Christ adds, 'But he is clean wholly.' For how [is he] 'clean wholly,' who is still bidden to wash [his] feet? Nay, how [is he] 'clean wholly,' who has been baptized — since Scripture everywhere asserts that no one is without sin? And indeed it is most true that no one is without sin; nevertheless it is [also] most true that whoever has been purified through faith is 'clean wholly.' For he, because he has been grafted into the body of Christ, participates in and possesses, through faith, the holiness and purity of Christ. Hence Paul says to believers, *[margin: 1 Cor. 6.]* 'You are washed, you are sanctified, through the name of the Lord Jesus.' And again, *[margin: Rom. 8.]* 'There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.' Hence the same [believers], grafted into Christ, are called holy, on account of the faith, the name, and the blood of Jesus Christ. Yet meanwhile in themselves they are nothing but sinners, and have indeed much of sin still, but nothing of condemnation, because before God they are reckoned clean on account of faith in Christ. Hence Paul says, 'With the mind I serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.'" These [things] the author [Ferus says]. Whose patronage **Michael** [Medina] taking up, thus speaks against Soto: "Who does not see that from these words the heretical sense is far off, by which offenses are said to remain in the sinner? For what the author here intimates is assuredly this: that even when the laver of

baptism has been received, if we consider ourselves and our nature, we are nothing

[catchword "-liud" (aliud) → "nothing else," continues on p. 515 (PDF 520).]

(printed p. 515 [PDF p. 520], recto — Annotation CCIX continued, on John 13:10 (Medina finishes defending Ferus against Soto; then Sixtus adduces Ambrose — On the Sacraments *3 and* On the Mysteries *6 — teaching that foot-washing after baptism removes hereditary sin, and begins to refute it). The whole page is one annotation. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCIX (Michael Medina's defense of Ferus), from the catchword "-liud":)

—[nothing else] than sinners, if [our] offenses be not destroyed and made to vanish by true and Christian faith. For Christian faith is the sole snare [*aucupium*] of the divine love, by which alone — otherwise foul and abominable — we please the divine will. We sin, therefore, daily, even when baptism has been received; but through the faith of Christ [our] offenses are pardoned to us, so that the [things] which otherwise would condemn us to eternal fire effect nothing of condemnation in us — Christ saying: *[margin: John 5.]* 'He who believes in him who sent me has eternal life, and comes not into judgment, but shall pass from death to life.' And so Christian faith, since it includes the whole business of Christian justice, includes in itself also the penance for those offenses which we commit by the frailty of the flesh — not only in the [work of the] author [Ferus], but in Paul, who a thousand times repeats that we acquire justice through faith. Otherwise, how could the author of this error be accused, who, in the same context of words, speaks so catholically of penance, saying that through it our feet are to be washed daily — since it cleanses the daily sins after baptism, and *[margin: Isa. 1.]* since it is the second plank after shipwreck, adducing the divine precept, 'BE WASHED, be clean, take away the evil of your thoughts from my eyes,' etc.? Who could be held suspect of the Lutheran dogma of the permanence of offenses, who in so many places so piously enjoins the satisfaction of sins? For truly those who are infected with this Lutheran dogma reject penance, exclude satisfaction, [and] judge the mere assent of faith, and the compliance of the understanding, to be the most sufficient medicine of sins. Does he who believes that daily offenses are cleansed and washed away through penance [really] believe the permanence of offenses in the sinner — especially [given] the metaphor taken from the washing of feet, where it was manifest that in the very washing the filth is wiped off? Why, then, did he not disclose, in that place, the difference between the bodily and the spiritual washing, if he believed that spiritual filth remains in the soul of the sinner, but that the defilements of the feet are wiped off after the washing? But what evil [is there]? He who most openly believes, from the prophecy of Isaiah, that evils are taken away from [our] hearts (that is, from the soul) through penance — is he to be reckoned to prove, with the Lutherans, the permanence of offenses? But nothing is so well and exactly said, but that to certain [men] born for this a burrow of calumniating [may] lie open." Thou hast [things] pertaining hereto below, Annotation 216.

There comes back to my memory, [suggested by] the proposed passage of the Gospel and the occasion of the present annotation, certain words of Ambrose concerning original sin — [namely] that it still remains after the washing of the sacred font; which if I shall add here, I judge I shall do nothing alien from [my] purpose.

[margin: Whether the washing of the feet after baptism is necessary for salvation.]

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, expounding the aforesaid clause of the Gospel, seems to determine that the washing of the feet, after the emersion from the font of baptism, is so necessary that no baptized [person] can be saved without it — because, just as by a certain immersion of the font actual sins are not remitted, so without the washing of the feet original sin is not relaxed. His words, in the third book *On the Sacraments*, are these: "Thou hast ascended from the font; what followed? Thou heardest the reading. The priest was girded — although indeed presbyters too may have done [it], yet the beginning of the ministry is from the

highest priest. Girded, I say, the highest priest washed thy feet: what [is] this mystery? Thou hast indeed heard that the Lord, when he had washed the feet of the other disciples, came to Peter, and Peter said to him, 'Dost thou wash my feet?' See all justice, see humility, see grace, see sanctification. 'Unless I wash thy feet,' he says, 'thou shalt not have part with me.'

(right column — continuing the Ambrose citation:)

We are not ignorant that the Roman church does not have this custom — whose type and form we follow in all [things]; yet it does not have this custom, that [the priest] should wash the feet: see, then, whether perhaps on account of the multitude it has declined [it]. Yet there are [some] who say, and try to excuse [it], that this is to be done in a mystery, not in baptism, not in regeneration, but as [if] the feet of a guest are to be washed. One thing belongs to humility, another to sanctification. Finally, hear that it is a mystery and a sanctification: 'Unless I wash thy feet, thou shalt not have part with me.' This I say, not that I may reprehend others, but that I may commend my own duties. In all [things] I desire to follow the Roman church, but yet we too are men, [and] have judgment. Therefore [in] that which is elsewhere more rightly observed, we too rightly keep [it]. We follow the Apostle Peter himself; we cleave to his devotion. To this, what does the Roman church answer? Assuredly Peter the Apostle himself is the author of this assertion to us, who was the priest of the Roman church. Peter himself said, 'Lord, not only [my] feet, but also [my] hands and head.' See the faith. That he before excused himself, was of humility; that afterward he offered himself, was of devotion and of faith. The Lord answered him, because he had said 'hands and head': 'He who is washed has not need to wash again, except to wash [his] feet.' Why this? Because in baptism all guilt is washed away. Guilt, therefore, recedes; but because Adam was supplanted by the Devil, and venom was poured out upon him above the feet, therefore thou washest the feet — that in that part in which the serpent lay in wait, a greater help of sanctification may come, so that afterward he cannot supplant thee: thou washest, therefore, [thy] feet, that thou mayest wash away the venoms of the serpent." The same opinion he more clearly approves in the book *On those who are initiated in the mysteries* [*On the Mysteries*], chapter 6, writing thus: "Thou hast ascended from the font; remember the evangelical reading. For the Lord Jesus washed the feet of his disciples; and when he came to Simon Peter, Peter said, 'Thou shalt not wash my feet forever.' To whom the Lord answered, 'If I wash not thy feet, thou shalt not have part with me.' Which having been heard, Peter [said]: 'Lord, not only [my] feet,' he says, 'but also [my] hands and head.' The Lord answered: 'He who is washed has not need except to wash [his] feet, but is clean wholly.' He was clean wholly, but he had to wash the sole [of his foot]: for he had, from the succession of the first man, sin, when the serpent supplanted him and persuaded [him to] error; therefore his sole is washed, that hereditary sins may be taken away — for our own [sins] are relaxed through baptism." Thus far he [Ambrose]. This opinion is exploded by the inveterate custom of all the churches, [and] by the common assent of the theologians, to whom it is agreed that all sins are remitted at once, in the same moment of time, and that, one being dismissed, the other cannot remain. Because both the discourse and the action of Christ plainly show that he washed the feet of the disciples not to this end, that [it should be] a sacrament of bap-

[signature "Vu 2"; catchword "baptis-" (baptismi) → "of baptism," continues on p. 516 (PDF 521).]

(printed p. 516 [PDF p. 521], verso — end of Ann. CCIX and Ann. CCX, on John 13–14 (Sixtus reconciles Ambrose's foot-washing doctrine with original sin; then Ferus on the Spirit as pledge → whether all believers are certain of grace: Soto's three objections and Medina's scholastic taxonomy of certitude — of evidence, of faith, and moral). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCIX (Sixtus's reply to Ambrose), from the catchword "baptis-":)

—[a sacrament] of baptism, which he had before conferred on them entirely and absolutely, as if he were completing, by a new washing of the feet, [something] not yet completed; but that he might set before them,

to be imitated, an example of his eminent humility. And to this tends that last epilogue of Christ's words: "If I, [your] Lord and master, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example, that as I have done, so you also may do." But [as to] what had before been said by the Savior, "He who is washed has not need except to wash [his] feet," it is not to be referred to the bodily washing of the feet, but — as it pleases Augustine — to the spiritual cleansing of the human affections, by which we continually cleave to the ground and are defiled by the filth of the earth. But, that we may interpret the Ambrosian sayings kindly, as is fitting: it is likely that Ambrose, by that sin which he calls hereditary from the succession, and [which] he calls the venom of the serpent poured upon the feet of Adam, did not signify the guilt of original sin, but the tinder [*fomes*] of the same sin, which — the guilt being blotted out — still remains in the baptized. For this too Paul frequently designates by the appellation of "sin," especially when, [speaking] of himself as already regenerated and sanctified, he repeats again and again, "I know that sin dwells in me." It is also credible that he [Ambrose] thought the washing of the feet to be necessary [as a sequel] from baptism, and not to be received for that sanctification which is given in baptism, but for the protection and increase of the sanctification already received in baptism; nor does the author himself seem to reject this sense, when he says, "In baptism all guilt is washed away; guilt, therefore, recedes," and the other [things] which follow thereafter.

Annotation CCX

"And he will give you another Paraclete." — John 14[:16]

[margin: Whether all believers are certain that they are in grace.]

John Ferus, in the commentary on this passage, weighing for what reason the Holy Spirit is called Paraclete, among other [things] which he had brought forward to this sense, had also assigned that cause: that he [the Spirit] certifies believers, as a pledge and earnest [*arrhabo*]. Which assertion **Domingo de Soto** reprehends, as flattering the Lutherans, who assert that all believers are certain that they are in grace. But **Michael** [Medina] refutes his reprehension with the following confutation:

"THIS opinion our Censor [Soto] calls a 'Lutheran perversion' — as if he would not have used a milder word (one which would not, by its novelty, express [his] zeal) in judging the opinion of a catholic man, whatever it might be. But such is, of old, the disposition of man, that before he understands a matter, he rushes headlong into the worse opinion. But now hear the reasons by which [Soto], to be triumphed over, insults the author: 'ALTHOUGH,' he says, 'as many as have faith may have some testimony that they are the sons of God, yet not a certainty. SECONDLY, heretics think themselves more securely to be in grace than some just [men do], although they are deceived. THIRDLY, finally: since — although the Holy Spirit, Paul being author, bears testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God — yet whether that testimony be from an angel of Satan, who sometimes transfigures himself into an angel of light, we know not.' These [things] Soto [says]. But by us it must first be discussed in how many ways certitude is distinguished, and then, indeed, of what certitude Paul and the author [Ferus] speak.

(right column — continuing Annotation CCX (Medina's taxonomy of certitude):)

SINCE, therefore, certitude is nothing else than a certain firmness of mind, by which the cognitive powers, adhering to their knowables, are rendered stable — from the threefold means by which this is wont to be done, the wise have found a threefold certitude. *[margin: Certitude of evidence.]* For there is a certain [certitude] which, because it is sought from evidence, they have called the certitude of evidence. Which they then distinguished [as] threefold: namely, of a principle, of a conclusion, and that which is derived not from the evidence of reason, but from a rightly-disposed sense. The first they say [is] such as is had concerning this principle, 'Every whole is greater than its part.' The second, such as [the certitude] which is possessed, after reasoning, from this conclusion (derived from that principle), 'The whole world is greater than the

earth.' The third, finally, they say [is] that which is produced from a sensible [object] duly brought near — as that the wall is white, which I see close [at hand], or the iron [is] hot, which I touch. *[margin: Certitude of faith.]* Of the second kind is the certitude which — because it descends from belief, or from the evidence of the thing — it has pleased our theologians to call the certitude of faith. For this [certitude] is not, like the others, produced first from the knowledge of the thing, then from adhesion, but immediately from adhesion — by which the mind, compelled by credible authority, adheres [to what is believed]. And this too they established [as] twofold, from a twofold faith: one which descends from divine authority, another which [descends] from human. Of the first they bring forward, [as] an example, the certitude which is had by Christians concerning the articles of faith. Of the second, that which is possessed concerning the existence of Rome, on account of the authority of a trustworthy man. *[margin: Moral certitude.]* There is, finally, a certitude of the third kind, which they call moral and human certitude — which, although it is much more imperfect and weaker than the preceding [kinds], is yet called certitude, because in its own kind it confirms and establishes the mind in the knowable. For in mortal [i.e. earthly] things that exact certitude cannot be had which is either produced from the perfect knowledge of the thing, or flows from the very constitution and firmness of the mind, such as the preceding [kinds] are held [to be]. But this moral certitude — by as much as natural things excel moral things in constancy and invariability — by so much is it inferior to the certitude of evidence, which flows from them [natural things]. And it is altogether inferior to the certitude of faith, since between the mean of each certitude there is no proportion. Assuredly natural and moral certitude are as far distant from each other as [are] moral and natural evidence, from which they are immediately born. But the certitude of faith, since it is not derived from evidence, nor depends on any natural principle by reason of which it might be comparable [to them], is in no way comparable to it. *[margin: Moral certitude [is] twofold.]* But this moral certitude is divided into that which descends from the strongest arguments and the firmest testimony (which, retaining the generic name, is called 'moral evidence'), and into that which is derived from apparent indications [*indicia*]. Of the first [kind], we are certain that adultery is evil — because both by human reasoning and by the authority of the human race its perniciousness and malice is proved. But of the second, we are certain that a man was slain by Socrates after inveterate hatreds — because, although the same

[catchword "eundem" → "the same [man]," continues on p. 517 (PDF 522).]

(printed p. 517 [PDF p. 522], recto — Annotation CCX continued, on John 14:16 (Medina answers Soto: Scripture calls a firm persuasion "certitude" — Judith, 2 Tim. 1, Gal. 4 "Abba Father," Rom. 8; the believer discerns the Spirit's cry as a lamb its mother's bleat; Augustine, Theophylact, and Pope Liberius). The whole page is one annotation. Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCX (Medina on certitude), from the catchword "eundem":)

—although we did not see the same Socrates attacking [him], yet we saw Socrates stand near the newly-prostrated corpse with a drawn sword.

[margin: Of which certitude the author speaks.]

And let these [things] be said concerning the first [point]. From which, with little labor, the second is had: of which certitude, I say, the author [Ferus] and holy Scripture speak in this matter, and as often as they attribute to us a certitude concerning our predestination, or concerning the obtaining of the divine friendship on account of some works of ours. For that certitude of evidence — since it descends from sense, or from evident reasoning, which have no place in [things] to be believed — is doubtless far from the opinion of the author and of Paul; for that [certitude] is proper to those things which reason alone measures. But neither can we, in this [present] state, be certain, by that [certitude] which is called the certitude of faith, that we have obtained justice, or the divine sonship. For concerning this it is most truly handed down that a man knows

not whether he be worthy of hatred or of love *[margin: Eccl. 9.]* — against the perfidy of the German heretics. And elsewhere, "If I shall be innocent," said Job, "this very [thing] my soul shall not know." *[margin: Job 9.]* Finally, that species of moral certitude which rests not on conjectures, but on arguments and reasons — although it is otherwise most usual, and most frequent in holy Scripture — yet by it we cannot be certain that we have the Spirit of God in us, because of this [there] are no arguments worthy of faith, nor testimonies, by which it might be established in the mind of man. Whether, therefore, Paul [said] that the Holy Spirit bears witness, etc., or Peter handed down that we are certified through the Holy Spirit concerning the divine sonship — [it is] because the just, by a certain internal inspiration, perceive the presence of the Holy Spirit, and a certain special instinct of divine sonship, not by trifling conjectures. But that a most probable conjecture and persuasion of mind (such as this is) is called "certitude" in the Scriptures *[margin: A persuasion [drawn] from probable conjectures, and from holy Scripture, and from the human manner of speaking, is called "certitude."]* — [this] the Censor seems not to have sufficiently understood, [as] is gathered from many passages both of the Old and of the New Testament. But let it suffice to have adduced a few for [the] many, since the human custom of speaking too makes this manifest. That wise Judith, therefore, about to deceive Holofernes, thus making words concerning the Bethulians, said before him: "And since the children of Israel know that they have offended their God, thy trembling is upon them. Moreover, famine also has invaded them, and by the dryness of water they are already reckoned among the dead. Finally, they ordain this, that they should kill their cattle, and drink the blood of them, and the holy [things] of the Lord their God, which God commanded not to be touched, in the corn, the wine, and the oil." And thereupon: "THEREFORE, since they do these [things], it is certain that they will be given over to destruction." Moreover, the Apostle, writing to Timothy, "I give thanks," he says, "to my God, whom I serve," etc., and afterward: *[margin: 2 Tim. 1.]* "Being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy, receiving the remembrance of that unfeigned faith which is in thee, which also dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois and thy mother Eunice; but I am certain that [it is] in thee too." In these passages, doubtless, "certitude" is called a certain conjecture, which is derived not from natural evidence, nor from a firm adhesion of the mind through faith, but from a probable conjecture. From these [things], thus, it will now be lawful to rise up against the Censor. That firmness and adhesion of mind which flows from probable conjectures is, by the catholic manner of speaking, called "certitude." Therefore [that] which contributes probable signs of the salvation to be obtained,

(right column — continuing Annotation CCX:)

certifies concerning the obtaining of the same salvation. But the Holy Spirit gives us those signs and conjectures: therefore he certifies us concerning the divine sonship, and that we shall obtain salvation — which the author taught. And what? Does not the Apostle everywhere insinuate this? Assuredly to this tends [that] which he says to the Galatians: *[margin: Gal. 4.]* "God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." And [that] which the Censor had brought forward from the same apostle, "For the Spirit itself renders testimony to our spirit, that we are the sons of God" — for what else is it, [that] the Spirit of the Son is sent into our hearts, crying, "Abba, Father," than that, by a certain internal paternal whisper, a certain filial confidence is begotten in us, [namely] that we are called into the lot and inheritance of the sons? "We would not dare," says Jerome upon these words, "to say, 'Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name,' except from the consciousness of the Spirit dwelling in us." And again, what else is it, [that] the Spirit bears witness to our spirit that we are the sons of God, than that, by a certain hidden insinuation, by a certain divine foretelling [*prælagium*], we conjecture ourselves to have been summoned into the divine sonship and the heavenly inheritance (which is the lot of the sons)?

BUT, SAYS THE CENSOR, a man is not certain whether that testimony be from an angel of Satan. But he thought far otherwise who said, *[margin: John 21.]* "We know that his testimony is true." And how, I ask, shall the creature not recognize the loving speech of its creator? Or how shall the sheep of Christ not hear the

voice of their shepherd, and [his] internal whistling? or in what way does a son not recognize the speech of [his] most dear parent? Assuredly, in John, Christ cried out: *[margin: John 10.]* "He who is of God hears the words of God." Those, therefore, to whom the Spirit bears witness that they are the sons of God, will hear the internal cry of God, [and] will discern his testimony from a Satanic murmur, just as a lamb discerns the bleating of its bleating mother from the bleating of the other sheep. Nay, and to this, without doubt, seems to look [that] which Paul, with apostolic confidence, boasted — that he was certain that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, etc., could move him from, and disjoin him from, the charity of Christ. For from these affections, which — crucified together with Christ — he experienced in himself; from that most close conjunction of mind with the same [Christ]; from that admirable and divine metamorphosis, by which he had been wholly converted and transformed into Christ; and finally from the growing-old and death of the old man, which he most certainly experienced in himself — so great a certitude of the divine adoption and of the salvation to be obtained flowed [in him], that it thrust him into these stupendous hyperboles. And in this sense Augustine expounds this passage, in the book *On the Morals of the Church*, and Theophylact, in the commentary on the same words — saying that these [things] came forth from the highest love of Christ, which he experienced in himself. Into our sense, indeed, the same words of the apostle **Pope Liberius** uses, in the epistle to all the faithful, transferring the same [words] to himself and to others, and at the same time expounding the apostle, when he says: "But WE ARE CONFIDENT concerning you, most dear brethren, of better [things], and [things] nearer to salvation; because neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor [things] present, nor [things] to come, nor power, nor height, nor any other creature (the teacher of the nations teach-

[signature "Vu 3"; catchword "-cente" (docente) → "teaching [it]," continues on p. 518 (PDF 523).]

(printed p. 518 [PDF p. 523], verso — end of Ann. CCX, then Ann. CCXI–CCXIIII, on John 15–17 (Euthymius/Filioque cross-ref; "faith alone" — Ferus/Soto/Medina; whether Christ "began to be," with Aquinas on the Arian danger; whether only the predestined believe). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCX (Medina, citing Pope Liberius), from the catchword "-cente":)

—[the teacher of the nations] teaching [it]) could separate you from the charity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and from the right faith which is in him." Thus far Liberius. Where thou seest a passage of the apostle to the Hebrews adduced to the same opinion. And no wonder: for the sense of both is the same, except that to the Romans the Apostle was speaking of himself, but to the Hebrews of others; for the word πείθω, which is placed in both passages, is the same as "I am confident, I am certain," etc. And [that] thou mayest see the apostle making words concerning this moral certitude, he at once subjoins the cause why he had persuaded himself of this: "For God," he says, "is not unjust, that he should forget your work, and labor, and love — [you] who have ministered to the saints, and [still] minister." From the rectitude of the divine justice, doubtless, the apostle was persuaded that the Hebrews possessed [things] near and close to salvation — which are those [things] which dispose us toward the state of perpetual salvation. But if it was lawful for the apostle to pronounce this of a whole people, why shall it not be lawful, without the suspicion of Lutheran perversion, for a catholic man to say of the just that they are certified through the Spirit concerning the divine sonship — especially with the support of apostolic doctrine? etc. Thus far Medina.

Annotation CCXI

"The Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father," etc. — John 15[:26]

Euthymius — what he is thought to have held in this place concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone — see above, Annotation 187.

Annotation CCXII

"Of sin indeed, because they believed not," etc. — John 16[:9]

[margin: Whether faith alone suffices for salvation.]

John Ferus, in the commentaries, elucidating these words: "By the merits of Christ ALONE," he says, "are we saved; and of these merits we are made partakers through faith alone." In this opinion, **Domingo de Soto** admonishes that that particle, "THROUGH FAITH ALONE," is to be guarded against, because from it [it] could be gathered that faith alone suffices for salvation — which is the error of the Lutherans. Meeting this censure, **Michael** [Medina] thus writes: "But how catholic this phrase is, we have brought to light in the preceding [pages], from many authors. Whence, [as to the fact] that he concludes, from the saying of the author, that we are saved through faith alone — we willingly grant [it], so long as we speak of the Christian faith, which includes love and works — [the faith] concerning which he sees, even unwilling, that the author always speaks, [and] understands [him to mean] this. But the Lutherans speak not of this faith, but of an unfruitful and unformed credulity, when the heretics attribute justice, or the obtaining of felicity, to faith [alone]. Nay, and the author, as is gathered from his words, teaches that we are made partakers of the merits of Christ through faith alone in this sense: that the participation of the same [merits] befalls [us] neither by nature, nor by any other [thing] besides the faith of Christ. For it is the faith of Christ alone through which, grafted into Christ and made one with him, we participate in his power and merits. Which sense, although it is most plainly gathered from the author's words, I know not by what means it could be stained with Lutheran suspicion. He then carps at another saying of the author, by which he had taught that unbelief makes all [things], even [those] good in appearance, unpleasing [to God] — as if he should say that all the

(right column:)

works of unbelievers are sins. For [they] are called unpleasing, whatever [things] are not produced from the Christian faith — not because they displease God (which is required for the notion of sin), but because they do not please, according to that [saying]: *[margin: Heb. 11.]* 'Without faith it is impossible to please God.'"

Annotation CCXIII

"Glorify thou me, Father, with the glory which I had before the world was." — John 17[:5]

[margin: Whether Christ began to be.]

Augustine, in tract 105 on John: "Before the world was," he says, "neither were we, nor [was] he himself, the mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," etc. **St. Thomas**, examining this passage — drawn by the scholastics for the sake of disputation — in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 16, article 9, says that the proposition which certain [men] build up from these words — namely, "This man" (Christ being pointed out) "began to be" — abhors from Christian piety, if nothing be added to it, and savors of the Arian dogma; because, when we say "Christ," we designate his eternal hypostasis, to whose eternity "to begin to be" is repugnant. He judges, therefore, that Augustine's opinion is to be understood with some addition — so that we say [that] the man Christ Jesus was not, before the world was, according to [his] humanity.

Annotation CCXIIII

"I have manifested thy name to men." — John 17[:6]

[margin: Whether only the predestined believe.]

John Ferus, in the commentary, teaches that by these words of Christ it is insinuated that not all men would believe, but those only who had been chosen by eternal predestination. **Michael Medina**, vindicating the present exposition from the reprehensions of Soto, writes thus in the *Apologeticum*: "This doctrine —

whether it be taken of unformed credulity, or of faith working through love — **Domingo de Soto** pronounces [to be] no less than a manifest heresy, since the reprobate too are very often in the grace and charity of God, from which afterward, having fallen, they go to perdition. But to condemn this is openly to condemn the doctrine of Paul, *[margin: 2 Thess. 3.]* who, writing to the Thessalonians, thus says: 'For the rest, brethren, pray for us, that the word of God may run, and be glorified, as [it is] among you, and that we may be delivered from importunate and evil men — for not all have faith.' *[margin: St. Thomas, in the commentary on the same epistle to the Thessalonians.]* This passage, doubtless, is understood of evil Christians who — although they seem (as blessed Thomas says on this passage) to have faith — yet do not have [it]. Nay, and in the same sense he adduces there that [passage] to the Romans, 'Not all believe the gospel'; and that which Paul there brings forward from Isaiah, 'Lord, who has believed our report?' And so, since the author speaks, with a perpetual tenor, of the true faith [and] of Christian truth, and by this truth only that is judged [to be] true faith which has the efficacy of obtaining salvation (according to that [saying], 'He who believes in me has eternal life, and comes not into death,' etc.), he could rightly say that the predestined alone would believe — because they alone will believe with a true and stable faith. For by this truth (which, however, is most frequent in the plain and theological manner of speaking), the faith which is for an hour [temporary], even if [it be] a mutable and in-

[catchword "con-" (inconstanti) → "inconstant [faith]," continues on p. 519 (PDF 524).]

(printed p. 519 [PDF p. 524], recto — Ann. CCXIV concluded, then Ann. CCXV–CCXVI, on John 17–19 (only the elect have "true faith"; whether believers are certain of grace — Medina vs. Soto, and precisely what Trent condemned; Ferus on "it is finished"). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCXIV (Medina on true faith), from the catchword "con-":)

—[the faith formed by an in]constant love (such as is the faith of the reprobate) is not called true faith. True faith assuredly consists of true love; but that love is called "true" only by moral truth, which has perseverance and permanence. Therefore, only the faith of the elect will be called true faith. The reprobate believe, I confess, but for an hour; for at the time of temptation they withdraw that faith — inasmuch as it has not driven [down] roots. Holy Scripture does not call [it] true faith; and it belongs also to the nature of true faith to produce fruit. But the fruit — Christ teaching — is one thirtyfold, another fiftyfold, another sixtyfold, *[margin: Matt. 13.]* by which difference the diverse degrees of beatitude are signified. The faith, therefore, which produces not the fruit of glory, will not be a true faith toward Christ. Finally, for this reason the reprobate are accused of unbelief in holy Scripture — because, although according to the outward face they may seem to have believed, yet they truly did not believe, because they either lacked true love, or constancy, which (as we have said) is so connected with true faith that in Scripture "faith" is taken for "faithfulness." "Behold," says the apostle Peter, *[margin: 1 Pet. 2.]* "I will place in Sion a chief cornerstone, approved, elect, precious: and he who believes in him shall not be confounded. To you, therefore, who believe, [is] honor and glory; but to the unbelieving, the stone which the builders rejected, this is made the head of the corner, and a stone of offense, and a rock of scandal, to those who stumble at the word, and do not believe." Here, certainly, "faith" is taken not for any [kind of] faith, but for that which effectively confers the reward of eternal felicity. For [that] which he says, "He who believes in him shall not be confounded," cannot be understood of any other [faith]; for sinners believing with an hourly [temporary] faith are at last confounded. And the same [thing] he then teaches more openly, when he says, "To you, therefore, who believe, honor and glory." For to a temporary faith honor and glory is by no means owed, but to a constant and faithful [faith], according to that [saying], "Be faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of glory." To believe, therefore, absolutely, or "faith" absolutely — since it is taken for "to believe perfectly," or [for] a constant faith — will belong only to those who by the divine decree are summoned to heavenly beatitude. For even if the reprobate sometimes believe, or love, yet, because they do not believe or love unto the end, they are said

not to believe truly, or to love truly. Whence it is rightly subjoined, "But to the unbelieving, the stone which they rejected," etc. He calls those "unbelieving" to whom Christ was made a stone of offense and a rock of scandal — [those] who are, without doubt, the reprobate. Paul too, *[margin: 2 Tim. 2 (in the print; but the passage quoted is 2 Thess. 2:8–11).]* writing to Timothy concerning certain reprobate, says: "And [the Lord] shall destroy [him] by the brightness of his coming — [him] whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to those who perish, because they received not the charity of the truth, that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, that they may believe a lie, and that all may be judged who believed not the truth, but consented to iniquity." Those who believe not the truth, who consented to iniquity, the apostle here calls the same [reprobate]; and this [is what] he calls "the reprobate." And finally the apostle Jude: *[margin: The [canonical] epistle of Jude.]* "I wish to admonish you," he says, "knowing all [things] once [for all], that Jesus, saving the people out of the land [of Egypt], secondly destroyed those who believed not."

(right column — concluding Annotation CCXIV:)

Here assuredly he speaks of the reprobate, whom yet he pronounces not to have believed absolutely. And so it would here have to be asked of Soto whether that conviction of the Holy Spirit, of which Christ speaks in John, *[margin: John 16.]* saying, "He shall convince the world of sin, because they believed not in me," is to be taken of all sinners. And if it is to be so taken, then sinners, Christ being witness, believe not in Christ. Then it would have to be asked whether he be called "faithful," or "a friend," who had been joined to him by an hourly friendship or faith. And if he would not be [so] called — since it belongs to the nature of true faith and true charity to have permanence and constancy — then those [who are] truly believing in Christ will not be called sinners. But the man [Soto] certainly labors under the same disease — namely, [from] a defect of human phrasing; for he confounds all [things] by a physical or metaphysical [manner of] speaking. There is not, therefore, in this part, a manifest heresy in the author's doctrine, but the express sentence of Christ and of the apostles.

Annotation CCXV

"They were thine, and thou gavest them to me." — John 17[:6]

[margin: Whether all believers are certain of grace.]

John Ferus, narrating this passage in the commentaries: "DO NOT [trust] thyself in God," he says, "but in Christ; in whom, if thou find thyself by faith and love, be certain that thou art predestined by God." **Michael Medina** thus refutes Soto, [who was] condemning these words: "Soto in this place accuses Ferus of the error concerning the certitude of grace, condemned in the Council of Trent. But since here the author speaks — after his manner, and [that] of all who speak humanly — of a moral certitude, which depends on the acts which we experience in ourselves, there is no reason why that error should be imputed to him, unless it be also imputed to all [those] whom we have already shown to have used this phrase in many [places]. Nay, unless the whole human race is to be condemned, because it calls those [things] 'certain' which are apprehended from human conjectures: it is assuredly true that, from the living faith which we experience in ourselves, we can know, through conjectures, that we are partakers of the eternal reward — since we know [it was] said by the truthful master, *[margin: John.]* 'He who believes in the Son has eternal life'; and 'he who loves me shall be loved by my Father, and we will come to him.' But that we can know in ourselves true love and faith, there is no one who doubts — although we cannot [with certainty] apprehend that we are pleasing to God, or that we have infused grace in us. And so, the error condemned at Trent is not that we can, by conjectures and human reasonings, know that we have divine love or grace, or that we presume concerning divine predestination, the divine promises encouraging [us]; but [the error is] that anyone of men could, by the certitude of faith — divine revelation being excluded — be certain of divine grace or predestination." *[margin: What the error condemned at Trent is.]*

Annotation CCXVI

"When therefore Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished." — John 19[:30]

To **John Ferus**, expounding this passage in the commentaries, **Domingo de Soto** imputes the error of the Germans — namely, that he taught that sin remains after justification, yet is not imputed.

[signature "Vu 4"; catchword "id" → "this [error]," continues on p. 520 (PDF 525).]

(printed p. 520 [PDF p. 525], verso — end of Ann. CCXVI, then Ann. CCXVII–CCXIX, on John 19–21 (Ferus on remaining sin, defended by Medina; faith and human reason — Gregory/Aquinas; auricular confession — Catharinus vs. Cajetan, with Trent sess. 14 canon 6; "Feed my sheep" — whether Peter's care is over the predestined alone). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCXVI (Ferus on remaining sin, defended by Medina), from the catchword "id":)

—this [error], indeed, he [Soto] conjectures from these sayings of the author: "SO also our salvation is consummated — not by full right, but in hope. For the man has begun to be justified and healed; yet meanwhile, while he is justified and healed, [that] which remains of sin in the flesh is not imputed to him, on account of Christ — who, since he is without any sin, [and] now made one with the man, intercedes for him before the Father." These [things] Ferus [says]; for whose defense **Michael Medina** refuted Soto with these words: "How far the author is from this calumny, we have long since shown. He assuredly calls 'sin,' in the Pauline manner, in the singular number, that natural lust of sinning which daily impels us to sin — which [lust] he [Soto] would complain is called 'sin' and 'not the effect of sin'; [he would complain] of Paul, who first introduced that manner of speaking: *[margin: Rom. 7.]* 'But if I do that which I will not, [it is] now not I that do it, but the sin that dwells in me.' Perhaps Paul did not know that the tinder of sinning and carnal concupiscence is to be called 'not sin, but the effect of sin'! Now, [as to the fact] that he [Soto] confirms his suspicion of him because the author uses the word 'impute' — by the same reasoning he will make the Holy Spirit suspect to him, [the Spirit] who, through the mouth of David, pronounces [that man] 'blessed,' *[margin: Ps. 31.]* to whom the Lord imputed not sin; and, through Ezekiel, *[margin: Ezek. 33.]* promises to [the man] doing penance and executing judgment and justice that [his] sins shall not be imputed. Nay, why should not Paul be suspect to him — from whom he [the author] took these words — *[margin: Rom. 7.]* since he says that until the Law sin was in the world, but was not imputed? Now let Soto infer that the permanence of sin is proved from Paul, from David, [and] from Ezekiel after justice is received — and we shall forthwith hold them [to be] heretics! And so it will always be lawful for catholic men to use a catholic phrase." These [things] Medina [says]. See above, Annotation 109 of this book.

Annotation CCXVII

"When it was late that same day, the first of the sabbaths." — John 20[:19]

[margin: Whether the mysteries of faith are to be proved by human reasons.]

Pope Gregory, in the beginning of the twenty-seventh homily on the gospels: "FAITH," he says, "has no merit, for which human reason furnishes proof." This proposition — usurped by those who denied that human reasons are to be brought in for the confirmation of divine [things] — **St. Thomas**, in the *Secunda Secundae*, elucidates with these words: "GREGORY, saying this, speaks in that case when a man has not the will to believe those [things] which are of faith except on account of a reason adduced. But when a man has the will to believe those [things] which are of faith from the divine authority alone, [and] if he has a demonstrative reason for some of them — as, for instance, for this, that God exists — the merit of faith is not on that account taken away, or diminished."

Annotation CCXVIII

"Receive the Holy Spirit: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained." — John 20[:22–23]

[margin: Whether auricular confession was instituted by Christ.]

To **Thomas Cajetan**, explaining this sentence in the commentaries, **Ambrosius** [Catharinus], in the fifth book of the Annotations, imputes two errors, writing these [things] against him: "Cajetan CONFESSES that in John, chapter 20, confession was instituted by the Lord — yet not auricular [confession]; but that this [was] left to the arbitration of the Church, whether it should be made into the ear [privately], or publicly. Which is most absurd. For that is not left to the arbitration of the Church which reason and Scripture teach [must] be observed in a certain [determined] manner. For the Church could not decree that everyone should publicly disclose [his] hidden sins, on account of the innumerable scandals which would arise thence. Therefore, confession being instituted by the Lord, of its own accord [there] comes also the institution of the manner of confessing — namely, that public [sins be confessed] publicly, [and] hidden [sins] secretly; and it is peevish to wish all [things] to be [explicitly] set out in the Scriptures. For if the Lord instituted confession, it is credible that he also taught the manner of confessing — and no other than that which has always been observed, and which reason itself persuades: namely, that public [sins] should be confessed publicly, and hidden [sins] secretly. This too did not please [me]: that, although he confesses that confession was instituted by the Lord, yet he does not confess that it is enjoined [as a precept].

(right column — concluding Annotation CCXVIII:)

But I, from the very institution, interpret [it] also [as] enjoined — lest we say that so great a remedy was instituted in vain. And since everyone is bound to seek his own salvation, and this is the manner instituted by the Lord, and (as Jerome says) the second plank after shipwreck — namely, that through confession the sinner is absolved by the priest — how can it be said not to be enjoined? Will it, then, be lawful to despise the goodness and grace of God, and one's own salvation, without crime? Far be it from the minds of the faithful, that these absurdities be believed." These [things] Ambrosius [Catharinus says]; to whose opinion is to be added the canon of the Council of Trent against both errors. It is had in session 14, canon 6, in these words: "IF anyone shall deny that sacramental confession was either instituted, or is necessary to salvation, by divine right; or shall say that the manner of confessing secretly to the priest alone — which the catholic Church has always observed from the beginning, and [still] observes — is alien from the institution and mandate of Christ, and is a human invention: let him be anathema."

Annotation CCXIX

"Feed my sheep." — John 21[:17]

[margin: Whether the care of the predestined alone was committed to Peter.]

The exposition of **Thomas Cajetan**, **Ambrosius** [Catharinus], in the third book, chastises with this censure: "CONCERNING the care given to Peter, Cajetan says thus: 'Although the care of all Christians is understood to be committed to Peter, yet the predestined alone — who alone are the lambs and sheep of Jesus Christ — are set forth as to be fed and ruled by Peter; for to this tends the institution of the pastoral office.' Thus he [Cajetan] — which [words] I doubt not to be both false and dangerous. For if the care is not committed to Peter by the Lord except over the predestined, then assuredly he will not have [it] over others — which is false and heretical. Moreover, we should be ignorant — nay, he himself would have been ignorant — over whom the care was committed to him; for he [Peter] did not know who were predestined, which it is foolish to confess. Moreover, the care of the angels is [exercised] indifferently for all, even the non-predestined; because to each one an angel is given for salvation — for they are ministering spirits, that we may obtain the

inheritance of salvation. Moreover, if it was committed to him only over the predestined, he would not have had the power of binding, as [well as] of loosing, so that [things] should be bound also in heaven — which yet was explicitly given to him by the Lord — lest the Most Rever-

[catchword "-dissimus" (Reverendissimus) → "the Most Reverend [Cajetan]," continues on p. 521 (PDF 526).]

(printed p. 521 [PDF p. 526], recto — end of Ann. CCXIX, then Ann. CCXX–CCXXII, on John 21 & Acts 1 (Peter's care over all, not the elect only; the SIC/SI Greek variant at John 21:22 — Valla vs. Erasmus vs. Augustine, and George of Trebizond; "Follow thou me" and Peter's keys vs. the Lutherans; then the series crosses into Acts — Judas's death). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXIX (Catharinus on "Feed my sheep"), from the catchword "-dissimus":)

—[lest the Most Rever]end [Cajetan] be able to say [that] what he perhaps meant [was] that over the non-predestined he had care [only] indirectly, or implicitly. Moreover, Peter is the perfect Vicar of Christ; but Christ had from God power over all flesh — thus over Judas, as [well as] over Peter; and with the same doctrine and care he fed both. But that Judas did not repent was effected by his own malice, not by the Lord's negligence or dereliction (which I shudder even to say). So, therefore, Peter received the care over my [sheep], so that, if anyone were lost through his negligence or sloth, his blood should be required at his hand — as the Lord threatens in Ezekiel. *[margin: Ezek. 34.]* For, by the mandate of the Lord, Peter owes care and vigilance to all without difference — as much to the non-predestined as to the predestined. But vain, and scandalous, are meditations of this kind, [being] built upon a false foundation."

Annotation CCXX

"So I will him to remain, till I come." — John 21[:22]

[margin: Whether it is to be read SIC ["so"] or SI ["if"].]

Augustine, narrating this period [passage] in tract 124 on John, **Lorenzo Valla**, in the Annotations on the New Testament, assailed with harsh reproaches — because, the truth of the Greek source being neglected, he [Augustine] had falsely thrust into the Gospel the particle "SIC," reading "SO [*Sic*] I will him to remain," for [that] which the genuine copies of the Greeks have, "Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν," "IF [*Si*] I will him to remain." **Erasmus**, in the Annotations on the New Testament, against Valla, takes up the patronage of Augustine — but in such a way that Erasmus's defense is far more odious than Valla's accusation. For he so defends him as to say that pardon must be given to the man's inexperience and simple credulity; who, although he was a holy man, upright, and endowed with a keen genius, was nevertheless credulous, and destitute of the aid of languages — without which the divine Scriptures cannot, as is fitting, be handled. To these [things] he adds that he came late to Christianity, and, soon, as a young man, was snatched to the episcopal office, so that he was compelled to learn by teaching what he taught, and to learn by writing what he wrote; and that, therefore, he is to be tolerated, if somewhere he does not attain what he aims at.

I cannot but greatly wonder that Erasmus, a man most learned in his own estimation, could think that Augustine had here slipped from ignorance of the Greek language — as if he were so devoid of Greek literature that, reading the Greek Gospel of John, he could not distinguish ἐὰν from ὄντως — since so many of his writings attest that he was not altogether ignorant of Greek letters. Nay, he himself, in the first volume of the *Confessions*, confesses that he learned Greek grammar while still a boy, and sang the songs of Homer in the literary school. I find also some sentences of Chrysostom, corrupted by the Pelagians, restored by him to their Greek integrity. Also the seven volumes of the *Locutions* of the Old Testament, in which he emends the sacred locutions to the Greek reading, and the *Categories* of Aristotle, translated by him into Latin,

plainly show that he was not so destitute of Greek letters but that he could know that ἐὰν signifies "IF." *[margin: Whether it is to be read SI or SIC.]*

George of Trebizond, a Greek, and most erudite in the Greek language, in the book which he wrote on this passage of John to Pope Eugenius,

(right column — concluding Annotation CCXX:)

shows that Augustine and the other Latin fathers translated Ἐὰν [as] "SIC" not from ignorance, but from design — because, just as the particle "SI" among the Latins, so the same [particle] among the Greeks, when joined to an indicative verb, is taken affirmatively; but with a subjunctive [verb], suspensively and dubitatively. But since Ἐὰν is here joined to an indicative, therefore the Latin fathers interpreted [it] not "SI" but "SIC" — lest, namely, the particle "SI" should trouble those [but] half-learned in the Latin and Greek tongues, on account of its double force. But by affirming "SIC," they said [it] expressly, so that no one should doubt that that Greek particle too was there placed not otherwise than affirmatively. There are also [those] who think that Augustine read and wrote "SI," and not "SIC," but that it happened by the fault of the copyists that "SIC" was put for "SI"; and this they endeavor to persuade from Augustine's own context.

Annotation CCXXI

"Follow thou me." — John 21[:19]

[margin: Whether Peter had the keys in his own person.]

Augustine, narrating this in tract 124 on John, says: "This the Church does, in blessed hope, in this toilsome life — of which Church Peter the Apostle, on account of the primacy of his apostolate, bore the person by a figured generality. For [as to] that which properly pertains to himself, by nature he was one man, by grace one Christian, by a more abundant grace one and the same [person, namely] Peter the Apostle: but when it was said to him, 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind,' etc., then he signified the whole Church." This passage the Lutherans adduce, to show that when Christ said, *[margin: Matt. 16.]* "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," etc., he spoke to Peter not as to his particular person, but to the whole Church, whose figure he bore — just as when he spoke to all the Apostles by a response directed to Judas.

Meeting these [Lutherans], **John Bunderius**, in the book of the *Concertationes*, thus says: "IF the Lord had directed the discourse to the Apostles, he would have enunciated [it] in the plural number — just as when, to Peter alone asking, 'Behold, now we have left all things; what therefore shall there be for us?', the Lord soon, directing [his] words to all the Apostles, says: 'You, who have followed me,' etc. But now, to Peter, on account of his singular dignity, he directed the discourse: 'I will give thee the keys,' etc." Examining which, Augustine, in the same place, says: "He first of the Apostles received the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Nor do we deny that the keys are given to the Church: for the Church is the end [purpose] of the gift; for [they] are given on account of the Church's utility. And this Augustine affirms, tract 124 on John, saying: "The Church, which is founded on Christ, received from him the keys of the kingdom of heaven in Peter." By this figure we say that the empire is among the Germans — not because the individual Germans [have it], but because one of them is distinguished with the title of the empire. [The keys] are, therefore, in Peter authoritatively, in the Church finally [as to their end]. See [things] pertaining to this argument in Annotations 68 and 206 of this book.

Annotation CCXXII

"Being hanged, he burst asunder in the midst: and all his bowels gushed out." — Acts 1[:18]

[catchword "OECY-" (Oecumenius) → the annotation on Judas's death begins; continues on p. 522 (PDF 527). This is the first annotation on the Acts of the Apostles — the series has now passed out of the Gospel of John.]

(printed p. 522 [PDF p. 527], verso — end of Ann. CCXXII, then Ann. CCXXIII–CCXXV, on Acts 1–6 (Judas's death — Oecumenius, quoting Papias's lurid account, which Sixtus rejects for the hanging, with poems from Juvencus and Arator; Chrysostom on oaths, twice; whether the seven of Acts 6 were true deacons — Cajetan vs. Catharinus). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCXXII (Judas's death), from the catchword "OECY-":)

[margin: Whether Judas died by hanging.]

Oecumenius, in the *Collectanea* on the Acts of the Apostles, affixed to this passage such an explanation: "JUDAS did not depart from life by hanging, but survived. For he was cast down before he was choked; and this the Acts of the Apostles indicate — that, [falling] forward, he burst asunder in the midst. But this **Papias**, the disciple of the Apostle John, wrote more plainly, saying: 'Judas remained in this world as a great example of impiety. For he was so swollen in body that he could not pass through where a chariot easily passes; and when a chariot was passing by in an easy course, he was crushed by the chariot, so that his bowels gushed out.' IN ANOTHER MANNER [he tells it]: 'For he was so swollen in body that he could not go forward where a chariot passed in an easy course — nay, not even the swelling of [his] head alone [could pass]. For they say that even the eyelids of his eyes were so swollen that he could not see the light at all, and his eyes could not appear even with the *dioptra* [physicians' instrument]: with so great a depth were they separated from the outer view. But his genital member exceeded all obscenity and magnitude. Furthermore, gore and worms, flowing together disgustingly, were borne out of his whole body, going out through the secret places alone. But after many torments and punishments, when he had died in his own field (as they say), on account of the stench that field remained deserted and uninhabited to this day; nor even to this present time can anyone pass by that place except with nostrils stopped by the hand.'" These [things] Oecumenius [says] — from whose narration **Theophylact**, expounding chapter 27 of Matthew, seems not to have altogether recoiled. The common consensus of all the Fathers rejects this opinion, [the Fathers] writing that Judas perished, according to the evangelical sentence, by the choking of the noose. Nay, and Oecumenius himself, reporting these [things] from the records of others, testifies that Judas perished by hanging immediately after the betrayal was done. Which also **Juvencus**, a most ancient poet, comprehended in these verses in the fourth book of the *Evangelical History*:

But the traitor Judas, after he sees such [things] —

[sees] that the received price of [his] crime has made [him] frenzied —

unhappy, condemning his own deeds with sick complaints,

and blaming the silver, cast [it] into the sacred temple;

and, having begun to take punishment on himself by the noose,

he snatched a shapeless death from the top of a fig-tree.

And **Arator** the deacon, in the first book of the *Apostolic History*, described the manner of the same death more fully in these verses. So the venerable [man] says:

You know that the mad traitor

paid himself the wages of [his] crime; he himself dreaded

the loathsomeness of his own [guilt], choking the voice in [his] throat —

the example [Christ] no longer [being present] to answer for the guilty [deed]; he who deserved

to be slain in [that] part in which the fault lay, and, revising [his] crime,

by such a token committed [his] limbs to frenzy

in the midst of the air, so that — hating both heaven and earth —

he might set, for the common enemy, the due place of punishment.

Between the two he perishes. His burst bowels fall,

to be buried in no sepulchres; and, slipped away into the thin airs,

[his] ash flees from the world, etc.

(right column:)

Annotation CCXXIII

"That every one may convert himself from his wickedness." — Acts 3[:26]

[margin: On the oath.]

Chrysostom, in the ninth homily on Acts, narrating this, detests those who — in forensic judgments, in contracts, in suretyships, and in public or private acts of this kind — either offer or exact oaths, whether just or unjust. Consult Annotation 26 of this book.

Annotation CCXXIIII

"We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." — Acts 4[:20]

[margin: On the oath.]

Chrysostom, in the tenth homily on Acts, inculcating [his] dogma about the oath — peculiar to himself alone — intimates that every oath is against the evangelical law, which entirely forbids to Christians the custom of swearing [once] allowed to the Jews of old. See Annotation 26 of this book.

Annotation CCXXV

"They chose Stephen, and Philip, and Prochorus." — Acts 6[:5]

[margin: Whether the seven [of Acts 6] were true deacons.]

Ambrosius [Catharinus], bishop of Compsa [Conza], is gravely indignant at **Thomas Cajetan**, because — against the tradition of all the saints — he wrote, in the Commentaries on Acts, that the seven men whom the Apostles set over the tables were not truly deacons and ministers of the sacred altar. I, more diligently inquiring into this matter, found among ecclesiastical writers grave authors and witnesses on both sides. For Thomas [stand] almost all the Greek Fathers; among whom **Chrysostom**, in the fourteenth homily on Acts, speaking of these seven men: "HOW GREAT a dignity these had," he says, "and what ordination they received [as] necessary, it will [be hard] to say. Was it, perchance, that which is of the deacons? And assuredly this is not [so] in the churches; but this dispensation is [that] of the presbyters. And yet [at that time] there was as yet no bishop, but the Apostles alone. Whence I think this [office] to be the name neither of the deacons nor of the presbyters." **Oecumenius**, in the *Collectanea* of the explanations on Acts, explaining this more clearly, writes thus: "The Apostles created the elect [not as] deacons according to the grade which is now in the Church, but [as] διακόνους [*diakónous*], that is, 'ministers' [servants] — so that, with all diligence and not negligently, they might distribute to the widows and orphans together those [things] which had been laid up for [their] nourishment; and this, especially, to the widows and orphans, on account of whom chiefly the murmur had arisen. And he calls the daily ministry 'alms,' as being both a medicine to those who do [it], and an honor to those affected by its benefit. But it was not of malice that the widows were despised, but of the sloth of many. Therefore also, when it seemed fitting that care should be applied, the grief of mind was soothed. Or they also call [it] a 'public administration'; for this the name

διακονία [*diakonía*] wishes to signify — since indeed the Greeks call a public store [that] into which each one strives, with great zeal, to contribute liberally, toward the common expense, [the things] which abound to him [privately]." In the opinion of Ambrose [that they were true deacons] I find nearly all the Latins; of whose number **Arator** the deacon, in the first book of the *Apostolic History*, expressed the office of these deacons in these verses:

The rights of the ministry, fit for the sacred altars,

they established in seven men, whom — chosen from every side —

it pleases [us] to call Levites, [at the time] when the Church, splendid, began

to shine with a hand [ministry] which [bore] the cups of life,

[catchword "Mi-" → the Arator verse continues, on p. 523 (PDF 528).]

(printed p. 523 [PDF p. 528], recto — end of Ann. CCXXV, then Ann. CCXXVI–CCXXXI, on Acts 9–17 & Romans 1 (the seven deacons concluded, with Bede; "kick against the goad" — the Greek text vindicated against Cajetan/Erasmus; suffrages for the dead; James of Jerusalem; Dionysius the Areopagite and the Pseudo-Dionysius question; then the series enters Paul — Origen on predestination and foreknowledge [Rom. 1:1]; Chrysostom on not scrutinizing the divine mysteries [Rom. 1:17]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXV (Arator's verses on the deacons), from the catchword "Mi-":)

[the Church began to shine with a hand which] mixes, and offers the liquids [water and wine] with the blood of the Lamb.

The honor conferred by this number [seven] carries with it sublime

sacraments, through which the measure of [my] road [i.e. brevity]

does not permit me to go further, etc.

The presbyter **Bede**, subscribing to Arator the deacon: "HENCE now," he says, "the Apostles, or the successors of the Apostles, decreed [that there be], throughout all the churches, seven deacons, who should be of a more sublime grade than the rest, and, as [it were] the nearest columns of the altar, should stand by around the altar — and not without some mystery of the septenary number."

Annotation CCXXVI

"It is hard for thee to kick against the goad." — Acts 9[:5]

[margin: On the true reading of this passage.]

Thomas Cajetan, in this place, following the judgment of Erasmus, says that in the Greek text this sentence is not had — "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad" — nor likewise the clause which follows, "And trembling and astonished, he said, Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" But that this is false, all the Greek copies printed [by the press] convince, in which these [words] are thus read: "Σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. Τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν εἶπεν, κύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι" [It is hard for thee to kick against the goads. And trembling and amazed he said, Lord, what wilt thou have me do?]. And that words of this kind ought to be placed in this passage, the very narration of Paul, in the 26th chapter of Acts, confirms — where the Apostle, narrating what happened to him on the road to Damascus, thus says: *[margin: Acts 26.]* "When we had fallen to the ground, I heard a voice speaking in the Hebrew tongue, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goad.'" Thus exactly the narration of Luke squares with the narration of Paul; for if he [Luke] had passed over these words, he would not have fully narrated the words of God to Paul.

Annotation CCXXVII

"It came to pass that he tarried many days in Joppa." — Acts 9[:43]

[margin: Suffrages for the dead.]

Chrysostom, at the end of the 21st homily on Acts, seems to allude to the opinion of those who think that the oblations, alms, and suffrages of the living profit even the saints, and those who have finished life, toward the increase of glory. See Annotation 47 of this book.

Annotation CCXXVIII

"James answered, saying, Men [and] brethren." — Acts 15[:13]

Oecumenius, in this place, writes that James — bishop of Jerusalem, and brother of the Lord according to the flesh — was the son of Joseph, the spouse of the Virgin Mary. See Annotation 59 of this book.

Annotation CCXXIX

"Among whom was also Dionysius the Areopagite." — Acts 17[:34]

[margin: Who Dionysius the Areopagite was.]

Bede, in the commentaries on Acts, explaining this, hands down that this Dionysius was that bishop of the Corinthians who wrote notable volumes for the utility of the Church. But **Eusebius**, in the 6th book of the Ecclesiastical History, plainly shows that the Dionysius who was bishop of Corinth (who wrote many [things]) was another [person]. And there he also cites the authority of this Dionysius, bishop of Corinth; who, in a certain epistle which he wrote

(right column — concluding Annotation CCXXIX:)

to the Athenians, showed that Dionysius the Areopagite, converted by Paul, was the first bishop of Athens, [and] instituted by the same Apostle. Moreover, [there is] a constant report that this Dionysius the Areopagite is the same who, at Lutetia of the Parisians [Paris], crowned with martyrdom, fell asleep. Whose also are thought to be the books which are now had *On the Hierarchies* and *On the Divine Names* — concerning which Thomas Cajetan, and very many others, doubt whether they are his by whose title they are inscribed, on this account, that Jerome, in the book *On Illustrious Men*, made no mention of this Dionysius. But concerning these [things] it has been said in this work, in the second book, under "Dionysius."

Annotation CCXXX

"Separated unto the gospel of God." — Romans 1[:1]

[margin: On the cause of predestination.]

Origen, in the first book of the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, inquiring into the causes of this separation, is thought to assert that the foreknowledge of merits is the cause of eternal predestination — which indeed seems to furnish an occasion to the Pelagian error. His words run thus: "BUT WE say that Paul was chosen neither by chance, nor by a natural difference, but that He — who knows all [things] before they come to be — gave to him the causes of his own election in himself. Therefore Paul, [in] that he is said [to be] 'separated unto the gospel,' and separated from the womb of his mother — the causes and merits, by which he ought to have been separated, He saw, from whom the heart is not hidden. For he foresaw that [Paul] would labor more abundantly than all the rest in the gospel; that he would preach the gospel in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness — lest perhaps, while he preached to others, he himself should be made reprobate. These [things], therefore, and [things] like these, and many others concerning him, Jesus, foreseeing [them] in the womb of [his] mother, separated him for these [reasons] unto the gospel. Which also

Paul himself, discoursing more fully in what follows, says: *[margin: Rom. 8.]* 'Because whom he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son,' etc. — evidently showing that those whom God foreknew would be such [as] to conform themselves to Christ in [his] sufferings, those same [ones] he also predestinated [to be] conformable and like to his image, and to [his] glory. The foreknowledge of God, therefore, precedes — by which they are known who are going to have in themselves labors and virtues; and thus predestination follows. Nor, again, will the foreknowledge be thought the cause of predestination. For [that] which, among men, the merit of each is weighed from past deeds — this, with God, is judged from future [deeds]." See below, Annotation 251.

Annotation CCXXXI

"For the justice of God is revealed therein, from faith unto faith." — Romans 1[:17]

[margin: Whether those who scrutinize the divine mysteries are to be condemned.]

Chrysostom, near the end of the second homily on the epistle to the Romans: "BUT IF it is dangerous to investigate those [things] which God has commanded, and the utmost punishment awaits curious men: what defense, in the end, will those have who presume to scrutinize [things] far more hidden than these, and more to be reverenced? — that is, in what way, and by what reason, God begot [his] Son, and what is his substance." And in the eighth homily on the epistle to the Romans: "BUT IF, scrutinizing and searching out these lower [things], we give not honor to God, we

[catchword "damu-" (damus) → "we give," continues on p. 524 (PDF 529).]

(printed p. 524 [PDF p. 529], verso — end of Ann. CCXXXI, then Ann. CCXXXII–CCXXXV, on Romans 1–5 (Lucian the Monk vs. the scholastics; Chrysostom on circumcision; Origen on "faith alone" reconciled with James and Trent session 6 [with the canons on justification]; Chrysostom on Abraham's faith; Anselm and Peter Lombard — is the charity of Rom. 5:5 the indwelling Holy Spirit himself?). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXXI, from the catchword "damu-":)

—we give [honor to God]: much more, investigating the origin of the Lord with superfluous curiosity, shall we suffer the extreme [punishment], as [those] who have affected God with contumelies. For if it is impious to scrutinize the figure of the resurrection, much more [impious to scrutinize] those hidden [things], dreadful and full of reverence." **Lucian the Monk** — wholly devoid of scholastic theology, and on that account the perpetual enemy of the scholastic name — in the Annotations upon Chrysostom (reprobated by the Council of Trent), on the occasion of these words, harasses the scholastic theologians, and accuses [them] of temerity, because they dare to enter the innermost recesses of the most sacred Trinity, and to define with fixed assertion in what [respects] each person differs from the others, [and] in what [respects] it agrees. Nor does this inept and miserable manikin observe that Chrysostom's words are aimed especially at those who search out [things] of this kind with an ambitious and empty curiosity, and with arrogant haughtiness — not against the pious and catholic theologians, who investigate these [things] with humble and reverent study, for the glory of God, for the defense of the faith, and for the overthrow of the heretics.

Annotation CCXXXII

"For circumcision profits indeed, if thou keep the law." — Romans 2[:25]

[margin: Whether circumcision confers grace.]

Chrysostom, in the seventh homily on the epistle to the Romans, makes this passage plain by such an exposition: "IT WAS ALLOWED to Paul to exclude circumcision otherwise, and to say: 'What is circumcision? Is it [any] merit of him who has had it? Is it [any] demonstration of a good mind and purpose? For indeed it is done in an immature age; and [those] who lived in the wilderness remained uncircumcised for many years; and from other [sources], by many arguments, it can be shown that it is not very necessary.' Nevertheless, he does not repudiate it from that [argument], but from where it most behooved [him] — namely, from Abraham himself. For this is an excellent victory: to show [a thing] easily to be contemned from that [source] whence it seemed chiefly to be venerated. Although he could also have said that the Jews too are called 'uncircumcised' by the prophets. But this is not yet a fault of circumcision, but of him who has it [only] by [outward] desert. But what is sought is this: namely, that it be shown [that circumcision] has no force even in the best life. This, therefore, he now sets about [to prove]." **Lucian the Monk**, in the Annotations upon Chrysostom condemned by the Council of Trent, gathers from these words that Chrysostom was of the opinion that circumcision brought no grace to the circumcised, and profited them nothing toward salvation. He also inveighs against the scholastics, because they determine otherwise about this article. But in what way the sayings of Chrysostom are to be understood, we admonished above, Annotation 96 of book 5.

Annotation CCXXXIII

"Where is thy boasting?" — Romans 3[:27]

[margin: Whether faith alone justifies.]

Origen, in the third book on the epistle to the Romans, narrating this, shows by a long digression that sinners are justified by faith alone, without any works. A fragment of this digression is cited in the *Collectanea* of the Lutherans, against the decree of the Council of Trent — by which it is established, according to the sentence of the Apostle James, that a man is justified not by faith alone, but by works also.

(right column — concluding Annotation CCXXXIII:)

But it must be observed that Origen speaks of the first justification, not of the second — or, of the beginning and origin of justification, and not of the progress and increase of justification. For the catholics hand down that the very increase of justification, through perseverance and consummation, is obtained not by faith alone, but by the labors of the cooperating man — in that manner in which the Apostle James said: *[margin: James 2.]* "Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is idle? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, offering up his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith cooperated with his works, and by works faith was made perfect?" Therefore, [as to the fact] that Origen says [that] sinners are justified by faith alone, without any works — that assuredly looks to this: that works which are meritorious of justification be excluded [as its cause]. For if [it were] of works, grace would not be grace. But not that he would reject the free cooperation and preparation of man toward justifying grace, or the increase of justification already obtained — concerning which the sacrosanct Council of Trent, *[margin: Sess. 6.]* session 6, decrees in this manner: "IF anyone shall say that the impious [man] is justified by faith alone — so as to understand that nothing else is required to cooperate toward obtaining the grace of justification, and that it is in no way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will: let him be anathema." And, in the twenty-fourth canon: "IF anyone shall say that the justice received is not preserved, and also not increased before God through good works, but that the works themselves are only the fruits and signs of the justification obtained, and not also the cause of its increase: let him be anathema."

Annotation CCXXXIIII

"And he was not weak in faith." — Romans 4[:19]

The exposition of **Chrysostom** applied to this passage, **Lucian the Monk**, in the Annotations, twists against the scholastics — because they dare to distinguish the divine persons, one from another, by certain relations. See above, Annotation 231 of this book.

Annotation CCXXXV

"The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who is given to us." — Romans 5[:5]

[margin: Whether the charity by which we love God is the indwelling Holy Spirit.]

Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, sifting this passage, affirms that the charity poured forth in our hearts — by which we love God and neighbor — is not any gift of the Holy Spirit created in us, but the very person of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us. Which [thing] **Peter Lombard**, in the commentaries on the same epistle, and in the first book of the Sentences, distinction 17, most constantly confirms, many testimonies of Augustine being adduced — of which the chief, and looking most of all to this clause of the Apostle, is had in book 15 *On the Trinity*, chapter 16, in these words: "GOD the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from God, when he shall have been given to a man, kindles him in the love of God and of neighbor; and the Holy Spirit himself is love. For a man does not have [that] whence he may love God, except from God. Whence the Apostle Paul [says]: 'Love [is]

[catchword "dile-" (dilectio) → "Love [is from God]," continues on p. 525 (PDF 530).]

(printed p. 525 [PDF p. 530], recto — end of Ann. CCXXXV, then Ann. CCXXXVI, on Romans 5 (Chrysostom's three opinions on original sin, held to be foreign to the common teaching: [1] Adam's sin passed to posterity as punishment, not guilt; [2] its penalty is bodily death, not the soul's damnation; [3] it brought us gains, not harm — documented from homilies 10 & 17 on Romans, 39 on 1 Cor., 24 on Ephesians, and the homily To the Neophytes*; and abused by Julian of Eclanum, Lucian the Monk, Erasmus, and Faber). Read order: left column, then right. NB: minor ink-blotting in the top margin; text intact.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXXV (Anselm/Lombard on charity), from the catchword "dile-":)

—'"Love,' he [Paul] says, 'of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit, who is given to us.' And below: 'Love, therefore, which is from God, and is God, is properly the Holy Spirit, through whom the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, through which the whole Trinity inhabits us. Wherefore most rightly the Holy Spirit, since he is God, is also called "the gift of God." Which gift, properly, what is it, but charity — [that] is to be understood — which leads through to God, and without which any other Gift of God does not lead through to God?'" To this opinion nearly all the scholastic theologians cry out against, with unanimous consent, teaching that the Holy Spirit does indeed glide into our souls, according to the substance of his deity, or the hypostasis of his person — yet is distinguished, by a long interval, from the gift of charity by which we are kindled into the love of God and neighbor.

Annotation CCXXXVI

"As by one man sin entered into the world," etc. — Romans 5[:12]

[margin: Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not [as] guilt, but [as] punishment.]

Chrysostom, expounding this passage and other passages akin to it, seems to hold three [things] concerning original sin, foreign to the common opinions of the theologians. The **first** of which is, that the sin of Adam passed to [his] posterity not [as] guilt, but [as] punishment — because, although one sometimes pays penalties for the offense of another, yet no one becomes a sinner from another's sin, but each one is made wicked from his own crime only. The **second** is, that the punishment of this sin is not the damnation of the

soul, but only the infirmity, corruption, and death of the body — since the death of the soul follows only those who, by free choice, sin voluntarily; but the death of the body comprehends both those who sin and those who do not sin. The **third** is, that the sin of the first parent brought us no detriment, but the greatest gains.

The **first** and **second** assertion he seems to build up [in] homily 10 on the epistle to the Romans, with these words: "WHAT, then, does this mean, 'In whom all have sinned'? It is answered, that, he [Adam] having fallen, those also who did not eat of the tree were made, from that time, all mortal." And a little below, in the exposition of that sentence, "By the disobedience of one man many were made sinners," etc., he speaks in this manner: "IT SEEMS indeed to have no small question — [namely] that which is said, that many were made sinners on account of the disobedience of one. For, he [Adam] having sinned and been made mortal, [that] those also who were born of him should be such is nothing absurd. But that from his disobedience another should be made a sinner — what congruity and consequence, I beseech [you], has this? For it is found thus, that he who was [made] such would not even owe [any] penalties, since he became not a sinner from himself. What, then, does this word 'SINNERS' signify in this place? To me it seems to signify just as much as [to be] 'liable to punishment, and guilty of death' — [namely] that, furthermore, Adam having died, all were made mortal." Again, in the exposition of the first epistle to the Corinthians, homily 39, explaining those words of the 15th chapter, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be made alive," he seems to confirm the same, saying thus: "WHAT then? Tell me, did all in Adam die by the death of sin? How then was Noah

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXXXVI:)

a just man in his generation? *[margin: John 15.]* how Abraham, how Job, how, in fine, many others? And how, tell me, shall all be made alive in Christ — and these especially, who are to be led away into gehenna? And so, if we wish this to be said of the body, the discourse will stand; but if of justice and sin, by no means." And [in] homily 17 on chapter 6 of the same epistle [Romans], showing that the death of the soul happens not from the guilt of the first parent, but only from the actual sins of each, he speaks thus: "WHAT, then, shall I do,' thou sayest, 'do I perish on account of him — namely, Adam?' By no means on account of him; for neither didst thou remain without sin. And if [it be] not the same sin, yet thou hast committed another." And [in] homily 24 on the epistle to the Ephesians, expounding the last words of the final chapter, he relates the same more openly, saying: "CORRUPTIBLE is our body, but incorruptible the soul: let us not, therefore, corrupt it also. This [is what] that first sin (that is, of the first man) did. But [that] which, after the laver [of baptism], can corrupt even the soul, and make [it] susceptible of the immortal worm [...]." To this also pertains [that] which, in the homily entitled *To the Neophytes*, he is thought to hand down — namely, that little infants, before baptism, are neither liable to any guilt, nor baptized for the remission of any guilt, but are baptized only for the sake of obtaining justification and inheritance. His words run thus: "THOU SEEST how many are the bounties of baptism? But to many, indeed, it seems that the grace of baptism consists only in the remission of sins; but we have already reckoned up ten honors of baptism. For this cause we baptize little infants too, although they are not defiled by sin — namely, that to them may be added holiness, justice, adoption, inheritance, and the brotherhood of Christ, that all [of them] may be his members, and [that they] may become a habitation of the Spirit." From these sayings, therefore, Chrysostom seems to have shown the two former propositions.

The **third** proposition also he persuades with these words: "THAT, moreover, Adam having died, we were all made mortal, he showed openly and by many [arguments]. But what falls into question is: for what cause was this done? And if any of you should seek to learn [it], we shall say this: that not only have we received no harm from a death and condemnation of this kind, if we are wise, but — [being] made mortal — we have even made a gain: first, this, namely, that in a mortal body we may not sin; then, that we may have infinite arguments for philosophy [the moral life]. For both present and awaited death persuades [us] to keep

measure, and to be composed and calm [as] temperate [men], and likewise [to be] freed from all viciousness. But together with these, or rather before these very [things], it brought many other goods," etc. Thus far Chrysostom.

[margin: Whether there is any original sin.]

From whose authority **Julian, bishop of Eclanum** [Celanensis], the chief champion of the Pelagian sect, at the end of the four books which he published against original sin, contended that Chrysostom was of the opinion of those who believe that there is no sin of origin transfused from the parents into the children. Which [opinion], in our age too, **Lucian the Monk** attributed to the same [Chrysostom], in the Annotations upon Chrysostom reprobated by the Council of Trent; and **Erasmus of Rotterdam**, in the Annotations on the fifth chapter of [the epistle] to the Romans; and **Jacobus Faber**, bishop of Vienne, in this

[signature "Xx"; catchword "parte" → "in this part," continues on p. 526 (PDF 531).]

(printed p. 526 [PDF p. 531], verso — Annotation CCXXXVI continued, on Romans 5 (Sixtus refutes the Pelagian misreading of Chrysostom — his own words show baptism plucks out "radical sin"; Augustine's defense of Chrysostom against Julian; the resolution that the posterity sinned "in Adam" as in a root; the To the Neophytes *homily corrupted by the Pelagians, with the true Greek text; and Gregory's* felix culpa*). The whole page is one annotation. Read order: left column, then right. NB: minor ink-blotting in the top margin; text intact.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCXXXVI, from the catchword "parte":)

—[in this] part a follower of Pelagius, [does the same] in the *Apologia* of his commentaries on Paul: in which, from the aforesaid testimonies of Chrysostom, he strives to defend that which he himself, in the exposition of the fifth chapter [of the epistle] to the Romans, had wrongly written concerning original sin — affirming that original sin is nothing else than an obligation of the human race to bodily death, contracted from the offense of the first parent.

BUT that Chrysostom did not so think, appears from those [things] which he left written here and there concerning the infection of human nature, corrupted in the first parents — especially [in] homily 12 on the epistle to the Romans, in which these words are had: "WHEN Adam sinned, then his body too was made mortal and passible, very many vices of nature being received, and, moreover, a heavier and unbridled horse [the flesh] being rendered [unruly]. But Christ, when he came, made that [horse] lighter for us through baptism, rousing up the same by other spirit[ual aids]." And [in] homily 11 on the same epistle, pursuing the same more fully, he says: "OUR BODY, before the coming of Christ, was easily conquered; for together with death a great swarm, as it were, of affections had entered in. And so the same body was not very agile for that course which leads to virtue; for neither was there [the] Spirit to bring help, nor baptism, which could mortify [it]; but it ran after the manner of an unbridled horse, and went astray." And again, [in] homily 13 on the same epistle, inculcating the same with words a little altered, he says: "INTO man, together with death, there entered a throng of affections. For when the body was made mortal, then at last it necessarily admitted both concupiscence, and anger, and grief, and all the rest [of the passions], which needed very great constancy and wisdom, lest the force of the flooding heat, and the tempest, should overwhelm reason in us — [reason] plunged into the whirlpool of sin. For those affections were by no means sin; but the immoderateness of them, [being] unbridled, effected sin." Again, [in] homily 40 on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, he manifestly pronounces that in the regeneration of baptism original sin is taken away — which he himself calls προέρριζον ἁμαρτίαν [*proérrizon hamartían*], that is, "radical sin," inasmuch as [it is] drawn from the root of the first parent — saying thus: "GOD, in the laver of regeneration, touches the mind with grace, plucks out the radical sin, and makes the man such as he was of old, when he was created — nay, [makes him] more illustrious."

FROM THESE [things] it is most clearly gathered that, according to Chrysostom's opinion, from the sin of Adam there passed to [his] posterity not only the punishment of bodily corruption and death, but also the languor of the now-vitiated soul, and a certain immoderate heat of unbridled concupiscence — leading the soul away from the path of virtue, and dragging [it] to the deadly enticements of pleasures, and to the death of the spirit. Wherefore **Augustine**, refuting Julian — because from the aforesaid sayings of Chrysostom he strove to overthrow the transmission of original sin — writes these [things] in the first volume against him, in defense of Chrysostom: "DOST THOU dare thus to oppose to us the words of the holy bishop John [Chrysostom]? Far be it — far be it to believe or say this evil of so great a man! Far be it, I say, that John of Constantinople, speaking of the baptism of little ones (who have the liberation of the paternal bond through Christ), should resist so many and so great fellow-bishops of his — and most of all the Roman

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXXXVI:)

Innocent, the Carthaginian Cyprian, the Cappadocian Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, [and] the Milanese Ambrose. For what those held, this John held, this he believed, this he taught." These [things] Augustine [says].

ACCORDINGLY, when Chrysostom says that no one is constituted a sinner from the sin of the first parents, and excluded from the kingdom of heaven, and made liable to eternal damnation — he did not simply and altogether take away the sin of the human race, contracted from the first transgression of our fathers; but, unless I am mistaken, he meant to signify that Adam's posterity are not sinners for this reason [only], that the first parents [alone] actually sinned, but that the posterity themselves also sinned in Adam, and together with Adam himself — inasmuch as all, by [reason of their] participation in the human species, are one and the same man with [their] progenitor Adam, and, as they participate [in] the same nature, so [they participate in] the vice of the same corrupted nature. For unless they too had transgressed in the first parent (in whom, as in a root, they were of old virtually contained), assuredly they would not be sinners from Adam's sin. For no one (as Chrysostom rightly said) is made wicked both from a crime that is another's and not participated in by himself.

BUT to that [point] which Chrysostom brought forward in the homily *To the Neophytes* — namely, that infants are neither defiled by sin, nor baptized for the remission of sins — **Augustine**, answering in the book already cited, noted that this sentence of John had been corrupted by the Pelagians, or badly translated. For they, in place of [that] which Chrysostom said, "Infants do not have sins," put — with the words a little changed — "Infants are not defiled by sin," so that he might seem to speak rather of that one sin transmitted from Adam than of others. But the uncorrupted reading of the Greek codices runs thus: "Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παιδία βαπτίζομεν, καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα οὐκ ἔχοντα" — that is, "For this reason we baptize infants too, although not having sins." By which words, as Augustine says, John does not deny that little ones are defiled by sin, but [only that they] have sins — that is, he does not deny that little ones are defiled by the sin of the first parent, and are baptized for the purgation of this sin; but he asserts that they have neither actual and proper sins, nor are baptized on account of proper and actual sins. And let these [things] be said for the elucidation of the first and second proposition of Chrysostom.

There now remains the third proposition of the same [Chrysostom], affirming that no detriment befell us from Adam's condemnation, but innumerable and most ample benefits. To which opinion **Augustine**, and the rest of his followers, seem diametrically opposed — [they] who hold that from the sin and condemnation of Adam alone the whole human race is damned to eternal punishment. Chrysostom's words, therefore, are to be taken so that we understand him to speak not of the spiritual condemnation of the soul to eternal death, but of the condemnation of bodily death — which brought forth for us all the gains already enumerated by him. But if anyone contend that these very words look also to the damnation of the soul, we shall say that they are to be interpreted in that sense in which the blessed pontiff **Gregory** pronounced the fault of the first parent to have been "happy" [*felix*], because it merited to have so great a Redeemer. These [things] for Chryso-

[catchword "-sosto-" (Chrysostomo) → "for Chrysostom," continues on p. 527 (PDF 532).]

(printed p. 527 [PDF p. 532], recto — end of Ann. CCXXXVI, then Ann. CCXXXVII–CCXXXVIII, on Romans 5 (Ambrose on the twofold "second death" and the Limbo of unbaptized infants, abused by Servetus; Theodoret's four-step "by occasion" account of original sin, and that the pre-Law saints escaped it; then the pseudo-Jerome commentary's near-Pelagian teaching that Adam's sin passed by imitation, not propagation). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXXVI (Ambrose on death), from the catchword "-sosto-":)

[These things] for the defense of Chryso[stom] I judge to be enough. Now it pleases [me] to subjoin certain words of St. Ambrose pertaining to this argument — but wrongly usurped by the heretics.

Ambrose, explaining this same pericope of Paul in the commentaries: "DEATH," he says, "is the dissolution of the body, when the soul is separated from the body. There is also another death, which is called the second, in gehenna — which we suffer not by the sin of Adam, but [which] is acquired, on its occasion, by one's own sins; from which the good are immune, only [in] that they were in hell [the underworld], but a higher [one], as [if] in a free [place], because they could not ascend to heaven." **Servetus** the Anabaptist, in his *Commonplaces*, gathers from these [words] that Ambrose held that Adam, by his sin, brought upon [his] posterity only the death of the body, not of the soul. But [the things] which Ambrose asserts — not only in very many other places, but in the immediately preceding and following words — openly contradict this opinion: [namely] that the whole human race was corrupted in Adam sinning, and that in him, as in a mass [lump], all men were seized by the death of sin; writing thus: "IT IS MANIFEST, therefore, that in Adam all sinned, as [it were] in a mass. For he himself, [being] corrupted through sin — those whom he begot, all were born under sin. From him, therefore, [are] all sinners, because from him we all are." And again, after the aforesaid words adduced by Servetus, he adds: "BY the sentence [given] in [the case of] Adam, all were held [bound] — [the sentence] whose bond [chirograph], [written] in the decrees, was blotted out by the death of Christ. But the sentence of the decree was, that the body of the one man should be dissolved upon the earth, but that the soul, held by the bonds of hell, should suffer perdition." Thus far he [Ambrose]. It must be known, therefore, that the second death is twofold: the one, by which the lower hell separates the soul from God, and binds [it] to the punishments of gehenna; the other, by which the upper hell disjoins the soul from God, whether forever or for a time — as of old, before Christ's death, it detained the souls of the saints in the bosom of Abraham; and still, after Christ's death, it holds in Limbo the souls of infants departing without baptism, perpetually lacking the vision of God. Ambrose, therefore, denies that that former species of the second death follows from Adam's sin, but teaches that it happens from the proper and actual offenses of each — which nearly all the theologians also approve. But the latter [species], which separates souls only from the divine vision, he plainly confesses to be inflicted on the human race by Adam's sin. Read the following annotation.

Annotation CCXXXVII

"In whom all have sinned." — Romans 5[:12]

[margin: Whether the sin of Adam passed to [his] posterity not [as] guilt, but only [by] occasion.]

Theodoret, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, elucidating the present passage, seems to intimate that the sin of the first parent did not pass over into [his] posterity according to guilt, but according to the occasion of sinning alone — so that the sin of Adam transfused into us is nothing else than a certain occasion and incitement to sinning, which leads us, as [it were] through four steps, to sin, in this order. First, the sin of Adam induces upon all born of him passibility, corruption, and the mortality of the body. Then mortality brings the indigence and privation of all things which are necessary [and useful]

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXXXVII:)

for the manner of life of mortal life. In the third place, indigence and privation begets the appetite and concupiscence of acquiring and handling the things profitable to mortal life. Finally, the handling and use of things persuades [to] the excess of the mean [i.e. immoderation]. To which persuasion whoever consents, at once sins, and is condemned by spiritual death. And in this way, each one is punished spiritually not on account of Adam's sin, but on account of his own sin. Theodoret's words, which seem to convey a sense of this kind, are these: "WHEN God had fashioned Adam, he gave him a precept. He, being deceived, transgressed the command. Since, therefore, on account of this, he had been made liable to the decree of death, thus he begot Cain, and Seth, and others. But all these, inasmuch as [they were] begotten of him, had a mortal nature. And [a nature] of this kind needs many [things] — food, and drink, and clothing, and habitation, and diverse arts. But the use of these often incites to the exceeding of the mean. And the exceeding of the mean generates sin. The divine Apostle says, therefore, that when Adam had sinned, and had been made mortal on account of sin, both came to the race: for upon all men death passed, inasmuch as all have sinned. For each one takes upon himself the decree of death not on account of the first parent's sin, but on account of his own." These are Theodoret's words, with which agree those [things] which he wrote about this matter in the exposition of Psalm 50, upon that [verse], "Behold, in iniquities I was conceived" — [things] observed by us above, in book 5, Annotation 179. To this also looks [that] which, in the *Epitome of Divine Decrees* [Doctrines], chapter 13, the same author teaches — namely, that there were many holy men who, living in the law of nature from the beginning of [its] founding, were not liable to Adam's sin. And he expresses a sense of this kind in these plain words: "AS by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, many shall be made just." And very necessarily did the Apostle place that [word] "many" in both [clauses]: for indeed, when Adam had sinned, and very many had transgressed the divine laws, [yet] some remained in the decrees of nature, and took care of virtue — as Abel, Enoch, and Noah, and the patriarchs, and the prophets, and very many others, not only among the Jews, but also among other nations; of whom the Apostle said: "For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature the things that are of the law; they, having not the law, are a law to themselves." For that cause did he place that [word] "MANY," both in the exemplar [type] and in the image [antitype]. Refer thyself to the preceding Annotation, and hither also thou wilt recall the sayings of **Arnobius** to this effect: which thou wilt find in book 5, Annotation 177.

Annotation CCXXXVIII

"In whom all have sinned." — Romans 5[:12]

[margin: Whether the sin of Adam passed to posterity not by propagation, but by imitation.]

The **author of the commentaries on Paul which are inscribed with the name of Jerome** [pseudo-Jerome], in the interpretation of this chapter, is believed to be not far from the error of Pelagius. For he teaches that the sin of the first parents emanated to [their] posterity not by the propagation of [their] corrupted origin, but only by [their] example and imitation — and not indeed to all, but only to those who sinned after the likeness of the prevarication of

[signature "Xx 2"; catchword "Adæ" → "of Adam," continues on p. 528 (PDF 533).]

(printed p. 528 [PDF p. 533], verso — end of Ann. CCXXXVIII, then Ann. CCXXXIX, on Romans 5 & 7 (pseudo-Jerome's near-Pelagian reading — that sin comes "by example," dead in infants — refuted and condemned by the African Council chapter 77 and the Council of Trent, session 5, canon 2 [full text]; then Chrysostom, hom. 12 on Romans, that the gospel's demands [no anger, no lustful look, no oath, love of enemies] are urgent precepts, not counsels — abused by Lucian the Monk, and the scholastics' three grades of oath-prohibition, with Bernard and Christian Druthmar). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXXVIII, from the catchword "Adæ":)

—[of Adam] sinned of their own accord. Which assertion the author himself expressed in these words: "THEREFORE into this world sin entered, and through sin death, by example or pattern [form]. And so death passed into all men, while they thus sin and die in like manner. For it did not remain [i.e. hold sway] in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob — of whom the Lord says, 'They all live.' But here [Paul] therefore says that all [are] dead, because in so great a multitude of sinners, the few just [men] will not be excepted. As [it says] there: 'There is none that doeth good, there is not even to one'; and, 'Every man [is] a liar.' Or, [death] passed into all those, because they lived by a human, not a heavenly, rite [manner of life]. Again, the Apostle here, by death, signifies the death of the soul, by which Adam, prevaricating, died — as the prophet says: 'The soul that hath sinned, itself shall die.' And then the Apostle adds, 'In whom all have sinned' — that is, in that [respect] that all have sinned, they sin after the example of Adam." These [things] the author has in the exposition of the fifth chapter. But afterwards, in the exposition of the seventh chapter of the same epistle, upon that [verse], "Without the law sin was dead," he descends more openly into the same opinion, writing thus: "LIKEWISE, if, when the law was not, sin was dead, they rave [are mad] who assert that sin comes to us from Adam by propagation [*per traducem*]. Therefore he says here, 'Sin is dead,' because in infants, who are without law, it does not live — that is, it is committed with impunity. For when an infant reviles [his] parents, it seems to be sin, yet not living, but dead. For although a boy sin, the sin is dead in him, because he is not subject to the law." This error too, and this interpretation of the apostolic sentence, are condemned by the decree of the African Council, which in chapter 77 of its definitions is had in these plain words: "WHOSOEVER shall say that little ones draw nothing of original sin from Adam, which is to be expiated by the laver of regeneration — whence in them the form of baptism unto the remission of sins is understood [to be] not true, but false — let him be anathema. For [that] which the Apostle says is not to be understood otherwise — 'By one man sin entered, and through sin death, and it passed into all men, in whom all have sinned' — save as the catholic Church, everywhere diffused, has always understood [it]." To this decree subscribes the sacrosanct Synod of Trent, session five, canon 2, whose words are these: "IF ANYONE asserts that the prevarication of Adam harmed himself alone, and not his offspring; and [that] the sanctity and justice received from God, which he lost, he lost for himself alone, and not for us also; or [that] he, defiled through the sin of disobedience, transfused into the whole human race the death and the punishments of the body only, and not also sin, which is the death of the soul: let him be anathema — since he contradicts the Apostle, saying, 'By one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death, and so death passed into all men, in whom all have sinned.'"

Annotation CCXXXIX

"That we may serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." — Romans 7[:6]

[margin: Whether abstinence from an oath, and love of an enemy, are counsels or precepts.]

Chrysostom, [in] homily 12 on the epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of this passage, put such words: "AT the time when Adam sinned, then his body was made mortal and passible; and thence it received very many diseases, whence the horse [the flesh] was rendered both heavier and more unbridled. But Christ, coming, restored it to us more moderate through baptism, lightening the same with the wings of the Spirit: whence neither are the same courses [stadia] set before us [as before the ancients], because [now] the course would not be so easy [to run].

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXXXIX:)

Wherefore also he demands of us not only that we be clean from slaughter, as he demanded of them, but that we be not even angry. And he bids us beware not only of adultery, but even of a lustful look. And he forbids us not only perjury, but any oath whatsoever; and he enjoins [us] to love, together with friends, [our] enemies

too. And so in all other matters he has appointed longer courses for us; and unless we obey, he has threatened gehenna — showing that these very [things] are not [matters] of the magnificence or liberality of those competing [for a prize], as virginity and poverty [are], but that they altogether ought to be fulfilled. For they are urgent and necessary; and whosoever shall not have done them, is to pay the utmost penalties."

Lucian the Monk, in the Annotations upon Chrysostom (condemned by the Council of Trent), having seized from these words a handle for biting the scholastic theologians, charges them [with this]: that among the evangelical counsels they have placed abstinence from an oath, and the love of enemies — which Chrysostom thus demonstrates to be necessary and urgent precepts, so that he who shall not have performed them is to pay the utmost punishments. But it appears that he [Lucian] fell into this opinion out of ignorance of scholastic theology, which he had not even saluted from the threshold [i.e. never so much as approached]. For no scholastic ever taught that the interdiction of an oath is altogether and in every part a counsel; nay rather, three grades are established by them in the prohibition of a true oath. Of these the first is, that we in no way — not even truly, nor in a just cause — swear by creatures, as [if] exhibiting divine reverence to them, lest we seem to reckon creatures among the gods. The second is, that we — [being] doubtful and ambiguous — swear not easily and lightly and rashly, even truly, and in a lawful matter. The third is, that those who profess the highest state of Christian perfection in no way swear in cases arising among themselves. The scholastics confess that the two former grades have the force of a precept; the third they enumerate among the counsels, delivered to the perfect — led by the authority of certain Fathers of no contemptible name, who referred this last grade of not-swearing to the counsels.

Of whose number is St. **Bernard**, who, in sermon 65 on the Canticle of Canticles, inveighing against certain heretics — [who] say that it is not lawful to swear, yet that it is lawful to forswear [commit perjury], lest the secrets of their sect be known by others — thus says: "IT IS PLAIN that you both superstitiously scruple concerning an oath, and wickedly presume concerning perjury. O perversity! [That] which was counseled for caution — namely, not to swear — this these [men] contentiously observe in the stead of a command; and [that] which was sanctioned by an immovable right — namely, that one must not forswear — this they dispense [with], as [if] indifferent, according to [their own] will." Into the same opinion, before Bernard, had [come] **Christian Druthmar**, in the commentaries on the fifth chapter of Matthew, saying: "LEST the Jews should swear by the names of idols, the Lord permitted them to swear by [his own] na-

[catchword "no-" (nomen) → "name," continues on p. 529 (PDF 534).]

(printed p. 529 [PDF p. 534], recto — end of Ann. CCXXXIX, then Ann. CCXL–CCXLII and the head of CCXLIII, on Romans 7 (the scholastics' threefold grade of love-of-enemies, and Calvin's abuse of a De tempore *sermon on counsel vs. precept; pseudo-Jerome again, that original sin is not "by propagation"; Augustine's retracted exposition of "I am carnal, sold under sin"; Chrysostom, hom. 13 on Romans & hom. 18 on Genesis — whether the natural passions were in man before the Fall, with Lucian the Monk's misuse). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXXXIX, from the catchword "no-":)

—[his own] name. Nor did he even forbid [it] to us, but taught us perfection, etc.

IN THE SAME MANNER too the scholastics distinguish the law concerning the loving of enemies by a threefold grade: namely, into a common love [dilection], to be shown indifferently to all friends and enemies, and at every time; into a particular love, to be shown to enemies in [their] time of necessity; and into a particular love, to be shown to enemies apart from the crises [emergencies] of necessity. The first and second grade they place among the precepts; the last they set among the counsels. And according to this distinction a certain passage of Chrysostom, in the first book *On Compunction of Heart*, is to be interpreted — where that author says that the love of enemies is not [a matter] of exhortation, but of injunction [command]. Which

passage indeed **John Calvin**, [in] chapter 3 of his *Institutes*, opposes to the opinion of the scholastics. Likewise, by this distinction is resolved that saying of Augustine which the Lutherans allege against the scholastics, from his sermon *On the Season* [*De tempore*], 61 — where it is thus read: "THE LORD, in the gospel, [in commanding] that we ought to love [our] enemies, gave not a counsel, but a precept. One [thing] is a counsel, another is a precept. A counsel is given, that virginity be preserved, that one abstain from wine and flesh, that all [things] be sold, and disbursed to the poor. A precept is given, that justice be kept, that every man turn aside from evil, and do good. And thus the Lord commanded, 'Love your enemies, and do good to them that hate you,' etc." *[margin: Matthew 5.]* Return to Annotations 26 and 27 of this book.

Annotation CCXL

"Without the law sin was dead." — Romans 7[:8]

[margin: Whether original sin [comes] by propagation.]

The **author of the Hieronymian commentary** [pseudo-Jerome] on the epistle to the Romans asserts that those [men] rave who think that the sin of Adam passed over to us by propagation [*per traducem*]. Then he adds that the sins of boys who revile [their] parents merit no punishment, but are committed with impunity — because as yet they are without law, and, until they grow up, are not subject to the law. See Annotation 238.

Annotation CCXLI

"We know that the law is spiritual." — Romans 7[:14]

[margin: The exposition of this passage retracted.]

Augustine, in the book of *Propositions* from the epistle to the Romans, expounding these words — "We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I work, I understand not. For it is not the good that I will, that I do; but the evil that I hate, that I do" — down to that passage, "Unhappy man that I am," etc. — judged that that [man in the text], who was spiritual, is to be taken not from the person of the Apostle, but from the person of a man placed under the law, and not yet constituted under grace, who, willing to do well, [being] conquered by concupiscence, does ill. Augustine reviewed this passage [in] the first [book] of the *Retractations*, chapter 23, wishing these words of the Apostle to be expounded better and more rightly, if they be understood of the person of a man constituted under grace — on account of the body of flesh, which is not yet spiritual, and on account of the concupiscence of the flesh, of whose motions the saints in this life are not free, although they resist them, and consent not to them unto evil.

(right column — Annotation CCXLII:)

Annotation CCXLII

"But I am carnal, sold under sin." — Romans 7[:14]

[margin: Whether the natural passions were in man before sin.]

Chrysostom, [in] homily thirteen on the epistle to the Romans, seems to hint that the affections of the concupiscible and irascible faculty — natural [as they are] — were not in man before sin, but entered into man immediately after sin, by necessity of mortality. For thus he declares: "INTO man, together with death, there entered in also a throng of affections. For when the body was made mortal, then at last it necessarily admitted both concupiscence, and anger, and grief, etc. — all [things] which needed exceeding great constancy and wisdom, lest the violence of the flooding heat, and the tempest, should overwhelm reason in us, [reason] plunged into the whirlpool of sin. For those affections were by no means sin; but the unbridled immoderateness of them effected this [sin]." To the same [point] looks [that] which he wrote [in] homily 18

on Genesis — [namely] that the concupiscence of the venereal thing [sexual desire] stole into man after sin, whereas before there had been none. His words run thus: "BEFORE [their] disobedience, the first parents imitated the angelic life, and there was no talk of the venereal thing. For how could there be, since they were not even liable to bodily necessities? And so from the beginning virginity received the palm of primacy: but after sin entered in through sloth, and access was opened to those [things] which are of sin, that [virginity] indeed flew away, inasmuch as [it fled] from those who had been made unworthy of so great a magnitude of virtue. But the law of the venereal thing stole in." And below: "FOR after sin entered in through disobedience, and the sentence made them mortal, consequently the omnipotent God — governing, according to his wisdom, the duration of the human race — granted that our race should be increased through coition." These sayings of Chrysostom are to be understood not of the natural affections themselves — which were in man even before sin, as [being] implanted in man himself in the first condition of [his] nature — but of the perturbation and excess of the affections, which followed sin. Whence prudently Chrysostom said not that after sin the affections entered in, but the throng of affections — that is, the perturbation and excess. These very words can also, in some part, be referred to the use and exercise of the natural passions. For it is agreed that both the use of the venereal thing, and the goads of anger, and the sense of pain, began after Adam's fall.

Lucian the Monk, in the condemned Annotations upon Chrysostom, sifting the aforesaid words from the thirteenth homily — namely, "Those affections were by no means sin," etc. — charges Chrysostom [with this]: that, against the common definition of the theologians, he taught that the disordered affections of mortals, and the innate concupiscence of sin, are not sin. But he wrongly expounded the saying of the holy man — which indeed is to be referred not to the affections of mortal man, corrupted after Adam's fall, but to those affections, [still] whole [and intact], which man had received in his first formation.

Annotation CCXLIII

"The grace of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." — Romans 7[:25]

[signature "Xx 3"; catchword "CHRY-" (Chrysostomus) → continues on p. 530 (PDF 535).]

(printed p. 530 [PDF p. 535], verso — end of Ann. CCXLIII, then Ann. CCXLIIII–CCXLV, on Romans 7–8 (Chrysostom, hom. 13 — that the Mosaic law gave lesser precepts than the law of nature, with the Greek scholion Pagninus wrote in the Lyons codex; pseudo-Jerome on whether Christ's flesh had an inclination to sin, corrected by Henry of Hesse; Chrysostom, hom. 14 — whether the heavens and elements were made corruptible by Adam's fall, and shall be renewed for man's sake). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXLIII, from the catchword "CHRY-":)

Chrysostom, [in] homily thirteen on the epistle to the Romans, in the narration of this clause, says that so great was the indulgence of God, that in the Mosaic law he gave lesser and lighter precepts than in the law of nature. Which opinion he demonstrates by a double argument in these words: "GOD, in the written law, did not draw men on to the highest polity [manner of conduct]; but permitted them to enjoy monies, not forbidding [them] to use several wives, and to gratify anger, so far as [it was] just, and to have the use of moderate pleasures. In fine, so great was [his] indulgence, that the written law exacted even lesser [things] than the natural law would dictate. For the law of nature commanded that one living man be content with the custom [companionship] of one woman. Which also Christ, indicating, says: 'He who from the beginning made [them], made them male and female.' But the law of Moses forbade neither that this [wife] be repudiated, nor that another be admitted in place of the repudiated one; nor did it prohibit two [wives] from being had at the same time. But besides this thou mayest see that those who lived before the law of Moses, instructed under the natural law, performed more [things] than were contained in the law of Moses."

[margin: Whether the law of Moses commands lesser [things] than the law of nature.]

In a Greek codex of Chrysostom, which **Sanctes Pagninus** — a most learned man — placed in the Library of the Preachers [Dominicans] at Lyons, we read in the margin of this passage a Greek scholion, thus inscribed by Pagninus's own hand: "Σκληρὸν τοῦτ' ἐστι, καὶ παρὰ τὰ τῶν Σχολαστικῶν δόγματα" — that is, "This is hard, and beside [contrary to] the tenets of the scholastics."

Annotation CCXLIIII

"God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," etc. — Romans 8[:3]

[margin: Whether the flesh of Christ had an inclination to sinning.]

The **author of the commentaries of Jerome** [pseudo-Jerome] on Paul, elucidating this, seems to hint that in the flesh of Christ there was an inclination to sinning, saying: "THE SON of God, [his] flesh assumed — [flesh] which would be [otherwise] more prone to sinning — nevertheless himself assumed it without sin. And therefore he is said to have come 'in the likeness of sinful flesh,' [his] flesh assumed, and to have condemned sin in that same flesh — since the flesh which he had assumed he kept harmless from all contagion of sin." **Henry of Hesse** [Henricus Hassius], on the third book of the Sentences, distinction 3, says that these words are not so to be taken as though the Son of God assumed a flesh prone to sinning; but [rather] because that flesh, which the Son of God assumed immune from all inclination to sin, he assumed from the mass of flesh which was [otherwise] more prone to sinning.

Annotation CCXLV

"The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly." — Romans 8[:20]

[margin: Whether the heavens were made corruptible and dissoluble on account of Adam's sin.]

Chrysostom, [in] homily fourteen on the epistle to the Romans, explaining the proposed sentence, seems to hold that the bodies of the elements and of the heavens, on account of the fall of the first man into sin and death, were made liable to old age, corruption, and destruction; and that again, for man's sake, they shall receive incorruption and immortality, when, in the last resurrection, men shall be gifted with the immortality of a glorious body. His words are these: "WHAT does this mean — 'The crea-

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXLV:)

—ture is subject to vanity'? 'It was made corruptible,' he says. For the sake of what [thing], and wherefore? 'On account of thee, [O] man.' For after thou madest thy body mortal and passible, the earth too was subjected to a curse, and brought forth thorns and thistles. But that the heaven also, growing old together with the earth, is at last to be transferred into a better state — hear the prophet, saying: *[margin: Psalm 101.]* 'In the beginning thou, O Lord, didst found the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall grow old as a garment; and as a vesture thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed.' Isaiah too asserts the same, saying: *[margin: Isaiah 51.b]* 'Look up to the heaven, and look down upon the earth: the heaven shall vanish like smoke; the earth shall grow old like a garment: but they that dwell therein shall perish after the manner of these.' Dost thou see how the universe [universal frame] serves vanity? and in what manner it is to be freed from corruption? For he [the Psalmist] says, 'As a garment thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed'; and Isaiah says, 'But they that dwell upon the earth shall perish after the manner of these' — signifying [that they are] not to be utterly abolished (for not thus shall those who dwell upon the earth, that is, men, perish), but that their destruction shall be temporary; through which also they shall pass over unto immortality; even as [shall] all created nature — [all] which indeed he set forth at once in that [word] which he says, 'After the manner of these'; as Paul too will say in what follows. But now he discourses so far concerning its servitude, [only] that he may open to us for what

cause it was made of such a kind: which cause he asserts to be us. What then? Was the world unjustly affected [wronged], sustaining these [things] by another's fault? By no means; for it was made on account of me [too]. And if it was made on account of me: how is it said to suffer injury, sustaining these [things] for my correction? Otherwise, neither the reason of the just nor of the unjust is to be sought in these things, which lack soul and senses. But Paul afterward — after he had once fashioned a person for the world — willed to use none of those things which I have set down, hastening by a certain other reason, as [by] an addition [makeweight], to relieve [uplift] the reader. But by what reason? 'What sayest thou?' he says. 'The whole [universe] was ill-treated for thy sake, and made dissoluble?' But it suffers no injury; for again it shall be made indissoluble on account of thee. For this is [that] which he says 'in hope.' But [as to that] which he said, 'It was made subject not willingly' — he said [it] not for this [reason], that he might make the world itself lord [master] of its own judgment, but that thou mightest understand that the whole matter is carried on by the providence of Christ, not by its [the world's] own power. But what that hope is, he subjoined, when he says: 'Because the very [creature-]nature also shall be delivered.' What is 'itself'? 'Not thou alone,' he says, 'but also [that] which is worse than thee; [that] which is not capable of reason, and lacks senses. This same [thing], I say, shall be partaker of those good things. It shall be delivered,' he says, 'from the servitude of corruption' — that is, it shall no more be corrupted, but shall imitate the nature of thy body. For as, it [thy body] being corrupted, [the creature] was at the same time corrupted: so also, [it] being made incorruptible, [the creature] shall follow it. Indicating which thing, he says, 'Into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God' — that is, on account of [their] liberty. For as a nurse, who has reared a royal boy, together with him enjoys good things when he is raised to the paternal throne: so also the world, he says, shall enjoy those good things. Dost thou perceive that man everywhere excels — for whose sake also all things were made? Dost thou see in what man-

[catchword "ad-" (quemadmodum) → "in what manner," continues on p. 531 (PDF 536).]

(printed p. 531 [PDF p. 536], recto — end of Ann. CCXLV, then Ann. CCXLVI–CCXLVII, on Romans 8 (Chrysostom concludes — the heavens grow old and shall be renewed for man [with his tenth homily to Antioch]; then Sixtus's counter: the scholastics hold the heavens incorruptible, but Ambrose, Hexaemeron *1.6, and nearly all the Greek Fathers hold heaven corruptible by nature yet preserved by God; Augustine's* Retractations *on whether Adam lost God's image; and the head of CCXLVII, Chrysostom on the privation of eternal glory). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXLV, from the catchword "quemad-":)

—in what manner it consoles the [one] struggling; and at the same time shows the ineffable benignity of God toward us? "Why grievest thou," he says, "in adverse things? But thou sufferest not for thine own sake alone: [is] not the whole world [made] for thy sake?" And he not only consoles the struggler, but even makes worthy of belief the [things] which have been said. For if the world itself hopes, he says, and trusts — [the world] which was founded on account of thee, and made [with] all things — much more oughtest thou too to nourish hope, thou for whose sake the world shall enjoy those good things. So also parents are wont to do, when a son is to be beheld in a higher rank: for they clothe [their] servants with new and more splendid garments, unto his glory. So therefore God too shall clothe this fabric [frame of the world] with immortality, unto the liberty of the glory of the sons [of God].

THUS FAR the discourse of Chrysostom: consonant with which are [the things] which the same [author] wrote [in] the tenth homily to the people of Antioch, in these words: "GOD made the world wondrous and great, but also corruptible and fading [withering]; and he mingled many demonstrations of its weakness. For David, demonstrating that although [it is] beautiful and great, yet it is corruptible, thus says: *[margin: Psalm 101.]* 'In the beginning thou, O Lord, didst found the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They

shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall grow old like a garment; and as a covering thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed.' And again, concerning the Sun, the same [author] says: *[margin: Psalm 18.]* 'As a bridegroom coming forth from his bride-chamber, [the sun] has exulted as a giant to run the way.' Hast thou seen its beauty? hast thou seen its magnitude? See also the demonstration of its weakness. For indeed, demonstrating this too, the wise man said: *[margin: Ecclus. 17.]* 'What is brighter than the Sun? and this shall fail.' Again from the scriptures I will demonstrate to you that not only the Sun, but the whole world is corruptible: but since, by reason of our slenderness [of understanding], this discourse is too lofty, come, let us — leading ourselves to the sweet fountain of the scriptures — soothe our ears. For we will not speak to you of heaven and earth severally, but of every creature alike; and we will show you the Apostle himself demonstrating this very [thing], thus manifestly saying: *[margin: Romans 8.]* that every creature now serves corruption, and why it serves, and when it shall be changed, and into what end it shall pass over. For after he had said, 'The sufferings of the present time are not worthy [to be compared] to the future glory that shall be revealed in us,' he inferred that 'the expectation of the creature waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but on account of him who subjected it in hope.' But [that] which he says is of this kind: 'The creature was made corruptible' — for this it is [that it was] 'made subject to vanity'; and it was made corruptible, God so commanding. But God so commanded on account of our race. For since he was to nourish [feed] a corruptible man, [the creature] too had to be of this kind: for it was not fitting that corruptible bodies should use an incorruptible creature. 'But,' he says, 'it does not, however, remain such: but the creature itself also shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption.' Then, demonstrating when this shall be, and through whom, he inferred: 'into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God.' For when, he says, at the resurrection we shall have taken up incorrupt bodies, then also the body of the heavens, and of the earth, and of the whole world, shall be incorrupt and unfading." Thus far I have recounted the words of Chrysostom.

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXLV:)

To this opinion the whole school of the recent theologians is opposed — but especially in those [things] which regard the heavenly bodies. For they show these [heavenly bodies] to be perpetual and incorruptible for this reason: because they have a substance diverse from the substance of the four elements, and devoid of every foreign impression [i.e. incapable of being acted upon from without]; and because, through the lapses of so many ages, they have thus remained incorruptible, that they have given no indication of growing old, and have consumed nothing of their magnitude or beauty by the injury of time. But **St. Ambrose**, [in] book 1 of the *Hexaemeron*, chapter 6, refuting those who posit the heavens [to be] incorruptible, and consisting of a certain fifth substance, thus writes: "OTHERS have thought the body of the heaven and of the stars to be ethereal — introducing a certain fifth nature of body, in order that they might think the substance of the heaven would remain long-enduring. But this opinion could not withstand the prophetic sentence, which the divine majesty of our Lord Jesus Christ, [our] God, also approved in the gospel. For David said: *[margin: Psalm 101.]* 'In the beginning thou, O Lord, didst found the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish,' etc. Which the Lord so approved in the gospel, that he said: *[margin: Luke 21.]* 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' They therefore accomplish nothing, who, for the asserting of the heaven's perpetuity, thought a fifth ethereal body was to be introduced." Thus Ambrose: with whom nearly all the Greek Fathers agree, affirming the heaven [to be] by its own nature corruptible and perishable, yet not to be corrupted — [being] preserved by the providence and grace of God. Things akin to these thou hast below, Annotation 340.

Annotation CCXLVI

"And the creature itself also shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption," etc. — Romans 8[:21]

[margin: Whether Adam, by sinning, lost the image [of God].]

Augustine, in the book of *83 Questions*, question 67, seems to have said two [things]: one, that the first man, by sinning, lost the image of God; the other, that the lowest angels live "animally" [after the manner of animals]. Both he retracted [in] the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 26, in these words: "WHEN I was expounding [that] which is written, 'And the creature itself also shall be delivered from the servitude of destruction,' I said: 'And the creature itself, that is, man himself — the seal of the image being lost on account of sin — remained only a creature.' Which is not so to be taken, as though man lost the whole [of that] which he had of the image of God. For, if he had lost [it] altogether, there would be nothing on account of which it might be said: *[margin: Ephesians 4.e]* 'Be ye reformed in the newness of your mind'; and, 'we are transformed into the same image.' But, again, if he had lost the whole, nothing would remain whence it might be said: 'Although man walk in [the] image, yet he is vainly disquieted.' Likewise, [as to] that which I said — that the highest angels live 'spiritually,' but the lowest 'animally' — [that] was said too boldly of the lowest [angels], [more] than it can be shown either by the holy scriptures or by the things themselves: for although perhaps it can [be shown], it can [be shown only] most difficultly."

Annotation CCXLVII

"He asketh for the saints according to God." — Romans 8[:27]

[margin: The privation of eternal glory.]

Chrysostom, not far from the end of homily 14 on the epistle to the Romans, [coming] to a sen-

[signature "Xx 4"; catchword "sen-" (sententiam) → "sentence," continues on p. 532 (PDF 537).]

(printed p. 532 [PDF p. 537], verso — end of Ann. CCXLVII, then Ann. CCXLVIII–CCL, on Romans 8 (Chrysostom — the privation of divine glory graver than any gehenna; then "Ambrose, bishop of Compsa" [= Ambrosius Catharinus, abp. of Conza] on predestination — a doctrine Sixtus himself once preached across Italy from age 20 to 30, then abandoned as disapproved, and which Domingo de Soto refuted; Origen on whether future things cause God's foreknowledge, harmonized by Augustine On the Trinity *15.13 and Aquinas; and Jacobus Sadoletus on election from foreseen works). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXLVII, from the catchword "sen-":)

—recurring to a sentence peculiar to himself, says: the privation of the DIVINE glory [to be] graver than any gehenna, and the alienation from the eternal rest [to be] worse than any punishments whatsoever. See above, Annotation 41 of this book.

Annotation CCXLVIII

"We know that to them that love God all things work together unto good, to such as, according to purpose, are called saints." — Romans 8[:28]

[margin: Whether all men are chosen and destined to eternal life.]

Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, treats this whole passage through to the end of the present chapter, and expounds it point by point according to the doctrine of the dogma *On Foreknowledge and Predestination*: which he himself, first of all men (unless I am mistaken), devised, and published in a peculiar [special] volume. But the sum of the dogma is [this]: that God, from eternity, by his gratuitous goodness, foreknew, loved, chose, [and] destined all men — none of them excluded — and in time called [them] to eternal life; yet not in the same manner and order. For God distinguished the whole race of men into two parts, or classes: in the former and more excellent of which he took up those whom thou mightest rightly call the foreknown,

the fore-beloved, the fore-elected, the predestined, and the fore-called — because God, by a certain excellent prerogative of love, loved them before others, chose them before others, destined them before others, and, by a certain singular privilege, called [them] more and more strongly than the rest: such as are the Virgin Mary, the Apostles, Paul, and others, whom God endowed with so great a gift of grace, and equipped with so great safeguards unto salvation, that — [their] freedom of will remaining even safe [intact] — they cannot fall from salvation, [seeing that] they, by a certain immutable and infallible decree of divine providence (the free arbitrament of the will always standing), have been predestined to eternal life. But in the second class God arranged the remaining multitude of the human race; which he willed to be saved not by a fixed and inevitable decree, but under a certain mutable condition; and on that account he neither deemed them worthy of so great an affluence of graces, nor aided [them] with so many and such helps toward attaining beatitude. Ambrose therefore, referring to the first class of those-to-be-saved whatsoever [things] are recounted at the end of this chapter, says [that] to it pertain those whom Paul writes to have been "called according to purpose"; to whom "all things work together unto good"; whom "God foreknew" — that is, knew before the rest, and knew with the knowledge of approbation; whom "God predestined" — that is, destined before all and before others to the conformity of the image of his Son; whom he "justified" more purely than others, called more powerfully, magnified more splendidly; whom "no one can accuse, no one condemn, no one separate from the charity and glory of Christ" — because they are immovably predestined to glory, and their number can neither be augmented nor diminished; in whom, finally, there is so great a certitude of future glory and present grace, that each one of them, together with Paul, can most confidently say: "For I am certain that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor any creature shall be able to separate us from the charity of God, which is in Christ."

THIS opinion of **Ambrose, my teacher**, I myself once believed to be so true, and judged so apt for plucking up certain hard and atro-

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXLVIII:)

—cious opinions concerning predestination, wherewith the heretics of our times had filled the minds of the simple with despair, that I expounded it — from the twentieth to the thirtieth year of my age — in many and chief cities of Italy, in [public] preaching, not without the applause of the hearers, and with fruit to disturbed minds. But afterward, when I had noticed that an assertion of this kind is pressed by not a few difficulties and straits, and on that account is not approved by very many learned and pious theologians, I judged [it] better to desist from preaching it, than to teach [things] disapproved by the pious judgment of the learned. **Dominic Soto of Segovia** wrote against this opinion in the commentaries which he published on the epistle to the Romans, chapter nine. Read below, Annotation 251.

Annotation CCXLIX

"Whom he foreknew, and predestinated." — Romans 8[:29]

[margin: Whether future things are the cause of the divine foreknowledge, or the contrary.]

Origen, [in] the seventh book of the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, seems to hand down that the foreknowledge of God is not the cause of future things, but that future things are the cause of God's foreknowledge — writing thus: "For although we think of Foreknowledge according to the common understanding, [yet] not on that account will a thing be [future] because God knows it [to be] future; but because it is future, it is known by God before it comes to be. For although, for example's sake, we feign that God does not foreknow something, [that thing] without doubt would [still] be future — as, for instance, Judas was made a traitor: and the prophets foretold that this would thus be. Not, therefore, because the prophets foretold [it], did Judas on that account betray [Christ]: but because he was going to be a traitor, the prophets foretold those [things] which he, out of the wickedness of his [own] purpose, was going to do."

Augustine is thought to be opposed to this opinion, [in] book 15 *On the Trinity*, chapter 13, saying: "[God knew] ALL creatures, both spiritual and corporeal, not because they are, [and] therefore knew [them]: for he was not ignorant of [the things] which he was going to create. Because, therefore, he knew, he created; not because he created, [did he] know; nor did he know [them] created otherwise than [he knew them] to be created. For nothing accrued to his wisdom from them; but, they existing as it behooved, and when it behooved, that [wisdom] remained as it was. Whence [it is said] in Ecclesiasticus: 'Before they were created, all things were known to him; so also after they were completed.'" **St. Thomas**, in the first volume of the *Summa*, question 14, article 8, says that Origen speaks of the knowledge of simple cognizance, to which the approbation of the will is not yet joined; but that Augustine spoke of the knowledge [to which] the purpose of the will [is] joined. But [as to that] which was said by Origen — that God foreknows some [things] for this [reason], because they are future — he [Aquinas] says [it] is to be understood according to the cause of consequence, and not according to the cause of being. For it follows, if some [things] are future, that God foreknew them: yet future things are not the cause that God knows [them].

Annotation CCL

"Whom he predestinated, them he also called." — Romans 8[:30]

[margin: Whether election and reprobation are from the foreseeing of works.]

Jacobus Sadoletus, bishop of Carpentras, illustrating this by [his] exposition [in] the second book of the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, says that God elects or reprobates no one from the arbitrament of the divine will alone, but elects this [man] because he foreknew him

[catchword "eum" → "him," continues on p. 533 (PDF 538).]

(printed p. 533 [PDF p. 538], recto — end of Ann. CCL, then Ann. CCLI, on Romans 9 (Sadoletus: God elects/reprobates from foreseen response, not good-pleasure alone, refuting Augustine at length; then "Jacob I loved, Esau I hated" — a large Chrysostom catena [homilies on Rom. 9, Eph. 1 & 2, Matthew 31 & 56, Psalm 113] all deriving predestination and calling from foreseen merits/obedience; then Origen [bk. 7 & bk. 1 on Romans] on the potter and clay — Jacob's soul had cleansed itself). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCL, from the catchword "eum":)

—that he would not spurn the divine calling, and would not turn away from the light of faith: but he reprobates that [other man], because he foresaw that he himself would set an obstacle against the divine calling, and would repudiate the divine grace. Which opinion he pursues with a prolix treatise, confuting Augustine's sentence on predestination and reprobation from the good pleasure of God alone. See the next following Annotation.

Annotation CCLI

"Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated." — Romans 9[:13]

[margin: Whether predestination is from the merits of the predestined foreseen by God.]

Chrysostom, [in] the homily on the epistle to the Romans, treating this passage, seems to indicate that the eternal love, election, and predestination of God toward his own, and [his] temporal calling, arise from the merits of the elect — foreseen from eternity in the divine foreknowledge. For thus he writes: "FOR WHAT cause, then, was Jacob held in love, but Esau in hatred? for what cause did this one serve, but that one rule? Because indeed this one was evil, but that one was good — although, they being not yet born, the one was

honored, but the other condemned. For while they were not yet born, God had said, 'The elder shall serve the younger.'" And below, comparing the divine election to the election of craftsmen, who choose the materials which they know [to be] more apt for their use, he says: "MANY seemed to be better than Matthew, by the apparent argument of works; but he who knows hidden things, and who can prove the aptitude of the thought [mind] — he knew also the pearl lying in the mire; and, the others being passed over, admiring the beauty of this one, he chose him: and, when he had joined his grace to the nobility of [Matthew's] will, he pronounced him approved. For if, in these frail arts, those who are able to judge choose not from those arguments by which the unskilled cast their reckoning, which are set before them, but from those [things] which they themselves rightly know — and the tamers of horses very often do this same [thing] in [choosing] horses, and those who are appraisers of precious stones, and those who are craftsmen of the other arts — much more [will] God, [who is] benign, who alone knows all things openly, cast the reckoning about all [men] from his own wisdom. On that account, indeed, he chose the publican, and the robber, and the harlot: but the priests, and the elders, and the magistrates he reprobated and cast out."

AND [in] the first homily on the epistle to the Ephesians, speaking of election, he says: "IF men, when they choose, select the best for themselves — much more [does] God. For to be chosen is a token both of the divine benignity, and of the virtue of those who are chosen."

AGAIN, [in] the second homily on the Ephesians: "HE altogether chose the predestined according to [his] free choice and purpose — that is, he predestined those whom he had selected for himself, according to [that] which he saw us [to be] before we were taken into the lot."

LIKEWISE, [in] the 31st homily on Matthew, ascribing the cause of the calling of Matthew, and of Paul, and of the other Apostles to the obedience which God had foreseen [would be] future in them, he brings forth these [things]: "FOR WHAT cause did he not call Matthew himself together with Peter and John and the other disciples? Certainly [it was] in the manner in which then he approached them and called [them], when he knew [they would] obey-

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLI:)

—[knew] they were going [to obey]: so also he called Matthew then, when he saw [he] would least resist. For which cause also he fished for [caught] Paul after the resurrection. For he who scrutinizes hearts was not ignorant even [of] when each one was prepared to obey."

AND [in] the 56th homily on Matthew, he attributed the calling of the laborers to their vineyard to their good will, in these words: "HE would indeed have willed to hire all from the beginning, but this difference resulted from the will of the called. Therefore some are called in the morning, some at the third, some at the sixth, some at the ninth, some at the eleventh hour — because they were then about to obey. Which Paul too openly signified, saying: 'But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb.' But when did it please him? Certainly when [Paul] was about to obey. For [God] would have willed [it] even from his first cradle [infancy]: but because he knew that [Paul] would resist, he willed [it] then, when he was not ignorant of the calling [that would] penetrate his mind. So also he called the Robber afterward. He could have called him before, but that [man], [if] called, would not have obeyed. For if Paul from the beginning did not obey, much less [would] the Robber himself."

LIKEWISE, [in] the homily on Psalm 113, speaking of the calling of the Centurion, confirming this same [thing], he says: "IF the Father draws, the Son leads, the Spirit illumines; [then] what fault [is it] of those who are neither drawn, nor led, nor illumined? Because they do not offer themselves worthy to receive that illumination. See, therefore, that this came to Cornelius: for neither did he find this at home with himself, but [only] when God called [him] — since he himself, forestalling [it, made] himself worthy. For although it belongs to [God] to draw and to lead in; yet he requires a soul that complies, and then he applies his own help. Wherefore elsewhere Paul says: *[margin: Rom. 8.]* 'To the called according to purpose.'"

THUS FAR Chrysostom: in whose opinion very many of the ancient fathers seem to have been; whose individual testimonies it pleases [me] to insert here, lest it be needful for me hereafter to return to this very argument.

Origen, [in] the seventh book on the epistle to the Romans, expounding that [text], "Has not the potter power over the clay?" etc., wrote these [things]: "THAT which he proposed a little before concerning Jacob and Esau is more openly explained. For [take it] that Jacob [was] a vessel sanctified unto honor, and useful to the Lord, prepared for every good work: his soul had cleansed itself; and God, seeing his purity (for [God], having power to make from the same mass another [vessel] unto contumely) made Jacob indeed — who, as we have said, cleansed himself — a vessel unto honor; but Esau, whose *[margin: Genesis 25.d]* soul he saw not so pure, nor so simple, he made from the same mass a vessel unto contumely. But that thou mayest know that Jacob was made a vessel unto honor for the purity and simplicity of [his] soul, hear what testimony of simplicity the divine scripture bears to him. 'And Jacob was,' it says, 'a simple [plain] man.' *[margin: Malachi 1.a]* Therefore, for this reason the Apostle says of them — because, before he was born, it is said of them, 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.'" The same [Origen], [in] book 1 on the epistle to the Romans, relating the cause for which Paul was chosen by God, speaks in this manner: "But we say, that neither

[catchword "neque" → "neither," continues on p. 534 (PDF 539).]

---

*(printed p. 534 [PDF p. 539], verso — Annotation CCLI continued (the great patristic catena for predestination-from-foreseen-merits): Origen (bk. 1 on Romans, Paul foreseen to labor), Ambrose, Jerome (to Hedibia q.10, on Galatians 1, on Malachi 1), the pseudo-Jerome commentator, Augustine (*Propositions on Romans, 83 Questions *q.68,* Six Questions against the Pagans *q.2 answering Porphyry), Theodoret, and Sedulius. The whole page is one annotation. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLI, from the catchword "neque":)

—that neither was Paul chosen by chance, nor by a natural difference, but that He — who knows all things before they come to be — gave to him [Paul] the causes of his own election in himself. Therefore Paul — in that he is said [to be] "separated unto the gospel," and separated from the womb of his mother — the causes in it [that womb], and the merits, by which he ought to have been separated, He saw, from whom the mind is not hidden. For he foresaw that [Paul] would labor more abundantly than all the rest in the gospel; that he would preach the gospel in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness — lest perhaps, while he preached to others, he himself should be made reprobate. These [things], therefore, and [things] like these, and many others in him, Jesus, foreseeing [them] from the womb of [his] mother, separated him for these [reasons] unto the gospel. Which also Paul himself, discoursing more fully in what follows, says: "Because whom he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son" — evidently showing that those whom God foreknew would be such [as] to conform themselves to Christ in [his] sufferings, those same [ones] he also predestined [to be] conformable and like to his image, and to [his] glory. The foreknowledge of God, therefore, precedes — by which they are known who are going to have in themselves labors and virtues; and thus predestination follows. Nor, again, will the foreknowledge be thought the cause of predestination. For [that] which, among men, the merit of each is weighed from past deeds — this, with God, is judged from future [deeds].

Ambrose, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, explaining that [text], "To those who according to purpose are called": "THEY," he says, "are called according to purpose whom, believing, God foreknew — so that before they believed, they were [fore]known. For those whom he foreknew would be devoted to him, those same he chose unto eternal rewards." Likewise, declaring that [text], "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," he writes thus: "THEREFORE I will have mercy," he says, "on him on whom I shall have had mercy" — that is, "I will have mercy on him of whom I was foreknowing that I would give mercy,

knowing that he would turn [to me] and would remain with me. And I will show mercy to him to whom I shall have shown mercy" — that is, "I will give mercy to him whom I foreknew would return to me with a right heart after [his] error." This is, to give to him to whom [it is] not [to be] given, and not not to give to him to whom [it] is to be given — [so] that he may call him whom he knows will obey, but not call that other, whom he knows will by no means obey.

Jerome, [in] the tenth question to Hedibia, expounding that [text], "Is there iniquity with God?": "the VESSELS," he says, "of mercy are not only the people of the Gentiles, but also these, who out of the Jews willed to believe. From which it is shown [that] not nations are chosen, but the wills of men." And [in] the first book on the epistle to the Galatians, upon that [text], "But when it pleased him who separated me," etc., he says thus: "IT COMES to pass from the foreknowledge of God, that whom he knows [will be] just in the future, he loves before he rises from the womb: and whom he hates [as] a sinner before he sins — not that in [his] love, and in [his] hatred, there be iniquity of God; but because he ought not to hold otherwise those whom he knows [will be] either sinners or just in the future. We, as men, judge only of present [things]: He, to whom future things are already done [as good as done], bears sentence from the end of things, not from [their] beginnings."

Likewise, in the commentary on Malachi, chapter one, expounding that [text], "Jacob I loved, Esau I hated": "MOREOVER," he says, "the love and hatred of God is born either from the foreknowledge of future things, or from works. Otherwise we should not

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLI:)

—hold that God loves all things, and hates nothing of those [things] which he has created: but that he properly vindicates to his charity those who are enemies and rebels of vices; and, on the contrary, hates those who desire to build up again [the things] destroyed by God."

The **author of the commentaries bearing the inscription of Jerome** [pseudo-Jerome], elucidating that [text], "He predestined [them] to be made conformable to the image of his Son": "TO PREDESTINE," he says, "is the same as to foreknow. Therefore those whom he foresaw would be conformable in life, he willed [them] to be made conformable in glory." And a little after: "WHOM he foreknew would believe, these he called. For the calling gathers the willing, not the unwilling." And again, upon that [text], "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy," he says: "This, in the right sense, is thus understood: I will have mercy on him whom I foreknew could merit mercy — so that already then I have had mercy on him."

Augustine, in the book of *Propositions* from the epistle to the Romans, upon that [text], "Jacob I loved," affirms that God chose Jacob from the faith which he foresaw in him, in these words: "GOD did not, therefore, choose the works of anyone in [his] foreknowledge, but he chose faith in foreknowledge — so that he chose the very [man] whom he foreknew would believe in him; to whom he would give the Holy Spirit, so that, by working good [deeds], he might attain even eternal life. The same God who works all things and in all: but nowhere is it said, 'God believes all things in all.' [That] which, therefore, we believe, [and that] good which we work, is his." The same [Augustine], in the book of *83 Questions*, question 68: "'On whom he will,' he says, 'God has mercy; and whom he will, he hardens.' But this will of God cannot be unjust. For it comes from the most hidden merits; because even the sinners themselves did not, on account of [their] general sin, make one mass; yet there is a certain diversity among them. Something, therefore, precedes in the sinners, whereby, although they are not yet justified, they may be made worthy of justification: and the same precedes in other sinners, whereby they may be worthy of blunting [hardening]." Again, in the book of *Six Questions against the Pagans*, question 2, he refers the cause of the divine calling to the faith of the called, foreseen by God. For there, answering the question of Porphyry — who asks why Christ did not come in earlier ages to call all men to the way of salvation — he writes thus: "THIS ONLY, for brevity's sake, let us say in the solution of this question: that Christ then willed to appear to men, and his doctrine to be preached

among them, when he knew, and where he knew, there were [those] who would be going to believe in him. For in those times, and in those places, in which the gospel was not preached, he foreknew that all, in its preaching, would be such [as] many were in his corporeal presence, who would not believe in him even when the dead were raised by him."

Theodoret, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, upon "Jacob I loved": "GOD," he says, "when he had foreknown the purpose of Esau and Jacob, foretold the difference of both. For the election of God accords with the purpose of men." And in the exposition of the eighth chapter of the same epistle: "WHOSE purpose," he says, "God foreknew, them he predestined from eternity."

Sedulius, in the *Collectanea* on the epistle to the Romans, upon that [text], "To those who according to purpose are called,"

[catchword "sunt" → "are [called]," continues on p. 535 (PDF 540).]

---

*(printed p. 535 [PDF p. 540], recto — end of the Annotation CCLI catena (Sedulius, Theophylact [Rom. & Matt. 22], Oecumenius, Theodulus, Sadoletus — all ascribing predestination to foreseen faith), then Sixtus's resolution: this "predestination from foreseen merits" was condemned in Pelagius; Augustine himself once held it but retracted it (*Retractations *1.25); Sixtus reconciles via Aquinas (*Summa *1 q.23) — the twofold cause (meritorious, final) and the grades before/after gratifying grace: foreseen works are NOT the meritorious cause of the earlier grades [election, predestination, vocation], but ARE the cause of the later grades and of "final" predestination. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLI, from the catchword "sunt":)

—are called, says: "THOSE whom he foreknew would be devoted to him, those same he chose to seize the promised rewards." And below: "THOSE whom he foreknew would believe, these he called. For the calling gathers the willing." It is one thing to foreknow, another to predestine. Foreknowledge foreknows [the things] to be done; afterward predestination describes [the things] to be repaid: the former foresees the merits, the latter predestines the rewards. And below: "JACOB and Esau, who are of one coition of [i.e. by] Rebecca, before they were born, were separated by the merit of faith, that the purpose might already remain [stand]. So therefore also now, [those] whom he foreknew, of the Gentiles, would believe, he chose, and out of Israel he rejected the unbelieving."

Theophylact, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Romans, explaining that [text], "Whom he foreknew and predestined," speaks thus: "GOD FOREKNOWS, or knows beforehand, those who are worthy of the calling; then thus he predestines. Foreknowledge, therefore, is prior; afterward predestination follows. But by predestination thou wilt understand the unchangeable will of God. He foreknew, therefore, that Paul was worthy of the calling, and so he predefined, or predestined [him] — that is, he unchangeably decreed, and so determined to call him." The same [Theophylact], on chapter 22 of Matthew, when he expounded that [text], "Many are called," etc.: "FEW indeed," he says, "are they who are saved, and who are worthy to be chosen by God; so that it belongs to God indeed to call, but that we be made elect, or not, is ours."

Oecumenius, in the *Collectanea* of explanations on Paul, expounding that [text], "But whom he predestined": "UNDERSTAND [as implied]," he says, "everywhere, 'who according to purpose are called.' For [those] whom he foreknew, these he also predefined; because they are according to purpose: but [those] whom he predefined, these he also called; because they are according to purpose: and [those] whom he called, the same he also justified; because they are according to purpose. And let nothing absurd occur, if to some God does good, but to others not. For when 'according to purpose' is subjoined, the virtue of those is established, who according to their own purpose believed: and thus God is freed from the respect of persons [partiality]."

Theodulus, in the *Collectanea* on the epistle to the Romans, expounding this same [thing], repeats almost the same, saying: "EVERYWHERE understand [as implied], 'who according to purpose are called.' For an absurdity is gathered, if God conferred a benefit on some, but did not confer [it] on others. But if 'according to purpose' be understood [as implied], the virtue of them is established, and God is freed from the respect of persons."

Jacobus [Sadoletus], bishop of Carpentras, [in] the second book of the commentary on the epistle to the Romans, making plain that [text] from the eighth chapter of the same epistle, "Whom he predestined, them he also called," persuades by a long discourse that God chooses not any [men] from the arbitrament of his own will, but because he foreknew that they would neither spurn the divine calling, nor reject the offered grace of God.

THESE, then, are the sayings of the fathers, from which it seems to be gathered that the foreknowledge of merits is the cause of divine predestination — which opinion indeed was condemned in Pelagius.

St. Augustine, when he had first constantly adhered to this dog-

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLI:)

—ma, at last — the matter being more diligently examined — retracted the opinion in almost innumerable places, especially [in] the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter twenty-five: in which place he testifies that he would never have said this, if he had known that election, without any preceding merits, is from grace alone, and that faith itself is found among the gifts of GOD which are given through the Holy Spirit. For although to believe and to work are both ours, on account of the free arbitrament of the will, and because they are done [only] by us willing [them]: yet both are the gift of GOD, who furnishes both to believe, and to will, and to accomplish.

BUT, lest I sift the fathers' opinions [that have been] set forth more loftily and prolixly than [befits] the manner of an annotation, and involve both myself and the minds of the readers in a matter so abstruse, and implicated in such labyrinths of disputations, I judge it more than enough to suffice, if I annotate that one [thing] which St. Thomas admonished [us] to observe from the doctrine of Augustine, in the first volume of the *Theological Summa*, and in the twenty-third question, namely: that in the works of the elect, foreseen by the divine foreknowledge, a twofold reason of cause can be regarded — [the] Meritorious, namely, and [the] Final. First, then, if we have looked to the meritorious cause, it must be known that the order of divine providence toward the elect is distinguished by a twofold variety of grades: of which some precede the reception of gratifying [sanctifying] grace — such as are Dilection [love], Election, Enrollment [Conscription], Predestination, Vocation, [and] the inception of Justification; but others follow the reception of gratifying grace — such as are the increase of Grace, the increment of justice, and the attainment of eternal felicity. If, therefore, it be asked whether the foreseeing of our works is the meritorious cause of the preceding grades: it must be flatly denied; lest we seem to connive with the Pelagians, who say that God chose our merits in his foreknowledge. And according to this opinion all the fathers are to be interpreted who define the eternal election and predestination of God to be from the grace of God alone, no merits foreseen. But if anyone should ask whether the following grades of the divine order have a meritorious cause in the divine foreseeing: without doubt it must be answered that God from eternity decreed that he would give increments of ampler justice to those who would use well the first gift of justifying grace, and then, on account of the merits of well-preserved justice, would render to them the crown of perpetual beatitude. And to this sense we shall endeavor, so far as it can be done, to accommodate some of the aforesaid opinions of the fathers, which seem to ascribe election and predestination to the foreseeing of merits — that is, [to ascribe to it] the completion of predestination and election, or the following and posterior grades of the divine order; because the fathers sometimes, denominating the whole from the part, called [it] Election, or Predestination.

AGAIN, if we turn ourselves to the contemplation of the final cause, we shall rightly indeed be able to affirm that the foreseeing of works, [and] the subsequent reception of divine grace, is the cause of election and of final predestination. For God, as Paul says, chose us before the constitution of the world, and predestined us

[catchword "nos" → "us," continues on p. 536 (PDF 541).]

(printed p. 536 [PDF p. 541], verso — end of Ann. CCLI (Sixtus's conclusion: foreseen works are the final, *not the meritorious, cause of predestination; "candid reader, use a better [account] if you have it"), then Ann. CCLII, on Romans 9:18 (the* opposite *catena — reprobation from God's good pleasure alone: Augustine's* Questions to Simplician *1.2,* Hypognosticon *6, and* Soliloquies *28 [the great "from the same clay, some vessels unto honor, some unto contumely" passage]; Sixtus notes this displeased many ancient fathers; and Prosper of Riez and Hilary of Arles writing to admonish Augustine on behalf of the monks of Marseilles). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLI, from the catchword "nos":)

—us, that we should be holy and immaculate before him, unto the praise of the glory of his grace. That is, he took us to himself from eternity among his own, and prepared for us the grace of vocation and of justification — to this end, namely, that we might use it well, and, from its good use, might attain the glory of everlasting felicity. Nor is there doubt that some of the aforesaid fathers, according to this manner of speaking, pronounced that our works, foreseen by God, are the cause of divine predestination — the final [cause] indeed, but not the meritorious. These are the [things], candid reader, which we judged were here to be briefly annotated: thou, if thou hast any [things] more apt than these for explaining the opinions of the fathers, use [them]; and take these [things] of ours, whatsoever they be, in good part.

Annotation CCLII

"On whom he will, he hath mercy; and whom he will, he hardeneth." — Romans 9[:18]

[margin: Whether God reprobates any from the purpose of his will alone.]

Augustine, [in] the first book of *Questions to Simplician*, the second question, when in the exposition of this passage he was speaking of the cause of Predestination and Reprobation, seemed to assert that, when God had foreknown the whole human race in Adam sinning — [as] lost and dead in a certain mass, [as it were,] of iniquity and perdition — he snatched out some thence, and predestined [them] to eternal life, not from their foreseen merits, but from the good pleasure of his will, unto the showing-forth of his mercy. But the rest he left in the same mass, reprobated from the heavenly kingdom — not from their singular demerits foreseen, but from the good pleasure of his will — forsaking [them as] lost, unto the showing-forth of the divine justice, [and leaving them] in their perdition by a just judgment. Which opinion he expressed in these words: *[margin: Romans 3.e]* "ALL men, therefore, are (since indeed, as the Apostle says, in Adam all die — from whom the origin of the offense of God is drawn into the universal race of men) a certain one mass of sin, owing punishment to the divine and highest justice; which [punishment], whether it be exacted or remitted, there is no iniquity. But from whom it should be exacted, and to whom it should be remitted, the debtors proudly [presume to] declare." This same [thing] he pronounces more clearly [in] the sixth book of the *Hypognosticon*, in this manner: "NOW, therefore, let us discourse more openly [as to] how God — in whom there is no iniquity — generally uses his foreknowledge and predestination toward the human race. For to the mass of the human race, which in Adam and Eve, by [their] prevarication, was made damnable and mortal — not by the divine condition [i.e. not by how God created it], but from debt — punishment and the torment of gehenna is owed: but pardon is conferred not by merit, but by the largess of the mercy of God, the just Judge. But because the Lord, [being] just and merciful, and foreknowing of future things, out of this damnable mass — not by acceptance of persons, but by the irreprehensible judgment of his equity — those whom he

foreknows, he prepares by his own gratuitous mercy, that is, he predestines to eternal life; but the rest (as I said before) he punishes with due punishment — whom he therefore punishes because he foreknew what they would be; yet he himself did not make [them], nor predestine [them] to be punished, but only (as I said) foreknew [them] in the damnable mass."

AGAIN, in the book of the *Soliloquies*, chapter 28, expressing this same [thing] in more open words, he wrote these [things]: *[margin: Isaiah 64.b]* "WE ALL, coming as [it were] a menstruous cloth from the corrupt and unclean mass, bring

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLII:)

—the stain of our uncleanness — which we cannot conceal even from thee at least, who seest all things. For we carry [it] on our foreheads, since we cannot be clean, unless thou hast cleansed [us], who alone art clean. But thou cleansest, out of us the sons of men, those in whom it has pleased thee to dwell: whom, by the inaccessible deep secrets of the incomprehensible judgments of thy wisdom — [judgments] always just, though hidden — without their merits, thou hast predestined before the world, called out of the world, justified in the world, and thou magnifiest them after the world. But these [things] thou dost not do for all: which all the wasting-away wise men of the earth marvel at. And I, O Lord, considering this, am affrighted, and am stupefied at the height of the riches of thy wisdom and knowledge — to which I do not attain — and [at] the incomprehensible judgments of thy justice, since from the same clay thou makest some vessels indeed unto honor, but others unto everlasting contumely. Those, therefore, whom thou hast chosen for thyself out of the many into thy holy temple, those thou cleansest, pouring out upon them clean water: whose names and number thou knowest, who alone numberest the multitude of the stars, and callest them all by name: who [are] also written in the book of life: who can in no way perish, to whom all things work together unto good, even [their] very sins. For when they fall, they are not dashed to pieces: because thou puttest under thy hand, keeping all their bones, that not one of these be crushed. *[margin: Psalm 33.d]* And yet the death of sinners is most evil: of those, I say, whom — before thou madest heaven and earth, according to the deep abyss of thy hidden judgments (yet always just) — thou hast foreknown unto eternal death: whose numbering of names and of depraved merits is with thee, [thou] who hast numbered the number of the sand of the sea, and hast measured the depth of the abyss; whom thou hast left in their uncleannesses: to whom all things work together unto evil: and their very prayer is turned into sin: so that even if they ascend up to the heavens, and set their nest among the stars of heaven, they shall perish in the end like a dunghill."

THIS is Augustine's opinion; which of old seems to have vehemently displeased very many of the ancient fathers.

Prosper, bishop of Riez, admonished Augustine concerning this matter by a letter, in these words: "MANY of the servants of Christ, who abide in the city of Marseilles, in the writings of thy holiness which thou hast composed against the Pe-lagian heretics, think [it] contrary to the opinion of the fathers and to the ecclesiastical sense, whatsoever in them thou hast disputed concerning the calling of the elect according to the purpose of God. For this purpose of the calling of God — by which, either before the beginning of the world, or in the very founding of the human race, the discretion [separating] of those-to-be-chosen and those-to-be-rejected is said [to have been] made, so that, according to what pleased the Creator, some are created vessels of honor, others vessels of contumely — they say both takes away from the fallen the care of rising again, and brings to the saints an occasion of torpor: on the ground that on either side the labor is superfluous, if neither the rejected [man] can by any industry enter [in], nor the elect [man] by any negligence fall out."

Hilary, bishop of Arles, signifying the same matter to Augustine by a letter, writes thus to him: "Most blessed Lord, and with all affection to be de-

[catchword "side-" (desiderande) → "de[sired]," continues on p. 537 (PDF 542).]

(printed p. 537 [PDF p. 542], recto — end of Ann. CCLII, then Ann. CCLIII–CCLV, on Romans 9–14 (the reprobation debate concluded — Hilary of Arles, Faustus of Riez [attacking Augustine's "mass of perdition" as pagan-flavored], Ambrose of Compsa's 25 objections; then Sixtus's resolution mirroring the last page — reprobation's eternal grades [Hatred, Neglect, Deletion, Reprobation] have no cause but God's will, its temporal grades [dulling, blinding, hardening, damnation] have the reprobates' own unbelief as meritorious cause [Hosea 13:9]; then Chrysostom on Paul's dignity [Germain de Brie]; Origen's "expiatory fire for all" error; and whether the whole life of unbelievers is sin — Anselm of Laon, Anselm of Canterbury, Ambrose, pseudo-Origen on Job, Ferus, Aquinas). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLII, from the catchword "side-":)

—sired [longed for]. These are the [things] which are bandied about at Marseilles, or also in other places in Gaul: that it is [something] new and useless to preaching, that certain [men] are said to be chosen according to the purpose of God." And below: "AND they testify that they prove this not only by the testimonies of other catholics, but also by the more ancient disputation of thy holiness [i.e. Augustine's own earlier writings]."

Faustus, bishop of the Gauls [of Riez], the name of Augustine suppressed, assails his opinion [in] the second book *On the Grace of God, and the Arbitrament of the Human Mind*, chapter six, in these words: "It was said, not from works, but from the caller: 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.' In these words the impiety of the gentile [pagan] persuasion wishes this to be understood: that God — without any examination of a moderator between good and evil, [acting] not by the order of one ruling, but by the right of one domineering — renders that one worthy of [his] affection, this one [worthy] of hatred; receives that one with zeal, excludes this one by [his] command [sovereign power]. And between two lost [men] let there be no consideration of labor, none of devotion: but let the one, without reason, be taken up (his duties ceasing — i.e. though he has done nothing), the other, without discretion, be damned. And thus, while in either [case] there exists the matter neither of merit nor of fault, the cause of the future judgment is altogether taken away."

Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, although he professes that he greatly venerates Augustine, and attributes to him as much as he would dare to concede to any of the illustrious doctors of the Church: yet he assails this opinion concerning the mass of perdition — first devised by Augustine himself (as he [Ambrose] says) — with five-and-twenty objections: which, if anyone desires to know, let him read his Commentaries on the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, where he has reduced into a compendium [the things] which he had earlier written against this opinion in a prolix volume.

FOR the understanding of these and of passages of this kind, it is worthy of notice that — even as we said in the preceding Annotation, [that] the order of divine providence toward those-to-be-blessed is distinguished by a twofold distinction of grades, the former, namely, and the latter — so now we say [that] the order of divine providence toward the reprobate is comprised by a twofold variety of grades: of which some are prior and eternal, such as Hatred, Neglect, Deletion [blotting-out], and Reprobation; which are diametrically opposed to the prior grades of the divine order — that is, to Dilection, Election, Enrollment [Conscription], and Predestination. These indeed have no cause in the divine foreknowledge, except the mind of God so willing, [and] looking-forward to the showing-forth of the divine justice. And in this sense, as I judge, are to be understood the opinions of the Fathers which establish no cause of Reprobation. But others are the posterior and temporal grades of the same Post-position [setting-behind] or Repulsion — namely, Obtusion [dulling], Blinding, Hardening, and eternal damnation: whose meritorious cause is the reprobates' unbelief, iniquity, and obstinacy; which, when God had foreknown [them] from eternity, he rightly appointed for them the due punishments — namely, Obtusion, Blinding, Obduration [hardening], and the damnation of eternal

punishment. According to the consideration of which [grades] it was said by very many fathers that evil works foreseen are the meritorious cause of the divine Reprobation and Repulsion — that is, of the posterior effects of the divine Post-position, which are produced only from the evil merits of the reprobate — the prophet

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLII, then Ann. CCLIII–CCLV:)

—saying: *[margin: Hosea 13.b]* "Thy perdition [is] from thyself, O Israel; only from me [is] thy help."

Annotation CCLIII

"For I also am an Israelite." — Romans 11[:1]

[margin: Whether Paul was equal to Peter in dignity.]

Chrysostom, [in] the eighteenth homily on the epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of the present clause: "FOR neither," he says, "if God had been about to repel his people, would he have chosen Paul for himself out of the Israelites — to whom he would grant all preaching, to whom the affairs of the world, all the mysteries, and the universal dispensation." **Germain de Brie** [Germanus Brixius], the interpreter [translator] of Chrysostom's homilies on Paul, annotating this passage in the margin, says: "SEE what Chrysostom attributes to Paul." Read below, Annotation 269.

Annotation CCLIIII

"The remnant, according to the election, are made safe [saved]." — Romans 11[:5]

[margin: Expiatory fire.]

Origen, [in] the eighth book on the epistle to the Romans, interpreting these [words], seems to be of that opinion, that all — the good as well as the evil — are to enter, after this life, the fire of gehenna. For he has these words: "YET the end shall press hard upon all [things], and those indeed who are blessed, whether they [be] of Israel, or of the Gentiles," etc. See above, Annotations 170 and 171 of the fifth book.

Annotation CCLV

"All that is not of faith is sin." — Romans 14[:23]

[margin: Whether the whole life of unbelievers is sin.]

Anselm of Laon [Laudunensis], in the *Glossa ordinaria*, explaining this clause, seems to hint that all the works of unbelievers are sins, and that nothing can be done by them which is good. And he uses these words: "THE WHOLE life of unbelievers is sin: and nothing [is] good without the highest Good, where the acknowledgment of eternal truth is lacking: [it is] false virtue even in the best morals. The works which seem probable [commendable], apart from faith, are thus: as great strength [powers], and a most swift running, off the road." To this opinion — which is taken word for word from Augustine — **Anselm, bishop of Canterbury**, agrees, [and] in the commentaries on this passage repeats these very words: "AMBROSE accords with these [things, in] the first book *On the Calling of the Gentiles*, chapter 3, saying: 'Without the worship of the true God, even [that] which seems [to be] virtue is sin, nor can anyone please God without God.' Nor does the author of the commentaries of Origen on Job dissent from these: who, [in] the first chapter, writes thus: 'That I may say [it] briefly, and boldly: All [things], whatsoever men shall do — whether in virginity, or in abstinence, or in the chastity of the body, or in the distribution of their goods — they do all in vain [for nothing], if they shall not have done [them] in faith. For all severity, and all justice, which anyone shall do outside the true faith of God, he does in vain, he does unto perdition; it profits him not, it helps him not in the day of wrath. To which Paul is witness, saying: "All that is not of faith is sin."'"

Thus he [Anselm]. **John Ferus** followed the words and sense of these, in the commentaries on Matthew — even as was noted above, [in] the fortieth Annotation of this book. **St. Thomas**, in the second [part] of the second [part], question 10, article 4, discour-

[signature "Yy"; catchword "rens" (disserens) → "discoursing," continues on p. 538 (PDF 543).]

(printed p. 538 [PDF p. 543], verso — end of Ann. CCLV, then Ann. CCLVI–CCLIX, on Romans 16 & 1 Corinthians 1–3 (Aquinas on whether unbelievers' works are all sin; Chrysostom's separate homily on Rom. 16:3 abused by Erasmus against just war; whether the divine precepts can be fulfilled by natural powers alone — Chrysostom, hom. 3 on 1 Cor., on the gentile philosophers, flagged by Augustine On Heresies *88 as a Pelagian error, answered via hyperbole / external-act-only [Cassian,* Conferences *13]; then the purgatory texts — Theodoret's testimony cited by Aquinas but absent from the extant Theodoret; and whether Chrysostom acknowledged purgatory — he reads "saved as by fire" of eternal gehenna, and Mark of Ephesus used this at Basel against purgatory). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLV, from the catchword "rens":)

—coursing [on] the proposed passage of Anselm, says [that] it can be understood in two ways, that is: either [in the sense] that the life of unbelievers cannot be without sin, since sins are not taken away without faith; or because whatsoever they do out of unbelief is sin. Whence in the same place it is subjoined, that everyone living or acting in unbelief sins vehemently. But hence it does not follow that unbelievers sin in every [single] work, since in them that natural goodness of reason — which pleads toward the best [things] — is not utterly extinct and abolished. See below, Annotation 178.

Annotation CCLVI

"Salute Prisca and Aquila." — Romans 16[:3]

[margin: War.]

Chrysostom, in the homily which he published separately on this passage, has certain words which Erasmus abuses against the right and equity of a just war — contending that it is not lawful for Christians to fight by any reason [in any way]. Read Annotation 156 of this book.

Annotation CCLVII

"I beseech you by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." — 1 Corinthians 1[:10]

[margin: Whether the precepts of the divine law can be fulfilled by natural powers alone.]

Chrysostom, [in] the third homily on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, narrating this, seems to hold that many of the gentile philosophers, aided by natural reason alone, not only fulfilled the precepts of the divine law, but even transcended [them]. For thus he declares: "DID not God give a law, both written and natural? Did he not send [his] Son? Did he not work signs? Did he not promise the kingdom of heaven? Are not his precepts so light [easy], that many, by philosophical reason alone, have exceeded them?" This assertion Augustine, in the book *On Heresies*, chapter 88, seems to place among the first and chief errors of the Pelagians, saying: "THE PELAGIANS are enemies of the grace of God, which is poured forth in our hearts, to such a degree that they believe man can, without it, do all the divine commands." There are [those] who judge Chrysostom's words [to have been] uttered by hyperbole — as by one who, by the example of the diligence of the gentiles, wished to confound the sloth of Christians, and to provoke their idle minds to the execution of the evangelical law. We can also interpret these very words thus, that we say [that] the philosophers indeed [fulfilled] not all, but some, of the divine precepts, both fulfilled and even surpassed

[them] — as far only as the very action of the work, and the sole external execution of the deed [is concerned]. For many Gentiles chose voluntary poverty, riches being utterly cast off; and many so kept virginity, that they preferred to be slain than to betray it. But if we consider these same works according to the internal manner of acting, and the right scope [aim] of working, which is required of us according to the rule of Christian charity: it must be denied that any of the gentiles fulfilled the precepts of the law by philosophical reason alone — much less surpassed [them]. For, as John Cassian, the disciple of John Chrysostom, writes in the thirteenth volume of the *Conferences*, it must by no means be believed that the philosophers attained such a chastity of mind as is required of us — to whom it is enjoined, that not

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLVII, then Ann. CCLVIII–CCLIX:)

—only fornication, but not even uncleanness, be named among us. For they had a certain μερικήν [merik■n] — that is, a little portion — of chastity; that is, an abstinence of the flesh, [such] that they restrained lust only from coition: but this internal and perfect purity of body — [that is, of] the mind — they could attain not only [not] in body, but not even in thought. Thou hast [things] alluding to this in the hundred-and-first Annotation of the fifth book.

Annotation CCLVIII

"But if any man build upon this foundation," etc. — 1 Corinthians 3[:12]

[margin: Purgatory.]

Theodoret's testimony for the purgatorial fire, from the exposition of the epistle to the Corinthians, **St. Thomas** adduces in the book *Against the Errors of the Greeks and Armenians*, in these plain words: "THE APOSTLE says, 'He shall be saved' — thus, as [it were] through a smelting fire, purging whatever has intervened through the incaution of [his] past life, from the dust at least of the feet of the earthly sense [affection], in which [fire] he remains so long, until whatever of grossness and of earthly affection has cleaved [to him] be purged — for whom mother Church devoutly offers victims and peaceful gifts [i.e. the Mass]." These words, indeed, are nowhere extant — neither in the Latin nor in the Greek commentaries of Theodoret. It can be believed [that] they were either withdrawn by certain Greeklings hostile to purgatory, or taken by St. Thomas from some other work, where Theodoret thus expounded this passage.

Annotation CCLIX

"But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." — 1 Corinthians 3[:15]

[margin: Whether Chrysostom acknowledged purgatory.]

Chrysostom, [in] the ninth homily on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, explaining this passage — of the perpetual fire of gehenna, and of those who shall be punished with the eternal punishment of fire — writes thus: "'BUT he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' This signifies that he himself shall not so perish as [his] works, going [back] into nothing, but shall remain in the fire. Salvation, therefore, he calls this matter not simply [absolutely]: on that account he added, 'As by fire.' For indeed there is with us a custom of saying that [those things] are 'safe' [saved] in the fire, which are not burned up, nor turned into ash. Do not, therefore, when thou hearest 'fire,' think [that they are] burning [and] going back into nothing. But if he calls such a punishment 'salvation,' marvel not. For [Scripture] is wont, in badly-signifying [pejorative] matters, to use good names, and in well[-signifying matters, bad names]. As, for example, the name of 'captivity' seems a name of bad signification: but in a good [sense] Paul uses it in these words: *[margin: 1 Cor. 10.b]* 'Bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ.' Contrariwise, in an evil matter he uses an illustrious [noble] word: *[margin: Romans 5.]* 'Sin reigned.' And yet the name of 'reign' is more laudable. Likewise in this place, when he says, 'He shall be saved,' it signifies nothing else than an increment of punishment: as [if] he should say, 'He himself shall remain perpetually in punishment.'"

Mark, bishop of Ephesus, in the Apologia which he presented on behalf of the Greeks — [who] reject purgatory — in the Council of Basel, examining these words of Chrysostom, asserts that he [Chrysostom] never either expressed in words, or thought, anything of purgatory (to which the Latins apply the present passage of Paul) — Chrysostom crying out against [it], who [interpreted] it of the everlasting fire of gehenna,

[catchword "igne" → "fire," continues on p. 539 (PDF 544).]

(printed p. 539 [PDF p. 544], recto — end of Ann. CCLIX, then Ann. CCLX, on 1 Corinthians 3 & 7 (Sixtus refutes Mark of Ephesus, proving Chrysostom did *teach a purgatory — a catena of homilies on Matthew 32, 1 Cor. 41, Philippians 3 / Antioch 69, and Hebrews 4, all on suffrages and alms for the dead; then his verdict that Chrysostom's "saved as by eternal fire" reading of 1 Cor. 3:15 is hard and violent, probably aimed at Origenists who thought hell would end; then Ambrosiaster on 1 Cor. 7:10 — two Church-rejected opinions: that a man may dismiss an adulterous wife and remarry, and that a wife may not do likewise to an adulterous husband). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLIX, from the catchword "igne":)

—[of gehenna] truly, and quite genuinely, expounded [it]. But since the Ephesian's [Mark's] reproof has two parts — one, by which he asserts that Chrysostom never brought forth anything of purgatory in [his] writings, or [ever] thought [of it]; the other, by which he prefers Chrysostom's exposition to the Latins' exposition — I shall show [that] the man both errs in this part, and impudently lies in that. For there are had, in Chrysostom, very many passages, from which it is clear that that blessed man believed [that] after this life there is a place where [those] stained with spots are purged; where, outside the eternal rest, they suffer tribulation; where they receive refreshment from our suffrages and prayers; where the angered Judge is appeased for them: which place the Latins call purgatory. That this is so, as we say, the passages written below, culled from his homilies, most openly demonstrate.

[In] **homily 32 on Matthew**: "WHY, after [thy kinsman's] death, dost thou call together the poor of thy [kin]? Why dost thou beseech the presbyters, that they may be willing to pray for him? I am not ignorant that thou wilt answer: that the deceased may attain rest, that he may find the Judge propitious." And below: "FOR if many barbarous nations are wont to burn the goods of the dead together with the dead: how much more justly oughtest thou to hand over thy [goods] for thy deceased son — not that they be reduced to ash, but that thou mayest render him more glorious. Thou thinkest that he departed, stained with spots: give him his own [goods, as alms], that he may wipe [himself] clean of the spots by them."

[In] **homily 41 on the [epistle] to the Corinthians**: "LET US therefore aid our deceased brethren, [and] make memory for them. For if a father's victim [sacrifice] purged the children of that Job, why dost thou doubt that, if we too offer [something] for the sleeping [dead], some [portion] of solace will accrue to them? God is wont to be gracious to some for the sake of others," etc.

[In] **the third homily on the epistle to the Philippians**, and [in] the 69th homily to the people of Antioch: "LET US bewail these dead, let us aid them according to [our] powers, let us procure for them some [thing] of help — a little, indeed, yet let us aid them. How, [and] by what reason? Praying, let us exhort others also, that they pray for them; and let us give alms unceasingly for them to the poor. This matter has no little of consolation. Hear, indeed, what God says: *[margin: 2 Kings 19.]* 'I will protect this city for my own sake, and for the sake of David my servant.' If the memory only of a just [man] availed so much, when [his descendants'] works also live [avail] for such a one: what shall [prayers and works] not be able [to do]? Not in vain was it sanctioned by the Apostles, that in the celebration of the venerable mysteries memory be made of those who have departed hence. They know [that] much emolument accrues to them thence, much of utility. For, the whole people standing, extending [their] hands to the heavens, and the priestly assembly likewise, and the awful sacrifice being set forth, how should we not appease God, praying for these [dead]?

But this indeed we say of those who departed in the faith: but the Catechumens we deem not worthy even of this solace, but they are destitute of all help of this kind, one only excepted. Which one? It is lawful to give in their name to the poor, whence some [portion] of refreshment accrues to them," etc.

[In] **the fourth homily on the epistle to the Hebrews**: "TELL me, what mean (at a funeral) those festive lamps? Do we not lead them forth (the deceased) as [it were] athletes? What too [mean] the hymns? [Is it] not that we may glorify God,

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLIX, then Ann. CCLX:)

—and give him thanks? [Is it not] that he has now crowned the departed [one], that he now holds with himself [one] led [forth], freed from labors, from servitude? [Are] not the psalms and hymns for this [reason]? [Is] not the psalmody for this [reason]? All these are [the acts] of [those] rejoicing," etc. And after a few [words]: "WHY dost thou chant at that time, *[margin: Psalm 114.]* 'Return, O my soul, into thy rest, for the Lord hath done well to thee. I will not fear evils, since thou art with me'? And again, *[margin: Psalm 31.]* 'Thou art my refuge from the tribulation that encompasses me'? Dost thou understand what these psalms mean?" etc. And again: "FOR what reason, tell me, dost thou call the presbyters and the chanters? [Is it] not that thou mayest receive consolation? [Is it] not that thou mayest honor the departed [one]?"

FROM these, therefore, and from other passages — which, lest the volume rise to a greater bulk, I of set purpose omit — let it be evident that Chrysostom held the very same [things] concerning Purgatory which we [hold].

BUT now, as to that [second charge] which the Ephesian adds — that Chrysostom's interpretation contradicts the exposition of the Latins, and truly and sincerely expresses the mind of Paul — it is certainly not mine to sift out and decide who understood Paul's sentence more rightly: whether, of the Greeks, Chrysostom, whom no pious [man] despises, or, of the Latins, Augustine, whom all the learned approve. Let his own honor remain, as far as pertains to me, to each. Yet this — by the leave of so great a man — I would dare to teach: that Chrysostom's interpretation is hard and violent [forced]. For who ever spoke thus, as to say, "he shall be saved, but so, as [it were] by fire," for [meaning] this, "he shall be tormented by eternal fire, nor ever consumed by it"? What, then, does that exception "But so" accomplish — which sounds [as if it means] that he shall be safe [saved] in some manner, yet not without torment? To me it becomes probable that Chrysostom in this place abused [the text] — not to contradict the exposition of the Latins (which perhaps he had not [even] seen), but to seize hence an occasion of deterring certain [men] who, at that time, believed — according to the dogma of Origen — that the punishments of gehenna would at some time have an end.

Annotation CCLX

"I command — not I, but the Lord — that the wife depart not from the husband; but if she depart, that she remain unmarried." — 1 Corinthians 7[:10-11]

[margin: Whether it be lawful for a husband to repudiate an adulterous wife, and for a wife an adulterous husband.]

Ambrose, bishop of Milan [Ambrosiaster], in the commentaries, sifting this passage, has two opinions not received by the Church: the first, that it is lawful for a man to dismiss an adulterous wife, and, while she lives, to take another; the second, that the rights of matrimony are unequal, and on that account it is not lawful for a wife to dismiss an adulterous husband, nor to depart from him. Both propositions he expresses in these words: "IT IS NOT permitted to a woman to marry [again], if, for the cause of [her husband's] fornication or apostasy, or if — lasciviousness illicitly impelling [him] — he seek the use of [his] wife [in an unnatural way]: because the inferior [the wife] does not altogether use this law [right], which the superior [the husband uses]. If, however, the man apostatize, or seek to invert [pervert] the use of [his] wife: the woman can neither marry another, nor return to him. And [that] 'the husband [is] not to dismiss the wife' —

but there is understood [as implied] 'except for the cause of fornication.' And therefore he did not subjoin, as concerning the woman, 'But if he depart, let him remain thus [unmarried]': because it is lawful for a man to take a wife, if he has dismissed a sinning [adulterous] wife;

[signature "Yy 2"; catchword "quia" → "because," continues on p. 540 (PDF 545).]

(printed p. 540 [PDF p. 545], verso — end of Ann. CCLX, then Ann. CCLXI–CCLXIII, on 1 Corinthians 7–14 (Jerome's Epitaph of Fabiola *and Augustine reject the divorce double standard; Cajetan and Ambrose of Compsa follow Ambrosiaster, whose first opinion Trent 24.7 condemned; then whether confession is necessary before communion — Cajetan says self-examination suffices, refuted by Ambrose of Compsa and condemned by Trent 13.6 [full text]; whether only apostle-written scriptures are canonical — Cajetan yes, Ambrose objects; and whether the Mass and public prayers should be in the vernacular — Cajetan for it, Ambrose of Compsa condemns it as a "Lutheran, nay diabolical" tradition, with Basil beginning a catena). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLX, from the catchword "quia":)

—because he [the husband] is not so bound by the law as the woman [is]." Of these opinions, the one which is the latter [second], Jerome reproves in the *Epitaph of Fabiola*, saying: "THE LORD commanded that the wife be not dismissed, except for the cause of fornication; and, if she has been dismissed, [that she] remain unmarried. Whatsoever is commanded to husbands, this consequently redounds to wives. For an adulterous wife is not to be dismissed [while] an adulterous husband is to be retained. For with us [in the Christian law], [that] which is not lawful for women is equally not lawful for men; and the same servitude is reckoned by an equal condition." The same [thing] Augustine holds, [in] the first book *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 26. Following whose authority, the pontiffs, and all the scholastic theologians, decree that in the cause of divorce the condition of husband and wife is equal. The former opinion, too, was lately condemned in the ecumenical Council of Trent, session 24, canon 7 — concerning which we have written copiously above, [in] Annotation 81 of this book.

Thomas Cajetan, in the exposition of this passage, follows the former opinion of Ambrose [Ambrosiaster]. See [there] in the same place.

Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, in the commentaries, expounding these [words], embraces the same opinion. See [there] in the same place.

Annotation CCLXI

"But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread." — 1 Corinthians 11[:28]

[margin: Whether before communion it is necessary to confess [one's] sins.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries on this passage: "PAUL," he says, "by saying 'And so,' signifies that, for taking the Eucharist not unworthily, it suffices that a man have proved himself." And hence an argument is drawn: that it is not necessary, simply and absolutely, that a man be proved [approved] by a confessor to this [end], that he take the Eucharist not unworthily. **Ambrose of Compsa**, [in] the fifth book of the *Annotations*, reproves the man [Cajetan], because both here he hinted, and in the *Summula on Sins* wrote more openly, that it is not necessary that one conscious to himself of mortal sin confess it before the reception of the Eucharist, even if he have the opportunity of a confessor. Which assertion the same Ambrose refutes by a long disputation, as a matter too dangerous. But the Synod of Trent, session 13, canon six, condemns the same error in these words: "LEST so great a sacrament be taken unworthily, and therefore unto death and condemnation, the holy synod itself establishes and declares, that for those whom the conscience of mortal sin burdens — however much also they may esteem themselves contrite — the opportunity of

confession being had, sacramental confession must necessarily be premised [made beforehand]. But if anyone shall have presumed to teach, preach, or pertinaciously assert the contrary, or even to defend [it] by disputing publicly: let him, by that very [fact], be excommunicate."

Annotation CCLXII

"God has set in the Church first apostles." — 1 Corinthians 12[:28]

[margin: Whether only the scriptures approved by the apostles are canonical.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries: "As the SUPREME members," he says, "he explains the Apostles. For to them looks the universal governance of the Church, not only by word and action, but also by scripture. Whence

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXII, then Ann. CCLXIII:)

—only [those things] written by the Apostles, or approved by them, have the authority of sacred scripture." **Ambrose** [of Compsa], [in] the first book of the *Annotations*, says that the last part of this opinion is opposed to the authority of the Church — which receives, as canonical, certain scriptures which it is not established were either published by the Apostles, or ever approved by them, and places [them] among the sacred volumes.

Annotation CCLXIII

"If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is without fruit. But how shall he who supplies the place of the unlearned say 'Amen' to thy blessing? — since he knows not what thou sayest." — 1 Corinthians 14[:14-16]

[margin: Whether the Mass and public prayers ought to be said in the vernacular tongue.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries: "FROM THIS doctrine of Paul," he says, "it is held that it is better for the edification of the Church that the public prayers, which are said in the hearing of the people, be said in a tongue common to the clerics and the people, than [that they] be said in Latin." This opinion **Ambrose of Compsa**, [in] the book of *Annotations*, condemns in these words: "I MARVELED that Cajetan was not deterred by the fruit [outcome] of a tradition of this kind — which was first devised by Luther, nay by the devil, speaking in Luther; who, by this cunning, has now made plebeian and rude men [into] theologians, and has so far advanced [it], that those who, in their [own] ignorance, were easily upheld in the faith of the Church, have now, in that wisdom of their own, miserably fallen from the bosom of Christ. That this counsel, therefore, comes not from the Spirit of truth, this was argument enough — that it proceeded from those who are driven by the spirit of error. But [as to] that which the Apostle desires — that [those things] which are brought forth in the churches be understood — he does not compel [us] to believe that they must be understood by all: for there is no detriment [in the fact] that individuals cannot answer 'Amen' upon the blessing. For the Church wisely provides, that the ministers answer in the stead of the whole people: nay, this is [that] which the Apostle there says, when he subjoins, 'How shall he who supplies the place of the unlearned, or the untaught, say "Amen" upon thy blessing?' Behold, [it means] that there were [those] who supplied the place of the common folk, and answered — [those] who had to understand the [things] which were being said. That, therefore, was rather to be blamed: that not only they who supply the place of the unlearned, for the most part understand not what is prayed; but also, very often, not even the presbyters themselves, or the deacons, who pray or read [understand]. But here there is an abuse, and [something] contrary to that which the ecclesiastical canons too enjoin — which [abuse] certainly ought to be amended."

THESE [things] Ambrose [says] against the opinion of Cajetan: to whom **Basil**, **Chrysostom**, and **Theophylact** seem, in a certain manner, to have said similar [things], in the subjoined opinions.

Basil, in the book of *Questions from various passages of Scripture*, question 278, speaks thus: "HOW does the spirit of someone, as Paul says, pray, but the mind is fruitless? I answer: this was said of those who utter prayers in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For since the words of the prayer are unknown to those present, the mind of the one praying is fruitless, since no one takes utility [profit from it]: but when those present have understood the

[catchword "ratio-" (orationem) → "prayer," continues on p. 541 (PDF 546).]

(printed p. 541 [PDF p. 546], recto — end of Ann. CCLXIII, then Ann. CCLXIIII, on 1 Corinthians 14–15 (Chrysostom hom. 35 = Basil, and Theophylact; Sixtus's defense of the Latin liturgy — Basil and Chrysostom speak of preaching, not the Mass; "the unlearned" [idiota] = the minister who answers "Amen" for the illiterate church [with the Greek], so the vernacularists cannot use these fathers to overturn the ancient tradition; the Church keeps the apostolic languages for reverence and against profanation; see Eck; then whether souls are blessed before judgment day — Chrysostom, hom. 39 on 1 Cor. & hom. 28 on Hebrews, seems to fall into the Armenian/Anabaptist error that the saints' souls do not yet enjoy heavenly beatitude but wait, crowned all together at the end, in Abraham's bosom). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLXIII, from the catchword "ratio-":)

—prayer, able to profit the hearers; then he who prays has fruit, in that those who take utility are rendered better."

Chrysostom, [in] the thirty-fifth homily on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, writes [things] consonant with Basil, saying: "BY 'the UNLEARNED [idiota]' he calls the promiscuous [common] people, and shows [that] it is no light inconvenience, if [one] cannot say 'Amen.' But [that] which he says is of this kind: If thou give thanks in a foreign tongue, which thou thyself neither understandest, nor interpretest to the rest — the plebeian [common man] cannot subjoin 'Amen': and, hearing that 'unto the ages of ages,' which is the end of the prayers, he will not say 'Amen.'"

Theophylact, in the commentaries, repeats these same words of Chrysostom.

THOSE who maintain that the sacred masses, psalms, hymns, and other prayers are to be recited in the churches in the vernacular tongue of each nation — that they may be understood by the whole multitude of the people — are wont to use these authorities. To whom it must be answered [that] Basil speaks not of those who recite psalms, or prayers, or masses in the temple [church], but of those who, in the church, hold [give] orations to the people, and make words concerning sacred matters. For this, with him, is "to pray": [namely] also "to speak to the assembly." So also Chrysostom, by that [one] whom Paul calls "the unlearned," understands not the promiscuous [common] people, as the Latin interpreter [translator] renders [it], but the ecclesiastical minister, who supplies the place of the unlearned [and] not-understanding [people], and answers "Amen" for the whole church of the illiterate. This [minister] Chrysostom calls "layman" — that is, "of the people," or "plebeian" — saying: Ἰδιώτην ἢ ... Λαϊκὸν λέγει ["He says 'unlearned,' or rather 'layman'"]. Since, therefore, from the opinions of these authors it cannot be gathered that the sacred liturgies, and the other divine praises, are to be pronounced in the peculiar [particular] speech of each nation, [those] are justly to be condemned who, on the authority of those [fathers], endeavor to overturn and abrogate the most ancient tradition of the Church — not only received by long custom, but also confirmed by prudent reason. For it seemed [good] to the pastors of the Church, that the offices of the masses and of the divine praises be celebrated especially in those languages in which they were first published by their authors — namely, by the holy Apostles, and their disciples and successors — both on account of the exceptional observance [reverence] which is owed to them, and on account of the greater veneration of the sacred mysteries: lest profane and impure men be able, in the marketplace and at the crossroads, to deride the oracles of the divine scripture and the mystical words of the sacraments — [things] worthy of all reverence

and silence — and to turn [them] into mockery. But if anyone, not content enough with these, should desire to know still other causes of this matter, John Eck [Ecckius] is to be read by him, [in] title 37 of the *Commonplaces*.

Annotation CCLXIIII

"If in this life only we are hoping in Christ, we are more miserable than all men." — 1 Corinthians 15[:19]

[margin: Whether souls are blessed before the day of judgment.]

Chrysostom, [in] the 39th homily on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, seems to slip into the error of the Armenians and the Anabaptists — who say that no soul, before the day of judgment, will be blessed with that felicity of beatitude which is placed in the intuition [vision] of the divine essence. For there, weighing the inference,

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXIIII:)

—the ratiocination proposed by the Apostle, he says that it takes its force from this: that it is necessary that the soul, as long as it has been separated from the body, remain outside the felicity of heavenly glory. His opinion, expressed word for word, is this: "WHAT sayest thou, [O] Paul? Would trust [confidence] alone survive, if the body be not raised up? Or would the mind not survive? It would: and [would be] immortal indeed. But although it be six-hundred-times [thoroughly] immortal, as indeed it is: yet without the flesh itself it will not enjoy those admirable goods, even as neither will it be punished with punishments. For all things shall be made manifest before the tribunal of Christ, Paul says, that each one may bear [receive that] which he has done through the body, whether good or evil. For if the body rise not, our soul will lie uncrowned, and will be outside the heavenly beatitude. Which indeed, if we concede [it], we shall then enjoy nothing at all there."

THIS opinion the same author delineates, with a longer compass of words and examples adduced, [in] homily 28 on the epistle to the Hebrews. Where, when he unfolded that clause from the eleventh chapter — *[margin: Hebrews 11.g]* "These received not the reward [promise], lest without us they should be consummated [perfected]," etc. — he brought forth these [things]: "'NOT YET,' says the Apostle, 'have they received the reward, but they still remain; and, thus dead, and in so great tribulation, they have not yet received the reward. So much time have they, since they conquered; and yet they have not received [it]. But you, set in the contest, are affected with grief. Understand, you also, of what kind and how great [a thing] it is [for] Abraham to sit, and to await the Apostle Paul — until thou too art consummated, that they may then be able to receive the reward. For unless we too have come thither, the Savior foretold to them that he would not give the reward. As a good father, a lover of [his] children, says to [his] upright and genuine children, who are finishing [their] work, that he will not give [them] to eat, unless the other brethren too have come. But art thou anxious, because thou dost not yet receive the reward? What, then, shall Abel do, who conquered before us, and yet sits without a crown? What Noah? what the rest of those times, who await thee and the others who are to be after thee? Seest thou that in this we surpass them? For concerning us, Paul says, God provided better, lest they should seem to have anything more than us, if they were crowned first, before us. He defined one time of all the crowns: and he who conquered so many years before, shall receive the crown together with thee. Dost thou contemplate the divine care and love? He did not say, "Lest without us they should be crowned," but, "Lest without us they should be consummated." They forestalled these [later ones] in the contests; but they shall not forestall [them] in the crowns. Nor did God on that account do them injury, but honored us: for the brethren themselves also gladly await us. For if we are all one body, the more is the joy of the body made from this — when it is crowned together and in common, and not by parts [piecemeal]. For indeed the just are, even in this, admirable: that, as over [their] own goods, so they rejoice also over the

goods of [their] brethren. Wherefore also in them this proceeds according to [their] wish: that they be crowned with [their] brethren. For to be glorified together is a great joy,'" etc.

THESE [things] Chrysostom [says] concerning the state of the holy souls without the body. But concerning the place in which those souls, not yet crowned, are detained, the same [Chrysostom], in the commentaries on Paul, seems to indicate that this is the

[signature "Yy 3"; catchword "sinum" → "bosom [of Abraham]," continues on p. 542 (PDF 547).]

(printed p. 542 [PDF p. 547], verso — end of Ann. CCLXIIII, then Ann. CCLXV, on 1 Corinthians 15 (Chrysostom's texts placing the saints' souls in the "bosom of Abraham" / holy vestibule until the general resurrection — abused by Cornelius Agrippa [Anabaptist] to deny the beatific vision before judgment day, but Sixtus answers with the other *Chrysostom texts [Wisdom 5, Antioch 69, Rom. 16 & 32, Phil. 4, the homily on the cross and the Good Thief] showing the saints see God "face to face" at once — the reconciliation deferred to Ann. 345; then whether all men are to die — Chrysostom, hom. 42, reads the Greek variant "we shall not all sleep, but all be changed," joined by a catena of Greek fathers). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLXIIII, from the catchword "sinum":)

—[of Abraham's] bosom. Since indeed [in] the seventh homily upon that [text] from the fifth chapter to the Hebrews, "Let us therefore draw near with confidence," etc., he thus declares: "LET no one now despair of himself. Then will be the time of despair, when the bridal-chamber has been closed, when the King has entered to see those reclining [at table], when they have come to the bosom of Abraham who have been made worthy of it. But now the contest still remains, still the palm hangs [in the balance]." And [in] the thirty-third homily to the people of Antioch, he says: "ALMSGIVING does not permit us to fall down thither, where that rich man [is], nor to hear those dreadful words; but leads us down into the bosom of Abraham." And [in] homily 53 on Matthew: "MERCY," he says, "does not suffer us to be thrust down thither, where that rich man is tormented; but leads [us], by a sure road, into the bosom of Abraham." And [in] the fortieth homily on Genesis: "HEAR," he says, "that all the just, from that time of Abraham until now, and until the consummation of Abraham himself, do the work of prayer, that they may meet [Abraham] in the bosom of the patriarch." Nay, in others of his sermons he is wont sometimes to call the same place τῶν ἱερῶν προθύρων [tôn hierôn prothýr■n] — that is, "the holy vestibule," or "the vestibules of the saints" — this appellation being taken, as the Greeks believe, from the occasion of this: that souls tarry there after the likeness of those who, before the doors of princes, in the vestibules of the palaces, wait to be admitted into the inner [parts] of the palaces, to the sight of the prince. Whence also [in] homily 24 on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians he thus pronounces: "IF we migrate hence fortified by the sacrifice of the Eucharist, we shall ascend the holy vestibule with the greatest confidence, as [if] covered on every side with golden garments."

BY these testimonies of Chrysostom, **Cornelius Agrippa**, a follower of the Anabaptists, [in] the third book *On the Occult Philosophy*, endeavors to build up [the notion] that the pious souls of the dead lack the vision of the Godhead until the day of judgment. Which [notion], how far it stands off from the mind of Chrysostom, the subjoined passages of the same holy man testify — which most openly proclaim that the souls of the saints, immediately when they have migrated from this life, obtain the glory of the divine sight [conspectus].

[In] **the homily upon that [text of] the fifth [chapter] of Wisdom, "The souls of the just are in the hand of God,"** etc.: "THE JUST," he says, "translated into another life, are blessed — because they have gone to Christ, and nearer to the King, not by [an act of] approach and by faith, but face to face." And [in] the 69th homily to the people of Antioch: "THE JUST," he says, "when they have migrated hence, are altogether happy: for they have passed over to Christ. There they are with the King; and there [they are] more, and more

nearly [present], not through an entering-in, not through faith, but face to face." [In] homily 16 on the epistle to the Romans: "DEATH," he says, "does not separate us from Christ, but rather joins [us] to that choir which is with Christ, and makes [us] obtain that glory." And [in] homily 32 on the epistle to the Romans: "LET US hear the voice of Paul: that, after we have departed hence, we may merit to see this athlete. For there we shall altogether see him — though not standing near [him]: yet we shall see [him] near to the resplendent royal throne, where the Cherubim glorify God, where the Seraphim fly: there we shall see Paul, existing in the choir of the saints; and we shall enjoy there a genuine love." *[margin: Philippians 1.]* [In] the fourth homily to the Philippians upon that [text], "What I should choose I know not," etc., he writes thus: "WHAT sayest thou, [O] Paul? When, departing hence, [thou art] about to migrate into

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLXIIII, then Ann. CCLXV:)

—heaven itself, and to be with Christ, art thou ignorant what thou oughtest to choose?" And [in] the homily on the cross and the thief he speaks in this manner: "PARADISE, closed to us for five thousand years and more, Christ this day laid open, and led the Thief into paradise, and showed the pleasant places of it; and at one time we have seen two benefits granted — one, that paradise was laid open; the other, that the Thief merited to be led into it. This present day has restored to us [our] ancient fatherland, has shown [us our] paternal city, has given back [our] former home." And, lest thou think Chrysostom to be speaking of the earthly paradise, he added these [things] after some [others]: "IT was no injury to Christ, entering [his] sacred fatherland, to make the Thief a partaker of his entrance: for he led him along with himself — not defiling paradise by the treading feet of the thief, but conferring honor on paradise. For when he led in publicans and fornicators to the kingdom of the heavens, he did not defame the kingdom of the heavens; but rather amplified [it] with [greater] honors — showing that such a one is the Lord of the kingdom of the heavens, who has made even unworthy persons to be so far bettered, that they merited even the glory of that dignity." And a little below he adds: "THOU hast seen the thief, and the thief: both of a thievish life; but a like outcome does not rule over [befall] them: the one merited, by hereditary right, the beatitude of heaven; the other was being sent to gehenna, and to punishment."

THE interpretation of the passages of Chrysostom which disagree [dissent] from these last passages, seek below, [in] Annotation 345 — where thou hast a catalog of the authors who, on this article, have brought forth ambiguous [conflicting] opinions.

Annotation CCLXV

"We shall all indeed rise, but we shall not all be changed." — 1 Corinthians 15[:51]

[margin: Whether all men are to die.]

Chrysostom, [in] homily 42 on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, reads this passage in an almost contrary sense, in this manner: πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα — that is, "We shall not all indeed sleep [die], but we shall all be changed." Which sentence he so expounds, that he asserts [that] not all are to die, writing these [things]: "WE shall not all die, yet we shall all be changed — even those who do not die: for although [they are] mortal. Lest, therefore, if it happen [thee] to die," he says, "thou be terrified on that account, as [one who is] not going to rise again: for there are certain [men], there are [those] who will even escape this [dying]: for whom, however, this will not suffice unto that resurrection, but it will nonetheless be needful that those bodies, [though] not yet dead, be also changed, and attain incorruptibility."

Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, in the little commentaries on the Apostle, applies the same exposition in this place.

Diodore, bishop of Tarsus, in the explanation of this epistle, has the same.

Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, in the commentaries on the Apostle, explains [it] in the same manner.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, has this same [thing].

Theophylact, bishop of Bulgaria, [has] the same.

[catchword "OECV-" (Oecumenius) → continues on p. 543 (PDF 548).]

(printed p. 543 [PDF p. 548], recto — end of Ann. CCLXV, then Ann. CCLXVI, on 1 Corinthians 15:51 (Oecumenius; the contrary "we shall all sleep, but not all be changed" [Vulgate] reading — Origen, Acacius of Caesarea, Didymus, Ambrosiaster, Augustine City of God *20.20, Ambrose of Compsa; both readings ruled catholic, Jerome leaving the choice to the reader; then* ***whether the writings of heretics may be read*** *— Jerome's defense ["test all, hold the good"; the money-changer], the heretics' [Oecolampadius's] appeal to Jerome, Theophilus of Alexandria [Socrates, HE], and Dionysius of Alexandria, and Sixtus's reply: never absolutely forbidden, only without a superior's leave — especially for the unlearned — the 4th Council of Carthage canon 17 permitting learned faithful bishops). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXV, from the catchword "OECV-":)

Oecumenius, in the *Collectanea* of explanations on Paul, writes similarly.

On the contrary, there are other ancient commentators who read this sentence of Paul thus: πάντες μὲν κοιμηθησόμεθα, ἀλλὰ οὐκ πάντες ἀλλαγησόμεθα — that is, "We shall all indeed sleep [die], but not all shall be changed." Which reading, indeed, differs little from the scripture of the Vulgate of our edition — nay, renders the same sense; because, if all shall sleep, all also shall rise. But those who, according to this reading, assert that all are to die, and afterward to rise again, are these, namely:

Origen, in the third volume [book] on Paul's epistle to the Thessalonians, expounding that [text], "We who are alive, and who remain."

Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, in book 4 of the *Select Questions*.

Didymus of Alexandria, in the commentary on the first epistle to the Corinthians.

Ambrose, bishop of Milan [Ambrosiaster], in the same place.

Augustine, *On the City of God*, book twenty, chapter 20.

Ambrose of Compsa, in the commentary on the present epistle, writes that Chrysostom — deceived by a false reading, since he had not exactly considered the matter — adhered to the former opinion, which he [Ambrose] says is both false and dangerous, and can be upheld only perversely. But, among the Greeks, Oecumenius, and among the Latins the author of the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas* [Gennadius], and Augustine, [in] the third question to Dulcitius, pronounce [that] those are equally catholic who follow either that reading and opinion or this. Jerome, in the epistle to Minervius and Alexander, sets [it] in the arbitrament [choice] of the reader, that he choose of these [readings] whichever he himself shall prefer.

Annotation CCLXVI

"We shall all indeed rise, but we shall not all be changed." — 1 Corinthians 15[:51]

[margin: Whether the writings of heretics are to be read.]

Jerome, in the epistle to Minervius and Alexander, when he had brought forward several expositions of the ancients for the explanation of this clause, at last, excusing himself — because in these he had enumerated even the opinions of heretics, and had read their condemned writings — added these [things]: "IF anyone murmurs [complains], why I read the explanations of those with whose dogmas I do not acquiesce; let him know that I gladly hear that [word] of the Apostle, *[margin: 1 Thess. 5.d (printed "2 Thess.")]* 'Test all

things: [that] which is good, retain'; and the words of the Savior, saying, 'Be ye approved money-changers' — so that if any coin is adulterate, and has not the [right] figure, nor is stamped with the public mint, it be rejected; but [that coin] which bears the face of Christ with a clear light, be laid up in the purse of our heart. *[margin: Matthew 22.b]* I profess, both in adolescence and in extreme [old] age, that both Eusebius and Origen were most learned men, but erred in the truth of [their] dogmas: which we can say also of Theodore, Acacius, and Apollinaris: and yet all left us a monument of their sweat [toil] in the explanations of the scriptures. In the earth gold is sought, and from the beds of rivers the shining gravel is brought forth. And Pactolus [the golden river] is richer in mire than in stream. Why do my friends tear me; and against [me who am] silent do the coarse swine grunt? My purpose is to read the ancients, to test each thing, to retain the [things] which are good, and not to depart from the faith of the catholic Church."

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXVI:)

FROM these words of Jerome, **Oecolampadius**, and very many other heretics of our times, gather that the reading of the volumes of heretics was unjustly forbidden by the Roman pontiffs, against the judgment of many most grave fathers, who held that the lucubrations [writings] of heretics are to be read — both for the understanding of the scriptures, and on account of the varied erudition of many matters which is not had among the catholics. And among other fathers they bring forward **Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria**; who, although in the synod of the Hebdomon, together with the other bishops who were present, he had damned all the volumes of Origen, and, by writings also published, had publicly confuted [them]: yet never left off the reading of them. And when he was asked by [his] friends why he again embraced those books which he had before rejected, **Socrates**, in [his] book of the *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter 17, relates that he answered in this manner: "The books of Origen are like a meadow adorned with flowers of every kind. And so, if I find anything good in them, I excerpt it: but if anything thorny appear, this I pass over as [something] prickly."

To this testimony of Theophilus they add the authority of **Dionysius the martyr, and bishop of the same church** [Alexandria]; who, long before him, concerning the reading of heretics' books, had written thus, word for word, in an epistle to Philemon, a Roman presbyter: "BUT I, indeed, have read even the commentaries and traditions of heretics — defiling my mind, for a little [while], with their most impure thoughts; yet taking thence this [much] of utility, that I may refute them before my own [judgment], and abominate [them] much more. And when I was forbidden by a certain brother presbyter, who feared lest I should be wrapped up in the mire of the malice of those writings, whence my soul might perish — [and] who, as I perceived, spoke truly: a certain vision was divinely offered to me, which strengthened me; and a discourse [word] made to me plainly commanded, saying: 'Read all things which come into thy hands. For thou shalt be able to weigh and to prove all things. And hence there was given to thee, at the beginning, an occasion [of confirming thy] faith.' I accepted this vision as conformable to the Apostolic voice, saying to the [more] powerful, 'Be ye approved dispensers.'" These, then, are the [things] which are brought forward by Oecolampadius for the defense of the reading of heretics.

TO WHICH we answer, that it was neither by the Roman pontiffs, nor ever by any synod, altogether and utterly forbidden, that the writings of heretics be read; but [only forbidden] that they be read without the concession [permission] of superiors — but especially by the unlearned, who could easily be deceived by their reading, and even by the learned, whom no necessity of reading of this kind pressed. For the Fourth Council of Carthage, [in] canon 17, grants to bishops conspicuous for erudition and faith the reading of heretics' volumes — that they may the more easily recognize their snares, and more forcibly confute [them]. Wherefore all — whether unlearned or learned — sin most gravely, who, without the knowledge and authority of superiors, read the books rejected by the Church, but especially [those] led to it by no necessity. Nor do the sayings and examples of Dionysius, Theophilus, and Jerome in any way excuse them, since on both sides the case between those [fathers] and these [heretics] is far unequal. For those were men everywhere learned, and most constant in the sincerity of the faith. Today Chri-

[catchword "Chri-" (Christiani) → continues on p. 544 (PDF 549).]

(printed p. 544 [PDF p. 549], verso — end of Ann. CCLXVI, then Ann. CCLXVII, on 1 Corinthians 15–16 (Sixtus concludes the "reading heretics" question — today's Christians are mostly unlearned and easily misled, unlike the early Church which read heretics from necessity; now we have abundant orthodox commentaries, and Trent forbids all heretical writings under anathema [the Index]; then whether the living or the dead may be anathematized — Chrysostom's homily On the Anathema *seems to forbid anathematizing anyone, even heretics, but Sixtus reconciles it: Chrysostom aimed it at rash unlearned laymen who anathematize what they don't understand, not at the Church's lawful anathema — and answers the heretics' two-horned dilemma against excommunication). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXVI, from the catchword "Chri-":)

—the common crowd of Christians is, for the greater part, unlearned, and is turned about by every wind of new doctrine. Those [ancients], since they were not far distant from the beginning of the nascent Church and from the Apostolic school, were compelled — on account of the scarcity of catholic interpreters — to consult the commentaries of heretics, that thence they might draw explanations of many parts of the divine scripture which the orthodox doctors had either not yet attempted, or not yet touched happily [successfully] enough. But we, since we abound with so many innumerable pious and most learned commentaries of ancient and recent doctors, and in these have all and each of the parts of both testaments explained far more truly, more learnedly, and more elegantly than in the books of heretics — of what pardon shall we be worthy, if, the purest fountains of doctrine being left, we search after the marshy and deadly waters of the heretics? Those [ancients], in fine, were kept back from the reading of heretics' volumes by no sanction of a general synod: [but] we, by the authority of many councils, and lastly by the decree of the ecumenical Synod of Trent, under the animadversion [penalty] of anathema, are commanded to abstain altogether from all heretical writings. See some [things] which pertain to this argument, [in] book 2, under the entry [dictio] "Curious Arts," and under the entry "Sennacherib," and [in] book 4, under "Julian, bishop of Eclanum."

Annotation CCLXVII

"If any love not our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema." — 1 Corinthians 16[:22]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to strike either the living or the dead with anathema.]

Chrysostom, in the homily which is inscribed *On the Anathema*, on the occasion of this sentence, seems to assert, and by a long discourse to demonstrate, that neither the living nor the dead are to be struck with anathema, even if they have been heretics. His words are these: "THE APOSTLES were exceedingly diligent in refuting and casting out heresies, but in applying this penalty of anathema to none of the heretics. Moreover, the Apostle brings forth this word in two places only, as [it were] compelled, nor even does he aim it at a certain and determinate person. For to the Corinthians he writes, 'If any love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.' *[margin: Galatians 1.b]* And, 'If anyone shall have evangelized to you beside that which you received, let him be anathema.' Why, therefore, dost thou dare to do [that] which none of those who received the power dared either to do or to declare — [thou], plainly an adversary of the Lord's death, and forestalling the judgment of the King?" And below: "'HE has been made a heretic,' they say, 'he has an indwelling devil, *[margin: 2 Tim. 2.d]* he speaks injustice against God, he leads away many into the deep of perdition by the efficacious persuasion and deception of his eloquence.' Surely Paul, refuting these [men], says, 'Teach in mildness, instructing those who resist; if perhaps God may give them repentance to acknowledge the truth, that they may recover [themselves] from the snares of the devil, [by whom they are] held captive at his will.' Extend the net of charity, that the halting [one] be not subverted, but rather be healed." And below: "HE whom thou hast decreed to anathematize either lives, and still survives in this

mortal life, or is dead. But if he still survives, thou actest impiously, who cruelly cuttest off him who can turn himself from evil to good; if he is dead, thou art much more cruel. Why so? Because he stands or falls to his own Lord, being no longer under human right." And after a few [words]: "FOR this cause I beseech you, lest these words fall away

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXVII:)

—from your mind. For it behooves [us] to refute and anathematize the dogmas — [those] which have proceeded from heretics: but men are to be spared, and prayer [is to be made] for their salvation."

THESE sayings of Chrysostom seem to fight against the power of the apostolic Church, which by the authority of Christ inflicts the penalty of excommunication not only on the living, but sometimes even on the deceased — especially heretics: concerning whose excommunication after death there is extant a determination of the fifth Synod of Constantinople, in the pontifical decrees, causa 24, question 2, the last chapter. Moreover, since in so many places Chrysostom defends the authority of ecclesiastical excommunication, it is not probable that, [his] sentence being changed, he willed to condemn it in this place. But this is rather to be believed: that he brought forth this homily against certain rash and unlearned [men], who — although they were neither pastors of the Church, nor had any power of excommunicating — yet, led by hatred and contention, rashly damned dogmas not understood by them, together with their authors, and marked [them] with anathema. This the very words of Chrysostom sufficiently openly indicate, *[margin: See Chrysostom, hom. 5 on Timothy, hom. 15 on the first [epistle] to the Corinthians, and hom. 4 on Hebrews.]* being in this manner: "BEHOLD, I watch men who hold no genuine sense from the sacred letters — nay, nothing at all of the sacred letters; and, to pass over most [things], I do not blush to call [them] furious, trifling, contentious, who neither know [the things] which they say, nor [the things] concerning which they affirm — bold in this one [thing] only, that they set up dogmas, and declare anathema on those [things] which they most ignore. Hence it is that we are a mockery to outsiders, and to the enemies of our faith." And below: "HO! who [art] thou of such authority, who usurpest to thyself so great a power of anathematizing? Why dost thou assume so great a dignity, which was communicated to the Apostles only, and to those who are fit successors of them?" etc.

BUT there still remains that dilemma of Chrysostom, which the heretics of our times object against the ecclesiastical discipline of anathema: namely, Either he whom thou anathematizest lives, or has died: if he lives, thou actest impiously, who cuttest off from the body of the Church him who can be converted: but if he has died, thou art much more cruel, who strivest to inflict a penalty upon him who is not under human right. To the former part of the dilemma, therefore, it must be answered that Chrysostom, by that saying, condemns not the penalty of anathema, by which the Church coerces the living, but the impious mind of those who perverted the pious and ecclesiastical end of anathema. For since the Church uses excommunication with a certain pious affection, as [with] a salutary medicine — that he who is marked with that ignominy may acknowledge his fault, and, [as] a suppliant, return to the Church whence he had been cast out — those cruel men anathematized the living to this end: that they might cast them out of the Church irrevocably, [as] not to be received unto repentance any further. Rightly, therefore, Chrysostom, refuting cruelty of this kind, says, "Thou actest impiously, who cruelly cuttest off him who can turn himself from evil to good."

TO the other part of the dilemma it is answered similarly: that Chrysostom refutes those same impious and unlearned [men], because they anathematized the dead, with a sense and intention plainly diverse from the ecclesiastical tradi-

[catchword "tione" (traditione) → "tradition," continues on p. 545 (PDF 550).]

(printed p. 545 [PDF p. 550], recto — end of Ann. CCLXVII, then Ann. CCLXVIII, and the head of CCLXIX, on 2 Corinthians 8 & Galatians 1 (the anathema of dead heretics only declares them

already-excommunicate, denying burial to deter the living; then whether the Eucharist must be given under both species to the laity — Chrysostom hom. 18 on 2 Cor., Calvin, Jerome on Malachi, and Gelasius's Comperimus, *all abused by the Lutherans; Sixtus's threefold distinction and the condemnations — Basel sess. 30, Constance sess. 13, and Trent sess. 21 canons 1–3 [full text]; then whether Peter was superior in dignity to Paul — Jerome on Galatians). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXVII, from the catchword "tione":)

—[from the ecclesiastical] tradition. Since indeed the pastors of the Church, when they pronounce anathemas upon those who have departed from this life in heresy, do not act [as] if they then for the first time willed to excommunicate, and to exclude the souls of heretics from the communion of the faithful souls resting in Christ. For those [souls], already before — both when they lived in [their] bodies, and when they migrated from [their] bodies — had been bound by the same bond of anathema by which the Church of God has bound all heretics; and immediately, when they went out from the body, they were delivered into the kingdom and power of the devil. When, therefore, the pastors of the Church anathematize heretics after death, they do not then for the first time excommunicate their souls, but — because they migrated in the pertinacity of error — pronounce them already excommunicated, and excluded from the assembly of the faithful souls; and their corpses and ashes, for the more evident demonstration of that matter, they keep far from ecclesiastical burial — not that they may harm those who have died, but that, by that aspect of demonstration, they may deter the living from heresies. This ecclesiastical rite of anathematizing the dead, therefore, Chrysostom does not disapprove; but he accuses those unskilled and raging [men], who — as [if] they had a right even over the dead — thought that by their anathemas they dislodged the souls of the deceased from the place of rest and the state of salvation, and cast [them] down into the place of eternal damnation. Restraining the insane fury of these, Chrysostom says that they are the crudest of all, because they desired to exercise savagery even upon those who were not under human right.

Annotation CCLXVIII

"Show ye, therefore, the demonstration which is of your charity." — 2 Corinthians 8[:24]

[margin: Whether it is necessary to exhibit the Eucharist under both species to the laity.]

Chrysostom, [in] homily 18 on the second [epistle] to the Corinthians, seems to indicate that the Eucharist is to be exhibited to the laity under both species of bread and wine, saying thus: "BUT there is [a case] where the priest differs in nothing from the subject [layman] — as when the dreadful mysteries are to be enjoyed: for similarly all of us are deemed worthy to receive those [mysteries], not as in the old law, where the priest indeed ate part, but the people [another] part, and it was not lawful for the people to be partaker of those [things] of which the priest was partaker: but now [it is] not so; rather, one body is set before all, and one cup." **John Calvin**, [in] chapter 18 of his *Institutes*, strives to build up, by this sentence of Chrysostom, the dogma of the recent Greeks and Lutherans, who assert that the Eucharist under both species is necessarily to be delivered to all Christians. He confirms this also by a saying of Jerome: who, in the commentary on Malachi, chapter 2, says: "PRIESTS, who confect the Eucharist, and distribute the blood of the Lord to the people." To these he adds a decree of Pope Gelasius, which in the decrees of the pontiffs, distinction 2, chapter "Comperimus," is adduced in these words: "WE HAVE FOUND [Comperimus], that certain [persons], having taken only a portion of the sacred body, abstain from the chalice; who, without doubt (since they seem bound by I know not what superstition), let them either receive the whole [entire] sacraments, or be kept from the whole. For the division of this mystery is not admitted without grave sacrilege," etc. These, then, are the fathers of the Church whom Calvin has brought forward for the approval of a condemned dogma: who, although at first sight they seem to favor the recent

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLXVIII, then Ann. CCLXIX:)

—Greeks and the heretics of the new Lutheran sect, yet differ from both by a threefold distinction. For, first, [that] which Gelasius and very many other pontiffs enjoined — [namely] the taking of both portions of the sacrament — upon priests only, these [heretics] will [have] to be commanded to the laity also: [though] the title of his decree, in which priests only are comprehended, resists [this]; and some historians contradict [it], among whom Philip, author of the *Supplement of the Chronicle*, relates a sanction passed by Gelasius, by which it was provided that priests should neither consecrate the Eucharist under one species only, nor distribute [it] to the people under both species. Secondly, [that] which Chrysostom, Jerome, and certain other pastors of the churches conceded to the people out of indulgence and benign dispensation, these [heretics] have turned into a precept and obligation. Thirdly, [that] which those [fathers] either permitted or conceded before the Church had determined otherwise concerning that matter, these [heretics] — even after synodal and ecumenical prohibitions — so make necessary, that they define and decree, from God's precept and from necessity of salvation, that both species of the Eucharist are to be taken by all the faithful, and that they sin gravely who take one without the other. Wherefore these heretics were rightly condemned by the Council of Basel, session 30; the Council of Constance, session 13; and lately by the Council of Trent, session 21, canon first, second, and third, in these words:

1. "If anyone shall say that, from God's precept, or [from] necessity of salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to take both species of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist: let him be anathema.

2. "If anyone shall say that the holy catholic Church was not led by just causes and reasons that the laity, and also the clerics not confecting [the sacrament], should communicate under the species of bread only, or [shall say] that she erred in it: let him be anathema.

3. "If anyone shall deny that the whole and entire Christ, the fountain and author of all graces, is taken under the one species of bread — because (as indeed they falsely assert) [Christ] is not, according to his own institution, taken under both species: let him be anathema."

Annotation CCLXIX

"Paul, an Apostle, not from men, neither through man," etc. — Galatians 1[:1]

[margin: Whether Peter was superior in dignity to Paul and the rest of the apostles.]

Jerome, beginning the commencement of the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians from the exposition of this title [heading], seems to hold that Peter was not superior to Paul in authority and dignity, writing thus: "IT can be taken obliquely against Peter and against the rest, that the gospel was handed to him [Paul] not by the Apostles, but by Jesus Christ himself, who had chosen both them and the Apostles. And all this he prepares for this [reason], that no one may be able to object to him — [as he is] disputing, against the burdens of the law, for the grace of the gospel — 'But Peter said this, but the Apostles established this, but thy predecessors decreed otherwise.' Which indeed, now preluding in what follows as [it were] by a hidden discourse, he makes more manifest, when he reckons that nothing was conferred on him by those who seem to be something. And he writes that he resisted Peter himself to the face, saying that he was compelled by no necessity, that he might not yield to the hypocrisy of the Jews." And below, expounding that [text], "The gospel I received not from man,"

[catchword "accepi" → "I received," continues on p. 546 (PDF 551).]

(printed p. 546 [PDF p. 551], verso — end of Ann. CCLXIX, then Ann. CCLXX–CCLXXI, on Galatians 1 (Jerome's texts seeming to equalize Peter with the apostles — the Galatians commentary, pseudo-Jerome, Against Jovinian, *the epistle to Evagrius — abused by Calvin against the papacy vs. the Council of Florence's primacy definition; Sixtus's resolution via a* ***threefold power in Peter*** *[Order, Apostolate, Kingdom/Rule]: in Order and Apostolate all the apostles/bishops are equal, but in the power of Rule Peter*

alone is head; then Jerome on election/reprobation from foreseen merits; and Chrysostom on Paul's modesty in going up "to see Peter" as to a greater and elder). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — continuing Annotation CCLXIX, from the catchword "accepi":)

—[I received], nor did I learn [it]," etc. — the same he repeats, saying: "IT CAN, moreover — as we said in the beginning, when we were expounding, 'Paul, an Apostle, not from men' — so also in the present place, be taken obliquely against Peter, and against the rest [who are] his predecessors, [namely] that he is moved by the authority of no one as [by] a law, [he] who has Christ alone [as] the preceptor of [his] gospel." Likewise, in other commentaries inscribed with his name, upon that [text] from chapter 2, "For he who wrought in Peter unto the apostleship," etc., speaking under the person of Paul, he says: "I am in nothing inferior to Peter, because we are both, by one God, ordained in [the] ministry." Again, [in] the first book against Jovinian, he seems to indicate that Peter is not greater than the rest of the Apostles, but has power equal with the rest, in these words: "THE CHURCH — although it be founded upon all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of the heavens, and the strength of the Church be established equally upon them — yet, on that account, one is chosen among the twelve, that, a head being constituted, the occasion of schism may be taken away. But why was John not chosen, [who was] a virgin? Deference was made to age [seniority]: because Peter was the elder; lest [one] still an adolescent, and almost a boy, should be preferred to men of advanced age. And the good Master, who ought to have removed the occasion of quarrel from [his] disciples, would seem to furnish a cause of envy against the adolescent [John] whom he had loved." Again, in the epistle to Evagrius, he seems to take away from the successors of Peter the power over other bishops, and to equal any bishop whatever to the Roman pontiff, writing in this manner: "THE Church of the city of Rome is not to be esteemed one [thing], [and] that of the whole world another. And the Gauls, and the Britains, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and India, and all the barbarous nations, adore one Christ, observe one rule of truth. If authority is sought, the world [orbis] is greater than the city [urbs]. Wheresoever there shall have been a bishop — whether at Rome, or at Gubbio, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at Alexandria, or at Tanis — he is of the same merit, of the same priesthood. The power of riches, and the humility of poverty, makes [a bishop] either more sublime or lower; but otherwise all are successors of the Apostles." These sayings of Jerome Calvin abuses, and the heretics of our times, against the primacy of Peter, and the primary power of the apostolic see and the Roman Church — the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence crying out against [them], whose decree, received by the common consent of all the Latins and Greeks, and promulgated in the last Session, runs thus: "We define that the holy apostolic see, and the Roman pontiff, hold primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church."

BUT if anyone unrolls the writings of Jerome, he will find that he, with a free and constant asseveration, preferred the faith, authority, and sentence of Peter and of his apostolic see to the judgment of all the churches — and that especially in the epistle to Pope Damasus, whose beginning is "Since the East," etc.; in the epistle to Pammachius; in the epistle to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria; in the invective against Rufinus; and in the dialogue against the Luciferians.

WHEREFORE, lest anyone judge that he wrote [things] fighting among themselves, it must be known that there was a threefold power in Peter — namely, of Order, of Apostolate,

(right column — concluding Annotation CCLXIX, then Ann. CCLXX–CCLXXI:)

—and of the Kingdom [Rule]. If we regard the Apostolate — that is, the office of teaching, and the care of evangelical preaching — Jerome rightly said, in the commentaries on the Galatians, that Paul was not inferior to Peter; because Paul was chosen for the evangelical office not by Peter, but by God, equally as Peter, that he himself might evangelize among the gentiles, as that one [Peter] among the Jews. But if we look to the power which is conferred in the sacrament of Order, Jerome skillfully pronounced, against

Jovinian, that all the Apostles equally received the keys and established the foundations of the Church. Most truly also he wrote to Evagrius that all bishops are equal: because all the Apostles were equal in the same order of priesthood, and in the same excellence of the sacrament; and all bishops [are] their successors — whether of Gubbio, or of Tanis, or of any lowlier little town — [and] are equal to the bishop of the city of Rome, namely in the order of the sacrament, and in the spiritual power of that same order. Finally, if the discourse be of the power of the Kingdom [Rule], and of that primary authority over all bishops and churches, Jerome most excellently wrote — against Jovinian, and against the Luciferians, and elsewhere — that Peter alone was chosen among the twelve Apostles, and constituted head of all, that by his supreme authority, and [his] power more eminent than the rest, the contentions of the Church might be settled, and every occasion of schisms taken away. We have annotated [things] akin to this argument further on, [in] Annotation 271.

Primasius, in the *Collectanea* on the first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, excerpted from the commentaries ascribed to Jerome this period: "HE who wrought in Peter unto the apostleship, wrought also in me among the gentiles. I am not inferior to him, because we are both, by one [God], ordained unto one ministry." The sense of this clause is plain from [the things] which have been said.

Annotation CCLXX

"But when it pleased him who separated me," etc. — Galatians 1[:15]

[margin: Election and reprobation from merits.]

Jerome, [in] the book on the epistle to the Galatians, [chapter] 1, upon these words, seems to hold that God neither chooses nor reprobates anyone except from the foreknowledge of merits, saying: "This comes to pass from the foreknowledge of God, that whom he knows [will be] just in the future, he loves before he rises from the womb: and whom he hates [as] a sinner before he sins — not that [there be iniquity] in [his] love," etc. See above, Annotation 251.

Annotation CCLXXI

"Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." — Galatians 1[:18]

[margin: Peter superior to the other apostles.]

Chrysostom, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, explaining this: "WHAT," he says, "could be more modest than the mind of Paul? After so many and such benefits [done], although he had no need of Peter, nor stood in want of him, but was equal [to him] in honor (for I will say nothing more here) — yet he went up as [it were] to a greater and elder [one]; and the sight of Peter alone moved him to set out thither." To the same sentence Chrysostom seems to allude [in] homily 18 on the epistle to the Romans, saying: "FOR neither, if God had been about to repel his people, would he have chosen Paul for himself out of the Israelites — to whom he would grant all preaching, to whom the affairs of the world, all the mysteries, and the universal dispensation." **Germa-**

[catchword "Germa-nus" (Germanus Brixius) → "Germain [de Brie]," continues on p. 547 (PDF 552).]

(printed p. 547 [PDF p. 552], recto — end of Ann. CCLXXI, then Ann. CCLXXII–CCLXXIIII and the head of CCLXXV, on Galatians 1–2 (Germain de Brie and Erasmus caution against these Chrysostom texts, but Sixtus answers that they concern the honor of apostolate, not primacy [Peter's monarchy in hom. 55 on Matthew]; James the Lord's brother = son of Joseph; Ambrosiaster on the Acts 15 precepts — only three genuine, "things strangled" added by Greek corrupters [Irenaeus 3.12]; then the famous ***Jerome–Augustine controversy*** *on Galatians 2:11 — whether Peter and Paul only* simulated *the Antioch dispute: Origen's two opinions and the great catena of Greek/Latin fathers who hold the simulation view, against Augustine, who*

insists the rebuke was real and even treats Peter harshly). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXXI, from the catchword "Germa-nus":)

—**Germain de Brie** [Germanus Brixius], the interpreter [translator] of Chrysostom's homilies on Paul, and **Erasmus**, the interpreter of the Chrysostomian commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, admonished [us] that these passages are to be read cautiously — judging, as I think, that from these the supreme power of Peter over all the Apostles is undermined [weakened]. But the very sense of the words, and the occasion, openly prove that Chrysostom here speaks not of the primary authority and jurisdiction of Peter over all the Apostles, and over the whole Church; but of the honor of the apostolate and the dignity of evangelical preaching, in which Paul was in nothing inferior to Peter. For, making mention of Peter's monarchy, [in] the 55th homily on Matthew, he says: "THE pastor and head OF THE CHURCH — which, so many and so great billows breaking in, remains immovable — is a fisherman-man." Hither pertain [the things] which thou hast [in] Annotation 269 of this book.

Annotation CCLXXII

"But [I saw none of the apostles], except James, the brother of the Lord." — Galatians 1[:19]

Ambrose [Ambrosiaster], in the commentaries on the present chapter, asserts that James the brother of the Lord was the son of Joseph. See above, Annotation 64 of this book.

Annotation CCLXXIII

"Lest perhaps I should run, or had run, in vain." — Galatians 2[:2]

[margin: On the four precepts of the apostles to those who [are] of the gentiles.]

Ambrose [Ambrosiaster], in the commentaries, under the exposition of this period, touching in passing upon that passage of Acts 15 — where it is read that the Apostles commanded the gentiles to abstain from four [things], namely, from things offered to idols, from fornication, from blood, and from what is strangled — admonishes that by the Apostles there were not prescribed [any] but three, and that the fourth was added by the Greek corrupters of that passage. His words run thus: "IN FINE, these three commands are found [to have been] given by the Apostles and the elders — [things] which the laws of the Romans are ignorant of: that is, that they keep themselves from idolatry, and from blood, as Noah [did], and from fornication. Which [three] the sophists of the Greeks, not understanding — yet knowing that [one] must abstain from blood — adulterated the scripture, adding a fourth command, that [one] must also abstain from what is strangled. Which [addition], I think, they will now, by God's nod, understand [to be superfluous], because it had already been said above [in the third precept, on blood] that which they added." How much is to be attributed to Ambrose in this part, let others see: certainly Irenaeus, [in] the book against heresies, the third, chapter 12, relates this passage, and does not add [any] mention of things strangled.

Annotation CCLXXIIII

"But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was reprehensible." — Galatians 2[:11]

[margin: Whether Peter and Paul used simulation, and whether by simulating they sinned.]

Origen, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, and in the tenth volume of the *Stromata*, sifting this passage, left two opinions, agitated by [his] successors with a long disputation. The former of these is, that Peter and Paul contended against one another with the greatest concord of mind — not by a true, but by a simulated [feigned] dissension — for the utility of the disciples: that, while Peter, rebuked by Paul's

simulated reproof concerning the simulation of the legal [observances], does not contradict, but keeps silent as [if] acknowledging his fault, those who thought the legal [observances] were to be kept might come to their senses, and might cease from the observance

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXIIII, then Ann. CCLXXV:)

—of the legal [observances]. The other opinion is, that neither of them sinned by simulating; because it is lawful — nay, even fitting — to use simulation in many matters, out of a pious zeal of helping. Both opinions of Origen all the below-written fathers follow:

Theodore, bishop of Heraclea, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **Eusebius, bishop of Emesa**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **Didymus of Alexandria**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **Chrysostom**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, and [in] book 1 *On the Priesthood*. **Jerome**, [in] the book on the epistle to the Galatians, [chapter] 1, and in the epistle to Augustine. **Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **Theophylact**, in the commentary on the epistle to the Galatians. **John Cassian**, [in] book 17 of the *Conferences*. **Oecumenius**, in the *Collectanea* of explanations on the Galatians.

These, then, are they who, in both opinions, agree with Origen.

Augustine, dissenting from these, affirms that Peter was reprehended by Paul not feignedly, but truly and justly — because the simulation, which he [Peter] had assumed as a remedy for his own nation [the Jews], was pressing toward the scandal and ruin of the Gentiles. Concerning this matter, although Augustine wrote learnedly and piously in three epistles to Jerome, and in other places also: yet he seems sometimes to treat Peter more harshly than is fair, hinting that Peter, by a certain superstitious and depraved simulation, willed to impose the legal burdens on the gentiles. For thus he declares in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians: "PETER, moreover, when he had come to Antioch, was rebuked by Paul — not because he kept the custom of the Jews, in which he had been born and brought up (although among the gentiles he did not keep it) — but he was rebuked because he willed to impose it on the gentiles." And in the book *On the Christian Combat*, chapter 30, mixing this simulation of Peter among his grave crimes, he says: "THE Catholic Church ought gladly to pardon her corrected children, because we see that pardon was granted to Peter himself — [Peter] bearing his [own] person — when he wavered in the sea; and when he carnally called the Lord back from the passion; and when he cut off the servant's ear with the sword; and when he thrice denied the Lord himself; and when he afterward lapsed into a superstitious simulation." And below, he says: "THESE the Catholic Church receives in [her] maternal bosom — as Peter, after the weeping of the denial, admonished by the crowing of the cock, or as the same [Peter], after the depraved simulation, corrected by the voice of Paul." I pass over, for the sake of brevity, the reasons and arguments brought forward on both sides by the defenders of either opinion. But whether it is lawful for a good man, for the sake of helping, either to lie or to simulate, thou hast above, [in] Annotation 107 of the fifth book.

Annotation CCLXXV

"I said to Cephas before all, If thou, being a Jew," etc. — Galatians 2[:14]

[catchword "OECV-" (Oecumenius) → continues on p. 548 (PDF 553).]

(printed p. 548 [PDF p. 553], verso — Ann. CCLXXV and CCLXXVI, on Galatians 2–3 (whether the Cephas rebuked by Paul was Peter the Apostle — Oecumenius, from Eusebius and Clement, says [no, one of the seventy], but Jerome strongly affirms it was Peter and warns against inventing a new Cephas to please Porphyry; then whether witches can bewitch infants [fascination / the evil eye] — Jerome and Virgil on the vulgar belief, Cornelius Agrippa's charge that the witch-inquisitors invented the calumny, and Sixtus's

defense of the scholastic account [a natural mode and a demonic mode], with a poem of Vida of Alba on a deadly-gazing old man, and Chrysostom [hom. 8 on Colossians] mocking the superstition while condemning those who flee to enchantresses). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCLXXV, from the catchword "OECV-":)

Oecumenius, in the *Collectanea* of explanations, in this place writes — from the opinion of Eusebius of Caesarea in the first [book] of the *Ecclesiastical History*, and of Clement of Alexandria in the fourth volume of the *Dispositions* [Hypotyposes] — that this Cephas, to whom Paul withstood to the face, was not Peter the Apostle, but some other of the seventy disciples of Christ, who had the same name as the prince of the Apostles. Which opinion Oecumenius approves by this argument: that there was no need for Peter to withdraw himself from the banquet on account of the intervention [coming] of the Jews, since much before he had satisfied all [who were] expostulating [complaining] that he had had commerce [dealings] with the uncircumcised Cornelius — and had so satisfied [them], that they, the matter being known, concordantly gave thanks to God; especially since no mention of this matter is made in the Acts of the Apostles. But this opinion, as invented and frigid, Jerome strongly rejects — since the matter itself teaches that this whole discourse pertains to Peter and his colleagues. And he denies that any Cephas is known to us except the Apostle, who in the language of the Syrians is called Cephas, because with them "Cephas" sounds the same as "Peter" [does] to the Greeks and to us. Then [he says] it is no wonder if Luke omitted this, by whom so many other [things] besides are passed over — as that [thing], that Peter first sat at Antioch, [and] then transferred his see to Rome. Finally, [he says] that Porphyry the sycophant ought not to be of so great [account] to us, that for his sake we should feign a new Cephas: otherwise, if we should try to erase from the scriptures whatever is liable to the calumnies of heretics, many other [things] would have to be erased.

Annotation CCLXXVI

"O senseless Galatians, who has bewitched you?" — Galatians 3[:1]

[margin: Whether witches [Striges] can bewitch little infants.]

Jerome, [in] the first book on the epistle to the Galatians, applies to this passage such an exposition: "FASCINATION [the evil eye] is said properly to harm infants, and the little age, and those who do not yet fix [their] step with a firm footprint. Whence also a certain one of the Gentiles said: *[margin: Virgil, Eclogue 3.]* 'I know not what eye bewitches [fascinates] my tender lambs.' Whether this be true or not, God shall see: for it can happen that even demons serve this sin, and turn away from good works whomsoever they have known either to have begun or to have advanced in the work of God. But now this is the point [in question]: that we think the example is taken from the opinion of the common folk — that, as the tender age is said to be harmed by fascination, so also the Galatians, newly born in the faith of Christ, and nourished with milk, were, as [it were] by a certain fascinator [bewitching thing], harmed; and, the stomach of [their] faith nauseating, vomited up the food of the Holy Spirit. But if anyone contradicts [this], let him expound how [the following] are taken from common opinion: *[margin: 1 Kings 23 (= 2 Sam. 5).]* the 'vale of the Titans' in the books of Kingdoms; the 'Sirens' and 'Onocentaurs' in Isaiah; 'Arcturus,' and 'Orion,' and the 'Pleiades' in Job; etc. — [things] similar to these, which surely have the vocabulary, causes, and origins of the fables of the Gentiles."

Cornelius Agrippa, a heretical man, in the book against the inquisitors of the Lamiae [witches] published by him, seizing occasion from these words to tear the inquisitors of heretical pravity, accuses them, that among other [things] they invented also this kind of calumny

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXVI:)

—against simple and harmless little women, whom they call Striges [witches] — namely, that these bewitch boys by the obtrusion [presenting] of the face, and corrupt [them] by the gaze of the eyes. Which matter, as he himself says, Jerome, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, and Chrysostom, in the homilies on the epistle to the Colossians, explode as a fable proceeding from the superstition of the Gentiles. But if anyone sincerely inspects the opinion of the scholastics, he will openly recognize that Cornelius lies iniquitously and impudently: for the scholastics hold that Fascination happens in two modes — that is, by animal [natural] power, and by the maleficence of a demon. And [some] indeed say [it] happens by animal power, when from the eyes of animals certain noxious spirits and malignant exhalations proceed to the things seen. In which manner, surely, the natural philosophers hand down that a bronze mirror is fouled with an almost indelible stain by the gaze of a menstruous woman; and that the air is infected by the diseased and wasting eyes of certain old men; that the flowers of plants are corrupted, and certain delicate little animals are killed by their gaze — even as **Jerome [Vida], bishop of Alba**, in the second volume of the *Bombyces* [Silkworms], expressed in these most elegant verses:

Since I remember that I myself, on the high rock of Tuscan Viterbo,

Saw a savage old man, whose dreadful face was rigid,

And [whose] heavy eyes were suffused round about with blood,

And [whose] brow was foul with squalor, and shaggy [hoary] with white hairs on [his] crown.

He, with fierce gaze (so [it is reported]), used to kill every kind —

Of creeping things, [and] slender souls [insects], and small flying [creatures].

Nay, even if ever he entered the gardens, when the new year,

Its cycle completed, had put off [its] ugly old age,

And here and there through the fields the tree had grown white [with blossom],

He gave slaughter to the gardens, and ruin to the trees;

And the mournful farmers wept the fallen hope of the year.

For wheresoever he had directed [his] horrible gaze, there one could

See the flowers, suddenly blasted, grow faint [wither].

By this reasoning, therefore, the scholastics judge that infants can be so harmed by the aspect [gaze] of wicked old women, that they gradually waste away and perish. The other mode of bewitching, and worse than the former, is when the same most wicked women make those effluxions emitted from the eyes more pestilent by the imprecation and cooperation of demons, and render [them] more potent for killing. This opinion of the scholastics, therefore, Jerome does not disapprove — nay, he confirms [it], when he says it can happen that demons serve this sin. Nor does Chrysostom dissent from Jerome, [while] mocking fascination [the superstition]; but he condemns those who, in the sicknesses of their infants — the help of Christ, and the remedies of the medical art, being abandoned — flee to enchantress-women: against whom, speaking in the homily cited by Cornelius (it is the eighth on the Colossians), he thus says: "CHRIST is cast out, and a drunken and trifling old woman is brought in; the mystery of the cross is trampled, and the seduction of the devil dances [triumphs]. But why should I mention the other ridiculous [things]? — ashes, salt, soot, and again an old woman brought into the midst? Truly [it is] ridiculous, and a disgrace. 'And some eye,' thou sayest, 'bewitched the boy.' How long [these] Satanic [things]? How will the Greeks not laugh at us — when we tell them that the power of the cross is great, [while] they see us needing those [things] which they themselves deride? Did not God give physicians and medicines?" These [things] Chrysostom [says].

[catchword "ANNOTA-" → continues on p. 549 (PDF 554).]

(printed p. 549 [PDF p. 554], recto — Ann. CCLXXVII and CCLXXVIII, on Galatians 3 (whether Scripture ever says God "cursed" anyone — Luther reproves Jerome, but Ambrose of Compsa clarifies that Jerome only meant the form *"cursed by God" never occurs; a possibly-interpolated Jerome period; then whether free will without grace can do good — Augustine [sermon 13, the letter to Hilary of Syracuse,* On Predestination, On the Spirit and the Letter*], Gregory of Rimini, and Luther's abuse [Compendium art. 36, the Eck disputation]; Sixtus's reply with John Fisher's distinction between* beatifying *works [impossible without grace] and ordinary* moral *works [possible], confirmed by Trent sess. 6 canon 7). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCLXXVII:)

Annotation CCLXXVII

"Cursed [is] everyone who shall not continue in all [things] which are written in the book of the law." — Galatians 3[:10]

[margin: Whether it is read in the sacred letters that God cursed anyone.] [margins: Genesis 3. Genesis 4. Malachi 2. 2 Kings 2.]

Luther reproves **Jerome** — [who,] in the commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, [was] sifting these words — because he so boldly denies that anyone is found in the scriptures [to have been] cursed by God, and [that] the name of God [is] never joined with a cursing: since [Luther] had read in Genesis that God cursed the serpent; and [that] the earth was cursed by God in the work of Adam; and [that] Cain was struck with a divine curse; and [that] God, in Malachi, says, "I will curse your blessings"; and [that] Elisha cursed the boys of Bethel in the name of the Lord. **Ambrose, bishop of Compsa**, [in] the fifth book against Luther, refuting his calumny, says [that] Jerome did not deny [that] which Martin builds up from the divine letters — namely, that God curses, or has cursed, or [that] holy men uttered a cursing in the name of God: but affirmed only this, that the name of God is nowhere found joined to the verb of cursing. For although in the sacred scriptures we read that God cursed some, and that some [were] cursed by God: yet nowhere is the divine cursing expressed under this form of words, "God cursed this [one]," or, "This [thing] was cursed by God." And that this was the opinion of Jerome, the same Ambrose approves from the same Hieronymian explanation, whose words run thus: "WITH bold foot, therefore, I proceed into this contest, that I appeal to the sacred books, [that] in no place is it written that anyone was cursed by God; and wheresoever a cursing is set down, never is the name of God joined. 'Cursed [art] thou from [above] all beasts,' is said to the serpent; and [to] Adam, 'Cursed [is] the earth in thy works'; and to Cain, 'Cursed [art] thou upon the earth'; and elsewhere, 'Cursed [is] the boy Canaan'; and also, in another place, 'Cursed [is] the fury of them, which [was] bold [audacious].' It would be long, if I should enumerate all the cursings which are written in Leviticus, and in Deuteronomy, and in Joshua [Jesus Nave]: and yet in none of them is the name of God added." These [things] he [Jerome]. There are [those] not lacking who affirm that this period, together with some following lines, is not Jerome's, but passed, by the fault of copyists, from the margin into the context [main text]; to whom I neither say nay nor yea. Read the [things] which are written concerning this passage of Jerome, [in] book 8 of this work, in the confutation of the second heresy.

Annotation CCLXXVIII

"For if a law had been given which could vivify," etc. — Galatians 3[:21]

[margin: Whether our liberty [free will] without grace can do good.]

Augustine, in the thirteenth sermon on the words of the Apostle, expounding these [words]: "IF the help of the Holy Spirit be utterly lacking," he says, "thou wilt be able to do nothing good: thou dost indeed act —

that [help] not aiding — by free will, but ill. Thy will, which is called free, is fit for this; and, by acting ill, it becomes a damnable handmaid." **Gregory of Rimini**, [in] the second [book] of the Sentences, distinction 26, hence elicits that the mind [meaning] of Augustine is, that without a peculiar [special] help of grace no work morally good according to virtue, and consonant to right reason, can be done

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXVIII:)

—from the liberty of human arbitrament. This same [thing] he confirms from his [Augustine's] epistle to Hilary of Syracuse: where it is thus read: "FREE will, therefore, avails, if it be divinely aided — which is done by humbly seeking and doing: but, deserted by the divine help, however much it may excel in any knowledge of the law, it will in no way have the solidity of justice, but the inflation of impious pride, and a pernicious swelling." Likewise in the little book *On the Predestination of God*, in which it is thus written: "THE FREE will which we have from God flows, by [its] fall, to wickedness; and, since — the help of God deserting [it] — it can [do] nothing apt for [toward] every kind of virtue, it subsists false [counterfeit] in virtue." **Martin Luther**, in the compendium of his articles, article 36, presses this same sentence more sharply upon Augustine, from the sayings which are had in him [in] the third chapter of the book *On the Spirit and the Letter*, in these words: "FOR neither does free will avail [for] anything but for sinning, if the way of truth lie hidden: and when [that] which is to be done, and toward which [one] must strive, has begun not to lie hidden — unless it also delight and be loved, it is not done, it is not undertaken, one does not live well." Again, the same Luther, in the disputation against Eck, says: "SAINT Augustine, in the third book against the Pelagians, chapter eight, says: 'Free will, [being] captive, avails not but for sinning; but for justice it avails not, unless divinely freed and helped.'" But far be it that Augustine held this [in the sense] which is imposed on him by Luther. For if — that general influx of divine help being granted, by which God aids every nature — man could [do] nothing at all of good according to moral virtue, it would seem to follow that he, in his works, however evil, never sins. Because, as Augustine says, "To say that anyone is held guilty of sin because he did not do what he could not do, is [a thing] of the highest iniquity, and of insanity." Wherefore the same doctor, in many places, manifestly demonstrates that even the worst men, without justifying grace, can avoid certain sins, and do certain good works — as it is permitted to see [in] the book *On the Spirit and the Letter*, chapter 28, where he says: "AS certain venial sins — without which this life is not led — do not hinder the just [man] from eternal life: so certain good works — without which the life of any of the worst men is very hardly found — profit the impious [man] nothing unto eternal salvation." **John [Fisher], bishop of Rochester**, in the book which he published against the Lutheran articles, says that all the passages proposed, and [those] like these, which seem to take away from men not yet justified by grace every faculty of doing good works, are to be understood of beatifying works — that is, [works] worthy of eternal beatitude: which indeed, without gratifying [sanctifying] grace, can in no way be either begun or completed. But concerning all the other moral works, not so [it is otherwise]. For it is in the power of man — even [one] destitute of justifying grace — to perform certain moral goods: as experience itself demonstrates. And this sentence the sacrosanct Synod of Trent seems to confirm, [in] session six, canon seven, in these words: "IF anyone shall say that all works which are done before justification — in whatever way they be done — are truly sins, or merit the hatred of God; or [that] the more vehemently one stri-

[signature "Zz"; catchword "niti-" (nititur) → "strives," continues on p. 550 (PDF 555).]

---

*(printed p. 550 [PDF p. 555], verso — end of Ann. CCLXXVIII, then Ann. CCLXXIX–CCLXXXI and the head of CCLXXXII, on Galatians 4–5 (Trent 6 canon 7; then whether abbots may be called "Fathers" — Jerome on Gal. 4:6 seems to forbid it, but Sixtus thinks that period interpolated, since Jerome on Matthew 4 plainly allows "father by courtesy"; whether the saints' Old-Testament sins may be allegorized — pseudo-Jerome and Augustine [*Against Faustus *22, on Lot's daughters]: the deed is prophecy in Scripture but a crime in their lives; whether those under grace are impeccable — Augustine's retracted reading of "the*

spirit lusts against the flesh"; and whether the damned are ever saved — Jerome and Origenism). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXXVIII, from the catchword "niti-":)

—strives to dispose himself to grace, the more gravely he sins: let him be anathema." See above, Annotation 40 and 255 of this book.

Annotation CCLXXIX

"God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." — Galatians 4[:6]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to call the prefects of monasteries abbots or fathers.]

Jerome, [in] book 2 on the epistle to the Galatians, in the explanation of this comma [clause], is believed to have disapproved the pious custom of the monks, who, for honor's sake, call their prefects Abbots and Fathers. But besides this, he also seems to take away from Christians the right of swearing. For he has in that place words of this kind: "SINCE, moreover, 'Abba, Father' is said in the Hebrew and Syriac tongue, and our Lord in the gospel commands that no one be called father except God: I know not by what license, in the monasteries, we either call others by this name, or acquiesce in being [so] called. And certainly he commanded this, who had said that we must not swear, [namely] if we do not swear; let us not even name any [man] father. If we shall interpret [the matter] of 'father' otherwise, we shall be compelled also to think otherwise concerning swearing." These [things] he [Jerome]. I judge this period was written on the front [top] of the page by some seditious little monk, and thence afterward translated [carried over] into the context [main text] by yawning [careless] copyists. And that I am not deceived, [those things] are argument, which Jerome, with a plainly contrary opinion, and professedly, wrote [in] the fourth book on Matthew, where, inquiring how that command of the Savior is to be understood — "Be not called masters," and "Call no [man] father to you upon the earth," etc. — he thus says: "IT IS ASKED, why, against this precept, the Apostle called himself the Teacher of the Gentiles; or how, in common speech — especially in the monasteries of Palestine and Egypt — they call one another fathers? Which is thus resolved: [that] it is one thing to be a father, or master, by nature; another by indulgence [courtesy]. If we call a man father, we defer honor to age; we do not show [him] the author of our life. Master too is said from consortship with the true Master. And, not to run through infinite [instances]: as one [being] God by nature, and one Son, does not prejudice the rest, [so] that they be [not] called gods and sons by adoption: so also one father, and master, does not prejudice the others, [so] that they be called fathers and masters abusively [in a transferred sense]."

Annotation CCLXXX

"Which things are said by allegory." — Galatians 4[:24]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to bend the sins of the saints to pious senses.]

The **author of the commentaries of Jerome** [pseudo-Jerome] on Paul, explaining this, taxes those who distort certain vices of the saints of the Old Testament into pious allegories, and by allegorical reasons defend those sins, to signify that the future mysteries of the Church were permitted in the Old Testament. And he writes thus: "THE APOSTLE gave, in this place, a rule of understanding allegorical reasons — namely, that, the truth of the history remaining, we expound the figures of the Old Testament. And he did this same [thing] there, where some honest deeds of the saints are related: not where sins are noted. But to call offenses [sins] mysteries is to accuse God either of impossibility or of ignorance — [as if] he could not otherwise show his sacraments, or certainly [as if he,] pu-

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXX, then Ann. CCLXXXI–CCLXXXII:)

—[nishing], reckoning to himself the sins of certain [men] necessary — let him [rather] first condemn those [sins] generally, but then also, by reproving and vindicating [avenging], let him show that those were not willed to be done for the sake of their mysteries." **Augustine** judges that the sins of the saints which are recounted in the Old Testament are to be expounded, according to the allegorical law, of the future mysteries of the Church: because in those saints not only virtues, but also vices, contained a figure and prophecy of things to come — yet so [warns he] that, in treating these [allegorically], allegory must be used [in such a way] that we confess the crimes of the saints to have been truly crimes, not committed by God commanding, *[margin: Isaiah 51.b]* but permitted by God not hindering, unto the signification and premonstration of things to come. By this rule Augustine, [in] book 22 against Faustus, drawing several errata [faults] of the ancient fathers to the figure and prediction of the coming Church, among other [things] also expounded allegorically, in this manner, the incest of the daughters of Lot with their father: "IN Lot, when [his] daughters lay with him, something was figured. For he seems to have borne the person of the future law — which indeed those procreated from it, and placed under the law, by [their] ill understanding in a manner intoxicating [it], and by not using [it] lawfully, bring forth the works of infidelity: yet we do not on that account justify this deed either of Lot himself, or of his daughters. Because it signified something, which would foreannounce the future perversity of certain [men]. For those [daughters] intended one thing, that they might do this: God, who permitted this to be done, [intended] another — that thence also he might demonstrate something — right judgment remaining over the sin of the men then present, and his providence watching for the signification of things to come. Therefore that deed, when it is narrated in holy scripture, is prophecy; but when it is considered in the life of those who committed it, is a crime [flagitium]."

Annotation CCLXXXI

"The spirit fights against the flesh." — Galatians 5[:17]

[margin: Whether those who live under grace are impeccable [free from sin].]

Augustine, in the exposition of the epistle to the Galatians, discoursing on this, asserted that those are under the law, and not under grace, whose spirit so lusts against the flesh, that they do not do the [things] which they will — that is, do not hold themselves unconquered in the charity of justice — but are conquered by the flesh lusting against them. Augustine excuses this sentence [in] the 24th chapter of the first book of the *Retractations*, saying that he said this because he had not yet understood that these words fit also those who are under grace; because they too have concupiscences of the flesh, against which they lust by [their] spirit, being unwilling to have them, if they could: and therefore they do not do whatsoever they will; because they will to lack them [the concupiscences], and cannot — but they will not have them then, when [they will] not [have] corruptible flesh [either]. A very similar [thing] Augustine retracted [in] the book of *Propositions* on the epistle to the Romans, chapter 7, and out of the book of *83 Questions*, question 66.

Annotation CCLXXXII

"But the fruit of the Spirit is charity." — Galatians 5[:22]

[margin: Whether the damned are ever to be saved.]

Jerome, [in] the fifth book of the commentaries on the Galatians, declaring this, seems to allude to the Origenist dogma concerning the damned [being] at some time [eventually] to be saved

[catchword "in" → continues on p. 551 (PDF 556).]

(printed p. 551 [PDF p. 556], recto — end of Ann. CCLXXXII, then Ann. CCLXXXIII–CCLXXXV and the head of CCLXXXVI, on Galatians 5–6 & Ephesians 1 (Jerome on the lover's joy; whether the departed saints can pray for us — Jerome speaking ironically against Vigilantius; whether all men are to be loved with equal

charity — Augustine [Gal. exposition, On Christian Doctrine *1.28,* On the Trinity *8.8] vs. the order of charity, reconciled by the Master of the Sentences 3.29; Chrysostom on election from foreseen merits [Eph. 1:4], a Pelagian-savouring reading; and Origen's pre-existent-souls dogma [souls created before the world and thrust into bodies for their sins], reported by Jerome). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXXXII, from the catchword "in":)

—in these words: "IT IS TO BE NOTED, that after love [dilection] joy follows. For he who loves someone always rejoices in his felicity. And if he sees him deceived by some error, and fallen into the slippery [ways] of sins, he will grieve indeed, and will hasten to rescue [him]: but he will not be able to change joy into sadness, knowing that none of the rational creatures perishes perpetually with God." Annotation 131, and 225, and 229 of the preceding book are to be seen by thee.

Annotation CCLXXXIII

"Every one shall bear his own burden." — Galatians 6[:5]

[margin: Whether the saints departed can pray for us.]

Jerome, [in] the third book on the epistle to the Galatians, subjoins to this saying such an exposition: "OBSCURELY, [though,] we are taught by this little sentence a new dogma, which lies hidden — [namely] that, while we are in the present age, we can help one another mutually, whether by prayers or by counsels; but when we shall have come before the tribunal of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah can pray for anyone: but each one bears his own burden." This exposition seems to suffer no little of difficulty; for if it is true that the saints, after this life, cannot pray for us: why does he mark this assertion by the appellation of a "new," and "lying-hidden," or "suspect" dogma? and if the dogma is new and suspect: why does he make Paul the author and teacher of a suspect dogma? It is probable that Jerome uttered these words by antiphrasis and ironically, against the new dogma of Vigilantius, who, in his hiding-places, taught that the saints who have migrated from this life can help no one by their prayers. For the words of this passage also seem to allude to the words of Vigilantius, which Jerome, in the declamation against Vigilantius, reports from that man's [own] book, saying: "THOU sayest in thy little book, that while we live, we can pray mutually for one another; but after we shall have died, no one's prayer is to be heard for another — especially since the martyrs, begging the vengeance of their blood, have not been able to obtain [it]."

Annotation CCLXXXIIII

"Let us work good toward all, but especially toward the domestics of faith." — Galatians 6[:10]

[margin: Whether all men are to be loved with an equal affection of charity.]

Augustine, in the exposition of the epistle to the Galatians, seems to hint that all men are to be loved with an equal affection of love, although in effect — that is, in the exhibition of service — a distinction is to be kept. "For to all," he says, "eternal life is to be wished with equal love, although the same offices of love cannot be exhibited to all." Which sentence, expressing more clearly [in] the first book *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 28, he says: "ALL men are to be loved equally: but since thou canst not be of profit to all, those especially are to be consulted [cared for] who, by the opportunities of places and times, or of any matters, are more closely joined to thee, as [by] a certain lot." And [in] the eighth book *On the Trinity*, chapter 8, affirming that all are to be loved equally as ourselves, he says: "NOR let that question move [us], how much we ought to spend upon the charity of a brother, how much [upon that] of God — incomparably more to God than to ourselves; but to a brother, as much as to ourselves." To this sentence seems opposed [that] of Origen,

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXXIIII, then Ann. CCLXXXV–CCLXXXVI:)

—and the definition of nearly all the theologians, establishing, in the order of charity, [that] first God is to be loved, secondly [our] parents, then [our] children, but afterward [our] domestics [household]. The Master of the Sentences, [in] book 3, distinction 29, discussing these passages, writes these [things]: "[THAT which] Augustine says — that all are equally to be loved, and eternal life is to be wished for all with equal love — can be so taken, that the equality be referred not to the affection, but to the good which is wished them: because by charity we ought to wish for all, that they may merit equal goods, as the Apostle says, 'I wish all men to be as [I am] myself.' For the perfection of the greater [ones] is to be wished for the lesser, that they themselves may be made perfect, and so may merit an equal beatitude: or 'with equal love,' that is, with the same love, all are to be loved. Likewise [that] which he says, 'that we love [our] brethren as much as ourselves,' can be so understood — that is, that we love [our] brethren unto as much good as [we love] ourselves: that we wish them as much good in eternity, as [we wish] for ourselves; although not with so great an affection. Or there [in the word] 'as much' [there] is [a matter] of similitude, not of quantity."

Annotation CCLXXXV

"He chose us before the constitution of the world." — Ephesians 1[:4]

[margin: Whether election [is] from foreseen merits.]

Chrysostom, [in] the first homily on the Ephesians, says that, as men choose the best [things] for themselves, so much more does God choose the best [things] for himself. And [in] the second homily on the Ephesians, upon that [text], "He predestined us," he adds: "HE PREDESTINED, or predefined, men according to the works which he foresaw in them, whom he had chosen. Whence the grace of election is not only from God, but is [also] from us." Which sentence seems to savor somewhat of the Pelagian. But concerning the understanding of these [sayings] it has been said by us [in] Annotation 251.

Annotation CCLXXXVI

"He chose us before the constitution of the world." — Ephesians 1[:4]

[margin: Whether souls [were] created before the world, and thrust into bodies for their offenses.]

Origen, [in] the first book of the commentaries on the Ephesians, narrating this clause, taught that souls were created before this visible world, and then, on account of their sins, were thrust into bodies. Which sentence Jerome, the name of Origen being suppressed, recounts in the first commentary on the Ephesians in these words: "ANOTHER, indeed, who tries to show God just — [namely] that he chooses each one not from the prejudgment of his [own] knowledge, but from the merit of the elect — says [that] before the visible creatures — heaven, earth, seas, and all [things] which are within them — there were other, invisible creatures; among which [were] also souls, which, for certain causes known to God alone, were cast down below into this vale of tears, into the place of our affliction and pilgrimage: in which the holy man, [being] placed, prayed to return to [his] pristine seat, saying: *[margin: Psalm 119.]* 'Woe is me, that my sojourning is prolonged; I have dwelt with the inhabitants of Cedar; my soul has much been a pilgrim.' And in another place: *[margin: Romans 7.]* 'Wretched man that I am, who shall free me from the body of this death?' And, *[margin: Philippians 1.]* 'It is better to return, and to be with Christ.' And elsewhere, *[margin: Psalm 113.]* 'Before I was humbled, I sinned': and other [things] similar to these. And so, before-

[signature "Zz 2"; catchword "quàm" → "than [i.e. before]," continues on p. 552 (PDF 557).]

(printed p. 552 [PDF p. 557], verso — end of Ann. CCLXXXVI, then Ann. CCLXXXVII and the head of CCLXXXVIII, on Ephesians 1 (the full Origenist pre-existence account concluded [souls cast into the "vale of tears," the Babylonian-captivity analogy, Ps. 89; confuted from Cyril in bk. 5 Ann. 185]; then Rufinus's long invective charging that Jerome, in his Ephesians commentary, cunningly taught Origen's error "under

another's person" [eight passages listed], and Jerome's fourfold self-defense from his Apology against Rufinus*; then whether penance may again be given to the lapsed — Chrysostom, hom. 2 on Ephesians, seeming to side with the Novatians). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXXXVI, from the catchword "quàm":)

—than the souls, they say, were precipitated into the world, and the world was made out of souls — [God] himself [being] cast down into the lowest [place] with its [own] inhabitants — God chose Paul, and those like him before his [sight], who were holy and immaculate. But no one is chosen except from many: and where there are some baser [ones], there election is perpetrated. But [just] as in the Babylonian captivity, when the people were led away by Nebuchadnezzar into Chaldaea, prophets were sent — Ezekiel, Daniel, the three boys, Haggai, Zechariah — not because they too had merited the captivity, but that they might be for the solace of the captives: so also in that casting-down of the world, those who, before the world was made, had been chosen by God, were sent for the erudition and mastership of the sinful souls; that, at their preaching, they might return to that place whence they had fallen. And that this is [that] which is said by Moses in the eighty-ninth psalm: *[margin: Psalm 89.a]* 'Lord, thou hast been made a refuge for us, from generation and into generation. Before the mountains were made firm, and the earth was made, and the round world' — that is, before the world was made, and the universal generation took [its] beginning, God was a refuge to his saints." This, then, is the Origenist opinion; which, as Jerome reports, the same Origen confirmed, and explained more fully, upon that [text] Eph. 1, "According to the good pleasure of his will"; and upon that Eph. 1, "Unto the praise of the glory of his grace"; and upon that Eph. 1, "That we may be unto the praise of his glory"; and upon that Eph. 1, "The eyes [of your heart] illumined in the knowledge of him"; and Eph. 3, upon that, "I Paul, bound in the Lord"; and Eph. 6, upon that, "For which I perform an embassy in a chain." The confutation of this error, from Cyril, thou hast [in] the fifth book, Annotation 185.

Annotation CCLXXXVII

"He chose us in him before the constitution of the world." — Ephesians 1[:4]

[margin: Whether souls [were] created before the world, and afterward cast into bodies for their [own] faults.]

Rufinus chides Jerome with a long and bitter invective, because in the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians he followed the error of Origen — affirming that all souls were created before this corporeal world, in the invisible world, and, after the founding of this visible world, were cast down into that vale of tears, and thrust into bodies — some indeed for the punishment of the sins which they had committed before, but others not on account of their offenses, but for the erudition and mastership of the sinful souls. And the passages, in which Rufinus complains that Jerome wrote these [things], are these:

The FIRST, upon those words of Eph. 1, "He chose us before the constitution of the world." The SECOND, upon that [text] of Eph. 1, "According to the good pleasure of his will." The THIRD, upon that [text] of Eph. 1, "Unto the praise of the glory of his grace." The FOURTH, upon that [text] of Eph. 1, "That we may be unto the praise of his glory, who before hoped." The FIFTH, upon that [text] of Eph. 1, "The eyes of our heart illumined in the knowledge of him." The SIXTH, upon that [text] of Eph. 3, "For this cause I, Paul, [am] bound in the Lord."

(right column — continuing Annotation CCLXXXVII, then Ann. CCLXXXVIII:)

The SEVENTH, upon that [text] of Eph. 6, "For which I perform an embassy in a chain." The EIGHTH, upon that [text] to Philemon, "Epaphras, my fellow-captive, salutes thee."

In all these passages Rufinus asserts that Jerome cunningly taught an error of this kind under the figure of another, unnamed person, in imitation of the rhetoricians — who, when they either fear to offend some, or desire to decline [avoid] odium, then, by a certain rhetorical artifice, bring forth their own opinion under the person of another. And he builds this up by four indications: first, that he does not name the author of that opinion, but only says, "Another," he says, etc. Secondly, because he does not express whether that "other" is contrary to himself, or concordant [in agreement]; nor shows whether he himself is discordant or concordant with him. Thirdly, because he does not destroy his sayings, nor impugn [them], nor reprehend the author himself; but praises him, and calls [him] "diligent." Fourthly, because the opinion set forth under another's person he not only does not refute, nor condemn; but fortifies [it] with strong reasons, and with many testimonies of the divine scripture.

THIS accusation of Rufinus, Jerome, confuting [it] in the first Apology against him, answers: to the first conjecture, that he did not put down the names of the authors of that error, because it was superfluous to put, at each of the Apostle's sayings, the names of those expositors, whom he had already named abundantly in the preface of the whole work. To the second suspicion he satisfies, saying that at the end of the chapter he showed sufficiently openly that he disagreed [was discordant] with that opinion which he had reported under another's person, and had in that same place refuted [it]. The third conjecture he thus dissolves, [saying] that he refrained, out of zeal for modesty and Christian shamefastness, from reprehending those authors — because, since he was performing the office of a commentator, he ought not to carp at those whom he was partly imitating, and whose opinions he was translating into the Latin tongue; and that, if he praised them for diligence, calling [them] "diligent," this matters little: since even thieves are wont to be called "diligent." To the fourth conjecture he says that, together with the Origenist errors, he also brought forward the reasons and arguments upon which those errors leaned — that, opening to the readers all the opinion of Origen, and omitting nothing said by him, he might avoid the calumnies of the malevolent: lest they should say that Jerome had kept silent [the things] which had been forcibly said by Origen, and that he [Origen] argued more robustly in the Greek.

Annotation CCLXXXVIII

"Unto the praise of the glory of his grace." — Ephesians 1[:6]

[margin: Whether penance is again to be given to the lapsed.]

Chrysostom, [in] the second homily on the Ephesians, seems, together with the Novatians, to deny penance to the lapsed — saying thus, in the beginning of the moral exhortation: "GOD advances to salvation those who, once they have been made his friends, persevere. But if they run back again to [their] former enmities, all [is] in vain and to no purpose. For a second laver of regeneration is not granted; nor does a secondary reconciliation remain over [again]; but a certain terrible expectation of judgment, and jealousy of fire, which shall consume the adversaries." And a little after: "HE SHOWS thee

[catchword "tibi" → "thee," continues on p. 553 (PDF 558).]

(printed p. 553 [PDF p. 558], recto — end of Ann. CCLXXXVIII, then Ann. CCLXXXIX and the head of CCXC, on Ephesians 1 (Chrysostom on the lapsed — read of the ancient non-repeatable solemn *penance, not private penance; then the Eucharist — Bertram/Ratramnus abuses Jerome and Clement of Alexandria [*Paedagogus *2.2] on the "twofold blood and flesh," resolved by the Master of the Sentences 4.8 via sacramentum/res; then whether the punishments of the damned are to be ended — Rufinus charges Jerome with the Origenist apocatastasis, and the Anabaptist Stanislaus Pannonius abuses Jerome's Isaiah-commentary and* Against the Pelagians *passages, though Jerome himself in the* Apology *insists even damned Christians are never freed from hell). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCLXXXVIII, from the catchword "tibi":)

—the true light. But if, that being expelled, thou again incur darkness: what place of excuse is left to thee? what pardon canst thou hope? Not even one is to be hoped for thenceforth." And a little below: "IF thou sufferest a necessity of sinning, or force, thou wilt indeed obtain pardon; but if thou fallest through cowardice [sloth] or torpor, not so." Which words are not to be understood of private penance — to which Chrysostom so frequently invites sinners, [and] for which, as we admonished [in] Annotation 173 of the preceding book, he was gravely reproved by the Novatians — but are to be expounded of the solemn penance, which, according to the ancient laws, was not iterated [repeated], as Augustine is witness, in the epistle to Macedonius, 54, lest the medicine, iterated many times, should grow cheap; and the same is had in the decrees, *On Penance*, distinction 3.

Annotation CCLXXXIX

"In whom we have redemption through his blood." — Ephesians 1[:7]

[margin: On the Eucharist.]

Bertram [Ratramnus] the presbyter usurps Jerome's interpretation from this passage, in the book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, to show that in the Eucharist there is neither the true and real flesh of Christ, which was crucified for us, nor that true blood which was shed for us, but a mystical blood, and spiritual and typical flesh, set forth not in truth, but in figure. The words of Jerome run thus: "IN A TWOFOLD manner is the blood of Christ and [his] flesh understood: either that spiritual and divine [flesh], of which he himself said, 'My flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink,' and, 'Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall not have eternal life'; or the flesh and blood which was crucified, and which was shed by the soldier's lance. According to this division, a diversity of blood and of flesh is taken also in his saints — so that there is one flesh, which shall see the salvation of God; [and] another flesh and blood, which cannot possess the kingdom of God." This sentence of Jerome seems to allude to those [things] which Clement of Alexandria wrote, [in] book 2 of the *Paedagogus*, chapter 2, in these words: "TWOFOLD is the blood of the Lord: for one is carnal, by which we are redeemed from destruction; but the other spiritual, by which, namely, we are anointed. And this is to drink the blood of Jesus — to be partaker of the incorruption of the Lord. For the strength of the Word is the spirit, as the blood [is] of the flesh. By a moderate proportion, therefore, and fittingness, wine is mingled with water, but the spirit with man. And the tempered wine indeed, as concerns faith, is received at the banquet; but the spirit is led to incorruption. But the mixture of both — namely, of the drink and of the Word — is called Eucharist; of which those who are partakers by faith are sanctified in body and soul." The Master of the Sentences, [in] book 4, distinction 8, says that Jerome's words are to be interpreted by the rule of "the sacrament and the reality of the sacrament," by which we are taught that the flesh of Christ is twofold: the one contained and signified by the Eucharist, which was crucified and dead, and after death, revived, ascended into heaven; but the other signified by the Eucharist and not contained, which is the unity of the Church in the predestined and the glorified. And according to the same rule the sayings of Clement are to be taken. This argument has been treated more copiously [in] Annotation 196 of this book.

(right column — Annotation CCXC:)

Annotation CCXC

"That we may be unto the praise of his glory, who before hoped in Christ." — Ephesians 1[:12]

[margin: Whether the punishments of the damned are to be ended.]

Rufinus objects to Jerome, that in the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians, expounding these [words], he asserted that the punishments of the damned are to be ended, and that the devil, and his angels,

and all sinners and unbelievers, after the day of judgment — some ages of years being completed — will not only receive pardon of [their] offenses, but will also attain the heavenly rewards. This same [thing] he writes that he [Jerome] held in the exposition of the second chapter to the Ephesians, upon that [text], "That he might show in the ages to come," etc.; and upon that [text] from the fourth chapter to the Ephesians, "From whom the whole body, compacted and knit together," etc. **Stanislaus Pannonius** [of Hungary], a minister of the Anabaptist sect, in the book *On Divine Philanthropy*, in which he defends the error of Origen, among other [things] which he brings for its defense, uses also the authority of Jerome — affirming that he, in this matter, partly denied to Origen, but partly assented. And that he first indeed denied [it], because he believed that the torments both of the demons and of the unbelieving impious would be eternal; but assented, because he thought that the sins of the wicked and damned faithful [Christians] would not be punished eternally with eternal punishments, but, out of divine clemency, would be pardoned after a certain measure of penalties. And this he [Pannonius] says is evident from those [things] which he [Jerome] wrote at the end of the commentaries on Isaiah, in these words: "ALL which [things] those desiring to assert the restoration [of all] — [saying] that after tortures and torments there will be future refreshments, which are now to be hidden from those to whom fear is useful, that, while they dread the punishments, they may cease to sin — [these things] we ought to leave to the knowledge of God alone: whose not only mercies, but also torments, are in weight [measured]; and [who] knows whom, in what manner, or how long, he ought to judge. And let us only say [that] which befits human frailty: *[margin: Psalm 6.a]* 'Lord, rebuke me not in thy fury, nor chastise me in thy wrath.' And, as of the devil, and of all the deniers, and impious, who said in their heart, *[margin: Psalm 13.]* 'There is no God,' we believe eternal torments: so of sinners, and impious, and yet Christians, whose works are to be tried and purged in the fire, we judge a moderate sentence of the judge, and [one] mingled with clemency." These [things] Jerome [says]. To which the same Pannonius subjoins another testimony of the same, from the first book against the Pelagians, where it is thus written: "IN FINE, Isaiah, from whom thou placest a testimony — 'The sinners and the wicked shall be burned together,' he says, [but] did not add, 'For ever'; and, 'those who forsake God shall be consumed' — he speaks this properly of heretics, who, forsaking the right path of faith, shall be consumed, if they will not return to the Lord." And after many [things] he adds: "IF Origen says that all rational creatures are not to be lost — what is that to us? who say both that the devil and his satellites, and all the impious, perish perpetually; but that Christians, if they have been overtaken in sin, are to be saved after penalties." These [things] Pannonius [alleges] concerning Jerome: whose imposture and impudent lie Jerome himself, refuting [it] in the Apology against Rufinus, and in very many other writings, most constantly confesses that even damned Christians are never [freed] from the punish-

[signature "Zz 3"; catchword "sup-" (suppliciis) → "punishments," continues on p. 554 (PDF 559).]

(printed p. 554 [PDF p. 559], verso — end of Ann. CCXC, then Ann. CCXCI–CCXCV, on Ephesians 1–2 (Jerome's five arguments against the Origenist apocatastasis, and that his "Christians saved after penalties" means purgatory; then a series of short annotations on Origenist errors reported by Jerome and reproved by Rufinus — whether souls' knowledge is reminiscence *[Eph. 1:17, with the Greek]; the ascents/descents [increments and decrements] of angels [Eph. 1:21]; whether the stars are rational and purged by Christ's blood [Eph. 1:22]; the bodies of demons [Eph. 2:2 — Cajetan's "aerial spirits" rejected by Ambrose of Compsa]; and whether the demons are ever saved [Eph. 2:7]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCXC, from the catchword "sup-":)

—to be freed from the punishments of hell; and [that] the opinion of those who think otherwise is to be utterly detested, and cast out from the minds of Christians — he proves by many arguments, out of which, in the commentary on the third chapter of Jonah, he touches upon these summarily.

FIRST, because the divine scripture nowhere teaches this opinion of the ending of the punishments of the damned.

SECONDLY, because in the gospel [the fire] is called eternal fire, and eternal punishment; and in Isaiah, "Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched."

THIRDLY, because this opinion utterly overturns the fear of God, while men easily slide into vices, thinking that all the wicked are at some time, after penalties, to be saved.

FOURTHLY, [because] if, after a long circuit of ages, a restoration of all things be made, so that there be one dignity of souls, there will be no distance [difference] between a virgin and a brothel-woman; between the mother of the Lord, and the victims of public lusts; Gabriel will be the same [as] the devil; the Apostles [as] the demons; the same [dignity for] the prophets, and the false prophets; the same [for] the martyrs, and the persecutors.

FIFTHLY, [because] if the end of all is alike, imagine infinite ages of torments — all the past is [reckoned] for nothing: because we do not ask what we once were, but what we shall always be.

FROM THESE [things], therefore, it appears that Jerome — an enemy of this dogma — reported [the things] which he wrote in the commentary on the Ephesians, not from his own, but from the opinion of others. But [that] which, at the end of the commentaries on Isaiah, and against the Pelagians, he asserts — that Christians are to be saved after penalties and the torments of fire — is to be referred not to the eternal fire of hell, but to the temporal fire of purgatory; in which, when souls have been purged for a time, they shall be saved. See [the things] regarding this, [in] Annotations 126 and 128 of the fifth book.

Annotation CCXCI

"May he give you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of him." — Ephesians 1[:17]

[margin: Whether the knowledge of souls is from reminiscence.]

Origen, in the commentaries, elucidating this passage, said that the knowledge by which they [souls] now know God is a certain reminiscence of the divine knowledge which they of old had in heaven, before they descended into bodies. This opinion Jerome, the name of Origen being suppressed, brought forth in his commentaries in these words: "[THAT] which Paul says, 'in the knowledge [agnitione] of him,' that is, ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ [epign■sei autoû], some understand thus: that between γνῶσις [gnôsis] and ἐπίγνωσις [epígn■sis] — that is, between 'notion' and 'recognition' — there is this difference: that 'notion' is of [things] which we did not before know, and afterward began to know; but 'recognition' [is] of [things] which, having before known, we then ceased to know, and afterward remember them — and suspect a certain former life in the heavenly [places]: after [that], being cast down into these bodies, and having forgotten God the Father, we have now come to know him through revelation, according to that [text]: 'All the ends of the earth shall remember, and shall be converted to the Lord,' and [they] repeat other [things] similar to these." These [things] Jerome [says]: whom Rufinus reprehends, because this Origenist opinion

(right column — continuing Annotation CCXCI, then Ann. CCXCII–CCXCV:)

—he inserted in his commentaries without any confutation of it [himself].

Annotation CCXCII

"Above all principality, and power, and virtues." — Ephesians 1[:21]

[margin: The increments and decrements of angels.]

Jerome is taxed in this place by Rufinus, because, following Origen, he posited in the angels advances and honors, ascents and descents, increments and diminutions. Refuting this accusation, Jerome says that by these words he did not signify those ascents and descents by which Origen feigns [that] angels descend to the nature of men and of demons, and, vice versa, men and demons are raised up into the nature of angels; but that he wished to express, by these sayings, the diverse offices of the angels, and [their] dignities, according to the understanding of ecclesiastical doctrine.

Annotation CCXCIII

"And he subjected all things under his feet." — Ephesians 1[:22]

[margin: Whether the stars are rational living beings, and purged by the blood of Christ.]

To **Jerome** Rufinus turns [it] for a fault, because, interpreting this passage, he affirmed that the stars are rational living beings, and capable of offense [sin], and [that] Christ also purged their sins, when he wrote these [things]: "BUT why all things — that is, angels, thrones, dominations, powers, and the other virtues, which were never contrary to God — are subjected under his feet, seems obscure. It can therefore be answered, that no one is without sin; and [that] the stars themselves are not clean before God; and [that] every creature fears the coming of the Creator. Whence also the cross of the Savior is reported to have purged not only those [things] which are on earth, but those which are in the heavens." He speaks, as has already been said, from the opinion of Origen.

Annotation CCXCIIII

"According to the prince of the power of this air, [the] spirit." — Ephesians 2[:2]

[margin: The bodies of demons.]

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries: "I WOULD believe," he says, "that the demons are aerial spirits; and that this is consonant to the reason of true philosophy: [namely] that, as the vegetative is found without the sensitive, and without the locomotive [that moves according to place]; and the intellective without the locomotive; so there may be found a locomotive without the sensitive — which is to posit aerial spirits of this kind, consisting of the intellective and the locomotive." **Ambrose of Compsa**, [in] the fourth book of the *Annotations*, rejects this opinion, because it was of old condemned by the fathers in Origen. Read Annotation 8 of the fifth book.

Annotation CCXCV

"That he might show in the ages to come." — Ephesians 2[:7]

[margin: Whether the demons are ever to be saved.]

Jerome is taxed by Rufinus, because to this passage he appends the exposition of Origen — saying that the demons, in the future age, shall receive benefits from the saints, and shall be under their care — the name of the author being passed over, and without any disapproval of the error. It has been answered above, [in] Annotation 290 of this book.

[catchword "AN-" → continues on p. 555 (PDF 560).]

(printed p. 555 [PDF p. 560], recto — Ann. CCXCVI–CCCI, on Ephesians 2–4 (all creatures, men and angels, purged by Christ's blood [Eph. 2:17]; the body as the soul's prison [Eph. 3:1]; whether the demons are to be restored — Ambrose's exposition and the anonymous Origen-scholiast [Eph. 3:10]; whether the angels knew the mystery of redemption before Christ's passion — Jerome, Sedulius, and Peter Lombard reconciling Jerome with Augustine via Haymo [Eph. 3:10]; bishops and presbyters the same [Eph. 4:11];

and whether one who cannot teach may be made a bishop [Eph. 4:11]). Read order: left column, then right.)

Annotation CCXCVI

"Coming, he evangelized peace." — Ephesians 2[:17]

[margin: Angels purged.]

Jerome, in this place, is reprehended by Rufinus, because, imitating Origen, he affirmed that all creatures, as well men as angels, were purged by the blood of Christ, saying: "The cross of the Lord profited not only the earth but also heaven; not only men but angels: and every creature of its Lord has been purged by his gore." See Annotations 170, 293, and 302 of this book.

Annotation CCXCVII

"Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ." — Ephesians 3[:1]

[margin: The soul's prison.]

Rufinus fastens [it] upon **Jerome**, that in this place he handed down [taught] the body to be the prison of the soul. Avoiding which calumny, Jerome says that he wrote it not from his own, but from Origen's, mind.

Annotation CCXCVIII

"That [it] might be made known to the principalities, and powers." — Ephesians 3[:10]

[margin: Whether the demons are to be restored.]

Ambrose, in the commentaries, elucidating this clause, writes thus: "SO WELL did God think concerning this [man], namely Paul, that he not only gave this master to the nations, but also that through him the truth of Christ might be made known to the spirits in the heavenly [places], who are principalities and powers. [They are called] 'powers,' therefore, because they are more powerful among the other spirits; but 'principalities,' because they hold princedom over the powers — that, recognizing through the Church (which has been drawn to life in manifold [ways]) the mystery of the one God to abide in Christ, they may cease from error. For this is the [thing] transacted: that the ecclesiastical preaching may profit even these, and [that] they may forsake the assent of the tyranny of the devil, wherewith it armed itself, with impious presumption, against the faith of the one God. Which sense is prescribed [set down beforehand] in the twenty-third Psalm: where God, the lord of the universe, is shown, the Spirit of God saying through David: *[margin: Psalm 23]* 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof, the round world, and all who dwell in it.' And among the [things] following: 'Lift up the gates of your prince, and be lifted up, ye eternal gates, and the king of glory shall enter in. Who is this king of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory.' It is said, therefore, to these princes, who are in error in the heavenly [places], or to his [the devil's] ministers on earth, that they take away the gates of their prince — that is, of the devil — from their minds, through which the error of asserting many [false things] entered in." **An anonymous** scholiast of Origen, in the scholia on the first book of the *Peri Archon*, noted that Ambrose in this place does not dissent from the dogma which Origen wrote in the sixth chapter of the same book — affirming that certain angels, who are not irremediably removed from the state of beatitude, can again be recalled to their pristine felicity, and restored, through ecclesiastical preachings and salutary admonitions. But this dogma the Catholic Church condemns.

(left column ends with the head of Annotation CCXCIX; its body continues in the right column.)

Annotation CCXCIX

"That now [it] might be made known to the principalities, and in the heavenly [places], through the Church, the manifold wisdom of God." — Ephesians 3[:10]

(right column:)

Jerome, [in] the second book on the epistle to the Ephesians, expounding these [words], seems to think that the angels, before the passion and resurrection of Christ, did not know the mystery of the incarnate Word, and the sacrament of human redemption. For thus indeed he speaks: "THE CROSS of Christ opened, not only to us, but also to the angels, and to all the virtues in heaven, a sacrament which before they knew not. Finally, they marvel at [him] returning to heaven with [his] body, and say, *[margin: Psalm 93.a; Psalm 23]* 'Who is this, who ascends from Edom, his tawny garments out of Bosor?' And in another place, 'Who is this king of glory?'" Thus he.

[margin: Whether the angels, before the passion of Christ, knew the mystery of redemption.]

Sedulius, agreeing with Jerome, [in] the *Collectanea* on this passage writes thus: "FROM WHICH we understand that the cross of Christ profited not only us, but also the angels; because it opened a sacrament which before they knew not. Whence they ask, 'Who is this king of glory?'"

Peter Lombard, [in] the second book of the *Sentences*, distinction 11, animadverting on this passage, writes thus: "AUGUSTINE seems to contradict Jerome, saying, upon the same passage of the epistle, 'The mystery of the kingdom of heaven was not hidden from the angels — which was revealed at an opportune time for our salvation. To them, therefore, the aforementioned mystery was made known from the ages [*a saeculis*]: because every creature is not before the ages, but from the ages.' Attend, reader, because illustrious doctors seem to dissent in this sentence. And therefore, that all repugnance may be taken out of the midst, following Haymo let us so determine the aforesaid words: that by those angels, who are of greater dignity, and by whose ministry those [things] were announced, [these things] were in part known from the ages — as [being] familiars and messengers; but by those, who are of lesser dignity, we say they remained unknown, until they were fulfilled and preached through the Church: and then they were perfectly known by all the angels. It is agreed, therefore, that all the angels have advanced in the knowledge of the divine mysteries according to the process of time. Whence not incongruously these same [doctors] say that the knowledge and beatitude of the angels is increased even unto the future consummation — when, in knowledge and beatitude, they shall be so most perfect, that it is neither increased further, nor diminished." See Annotations 165 and 182 of this book.

Annotation CCC

"And he himself indeed gave some [to be] apostles." — Ephesians 4[:11]

Ambrose, in the commentaries, expounding this particle [clause], intimates that bishops and presbyters are the same — concerning which matter see below, Annotation 324.

Annotation CCCI

"And others indeed [to be] pastors and masters [teachers]." — Ephesians 4[:11]

[margin: Whether he is to be constituted a bishop, who cannot teach.]

Jerome, [in] the second book on the epistle to the Ephesians, explaining these particles, seems to affirm that no one is to be constituted a bishop and pastor of the Church, who cannot teach those whom he feeds; nor is anyone to be called by the name of "pastor," who does not instruct the subject people: because the offices of a pastor and of a master are the same. His words run thus: "NOR truly is it to be thought, that, as in the [things] above he said some [to be] apostles, some prophets, some evangelists: so in the pastors and masters he set down diverse offices. For he does not say,

[signature "Zz 4"; catchword "alios" → "others," continues on p. 556 (PDF 561).]

(printed p. 556 [PDF p. 561], verso — end of Ann. CCCI, then Ann. CCCII–CCCVII, on Ephesians 4–5 (a pastor must be able to teach — but legitimate impediments excused, and teaching by fit ministers suffices [Eph. 4:11]; whether Christ's blood profited angels and demons [Eph. 4:10]; the restoration of all into one body [Eph. 4:16]; whether song is to be used in the divine praises — Jerome, with Aquinas and Augustine's Confessions *10 [Eph. 5:19]; whether sinners are members of the Church — the Lutheran abuse answered by the distinction of the militant and triumphant Church [Eph. 5:24]; the Origenist transformation of women into men [Eph. 5:28]; and the sacrament of matrimony — Ambrose of Compsa against Cajetan's "mystery, not sacrament" [Eph. 5:32]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCCI, from the catchword "alios":)

"—others indeed [to be] pastors, and others masters: so that he who is a pastor, ought also to be a master. Nor, in the churches, however holy he be, [ought anyone] to assume to himself the name of pastor, unless he can teach those whom he feeds — or else otherwise [understand it]: that one and the same [man], president of the church, be pastor and doctor. For the pastor of the sheep is the master of men. And below: 'IF anyone, therefore, does not instruct the people subject to him, that out of the subject people the Church of Christ may be built up: he is to be called neither apostle, nor prophet, nor evangelist, nor pastor, nor master.'" These words of Jerome THERE ARE [some] who admonish are not to be so taken, that we believe no one to be a bishop and pastor of the Church, who does not teach, or cannot teach. For there are many true and excellent bishops, who, detained by legitimate impediments, are unable to teach. But it is to be judged, that he who takes care to teach neither by himself, nor by another, is unworthy of the dignity and name of pastor. But if he himself be not able to instruct the people, [yet] instructs his people in the doctrine of the Lord through fit ministers, he is to be judged to have satisfied the office of the pastoral care. For Theophylact also, expounding this passage, affirms that by "pastors" can be understood bishops, but by "doctors [masters]" deacons and the ministers of bishops, who instruct the people in the word of God.

Annotation CCCII

"He who descended, he it is who also ascended." — Ephesians 4[:10.b]

[margin: On the angels, and the demons.]

Jerome, [in] the second book on the epistle to the Ephesians, upon this sentence seems not to stand far distant from the dogma of Origen, [who] thinks the passion of Christ profited not only men, but also angels and demons; for he says: "THE Son of God, therefore, descended into the lower [parts] of the earth, and ascended above all the heavens, that he might fulfil not so much the law and the prophets, but also certain other hidden dispensations, which he alone knows with the Father. For neither can we know in what manner the blood of Christ profited both the angels, and those who were in hell; and yet, that it did profit, we cannot but know." And this Rufinus condemned in Jerome, in the place cited above — namely, Annotations 170, 292, and 296.

Annotation CCCIII

"From whom the whole body [is] compacted." — Ephesians 4[:16.b]

Jerome is arraigned by Rufinus, because in the explanation of this sentence he wrote that all things are to be restored into one body of the same nature — men, angels, and demons. The response is above, Annotations 290 and 298.

Annotation CCCIIII

"Singing, and making melody in your hearts." — Ephesians 5[:19]

[margin: Whether song is to be used in the divine praises.]

Jerome, [in] the third book on the epistle to the Ephesians, expounding these [words], seems to think, that in the temples the divine praises are not to be sung with musical voice; for he says: "LET THE young men hear these [things]; let those hear, whose office it is to make melody in the church, that [they must sing] to God not with the voice, but with the heart; nor are the throat and jaws, after the manner of tragedians, to be smeared with sweet medicament, so that theatrical *(right column:)* strains and songs be heard in the church." This sentence is reported in the *Collectanea* of the decrees, distinction 92, chapter 1: which the divine Thomas [Aquinas], in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 91, examining, thus says: "JEROME does not simply blame song, but reprehends those who sing in the church in a theatrical manner — not to excite devotion, but for the sake of ostentation, or to provoke delight. Whence Augustine, in the tenth [book] of the *Confessions*, says: 'WHEN it befalls me, that the singing move me more than the thing which is sung, I confess that I sin penally; and then I would rather not hear the singer.'"

Annotation CCCV

"But as the Church is subject to Christ." — Ephesians 5[:24]

[margin: Whether sinners are members of the Church.]

Jerome, [in] the third book on the epistle to the Ephesians, seems to think that no sinner is of the Church of Christ, while he says: "THE Church of Christ is glorious, not having spot, nor wrinkle, or any such thing. He, therefore, who is a sinner, and stained with some filth, cannot be called [a member] of the Church of Christ, nor be said [to be] subject to Christ. But it is possible, that, as the Church, which before had had wrinkle and spot, was afterward restored to youth and cleanness: so also the sinner may run to the physician, and his wounds be cured, and he be made [a member] of the Church, which is the body of Christ." This passage is usurped by the **Lutherans**, hence building up that the true Church consists of the predestined and the elect of God alone, to whom sins are not imputed. But Jerome does not speak of this earthly and militant Church, which daily prays, "Forgive us our sins"; but of the heavenly Church, triumphant and glorious, which, free from all sins, has neither wrinkle nor spot.

Annotation CCCVI

"He who loves his wife, loves himself." — Ephesians 5[:28]

[margin: The transformation of women.]

Origen, [in] the third book of the commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians, in this place wrote that in future ages women are to be changed back into men, and human bodies into souls. Rufinus chides Jerome, that he transfused this heresy — without the author's name, and without confutation — into his commentaries.

Annotation CCCVII

"This is a great sacrament." — Ephesians 5[:32]

[margin: On the sacrament of matrimony.]

Thomas Cajetan, expounding these [words] in the commentaries, **Ambrose of Compsa**, [in] the fourth book of the *Annotations*, reprehends with these words: "CAJETAN here notes that matrimony is not held by Paul to be a sacrament. For Paul does not say, 'This sacrament is great,' as the interpreter [Cajetan] expounded, but, 'This mystery is great.' Who would not marvel [at this]? Could Paul, writing in Greek, have said *sacramentum*, which is a Latin word — whereas, saying in Greek *mystery*, he certainly said in Greek

that which in Latin signifies *sacrament*? For Cyril, and Chrysostom, and Basil, and Dionysius before these, also—

[catchword "etiam" → "also," continues on p. 557 (PDF 562).]

(printed p. 557 [PDF p. 562], recto — end of Ann. CCCVII, then Ann. CCCVIII–CCCX, on Ephesians 5–6 and Philippians 1 (Ambrose of Compsa's continued critique of Cajetan on matrimony as "mystery"/sacrament [Eph. 5:32]; Jacob's wrestling with the angel not corporeal [Eph. 6:12]; original sin brings bodily death, actual sin the soul's [Chrysostom, Eph. 6:24]; and whether the saints are to be invoked — Chrysostom's "De profectu Evangelii" homily abused by the Lutherans as their "Achilles," answered from many passages that he condemns only sloth, not intercession [Phil. 1:18]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — concluding Annotation CCCVII, from the catchword "etiam":)

"—they also call the Eucharist a 'mystery,' and so [name] the other [things] which we call sacraments. But if Paul had said 'sacrament,' there would still be a question, whether he took it thus, as that word is restricted by the theologians. But if we agree as to the thing — namely, that matrimony is a sacrament, as that word is taken strictly — and Paul, speaking in Greek, calls it a 'mystery,' which is that which in Latin is 'sacrament': why, then, did not Paul understand such a sacrament, and express [it] by that word, as we also confess it to be? But attend to this also, I pray, good reader: [namely] what Cajetan subjoined for the declaring of this mystery. For thus he says: 'This mystery is great; and truly [it is] a mystery of these words: For this cause shall he leave, etc. For they contain the indivisibility of wedlock, as the Lord explained in Matthew; [the words] contain also the right of nature abhorring [forbidding] marriage with father and mother; they contain also the debt owed by the husband more to the wife than to father and mother; and this, which Paul has just declared, [namely] that the wife is the flesh of the husband. Thus he'" — and [it is one of] the great mysteries. "Paul says, 'This' — that is, matrimony itself — 'is a great mystery.' And the Cardinal [Cajetan] expounds [it]: 'the mystery of these words, For this cause shall he leave, etc., is great.' Paul declares in what way this mystery is great — that is, in Christ and the Church: but the Cardinal, [says it is great] because those words contain the right of abhorring marriage with father and mother — which is also false, as we shall say in its place. Which, however, if it were [so], how great and admirable a mystery would it be, which no nation, however fierce and savage, ever was ignorant of! The indivisibility, too, of wedlock, and the most close bond of the married, is not worthy to be called a 'mystery,' since it is persuaded even by natural reason. That, therefore, is truly the great mystery which is signified in matrimony — namely, Christ and the Church, the bridegroom and the bride: for so the Apostle declares himself. Why, therefore, do we still seek an alien interpretation?"

Annotation CCCVIII

"Our wrestling is not [against flesh and blood]." — Ephesians 6[:12]

[margin: Jacob, and the wrestling of the angel.]

Jerome, in the commentaries, thinks those to be ridiculous who deem that Jacob contended with the angel by a corporeal wrestling. See above, Annotation 111 of the preceding book.

Annotation CCCIX

"Who love the Lord Jesus Christ in incorruption." — Ephesians 6[:24]

[margin: The punishment of original sin.]

Chrysostom, [in] the 24th homily on the Ephesians, narrating this, hints that the sin of Adam, in which we are born, brings to us the death of the body; but actual sins, after baptism, bring to us the death of the soul. For thus he speaks: "TO US the body is corruptible, but the soul incorruptible: therefore, lest we corrupt it also, this [is what] that first sin did. But that which is committed after the laver [of baptism] can corrupt also the soul, and render [it] easy in the taking to the immortal worm." The sense of these words see above, Annotation 236 of this book.

Annotation CCCX

"Whether by occasion, or by truth, Christ is announced." — Philippians 1[:18]

(right column:)

[margin: Whether the saints are to be invoked.]

Chrysostom, at the end of the homily which is written out of the order of the others upon this passage, and which is inscribed *On the Advancement of the Gospel [De profectu Evangelii]*, seems to explode [reject] the intercessions and patronages of the saints, writing thus: "MOREOVER, thou hast no need of patrons with God, nor of much discourse, that thou mayest flatter others: but although thou be alone, and lack patrons, and pray to God through thyself, thou wilt nonetheless be altogether the possessor of thy wish. For neither does God assent so easily when others pray for us, as when we ourselves pray — even if we be full of very many evils." And a little after: "DOST thou wish to learn, that even we ourselves, praying to God, effect more than when others pray for us? The Canaanite woman cried out; and, as the disciples came, they say, 'Send her away, because she cries after us.' And to them indeed he said, 'I am not sent except to the sheep of the house of Israel.' But when she herself approached, and persevered crying, 'Lord, even the whelps eat of the crumbs from the table of their masters': then he gave the benefit, and said, 'Be it done to thee as thou wilt.' Thou seest in what manner he repelled [her], when others prayed: but when she herself cried out for the gift, he assented."

This passage the **Lutherans**, as [it were] the Achilles of Zeno, oppose to the Catholics against the invocation of the saints. But it appears that Chrysostom brought these [things] forth not against the imploring of the saints — which everywhere he most keenly defends — but rather against certain slothful [men], who so commit themselves to the patronage of the saints, that meanwhile they, idle, cast themselves wholly into sins, and, sleeping, will do nothing for their own salvation. That to these the prayers of the saints profit nothing, Chrysostom affirms in almost innumerable places — but especially [in] the 8th homily on Matthew, saying: "IF we be negligent and slothful, we cannot be saved even by the merits of others, etc. But these [things] we say, not that we deny that the saints are to be supplicated for sinners; but lest we resolve [dissolve] ourselves into idleness and sloth, and, sleeping ourselves, commit the care of our [affairs] to others only." And [in] the 5th homily on Matthew he says: "EVEN if the patriarch Abraham supplicate for those who, by remaining in their vices, are incurably sick, God will depart, forsaking the one who asks, lest he hear the voice of the one interceding for such [men], etc." Not therefore, as if yawning and slothful, are we to depend upon the merits of others; *(right column, lower:)* for the prayers and supplications of the saints have a force on our behalf — and indeed a very great one — but then truly, when we too ask this same [thing] through penance, and flee to better pursuits. And [in] the 43rd homily on Genesis he says: "WHEN [that] which is from us we bring at the same time, and the intercession of the saints is added, it profits us very much. But if we ourselves be negligent, and place the hope of our salvation in them alone, it profits us nothing further. Not because the just are weak, but because through our own sloth we destroy ourselves." And [in] the 1st homily on the first epistle to the Thessalonians he says: "'WHAT need have I,' sayest thou, 'of the prayers of others, when I myself shall have been diligent?' Never say this, O man. There is need, and need of much prayer, etc." And after he has by many arguments demon-

[catchword "demon-" (demonstrat) → continues on p. 558 (PDF 563).]

(printed p. 558 [PDF p. 563], verso — end of Ann. CCCX, then Ann. CCCXI–CCCXII, on Philippians 1 and Colossians 1 (Chrysostom's close on the invocation of the saints [Phil. 1:18]; whether prayer is to be made for catechumens who die without baptism — Chrysostom, the First Council of Braga's canon on the damned, Gennadius of Marseilles, and Ambrose's oration at Valentinian's funeral, with Aquinas reading Gennadius via purgatory [Phil. 1:23]; and whether scripture attributes "patience" to God — Chrysostom's distinction of ὑπομονή *[endurance] from* μακροθυμία *[longsuffering], with Augustine* On Patience *[Col. 1:11]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCCX, from the catchword "demon-":)

—demonstrated the intervention of the saints to be exceedingly necessary to us, at length he concludes the discourse with these words: "THESE [things], therefore, being known, let us neither contemn the prayers of the saints, nor cast [our] whole [selves] upon them: this indeed, lest we be rashly overwhelmed by [their] snares; but that, lest we fall away from much gain and advancement — but let us also pray that they may pray for us, and reach out a hand; and let us ourselves cleave to the pursuit of virtue, that we may be able to attain the goods promised to those who love God, etc."

Annotation CCCXI

"Having a desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ." — Philippians 1[:23]

[margin: Whether prayer is to be made for catechumens departing without baptism.]

Chrysostom, [in] the third homily on the epistle to the Philippians, seems to indicate that for catechumens departing without baptism, prayer is not to be made. For thus he writes: "WE APPEASE God, praying for the dead. But this we say indeed of those who died in the faith; but catechumens we do not deem worthy even of this solace, but they are destitute of all help of this kind — one indeed being excepted. What is that? It is permitted to give to the poor in their name [as alms]; whence some refreshment accrues to them." I would believe these [things] are to be understood not of private and secret prayers, but of public and solemn supplications — that is, of the singing of psalms, and the sacrifices of masses, wherewith the funerals and obsequies of Christians are wont to be celebrated. For when the ancient fathers had observed that certain catechumens, out of laziness and sloth, deferred the sacrament of baptism even to the last day of life, they took away from them the honor of ecclesiastical burial and the public oblation of the divine sacrifice — that, deterred by fear of this ignominy and detriment, they might hasten to baptism as soon as possible. Whence in the first Council of Braga there is extant a canon "On the punishment of the damned [de supplicio damnatorum]," decreeing the same [kind of] funeral for catechumens of this sort, and for those who inflict death upon themselves, or who, on account of crimes committed, are put to death by public execution, in these words: "LIKEWISE it has been decreed, that for those who inflict death upon themselves either by the sword, or by poison, or by a precipice [fall], or by hanging, or in any manner of violence, no commemoration be made for them in the oblation, nor be their bodies led to their burial with psalms. Likewise it has been decreed to be done concerning those who are punished for their crimes. Likewise it has been decreed, that for catechumens who die without the redemption of baptism, in like manner neither be commemoration made in the oblation, nor the office of psalm-singing be expended."

Gennadius, presbyter of Marseilles, in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas* (which is wrongly inscribed to Augustine), reckons among the Christian dogmas a decree which seems to exclude all catechumens — except those who died in martyrdom — not only from the ecclesiastical suffrages, but also from the felicity of eternal life, in these plain words: "WE BELIEVE the way of salvation to be for the baptized only; but we believe no catechumen — although he has died in good works — to have eternal life, martyrdom excepted,

wherein the whole sacrament of baptism is fulfilled." The divine **Ambrose**, whom all the theologians follow especially in this passage, judges that for all catechumens, migrating [dying] even without baptism and without martyrdom, *(right column:)* the entrance of perpetual beatitude lies open — provided that the will of baptism, and the zeal of living piously, have not been lacking to them. For indeed, in the oration which he delivered at the funeral of Valentinian Augustus, he addresses his sisters, the queens, with these sayings: "BUT I hear that you grieve, because Valentinian did not receive the sacraments of baptism. Tell me, what else is there in you but the will, but the petition [asking]? And yet he also had long ago this vow, that before he came into Italy he might be initiated, and he signified that he would shortly be baptized by me. Has he not, then, the grace which he desired? He has not [that] which he asked for? And where is that [text]: 'The just man, by whatever death he be overtaken, his soul shall be in refreshment'? And a little below: 'Or is it this that moves [you], that the mysteries were not solemnly celebrated? Then neither are the martyrs crowned, if they be catechumens; for they are not crowned, if they be not initiated. But if they are washed in their own blood, then his piety and his will have washed him also.'" Thus Ambrose. The divine **Thomas** [Aquinas], in the third volume of the *Summa*, question 68, thus interprets Gennadius: that he says catechumens are not by that decree utterly barred from the kingdom of heaven, but for a while retarded from its entrance, until they be expiated in the purgatorial [fire] of the flames, and freed from the filth and the penalties of past crimes — which, in the baptized, the water of baptism washes away; but in the unbaptized martyrs, the shedding of blood cleanses.

Annotation CCCXII

"Unto all patience, and longanimity." — Colossians 1[:11]

[margin: Whether the sacred letters attribute patience to God.]

Chrysostom, [in] the second homily on the epistle to the Colossians, at the exposition of this clause, says that nowhere in the sacred letters is patience attributed to God, but frequently longanimity [longsuffering]. His words are these: "WE ARE LONGANIMOUS toward those whom we are able to avenge ourselves upon; but patient toward those whom we cannot avenge ourselves upon. Therefore patience indeed is never attributed to God, but longanimity very often — as here this same blessed [Paul], writing elsewhere, says: *[margin: Rom. 2.4]* 'Or dost thou despise the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and longanimity?'" There seem to gainsay this assertion very many testimonies of divine scripture, which call God "patient," and commend his patience — as in Psalm 85, *[margin: Psalm 85]* where it is read, "And thou, Lord God, [art] patient, and of much mercy, and true"; and [in] Psalm 144, *[margin: Psalm 144]* "The Lord [is] patient, and of much mercy." But concerning his patience it is written [in] Ecclesiastes 8, *[margin: Eccl. 8]* "A hundred times the sinner does evil, and is awaited by God through patience"; and to the Romans 9, *[margin: Rom. 9]* "God SUSTAINED, in much patience, the vessels fitted for destruction"; and [in] the first of Peter, the third [chapter], *[margin: 1 Pet. 3]* "They awaited the patience of God in the days of Noah." It is to be known that the word "patience" signifies two [things] in the sacred letters: namely, the virtue by which adversities are bravely borne — which he calls ὑπομονήν [hypomon■n] — which is not ascribed to God, in whom there is no calamity to be borne; and a certain expectation, called by the Greeks μακροθυμίαν [makrothymían], by which the erring are wont to be awaited a long time unto repentance — which is properly attributed to God. Both significations of patience Augustine, comprehending in the book *On Patience*, said: "THE PATIENCE of God is preached, not in this — that ma-

[catchword "ma-" → continues on p. 559 (PDF 564).]

(printed p. 559 [PDF p. 564], recto — end of Ann. CCCXII, then Ann. CCCXIII–CCCXVII, on Colossians 1–3, 2 Thessalonians 2–3 (the Hebrew and Greek terms behind God's "longanimity" not "patience" [Col. 1:11]; whether individual men have individual guardian angels — Chrysostom vs. Jerome, with the

theologians following Jerome [Col. 1:20]; a cross-reference on bewitchment [Col. 3:15]; whether the common/vernacular Bibles are to be read by all — Chrysostom bidding all lay people acquire Scripture, abused by the Lutherans [Col. 3:16]; all things in Scripture clear and plain [2 Thess. 2:5]; and whether monks must earn their bread by manual labor — Augustine's On the Work of Monks *answering the four monastic excuses [2 Thess. 3:10]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — concluding Annotation CCCXII, from the catchword "ma-":)

—suffer some evil, but in this — that he awaits the wicked, that they may be converted." Chrysostom, therefore, regarding the former signification, rightly noted that nowhere in the sacred books is the name of ὑπομονή [hypomon■] — that is, "patience" — attributed to God. For in these [passages], wherever God is called "patient," it is read in Hebrew אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם, *Erech aphaim*, "long of anger" [the print glosses "longus iris"] — that is, slow to anger; but in Greek Μακρόθυμος [Makróthymos], that is, "longanimous [long-suffering]." Likewise, wherever mention is made of the divine patience, among the Hebrews there is had תִּקְוָה, *thikuath* [tiqw■h], that is, "expectation"; but among the Greeks Μακροθυμία [makrothymía], that is, "longanimity," or ἀνοχή [anoch■] — which word, according to the testimony of Ammonius, properly signifies a truce, which, a treaty being struck, is granted to enemies in war, that they may pass to and fro to treat of peace. Both words Paul used to the Romans, in the second chapter, when he was speaking of the divine patience, saying: ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς; — that is, "Or dost thou despise the riches of his goodness, and of [his] forbearance [truce], and of [his] longanimity?"

Annotation CCCXIII

"Making peace through the blood of his cross, [both] the [things] which are on earth, and the [things] which are in the heavens." — Colossians 1[:20]

[margin: Whether to individual men individual angels are deputed.]

Chrysostom, [in] the third homily on the Colossians, seems to indicate that individual angels are not deputed to individual men for [their] guardianship, but only to the faithful who believe in Christ. For thus he speaks: "AT FIRST, according to the number of the nations, were the angels; but now not according to the number of the nations, but according to the number of the faithful. Whence is it plain? Hear Christ saying, 'Their angels always see the face of my Father, who is in the heavens.' For indeed every one of the believers has an angel. For also from the beginning each of the famous and approved men had an angel — as Jacob says: 'The angel, who feeds me, and who delivered me from my youth.'" But **Jerome**, expounding that passage, "Their angels, etc.," cited from Chrysostom, judges that individual men have individual angels as guardians, saying: "GREAT is the dignity of souls, that each one has, from the rising of nativity [birth], an angel delegated for its guardianship." And the consent of all theologians follows this opinion.

Annotation CCCXIIII

"And let the peace of God abound in your hearts." — Colossians 3[:15]

[margin: Fascination [bewitchment].]

Chrysostom, [in] the eighth homily on the epistle to the Colossians — what he pronounced concerning the fascination [bewitchment] of old women bewitching boys, see above, Annotation 276 of this book.

Annotation CCCXV

"Let the word of Christ dwell in you." — Colossians 3[:16]

[margin: The common [vernacular] Bibles are to be read by all.]

Chrysostom, [in] the ninth homily on the epistle to the Colossians, says: "HEAR, I beseech [you], all ye seculars [laity]: procure for yourselves Bibles, the medicines [pharmaka] of the soul; if you wish nothing else, at least acquire the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, the gospels. Pore over these — nay, not only pore over [them], but take up *(right column:)* all, and retain them with the mind." The **Lutherans** object this passage to the Catholic bishops, who do not grant to all the reading of the vernacular Bibles, which Chrysostom admonishes to be bought by all the laity. See above, Annotation 152 of this volume.

Annotation CCCXVI

"When I was yet with you, [I told you these things], etc." — 2 Thessalonians 2[:5]

Chrysostom, [in] the third homily on the latter [epistle] to the Thessalonians: "All [things]," he says, "in the divine scriptures are clear and plain." See above, Annotation 152 of this book.

Annotation CCCXVII

"He who will not work, let him not eat." — 2 Thessalonians 3[:10]

[margin: Whether monks are to be compelled to provide for themselves a living by the labor of [their] hands.]

Augustine, in the book *On the Work of Monks*, which he almost wholly consumed [spent] on the exposition of this period [passage], thus interprets this sentence of the Apostle, that he seems to teach that all monks are to be driven [compelled] to acquire for themselves, by the labor of [their] hands, the [things] necessary for their sustenance, and at the same time [that they are] to be forbidden to seek their living from the alms of the faithful. For in many places of his book, but especially in chapter 17, he refutes the monks who, being unwilling to work with [their] hands, were saying that the aforesaid precept of Paul neither pertained to them, nor could be observed by them. But he confutes them with these words: "I DESIRE to know what those do who are unwilling to work bodily — to what thing they are at leisure. 'We are at leisure,' they say, 'for prayers, and psalms, and reading, and the word of God.'" Then, rejecting these four excuses as invalid — first, against that [excuse] concerning prayer, he says: "WHY do they not set aside some parts of the times for working, according to the apostolic precepts, since the prayer of one obeying is sooner heard than [that] of a thousand contemners?" Secondly, against that [excuse] concerning the occupation of psalm-singing, he says: "BUT they can easily sing the divine songs even while working with [their] hands, and console the very labor as with a divine rowing-chant [celeuma]. Or are you ignorant of the craftsmen — upon what vanities of theatrical fables they bestow their hearts and tongues, while [their] hands recede not from work? What, then, hinders the servant of God, working with [his] hands, from meditating in the law of the Lord and singing psalms — so indeed, that for the learning of those [things] which he would recall from memory, he have set-apart times?" Thirdly, to those alleging the assiduity of reading, he says: "BUT those who say they are at leisure for reading — do they not find there [in Scripture] that which the Apostle enjoins? What, then, is that perversity — to be unwilling to obey the reading, while one wishes to be at leisure for it; and, that what is good may be the longer read, for that reason to be unwilling to do what is read?" Fourthly, those who defend themselves by the exercise of divine preaching he thus convicts: "IF a discourse [sermon] is to be dispensed to someone, and he is so occupied that he cannot work with [his] hands: can all in the monastery do this? Why do all wish to be at leisure under this pretext? Although even if all could [preach], they ought to make [take] turns by vicissitude — not only that the rest might labor at the necessary [tasks] in the manner [aforesaid], but also because it suffices that one speak while many hear."

John Calvin, [in] chapter four of the *Heretical Institution*,

[catchword "quarto," → continues on p. 560 (PDF 565).]

(printed p. 560 [PDF p. 565], verso — Ann. CCCXVII continues (whether monks must earn their bread by manual labor): Calvin's fourth-chapter abuse of Augustine, shared earlier by William of Saint-Amour, Wycliffe, and Luther; the Council of Constance (session 8) condemning Wycliffe's 24th article; then Augustine's own four classes of monks who may by evangelical right live without manual labor — preachers of the word [Luke 10; 1 Cor. 9; Gal. 6], ministers of the altar [1 Cor. 9], the sick, and the delicately-reared — and Augustine's true target, the idle Psallian/Euchite/Massalian monks who wholly refused work [2 Thess. 3:10]. Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXVII continued, from the catchword "quarto,":)

—[chapter] four, gathers from these sayings of Augustine that it is not lawful for monks to procure their living from anywhere but from mechanical crafts, even if they be assiduous in prayers, psalmodies, and sacred studies. Which error, even before Calvin, **William of Saint-Amour**, **John Wycliffe**, and **Luther** professed: for these also asserted that monks who, work of the hands being omitted, procure a living for themselves by begging, are to be coerced, as enemies of the divine law, which says: *[margin: Deut. 15.a]* "There shall by no means be a needy man and a beggar among you." This error of theirs the Council of Constance, in the eighth session, in the condemnation of Wycliffe, condemned in these words:

"The 24th article of Wycliffe thus says: 'Let the brothers [friars] be bound to acquire a living by the labors of [their] hands, and not by begging.' The first part of this article is scandalous, and presumptuously asserted, inasmuch as it speaks so generally and indistinctly; and the second [is] erroneous, inasmuch as it asserts that begging is not lawful for the brothers." Thus the Council.

But the divine **Augustine** is so far from the opinion which the heretics preposterously gather from his sayings, that in the same volume he demonstrates — both by many reasons and by testimonies of divine scripture — that there are four kinds of monks to whom, by evangelical right, it is lawful to lead life without the labors of [their] hands, and to be sustained by the aids and oblations of others. Of these, *[margin: [Augustine,] Book On the Work of Monks, ch. 6 & 7]* in the first place he sets those who devote themselves to the preaching of evangelical doctrine, and teach the word of God; because to these Christ gave the power to take the [things] necessary for sustenance from the means of [their] hearers, when, sending the apostles to preach, he says: *[margin: Luke 10]* "Remain in their house, eating and drinking the [things] which are among them. For the laborer is worthy of his hire." And Paul, approving the same, in the former epistle to the Corinthians says: *[margin: 1 Cor. 9.b]* "The Lord ordained for those who announce the gospel, to live by the gospel." And again: "Who ever serves as a soldier at his own charges? Who plants a vineyard, and does not eat of its fruit? Who feeds a flock, and does not eat of the milk of the flock? If we have sown spiritual [things] for you, is it a great [thing] if we reap your carnal [things]?" And in the epistle to the Galatians, imposing the same law on hearers, he says: *[margin: Gal. 6.b]* "Let him who is catechized in the word communicate to him who catechizes him, in all good [things]." In the second place he sets those who serve the altar, or distribute the sacraments, or are detained by other ecclesiastical ministries and occupations; because concerning these Paul wrote in the same epistle to the Corinthians: *[margin: 1 Cor. 9.b]* "Know you not that those who work in the sacred [precinct] eat the [things] which are of the sacred [precinct]? and those who serve the altar partake with the altar? For so the Lord ordained." The third place he assigns to sick monks, laboring either with continual or with frequent sickness; concerning whom, in the 16th chapter of that book: "On account of bodily infirmities (he says), which by no means can be lacking, the Apostle not only permits the needs of the saints to be supplied by the good faithful, but even most wholesomely exhorts [it]." In the fourth place, finally, he subjoins certain monks, delicately and splendidly reared by [their] parents, who, the world being forsaken — and [their] riches either expended upon the poor, or conferred for the support of the monastery — have chosen the monastic life. These, because, being more softly nourished, they cannot bear labor, he exempts from the exercises of craftsmen; thus writing in chapter 25 of the same *(right*

column:) work: "THOSE who, having relinquished — or distributed among the poor of Christ, with pious and wholesome humility — an ample or any kind of opulent means, have willed to be numbered [among the poor]: if they are strong in body, and are free from ecclesiastical occupations, although — [they] bringing so great a proof of their mind, and the needs of that same society [receiving] from those things which they had either very much or not a little — the common thing itself and fraternal charity owes them, in turn, the sustaining of their life; nevertheless, if they too work somewhat with [their] hands, that they may take away the excuse from the lazy who come from a humbler life [and] on this account [claim exemption from] the exercise, they act far more mercifully than when they divided all their [goods] among the needy. Which indeed, if they be unwilling [to do], who would dare to compel [them]? etc." Again, in the 21st chapter of the same book, more briefly touching upon these four conditions of monks in few words, he speaks after this manner: "OUR brothers, if they are evangelists, if ministers of the altar, if dispensers of the sacraments, do not arrogate this to themselves, but plainly vindicate [claim] the power of not laboring. If at least they had something in this world, whereby they might easily, without craft [-labor], sustain that life — which, being converted to God, they distributed to the needy — then their infirmity is to be believed, and to be borne. For such [men] are wont, not (as many think) better, but — which is true — being more feebly reared, to be unable to sustain the labor of bodily works." THUS Augustine: from which it appears clearer than light that he opposes the heretics, who, without any distinction, compel all the orders of monks to the labor of the hands, and forbid those who refuse to be aided by the alms of the pious.

BUT, lest the sayings of Augustine, brought forth by Calvin and other heretics, disturb anyone, it is to be known that he does not by these words impose upon all monks indiscriminately the necessity of laboring, but refutes a certain idle throng of monks, who — although with unimpaired strength they were rightly strong, and were free from the preaching of the word of God, and from the dispensation of the sacraments, and from all ecclesiastical service — nevertheless so shrank from labor that they even said it was not lawful for the servants of God, especially monks, to apply [themselves] to the works of the hands, and to be exercised in bodily crafts; but that they ought, without any cause of acquiring a living, to rest in prayers, readings, and songs alone, and to expect the necessaries of life from God, and to receive [them] from the friends of God, after the manner of the birds of heaven, and the flowers of the earth, which Christ set before his disciples to be imitated when he said: *[margin: Matt. 6]* "Be not solicitous what you shall eat, or wherewith your body shall be clothed. Regard the birds of heaven, for they neither sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feeds them. Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they labor not, neither do they spin. Be not, therefore, solicitous, saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For all these things the nations seek." Therefore, against idle monks of this kind — who at that time in Africa were fostering this error, sprung from the Psallian, Euchite, and Massalian heretics — Augustine composed the book *On the Work of Monks*, in which he demonstrated three [things] especially. FIRST, that it is by no reason to be borne, that monks who, by no evangel-

[catchword "gelico" (evangelico) → continues on p. 561 (PDF 566).]

(printed p. 561 [PDF p. 566], recto — end of Ann. CCCXVII, then Ann. CCCXVIII–CCCXXI, on 2 Thessalonians 3 and 1 Timothy 3–5 (Augustine's three demonstrations against the idle monks concluded, and the two pious readings of Deut. 15 [Aquinas and Thomas Waldensis] answering the heretics' attack on religious mendicancy [2 Thess. 3:10]; whether a "bigamist" may be made a bishop — Jerome's affirmative vs. the "Cainan heresy," rejected by Pope Innocent I's decree [1 Tim. 3:2]; almost no difference between bishop and priest [1 Tim. 3:8]; whether God was seen by the angels before the Incarnation — Theodoret [1 Tim. 3:16]; and whether clerics may own anything beyond food and clothing [1 Tim. 5:18]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXVII concluded, from the catchword "gelico":)

—[by no] evangelical business, and [being] occupied by no ecclesiastical care, should pass an idle and inert life without any labor of the hands; since Paul, in the latter epistle to the Thessalonians, takes away from men of this kind the power of eating, *[margin: 2 Thess. 3.e]* saying: "When we were with you, this we declared to you: that if anyone will not work, neither let him eat. For we have heard that certain [people] among you walk disorderly, working nothing, but acting curiously [as busybodies]; but to those who are of this sort we declare, and beseech [them] in the Lord Jesus Christ, that, working with silence, they eat their own bread." SECONDLY, he shows that to monks — even [those] occupied with the ministry of the church and the office of preaching — the crafts of artificers are not forbidden by Christ; but that they can, if they will, and if it so be expedient for the salvation of souls, sometimes procure for themselves by some craft the [things] necessary for a living, after the imitation of Paul — who, although (as he himself writes in the former [epistle] to the Corinthians) *[margin: 1 Cor. 9]* he had the power of living by the gospel without the labor of the hands, nevertheless testifies in the second [epistle] to the Thessalonians that he was unwilling to use that power, but lived by mechanical work, that he might present himself as an example of laboring voluntarily. For thus in that epistle he addresses them: "You yourselves know how it behooves [you] to imitate us: since we were not in idleness among you, neither did we eat bread of anyone for nothing, but in labor and fatigue, working night and day, lest we should burden any of you: not as if we had not the power, but that we might give ourselves as a pattern to you for imitation." *[margin: Book On the Work of Monks, ch. 26]* THIRDLY, he rejects the excuses of idle monks, painted over [disguised] with a perverse interpretation of the scriptures. For [as] to that which they say — that our Savior commanded the apostles to live after the manner of the birds, without any solicitude — Augustine shows that it was not said by Christ for this reason: to lead away his disciples from honest labor of the hands to idleness and sloth, the seed-bed of all evils; but that he might instruct them, lest by the solicitude of acquiring a living they should forsake the evangelical vocation — [they] fearing lest, being detained in the apostolic ministry, the providence of the most high Father should be lacking to them; who, since he feeds the birds — [which] work nothing at all — for nothing, why should he not nourish his sons, laboring in the work of God? The aim, therefore, of Augustine in the book *On the Work of Monks* is not that which the heretics boast — namely, that monks be relegated to the workshops of craftsmen — but that idle monks, and those who think the labors of artificers forbidden to them, be recalled from base idleness to honest business. Thus far concerning the labor of the hands.

THERE REMAINS now that passage cited from Deuteronomy — namely, *[margin: Deut. 15.a]* "There shall not be a needy man and a beggar among you" — which the heretics, with wrenched neck [violently], drag against religious mendicancy. To this two Thomases brought two pious explanations: [Thomas] Aquinas, and [Thomas] Waldensis. Of these, the latter [Waldensis], in the work which he inscribed *On the Doctrine of the Ancient Faith*, in the fourth book of the second tome, says that those words are not prohibitory, but promissory — that is, that by these God does not forbid begging, but promises to the Jews (if, however, they keep the law) so great an affluence of riches, that no one among them will be needy and a beggar. Which exposition those promises prove to be true, which Moses immediately sub- *(right column:)* joins to the aforesaid words, saying: "The Lord will bless thee, as he has promised. Thou shalt lend to many nations, and thyself shalt take a loan from none. Thou shalt rule over very many nations, and no one shall rule over thee, etc." But the divine **Thomas** [Aquinas], in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 187, article 5, more aptly and (as I judge) more genuinely elucidating the same passage, holds that by that sentence a pious and just begging is not forbidden, but that the rich are restrained, lest they be so tenacious of their riches that, for that cause, the poor be reduced to extreme want, and driven to compelled beggary. See above, Annotations 18, 147, and 192.

Annotation CCCXVIII

"A bishop must be the husband of one wife." — 1 Timothy 3[:2]

[margin: Whether it is lawful to constitute a bigamist a bishop.]

Jerome, in the epistle to Oceanus, expounding the present passage, affirms that those can be created bishops who had two wives — one before baptism, and, she being dead, another after baptism; and the opinion of those who deny this he calls the Cainan heresy [*Cainam haeresim*]. This same [thing] he has in the exposition of the first chapter to Titus. This opinion is rejected in the decrees of the pontiffs, cause 28, question 3, where the decree of Pope Innocent the First is had in these words: "WHOEVER before baptism had one [wife], and after baptism another, is judged a bigamist [*digamus*]; and although he be strong in the merit of [his] life, and in the knowledge of industry, nevertheless he cannot be ordained a bishop." **Sedulius Scotus**, in the explanation of the third chapter of the former epistle to Timothy, embraces the opinion of Jerome. See below, Annotation 225.

Annotation CCCXIX

"Deacons in like manner chaste, etc." — 1 Timothy 3[:8]

[margin: Bishop, and presbyter.]

Chrysostom, [in] the eleventh homily on the former [epistle] to Timothy, asserts that between a bishop and a priest [*sacerdotem*] there is almost no difference. The **Author** of the commentaries [ascribed to] Jerome writes the same in this place. See below, Annotation 324.

Annotation CCCXX

"He appeared to angels, he was preached to the nations, etc." — 1 Timothy 3[:16]

[margin: Whether God, before the incarnation of Christ, was seen by the angels.]

Theodoret, in the commentaries, expounding this passage, intimates that God, before the flesh assumed by Christ, was not seen by the angels, but afterwards was seen through the flesh of Christ, as through a veil. For thus he says: "HE was seen by angels. For the nature of the divinity, which falls not under sight, not even the angels themselves saw; but the incarnate [God] they saw." This same [thing] he teaches more openly and copiously, by a long narration, in the dialogue whose title is IMMUTABILIS [*The Immutable*]. This thou hast above, Annotation 182 of this book.

Annotation CCCXXI

"The laborer is worthy of his hire." — 1 Timothy 5[:18]

[margin: Whether clerics ought to possess anything beyond food and clothing.]

Chrysostom, [in] the former [epistle] to Timothy, homily 15: "To the Levites," he says, "there had been rendered, constituted by law, tithes, gold, first-fruits, vows, and very many other [things]. But to them, by the law, these [things] by right per-

[signature "Aaa"; catchword "per-" → continues on p. 562 (PDF 567).]

(printed p. 562 [PDF p. 567], verso — end of Ann. CCCXXI, then Ann. CCCXXII–CCCXXIIII, on 1 Timothy 5 and Titus 1 (clerics ought to have nothing beyond food and clothing [1 Tim. 5:18]; the punishment of blasphemers — Chrysostom's fierce "strike the blasphemer's mouth" petition, excused as zealous hyperbole [1 Tim. 5:23]; angels created long before the visible world — Jerome on Titus [Titus 1:2]; and the great question whether a bishop is greater than a presbyter — Jerome's identification of the two [flagged by Augustine as Aerius's error], with Ambrosiaster and Chrysostom nearly agreeing [Titus 1:5]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXXI concluded, from the catchword "per-":)

—were permitted [to them], [namely] to those seeking only present and earthly [things]. But I would boldly say that the prelates of the church ought to have nothing beyond food and clothing, lest they be drawn to those [things] by desire." These [things] have been observed [in] Annotation 121 of this book.

Annotation CCCXXII

"Use a little wine." — 1 Timothy 5[:23]

[margin: The punishment of blasphemers.]

Chrysostom, [in] the first homily to the people of Antioch, when, after the exposition of this passage, he had diverted to a discourse on blasphemy, brought forth, among other [things], this petition against blasphemers: "BUT after words have been made by us concerning blasphemy, I wish to ask one retribution [recompense] from you all for this assembly and sermon: that you chastise for me those who blaspheme in the city; and if you hear anyone at the crossroads and in the marketplace blaspheming God, approach, rebuke [him]; and if it be needful to inflict blows, refuse not: strike his face with the palm, bruise his mouth, sanctify thy hand by the striking. And if any accuse [thee], and if they drag [thee] to prison" — there follows — "and if the judge demand penalties before the tribunal, say with freedom [boldness], that he blasphemed the king of the angels. For if it behooves that one blaspheming an earthly king be punished, much more [must one punish] him who afflicts that [heavenly king] with contumely."

THERE ARE [some] to whom this petition of Chrysostom seems harsh, and little worthy of the modesty of an evangelical doctor. But they excuse [it], because a burning zeal of the divine honor, and a most keen hatred of blasphemy, compelled the man of God — flagrant [ablaze] with charity — to exceed the mark, and, according to the old proverb, to ask much, that he might at least obtain a little, and sometimes to demand unjust [things], that he might receive just [things].

Annotation CCCXXIII

"Which God promised before the ages of the world." — Titus 1[:2]

[margin: Angels existing long before the world.]

Jerome, in the commentary on the epistle to Titus, explaining this, teaches that the angels were founded [created] before this visible world, saying: "SIX thousand years of our world are not yet fulfilled: and how many eternities before — how many times, how many origins of ages — is it to be thought there were, in which the angels, thrones, dominations, and the other virtues served God, and, without the vicissitudes of times and measures, subsisted at God's bidding?" Inspect [look at] Annotation five of the fifth book.

Annotation CCCXXIIII

"That thou mayest constitute presbyters throughout the cities." — Titus 1[:5]

(The printed running-head cites "Tim. 1," but the annotation expounds the epistle to Titus.)

[margin: Whether a bishop is greater than a presbyter.]

Jerome, in the commentary on the epistle to Titus, elucidating this period, is believed to be of the opinion of those who teach that a bishop is not superior to a simple priest [*sacerdote*], but that both are the same. Which opinion Augustine, in the book *On Heresies*, chapter 53, numbers among the condemned errors of Aerius. The words of Jerome are these: "LET US diligently attend to the words of the Apostle, saying, 'That thou mayest constitute presbyters throughout the cities.' For the same is a presbyter who [is] a bishop; and before, by the devil's instinct, partisanships in religion came to be, and it was said among the peoples, *[margin: 1 Cor. 1.b]* 'I am of Paul, I of Apollo, but I of Cephas,' the churches were governed by the common counsel of

presbyters. But after each one thought those whom he had baptized to be his own, not Christ's, it was decreed in the whole world that one chosen from the presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom the whole care of the church should pertain, and the seeds of schisms be taken away. Does anyone think this to be not the scriptures', but our own opinion — [namely] that a bishop and a presbyter are one, and that the one [word] is of seniority, the other a name of office? Let the words of the Apostle to the Philippians be re-read, saying: *[margin: Phil. 1.a]* 'Paul and Timothy, to the saints who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons, grace and peace.' Philippi is one city of Macedonia; and certainly in one city there could not be more bishops, as they are [now] named. But because at that time they called the same [men] bishops and presbyters, therefore he spoke indifferently of bishops, as of presbyters. Still, [lest] this seem ambiguous to anyone, unless it be proved by another testimony: in the Acts of the Apostles it is written, that when the Apostle came to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus, and called the presbyters of that same church, to whom afterward, among other [things], he thus spoke: *[margin: Acts 20.b]* 'Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, in which the Holy Spirit has placed you bishops.' And here diligently *(right column:)* observe, in what manner he called the presbyters of one city, Ephesus, afterward the same [men] bishops. These [things] we said for this reason, that we might show that among the ancients the same were presbyters whom [they called] also bishops; but by little and little, that the seed-plots of dissensions might be plucked up, all the solicitude was deferred [transferred] to one. As, therefore, the presbyters know that they, by the custom of the church, are subject to him who shall have been set over them: so let the bishops know that they are greater than the presbyters more by custom than by the truth of the Lord's disposition, and that they ought to rule the church in common." These [things] Jerome.

Ambrose [Ambrosiaster] is thought to favor the opinion of Jerome in the commentaries on the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians, thus saying: "NOT in all [things] do the writings of the Apostle agree with the ordination which now is in the church, because these were written in the very beginnings. For he also calls Timothy — created a presbyter by himself — a bishop, because the first presbyters were called bishops; so that, he departing, the next might succeed to him. Finally, in Egypt the presbyters consecrate [seal], if a bishop be not present. But because the following presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the primacies, the method was changed — the council [taking] foresight, that not order [seniority], but merit, should create a bishop, constituted by the judgment of many priests; lest an unworthy [man] should rashly usurp [it], and be a scandal to many."

Chrysostom seems not to differ much from both [parties], [in] the fifteenth homily on the former [epistle] to Timothy, thus writing: "AFTER he had spoken of bishops, the order of presbyters being omitted, he passes to the diaconate. Why that, I ask? Because, namely, between a bishop and a presbyter there is almost no difference. For to the presbyters also the care of the church has been committed; and [the things] which he said of bishops agree also to presbyters. For by ordination alone are they superior to those; and in this only do they seem to have more than presbyters."

The **Author** of the commentaries on Paul, which are inscribed to Jerome, in the explanation of the third chap-

[catchword "tis" (capitis) → continues on p. 563 (PDF 568).]

---

*(printed p. 563 [PDF p. 568], recto — end of Ann. CCCXXIIII, then Ann. CCCXXV–CCCXXVIII, on Titus 1–2 and Hebrews 1 (the bishop-vs-presbyter question concluded — the Author on Jerome, Sedulius, Anselm, Thomas Waldensis, Alfonso de Castro admitting Jerome erred, the sacramental-order reading, and **Trent session 23 canon 7** on holy orders; whether a "bigamist" may be chosen bishop — Jerome's answer [Titus 1:6]; the "daily bread" as spiritual food [Titus 2:11]; whether Hebrews is Paul's — Ambrose of Compsa vs. Cajetan [Heb. 1:1]; and whether the Father is the "cause" of the Son — Aquinas on Theodoret, defended via the Greek "principle/principiate" usage and Gregory of Nyssa [Heb. 1:3]). Read order: left column, then*

right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXXIIII concluded, from the catchword "tis":)

—[the third chap]ter of the former [epistle] to Timothy, handing down almost the same [things], thus speaks: "IT IS ASKED, why he made no mention of presbyters, but comprehended them under the name of bishops? Because [the presbyterate] is the second, nay almost one [and the same] grade; as [he shows when] he writes to the Philippians [addressing] bishops and deacons, *[margin: Phil. 1.a]* since one city cannot have several bishops. And in the Acts of the Apostles, gathering the presbyters of the church [as he was] about to go to Jerusalem, he says among other [things]: *[margin: Acts 20.b]* 'See to the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has ordained you bishops.'"

Sedulius Scotus, in the *Collectanea* on the epistle to Titus, gathered this same opinion, excerpted from the commentaries of Jerome on Titus, [and] repeated in [the same] words.

Anselm, bishop of Canterbury, in the commentaries on Titus, expounds the present clause of the Apostle in almost the same manner.

Thomas, bishop [i.e. Thomas Waldensis], writing against Wycliffe the heresiarch — who from the authority of Jerome equated a priest with a bishop — says that it is indeed had from Jerome that bishops are presbyters; but that between bishops and presbyters there is no distinction of grade, that cannot be deduced from his words. But because the sayings of Jerome plainly convict him of making priests equal to bishops, therefore **Alfonso de Castro**, in the sixth book *Against Heresies*, does not fear to confess that Jerome in this part erred; and, responding to those [things] which are brought by him from the epistle to the Philippians and from the Acts of the Apostles, says that it is true that at that time presbyters were also called bishops, because the distinction of the words had not yet been made; but that from this it is not gathered that presbyters and bishops were altogether the same. There are [some] who think that Jerome equated a presbyter with a bishop, and pronounced both the same — not indeed in the power of jurisdiction, in which certainly a bishop is far greater than a presbyter, but in the sacrament of order, in which indeed a presbyter differs nothing from a bishop, nor has a priest anything more than a bishop. For the sacrament is the same to both, and the same force of the sacrament — the character, and the grace — is in both. To this sense likewise they judge the sayings of Ambrose, Chrysostom, Anselm, and the Anonymous author are to be interpreted — especially since **Ambrose** [Ambrosiaster], on the former [epistle] to Timothy, chapter 4, opening his mind, expresses this same understanding in these words: "A BISHOP and presbyters are one ordination (for each is a priest); but the bishop is first, so that every bishop is a presbyter, yet not every presbyter a bishop. For he is a bishop, who is first among the presbyters." Thus Alfonso: to whose opinion it pleases [us] to subjoin the canon which is had concerning this matter [in] session 23 of the Council of Trent, in these words:

"IF ANYONE shall say, that bishops are not superior to presbyters; or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or that [the power] which they have is common to them with the presbyters; or that orders conferred by them are invalid without the consent or calling of the people, or of the secular power; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained by ecclesiastical and canonical power, nor sent, but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments: let him be anathema."

(right column:)

Annotation CCCXXV

"If any is without crime, the husband of one wife." — Titus 1[:6]

[margin: Whether a bigamist is to be chosen for bishop.]

Jerome, in the commentary on the epistle to Titus, thus expounds this passage: "MANY, more superstitiously than truly, think that even those who, when they were gentiles, had one wife — she being lost [dead], [they] after the baptism of Christ took another — are not to be chosen [*legendos*] in the priesthood; whereas surely, if this is to be observed, those rather ought to be barred from the episcopate who, before, exercising a wandering lust through harlots, received one wife [only after being] regenerated [baptized]. And [it is] much more detestable to have fornicated with many, than to be found a bigamist. For in the one [there] is the infelicity of matrimony; in the other, a lasciviousness prone to sin." **Anselm**, bishop of Canterbury, repeats almost the [same] in this place. See above, Annotation 318 of this book.

Annotation CCCXXVI

"The grace of God has appeared." — Titus 2[:11]

[margin: Daily bread.]

Jerome in this place affirms that the petition of daily bread, which we ask in the Lord's Prayer, is not to be understood of corporeal bread, but of spiritual food only. Read Annotation 31 of the present book.

Annotation CCCXXVII

"In many portions, and in many manners." — Hebrews 1[:1]

[margin: Whether the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's.]

Ambrose of Compsa chides Thomas Cajetan, [in] the first book of the *Annotations*, because in the preface of the epistle to the Hebrews he taught that the author of that same epistle is not Paul the Apostle, but another — a writer of uncertain name, unskilled in the Hebrew tongue — who wrote some [things] against the truth of the old scripture, and wrested certain testimonies from it to Christ, which cannot pertain to Christ. Thou hast this argument treated more than enough [*satis superque*] in the following book, in the confutation of the eighth heresy.

Annotation CCCXXVIII

"Who, since he is the splendor of glory." — Hebrews 1[:3.a]

[margin: Whether the Father is the cause of the Son.]

The divine **Thomas** [Aquinas] notes **Theodoret**, bishop of Cyrus, in the book *Against the Errors of the Greeks*, because in the commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews he wrote that the Father is the cause of the Son. Which locution the Latin Church abhors, lest it afford an occasion that the Son be understood [as] "caused" and "made," according to the understanding of the philosophers — among whom the same is "caused" as "made." But he [Aquinas] admonishes that this is a custom peculiar to the Greek fathers, that they use the name of "cause" and "caused" in divine [matters], yet not with this end, that they introduce a diversity of nature into the divine persons, and show the Son [to be] a making [*factura*] of the Father; but that by these words they explain that which we signify by the name of "principle" and "principiate [that-which-is-from-a-principle]." This **Gregory of Nyssa** openly testifies, saying: "BUT saying 'cause' and 'caused,' we do not signify nature by these names. For neither [do] these names, in place of essence [essen-

[signature "Aaa 2"; catchword "essen-" (essentiae) → continues on p. 564 (PDF 569).]

(printed p. 564 [PDF p. 569], verso — end of Ann. CCCXXVIII, then Ann. CCCXXIX–CCCXXXII, on Hebrews 1–4 (the Greek "cause/caused" defended as "principle/principiate" [Heb. 1:3]; whether there are two persons in Christ — Chrysostom's "God and man" suspected corrupt for "God and God," with Theophylact [Heb. 1:9]; whether the celestial bodies are to be burned up — Ambrose of Compsa's two

school-rejected opinions, deferred to Ann. 340 [Heb. 1:11]; whether Christ was "lessened" from God — Ambrose of Compsa's sharp attack on Cajetan's substantial/personal distinction [Heb. 2:7]; and whether laity and monks are held equally — Chrysostom that all the same law binds both, only marriage excepted [Heb. 4:16]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXXVIII concluded, from the catchword "essen-":)

—[do we give these names, in place] of essence, or by way of nature; but we demonstrate how [the relation] stands — namely, that the Son is not unbegotten, and that we do not show the Father [to be] from anyone by any generation."

Annotation CCCXXIX

"God, thy God, has anointed thee." — Hebrews 1[:9]

[margin: Whether in Christ there are two persons.]

Chrysostom, [in] the third homily on the epistle to the Hebrews, seems to place two persons in Christ, divine and human — which the theologians judge it unlawful [*nefas*] both to say and to think. For thus he speaks: "WHAT is [that] which he says, 'God, thy God'? Here he struck the Jews, and Paul of Samosata, and the Arians, and Marcellus, and Sabellius. In what manner? The Jews indeed, by showing them two persons, God and man." I suspect this passage in the Greek codices also to be corrupted [depraved]; and, for that which in them is written Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον [Theòn kaì ánthr■pon], that is, "God and man," [I suspect] it is to be read Θεὸν καὶ Θεὸν [Theòn kaì Theòn], that is, "God and God." Occasion of the suspicion is afforded by a twin conjecture. Of these the former is, that Theophylact, reporting these same words of Chrysostom — the mention of "man" being omitted, and the name of God being placed twice — thus writes: "This fights against the Jews, and Sabellius, and Marcellus, as indicating two persons, God and God." The other conjecture is, that the reduplication of the particle "God" fits most aptly with the proposed sentence of Paul, in which, by the twin name of God, it is said, "God, thy God, has anointed thee" — [namely] for the expression of two persons, the Jews, Sabellius, and Marcellus gainsaying, who acknowledge only one person of the deity. But if anyone urge that the reading of the Greek codices is entire [sound], and that it is to be read, "Two persons, God and man," we shall not much resist — provided that we understand by "man" to be signified the person of Christ, God and man at once; but by "God," the person of the Father, or of the Holy Spirit.

Annotation CCCXXX

"The heavens themselves shall perish, but thou shalt remain; and all, like a garment, shall grow old." — Hebrews 1[:11]

[margin: Whether the celestial bodies are to be burned up.]

Ambrose of Compsa, in the commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews, explaining this versicle, brings forth two opinions, not received by the schools of theologians: of which the former is, that the heavens are to be set aflame by fires at the end of the world, and thereafter, as by a certain re-fusion [remolding], are to obtain a far better state; the latter is, that the earth, renewed by the same fires, will be the perpetual habitation of those men who shall be found worthy neither of heaven nor of hell. Both assertions he confirms in the commentary of the latter epistle of Peter, where thou shalt find these [things] more amply annotated, Annotation 340.

Annotation CCCXXXI

"Thou hast lessened him a little less than the Angels." — Hebrews 2[:7]

[margin: Whether Christ was diminished from God.]

Thomas Cajetan, explaining these [words] in the commentaries, **Ambrose** [of Compsa], [in] the fourth book of the *Annotations*, accuses with these words: "NEW, and unheard-of, and unspeakable [is that which] he teaches in this place — namely, that Christ *(right column:)* is a little diminished from God according to substantial being; because he is God personally. But God is God both naturally and personally. Therefore he is a little diminished from God, because he is indeed God according to personal being (which is agreed to be substantial), but not according to nature. Thus he." But what theologian ever spoke thus, and in the same person separated these — namely, person and essence? Falsely, then, did the most holy synod and the whole church acclaim the *homoousion* — that is, consubstantial or co-essential! Besides, whatever is less than God in any manner whatsoever is not "a little less," as he teaches, but is infinitely less than He. I pass over [the fact] that he destroys his own self: for if personal being is substantial being, as he says, then to be God according to personal being is to be God according to substantial being. Let the learned, therefore, see to these [things] — whether they be to be approved, or to be eliminated — which so clearly fight with the celebrated profession of our faith.

Annotation CCCXXXII

"Let us therefore approach with confidence to the throne of grace." — Hebrews 4[:16]

[margin: Whether the laity and monks are equal — [their] obligations and offenses [being] equal.]

Chrysostom, [in] the seventh homily on the epistle to the Hebrews, seems to think, that to the laity [*saecularibus*] nothing more is lawful than to monks, except to have a wife; but in the rest they are held to live equally; nay, that — fornication excepted, which is graver in monks — the sins of the laity are as grave as [those] of monks. His words are these: "BUT what [have] labors, readings, vigils, fasts to do with us (sayest thou), who are not monks? These [things] thou sayest to me; say [them] to Paul when he says, *[margin: Col. 4.a]* 'Watching in all patience and prayer'; when he says, *[margin: Rom. 13.d]* 'Make not provision for the flesh in [its] concupiscences.' For he wrote thus not to monks only, but to all who were in the cities. For a secular man ought not to have anything more than a monk, except to cohabit with a wife only. For in this he has pardon, but in others by no means; but he ought to do all [things] equally as a monk." This same [thing], in the third book against the vituperators of the monastic life, more clearly and fully explaining, he thus writes: "BUT (thou wilt say) it is not of the same crime, for him who is addicted to the world to sin, and [for] him who once, and utterly, has devoted himself to God, to fall from the purpose of religion. For neither do both fall from the same height, so neither indeed do they receive the same wounds. Thou deceivest thyself utterly, and beguilest [thyself], if thou thinkest one [thing] to be required from secular men, another from monks. For this is almost the sole difference in either kind of life: that they [laymen] indeed bind themselves with the bonds of matrimony, but these [monks] endure free from these. But in the rest a common, and the same, method of the whole life is required from both; and to the same, for [their] faults, one [and the same] penalty is owed to all. For he who is angry at his brother without cause — whether he be a secular or a monk — offends God equally. And he who looks upon a woman, and covets her — in whatever state of life he be — is smitten with the same penalty of adultery. Nay rather (that we may dare to add something from ourselves, which may seem consonant to reason), he will sin more, without any hope of pardon, who from the world [secular life] has committed that crime. For neither [is it an equal misdeed] to commit—

[catchword "tere" (committere) → continues on p. 565 (PDF 570).]

(printed p. 565 [PDF p. 570], recto — end of Ann. CCCXXXII, then Ann. CCCXXXIII–CCCXXXVII, on Hebrews 4–12 and James 1 (Chrysostom's laity-vs-monks parity concluded, with Aquinas's twofold distinction of monastic sin [Heb. 4:16]; the beginning of salvation from the human will with grace

preventing [Heb. 7:10]; heaven neither mobile nor spherical — Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact [Heb. 8:2]; whether the saints' souls yet enjoy the divine vision before judgment [Heb. 11:37]; confession to God alone vs. to a priest [Heb. 12:17]; and whether the epistle of James is canonical — Ambrose of Compsa vs. Cajetan, with Jerome affirming James's authorship [James 1:1]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXXXII concluded, from the catchword "tere":)

—[to] commit [an equal misdeed], it seems, [for] him who, propped by the solace of a wife, is entangled by the comeliness of the woman, and [for] him who, destitute of such help and remedy of [his] infirmity, is nevertheless sometimes seized by this plague [of lust]." Thus far Chrysostom.

THERE ARE [some] who think that the monks of whom Chrysostom speaks were different from those whom the church now has — bound by monastic vows and by the constitutions of their founders and leaders — but were so like to seculars, that, beyond the voluntary institute of celibacy, they had no obligation of profession which bound them more than seculars. There are also [some] who think that Chrysostom uttered such [things] by hyperbole, to drive away the slothful and dull opinion of certain seculars, who thought that prayers, fasts, and vigils were imposed by Christ upon monks only. The divine **Thomas** [Aquinas], in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 186, discerning monastic sins by a twofold distinction, says that some are done either against the vows of profession, or from contempt of the offense, or with scandal of neighbors — and these he judges far graver and worse than crimes of the same kind committed by seculars; but others are admitted from frailty, or ignorance, without transgression of the vow and scandal of the neighbor — which indeed he shows to be lesser and lighter, at least for this reason: that they are absorbed by the many good works which the monk does, and are much more easily forsaken by him. And that Chrysostom regarded these [things] can be an argument [from the fact] that he says, "The secular will sin more, without any hope of pardon, [in] that he looks upon a woman and covets [her], than the monk. For neither does he seem to commit an equal misdeed, who, propped by the solace of a wife, is entangled by the comeliness of the woman, and he who, destitute of such help and remedy of [his] infirmity, is nevertheless sometimes seized by this plague."

Annotation CCCXXXIII

"For he was yet in the loins of [his] father." — Hebrews 7[:10]

[margin: Whence the beginning of salvation.]

Chrysostom, [in] the twelfth homily on the Hebrews, explaining this, seems to attribute the beginning of our salvation to the human will, [with] the divine grace preventing [going before], while he says: "IT BEHOOVES us, namely, first to choose the [things] which are good, and then he himself introduces the [things] which are his own. He does not precede our wills, lest free will be injured; but when we shall have chosen, then he brings us much assistance." This same [thing] he repeats in very many places. See above, Annotation 101 of the fifth book, and Annotation 184 of this book.

Annotation CCCXXXIIII

"Of the true tabernacle, which God fixed, and not man." — Hebrews 8[:2]

[margin: The state and figure of heaven.]

Chrysostom, [in] the fourteenth homily on the Hebrews, hints that heaven is neither mobile nor spherical. **Theodoret**, in the commentaries, follows the same opinion. **Theophylact**, in the commentaries: "HENCE (he says) observe, according to the divine John Chrysostom, that heaven is neither round, nor *(right column:)* mobile: for both [these things] he takes away, [by] that which he says, 'God fixed [it].'" See Annotations

three and nine of the fifth book.

Annotation CCCXXXV

"They went about in sheepskins [melotae], in goatskins." — Hebrews 11[:37]

[margin: Whether the souls of the saints are yet blessed.]

Chrysostom, [in] the 28th homily on the epistle to the Hebrews, narrating this, indicates that the souls of the saints, before the day of judgment, do not enjoy the divine vision. Read above, Annotation 264 of this book, and below, 345. **Theodoret** writes this same [thing] in this place. See there [*ibidem*]. **Theophylact** brings the same opinion hither. See there. **Oecumenius** similarly expounds. See the same Annotations.

Annotation CCCXXXVI

"He found no place of penance." — Hebrews 12[:17]

[margin: Confession.]

Chrysostom, [in] the 31st homily on the epistle to the Hebrews, alludes to the dogma of those who think that sins are to be confessed to God alone, and not to a priest [*sacerdoti*], for he says: "I DO NOT tell thee, that thou betray thyself in public, that thou accuse thyself before others, etc." See Annotation 175 of the preceding book.

Annotation CCCXXXVII

"James, [servant] of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ." — James 1[:1]

[margin: Whether the epistle of James is canonical.]

The exposition of Thomas Cajetan applied to this passage, **Ambrose of Compsa**, [in] the first book of the *Annotations*, confutes, writing these [things]: "I HAVE noted, moreover, concerning the epistle of James, those words which he [Cajetan] writes: 'It is not altogether certain whether this epistle be of James, the brother of the Lord — Jerome saying, in the book *On Illustrious Men*: "James, the brother of the Lord, wrote only one epistle, which is of the seven canonical" — which itself also is asserted [to be] by some other under his name, although by little and little, with time proceeding, it obtained authority. The salutation is so pure [plain], that it is conformable to no salutation of any other apostolic epistle. For it sounds nothing of God, nothing of Jesus Christ, nothing of grace [or] of peace, but [gives a] salutation after a profane manner; nor does he name himself an Apostle, but only a servant of Jesus Christ; from which, joined together at once, the author is rendered less certain.' Thus he [Cajetan]. But I have marveled, first, that he elicits from the words of Jerome that the author of this epistle is not certain — since Jerome so expressly says (and not as one doubting, but as one asserting) that James, the brother of the Lord, wrote this epistle; and asserts that it is one of the seven canonical, and that, with time proceeding, it obtained authority. And to Paulinus he thus says: 'JAMES, Peter, John, Jude — [these] seven wrote epistles, as mystical, so succinct — brief and long; brief in words, long in sentences [meanings]: so that rare is he who does not go blind [*caecutiat*] in the reading of them.' But as to what Cajetan adds — that the salutation is conformable to no salutation of any other apostolic epistle — it has nothing of moment. For John too is like to none in this—

[signature "Aaa 3"; catchword "hoc" → continues on p. 566 (PDF 571).]

(printed p. 566 [PDF p. 571], verso — end of Ann. CCCXXXVII, then Ann. CCCXXXVIII–CCCXL, on James 1, 5 and 2 Peter 3 (the canonicity of James concluded — Cajetan's "profane salutation" argument would condemn the whole apostolic council [James 1:1]; whether Christians may swear at all — Oecumenius [James 5:12]; whether extreme unction may be ministered by any layman — Bede and Pope Innocent I, then

Cajetan denying James speaks of the sacrament, refuted by Ambrose of Compsa and by ***Trent session 14 canon 1*** *[James 5:14]; and whether the heavens are to be burned in the world-conflagration — Ambrose of Compsa's two school-rejected opinions [2 Pet. 3:10]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXXXVII concluded, from the catchword "hoc":)

—this, [John,] who, having no salutation at all, at once bursts into that [text], "That which was from the beginning, etc." That is altogether marvelous, that he [Cajetan] says there is nothing of Jesus Christ in this salutation, since it begins from here, "James, servant of Jesus Christ." Then, [as to] that which he notes as though profane — [namely] to say "greeting [*salutem*]" thus baldly — he condemns not so much this Apostle as, at once, all [the apostles], and the whole apostolic council, who with these words saluted those to whom they sent the epistle: "The apostles and elder brethren, to those who are at Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, the brethren from among the gentiles, greeting." Read the following book, in the confutation of the ninth heresy, objection first, second, third, and fourth.

Annotation CCCXXXVIII

"Before all things, my brethren, swear not." — James 5[:12]

[margin: Oath.]

Oecumenius, in the *Collectanea*, in this place seems to forbid the right of swearing altogether to Christians. See Annotation 26 of this book.

Annotation CCCXXXIX

"Is anyone sick among you? Let him bring in the presbyters of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with holy oil." — James 5[:14]

[margin: Whether extreme unction can be ministered by any layman whatsoever.]

Bede the presbyter, in the commentaries on the epistle of James, elucidating this saying, seems to think that the sacrament of extreme unction can be conferred not only by presbyters, but also by any layman [*a quouis laico*]; for he says: "THIS also we read the Apostles to have done in the Gospel; and now the custom of the church holds, that the sick be anointed with consecrated oil by presbyters, and healed with accompanying prayer. Nor [is it lawful] to presbyters only, but — as Pope Innocent writes — it is even lawful for all Christians to use the same oil in anointing, in their own or their [household's] necessity. Which oil, however, it is not lawful to confect [prepare] except by bishops. For [as to] that which he says, 'With oil in the name of the Lord,' it signifies oil consecrated in the name of the Lord." The words cited by Bede are extant in the epistle of Pope Innocent the First to Decentius, bishop of Gubbio [Eugubium].

Thomas Cajetan, in the commentaries, examining this passage, thus writes: "NEITHER from the words, nor from the effect, do these words speak of the sacramental unction of extreme unction, but rather of an unction which the Lord Jesus instituted in the gospel to be exercised upon the sick, etc. For the text does not say, 'Is anyone sick unto death?' but absolutely, 'Is anyone sick?' And it says the effect [is] the alleviation of the sick; and of the remission of sins it speaks only conditionally. Since extreme [unction] is not given except on account of the point of death, and directly (as its form sounds) tends to the remission of sins — besides this, [namely] that James commands many presbyters to be called to one sick man, both praying and anointing, which is alien from the rite of extreme unction." This opinion of Thomas [Cajetan], **Ambrose** [of Compsa], [in] the fifth book, confutes with these words: "I GRIEVE vehemently, that he has attempted to take away from us the testimonies of the sacred unction, which are received from Mark, and from James the Apostle. *[margin: Mark 6.b]* For [as to] that which Mark testifies of the disciples — that they anointed the sick with oil — he denies that this can be understood of the sacrament which the church uses. But why it cannot be so

under-*(right column:)* stood, he proves no otherwise than by this: 'He himself said [it]' — which was [the manner] of the Pythagoreans — 'is to be observed toward him' — especially since Bede and Thomas and many others contradict [him]. Similarly, concerning that which the blessed James says, 'Is anyone sick among you,' he thus judges: 'Neither from the words, nor from the effect, do these words speak of the sacramental unction of extreme unction, but rather of an unction which the Lord Jesus instituted to be exercised upon the sick, etc.' But these [things], as they are surely ineptly [said] (for what is it that he says, 'the unction of extreme unction'? what is 'the unction of an unction'?), so are they also falsely said. For why do the words not agree? 'Because,' says he, 'it is not there said, "If anyone is sick unto death."' Likewise, because the effect of that unction is the alleviation of the sick. But does this repugn to that sacrament? Nay, it agrees [with it], as Thomas teaches, and others. Add, that of the remission of sins he speaks only conditionally: but that condition — namely, 'if he be in sins' — is tacitly present. For does he wish sins to be forgiven to those who wholly lack them? He added, that James bids many presbyters to be called to one sick man, both praying and anointing — which is alien from the rite of extreme unction. But the Apostle commanded that for solemnity, not for necessity; which, if it also were observed, would rightly be done. Which is even observed by the regulars [religious], that many pray, although one anoints; but the others also seem to anoint through him. Therefore, although I have grieved that these [things] are taught by this man, and against the doctrine of Augustine and the divine Thomas, and the tradition and persuasion of other doctors and of the church: nevertheless I have rejoiced, that he brought these reasons, which it will be no trouble to refute. Whereby it comes to pass, that while they strive to obscure the truth, they rather in fact illustrate [it]. But I do not wish to be superfluous in the allegations, and tiresome to a reader skilled and learned from the books of other Catholics." These [things] Ambrose against the error of Cajetan, lately rejected in the Council of Trent, session 14, canon 1, in these words: "IF ANYONE shall say, that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed James the Apostle, but only a rite received from the fathers, or a human figment: let him be anathema" [the print reads "Anathesima," for *Anathema*].

Annotation CCCXL

"But the day of the Lord will come, in which the heavens shall pass away with great violence." — 2 Peter 3[:10]

[margin: Whether the heavens are to be burned by the fire of the world-conflagration.]

Ambrose, bishop of Compsa, in the commentary of the latter epistle of Peter, elucidating this clause, professes two [things] against the opinion of all the theologians of the schools: the first is, that the heavens are to be burned up by the fires of the world-conflagration, and thereafter to be re-fused [remolded], and renewed into a better form; the second is, that the earth, by the final burning of the world, is to be renewed, and adorned with greater pleasantness, that there may be in it a perpetual habitation of those men who are worthy neither of heaven, nor of hell. The former assertion he explains with almost these words: "I ADMONISH the reader, [that] elsewhere the exposition of the Scholastics is too constrained [forced], who wished the heavens to suffer nothing, but only to cease from motion. Since certainly by these words of blessed Peter, and [those] of the ancient prophecies [vatici-

[catchword "vatici-" (vaticiniorum) → continues on p. 567 (PDF 572).]

(printed p. 567 [PDF p. 572], recto — Ann. CCCXL continues (the world-conflagration, 2 Pet. 3:10): Ambrose of Compsa's proof that Peter speaks properly of the heavens [not the air], with the scriptural catena [Apoc. 21, Isa. 51/65, Matt. 24] for a real fiery alteration of the heavens; his second opinion — that the renewed earth will be the eternal dwelling of those worthy neither of heaven nor hell [e.g. unbaptized children]; then Sixtus's own survey of the three patristic opinions on the heavens' dissolution — Clement's

Recognitions *[Peter vs. Simon Magus, the eggshell analogy], embraced by Hilary and reported by Jerome on Isaiah. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXL continued, from the catchword "vatici-":)

—[of the ancient] prophecies, it [the Scholastic reading] is repugnant. But that he [Peter] speaks properly of the heavens, and not of the air, is plain. For after he had said, 'In which the heavens shall be dissolved with great violence,' he added, 'But the elements shall be dissolved with heat' — which seems to pertain to the air and to the water, which are to be dissolved by fire. But of the earth he says particularly, 'and the earth, etc.' And the passage in which this author says he indicated these [things] elsewhere is had in the Commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews, where, examining that [text] from the first chapter of the same epistle, 'The works of thy hands are the heavens: they shall perish, etc.,' he writes these [things]: 'THEY shall perish; but thou shalt remain: and all, like a garment, shall grow old. In what manner shall the heavens perish? Most say, as regards local motion. But this is not to perish, nor to grow old. For that which tends to destruction is (as the Apostle says) lower [inferior]; and that which grows old is near destruction.' Besides, blessed Peter, in the second epistle, left this testimony concerning the heavens: 'The day of the Lord will come as a thief; in which the heavens shall pass away with great violence, but the earth, and the works which are in it, shall be burned up. Since, therefore, all these [things] are to be dissolved: what manner [of men] ought you to be in holy conversations, awaiting the coming of the day of the Lord, through which the burning heavens shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with the heat of fire? But we await new heavens and a new earth, according to his promise.' Besides these, the Beloved [John], in the Apocalypse: *[margin: Apoc. 21.a]* 'I saw a new heaven and a new earth. For the first heaven, and the first earth, passed away.' And Isaiah: *[margin: Isaiah 51]* 'Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look down beneath the earth: for the heavens shall melt like smoke; and the earth shall be worn away like a garment; and its inhabitants shall perish like these.' And again: *[margin: Isa. 65]* 'Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth.' And our Lord himself: *[margin: Matt. 24]* 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' From these testimonies of the scriptures, therefore, unless we altogether wish to do violence to the words, we are compelled to confess that there will truly be some great alteration of the heavens by fire, and not merely a cessation of motion alone: by which alteration the heavens shall in a certain manner be founded [anew], and shall become far more beautiful than they now are." Thus far concerning the former assertion of Ambrose — which also **Lucian**, a Benedictine monk, in his *Annotations on Chrysostom* (reproved by the Council of Trent), not only defends, but even strives to draw Chrysostom into the same opinion.

The latter assertion — concerning the earth, [as] to be inhabited by men after the judgment — he declares with these words in the same commentary on Peter: *[margin: Whether the earth, after the day of judgment, is to be inhabited by men.]* "PETER says, 'But we await new heavens, and a new earth.' But for what use [is] a new earth, if no one is to inhabit it? Therefore it is most fittingly believed by many, that those who by their own sin will not merit hell, nor yet have been received in Christ through grace (such as children departing without baptism), shall possess this new, much more beautiful earth, pure from all defilement and corruption, where they shall perpetually praise God." And in the commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews, in the passage adduced above, confirming this same [thing] more certainly, he says: "BUT if thou ask, for what use, then? This certainly needs a longer inquiry — or, more truly, a special revelation — unless indeed we wish piously to say, that there shall be *(right column:)* certain men upon this new and most pleasant earth, who shall be found worthy neither of heaven, nor of hell: as certain [authors] hand down, not without great reasons; and I indeed have accepted [it], and believe [it] not unwillingly." Thus Ambrose.

But I, re-reading the writings of the ancient fathers, find in their monuments a threefold opinion concerning the final dissolution of the heavens.

The FIRST is that of the divine **Clement**, who, in the second volume of the *Recognitions*, introduces Peter the Apostle teaching two heavens: one higher and invisible, perpetual and eternal, which the blessed spirits inhabit; the other lower [and] visible, distinguished by various stars, corruptible, and to be dissolved at the consummation of the age, and utterly abolished — that, the veil of its corpulence [material bulk] being removed, that higher heaven may appear to those who are worthy of its sight. Then, in the third book of the same work, bringing in Simon Magus objecting to Peter's opinion, he thus writes: "BUT Simon says, 'Answer me, and tell [me]: if this visible heaven (as thou wilt) shall be dissolved, why was it made from the beginning?' Peter answered: 'This present life was made for the sake of men, that there might be a certain interjection and division; lest perhaps anyone unworthy should see the habitation of the heavenly [ones], and the seat of God himself — which are prepared to be seen by those alone who are pure of heart. But now, that is, in the time of the contest [agon], it has pleased [God] that those [things] be invisible, which are destined as a reward to those who conquer.' And Simon says, 'If the Founder is good, and the world is good: how shall the Good [one] at some time dissolve good [things]? But if he dissolves and destroys [it] as if [it were] evil, how shall he not seem evil, who made evil?' Peter to these [things]: 'Hear: this heaven, which is visible, also passes away. If indeed it had been made for its own sake, it would perhaps have something of the reason which thou sayest, because it ought by no means to be dissolved. But if it was made for the sake of something else, and not for its own sake, it will necessarily be dissolved, that that [thing], for which it seems to have been made, may appear. As, for example, I might say, the shell of eggs, although it seem made and diligently formed, must nevertheless be broken and dissolved, that from it the chick may come forth, and that [thing] may appear, for [the sake of] which the form of the whole egg seems to have been expressed. So, therefore, this state also must needs pass away, that that more sublime state of the heavenly kingdom may shine forth.'" Thus far the opinion of Clement.

Embracing which, **Hilary**, [in] canon 4 on Matthew, says: "We judge the heaven and earth, [the] greatest elements, to be dissolved"; and in the exposition of Psalm 122, explaining the same more amply, he says: "This heaven, which lies subject to our sight through its matter — which took both nature and name as [it were] a solidified smoke of the firmament — shall pass away, and shall not be. But the seat of the Lord — namely, the heaven in which God dwells — remains for ever." This opinion of Hilary and Clement, Jerome, in the fourteenth book on Isaiah, reports to have been approved by certain [authors] by the present testimony of Peter, *[margin: 2 Pet. 3; 1 Cor. 7 (the print reads "2 Cor. 7")]* "The heavens which now are, and the earth, are reserved unto fire, and the burning elements shall be dissolved." And likewise by the authority of Paul, saying, "The figure of this world passes away — [with] us contemplating not the [things] which are seen, but [those] which are not seen. For the [things] which are seen are temporal; but the [things] which are not seen, eternal." And again, by the prophecy of Isaiah crying—

[signature "Aaa 4"; catchword "man-" (clamantis) → continues on p. 568 (PDF 573).]

(printed p. 568 [PDF p. 573], verso — end of Ann. CCCXL, then Ann. CCCXLI, on 2 Peter 3 (Sixtus's survey of the three patristic opinions on the heavens' dissolution concluded — the Stoic parallel [Eusebius, Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus]; the second opinion [purification not abolition — Oecumenius, Gennadius]; and Augustine's [only the aerial heavens burned, the starry heavens untouched — City of God *20.24], which the Scholastics followed; the twofold "change" [decay vs. betterment], with Ps. 8, Isa. 30, and the infant-to-old-man analogy; then whether air and water shall be wholly dissolved — Bede's "four elements" [2 Pet. 3:10/12]). Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXL continued, from the catchword "man-":)

—[of Isaiah] crying, "The heavens shall melt like smoke" — which Aquila and Symmachus rendered, "The heavens shall be broken into nothing, and shall be ground to the manner of salt, and shall vanish." Jerome

also notes that this was the opinion of certain philosophers, who thought that all [the things] which we behold would perish by fire. **Eusebius**, [in] the 15th [book] of the *Evangelical Preparation*, writes that this was the doctrine of the Stoics — among whom the most ancient of all, **Zeno**, **Cleanthes**, and **Chrysippus**, handed down that all things, after long circuits of ages, are to be dissolved into ethereal fire.

The SECOND opinion is of those who believe that the heavens shall neither perish nor be abolished, but shall nevertheless be purified by the burning of the flames — that, purged from [their] inborn corruption, they may from corruptible become incorruptible and immortal. Among these, **Oecumenius**, examining the proposed passage of Peter in his *Collectanea*, left [this] thus written: "MOREOVER, that a corruption of this universe should take place seems [true] not only to Christians, but also to the wise men of the Greeks — as to Heraclitus of Ephesus, and Empedocles of Etna. But someone will say: And what was the reason that it should be founded, if it had to be reduced again to nothing? And we say, that the world will not tend wholly to corruption, but to renewal — just as we are wont to melt certain corporeal things by fire, not that we attribute an absolute destruction to them, but that we may afford them purity and sincerity."

Thus far Oecumenius, with whom **Gennadius** agrees, in the book *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, chapter 70, saying thus: "Let us not believe the elements, heaven and earth, [to be] abolished by fire, but changed for the better; and [that] the figure also of the world — that is, [its] image, not [its] substance — shall pass away."

The THIRD is the opinion of **Augustine**, asserting that the higher heavens are neither to be purged by that final burning, nor even to be touched by the fires, but only the aerial heavens, and the elements alone, are to be renewed by the conflagration of fire. He, in the twentieth book *On the City of God*, chapter 24, expounding the testimony of Peter taken up concerning the burning of the aerial heaven, sets forth these [things]: "IN the epistle of Peter the Apostle — where the world, which then was, is said to have perished, flooded by water — it is clear enough both what part of the world is signified by 'the whole,' and in what sense it is said to have perished, and which heavens are 'laid up, reserved unto fire' for the day of judgment and of the perdition of the impious. And in that [text] which he says a little after, 'The day of the Lord will come as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass by with great violence, but the burning elements shall be dissolved, etc.,' those heavens can be understood [as] about to perish, which he says are 'laid up, to be reserved unto fire'; and those elements [can be] taken [as] about to burn, which subsist, stormy and turbulent, in this lowest part of the world — in which he said those same heavens were laid up, those higher [heavens] remaining safe and in their integrity, in whose firmament the stars are constituted."

This opinion of Augustine the Scholastics have followed, as [being] more reasonable, and more consonant to the words of Peter; who, explaining himself, shows that he speaks not of the starry heavens, but of the heavens and earth which once perished by the flood's inundation, saying: "The heavens formerly, and the earth, perished by water." And according to this understanding of the aerial heaven, they have expounded that which, in the premises, was said by the oracles of divine scripture — *(right column:)* [namely] that the heavens grow old, are worn away, melt, are dissolved, are changed, pass away, fail, and perish. Nor does it stand against this interpretation, that **Lucian** objects that never in the sacred letters are "heavens," in the plural number, taken for "air." For this he [Sixtus] shows to be most false — [seeing] that in the eighth Psalm, and elsewhere most frequently, is read *[margin: Psalm 8]* צִפּוֹר שָׁמָיִם, *zipur sciamaim* [tsippor shamayim], that is, "the birds of the heavens." But if anyone press more sharply, that these [things] are to be understood of the higher heavens, which David said grow old, are changed, and perish: we shall answer, that there is a twofold change — old age and destruction: the one, by which mortal things are corrupted and abolished, of which there is none in the heavens; the other, [merely] by way of likeness, which — according to Didymus — designates a cessation from [their] former use, and — according to Jerome — a change for the better. They shall therefore grow old and perish, not by that oldness by which animals and plants tend to destruction, but by a cessation of use — by which (as Didymus says) their use shall cease. For, men being taken up from the earth into eternal felicity, there will no longer be any use of the heavenly motion, of light,

and of heat, by which the life of mortals is fostered. Or they shall also perish by the destruction of change and renewal — in that manner in which Jerome, [in] the eighteenth book on Isaiah, expressed [it] with these words: "THEY shall perish; but thou shalt remain; and all, like a garment, shall grow old; and like a mantle thou shalt fold them, and they shall be changed." In which it is plainly demonstrated, that "perdition" and "destruction" sound not an abolition into nothing, but a change for the better. For neither does that which is written in another place — *[margin: Isa. 30]* "The moon shall shine as the sun, and the sun shall receive sevenfold light, etc." — signify a destruction of the former [luminaries], but a change for the better. That this may be understood, let us set examples from our own condition. An infant, when it grows into a boy, and the boy into a youth, and the youth into a man, and the man into an old man, by no means perishes through the several ages. For he is the same who before was, but is little by little changed, and is said to have perished to [his] former age. Which understanding, Paul the Apostle also spoke: "FOR the figure of this world passes away." Let us consider what he said: the figure passes away, not the substance. This same [thing] Peter also signifies, saying: "THIS is hidden from them, willing [it so]: that the heavens were from the beginning, and the earth [was] out of water, and through water, by which the former world perished in the flood. But the heavens which now are, and the earth, are by the same reason kept unto fire." In what sense this is to be taken, he afterward teaches: "But we shall see new heavens and a new earth." He did not say, "We shall see other heavens and another earth," but the old and ancient [ones] changed for the better. See certain [things] pertaining to this argument [in] the third book of the *Method of Exposition*, which is called *Ethnic Rhapsody*, and Annotation 245 of this book.

Annotation CCCXLI

"But the elements shall be dissolved with heat." — 2 Peter 3[:10]

[margin: Whether air and water at the end of the world shall be wholly dissolved.]

Bede, in the commentary of the second epistle of Peter, explaining this, affirms that two elements — namely, air and water — are to be wholly consumed by the fires of the final conflagration, saying: "FOUR are the elements of which this world consists — fire,

[catchword "ignis" → continues on p. 569 (PDF 574).]

(printed p. 569 [PDF p. 574], recto — end of Ann. CCCXLI, then Ann. CCCXLII–CCCXLV, on 2 Peter 3, 1 John 5, Jude, and Revelation 6 (Aquinas on which two elements are consumed [2 Pet. 3:10]; the Johannine Comma — Cajetan doubting whether "There are three who give testimony in heaven" is genuine [1 John 5:7]; whether impugning the brotherhood is an irremissible sin — Bede from a passage Augustine later retracted [1 John 5:16]; the canonicity of Jude — Ambrose of Compsa vs. Cajetan [Jude 1]; and whether the saints' souls see God before judgment — Bernard of Clairvaux seeming to fall into the Armenian/Anabaptist error, All Saints sermons 4 and 3 [Rev. 6:9]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXLI concluded, from the catchword "ignis":)

—fire, air, water, and earth. All of which that greatest fire shall consume; nor yet will it consume all so far, that they be utterly not [i.e. annihilated]; but two it will consume wholly, and two it will restore to a better face [form]." The divine **Thomas** [Aquinas], in the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 47, question 2, elucidates this passage with these words: "THAT [which is said], that the fire will consume two wholly, is not to be understood [to mean] that two elements will be destroyed according to substance, but that two will be more removed from the property which they now have. Which two are said by some to be fire and water, which exceed most in active qualities — namely, in heat and cold, which are chiefly the principles of corruption in other bodies. And because there will then be no action of fire and water, which are most active, they will seem to be most changed from the power [virtue] which they now have." Read the preceding

Annotation.

Annotation CCCXLII

"There are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one." — 1 John 5[:7]

[margin: Trinity.]

Ambrose [of Compsa] reprehends **Thomas Cajetan**, [in] book 1, because he doubted whether these words — containing the clearest testimony of the divine Trinity — are of the context [genuine text] of the epistle of John. See the seventh book, in the confutation of the ninth heresy, objection seven.

Annotation CCCXLIII

"There is a sin unto death: not for that do I say, that anyone should ask." — 1 John 5[:16]

[margin: Whether the impugning of the brotherhood is an irremissible sin.]

Bede the presbyter, in the commentaries, explaining this, seems to think that the sin of those who impugn the brotherhood [fraternity] is altogether irremissible; thus saying: "A GREAT question is born here, because blessed John openly shows that there are certain brethren for whom we are not commanded to pray — since the Lord commands us to pray even for our persecutors. Which cannot otherwise be solved, unless we confess that there are certain sins in the brethren which are graver than the persecution of enemies. The sin of a brother, therefore, is unto death, when, after the knowledge of God (which was given through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ), someone impugns the brotherhood, and is agitated by the firebrands of envy against that very [brotherhood] by which he was reconciled to God." This opinion, taken by Bede in almost the same words from the first book of Augustine's *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, Augustine retracted in the first book of the *Retractations*.

Annotation CCCXLIIII

"Jude, servant of Jesus Christ." — Jude [1]

[margin: Whether the epistle of Jude is canonical.]

The exposition of **Thomas Cajetan**, Ambrose chastised with this censure: "I HAVE noted," he says, "that he says the epistle of Jude is not certainly canonical, because Jerome does not have this as certain — from that which he says: 'Jude, the brother of the Lord, wrote indeed a small epistle, which is of the seven canonical.' Who here would not be stupefied, that thence it is gathered from Jerome that this epistle is not certainly canonical — when he himself says [it is] one of the seven canonical? Nor truly [is it uncertain] because he adds, 'by some *(right column:)* rejected, in that it takes testimony from apocrypha' — [and] therefore he too is to be thought to reject [it], or not to receive [it]: [Jerome,] who at once, on the contrary, added — namely, that it merited authority by antiquity and use, and is computed among the sacred scriptures." Read the seventh book, in the confutation of the ninth heresy, objection seven.

Annotation CCCXLV

"I saw under the altar of God the souls of the slain." — Apocalypse 6[:9]

[margin: Whether the souls of the saints see God before the day of judgment.]

Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, narrating this passage, seems to be rolled down [devolve] into the error of the Armenians and Anabaptists, who teach that the souls of the saints, before the resurrection of the body, cannot enjoy the glory of the divine vision. For in the fourth sermon of the festival of All Saints he asserts, that the

souls of the saints rest under the altar of God until the day of judgment — that is, in the sole vision of the humanity of Christ, until the time come, in which the Son of God, after the universal resurrection, shows himself to them in the form of God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Which opinion he expresses with these words: "INTO this place, then (that is, the bosom of Abraham), the Savior, descending, broke the brazen gates, and, the bound being led out from the house of the prison, placed them then indeed under the altar of God, hiding them in the hidden [place] of his tabernacle, until the time come in which they may go forth — the number of the brethren being now completed — and receive the kingdom prepared from the origin of the world." And a little after he adds: "BUT of the altar of God, of which our discourse is, I judge, according to my [capacity], [it to be] nothing else than the very body of the Lord Savior; of which it was said in the gospel, 'Wheresoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles be gathered together.' Meanwhile, therefore, under the humanity of Christ the saints happily rest — into which surely even the holy angels desire to look — until the time come, when they shall now not be placed under the altar, but exalted above the altar. But what have I said? Can anyone attain — not to say surpass — the glory of the humanity of Christ, [the glory] not of men [only], but even of the angels? In what manner, therefore, did I say that those who now rest under the altar are to be exalted above the altar? By vision surely, and by contemplation, not by prelation [precedence]. For then the Son shows himself to us, as he promised, not in the form of a servant, but in the form of God. He shows to us also the Father, and the Holy Spirit — without which vision surely nothing would suffice us: since this is life eternal, that they know thee, the true God, and [him] whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ, *[margin: John 17.a]* and in them (which is not doubtful) also the Spirit of both." Again, in the third sermon of the same feast, explaining by the way [*obiter*] that Davidic [text], *[margin: Psalm 83.a]* "How beloved [are] thy tabernacles, O Lord: my soul concupisceth in the courts of the Lord, etc.," he says [there are] three states of souls: the first in the tabernacles, the second in the courts, the third in the house of God — that is, in beatitude, into which it is not entered without bodies. His sermon runs thus: "YOU have perceived, unless I err, from those [things] which were said in the preceding sermon, that there are three states of holy souls: the first, namely, in the corruptible body; the second, without the body; the third, in consummated beatitude: the first, in fine, in the taber-

[catchword "nacu-" (tabernaculis) → continues on p. 570 (PDF 575).]

---

*(printed p. 570 [PDF p. 575], verso — Ann. CCCXLV continues (Rev. 6:9, whether the saints' souls see God before judgment): Bernard's opinion concluded [the blessed enter God's house neither without us nor without their bodies]; Alfonso de Castro notes it is condemned, but Sixtus excuses Bernard by the great number of earlier fathers who seemed to teach the same — and assembles their testimonies in chronological order: the Liturgy of St James, Irenaeus [*Against Heresies *5], Justin Martyr [*Questions *76 & 60], Tertullian [*Against Marcion *4,* On the Soul *— souls held in Abraham's bosom / the underworld until judgment], and Clement of Rome's* Hypotyposes *[which Sixtus candidly admits he found only in the heretic Cornelius Agrippa's* Occult Philosophy*, likely lifted from Irenaeus]. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXLV continued, from the catchword "nacu-":)

—[in the] tabernacles, the second in the courts, the third in the House of God." And after a few [words] he subjoins: "Into that most blessed House of God the souls shall enter neither without us, nor without their [own] bodies: that is, neither the saints without the people, nor the spirit[s] without the flesh."

Alfonso de Castro, [in] the third book *Against Heresies*, admonishes that this opinion of Bernard is condemned — which I too do not deny; but the author, nevertheless, I judge is to be excused with a grateful and benign affection, on account of the vast number of illustrious fathers of the church who, before him, seemed to lend authority to this dogma by their testimony. Whose opinions — collected according to the series of the times in which they flourished — it pleases [me] to set down here; that, in the running-over of a

single page, the reader may, without long delay, briefly recognize which authors are, in this part, prudently to be read by him, and benevolently (when it can be done) to be interpreted.

James the Apostle, in the Liturgy of the divine sacrifice, prays thus for the souls of the saints resting in Christ, so as to indicate that they have not yet arrived at the place of the awaited beatitude. And the form of the prayer is of this kind: "O Lord our God, be mindful of all the orthodox, and [those] rightly thinking concerning the faith, from Abel the just even unto the present day: make them to rest in the region of the living, in thy kingdom, in the delights of Paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, our holy fathers: whence grief, sadness, and groaning are exiled: where the light of thy countenance presides, and perpetually shines forth."

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, at the end of the fifth book *Against Heresies*, thus says: "FOR since the Lord went away into the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were, and afterward rose again corporeally, and after the resurrection was taken up: it is manifest that the souls of his disciples also — for whose sake the Lord wrought these [things] — shall go away into an invisible place defined for them by God, and there shall abide until the resurrection; awaiting the resurrection, then receiving [their] bodies, and rising again perfectly — that is, corporeally, as Christ rose again — and so shall come to the sight of God."

Justin, philosopher and martyr, in the book of *Questions* set [posed] by the gentiles, question 76: "IF before the resurrection there are no rewards of works, what fruit was there to the thief, when his soul was introduced into his [Christ's] Paradise — especially since Paradise falls under sense, but the essence of the soul is not perceived by the senses? Answer: This the thief obtained, when he entered into Paradise, that he knew in the very thing the emolument and fruit of faith; because he was held worthy of the assembly of the blessed, in which he is guarded unto the day of resurrection and remuneration. And he has a sense of Paradise by the sense of the intelligence — which is [that] by which souls both see themselves, and the [things] which are beneath them, and moreover the angels and demons." And again, question 60: "TO NO ONE (he says), before the resurrection, is a reward rendered from those [things] which he did in life."

Tertullian, [in] the fourth book *Against Marcion*, says: "WHENCE it appears to every wise [man] who has ever heard of the Elysian fields, that there is some local determination which is called the bosom *(right column:)* of Abraham; and that the souls of his sons are to be received, even from the nations — [Abraham] namely [being] the father of many nations, to be reckoned to the census of Abraham, and out of the same faith by which Abraham also believed God, under no yoke of the law, nor in the sign of circumcision. That region, therefore — the bosom, I say, of Abraham — even if not heavenly, [is] nevertheless higher than the lower regions [inferi], meanwhile about to afford refreshment to the souls of the just, until the consummation of things achieves the resurrection of all by the plenitude of reward — this [region] about to appear by the heavenly promise, to which Christ builds an ascent into heaven, where is the eternal place." Likewise, in the book *On the Soul*, in the antepenultimate chapter: "TO NO ONE (he says), before the resurrection, is a reward rendered from those [things] which he did in life." The same again, in the book *On the Soul*, in the antepenultimate chapter: "IF Christ, having discharged the form of human death among the lower regions, did not ascend into the higher [parts] of the heavens before he descended into the lower [parts] of the earth, that he might there make the patriarchs and prophets partakers of himself: thou hast [ground] also to believe [there is] a subterranean region of the lower world, and to push away by the elbow [thrust aside] those who, arrogantly enough, think not the souls of the faithful worthy of the lower regions — [as] servants [scorning to be] above [their] lord, and disciples [scorning to be] above [their] master, if perchance in Abraham's bosom they should snatch the solace of the consolation of the resurrection to be awaited." And a little below: "TO NO ONE is heaven open, the earth being yet safe [intact] — not to say closed. For [only] with the transaction [passing away] of the world shall the kingdoms of the heavens be unlocked." And after some [words] he adds: "THOU hast also, concerning Paradise, a little book from us, in which we have established that every soul is sequestered among the lower regions unto the day of the Lord." Finally, in the last chapter of the same

work, he inferred these [things]: "ALL souls, therefore, are held among the lower regions, wilt thou or wilt thou not; and [there are] punishments there already, and refreshments: thou hast [the example of] the poor man and the rich. For why shouldst thou not think that the soul is both punished among the lower regions meanwhile, under the expectation of the twofold judgment? What then shall be done in that time? Shall we sleep? But souls do not sleep even in the living: for sleep is of bodies. The soul knows, even among the lower regions, both to rejoice and to grieve without the flesh: since even in the flesh, [when it is] unharmed, it grieves if it will, and [when] harmed, it rejoices if it will. If this be from its own choice in life, how much more from the judgment of God after death."

Clement of Rome, [in] the second book of the *Hypotyposes* [ὑποτυπώσεων], out of the opinion of Peter says these [things]: "AS our master Christ did not at once fly away and depart, but, awaiting the time of his resurrection defined by the Father — which was made manifest also through Jonah — after three days, rising, was taken up: so we too ought to await the time of our resurrection and glory, foretold by the prophets; and so, rising again, to be taken up into heaven. But meanwhile the souls must patiently await the future glory, outside heaven, until the day of judgment." Know well, good reader, that I have not taken this testimony from the very work of Clement (whether it be now found anywhere, I know not), but from the third book of the *Occult Philosophy* of Cornelius Agrippa — a heretical man, and, in this article especially, thinking perversely. Who, unless my suspicion deceive me, transcribed these [things] from the fifth book of Irenaeus: at the end of which this opinion is had word for word, except that last clause, "But meanwhile the souls must, until the day of judgment, [remain] out-

[catchword "tra" (extra coelum) → continues on p. 571 (PDF 576).]

(printed p. 571 [PDF p. 576], recto — Ann. CCCXLV continues (Rev. 6:9, whether the saints' souls see God before judgment): Sixtus's chronological catena of fathers who seemed to hold that the blessed await their reward — Origen [hom. 7 on Leviticus, Peri Archon *2 & 4], Lactantius [*Divine Institutes *7.21], Victorinus of Pettau [on the Apocalypse — the golden and bronze altars], Prudentius [two hymns quoted as verse — the* Cathemerinon *funeral hymn and the* Peristephanon *on the eighteen martyrs of Zaragoza], Ambrose [*On Cain and Abel *2.2,* On the Good of Death *10], and Chrysostom [hom. 39 on 1 Corinthians]. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXLV continued, from the catchword "tra":)

—[the souls must] patiently await the future glory "out[side] heaven" — which indeed it is probable that Cornelius [Agrippa] added of his own, as [being] favorable to his [own] dogma.

Origen, [in] the seventh homily on Leviticus: "NOT YET (he says) have the saints received their joy, nor even the Apostles: but they too await, that I may become a partaker of their joy. For neither do the saints, departing hence, at once obtain the whole rewards of their merits, but they await us also — though we linger, though we be slothful. For their joy is not perfect, until they grieve for our errors, and mourn our sins — as Paul says: 'They have not yet obtained the promises, God providing something better for us, lest without us they should attain perfection.' Thou seest, then, that Abraham still awaits, that he may attain the [things] which are perfect; Isaac and Jacob also await; and all the prophets await us, that with us they may perceive the perfect beatitude." The same, [in] the second book of the *Peri Archon*, not far from the end, speaking of the place to which the souls of the saints tend after death: "I THINK (he says) that all the saints, departing from this life, remain in some place set on the earth, which the divine scripture calls Paradise — as in a certain place of erudition, and (so to say) of assistance, or [a] school of souls: in which they may be taught concerning all those [things] which they had seen on the earth; and receive also certain judgments concerning the [things] to come and future — as, being placed in this life also, they had conceived certain [notions] of the judgment of future [things], though through a glass in a riddle, yet in some part — which are more

manifestly and lucidly revealed to the saints in their [own] places and times. If indeed anyone be pure of heart, and purer in mind, he shall ascend thence to the place of the air, and shall arrive at the kingdoms of the heavens." Again, [in] book 4 of the *Peri Archon*, making mention of the place of holy souls, but somewhat more diversely, he says: "THOSE who depart from this world according to that common death are dispensed [assigned] according to their acts and merits, as they shall have been judged worthy — some indeed to the place which is called hell [infernus], others to the bosom of Abraham, through diverse mansions."

Lactantius, [in] book 7 of the *Divine Institutions*, chapter 21: "NOR let anyone think that souls are judged immediately after death. For all are detained in one common custody, until the time come, in which the greatest Judge shall make examination of merits. Then, those whose justice shall have been approved, these shall receive the reward of immortality; but those whose sins and crimes shall have been detected shall not rise again, but shall be hidden away with the impious into the same darkness, destined to certain punishments."

Victorinus the Martyr, bishop of Pettau [Petabio], in the commentaries on the Apocalypse, explaining that [text], "I saw under the altar of God, etc.": he says that he saw the souls of the slain "under the altar [ara]," that is, under the earth. For an "altar" is called both heaven and earth; as the Law says, which had made two altars — one golden within, and one of bronze without. As, therefore, by the golden altar (which was the inner one, to which the priests entered once a year) heaven is understood: so also by the bronze altar the earth is understood, under which is hell, a region remote from penalties and fires, and the rest of the saints — in which indeed the just are seen and heard by the impious, and yet [the impious] cannot pass over thither. "That these souls of the slain, then, seek *(right column:)* the avenging of their blood — that is, of their body — upon those dwelling on the earth, He willed us to know, who sees all things. But because in the last time the perpetual remuneration of the saints, and the coming damnation of the impious, is [to be]: it was said to them, 'Wait'; and for the solace of their body they received (he says) white robes — that is, the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Prudentius, in his poems, seems now to place the souls of the pious, departing from the body, in the bosom of Abraham, now in the terrestrial paradise, now under the altar of God — as he does in the hymn for the obsequies of the departed, where he sings in this manner:

In what region wilt thou bid

the pure soul to rest?

Hidden in the bosom of the holy old man

it shall recline, as is Eleazar [Lazarus].

Whom, hedged about on all sides with flowers,

the rich man from afar beholds, burning.

We follow thy words, O Redeemer,

by which, triumphing over black death,

thou biddest the companion of the cross, the thief,

to go in thy footsteps.

Behold, the bright way of the ample paradise

now lies open to the faithful:

and it is permitted to man to enter that grove,

which the serpent had taken away.

And in the hymn of the eighteen martyrs of Caesaraugusta [Zaragoza], indicating in what place that throng of Martyrs rests, he says:

> *This throng, placed beneath the eternal altar,*
>
> *prays pardon for our lapses [sins] —*
>
> *the throng which the creatrix of the purple*
>
> *nobles [i.e. she who brings forth the crimson-robed martyrs] preserves.*

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, [in] book 2 *On Cain and Abel*, chapter 2: "THE soul (he says) is loosed from the body, and after the end of this life; yet still it is held suspended by the ambiguities of the future judgment." And in the book *On the Good of Death*, chapter 10: The scripture of Esdras names the dwellings of souls "storehouses [*promptuaria*]"; and, meeting the human complaint — [namely] that the just who have gone before seem, even to the day of judgment (for the most part, that is, of time), to be defrauded of the remuneration owed to them — he wonderfully says that the day of judgment is like a crown. For the day of the crown [contest] is awaited by all, that within the same day both the conquered may blush, and the victors may obtain the palm of victory. Therefore, while the plenitude of time is awaited, the souls await the remuneration owed: for some [there] remains penalty, for others glory. And a little below, in the same chapter, the place which all souls, stripped of [their] bodies, seek, he calls "hell [infernus], which is not seen."

John Chrysostom, [in] homily 39 on the former [epistle] to the Corinthians, examining the force of that Pauline argumentation — namely, "If in this life only we are hoping, then we are more miserable than all living things" — he says: "WHAT sayest thou, Paul? Would confidence alone survive [remain over], if the body be not raised? Or would the soul not survive? It would — and immortal indeed: yet although it be six hundred times over immortal (as surely it is), nevertheless without the flesh it will not itself enjoy those admirable goods, just as neither will it be punished with penalties. For all their [things] shall be made manifest at the tribunal of Christ (says Paul), that each one may bear the [things which he did] through [his] body—

[catchword "corpu" (corpus) → continues on p. 572 (PDF 577).]

(printed p. 572 [PDF p. 577], verso — Ann. CCCXLV continues (Rev. 6:9): the catena on the saints awaiting their reward — Chrysostom concluded; the Author of the Opus imperfectum *[hom. 34, all crowned together, the "crown/circle" image from Esdras]; Augustine [on Ps. 36,* On Genesis literally *12.9]; Theodoret, Arethas of Caesarea, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus [all on Heb. 11 / Luke 23 — the saints not yet crowned]; then* ***Pope John XXII****'s controversial view [that purged souls lack the facial vision of God before judgment — reported via Ockham's* Ninety Days' Work *and Adrian VI], and Sixtus's turn: these testimonies, taken at face value, seem to carry the Armenian error condemned by Innocent III, Benedict XI, and the* ***Council of Florence*** *decree. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXLV continued, from the catchword "corpu[s]":)

—[the things which he did] through the body, whether it did good or evil. For if the body rise not, our soul will remain uncrowned, and will be outside the heavenly beatitude." And there are also many other opinions in Chrysostom akin to this, which will occur to thee, above, Annotation 264.

The **Author** of the *Unfinished Work [Opus imperfectum]* on Matthew, homily 34, upon that [text], "The first shall be last, and the last first, etc.," showing that all shall receive the denarius of eternal beatitude at the same time, thus says: "OR he therefore says that the first shall be last, and the last first, not that the last be worthier than the first, but that they be made equal. For the prophet Esdras — wishing to show that the

vocation of all the saints is one, and that there is no difference among them by reason of time — says that the number of all the saints is, as it were, a crown [circle]. For as in a crown, since it is round, thou findest nothing which may seem to be a beginning or an end: so among the saints, as regards the time in that age, no one is called last, no one first. Therefore, to those to whom it was given to be born first, [reward] is rendered last; because the saints, as [it were] a crown, are all equal: the last-born are rewarded first, that those, having that glory, [and] these being made equal to them through it."

Augustine, in the exposition of Psalm 36, says: "AFTER this life thou shalt not yet be [there], where the saints shall be, to whom it will be said, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom, which was prepared for you from the origin of the world.' That thou shalt not yet be there, who knows not? But thou canst already be there, where that proud rich man, in the midst of torments, saw that once ulcerous poor man resting far off. In that rest, surely, thou shalt securely await the day of judgment." And [in] book 12 *On Genesis according to the Letter*, chapter 9, he says: "THAT part of the city of God, which is to be joined to the immortal angels [and] is gathered out of mortal men, now either travels [as a pilgrim] mortally on the earth; or, in those who have died, rests in the secret receptacles and seats of souls." Other passages of Augustine, akin to these, thou shalt review above, Annotation 169 of the fifth book, and elsewhere.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, in the commentaries on the eleventh chapter to the Hebrews: "OF the saints, then (he says), there were so many and so great contests: but these, nevertheless, have not yet received [their] crowns. For the God of all awaits the contests of the others; that, the stadium [race] being finished, he may at once pronounce victors all who shall have obtained the victory, and reward [them]."

Arethas, bishop of Caesarea, in the commentaries on the Apocalypse (collected out of the monuments of Andreas, bishop of Caesarea), when he was expounding that [text], "How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood, etc.," says: "BY these [words] the saints appear to seek the consummation of the world: therefore they are bidden to await with longanimity [patience], until the consummation of the brethren — lest they be consummated [perfected] without them, according to the divine Apostle. But the white robes designate the splendor of virtues, flourishing in them, wherewith they are clad — although they have not yet carried off the promises. By the hope, therefore, of these [things], which they contemplate through the understanding as [it were] in a mirror — being freed from all grossness — they justly rejoice, resting in the bosoms of Abraham. For this has been said by many of the saints: that each *(right column:)* cultivator of virtue is allotted a worthy place, whence he even attains a certain sure conjecture concerning his future glory."

Oecumenius, on the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews: "ALL the saints (he says), having merited the testimony that through faith they pleased God, have not yet obtained the goods promised to the just — God providing something better concerning us, lest they should have anything more than we in this, that they were crowned first. He defined one time, that we too may be crowned together with them. And this is for our sake: they never sit unrewarded, awaiting our administration [the completion of our course]." "(Lest they be consummated without us)": he did not say, "Lest they be crowned," but — which has a greater emphasis — "Lest they be consummated" — that is, receive the term of goods, for which all the effort and fatigue of him who is endowed with virtue labors.

Theophylact, bishop of Bulgaria, on the Hebrews, [chapter] 11: "THE saints (he says) have not yet obtained anything of the heavenly promises. Although it is agreed that some were affected [endowed] with these goods of the earth, as David the king: yet we do not here inquire after these present [things], but after those promises which are in heaven, more sure and more true." This same [thing] he has in the commentaries on the 23rd chapter of Luke, expounding that [text], "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." See above, Annotation 163 of this book.

Euthymius Zigabenus, in the commentaries on the 23rd chapter of Luke, expounding the promise of Christ to the Thief, "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise," wrote these [things]: "CHRIST, knowing the Thief's

intention, promised that which seemed most desirable to him. For the thief knew Paradise from the Mosaic doctrine. And then indeed he gave him a converse [dwelling] in Paradise, as [it were] the pledge [earnest] of his kingdom — which is the fruition of the ineffable and eternal goods, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have they ascended into the heart of man. For not yet has any of the just received the promise, as the great Paul taught; but afterward he will deliver this also, [namely] the kingdom, at the time of the universal resurrection."

John, Roman pontiff, the twenty-second of that name, is said to have subscribed to the opinion of these, and to have sanctioned by decree that it was so to be believed. Witnesses of this decree are **William of Ockham**, in the work of the *Ninety Days*, and **Pope Adrian the Sixth** — whose words, in the 4th book of the *Sentences*, at the end of the question *On the Sacrament of Confirmation*, are these: "LASTLY, it is reported concerning John XXII, that he publicly taught, declared, and commanded to be held by all, that the purged souls, before the final judgment, do not have the robe, which is the clear and facial vision of God: and he is said to have induced the University of Paris to this — [namely] that no one could obtain a degree in theology in it, unless he first swore that he would defend this error, and perpetually adhere to it."

These testimonies of the fathers, if they be inspected according to the simple utterance of the words, seem to bear before them the error of the **Armenians** — condemned in the decretal epistles of Innocent the Third, and of Benedict the Eleventh, Roman pontiffs, and by the decree of the ecumenical Council of Florence, whose words are these: "WE DEFINE, that the souls of those who, after baptism received, have incurred no stain of sin at all, in-

[catchword "cur-" (incurrerunt) → continues on p. 573 (PDF 578).]

(printed p. 573 [PDF p. 578], recto — end of Ann. CCCXLV, then Ann. CCCXLVI–CCCXLVII, on Revelation 6, 11, 20 (the intermediate-state annotation concluded: the Council of Florence decree, and Sixtus's resolution — two states of beatitude, the soul-without-body vision before judgment [called by many patristic names] and the fuller consummated state after the resurrection; plus Benedict XI's decretal that John XXII, prevented by death, decreed nothing [Rev. 6:9]; whether Jeremiah is one of the two witnesses and not yet dead — Victorinus's view, refuted [Rev. 11:3]; and whether there are two resurrections and a golden thousand-year age between — Victorinus and the Chiliast/millenarian error, which Jerome ascribes to him [Rev. 20:6]). Read order: left column, then right.)

(left column — Annotation CCCXLV concluded, from the catchword "cur-":)

—[have] incurred [no stain of sin at all]; those also which, after the stain of sin contracted, have been purged — whether in their [own] bodies, or, stripped of those bodies, as was said above — [we define] to be soon received into heaven, and to behold clearly the very Lord, three and one, as he is; yet, according to the diversity of merits, one more perfectly than another. But the souls of those who depart in actual mortal sin, or in original [sin] alone, [we define] to descend soon to hell, [there] to be punished, however, with unequal penalties."

THUS FAR the decree of the council: to whose definition thou canst easily reduce some of the aforesaid opinions of the fathers, if thou observe that, of the blessed who enjoy the divine vision, there are two states of beatitude. The one, of the soul without the body, until the universal judgment; which the ancients, describing by various names, called the Bosom of Abraham, the Paradise taken away from the first parents, the Outer Altar, "Under the altar of God," the Vestibule of the saints, the Courts of God, the Storehouses of souls, the Hidden receptacles, the Custody of souls, the Rest of security, the Pledge [earnest] of the kingdom, the White Robe, the Obtained promises, and other [names] of this kind. But the other is the state of the soul, the body being resumed, after the judgment; which likewise they named by diverse appellations — the House of God, the Inner Altar, "Above the altar," the Higher [parts] of the heavens, the Consummation of glory, the Glory

of the resurrection, Perfect joy, the Reward of immortality, the Term of all goods, the whole [entire] rewards of merits, the Reward yet awaited, the Promises not yet received, the Future glory, the Time of the crowns, the Kingdom of fruition, and the rest like to these. Accordingly, when among the ancient doctors of the church thou readest that the souls of the just live either in the bosom of Abraham, or in the grove of Paradise, or under the altar of God, or in the hidden receptacles, and there await the rewards of the future glory: do not at once suspect that the souls of the saints lack the glory of the divine sight; but understand that they do not yet possess that perfect and consummated felicity, which they await after the resurrection of the body. For thus we too have interpreted the opinions of Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom, which thou hast above, Annotations 64 and 169 of book 5, and 264 of this book, and elsewhere.

But if there be any sayings of the holy authors which cannot bear an interpretation of this kind: remember, at least, that this error nothing hinders [detracts from] the erudition and piety of such illustrious fathers — since the church, in their times, had not yet established anything certain to be believed in this article.

FINALLY, lest any scruple reside in thy mind on account of the decree of Pope John XXII (whom we mentioned above to have assented to this error), know that it is not, among approved writers, in every way certain, [that] which Ockham — hostile to that same pontiff, and, in this [matter], condemned by the Council of Trent — wrote concerning him. Nay, there are not lacking authors of the greatest authority and faith who relate otherwise. Among these, **Benedict XI**, pontiff of the same name, in his decretal epistle, put on record that he [John XXII] could decree nothing concerning this matter, being prevented by death; thus speaking: "SOME TIME ago, in the time of John XXII, our predecessor of happy memory, among certain masters also of the theolog-*(right column:)* ical faculty, there arose a matter of question concerning the vision of the souls of just men after their death — whether they see the divine essence before the general judgment — and concerning certain other [matters]. And when the same our predecessor was preparing himself for the decision of contentions of this kind, in his public consistory — enjoining more strictly both upon his brethren, the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church (of whose number we then were), and upon the prelates and masters in theology, of whom many were present, that upon the aforesaid matter of the vision each one, deliberately, should say what he thought — nevertheless, prevented by death, as it pleased the Lord, he was unable to accomplish it."

Annotation CCCXLVI

"And I will give to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy 1,260 days, clothed in sackcloth." — Apocalypse 11[:3]

[margin: Whether Jeremiah is dead.]

Victorinus the Martyr, in the commentaries on this book, elucidating these [words], affirms that Jeremiah the prophet is not yet dead, [but] lives in Paradise, that thence, at the end of the world, he may come to preach penance, and be slain by Antichrist. His words are these: "MANY think that one of these witnesses is Elijah, or Elisha, or Moses: but these are [all] dead. But the death of Jeremiah is not found, *[margin: Jerem. 1]* because all our ancients handed down that he is [the] Jeremiah [meant]. For the very word which was made to him testifies, saying to him: 'Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth from the womb, I sanctified thee, and I set thee a prophet among the nations.' But among the nations he was not a prophet. And therefore the truthful word of the Lord necessarily has [it], that [what] he promised he should exhibit, [namely] that among the nations he should be a prophet." **Hilary** condemns this opinion, in the canon on Matthew 20. And the conjecture of Victorinus is frivolous. For [as to] that which God says, "I set thee a prophet among the nations," it is not so to be taken, as if God were about to send him outside Judaea to prophesy and preach in the regions of the nations; but that he should prophesy concerning the deeds of the nations. For he foretold the victories of the Assyrians against Israel, and the destruction also of their [own] kingdom.

Annotation CCCXLVII

"Blessed [is he] who has part in the first resurrection. In these shall be priests of God, and of Christ, and they shall reign with him a thousand years." — Apocalypse 20[:6]

[margin: Whether there are to be two [future] resurrections, and a golden age of a thousand years between the two.]

Victorinus of Pettau, expounding these [words] in the commentaries on the Apocalypse, is believed to have approved the error of the **Chiliasts** [Millenarians]: who say that there are to be two future resurrections of the flesh — the first, of the good; but the second, of the bad, after a thousand years; and that Christ, from the first even to the second resurrection, will remain on the earth, and there for a thousand years will reign with his saints and elect in the greatest peace, with an incredible felicity of all earthly delights flowing on every side. This the divine **Jerome** attributes to him in various places, but especially in a certain little preface, which [he set before] the commentaries on the Apo-

[signature "Bbb"; catchword "poca-" (Apocalypsim) → continues on p. 574 (PDF 579).]

---

*(printed p. 574 [PDF p. 579], verso — Ann. CCCXLVII concluded, on Revelation 20:6, and **the end of Liber Sextus**. Jerome's preface [to Anatolius] naming the ancient millenarians [Papias, Nepos, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Apollinaris, Severus, Sulpicius, Justin Martyr's* Dialogue with Trypho*]; then Sixtus's own investigation — the extant Victorinus commentary actually* refutes *Chiliasm [closing against Cerinthus], so either it is not Victorinus's, or the Jerome-titled preface is forged, or the absurd chiliast passage was removed and the present one substituted; and finally Sixtus's spiritual resolution of Rev. 20 — the two deaths, the two resurrections, and the thousand years = the whole age of evangelical grace from Christ's resurrection to the last day [cross-ref Ann. 233 of bk. 5]. Read order: left column, then right.)*

(left column — Annotation CCCXLVII concluded, from the catchword "poca-":)

—[to the commentaries on the] Apocalypse of this author he affixed [it], where he thus wrote to **Anatolius**: "DIVERS mishaps befall those crossing over the perils of the sea. If the throng of the winds be more vehement, there is dread: if the more moderate breeze ruffle the surfaces of the lying [calm] element, they [still] dread ambushes. So it seems to me in this — [namely] the volume thou hast sent, which, in the explanation of the Apocalypse, seems to contain [the work] of Victorinus: it is both perilous, and open to the barkings of detractors, to judge concerning the little works of an excellent man. For the earlier [author] **Papias**, bishop of Hierapolis, and **Nepos**, a bishop in the parts of Egypt, thought concerning the reign of a thousand years just as Victorinus [did]." Thus Jerome: who, in the preface of the eighteenth book on Isaiah, and in the fourth book on Jeremiah, reports that **Irenaeus**, bishop of Lyons, **Tertullian**, **Lactantius**, **Apollinaris**, **Severus**, **Sulpicius**, and a great multitude of catholic men, were in the opinion of Victorinus: in which I find also to have been **Justin**, philosopher and martyr, who, in the disputation held with Trypho, writes many [things] concerning the restoration of the terrestrial Jerusalem, and concerning the age of a thousand years — which, studying brevity, I pass over.

BUT as regards the opinion of Victorinus: when I myself had once and again pertinaciously unrolled the little commentary which now is circulated under his name on the Apocalypse, to search out this error, so far [is it] from [being the case] that I found [that] which Jerome fastens upon him, that I even, at the end of the little work, fell upon an open confutation of this very error; in which, when the author had catholicly discoursed [on] the proposed chapter of John, at last he concluded his commentary with these words: "THEREFORE they are not to be heard, who affirm that the reign of a thousand years is earthly — who think with Cerinthus the heretic." It is probable, either that the work is not Victorinus's, and that the preface prefixed to the volume under the title of Jerome is falsified [forged]; or that the absurd explanation of Victorinus was thence

removed — whether by Jerome, or by some other friendly reader — and, in place of it, that which now is had was substituted. BUT howsoever it happened, it appears that these most weighty men were deceived out of the foregoing words of the Apocalypse, wrongly understood by them; in which, concerning the twin resurrection, and the thousand years between the two, it is thus read: *(right column:)* "I SAW the souls of those beheaded for the word of God; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest [of the] dead lived not, until the thousand years be consummated. This is the first resurrection. Blessed [is] he who has part in the first resurrection. In these the second death has no power: but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And after a thousand years Satan shall be loosed, etc. And I saw the dead standing in the sight of the throne: and the dead were judged according to their works, etc. And this is the second death, etc." The obscurity of these words — which afforded so many and so great men an occasion of erring — will be illustrated by the clearest light, if we observe those three [things] here mentioned: namely, the twofold death, the twofold resurrection, and the space of a thousand years.

And so, the **first death** is the separation of the divine grace from the soul through sin. The **second death** [is] the exclusion of the soul from the life of eternal felicity, and [its] damnation to perpetual punishments. The **first resurrection** is the passage from the death of sin to the life of grace, and from the life of grace to the life of his [i.e. that eternal] glory — which souls, stripped of [their] bodies, shall possess until the day of judgment. The **second resurrection** is that universal re-formation of the whole human flesh, in which souls, [their] bodies being resumed, shall fully enjoy the doubled joy of felicity. The **space of a thousand years** — which often in the sacred letters is taken for an indefinite multitude of number — is the time of evangelical grace, from the resurrection of Christ even to the day of the last resurrection. The sense, therefore, of this revelation is: that the souls of the saints, for a thousand years — that is, until the day of judgment — shall reign with God in the first resurrection (namely, in the vision of the divine glory), their own bodies not yet received; and that they shall not be liable to the second death, which brings with it eternal punishments: but that at last, in the second universal resurrection, they shall be judged, together with all mortals, in the sight of the throne. And then, the judgment being completed, the souls of the saints, clothed with their [own] bodies, shall receive a doubled beatitude. But the wicked, in whom the first resurrection of grace and glory had no place, shall be punished with the second death — that is, with the perpetual torments of hell. To this pertain the [things] which we wrote copiously above, in Annotation 233 of the fifth book.

THE END OF THE SIXTH BOOK.

INDEX OF AUTHORS & INTERPRETERS

Ancient and modern writers discussed, censured, or cited in Book VI, with the annotations in which each appears. Annotation numbers are clickable.

Agrippa, Cornelius CCLXIV, CCLXXVI

Alcuin LXV

Ambrose of Compsa (Catharinus) CXXVIII, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXLIII, CLIX, CLXIX, CXCVII, CXCVIII, CCI, CCXVIII, CCXIX, CCXXV, CCLXI, CCLXII, CCLXIII, CCLXV, CCXCIV, CCCVII, CCCXXVII, CCCXXX, CCCXXXI, CCCXXXVII, CCCXXXIX, CCCXL, CCCXLII

Ambrose of Milan XIII, XXVI, LXXIII, CV, CIX, CXXXIV, CXXXVII, CXLVIII, CLVI, CLVIII, CLX, CLXI, CLXII, CLXIV, CXCVI, CCIX, CCXLV, CCCXI, CCCXLV

Ambrosiaster (pseudo-Ambrose) LXXXI, CCXXXVI, CCLI, CCLXXII, CCLXXIII, CCXCVIII, CCC, CCCXXIV

Anatolius CCCXLVII

Anselm CCXXXV, CCCXXIV, CCCXXV

Anselm of Laon CCLV

Apollinaris CCCXLVII

Aquinas, Thomas XLVII, LXII, LXXIV, XCV, XCVIII, CII, CXVII, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, CXLV, CXLVIII, CLXVII, CLXXV, CLXXXII, CXCV, CCVII, CCXIII, CCXVII, CCXLIX, CCLV, CCLVIII, CCCXI, CCCXXVIII, CCCXXXII, CCCXLI

Arator CCXXII, CCXXV

Arethas CCCXLV

Arnobius CXXXVI, CCXXXVII

Athanasius XXVI, LIII, LVI, CXXIII, CXXXIII, CLXXXVII

Augustine XIII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, LXIV, LXVIII, LXXVI, LXXXI, CIV, CV, CIX, CXXXVIII, CXLVI, CLVI, CLXVII, CLXXIII, CLXXIV, CLXXXVI, CXCIII, CXCIV, CXCV, CXCVI, CCVI, CCXIII, CCXX, CCXXI, CCXXXVI, CCXLI, CCXLVI, CCXLIX, CCLI, CCLII, CCLXV, CCLXXIV, CCLXXVIII, CCLXXX, CCLXXXI, CCLXXXIV, CCCXVII, CCCXL, CCCXLV

Basil LXVIII, LXXXV, CXI, CXLVIII, CLXXV, CCLXIII

Beatus Rhenanus CLIV

Bede LXII, CIX, CXXIV, CXLIII, CXLIV, CXLVI, CLIV, CLXII, CCVII, CCXXV, CCXXIX, CCCXXXIX, CCCXLI, CCCXLIII

Bernard CIX, CXXXIII, CXXXVII, CLVI, CCXXXIX, CCCXLV

Bertram CXCVI, CCLXXXIX

Bodius CVII

Boniface CLVI

Brie, Germain de CCLIII, CCLXXI

Bunderius, John (Bonderius) LXIX, CCXXI

Cajetan, Thomas de Vio XIII, XXXII, LII, LVII, LXI, LXII, LXXVII, LXXVIII, LXXIX, LXXXI, LXXXII, LXXXVI, CXI, CXXVIII, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXLIII, CLIX, CLXIX, CXCVII, CXCVIII, CCI, CCXVIII, CCXIX, CCXXV, CCXXVI, CCLX, CCLXI, CCLXII, CCLXIII, CCXCIV, CCCVII, CCCXXXI, CCCXXXIX, CCCXLII, CCCXLIV

Calvin, John LXXII, CCXXXIX, CCLXVIII, CCCXVII

Cassian, John XXXV, CLXXXIV, CCLXXIV

Castro, Alfonso de CXLVII, CLXIII, CCCXXIV, CCCXLV

Christian Druthmar CIX, CXII, CCXXXIX

Chromatius XXIII, XXV, XXVI, LXXXI

Chrysippus CCCXL

Chrysostom, John I, II, XI, XIII, XXIII, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXXI, XLI, XLVI, XLVII, LI, LVIII, LX, LXV, LXVII, LXXXI, LXXXVII, XCIII, CV, CVI, CIX, CXI, CXIII, CXVI, CXXI, CXXV, [unnum.], CXXXVIII, CXLIV, CLI, CLII, CLIII, CLV, CLVI, CLXV, CLXXI, CLXXIII, CLXXV, CLXXX, CLXXXII, CLXXXIII, CLXXXIV, CLXXXV, CC, CCVII, CCXXIII, CCXXIV, CCXXV, CCXXVII, CCXXXI, CCXXXII, CCXXXIV, CCXXXVI, CCXXXIX, CCXLII, CCXLIII, CCXLV, CCXLVII, CCLI, CCLIII, CCLVI, CCLVII, CCLIX, CCLXIII, CCLXIV, CCLXV, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII, CCLXXI, CCLXXIV, CCLXXXV, CCLXXXVIII, CCCIX, CCCX, CCCXI, CCCXII, CCCXIII, CCCXIV, CCCXV, CCCXVI, CCCXIX, CCCXXI, CCCXXII, CCCXXIV, CCCXXIX, CCCXXXII, CCCXXXIII, CCCXXXIV, CCCXXXV, CCCXXXVI, CCCXLV

Cleanthes CCCXL

Clement (of Alexandria) CXI, CXLVI, CCCXL

Clement of Rome LXVIII, CCCXLV

Cyril CXI, CLXXIII, CLXXV

Didymus of Alexandria CLXXXVII, CCLXV, CCLXXIV

Edward Lee CXI, CCI

Epiphanius XXVI, CXXII, CXLVI, CLXXXVII

Erasmus of Rotterdam LXVI, LXXV, LXXXIII, CVII, CXVI, CXXXIII, CXLVI, CLVI, CLXII, CCXX, CCXXXVI, CCLXXI

Eusebius CCVII, CCXXIX, CCCXL

Eusebius of Emesa CXLIV

Euthymius Zigabenus XXIII, XXV, XXVI, LIX, LX, LXXXI, CX, CXV, CXX, [unnum.], CXXXIX, CXLIV, CLXIII, CLXXIII, CLXXXII, CLXXXV, CLXXXVII, CCVIII, CCXI, CCCXLV

Ferus, John XL, XLIII, XLV, LV, LXXII, LXXXIX, CXV, CLVI, CLXXVIII, CLXXIX, CLXXXI, CXC, CXCI, CXCII, CCIX, CCX, CCXII, CCXIV, CCXV, CCXVI, CCLV

Gennadius CLXXXIV, CCCXI, CCCXL

George of Trebizond XCIII, CCXX

Gilbert XLVII

Godefridus Tilmannus CXXVII, CXXIX, CXXX

Gratian CLXI

Gregory VII, L, CIX, CLVI, CCXXXVI

Gregory of Nyssa CCCXXVIII

Gregory of Rimini CCLXXVIII

Gregory the Theologian CXLIV

Henry Hayton CXXXIV

Henry of Andernach XLII

Henry of Hesse CCXLIV

Hilary of Poitiers V, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXXV, LXII, LXVIII, LXXIII, LXXXI, XCI, XCVI, CV, CVII, CXIV, CXVIII, CXXVI, CLX, CLXIV, CLXXV, CCCXL, CCCXLVI

Hugh of Saint-Cher CXLV, CLVI

Irenaeus CCCXLV, CCCXLVII

Jacobus Faber CCXXXVI

Jacobus Sadoletus CCL

James the Apostle CXI

Jerome (of Stridon) III, XXV, XXVI, XXXI, LXIV, LXVIII, LXXI, LXXIV, LXXV, XCVI, CII, CV, CXIV, CXXI, CXXII, [unnum.], CXLIV, CL, CLII, CLX, CLXXIV, CCLI, CCLXVI, CCLXIX, CCLXX, CCLXXIV, CCLXXVII, CCLXXIX, CCLXXXII, CCLXXXIII, CCXCII, CCXCIII, CCXCV, CCXCVI, CCXCVII, CCXCIX, CCCI, CCCII, CCCIII, CCCIV, CCCV, CCCVIII, CCCXIII, CCCXVIII, CCCXXIII, CCCXXIV, CCCXXV, CCCXXVI, CCCXLVII

John Damascene XLVII, LXXXV, CLXXXVII

John Driedo LXIII

John Henten CXV, CCVIII

John of Torquemada LXXII

John Wycliffe CCCXVII

Justin CCCXLV, CCCXLVII

Juvencus CCXXII

Lactantius CCCXLV, CCCXLVII

Lanfranc CXCVI

Lombard, Peter (Master of the Sentences) CL, CLXIV, CLXXXVI, CXCIV, CXCVI, CCXXXV, CCXCIX

Lorenzo Valla CCXX

Lucian the Monk CCXXXI, CCXXXII, CCXXXIV, CCXXXVI, CCXXXIX, CCXLII, CCCXL

Luther, Martin CCLXXVII, CCLXXVIII, CCCXVII

Mark of Ephesus CXI

Maximus CLXI

Medina, Michael XL, CLXXIX, CXCI, CXCII, CCIX, CCX, CCXII, CCXIV, CCXV, CCXVI

Nepos CCCXLVII

Nicholas Cabasilas CXI

Nicholas of Lyra CLVII

Oecolampadius, John CXLVII, CCLXVI

Oecumenius XXVI, CCVII, CCXXII, CCXXV, CCXXVIII, CCLI, CCLXV, CCLXXIV, CCLXXV, CCCXXXV, CCCXXXVIII, CCCXL, CCCXLV

Origen VIII, XXVI, LVI, LXVI, LXVIII, LXIX, LXX, LXXXIII, CV, CIX, CXVII, CXIX, CXXII, CXXIV, CXXXV, CXXXVI, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, CXL, CXLII, CXLIX, CLVI, CLXV, CLXVI, CLXVIII, CLXX, CLXXI, CLXXII, CLXXV, CLXXVI, CLXXVII, CLXXXVIII, CLXXXIX, CXCIX, CCIII, CCIV, CCV, CCXXX, CCXXXIII, CCXLIX, CCLI, CCLIV, CCLXV, CCLXXIV, CCLXXXVI, CCXCI, CCCVI, CCCXLV

Papias CCXXII, CCCXLVII

Peter d'Ailly X

Philip Melanchthon LXXXI

Pope Adrian the Sixth CCCXLV

Pope Alexander the Third LXXII

Pope Benedict XI CCCXLV

Pope Gelasius the First LXXII

Pope Gregory CXLIV, CCXVII

Pope Gregory the Fifth LXXII

Pope Gregory the Fourth LXXII

Pope Gregory the Seventh LXXII

Pope Gregory the Third LXXII

Pope Hadrian the First LXXII

Pope John the Eighth LXXII

Pope John XXII CCCXLV

Pope Leo the Eighth LXXII

Pope Leo the Fourth LXXII

Pope Leo the Third LXXII

Pope Liberius CCX

Pope Nicholas the First LXXII

Pope Urban the Second LXXII

Pope Zacharias LXXXI

Pope Zacharias the First LXXII

Prepositinus XLVII

Primasius CCLXIX

Procopius of Gaza XIII

Prosper CLXXXIV

Prudentius XLI, CCCXLV

Rabanus CIX

Rufinus CCLXXXVII, CCXC

Rupert XLVII

Sanctes Pagninus CCXLIII

Sedulius Scotus CCLI, CCXCIX, CCCXVIII, CCCXXIV

Servetus CCXXXVI

Severus CCCXLVII

Socrates CCLXVI

Soto, Domingo de XLIII, CLXXVIII, CLXXIX, CLXXXI, CXC, CXCII, CCIX, CCX, CCXII, CCXIV, CCXVI, CCXLVIII

St. Augustine CV, CCLI

Stanislaus Pannonius CCXC

Strabo XXXIII, XCVIII

Sulpicius CCCXLVII

Sulpicius Severus CLVI

Tertullian XXXV, LXXXI, CXXXVII, CCCXLV, CCCXLVII

Theodoret CLXV, CLXXXII, CCXXXVII, CCLI, CCLVIII, CCCXX, CCCXXVIII, CCCXXXIV, CCCXXXV, CCCXLV

Theodulus CCLI

Theognostus LVI

Theophylact XXIII, XXV, XXVI, LVIII, LXIV, LXVIII, LXXXI, XCIX, [unnum.], CXXXI, CXXXIII, CXXXVIII, CXLIV, CXLVII, CLVI, CLX, CLXII, CLXIII, CLXXIII, CLXXXII, CLXXXV, CLXXXVII, CXCIV, CCII, CCV, CCXXII, CCLI, CCLXIII, CCLXXIV, CCCXXXIV, CCCXXXV, CCCXLV

Ulphilas CLII

Victorinus CCCXLV, CCCXLVI, CCCXLVII

Vida, Marco Girolamo (of Alba) CCLXXVI

Vincent of Lérins CIV

Waldensis, Thomas CCCXVII, CCCXXIV

William XLVII

William of Ockham CCCXLV

William of Saint-Amour CCCXVII

William Opembacchius CXXXIV

Zeno CCCXL

SUBJECT INDEX

Topics treated in Book VI, grouped by area. Many annotations appear under more than one subject. Annotation numbers are clickable.

GOD, TRINITY, CHRIST

Christology (Christ's person, natures, soul, body) X, XIII, XVIII, XXX, LI, LXI, LXXIV, XCII, XCVIII, CV, CX, CXI, CXIV, CXVIII, CXIX, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXVI, [unnum.], CXXXI, CXXXIV, CXXXVIII, CXXXIX, CXLI, CXLIII, CXLIV, CXLV, CXLVI, CLI, CLX, CLXII, CLXIV, CLXX, CLXXXV, CLXXXVI, CXCVI, CCI, CCIV, CCXIII, CCXVIII, CCXLIV, CCXCIII, CCXCIX, CCCXX, CCCXXIX, CCCXXXI

Knowledge of God; divine attributes & the mysteries CLXVII, CLXXXII, CCXVII, CCXXXI, CCCXII

Procession of the Holy Spirit / Filioque CLXXII, CLXXV, CLXXVI, CLXXXVII, CLXXXVIII, CCVIII, CCXI, CCCXXVIII

The Trinity; equality of the divine persons VI, XIV, XV, XVI, XXXIX, XLIV, LXXXVIII, XCIV, C, CIII, CLXIX, CLXXI, CCXXXV, CCCXLII

GRACE, JUSTIFICATION, PREDESTINATION

Free will; the beginning of salvation CLXXXIV, CCLXXVIII, CCCXXXIII

Justification; faith & works; 'faith alone' XLIII, LI, CLXXVIII, CLXXIX, CXC, CXCI, CXCII, CXCIV, CC, CCIX, CCX, CCXII, CCXV, CCXVI, CCXXXII, CCXXXIII, CCXXXIV

Merit; grace, nature & impeccability XX, XL, XLVI, LXIII, LXXXVII, LXXXIX, XCVII, XCIX, CI, CVII, CLXXXI, CCLI, CCLV, CCLVII, CCLXX, CCLXXXI, CCLXXXV

Original sin CCIX, CCXXXVI, CCXXXVII, CCXXXVIII, CCXL, CCXLII, CCXLV, CCCIX

Predestination, reprobation & foreknowledge XLVI, LII, XCIX, CCXIV, CCXIX, CCXXX, CCXLVIII, CCXLIX, CCL, CCLI, CCLII, CCLXX, CCLXXXV

CHURCH, MINISTRY, AUTHORITY

Bishop, presbyter & holy orders CCXXV, CCC, CCCI, CCCXVIII, CCCXIX, CCCXXIV, CCCXXV

Clergy: temporal power, immunity & possessions XXXVI, LXXII, LXXV, LXXVI, XCV, CXXI, CXLVIII, CCCXXI

Heresy: coercion, excommunication & anathema LX, LXXVIII, CCLXVII

Papal primacy (Peter & Paul) LXXII, CXVIII, CLX, CCVI, CCXXI, CCLIII, CCLXIX, CCLXXI, CCLXXIV, CCLXXV

The Church: its nature, marks & members XXXVIII, XLII, LXVIII, LXIX, CIV, CCCV

The power of the keys; priestly absolution XLV, LV, LXX, LXXI, CVIII, CCII

SACRAMENTS

Baptism; rebaptism; unbaptized catechumens XI, XII, XVII, CCIX, CCCXI

Extreme unction CCCXXXIX

Matrimony as a sacrament IV, XXIII, CCCVII

Penance, confession & the remission of sins XXVIII, LVI, LVII, CXIX, CXLII, CLIII, CLIV, CLV, CLXI, CXCIX, CCII, CCXVIII, CCLXI, CCLXXXVIII, CCCXXXVI, CCCXLIII

The Eucharist; communion under both kinds XXI, LXVI, CXI, CXII, CXIII, CXCIII, CXCV, CXCVI, CXCVII, CCLXVIII, CCLXXXIX

THE LAST THINGS

End of the world; the state & conflagration of the heavens LXXIII, CCXLV, CCCXXX, CCCXXXIV, CCCXL, CCCXLI

Hell; eternity of punishment; apocatastasis XLI, CCXLVII, CCXLVIII, CCLXXXII, CCXC, CCXCV

Purgatory & the expiatory fire CCLIV, CCLVIII, CCLIX

Resurrection of the body; whether all die; the millennium XCI, CLI, CCLXV, CCCXLVI, CCCXLVII

The intermediate state; whether souls see God before judgment XC, CCLXIV, CCCXXXV, CCCXLV

ANGELS, DEMONS & THE SOUL

Angels (nature, orders, guardian angels) VII, LIII, LXV, LXXVII, CXXXV, CXLII, CXLIX, CL, CLIX, CLXV, CLXX, CLXXXIX, CCXCII, CCXCVI, CCXCIX, CCCII, CCCVIII, CCCXIII, CCCXX, CCCXXIII

Demons (their bodies; whether restored or saved) XIX, CXVII, CCXCIV, CCXCV, CCXCVIII, CCCII

The human being: body, soul & bodily goods XXXV, XXXVII, XLVIII, LXXXIV

ORIGENIST ERRORS

Pre-existence & imprisonment of souls CLXVI, CLXXVII, CLXXXVI, CCIII, CCIV, CCLXXXVI, CCLXXXVII, CCXCI, CCXCVII

Restoration of all (apocatastasis) LXVII, CCCIII, CCCVI

Stars ensouled; God the 'form' of things; sin as 'nothing' CLXVII, CLXVIII, CLXXIV, CCXCIII

SAINTS, MARY, VENERATION

Invocation, intercession & merits of the saints XLVII, LXXXV, CLXIII, CCXXVII, CCLXXX, CCLXXXIII, CCCX, CCCXXXV, CCCXLV

Mariology; the Holy Family; the 'brethren of the Lord' II, III, V, LVIII, LIX, LXII, LXIV, [unnum.], CXXXIII, CXXXVI, CXXXVII, CXXXVIII, CXXXIX, CXL, CLXXXV, CCXXVIII, CCLXXII

Relics, images & amulets CII, CCXLVI

SCRIPTURE

Canon & canonicity CCLXII, CCCXXVII, CCCXXXVII, CCCXLIV

Clarity vs. obscurity of Scripture CCCXVI

Reading heretical books; the Index CCLXVI

Text-criticism, authenticity & punctuation LXI, CXXIX, CXXXII, CXLIII, CLXXIII, CXCVIII, CCXX, CCXXVI, CCXLI, CCXLV, CCLXXVII

Vernacular Bible reading; who may read Scripture I, CLII, CLXXX, CLXXXIII, CCLXIII, CCCXV

MORALS, DISCIPLINE, SOCIETY

Blasphemy & its punishment CCCXXII

Christian ethics: love, injury & forgiveness XXVII, XXXII, XXXIV, CCLXXXIV

Magic, astrology & superstition IX

Magic, witchcraft, astrology & the evil eye VIII, IX, X, CCLXXVI, CCCXIV

Marriage, divorce & impediments XXII, XXIV, LXIV, LXXIX, LXXX, LXXXI, LXXXII, CCLX

Monastic life, manual labor & mendicancy XVIII, XXXIII, LXXXVI, CXXVIII, CXLVII, CCLXXIX, CCCXVII, CCCXXXII

Oaths & swearing XXV, XXVI, CXXIII, CCXXIII, CCXXIV, CCXXXIX, CCCXXXVIII

Prayer, liturgy & worship XXIX, XXXI, XCVI, CCCIV, CCCXI, CCCXXVI

The Law: Mosaic & natural LIV, LXXIX, CI, CCXLIII, CCLXXIII

War, the sword, trade & almsgiving LXXXIII, XCV, CVI, CXV, CXVI, CLVI, CLVII, CLVIII, CCLVI

BIBLICAL HISTORY, PERSONS & REALIA

Gospel history, persons & antiquities XLIX, L, LXII, XCII, XCIII, CIX, CXX, CXXII, CXXIV, CXXVII, CXXX, CXLIII, CXLIV, CXLV, CXLVI, CCV, CCVII, CCXXII, CCXXIX

INDEX OF COUNCILS & CANONS

Church councils cited in Book VI. Annotation numbers are clickable.

Council of Trent X, XL, XLI, XLIII, XLV, LVIII, LXX, LXXXI, CLII, CLXXIX, CCXIV, CCXV, CCXVI, CCXVIII, CCXXXI, CCXXXII, CCXXXIII, CCXXXVI, CCXXXVIII, CCXXXIX, CCLX, CCLXI, CCLXVI, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII, CCLXXVI, CCLXXVIII, CCCXXIV, CCCXXXVII, CCCXXXIX, CCCXL, CCCXLV

Council of Florence CXI, CLXXXVII, CCLXIX, CCCXLV

Council of Constance XXVI, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII, CCCXVII

Council of Basel CCLV, CCLIX, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII

Council of Nicaea XVII, CI

Lateran Council CLXXXVII

Fourth Council of Carthage CCLXV, CCLXVI

First Council of Braga CCCX, CCCXI

INDEX OF HERESIES & CENSURED OPINIONS

Heretical sects, heresiarchs, and censured opinions refuted or corrected in Book VI. Annotation numbers are clickable.

Anabaptists XXVI, CCXXXVI, CCLXIII, CCLXIV, CCLXXXVIII, CCXC, CCCXLI, CCCXLV

Arians XIII, XV, XVI, XXXIX, XLIV, XCI, CV, CLXVI, CLXXI, CLXXV, CCX, CCXIII, CCCXXIX

Armenians (on the beatific vision) CXI, CXIII, CLII, CLXIII, CCLVIII, CCLXIII, CCLXIV, CCCXLI, CCCXLV

Bertram / Ratramnus (on the Eucharist) CXCIV, CXCVI, CCLXXXVIII, CCLXXXIX

Calvin XI, LXXII, CXCVI, CCI, CCVI, CCXXXIX, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII, CCLXIX, CCCXVII

Cerinthus CCCXLVII

Chiliasts / Millenarians LXXIII, LXXXI, CCLXIV, CCCXXIII, CCCXLV, CCCXLVII

Erasmus (censured) XXVII, LXVI, LXXV, LXXVI, CXI, CXVI, CXXIV, CXXXIII, CLVI, CLXII, CCI, CCXIX, CCXX, CCXXXVI, CCLV

Errors of Cajetan (censured) IX, XIII, XVIII, XXXII, LII, LVII, LXXVIII, LXXXI, LXXXII, LXXXVI, XCVII, CI, CXI, [unnum.], CXXVIII, CXXXI, CXXXII, CXLIII, CLIX, CLXIX, CXCVI, CXCVII, CXCVIII, CCI, CCXVI, CCXVIII, CCXIX, CCXXII, CCLX, CCLXI, CCLXIII, CCXC, CCXCIV, CCCVII, CCCXXIV, CCCXXVII, CCCXXVIII, CCCXXXI, CCCXXXVII, CCCXXXIX, CCCXLI, CCCXLII, CCCXLIV

Lutherans / Luther XVI, XXVI, XXVII, XXXVIII, XL, XLIII, XLV, LX, LXIX, LXXI, LXXXVI, CLIV, CLXXVIII, CLXXIX, CXCI, CXCVII, CCII, CCIX, CCX, CCXII, CCXIX, CCXXI, CCXXXIII, CCXXXIX, CCLX, CCLXIII, CCLXVII, CCLXVIII, CCLXXVI, CCLXXVII, CCLXXVIII, CCCI, CCCV, CCCVII, CCCX, CCCXII, CCCXV, CCCXVII

Macedonians (pneumatomachi) XV, CIV, CLXXIII, CCLXXXVIII, CCCXXIV

Manichaeans CLVI, CLXXIV

Marcion / Marcionites IV, LXXXI, CCCXLV

Novatians LVI, CIV, CXV, CXIX, CCLXXXVI, CCLXXXVIII

Origenism (see also Origenist errors under Subjects) XLVII, CCLIX, CCLXXXII, CCLXXXVI, CCLXXXVII, CCLXXXVIII, CCXC, CCXCI, CCCI, CCCII

Paul of Samosata XVII, CCCXXIX

Pelagians XCVI, CI, CLXXXII, CLXXXIV, CCXX, CCXXX, CCXXXVI, CCXXXVIII, CCLI, CCLV, CCLVII, CCLXXVIII, CCLXXXII, CCLXXXV, CCLXXXVIII, CCXC

Sabellius / Sabellians CIV, CCCXXIX

Stanislaus Pannonius (Anabaptist) CCLXXXVIII, CCXC

Vigilantius CCLXXXII, CCLXXXIII